

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY  
**REFERENCE**

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL,  
THEOLOGICAL and  
ECCLESIASTICAL  
LITERATURE

**Mead, Matthew - Mephibosheth**

*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**

## Mead, Matthew

an English divine, was born in Buckinghamshire in 1629. Of his early history we know but little. He first came prominently into public notice during the Cromwellian movement. Mead identified himself with the cause of the Independents, and was appointed by the Protector to the living of Shadwell in 1658. Four years later he was ejected for nonconformity, and removed to Holland, in common with many other ministers of that age. He became acquainted with the duke of Orange, and was greatly favored by him and the States. Afterwards he returned to England, and gathered about him one of the largest congregations in London. He settled at Stepney as pastor of a dissenting congregation in 1674, and the community betokened their love and esteem for him by presenting him with building material for a new chapel. He died in 1699. Matthew Mead, whom his friend and associate, Howe (*Funeral Sermon* for Mead), describes as “that very reverend and most laborious servant of Chris,” was as indefatigable in Christian work as he was amiable in spirit, and, in consequence of his mild temperament and the moderation of his opinions, formed the strongest personal link between the Presbyterians and Independents of England in the second half of the 17th century. Among his publications are, *The Almost Christian*, or seven sermons on ~~4038~~ Acts 26:28 (Loud. 1666, 8vo):-- *The Almost Christian Discovered* (1684, 4to; Glasgow, 1755, 12mo; with Essay by Dr. Young of Perth, Lond. 1825; 1849, 12mo):--*Life and Death of Nathaniel Mather* (1689, 8vo):--*Vision of the Wheels* sermon on ~~3003~~ Ezekiel 10:13 (1689, 4to). See Calamy, *Nonconformists*; Skeats, *Hist. of the Free Churches of England*, p. 167 Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.* 2:1257.

## Mead, Richard

a distinguished English physician, who was born at Stepney in 1673, and after studying at the most eminent medical schools on the Continent, returned and settled in England, and became one of the most celebrated practitioners of his time, wrote a treatise on the diseases mentioned in Scripture, entitled *Medicina Sacra, seu de morbis insignioribus qui in Bibliis memorantur* (Lond. 1749, 8vo; republished at Amsterdam, 1749, 8vo). A translation of this work was made by Dr. T. Stark, and was published with a memoir of the author (Lond. 1755, 8vo). Dr. Mead died in 1754. See Alliboué, *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Biog.* s.v.

## Mead, Stith

an early Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Bedford County, Va., Sept. 25, 1767; was converted in 1789, and feeling called of God to preach the Gospel, entered the itinerancy in 1793; was located in 1816; readmitted superannuate in 1827, and died in 1835. Mr. Mead was eminently useful as a preacher, and particularly conspicuous in the great revivals of his time, yet remembered in the Southern States. See *Minutes of Conferences*, 2:347.

## Mead Zechariah

a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born at Greenwich, Conn., some time in the first half of our century (perhaps 1802), and was educated at Yale College (class of 1825). He was ordained priest at Norfolk, Va., May 22, 1831; became rector of Grace Church, Boston, Mass.; from 1837-1840 was editor of the *Southern Churchman*, published at Richmond, Va.; and died Nov. 27, 1840. See *General Catal. of the Divinity School of Yale College*, p. 7.

## Meade, William, D.D.

a noted prelate of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born at Millwood, Clarke County, Nov. 11, 1789, his father being Colossians Richard K. Meade, aide-de-camp to Genesis Washington, and was connected both by birth and marriage with some of the oldest and best families in Virginia. His great-grandfather was an Irish Romanist, who came to this country, married a Quakeress in Flushing, L. I., and removed to Virginia. His grandmother was a descendant of Richard Kidder, bishop of Bath and Wells. William was educated at Princeton College, N. J. (class of 1808); was ordained deacon by bishop Madison, Feb. 24, 1811, in Williamsburg, Va.; and priest by bishop Claggett, in St. Paul's Church, Alexandria. He commenced his ministry in his own native parish, Frederick (now Clarke) Comity, as assistant to the Revelation Alexander Balmaine; in the fall of 1811 he took charge of Christ Church, Alexandria. where he remained two years, when he returned to Millwood, and, on the death of Mr. Balmaine, became rector of that Church. In 1826 he was a candidate as assistant bishop in Pennsylvania, but failed by one vote of nomination by the clergy; and in the following year the Revelation H. U. Onderdonk, D.D., was elected. In 1823 he was elected assistant bishop to bishop Moore, and was consecrated Aug. 19, 1829, in St. James's Church, Philadelphia, by bishops

White, Hobart, Griswold, Moore, Croes, Brownell, and H. U. Onderdonk. On the death of bishop Moore, Nov. 11, 1841, he became bishop of the diocese of Virginia. In this capacity he labored unceasingly, up to the hour of his death, March 14, 1862, for the good of evangelical Christianity. He advanced the interests of his Master's cause not only in the pulpit, but in many and various ways he labored for the good of humanity. Several educational and missionary societies owe their origin to him, and the Theological School of Virginia, lately at Alexandria, was largely indebted to him for its existence (though the plan of a theological seminary in Virginia was not original with him). He gave to, this school of the prophets his personal care and labors, nearly to the close of his life. During the exciting days of 1861 bishop Meade made many fervent though futile efforts to save Virginia from the troubles of the impending civil war. He steadfastly opposed secession to the very last. Taken altogether, but few men in the nation have enjoyed the confidence of the people to a greater degree than did this honest ecclesiastic, who sought in more ways than one to serve his day and generation as a truly Christian man. For years before his death bishop Meade was the recognized head of the evangelical branch of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States. On bishop Meade's ecclesiastical position, the *Church Review* (July, 1862) thus comments: "The gross worldliness, and even the open immorality of many of the early clergy of Virginia; the moral-essay style of preaching which characterized many of the missionaries; the French infidelity introduced during the Revolution, and the absence of that bitter opposition to Church principles which was, and even now is waged in the Northern States, led the bishop to regard as not only mainly, but only important, the development of the subjective in religion. His 'extraordinary will,' as the *Episcopal Recorder* calls it, and his Calvinistic doctrines, led him to separate evangelical truth from apostolic order, and to make him, we doubt not an honest, but a most determined. opponent to any earnest presentation of the positive institutions of Christianity." Bishop Meade was buried from St. Paul's Church, Richmond, March 17. His principal published works. are, *Family Prayer* (1834):-*Lectures on the Pastoral Office*, and *Lectures to Students* (1849): -*Old Churches and Families in Virginia* (Philad. 1856, 2 vols. 8vo):-*The Bible and the Classics* (1861, 12mo). Besides these, he also published *Memorials of [his] 'Two Beloved Wives*, which the *Church Review* informs us was suppressed. His controversial writings are numerous. See *Life*, by bishop Johns (Baltimore, 1868). (J.H.W.)

## Meadow

a term used in the A. V. as the translation of two Hebrews words, neither of which seems to have this meaning, although terms otherwise rendered doubtless have. *SEE ABEL.*

1. <sup><0412></sup>Genesis 41:2 and 18. Here the word in the original is **אֲחוּ** (*ah*;(with the definite article), *ha-Achu*. It appears to be an Egyptian term, literally transferred into the Hebrew text, as it is also into that of the Alexandrian translators, who give it as **ἄχαι**. (This is the reading- of Codex A. Codex B, if we may accept the edition of Mai, has **ἔλαος**; so also the rendering of Aquila and Symmachus, and of Josephus [*Ant.* 2:5, 5]. Another version, quoted in the fragments of the Hexapla, attempts to reconcile sound and sense by **ὄχθη**. The Veneto-Greek has **λειμών**.) The same form is retained. by the Coptic version. Its use in <sup><3881></sup>Job 8:11(A.V. “flag”)-where it occurs as a parallel to *gome* (A.V. “rush”), a word used in <sup><0113></sup>Exodus 2:3 for the “bulrushes” of which Moses’s ark was composed-seems to show that it is not a “ meadow,” but some kind of reed or water plant. This the Sept. supports, both by rendering in. the latter passage **βούτομον**, and also by introducing **ἄχι** as the equivalent of the word rendered “paper reeds” in <sup><2397></sup>Isaiah 19:7. Jerome, in his commentary on the passage, also confirms this meaning. He states that he was informed by learned Egyptians that the word *achi* denoted in their tongue any green thing that grew in a marsh-*omne quod in palude virens nascitur*. But, as during high inundations of the Nile-such inundation’s as are the cause of fruitful years-the whole of the land on either side is a marsh, and as the cultivation extends up to the very lip of the river, is it not possible that *Achu* may denote the herbage of the growing crops? The fact that the cows of Pharaoh’s vision were feeding there would seem to be as strong a figure as could be presented to an Egyptian of the extreme fruitfulness of the season: so luxuriant was the growth on either side of the stream, that the very cows fed among it unmolested. The lean kine on the other hand, merely stand on the dry brink. *SEE NILE*, No one appears yet to -have attempted to discover on the spot what the Signification of the term is. *SEE REED.*

2. <sup><0123></sup>Judges 20:33 only: “the meadows of Gibeah.” Here the word is **הַרְמֵי מַאֲרֵחַ** (*Maareh*’, which occurs nowhere else with the same vowels attached to it. The sense is thus doubly uncertain. “Meadows” around Gibeah can certainly never have existed: the nearest approach to that sense

would be to take *maareh* as meaning an open plain. This is the dictum of Gesenius (*Thesaur.* p. 1069), on the authority of the Targum. It is also adopted by De Wette (“Die Plane von G.”). But, if an open plain, where could the ambush have concealed itself? *SEE PLAIN.*

The Sept., according to the Alex. MS. (the Vatican Codex transfers the word literally- *Μαραγαβέ*), read a different Hebrew word— *br[mi]*— “from the west of Gibeah.” Tremellius, taking the root of the word in a figurative sense, reads “after Gibeah had been left open,” i.e. by the quitting of its inhabitants-*post denudationem Gibhoe*. This is adopted by Bertheau (*Kurzgef. Handb.* ad loc.). But the most plausible interpretation is that of the Peshito-Syriac, which by a slight difference in the vowel-points makes the word *tr[m]*, “the cave;” a suggestion quite in keeping with the locality, which is very suitable for caves, and also with the requirements of the ambush. The only thing that can be said against this is that the liers-in-wait were “set round about” Gibeah, as if not in one spot, but several. *SEE GIBEAH.*

## Me’ah

(Hebrews *Meah* *hamēa* hundred, as often; Sept. *ἑκατόν, Μεά*; Vulg. *centum, Emnath*), a tower in Jerusalem, situated on the eastern wall (<sup><1018></sup>Nehemiah 3:1; 12:39), probably at the north-eastern angle of the Temple enclosure (Strong’s *Harmony and Expos. of the Gospels*, Append. ii, p. 19; but it is not likely that the outer wall was different from that of the Temple, as supposed by Dr. Barclay, *City of the Great King*, p. 152). *SEE JERUSALEM.*

## Meal

(*j mīq*, *ke’mach*, in pause *j mī\* q*, prob. *fat*, i.e.. *marrow*; hence the *fatness* of wheat or barley, i.e.. its ground substance, <sup><1018></sup>Genesis 18:6; <sup><1015></sup>Numbers 5:15; <sup><1042></sup>1 Kings 4:22; 17:12,14,-16; <sup><1041></sup>2 Kings 4:41; <sup><1324></sup>1 Chronicles 12:40; <sup><2302></sup>Isaiah 47:2; <sup><2007></sup>Hosea 8:7; “*flour*,” as elsewhere rendered, <sup><10124></sup>1 Samuel 1:24; 28:24; <sup><10728></sup>2 Samuel 17:28; Gr. *ἄλευρον*, <sup><10133></sup>Matthew 13:33; <sup><121></sup>Luke 13:21; also *tl sōso’leth*, *stripped* of its bran, the finest portion of the ground grain, <sup><10186></sup>Genesis 18:6 [where it stands after the preceding term, in apposition]; elsewhere “*flour*” or “*fine flour*,” Sept. *σεμίδαλις*), the ground produce of any species of grain. *SEE*

**GRITS.** This is usually prepared in the East by females in hand-mills. **SEE FLOUR.**

## Meals

**SEE DINE; SEE REPAST; SEE SUP;** and the article following.

## Meal-Time

(**Ι κατ** [**ε**eth o'kel, the season of eating, <sup><8214></sup>Ruth 2:14). That the Hebrews took their principal meal (*coena, supper*) in the latter part of the afternoon or towards evening, follows as well from the circumstance that banquets and convivial entertainments generally (perhaps always) occurred near the close of the day (sometimes being continued far into the night, Josephus, *Life*, 44), as from the custom still prevalent in the East (Wellsted, *Trav.* 1:113; the Persians sup about six or seven o'clock), a usage to which the Essenes were an exception (Josephus, *War*, 2:8, 5). **SEE FEAST.** The agricultural and laboring portion of the community, however, probably took their principal meal at noon (<sup><1206></sup>1 Kings 20:16). **SEE DINE.** In the forenoon a slight repast was partaken (*breakfast*, **ἄριστον**, comp. <sup><1412></sup>Luke 14:12; <sup><422></sup>John 21:22). Among the later Jews, it was usual for the deeply religious not to taste anything before the hour of morning prayer (comp. <sup><425></sup>Acts 2:15; see Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* ad loc.; the passage in *Berach.* fol. 27:2, quoted by Kuinol, refers to the blessing before eating, see *Gemar. Bab.* 6:1,1); on the Sabbath, the synagogue worship led to the rule of not eating before the sixth hour, or noon. Before each meal, persons were accustomed, especially in later times, carefully to wash (<sup><132></sup>Matthew 15:2; <sup><213></sup>Luke 11:38; <sup><102></sup>Mark 6:2; see the younger Buxtorf's *Dissert. philol. theol.* p. 397 sq.), like the ancient Greeks (*Hiad.* 10:577; *Odyss.* 1:136 sq.; 4:216 sq.; Aristoph. *Vesp.* 1216) and the modern Orientals (Niebuhr, *Beschr.* p. 54; Shaw, *Trav.* p. 202), and also to "say grace". (**ηκρβ** *the blessing, εὐλογία, εὐχαριστία;* <sup><149></sup>Matthew 14:19; 15:36; 26:26; <sup><396></sup>Luke 9:16 <sup><421></sup>John 6:11; comp. <sup><5013></sup>1 Timothy 4:3; see the Gemara, *Berach.* p. 278; and the rabbinical tract, *Berachoth*, p. 6-18; also Kuinol's *De precum ante et post cibum ap. Jud. et Christian. antiquitate*, Lips. 1764). While eating the Hebrews originally *sat* (<sup><1279></sup>Genesis 27:19; Hengstenberg, *Mos.* p. 36, incorrectly infers their recumbency at table from <sup><1804></sup>Genesis 18:4; comp. <sup><796></sup>Judges 19:6; <sup><1115></sup>1 Samuel 20:5, 24; <sup><1133></sup>1 Kings 13:20), like the Greeks in the heroic period (*Hiad.* 10:578; *Odyss.* 1:144; 15:134; Athen. 8:363; 11:459), and the

Romans anciently (Serv. *ad AEn.* 7:176; Varro, *Ling. Lat.* 1, p. 236: Bip.; see Becker, *Charikl.* 1:425), and in this posture are the early Egyptians represented on the monuments (Wilkinson, 2:201). In later times the practice of reclining (**ἀνακείσθαι, κατακείσθαι, κατακλίνεσθαι**, see the Mishna, *Berach.* 6:6) on cushions or divans (**τ/φμακλίνας**, Xen. *Cyrop.* 8:8, 16; **κατακλίματα**, Josephus. *Ant.* 15:9, 3; comp. A. Baccins, *De conviv. antiq.* ii, sq., in Gronov. *Thesaur.* ix), at first only in special entertainments (<sup><308></sup>Amos 6:4 comp. 2:8; <sup><409></sup>Matthew 9:10; 26:7; <sup><402></sup>Mark 6:22; 14:3; Luke v. 29; 7:37; 14:10; <sup><812></sup>John 12:2; 13:23, etc.), but eventually in common life (<sup><270></sup>Luke 17:7), without any particular invitation to that effect (*Terent. Heautont.* 1:1, 72; *Plant. Trucul.* 2:14, 16; Martial; 3:50, 3; comp. Plat. *Conviv.* p. 213), and universally (see H. Mercurialis, *Diss. de accubitu triclinio*, in his *Ars gymnast.* p. 75 sq.). **SEE ACCUBATION.** Every such divan or dinner-bed accommodated (according to Roman fashion) three persons (*triclinium* [Plin. 37:6], a prevalent form of luxury [Plin. 33:52; Josephus, *Ant.* 15:9, 3; Philo, 2:478], introduced from the Babylonians, who used a carpet or tapestry over it [Plin. 8:74], whence: the terms descriptive of *spreading* it [*sternere*, Cic. *Mur.* 36; Macrob. *Sat.* 2:9; **στρωννύειν**, Xen. *Cyrop.* 8:3, 6; which explains the **ἀνάγαιον ἐστρωμένον** of <sup><414></sup>Mark 14:15; see generally Ciacon. *De triclinio*, Amst. 1699]), sometimes as many as five, who leaned upon the left arm, the feet being stretched out behind. Each one on the right touched with the back of his head the breast of his left neighbor, whence the phrase “to lie in one’s bosom” (**ἀνακείσθαι ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ**, <sup><813></sup>John 13:23; 21:20), as being the place of the spouse (among the Jews, however, wives ate sitting, which the Romans generally held to be the most becoming attitude, Isidor. *Orig.* 20:11; comp. Sueton. *Claud.* 32; Val. Max. 2:1, 2; the “sitting at the feet” in <sup><219></sup>Luke 10:39, was not an act of participation in the meal), a friend, or a favorite (Plin. *Ep.* 4:22; see Kype, *Observ.* 1:402; comp. Talm. Babyl. *Berach.* 7:2, 5); the place of honor being in the middle of the three (Talm. Hieros. *Taanith*, Ixviii, i; comp. Potter, *Archceol.* 2:661). The tables (comp. <sup><119></sup>1 Samuel 20:29; <sup><107></sup>2 Samuel 9:7 11; <sup><105></sup>1 Kings 10:5; <sup><390></sup>Ezekiel 39:20; <sup><221></sup>Luke 22:21; <sup><416></sup>Acts 16:34, etc.) were probably, as still in the East (Mariti, *Trav.* p. 283; Shaw, *Trav.* p. 202; Mayr, *Schicksale*, 1:51; Robinson, *Researches*, 2:726), low (among modern Orientals consisting of a round skin [*sufra*] or reed-mat, Rttippel, *Abyssin.* 2:85, spread on the floor in the middle of the room, Arvieux, *Voyage*, iii 237; Pococke, *East*, 1:292; Harmar, *Observ.* 2:453, or on ‘a stool, and furnished with rings on the edge, so that after the meal it may be

folded together, and hung up like a bag, the food being laid on mats, or upon cloths covering it, comp. Niebuhr, *Trav.* 1:372; Paulus, *Samml.* 3:101), as appears likewise from the pattern of the table of show-bread. **SEE TABLE.** Meat and vegetables, the first cut into small pieces (the loins and shoulders affording what were regarded as choice morsels, <sup><3204></sup>Ezekiel 24:4), were set on the table in large platters, out of which each guest took his share with his fingers upon the flat pieces of bread, and ate without either knife or fork (comp. Zorn, in the *Miscell. Duisburg.* 2:437' sq.; Mariti, *Trav.* p.284); or was sometimes helped by the host (<sup><0004></sup>1 Samuel 1:4; comp. <sup><3123></sup>John 13:26; Xen. *Cyrop.* 1:3, 7). The pieces of bread were dipped into the sauce (<sup><3123></sup>Matthew 26:23; Aristoph. *Eg.* 1176), and the vegetables were conveyed from the dish by means of the hand or fingers to the mouth (comp. <sup><3124></sup>Proverbs 19:24: 26:15; <sup><3124></sup>Ruth 2:14 is not in point), a custom which still prevails in the East even at the royal table (Tavernier, *Trav.* 1:282; Arvieux, *Voyage*, iii, 238.; Pococke, 2:63; Niebuhr *Besch.* p. 53; Shaw, *Trav.* p. 203; Burckhardt, *Wahaby*, p.51; Rosenmiller, *Morgenl.* 4:138; Robinson, 2:726; 3:201). Whether they drank wine during the meal (like the Romans) or after it (like the Egyptians, Herod. 2:278, and Persians, Herod. v. 18, and as is still the practice of most Arabians and Persians, Chardin, 4:44, 52; Arvieux, 3:277; Burckhardt, *Sprachen*, p. 137; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 15:1, 2), is not positively stated, although the Talmud (Babylon. *Berach.* p. 251) seems to imply that the Jews did both, the draught following the meal, however, being the principal one (*Berach.* 8:4,7; comp. Robinson, 2:726). **SEE EATING.** (See generally M. Geier, in the *Biblioth. Lubec.* v. 1 sq.) **SEE ENTERTAINMENT.**

### Meal-Tub Plot

is the name of a plot concocted on the part of Romanists, but intended to be fathered on a number of eminent persons engaged in the interests of the Protestants during the reign of Charles II, in the year 1679. A conspiracy on the part of the Jesuits to dethrone or make away with Charles, and place the duke of York (who was in favor of the papal rule) on the throne, having come to light, the papists, exasperated, determined to set on foot a sham plot, and brand the Presbyterians as the originators. The dastardly attempt was timely discovered, and heaped infamy upon the already spotted character of the Jesuits. For a full account, see Neale, *Hist. of the Puritans*, 2:290; Stoughton, *Eccl. Hist. of Engl. (Ch. of the Restoration)*, 2:21 sq.

## Mea'ni

(Μεαῖνι v. r. Μαῖνι and Μααῖνι), a less correct form (1 Esdr. 5:31) for the *SEE MEHUNIM* (q.v.) of the Hebrews text (<sup><1520></sup>Ezra 2:50).

## Means Of Grace,

a convenient but unscientific and unscriptural phrase for those exercises or agencies which become the channel or occasion of spiritual influences to the Christian. The doctrine concerning the means of grace is based on that of grace itself. It has only received its adequate form through the Reformation, which, in opposition to the Roman Church, who considers that grace is imparted by the visible Church, particularly by the priest, asserts as the only regular means of grace the Word of God and the sacraments instituted by Christ. In popular language, however, the term “means of grace” is extended so as to include those duties which we perform for the purpose of improving our minds, affecting our hearts, and of obtaining spiritual blessings; such as hearing the Gospel, reading the Scriptures, self-examination, meditation, prayer, praise, Christian conversation, etc. The means are to be used without any reference to merit, solely with a dependence on the divine Being; nor can we ever expect happiness in ourselves, nor be good exemplars to others, while we live in the neglect of them. It is in vain to argue that the divine willingness to bestow grace supersedes the necessity of them, since God has as certainly appointed the means as the end. Besides, he himself generally works by them, and the more means he thinks proper to use, the more he displays his glorious perfections. Jesus Christ, when on earth, used means; he prayed, he exhorted, and did good, by going from place to place. Indeed, the systems of nature, providence, and grace are all carried on by means. The Scriptures abound with exhortations to them (Matthew 5; Romans 12), and none but enthusiasts or immoral characters ever refuse to use them. In the following article we use the term in its more restricted sense, as related to the sacramental controversy between Roman Catholics and Protestants, condensing the statements in Herzog’s *Real Encyklop.* v. 200 sq.

The starting-point of the Protestant doctrine on this subject is contained in the fifth article of the *Confession of Augsburg*. Grace itself is presupposed, such as exists in the form of justification by faith. The hearing of the Word and the partaking of the sacraments are methods of arriving at this faith: “Nam per verbum et sacramenta, tamquam per instrumenta donatur

Spiritus Sanctus, quoniam fidem afficit, ubi et quando visum est Deo in iis, qui audiunt Evangelium,” etc. To this statement is joined the declaration, “Damnant Anabaptistas et alios, qui sentiunt, Spiritum Sanctum. contingere sine verbo externo hominibus per ipsorum praeparationes ad opera.” The *Heidelberg Catechism* enounces the same doctrine, and at the same time states still more emphatically the connection between the sacraments and the Word of God in quest. 65: “Whence comes saving grace? It is the effect of the Holy Spirit in our heart by means of the preaching of the holy Gospel, and confirmed by the use of the holy sacraments.” (The most important passages of symbols on this point are *Apolog.* 4:153; *Artic. Smalc.* pars 2:2,;8; *Catechism. maj.* Praeceptum iii, p. 426; *Symbol. apost.* p. 502; *Formul. conc.* Epitome: “De lib. arbitr.” Negativa vi; *Solid. decl.* p. 655, 669, 828; *Conf. Helv.* ii, c. 1; *Conf. Gall.* art. 25, 35; *Conf. Belg.* art. 24.) The means of grace are called *instrumenta gratiae, media, adminicula gratiae*. In the Lutheran Church the union between the Word and the sacraments is made much closer than in the Reformed. The *Helvetic Confession* treats of the Word of God in the first-chapter, and of the sacraments in the nineteenth. The reason of this separation is that the Bible, as the Word of God, is the foundation of the whole system. Yet their connection and union are not lost sight of: “Praedicationi verbi sui adjunctus Deus imo ab initio in ecclesia sua sacramenta, velsigna sacramentalia.” The idea of the unity of the means of grace is not considered by the evangelical Church as only a formal, human, or theological connection between the Word of God, baptism, and the Lord’s Supper, but as the consequence of a divine act, the institution of the Church and of the ecclesiastical office. The means of grace are not mere possessions of the Church, but its foundation itself. The Church is called into existence by the Word of God, while by baptism and communion it is manifested as a religious community (see *Conf. Aug.* art. vii). Schleiermacher himself recognised in them the essential and unchangeable foundations of the Church (ii, § 127). ‘Thus he contradicts himself when further on, treating of the connection between baptism and the Lord’s Supper, he refuses to consider it as an actual dogmatic point (p. -A16). The unity of the means of grace may be briefly said to consist in their constituting the Church as the organ of transmission of grace. The inner ground of their unity is grace itself, of which they are the channels; the outer aspect is the *ministerium*, the office appointed by Christ, which has to administer both forms of the means of grace.

This brings us to the significance and necessity of these means of grace, or to the views of the Protestant Church as opposed to the Roman Catholic Church on these points. ‘The first point of difference lies in the conception of the ecclesiastical office. Both, indeed, consider it as a divine institution, but the Protestants look upon it as a *ministerium*, which can be considered as a continuous Christian working of the Church in the Word and sacraments, while the Roman Catholics retain the idea of a *sacerdotium* forming the real fundamental means of grace, and creating itself the distinct means of grace after the manner of the apostles (see Dieringer. *Lehrbuch d. Kath. Dogmatik*, p. 512), “The substitution of the Son of man by the apostleship.” If its sacerdotal character is susceptible of being defended by Scripture and tradition, it yet is certain that it is only through tradition that it obtained this superior importance, as capable of creating the other means of grace., The practical results of this superior importance became manifest in the prohibition to read the Bible, the refusal of the chalice in communion, etc., thus diminishing the other means of grace, while they were increased on the other hand by the promulgation of the commandments of the Church, and the institution of additional sacraments; and also modified in the doctrine of the sacrificial character of the Eucharist, etc. Thus the Protestant doctrine of the means of grace differs at once from the Roman Catholic, by its conception of a *ministerium* in the place of a *sacerdotium*. They next differ in the relative position they assign to the means of grace. ‘Protestants maintain that this grace is first communicated through the Word of God, and confirmed by the sacraments; Roman Catholics, on the contrary, consider the sacraments as the chief means of grace, and the Word of God as accessory. Then, as regards the Word of God, Protestants consider it as consisting essentially in Scripture, together with explanations, while by it Roman Catholics understand only the *praedicatio verbi*. The latter also increase the number of sacraments, and recognise other means of grace. On these points, **SEE WORD OF GOD** and **SEE SACRAMENTS**. Another distinction is the difference in which the means of grace themselves are apprehended in their connection with grace and forgiveness. According to the *Concil. Trident.*, sess. 7, the sacraments work *ex opere operato*, a doctrine which the *Conf. Aug.* art. xiii, rejects. We must, of course, refer to Roman Catholic theologians to find the sense which that Church attaches to the *opus operatum* (Bellarmine, *De sacr.* 2:1). According to them, infant baptism is efficient in itself to regenerate them, without any resistance being for a moment to be thought of. The opposition of adults to baptism, confession,

and the mass could only consist in an obstacle (*ponere obicem*), a deceitful hiding of a mortal sin, and the persistence in it, for absolution presupposes a full and candid confession. But a passive faith as saving faith, in the Protestant sense, is not required to give efficiency to the sacraments. We might then suppose that the Word would here, as a means of grace, be placed before the sacrament, and produce conversion, which would insure the effect of the sacrament. But we must remember that, for the most part, Roman Catholics are such from being born of Roman Catholic parents. Of converts themselves nothing further is demanded than that they should have enough *fides. implicita* in the word-announced to them to submit to the authority of the Church; History teaches us how even the word itself may become the *opus operatum*.

In opposition to the Roman Catholic Church, Protestants generally draw a distinction between grace and the means of grace, although they recognise their relation. We must, however, distinguish between such as reject altogether the necessity and ordinance of the means of grace, and those who recognise as such the Word of God but not the sacraments. Among the former we find in the time of the Reformation the Anabaptists, in later times the Quakers. They maintain that the Holy Spirit, without the aid of the Word, illuminates each man immediately by an inner light at a certain time, and that by it only is man able to understand the Word of God (see Barclay, *Apol.*). Still it would be unjust to say that they altogether reject the notion of means, of grace, for the Quakers are especially distinguished for diligent searching of the Scriptures.” But they ‘deny the’ existence of divinely-ordained, special means of grace of the Church. The Socinians and Mennonites, on the other hand, consider, in a certain sense, the Word of God as an objective means of grace; the former considering the sacraments purely as symbols of the Christian faith (*cerimoniae*), while the Mennonites consider them also as objective signs of the action of grace (Riz, *Conf.* art. 30). Here also we miss the objective character of the means of grace, but we find it again among the Arminians. ‘Necessarily as the sphere of action of the sacraments is restricted as means of grace, that of grace itself, as immediately active, becomes enlarged; this we see exemplified in the doctrine of restoration of the Anabaptists, in the Quaker doctrine of the action of the revealing Spirit (“Deus spiritus revelatione se ipsum semper filiis hominum patefecit,” Barclay, *Apol.* thes. ii), and in the Socinian notion of an extraordinary and special action of the divine Spirit aside from its general action through the Gospel (Osterodt, *Unferricht.* K.

p. 34). The Protestant Church, in its doctrine of *grati praeveniens*, recognises, with some, restriction, the truth of these views, but still maintains the necessity of the sacraments. According to Scripture, the sphere of the *gratia praeveniens* extends beyond that of the theocratic revelation. The Spirit dwells where it chooses, the Logos shines in all human souls, and the *gratia praeveniens* is active in all receptive hearts. Yet the prepared soul only arrives to an *experimental* knowledge of salvation within the sphere of revelation, and to a *certainty* of it by the ordained means of grace. On this point of the necessity of the means of grace, the difference, such as it is, which exists between the Lutheran and the Reformed Church on that doctrine, cannot but appear. The possibility of the spiritual enlightenment of individual members of the Church, *sine externo ministerio*, is clearly recognised by the *Conf Helv.* ii, cap. i. Still the article considers it as divinely ordained that it is imparted by the *usitata ratio instituendi homines*. It insists still more strongly on the necessity of the *praedicatio dei verbi*, to which, of course, is joined the *interna Spiritus illuminatio*. But this necessity is defined as a *necessitas precepti, non absoluta*, i.e.. God, in the work of redemption, is not confined to these means, as is proved by the prophets and by revelation, but, in consideration of the weakness of our nature, has appointed these means (see Schweizer, *Glaubenslehre d. ec. ref. Kirche*, 2:561). Luther, on the contrary, refers even the inspiration of the prophets to the *verbum vocale* (*Art. Smal.* p. 333). Another difference consists in the close connection existing in the Lutheran Church between the sacrament and the Word, while in the Reformed theology the Word takes the prominent position as the *causa instrumentalis fidei* (see Ebrard, *Christliche Dogmatik*, p. 578). The Lutheran Church teaches an organic joint action of grace and the means of grace, without, however, making them identical. The Reformed Lutherans understand only an; economic joint action, which, however, does not exclude irregularities or rather exceptions. As regards the Word of God, the Lutheran theologians strongly uphold its *efficacia*, and Calovius and Quenstedt speak of a *unio mystica gratiae sive virtutis divince cum verbo* (see Hahn, *Lehrbuch*, p. 549). At this point orthodoxy approaches the idea of the *opus operatum* (see Lange, *Dogmatik*, p. 1119). According to Reformed theology, the connection of the Spirit with the Word is conditioned by the number of the elect among the number of hearers, while the *Heidelberg Catechism*, holds that the Spirit awakens faith in our heart through the preaching of the holy Gospel. According to Nitzsch, the point of union of the two confessions on this doctrine lies in the conception of

the *pignus*. We further notice that the Reformed Church does not insist as strongly on the necessity of baptism as the Lutheran. The *Confessio Scotica* (p. 127) emphatically rejects the Roman Catholic doctrine of the damnation of children dying without baptism; so does also Calvin, in his *Instit.* 4:16, 26. As regards the connection between baptism and regeneration, the twenty-seventh article of the *Conf. Anglic.* takes a middle course, saying that baptism is a *signum regenerationis per quod recte baptismum suscipientes ecclesiis inseruntur*. By this is meant that the ecclesiastic, social regeneration is accomplished, the individual, social regeneration made thereby perceptible to the senses, and sacramentally promised. **SEE REGENERATION.**

With regard to the action and the necessity of the means of grace, the differences of the different confessions come again into play. While the evangelical churches teach that the sacraments are agents of sanctification for those who receive them with faith, strengthening and increasing that faith, the Roman Catholic holds that they are the agents of faith, requiring none to be worthily participated in beyond faith in the authority of the Church, and that mortal sin alone can render them ineffectual, and the Baptists and Socinians look upon the participation in the sacraments only as outward acts, professions of the Christian faith,

In dogmatics, the means of grace represent the eternal presence of Christ in the spiritual Church, and through her in the world. In his institutions, Christ, by the Holy Spirit, identifies himself with them, and in his eternal presence draws the world to his salvation. The Word and the sacraments are inseparably connected with each other the Word receives its fulfillment and seal in the sacrament, while the sacrament receives light and spiritual life from the creative power of the Word. The Word, without the seal of the sacrament, is only a scholastic knowledge; the sacrament, without the vivifying influence of the Word, is a piece of priestly magic. But though the means of grace, in their connection with the Holy Spirit, set at work the saving power of the life of Christ, as a participation in his salvation, still they must be preceded by faith, since Christ required faith when personally present on earth. Yet he no more requires a perfect faith than he compels to believe. Those who ask shall receive. **SEE SACRAMENT.**

See Fletcher, *Works*; Wesley, *Works*; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*; Winer, *Symbol.* p. 113; Kurtz, *Ch. Hist.* vol. i; Niedner, *Philos.* p. 441.

## Mea'rah

(Hebrews *Mearah'*, **hr[m]** a *cave*, as often; Sept. ἀπὸ Γάζης, apparently reading **hZ[m]** *from Gaza*; Vulg. *Maara*), a place mentioned in ~~Joshua~~ Joshua 13:4 as situated in the northern edge of Palestine: "From the south, all the land of the Canaanites, and Mearah that is beside the Sidonians, unto Aphek." Some find it in the town *Marathos* (Strabo, 16:753; Pliny, v. 17; Ptolemy, v. 15, 16). Most interpreters, following the Chaldee and Syriac (see the *Critici Biblici*, s.v.), are of the opinion that the term should rather be rendered as an appellative-*the cave* (Keil's *Comment.* ad loc.); but if a mere cave were intended, and not a place called Mearah, the name would surely have been preceded by the definite article, and would have stood as **hr[M]h** "the cave." Besides, the scope of the passage shows that some place-either a city or district-must be meant. "Reland (*Palaest.* p. 896) suggests that Mearah may be the same with Meroth, a village named by Josephus (*Ant.* 3:3,1) as forming the limit of Galilee on the west (see also *Ant.* 2:20, 6), and which again may possibly have been connected with the waters of Merom. A village called *el-Mughar* is found in the mountains of Naphtali, some ten miles west of the northern extremity of the Sea of Galilee (Robinson, 3:79, 30; Van de Velde's *Map*), which may possibly represent an ancient Mearah." "About half-way between Tyre and Sidon. close to the shore, are the ruins of an ancient town; and in the neighboring cliffs are large numbers of caves and grottos hewn in the rock, and formerly used as tombs. Dr. Robinson suggested that this may be 'Mearah of the Sidonians (ii. 474). The ruins are now called 'Adlan, but perhaps take that name from the village on the mountain-side." Ritter (*Erdk.* 17:10; also 16:8, 9), on the other hand, identifies Mearah, under the name *Mughara*, with the remarkable cavern (Rosenmiller, *Alterth.* II, 1:39 sq., 66) which the Crusaders fortified, and which is described by William of Tyre (*Histor. Hieros.* 19:2, 11) as "a certain fortress of ours in the Sidonian territory, namely, an impregnable grotto, commonly called the *Cave of Tyre (Cavea de Tyron).*" It was afterwards the last retreat of the emir Fakhr ed-Din. The place is now also known as *Shukif Tairun* (Abulfeda, *Table*). Schultz is the first traveller who mentions it in modern days. It is situated in the high cliff east of Sidon, between Jezim and Michmurhy (Van de Velde, *Memoir*, s.v.). **SEE CAVE.**

## Mears, Thomas, M.A.

an English divine of note, flourished near the opening of the present century. He was at one time rector of St. Lawrence and vicar of St. Michael's in Southampton, and chaplain to the corporation of that town. He died about 1810. Mr. Mears was a prolific writer, and a pulpit orator of no mean ability. He contributed many articles to the *Orthodox Churchman's Magazine*, and published several of his sermons, among which the following deserve special mention: *England expects every Man to do his Duty* (1805, 8vo):--*Religious Example* (1807, 8vo):--*On the Lord's Supper* (1807j 8vo).

## Measure

is the rendering in the Auth. Vers. of a number of Hebrew and Greek terms, some of which are descriptive of dimension or extent generally, while others denote a specific length or capacity, Again, there are other words in the original denoting a particular quantity or space, which are still differently rendered in the Auth. Vers. It is our purpose in the present article to present merely a general view of the various renderings, leaving the determination of the modern equivalents to the special head of METROLOGY *SEE METROLOGY* (q.v.). The following are the words rendered "measure" in the A.V.:

### 1. Those that are of indefinite Import.

(1) **qj** *ochok* (Isaiah v. 14; a *statute*, as elsewhere usually rendered);

(2) **dmj** *mad* (<sup><8100></sup>Job 11:9; <sup><2435></sup>Jeremiah 13:25; reduplicated plur. <sup><1835></sup>Job 38:5; elsewhere a *garment*, as usually rendered);

(3).properly **hDma** *middah'*, the usual word thus rendered (<sup><1240></sup>Exodus 26:2, 8; <sup><4004></sup>Joshua 3:4; <sup><1025></sup>1 Kings 6:25; 7:9,11, 37; <sup><4432></sup>2 Chronicles 3:3; <sup><8325></sup>Job 28:25; <sup><4904></sup>Psalms 39:4 [5]; <sup><2203></sup>Jeremiah 21:39; <sup><3608></sup>Ezekiel 40:3, 5, 10, 21, 22, 24, 28, 29, 32, 33, 35; 41:17; 42:15,-16, 17, 18, 19; 43:13; 45:3; 46:22; 48:16. 30,33; <sup><3801></sup>Zechariah 2:1 [5]; elsewhere "piece," etc.);

(4) **hrWçm** *mesurah'* (<sup><8065></sup>Leviticus 19:35; <sup><1233></sup>1 Chronicles 23:39; <sup><2011></sup>Ezekiel 4:11,16);

(5) **fPvina** *nishpat'* (Jeremiah 30, 2; 46:28; judgment, as elsewhere usually rendered);

(6) **tnKōthna** *nithko'neṯh.* (<3651> Ezekiel 45:11; “tale,” <1078> Exodus 5:8; “composition,” <1078> Exodus 30:32; 37; “ state,” <1443> 2 Chronicles 24:13);

(7) **kTo** *ken* (<3651> Ezekiel 45:11; “tale,” Exodus v. 18);

(8) **μέτρον**, the usual and proper Greek word (<4070> Matthew 7:2; 23:32; <1024> Mark 4:24; <1638> Luke 6:38; <1634> John 3:34; <5178> Romans 12:3; <4703> 2 Corinthians 10:13; <4047> Ephesians 4:7, 13,16; <6217> Revelation 21:17).

## 2. Such as represent a definite Value.

(1) **hpyae** *eyphah'* (<1654> Deuteronomy 25:14,15; <3100> Proverbs 20:10; <3360> Micah 6:10; elsewhere “*ephah*” [q.v.]);

(2) **hMai** *ammah'* (<2613> Jeremiah 51:13; “post,” <2064> Isaiah 6:4; elsewhere “*cubit*” [q.v.]);

(3) **rKkor** (<1102> 1 Kings 4:22 [5:2]; 11:22); <1420> 2 Chronicles 2:10 [9]; 27:5; Chald. plur. <1572> Ezra 7:22; elsewhere “*cor*” [q.v.]), Gr. - **κόρος** (<2167> Luke 16:7);

(4) **haš]** *seah'* (<0186> Genesis 18:6; <0258> 1 Samuel 25:18; <1182> 1 Kings 18:32; <1376> 2 Kings 7:16, 18; a *seah* [q.v.]), the Gr. **σάτον** (<0133> Matthew 13:33; <2121> Luke 13:21), and the reduplicated form **haššasi** *sasseah* (<2378> Isaiah 27:8; used indeterminately);

(5) **vyl æ** *shalish'* (<2412> Isaiah 40:12; “great measure,” <4805> Psalm 80:5; lit. a *third*, i.e.. prob. of the ephah, but used indefinitely;

(6) **βάτος** (<2145> Luke 16:6; the Hebrew *bath* [q.v.]); (7) **χοϊνιξ** (<4016> Revelation 6:6; the Greek *choenix* [q.v.]).

## Meat

**I.** It does not appear that the word “meat” is used in any one instance in the Authorized Version of either the O. or N. Testament in the sense which it now almost exclusively bears of animal food. The latter is denoted uniformly by “flesh.”

**1.** The only possible exceptions to this assertion in the. O.T. are:

(a) <sup><Q1704></sup>Genesis 27:4, etc., “savory meat ;” <sup><Q4523></sup>Genesis 45:23,” corn and bread and meat.” Here the Hebrew word, מַטָּמִים *matammim*, which in this form appears in this chapter only, is derived from a root which has exactly the force of our word “taste,” and is employed in reference to the manna. In the passages in question the word “dainties” would be perhaps more appropriate.

(b) In Genesis the original word is one of almost equal rarity, מַזֶּן *mazon*; and if the Lexicons did not show that this had only the general force of *food* in all the other Oriental tongues, that would be established in regard to Hebrew by its other occurrences, viz. 2. Chronicles 11:23, where it is rendered “victual;” and <sup><Q092></sup>Daniel 9:12, 21, where the meat spoken of is that to be furnished by a tree.

2. The only real and inconvenient ambiguity caused by ‘the change’ which has taken place in the meaning of the word is in the case of the “meat-offering,” the second of the three great divisions into which the sacrifices of the Law were divided—the burnt-offering, the meat-offering, and the peace-offering (<sup><Q1118></sup>Leviticus 2:1, etc.) and which consisted solely of flour, or corn, and oil, sacrifices of flesh being confined to the other two. The word thus translated is מִנְחָה *minchah*, elsewhere rendered “present” and “oblation,” and derived from a root which has the force of “sending” or “offering” to a person. It is very desirable that some English term should be proposed which would avoid this ambiguity. “Food offering” is hardly admissible, though it is perhaps preferable to “unbloody or bloodless sacrifice.” **SEE MEAT OFFERING.**

3. There are several other words, which, though entirely distinct in the original, are all translated in the A.V. by “meat ;” but none of them present any special interest except אַרְפָּה *te’reph*. This word, from a root signifying “to tear,” would be perhaps more accurately rendered “prey” or “booty.” Its use in <sup><Q315></sup>Psalms 111:5, especially when taken in connection with the word rendered “good understanding” in ver. 10, which should rather be, as in the margin, “good success,” throws a new and unexpected light over the familiar phrases of that beautiful Psalm. It seems to show how inextinguishable was the warlike, predatory spirit in the mind of the writer, good Israelite and devout worshipper of Jehovah as he was. Late as he lived in the history of his nation, he cannot forget the “power” of Jehovah’s “works” by which his forefathers acquired the “heritage of the

heathen;" and to him, as to his ancestors when conquering the country, it is still a firm article of belief that those who fear Jehovah shall obtain most of the spoil of his enemies-those who obey his commandments shall have the best success in the field.

4. In the N.T. the variety of the Greek: words thus rendered is equally great; but dismissing such terms as ἀνακεῖσθαι or ἀναπίπτειν, which are rendered by "sit at meat"-φαγεῖν, for which we occasionally find "meat" - τράεζα (<4164> Acts 16:34), the same- εἰδωλοθύτα, "meat offered to idols"- κλάσματα, generally "fragments," but twice "broken meat"- dismissing these, we have left τροφή and βρῶμα (with its kindred words, βρῶσις, etc.), both words bearing the widest possible signification, and meaning everything that can be eaten or can nourish the frame. The former is most used in the Gospels and Acts. The latter is found in John and in the Epistles of Paul. It is the word employed in the famous sentences, "for meat destroy not the work of God," if meat make my brother to offend," etc. *SEE ALISGEMA.*

II. Meat, however, in the proper modern sense (rcB; *basar'*, *flesh*, as it is rendered in the Auth. Vers.), i.e.. of clean beasts (Leviticus 11.), namely, lambs (<2837> Isaiah 53:7; <3064> Amos 6:4), calves (<0224> 1 Samuel 28:24; <0187> Genesis 18:7; <3064> Amos 6:4; <2152> Luke 15:23; comp. Russell, *Aleppo*, 1:145), oxen (<2223> Isaiah 22:13; <0157> Proverbs 15:17; <1023> 1 Kings 4:23; <0224> Matthew 22:4), kids (<0161> 1 Samuel 16:20; <0769> Judges 6:19), also venison (<1023> 1 Kings 4:23), and poultry (<1023> 1 Kings 4:23; see Gesenius, *Thes. Hebrews* p. 715; Michaelis, *Mos-Recht*. 4:198), was a favorite dish among the Hebrews, either roasted entire, or cooked with choice vegetables and eaten with bread (<3069> 2 Samuel 6:19; <1176> 1 Kings 17:6); yet only royal personages partook of it daily (<1023> 1 Kings 4:23; <3658> Nehemiah 5:18), the less wealthy merely on festive occasions (<2152> Luke 15:23; comp. Niebuhr, *Besch.* p. 52), especially at the great sacrificial festivals; and we find that the modern Arabs, namely, the Bedouin, as a general rule. but seldom eat flesh (Shaw, *Trav.* p. 169; comp. Burckhardt, *Trav.* 2:1003; Wellsted, 1:248; those of the peninsula of Sinai live mostly on sour milk, dried dates, and unleavened bread, Rtippel, p. 203; but among the ancient Egyptians flesh was very commonly eaten, <0163> Exodus 16:3; comp. Rosellini, *Monum. cir.* 1:151). The shoulder was the -most esteemed piece of the animal (<0024> 1 Samuel 9:24; comp. Harmer, 1:311). Flesh which contained the blood, was forbidden (<0817> Leviticus 3:17; 7:26; 17:10; <5126> Deuteronomy 12:16, 27),

because the life was regarded as residing in the blood (<sup><0000></sup>Genesis 9:4; comp. Oedmann, 6:89 sq.). **SEE BLOOD**. The pieces of flesh were taken by each guest from the common dish with his fingers. **SEE EAT**; 4. The Jews were very careful to avoid the flesh of heathen victims (*Aboda Sara*, 2:3). **SEE CLEAN**; **SEE OFFERING**.

**III.** As above noted, in the English version the word “meat” means *food* in general; or when confined to one species of food, it always signifies meal, flour, or grain, but never *flesh*, which is now the ‘usual acceptance of the word. **SEE FLESH**. A “*meat-offering*” in the Scriptures is always a vegetable, and never an animal offering; and it might now be rendered a *bread-offering*, or a *meal-offering*, instead of a *meat-offering*. It does not appear that the ancient Hebrews were very nice about the dressing of their food. We find among them roast meat, boiled meat, and ragouts. **SEE COOK**. Their manner of living would be much like that of the ancient Egyptians, among whom they had long resided. Wilkinson says, “No tray was used on the Egyptian table, nor was it covered by any linen; like that of the Greeks, it was probably wiped with a sponge or napkin after the dishes were removed, and polished by the servants when the company had retired. The dishes consisted of fish; meat, boiled, roasted, and dressed in various ways; game, poultry, and a profusion of vegetables and fruit, particularly figs and grapes during the season; and a soup or pottage of lentils. Of figs and grapes they were particularly fond. Fresh dates during the season, and in a dried state at other periods of the year, were also brought to table.” **SEE FOOD**. Among the Hebrews meats that were offered were boiled in a pot (<sup><0014></sup>1 Samuel 2:14, 15). They were forbidden to seethe a kid in the milk of its dam (<sup><0239></sup>Exodus 23:19; 34:26). They might not kill a cow and its calf on the same day; nor a sheep or goat and its young one at the same time. They might not cut off a part of a living animal to eat it, either raw or dressed. If any lawful beast or bird should die of itself or be strangled, and the blood not drain away, they were not allowed to taste of it. He that by inadvertence should eat of any animal that died of itself, or that was killed by any beast, was to be unclean till the evening, and was not purified till he had washed his clothes. They ate of nothing dressed by any other than a Hebrew, nor did they ever dress their victuals with-the kitchen implements of any but one of their own nation.

The prohibition of eating blood, or animals that are strangled, has been always rigidly observed by the Jews. In the council of the apostles held at Jerusalem. it was declared that converts from paganism should not be

subject to the legal ceremonies, but that they should refrain from idolatry, - from fornication, from eating blood, and from such animals as were strangled, and their blood thereby retained in their bodies; which decree was observed for many ages by the Church (<sup><4151></sup>Acts 15:20-29).

In reference to “meats offered to idols,” it may be observed that at the first settling of the Church there were many disputes concerning the use of meats offered to idols (<sup><4187></sup>1 Corinthians 8:7,10). Some newly-converted Christians, convinced that an idol was nothing, and that the distinction of clean and unclean creatures was abolished by our Saviour, ate indifferently of whatever was served up to them, even among pagans, without inquiring whether the meats had been offered to idols. They took the same liberty in buying meat sold in the market, not regarding whether it were pure or impure, according to the Jews; or whether it had been offered to idols or not. But other Christians, weaker or less instructed, were offended at this liberty, and thought that eating of meat which had been offered to idols was a kind of partaking in that wicked and sacrilegious offering. This diversity of opinion produced some scandal, for which Paul thought that it behoved him to provide a remedy (<sup><6140></sup>Romans 14:20, 21; <sup><6115></sup>Titus 1:15). He determined, therefore, that all things were clean to such as were clean, and that an idol was nothing at all; that a man might safely eat of whatever was sold in the shambles, and need not scrupulously inquire whence it came; and that if an unbeliever should invite a believer to eat with him, the believer might eat of whatever was set before him (<sup><6105></sup>1 Corinthians 10:25, etc.). But at the same time he enjoins that the laws of charity and prudence should be observed; that believers should be cautious of scandalizing or offending weak minds; for though all things might be lawful,” yet all things were not always expedient. *SEE SACRIFICE.*

## Meat-Offering

(*h* *j* *n* *m* *a* *n* *i* *n* *c* *h* *a* *h*’; sometimes more fully *h* *j* *n* *m* *a* *n* *i* *n* *c* *h* *a* *h* *q*; to mark its *sacrificial* character; Sept. fully *δῶρον θυσία*, but generally simply *δῶρον* or *θυσία*, sometimes *προσφορά*; Vulg. *oblatio sacrificii*. or simply *sacrificium*). The word *minchah* (from the obsolete root *j n m*; “to distribute” or “to give”) signifies originally a *gift* of any kind, and appears to be used generally of a gift from an inferior to a superior, whether God or man (Lat. *fertum*). Thus in <sup><1323></sup>Genesis 32:13 it is used of the present from Jacob to Esau, in <sup><1431></sup>Genesis 43:11 of the present sent to Joseph in Egypt, in <sup><1082></sup>2 Samuel 8:2,6 of the tribute from Moab and Syria to David, etc.;

and in <sup><000B></sup>Genesis 4:3, 4, 5 it is applied to the sacrifices to God offered by Cain and Abel, although Abel's was a whole burnt-offering. Afterwards this general sense became attached to the word corban (<sup><B></sup>כֹּרְבָן), and the word *minchah* restricted to an "unbloody offering," as opposed to <sup><B></sup>בֶּזֶק, a "bloody" sacrifice. It is constantly spoken of in connection with the *drink-offering* (<sup><E></sup>שֵׁנָה, Sept. <sup><S></sup>σπονδή, Vulg. *libamen*), which generally accompanied it, and which had the same meaning. **SEE DRINK-OFFERING.** The law or ceremonial of the meat-offering is described in Leviticus 2 and 6:14-23. It was to be composed of fine flour, seasoned with salt, and mixed with oil and frankincense, but without leaven; and it was generally accompanied by a drink-offering of wine. A portion of it, including all the frankincense, was to be burnt on the altar as "a memorial;" the rest belonged to the priest; but the meat-offerings offered by the priests themselves were to be wholly burnt.

Its meaning (which is analogous to that of the offering of the tithes, the first-fruits, and the showbread) appears to be exactly expressed in the words of David (<sup><1390></sup>1 Chronicles 29:10-14), "All that is in the heaven and in the earth is thine. All things come of thee, and *of thine own have we given thee.*" It recognised the sovereignty of the Lord, and his bounty in giving us all earthly blessings, by dedicating to him the best of his gifts: the flour, as the main support of life; oil, as the symbol of richness; and wine, as the symbol of vigor and refreshment (see <sup><9415></sup>Psalm 104:15). All these were un-leavened and seasoned with salt, in order to show their purity, and hallowed by the frankincense for God's special service. This recognition, implied in all cases, is expressed clearly in the form of offering the-first-fruits prescribed in <sup><6315></sup>Deuteronomy 26:5-11.

It will be seen that this meaning involves neither of the main ideas of sacrifice—the atonement for sin and the self-dedication to God. It takes them for granted, and is based on them. Accordingly, the meat-offering, properly so called, seems always to have been a subsidiary offering, needing to be introduced by the sin-offering, which represented the one idea, and forming an appendage to the burnt-offering which represented the other. Thus, in the case of public sacrifices, a "meat-offering" was enjoined as a part of

- (1) *the daily morning and evening sacrifice* (<sup><0290></sup>Exodus 29:40,41);
- (2) *the Sabbath-offering* (<sup><0300></sup>Numbers 28:9, 10);
- (3) *the offering at the new moon* (<sup><0311></sup>Numbers 28:11-14):

(4) *the offerings at the great festivals* (<sup><0830></sup>Numbers 28:20, 28; 29:3,4,14, 15, etc.);

(5) *the offerings on the great day of atonement.*

(<sup><0209></sup>Numbers 29:9, 10). The same was the case with private sacrifices, as at

(1) *the consecration of priests* (<sup><0291></sup>Exodus 29:1, 2; <sup><0163></sup>Leviticus 6:20; 8:2) *and of Levites* (<sup><0408></sup>Numbers 8:8);

(2) *the cleansing of the leper* (<sup><0840></sup>Leviticus 14:20);

(3) *the termination of the Nazaritish vow* (<sup><0165></sup>Numbers 6:15).

The unbloody offerings offered alone did not properly belong to the regular meat-offering. They were usually substitutes for other offerings. Thus, for example, in <sup><0161></sup>Leviticus 5:11 a tenth of an ephah of flour is allowed to be substituted by a poor man for the lamb or kid of a trespass-offering: in <sup><0165></sup>Numbers 5:15 the same offering is ordained as the “offering of jealousy” for a suspected wife. The unusual character of the offering is marked in both cases by the absence of the oil, frankincense, and wine. We find also at certain times libations of water poured out before God; as by Samuel’s command at Mizpeh during the fast (<sup><0106></sup>1 Samuel 7:6), and by David at Bethlehem (<sup><0236></sup>2 Samuel 23:16), and a libation of oil poured by Jacob on the pillar at Bethel. (<sup><0154></sup>Genesis 35:14). But these have clearly especial meanings, and are not to be included in the ordinary drink-offerings. The same observation will apply to the remarkable libation of water customary at the Feast of Tabernacles, but not mentioned in Scripture. *SEE TABERNACLES, FEAST OF.*

From the above statements it appears that the “meat-offering” (or, rather, food-offering) was in general such eatable but bloodless articles (of vegetable growth) as were to be presented to Jehovah as devout gifts (comp. the early instance, <sup><0408></sup>Genesis 4:3 sq.), and in a special sense only gifts of meal, raw or baked, which were brought to the altar of burnt-offerings, (<sup><0149></sup>Exodus 40:29; comp. 30:9), and either wholly or partially burnt to the honor of Jehovah (commonly with incense) by the hand of the priest. The portion of such “meat-offering” that was to be consumed is called **hrKz̄ai**, in contradistinction from that part which fell to the priest (<sup><0112></sup>Leviticus 2:2, 9, 16; <sup><0165></sup>Numbers 6:26; comp. <sup><0147></sup>Leviticus 24:7, where the incense of the showbread is so called, which was also consumed). This word certainly has not the signification of *odoramentum*

(Saadias), or in general *offering* (as Michaelis thinks), but is a verbal noun from , **ρυκαπα** (*to cause to remember*), and the Sept. translates **μνημόσυον** accordingly (see Gesen. *Thesaur.* p. 417). The Mishnic tract *Menachoth-* (v. 2; comp. Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 649) treats of the “meat-offering” in the above broad sense as an important part of the sacred ritual. The Bible itself specifies, of the *not* burned “meat-offerings,” only the Pentecostal bread expressly by the name of a *minchah* (<sup><R238></sup>Leviticus 23:18; comp. ver. 17), while the Passover sheaf and the showbread belong by their own nature to the same category. The proper “meat-offerings,” as above particularized, were either independent gifts (Talm. **מַחְבֵּט** [**twabh**]), or simply additions to other principal offerings (**בִּזְחָל** [**twabh**]). For example, no burnt-offering’ could be presented without a meat or drink offering (see <sup><R108></sup>Leviticus 7:8 sq.); and drink-offerings were associated likewise with thank-offerings (<sup><R172></sup>Leviticus 7:12 sq.), and in a certain case with a sin-offering (<sup><R140></sup>Leviticus 14:10, 20). This appears to have been on the principle that men do not eat flesh without bread and wine; a signification which also lay at the bottom of the Greek **οὐλαί** (coarse ground barley grains) and the Roman *mola salsa*, with which the victim was strewn. Bahr (*Symbol.* 1:216), however, regards the supplementary unbloody offering as a sort of compensation for the life taken from the sacrifice. Such additional meat-offerings, at all events, appear regularly in connection with the principal offerings, whether (a) free-will (<sup><R101></sup>Numbers 16:4 sq.; comp. <sup><R169></sup>Judges 6:19) or (b) enjoined. The latter, again, were sometimes offered *publicly* in the name of the whole people (**רַב־בָּחַר** [**tj nm**]), as those in connection with the daily morning and evening oblation (<sup><R294></sup>Exodus 29:40; 28:6; <sup><R146></sup>Numbers 4:16), or with the sabbatical (<sup><R109></sup>Numbers 28:9) and feast offerings (<sup><R115></sup>Numbers 28:11 sq.; Leviticus 23); at other times they were *private* (**דַּיָּק** [**y tj nm**]), as that of the purification of the leper (<sup><R140></sup>Leviticus 14:20 sq.), the Nazarite who had fulfilled his vow (<sup><R146></sup>Numbers 6:16, 17), and the consecration of Levites (<sup><R108></sup>Numbers 8:8 sq.), and perhaps of priests (<sup><R292></sup>Exodus 29:2, <sup><R102></sup>Leviticus 8:2). In these cases the essential part of the meat-offering was fine wheat flour (**טֵל סֹדֵךְ** Josephus, **ἄλευρον καθαρῶματῶν**, *Ant.* 3:9 4), mixed with olive oil (these were both to be the best procurable in Palestine; see the Mishna, *Menach.* 8:1), and it was all consumed upon the altar. The proportions were: for a lamb, 1/10 ephah of flour and 1/4 hin of oil; for a ram, 2/10 ephah of flour and 1/3 bin of oil; finally, for a bullock, 3/10 ephah of flour and 1/2 hin of oil (<sup><R154></sup>Numbers 15:4 sq.; 28:5, 9, 12 sq., 28

sq.; 29:3 sq., 8 sq., 13 sq.; <sup>(-R121)</sup>Leviticus 14:21). For the lamb offered with the Passover sheaf, 3/10 ephah of fine flour was prescribed (<sup>(-R213)</sup>Leviticus 23:13). In the case of the Nazarite still different regulations are made (<sup>(-R136)</sup>Numbers 6:16 sq.). **SEE NAZARITE**. From the fact that in connection with (free-will) burnt offerings a handful of the meal only as a meat-offering was to be sprinkled upon the altar to be consumed with the incense, while the remainder fell to the priest's lot (<sup>(-R174)</sup>Leviticus 7:14 sq.), we see that priestly festivities were associated with the thank-offerings.

It likewise appears from the foregoing account that the independent "meat-offerings" were sometimes freewill (Leviticus 2), and sometimes obligatory. To the latter belonged the casts specified above: (a) that of a poor man, who had made himself liable in the manner stated in Leviticus v. 1 sq. (comp. ver. 11); and (b) the "jealousy offering" of a wife charged with adultery (Numbers v. 15, 26); to which is to be added (c) the consecration-offering of a priest (high-priest) on entering upon his office (<sup>(-R16)</sup>Leviticus 6:20 [13] sq.). The Talmud (see *Menach.* 4:5; 11:3) applies this law exclusively to the oblation of the high-priest, and makes the meat-offering to be a *daily* one (**dymæhj nñæ**) with which Josephus agrees (*Ant.* 3:10, 7). In both the first cases the meat-offering consisted of 1/10 ephah of meal (without oil or in, cense), of which, as above noted, only a handful was burned, and the rest, as usual, went to the priest; whereas in the third case, the whole meat-offering was to be consumed (if so we may understand the somewhat dark passage of <sup>(-R122)</sup>Leviticus 6:22). The meal in cases (a) and (c) was to be of wheat, but in the case (b) of barley. The free-will offering might be brought in either of three conditions, namely, as raw flour, upon which oil was poured and incense laid (strewed) (Leviticus ii, 1 sq.); or as roasted and pounded (firstling) grains, likewise with oil and incense (<sup>(-R14)</sup>Leviticus 2:14 sq.); or, lastly, as baked dough. The dough, moreover, might be baked either in the oven, and in that case the oil must be spread under the loaves, or sprinkled 'upon them' (<sup>(-R14)</sup>Leviticus 2:14); or in a pan (**tbj ññ**), when the dough must be mixed with the oil. and in the presentation the loaves were broken in pieces and oil poured on them (<sup>(-R15)</sup>Leviticus 2:5 sq.); or, finally, in the **tvj rññi** i.e., according to the Jews, a deep stewpan, so that the loaves swam in oil-<sup>(-R17)</sup>Leviticus 2:7). **SEE CAKE**. The priest always burned of these free-will offerings a handful of meal with oil (or a batch), with all the incense, on the altar (<sup>(-R12)</sup>Leviticus 2:2); the remainder fell sometimes to him, sometimes to the other priests (<sup>(-R19)</sup>Leviticus 7:9 sq.), and must be consumed in the sanctuary

(<sup><RB3></sup>Leviticus 2:3; 10:10,12 sq.; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 3:9, 4). Leaven or honey must not be mixed with the meat-offering (<sup><RB1></sup>Leviticus 2:11; a rule which, with one exception [<sup><RB3></sup>Leviticus 7:13], applied to all such offerings; see <sup><RB2></sup>Exodus 29:2; <sup><RB2></sup>Leviticus 7:12; 8:26; 10:12; Mishna, *Menach.* v. 1), but they must be salted (<sup><RB3></sup>Leviticus 2:13). Even in eating the meat-offering the priests were not allowed to use ferment (see <sup><RB6></sup>Leviticus 6:16 [9]; 10:12). See generally Reland, *Antiq. Sacr.* 3:7; Iken, *Antig.* <sup><SB14></sup>Hebrews 1:14; Carpzov, *Appar.* p. 708 (brief); Bauer, *Gottesd. Verd.* 1:187 sq. (incomplete and inexact). See Vollborth, *De sacrificio farreo Hebraeorum* (Gottingen, 1780). **SEE OFFERING.**

### Mebane, William N.

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Guilford County, N.C. March 10, 1809. His preparatory education was received in Greensborough, N. C., under the Revelation Drs. Pressly and Carothers. He graduated at the University of North Carolina in 1833, and at Princeton Theological Seminary in 1837; in 1838 and 1839 labored as a missionary in the bounds of the states of Louisiana and Texas; in 1840 was ordained and installed pastor of Spring Garden Church, N. C.; in 1852 took charge of Madison Church. He died in May, 1859. Mr. Mebane possessed fine conversational powers, together with a striking independence of thought; as a pastor he was very successful, as he was gifted with the happy faculty of introducing the subject of personal religion. See *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1861, p.97.

### Mebun'nai

(Hebrews *Mebunnay'*, מְבַנַּי], *constructive*, if genuine; Sept. ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν [apparently pointing מְבַנַּי], but v. r; Σαβουχαΐ; Vulg. *Mebounai*), a person named as one of David's body-guard (<sup><RB2></sup>2 Samuel 23:27), but elsewhere more correctly SIBBECHAI (<sup><RB18></sup>2 Samuel 21:18; <sup><RB14></sup>1 Chronicles 20:4) or SIBBECAI (<sup><RB12></sup>1 Chronicles 11:29; 27:11). *See DAVID.*

### Mecaskey, John W., A.M.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, born in 1821, was the son of pious parents, and inherited an honored name, a fine physical form, a vigorous intellect, and an amiable disposition. On the death of his devoted mother in his twelfth year, he was placed by his remaining parent in the academy of the Revelation Mr. Andrews, of Doylestown, Pa., and there

completed his academical course. His inclinations were for the legal profession, and he consequently fitted himself for admission to the bar, with fair promises of a bright future. Suddenly brought to acknowledge his need of religion, he gave himself to Christianity, and, believing himself to be called to preach the Gospel, at once prepared for the great work. After rendering good service in the Sunday-school, and as a class-leader and exhorter, he was; licensed to preach; and being further proved by one year's travel on the Newtown Circuit, he was recommended to the Philadelphia Conference, by which he was received in 1844, and sent to Radnor Circuit. His subsequent fields of labor were Grove Circuit, Mauch Chunk, Stroudsburg, Bustleton, St. John's, the Tract Agency, and West Philadelphia. After this he was stationed in Columbia, Reading, Norristown, and Pottsville. In 1862 he was again brought to Philadelphia, and stationed in Asbury, West Philadelphia, and here he worked for the Master's cause until death, Oct. 16, 1863. "He was instant in season and out of season, an able minister of the New Testament, and a faithful steward of the mysteries of God. Purity, dignity, and earnestness, culminating in deep, constant devotion to God and his work, marked and illuminated his whole course." See *Minutes of Conferences*, 1864, p. 26.

## Mecca

(*Om A -Kora*, Mother of Cities), the birthplace of Mohammed, and therefore the central and most sacredly guarded and honored city of Arabia, is one of its oldest towns, the capital of the province of Hejaz. It is situated in 21° 30' N. lat., and 40° 8' E. long., 245 miles south of Medina (q.v.), and about 65 miles east of Jiddah, the well-known port on the Red Sea, in a narrow, barren valley, surrounded by bare hills and sandy plains, and watered by the brook Wady Al-Tarafeyn. The city is about 1500 paces long, and about 650 broad, and is divided into the Upper and Lower City, with twenty-five chief quarters. The streets are broad and rather regular, but unpaved; excessively dusty in summer, and muddy in the rainy season. The houses, three or four stories high, are built of brick or stone, ornamented with paintings, and their windows open on the streets. The rooms are much more handsomely furnished, and altogether in a better state than is usual in the East, the inhabitants of Mecca making their living chiefly by letting them to the pilgrims who flock hither to visit the Beit Allah (House of God), or chief mosque, containing the Kaaba (q.v.). This mosque, capable of holding about 35,000 persons, is surrounded by nineteen gates surmounted by seven minarets, and contains several rows of

pillars, about twenty feet high, and about eighteen inches. in diameter, of marble, granite, porphyry, and common sandstone, which at certain distances are surmounted by small domes. A great number of people are attached to the mosque in some kind of ecclesiastical capacity, as katibs, muftis, mueddins, etc. Pilgrimages have very much decreased of late years, and in consequence the inhabitants of this city, at one time containing 100,000, now scarcely counts 40,000 regular residents. The age of the city of Mecca is not exactly known. We find that it was in quite a flourishing condition in the days of Ptolemy, under. the name of *Macoraba*. ‘ Mohammed, who had been obliged to quit it quite precipitately in AD. 622, returned to it in 627, forcing his entrance as conqueror. At first it belonged to the tribe of the Kosaites, later to the Koreish (q.v.). Within the course of the present century (1803) Mecca was taken by the Wahabies (q.v.), but given up again to the pacha of Egypt, Mehemet Ali (1833), whose son Ibrahim was made sheik El-Haram -” of the Sacred Place.” At present, however, Mecca is directly dependent on the sultan of Turkey. A certain balm, the “Balm of Mecca,” is made from a plant called *Besem*, which grows in abundance in the neighborhood of the city. Another chief article of manufacture, and a great source of income to the residents of Mecca, are the *chaplets* for pious pilgrims. See Chambers, *Cyclop.* s.v.; *Der Christliche Apologete*; 1872, Nov. 12.

## Mechanic

The Hebrews appear to have learned in Egypt the elements at least of all the forms of handicraft practiced in that highly-civilized country, and later their neighbors the Phoenicians, famous in early times for their progress in the industrial arts, doubtless exerted a further influence upon them; nevertheless, down at least to the close of the period of the judges, the skill of the Hebrews in manufactures was quite inconsiderable (<sup><0130></sup>1 Samuel 13:20). Many of the handicrafts were practiced by the proprietor of the house (landowner) himself (comp. Homer, *Odys.* v,243), chiefly the coarser kinds of work (i.e. in wood), while other sorts fell to the female head of the family, such as baking (<sup><0138></sup>2 Samuel 13:8), weaving and embroidering (<sup><0258></sup>Exodus 35:28; <sup><0324></sup>Proverbs 31:24), and the making up of garments, including those of the men (<sup><0321></sup>Proverbs 31:21; <sup><0029></sup>1 Samuel 2:19; <sup><0109></sup>Acts 9:39). **SEE WOMAN**, and comp. the Mishna, *Kethuboth*, v. 5. But all the varied forms of manufacture, which, being generally executed by dint of actual manipulation, required a good degree of personal dexterity, were carried on among the Hebrews by the owners themselves,

who were not slaves. So in the Homeric poems several kinds of mechanic arts appear (*Hiad*, 4:110, 485; 18:601; *Odyss.* 3:425, 432; see Wachsmuth, *Hellen. Alterth.* II, 1:47 sq.).

## Picture for Mechanic 1

## Picture for Mechanic 2

Accordingly we find mention of the *gold* and *silver smith* ( $\bar{\alpha}\rho\omega\alpha$  or  $\bar{\alpha}\rho\omega\mu$ ]  $\langle 0704 \rangle$  Judges 17:4;  $\langle 2409 \rangle$  Isaiah 40:19;  $\langle 2404 \rangle$  Jeremiah 10:14, etc.), who especially fabricated idols, or plated and ornamented them; the apothecary ( $j\ q\epsilon\omega\tau$   $j\ Qri$   $\langle 0215 \rangle$  Exodus 30:35; comp.  $\mu\upsilon\rho\epsilon\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$ , Ecclus. 38:7); the *artificer* ( $vrj$ ;  $\langle 0255 \rangle$  Exodus 35:35;  $\langle 0275 \rangle$  Deuteronomy 27:15;  $\langle 0139 \rangle$  1 Samuel 13:19), a term inclusive of blacksmiths ( $l\ z\beta i\upsilon\upsilon\epsilon j$ ;  $\langle 2342 \rangle$  Isaiah 44:12;  $\langle 1244 \rangle$  2 Kings 24:14;  $\langle 0139 \rangle$  1 Samuel 13:19; Tam.  $\hat{y}j\ \beta\eta i$ , Mishna, *Chel.* 14:3) and braziers ( $tvj\ n]8j$  Kings 7:14; comp.  $\chi\alpha\lambda\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\varsigma$ )C,  $\langle 5044 \rangle$  2 Timothy 4:14), as well as carpenters ( $/[\ \epsilon]j$  .  $\langle 1051 \rangle$  2 Samuel 5:11;  $\langle 2343 \rangle$  Isaiah 44:13; comp.  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\omega\nu$ ,  $\langle 4105 \rangle$  Matthew 3:55;  $\langle 4103 \rangle$  Mark 6:3; also cabinet-makers, Mishna, *Baba Kamma*, 9:3) and masolis ( $y\upsilon\epsilon j\ ;ryq\alpha$   $\langle 3141 \rangle$  1 Chronicles 14:1); the *stone-squarers* ( $\bar{\alpha}\beta\alpha\gamma\beta\alpha] q$   $\langle 1212 \rangle$  2 Kings 12:12), which was distinct from the last named, but whether the *plasterers* ( $yj\ \epsilon; l\ p\epsilon$ ;  $\langle 2331 \rangle$  Ezekiel 13:11) were a separate trade from the masons is not clear; the *potter* ( $r\chi\psi\theta$   $\langle 2296 \rangle$  Isaiah 29:16, etc.;  $\langle 4203 \rangle$  Matthew 27:7, 10; comp. Gesenius, *Monum. Phoen.* p. 161); the *locksmith* ( $r\Gamma\epsilon\sigma\eta i$   $\langle 2402 \rangle$  Jeremiah 29:2); the *fuller* ( $sb\beta\theta$  or  $sb\kappa\eta i$   $\langle 0287 \rangle$  2 Kings 18:17;  $\langle 4103 \rangle$  Mark 9:3; comp. Gesen. *ut sup.* p. 181); the *weaver* ( $gr\alpha$  yearly ( $\langle 0282 \rangle$  Exodus 28:32) formed a separate branch of industry (especially in fabrics of byssus,  $\langle 1302 \rangle$  1 Chronicles 4:21), and in large cities the *baker* ( $h\beta\alpha\rho$   $\langle 2074 \rangle$  Hosea 7:4;  $\langle 2572 \rangle$  Jeremiah 37:21; see Josephus, *Ant.* 15:9, 2; but  $\langle 0112 \rangle$  Luke 11:2, does not: rove the absence of such a trade); later also the *barber* ( $b\lambda\Gamma i$   $\langle 4101 \rangle$  Ezekiel 5:1) is named ( $r\psi i$  according to the Targum of Jonath. at  $\langle 0335 \rangle$  Leviticus 13:45; Mishna, *Shabb.* 1:2). See each in its place. 'Nevertheless, that the Hebrews took no very high rank in the fine styles of work, especially those in which labor passes over into an art, appears from the fact that a single individual often carried on several trades at once ( $\langle 0203 \rangle$  Exodus 31:3 sq.;  $\langle 1414 \rangle$  2 Chronicles 2:14); while David and Solomon are recorded as having imported for their

structures Phoenician (Sidonian) artificers (<sup><1116></sup>1 Kings 5:6; <sup><1340></sup>1 Chronicles 14:1; <sup><4107></sup>2 Chronicles 2:7, 14, etc.). *SEE PHOENICIA.*

After the exile handicrafts and arts in general stood in greater esteem among the Jews, so that experts were found among them, and their productions acquired considerable reputation (see Rosenmuller, *Morgenland*, 6:42). It passed for a sign of a bad bringing up when a father failed to teach his son a trade (Mishna, *Kiddush*. 4:14; Lightfoot, p 616; comp. *Pirke Aboth*, 2:2; Wagenseil, *Sota*, p. 597; Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p.491). In the Apocrypha of the Old Test. there are mentioned the **κεραμεύς**, as a moulder of figures of clay (Wisdom. 15:8), the **χρυσουρνός, ἀργυροχόος**, and **χαλκοπλάστης** among metal-workers (Wisdom. 15:19), chiefly as tributary to idol image-makers.; in the New Test. the tanner (**βυρσεύς**, <sup><408></sup>Acts 9:43; 10:6, 32; Talm. **ḡysrwm** or **ḡynda** [ , *Chel.* 15:1), the tentmaker (**σκηνοποιός**, <sup><418></sup>Acts 18:3); in Josephus occur the cheese-makers (**τυροποιοί**, *War*, v. 4, 1), the barbers (**κουριεῖς**, *Ant.* xvi, 5; *War*, 1:27, 5), who were of service to princes; in the Talmud, among others, the tailor (**ḡyyh**, *Shabb.* 1:3), the shoemaker (**ḡ xr**, *Pesach*, 4:6), the plasterer (**dyys**, *Chel.* 29:3), the glazier (**zzq**, *Chel.* 8:9), the goldsmith (**rhz**, *Chel.* 29:6), the dyer (**[ bx**, comp. Thilo, *Apocr.* p. 111). Some of these occupations were of so low repute that those who followed them could not attain the office of high-priest (*Kiddush*. lxxxii. 1); viz. those of the weaver, the barber, the fuller, the apothecary, the bloodletter, the bath-keeper, the tanner, which avocations, especially the barber's and the tanner's, were very odious (*Kiddush*. 4:14; *Megilla*, 3:2; comp. Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 155; Wetstein, *Nov. Test.* 2:516). The workshops or place of business of the artisans appear (in the larger cities) to have been in certain streets or squares (*bazaars*, Tournefort, *Trav.* 2:322), where they were collected (<sup><2812></sup>Jeremiah 39:21); as in the Talmud, for instance, there is mention (Surenhusius, *Mischna*, v. 169, 225) of a *meat-market* (**sl fa ḡl çya**), and in Josephus (*War*, v. 4, 1) of a *cheese-maker's valley* (the Tyropceon), as likewise of forges and dealers in wool and garments (*War*, v. 8, i). On occasions of public mourning such places were closed (Philo, 2:525). See generally, Iken, *Antiq. Hebr.* 2:578 sq.; Bellermand, *Handb.* 1:221 sq. *SEE HANDICRAFT.*

**Mecherah.**

*SEE MECHERATHITE.*

## Mech'erathite

(Hebrews *Mekerathi'*, *ytǣk̄ǣ*] gentile from *hr̄k̄ǣ*], *Mekerah'*, a sword, as in. <sup><1048></sup>Genesis 49:5; Sept. *Μεχουραθί* v. r. *Μεχωραθρί*, Vulg. *Mecherathites*), an epithet applied to Hopher, one of David's famous warriors, probably as being a native of MECHERAH, a place otherwise unknown (<sup><1313></sup>1 Chronicles 11:36); but from 'the parallel passage (<sup><1023></sup>2 Samuel 23:34) it would appear to be a corruption for MAACHATHITE. *SEE UR.*

## Mechitar

(or Mekhitar), DA PETRO, the founder of the Order of Mechitarists (q.v.), was born at Sebaste, a town of Armenia Minor, Feb. 7, 1676. His father's name was Peter Mauukean (i.e. son of Manug), but he exchanged his family name (Manug) for that of Mechitar, or "Consoler," on entering into ecclesiastical orders. His early education had been intrusted to monastics; they, no doubt, influenced him to devote himself to the service of the Church. At the age of fifteen he became an inmate of the Convent of the Holy Cross, near Sebaste; and a few years after, being made secretary of the archbishop Michael, who took him to Erzerum, he became acquainted with a fellow-countryman who had travelled in Europe, and wholenthim an Armenian work by Galanus, an Italian missionary, *On the Reconciliation of the Armenian Church with that of Rome* (published at Rome in 1650). Though Mechitar still continued professedly a member of the Armenian priesthood, he appears from this time to have become in secret a proselyte to the Church of Rome but the exact date of his passing over seems to have been unknown to all his biographers. He was anxious to make himself acquainted with the civilization of the West, it is urged by some; others believe that Mechitar had fallen into the hands of Romish priests, and was induced, as early as 1693, to accept the Romish interpretation of the sacred writings, and, consequently, of the doctrines and faith of the hierarchy, and that he determined on a visit to Rome to enjoy an interview with the holy father and the great dignitaries of the Latin Church. There is some reason also for the belief that Mechitar was at once, after his entry into the Latin Church, made a member of the Society of Jesus, and that he secretly worked for the good of the order. On his way to Rome he was attacked by severe illness in the island of Cyprus, and compelled to return, begging his way as he went. In 1696 he reentered the convent, determined to become a worker for higher religious and literary culture among his countrymen, and

to further this undertaking effectually he sought to gather about him young men desiring to work as missionaries. In 1699 he was made DD., and shortly after he removed to the Byzantine capital. In 1700, when he was a preacher at Constantinople, some dissensions between the partisans of two rival patriarchs divided the Armenian community into two hostile parties. Mechitar at first advised reconciliation, and afterwards, to their surprise, preached submission to the Church of Rome, and this roused such a storm against him that he was obliged to claim the protection of the French ambassador, which was readily afforded.

Thenceforth Mechitar appeared openly as a Roman Catholic. To escape from the animosity of his countrymen he still found it necessary to remove in disguise to Smyrna, and finally he settled at Modon, in the Morea under the protection of the Venetian government, to whom it then belonged. As early as Sept. 8, 1701, he had founded at Constantinople a new religious community, in which ten other persons joined with him; at Modon, on Sept. 8, 1703, he took possession of an estate given him by the Venetians, to build a convent of the new order, which was called after his own name. The war between the Turks and the Venetians drove Mechitar in 1715 'to Venice, where he remained until after the conquest of the Morea by the Mussulman. His petition for a place instead of Modon found a willing ear at the Venetian Senate in 1717, and he was presented with the little island of San Lazaro, near the Lido, and there Mechitar built the convent which still attracts the attention of every visitor to Venice. It was opened on the day of the Virgin Mary's birth, Sept. 8. Thenceforth Mechitar labored assiduously for the good of the Church of Rome and the elevation of his countrymen. He is acknowledged even by his opponents of the Armenian Church to have revived the high literary attainments of his country in former days. He not only contributed to this by his own efforts as a voluminous writer, but in a still more important degree by establishing printing presses. He died April 27, 1749. His own productions are, besides many hymns, which are still sung in the Armenian churches, because they were written before his apostasy, a translation of Thomas B Kempis's *Imitation of Christ*, and of Thomas Aquinas's *Theology*, and many philological works of value. The fullest account of Mechitar, of his work, and of his followers, in English, is to be found in *Brief Account of the Mechitaristic Society*, by Alexander Gorde (Venice, 1835). **SEE MECHITARISTS.**

## Mechitarists

a congregation of Armenian Christians, who reside on the island of San Lazaro at Venice, but who have also obtained a footing in France and Austria. They derive their name from MECHITAR DA PETRO *SEE MECHITAR DA PETRO* (q.v.), Who in the year 1701 founded this religious society for the purpose of diffusing a knowledge of the old Armenian language and literature. The Mechitarists, like their founder and instructor, acknowledge the supremacy of the Roman pontiff, and seek to spread the faith and practices of the Church of Rome in the East. The rules of the Mechitarists are modelled after those of the Benedictines, but every member must be of the Armenian nation, and promise an active devotion to the cultivation of the Armenian language and literature. The result, as we have said above, has been the formation not only of a convent but of an academy; and, in fact, the best schools for the study of Armenian are in the houses of the order. A division was provoked in 1773, and some of the Mechitarists settled at Trieste, and there founded an institution like that at San Lazaro. In 1810 these seceders removed to Vienna, the Austrian capital, and there they still remain, busy mainly in the publication of Armenian classical productions and instructing young Armenians. A third society has recently been founded at Paris, and efforts are making for the establishment of a fourth at Constantinople. Several hundred volumes have already been published by the Mechitarists. Of these the theological portion has a Roman Catholic circulation only, but the others have been welcomed by the Armenians generally. They publish a periodical like the English *Penny Magazine*. See Boze, *De Convent de St. Lazare a Venise on Histoire succincte de l'Ordre des Mechitaristes Armeniens* (Paris, 1837).

## Mechthildis, ST.

a younger sister of St. Gertrude (q.v.), of the ancient and renowned family of Hackeborn, was born at Eisleben in the early part of the 13th century. She early manifested a decided taste for religious exercises, and at the age of seven, having gone one day with her mother to visit the Convent of Rodersdorf, occupied by Benedictine nuns, she was so much delighted with it that she insisted one remaining in it. She was allowed to become a novice, and fulfilled all the duties imposed upon her in that position with great zeal, showing herself particularly serviceable in taking care of the poor' and the afflicted. At the end of her noviciate she took the veil, and remained in the convent until 1258, when, together with the other nuns.

she removed to that of Helpede, where she died shortly after. Inclining from youth to mysticism, she, like her sister Gertrude, claimed to have had visions, but she steadfastly declined writing them down; this was, however, done against her will, by one of her friends, under the title *Revelationes selectae S. Mathildis*, together with a short biographical notice. These mystic pieces are not only full of elevated thoughts and aspirations, but give evidence of a thorough acquaintance with Scripture. The best edition is that published, together with a German translation, in the *Bibliotheca mystica et ascetica* (Cologne, 1854, pt. x).

Another Mechthildis, also honored as a saint in the Roman Catholic Church, flourished near the middle of the 12th century. She was a descendant of the counts of Andechs. In early youth she commenced to manifest signs of piety, and when she attained the requisite age she became a nun in the Convent of Diessen, in Bavaria. Here she acquired such reputation for piety and zeal that she was elected abbess in 1153. Some years afterwards she was obliged, at the command of the bishop, to go as abbess to the Convent of Edelstetten, which she was to renovate. She labored there with her usual zeal, and proved very successful, yet she always regretted leaving her former convent, and during her last illness was removed to it. She died May 31, 1160. She is commemorated April 10. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 9:223; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lex.* 12:788.

## Mecklenburg

a North German territory, now part of the German empire, consists of two grand-duchies, the larger one called Mecklenburg-Schwerin, and the smaller one called Mecklenburg-Strelitz.

(1.) *Mecklenburg-Schwerin*, bounded on the north by the Baltic, on the east by Pomerania, on the south by Brandenburg, and on the west by Laienburg, covers an area of about 5126 square miles, and has a population of 560,618 (in 1867), of which 556,290 are Lutherans (200 Reformed), 1195 communicants of the Church of Rome, and 3064 adherents to the Jewish faith. The Mecklenburgers are for the most part Slavonic origin, but amalgamation with their Saxon neighbors has largely Germanized the original race. The predominating form of religion is the Lutheran, the religion of the reigning prince. The grand-duke, whose powers are limited by a mixed feudal and constitutional form of government, has the title of royal highness, and is styled prince of the Wends, and of Schwerin and

Ratzeburg, count of Schwerin, and lord of Rostock, Stargard, etc. The state Church divides the territory into 331 rectories, with 475 churches, which are controlled by six superintendents and thirty-seven prepositors. Much has been done of late years in extending the educational organization of Mecklenburg, although the lower classes do not yet enjoy as many advantages as in some other districts of Germany. Besides the university at Rostock (q.v.), there are five gymnasia, and numerous burgher, parochial, and other schools. The principal towns are the capital Schwerin, Ludwigslust, Rostock, Gistrow, and Wismar.

(2.) *Mecklenburg-Strelitz*, the other grand-duchy, is composed of two distinct portions of territory, viz. Stargard (by far the larger division, lying to the east of Mecklenburg-Schwerin) and the principality of Ratzeburg (between Mecklenburg-Schwerin and Lauenburg), and comprises an area of rather more than 1000 square miles, with a population of 98,770 (in 1867), of which 97,937 are Lutherans (1000 Reformed), 169 Roman Catholics, and 466 Jews. Like the other Mecklenburg duchy, the country is in the hands of the Lutherans. It is divided into sixty-two rectories, and is governed by seven diocesan superintendents (propste).

The two Mecklenburg duchies have provincial estates in common, which meet once a year, alternately at Malchin and Sternberg. This united chamber consists of noble landowners and the representatives of forty-seven provincial boroughs, each of which has, however its separate municipal government.

*History.*-The Mecklenburg territory, anciently occupied by Germanic and afterwards by Slavonic tribes, was in the 12th century conquered by Henry the Lion, duke of Saxony, who, after thoroughly devastating the country, and compelling the small number of inhabitants remaining after the war to adopt Christianity, restored the greater part of the territory to Burewin, the heir of the slain Slavonic prince, Niklot, and gave him his daughter in marriage. The country at that period received its present designation from its principal settlement, Mikilnburg, now a village between Wismar and Brul. Christianity was, however, known to the inhabitants of this country long before the inroads of Henry the Lion. Missionaries of the Cross are said to have been there in the days of Charlemagne; but true Christian principles and faithful adherents to the Christian cause were not made there until the first half of the 10th century. After Henry I had vanquished the natives in the battle at Leuzen (931), bishop Adalward, of Verden, in that

very year baptized one of their rulers, and by the close of that century many converts had been gathered. But Christianity was still unpopular, and its confessors suffered much persecution, especially near the middle of the 11th century (comp., Jaffe, *Lothar*, p. 147, 232; *Conrad III*, p. 16). Not until the successful incursions of Henry the Lion can Christianity be really said to have found a hold in Mecklenburg territory, and hence he is generally looked upon not only as the author of the consolidation of the territory as Mecklenburg, but also as the founder of Christianity within its bounds. Shortly after the middle of the 12th century convents were built, and several monastic establishments founded. We find one Vicelin (t 1154), bishop of Lubeck, and his successor Geroldj especially active as missionaries. But Christianity did not attain to a really prosperous condition during the Middle Ages in this part of the-Teutonic domains, although it was elevated into a duchy in 1349 by the emperor Charles. The Protestant doctrines were first introduced here in 1550 by duke Johann Albrecht, and his grandsons, Wolf-Friedrich and Johann Albrecht, who founded the lines of Mecklenburg-Schwerin and Mecklenburg-Giistrow. They were, however, deprived of the ducal title in 1627, in consequence of their adhesion to the Protestant cause, and the imperial general Wallenstein was proclaimed duke of all Mecklenburg. In 1632 Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden restored his kinsmen, the deposed dukes, to their domains. Kotzer, alias Schluter (q.v.), who was poisoned in 1532 was particularly prominent in the cause of the Reformers. The fruit of his labors was seen in 1534 in the decree against the reading of the mass, and in the final official adoption of the Protestant cause in 1550. The secular affairs of Mecklenburg continued to undergo changes. After various subdivisions of the ducal line into the branches of Schwerin, Strelitz, and others, and the successive extinction of several of these collateral houses, the Imperial Commission, which met at Hamburg in 1701, brought about the settlement of a family compact, by which it was arranged that Schwerin and Giistrow should form one duchy, and Strelitz, with Ratzeburg and Stargard, Mirow and Nemerow, another independent sovereignty. After this, very few events of importance occurred till the accession in Schwerin, in 1785, of Friedrich Franz, who obtained the title of grandduke in 1815, and died in 1837, after a long reign, which he had made highly conducive to the internal welfare and external reputation of his hereditary dominions. The reign of Friedrich Franz II, who succeeded his father, Paul Friedrich, in 1842, was disturbed by a contest between the nobles and the burgher and equestrian landowners, the former arrogating to themselves the exclusive right of

electing members into the equestrian order, nominating to benefices, and monopolizing other prerogatives of the ancient feudal nobility. The revolutionary excitement of 1848 gave a fresh stimulus to the popular ferment, and the disturbances could only be quelled by the intervention of Prussian troops. In 1866 the duchies were incorporated in the North German Confederation, and since the establishment of the new German empire they form part of the latter. Religious toleration and freedom of speech, which were comparatively unknown in the duchies of Mecklenburg, have since 1866 gained quite a footing there, and promise much aid in the extinction of a very lukewarm profession of Christianity, and the establishment of vital Christianity in its stead. See Adam. *Bremens. Hist. Eccles.* in Pertz, *Mon. Script.* vol. iii; Ernst Boll, *Geschichte Mecklenburg's mit besonderer. Berucksichtigung der Culturgesch.* (Neubrandenburg, 1855-5.); Herzog, *Real-encyklopadie*, s.v.; *Deutsch-Amerik. Conv. Lexikon*, s.v., (J. H. W.)

## Med'aba

(**Μηδαβά** 2 Macc. 9:36). *SEE MEDEBA.*

## Me'dad

(Hebrews *Meydad'*, **ddymelow**; Sept. **Μωδάδ**), a person mentioned in connection with Eidad, as two of the seventy elders who were nominated to assist Moses in the government of the people, but who remained in the camp, probably as modestly deeming themselves unfit for the office, when the others presented themselves at the tabernacle. The divine Spirit, however, rested on them even there, "and they prophesied in the camp" (<sup><01124></sup>Numbers 11:24-29). The Targum of Jonathan alleges that these two men were brothers of Moses and Aaron by the mother's side, being sons of Jochebed and Elizaphan. BC. 1657. *SEE ELDAD.*

## Me'dan

(Hebrews *Medan'*, **dm]** *contention*, as in <sup><0164></sup>Proverbs 6:14, 19; Sept. **Μαδάν** v. r. in Chron. **Μαδιάν**; Vulg. *Madan*), the third son of Abraham by Keturah (<sup><022></sup>Genesis 25:2). BC. post 2024. He and his brother Midian are believed to have peopled the country of Midian, east of the Dead Sea. "It has been supposed, from the similarity of the name, that the tribe descended from Medan was more closely allied to *Midian* than by mere blood-relation, and that it was the same as, or a portion of the latter. There

is, however, no ground for this theory beyond its plausibility. The traditional city Medyen of the Arab geographers (the classical Modiana), situate in Arabia on the eastern shore of the Gulf of Eyleh, must be held to have been Midianitish, not Medanitish (but Bunsen, *Bibelwerk*, suggests the latter identification). It has been elsewhere remarked, *SEE KETURAH*, that many of the Keturahite tribes seem to have merged in early times into the Ishmaelite tribes. The mention of 'Ishmaelite' as a convertible term with 'Midianite,' in <sup>405728</sup>Genesis 37:28 36, is remarkable; but the Midianite of the AV. in ver. 28 is Medanite in the Hebrew (by the Sept. rendered *Μαδιθηναῖοι*, and in the Vulg. *Isimaelitae* and: *Madianitae*), and we may have here a trace of the subject of this article, though Midianite appears on the whole to be more likely the correct reading in the passages referred to. *SEE MIDIAN*. .

### Medard, ST.

bishop of Noyon, in France, was born about 456, in the village of Sallency, near Noyon. Through his father, Nectardus, he belonged to a noble Frank family; his mother, Protagia, a Gallo-Roman, also claimed high connections. He was educated in the school of his native city, and early manifested that zeal and charity for which he afterwards became distinguished. He entered the Church under the guidance of the bishop of Vermand, and on the death of the latter, in 530, was appointed his successor. In consequence, however, of the frequent invasions which desolated that district, he exchanged this see for Noyon, a strongly-fortified town. When St. Eleutherus, bishop of Tournay, died, in 532, Medard was invited to join this see to that of Noyon; he refused at first, but was finally induced to accept by king Clotaire himself, and the two dioceses continued to be administered by the same bishop until 1146, when they were again divided. St. Medard was one of the most influential and most universally-respected bishops of his time. King Clotaire came to visit him shortly before his death, which occurred about 545, and afterwards caused his remains to be buried in the royal estate of Crouy, near Soissons. The renowned cathedral of St. Medard is erected over his grave. He is commemorated on June 8. He is highly praised by Gregory of Tours (lib. 4:c. 19), who, like his biographers Venantius, Fortunatus, and Radbodus, attributes to him a great number of miracles. The best biography of St. Medard is contained in the *Acta Sanctorum* for July 8. See Perz *Monun. Hist. Germ.* vol. i and ii; Gregorius Turon. *Hist. Franc.* lib. iv, c. 19; same,

*De Gloria Confess.* c. 95; Radbodus, *Vita S. Medardi, Noviomn. episc. apud Suriun*, 8 Junii; *Gallia Christ.* vol. ix, col. 979. (J. N. P.)

## Medatha.

*SEE HAMMEDATHA.*

## Mede

(Hebrews *Maday'*, **ydm**; a word of Indian origin, meaning, according to Gesenius, *Thes. Hebrews* p. 768, the *middle* country, from its position, as in Polybius, v. 44; Auth. Vers. "Medes," "Media," "Madai," <sup><1002></sup>Genesis 10:2; <sup><1276></sup>2 Kings 17:6; 18:11; <sup><1306></sup>1 Chronicles 1:5; <sup><1003></sup>Esther 1:3, 14, 18, 19; 10:2; <sup><2317></sup>Isaiah 13:17; 21:2; <sup><255></sup>Jeremiah 25:25; 51:11, 28; <sup><2831></sup>Daniel 8:20; 9:1; also *Madi'*, **ydmæ**, "Mede," <sup><2103></sup>Daniel 11:1; Chald. *Maday'*, **ydm**; "Mede," "Medes," <sup><1002></sup>Ezra 6:2; <sup><2153></sup>Daniel 5:28; 6:8, 12, 15; and *Madaah'*, **hadm**; "Me, "Median," or *Madaa'*, **aydm**; <sup><2751></sup>Daniel 5:31; Gr. **Μῆδος**), the ethnographic title of a *Median*, or inhabitant of *Media*; the same of that of **MADAI** *SEE MADAI* [q.v.]. The Hebrew form, "which occurs in <sup><1002></sup>Genesis 10:2, among the list of the sons of Japhet, has been commonly regarded as a personal appellation; and most commentators call Madai the third son of Japhet, and the progenitor of the Medes. But it is extremely doubtful whether, in the mind of the writer of Genesis 10, the term *Madai* was regarded as representing a person. That the genealogies in the chapter are to some extent ethnic is universally allowed, and may be seen even in our Authorized Version (verse 16-18). As Gomer, Magog, Javan, Tubal, 'and Meshech, which are conjoined in <sup><1002></sup>Genesis 10:2 with Madai, are elsewhere in Scripture always ethnic and not personal appellatives (<sup><3273></sup>Ezekiel 27:13; 38:6; 39:6; <sup><2782></sup>Daniel 8:21; <sup><2916></sup>Joel 3:6; <sup><3005></sup>Psalms 120:5; <sup><2769></sup>Isaiah 66:19, etc.), so it is probable that they stand for nations rather than persons here. In that case no one would regard Madai as a person; and we must remember that it is the exact word used elsewhere throughout Scripture for the well-known nation of the Medes. Probably, therefore, all that the writer intends to assert in <sup><1002></sup>Genesis 10:2 is that the Medes, as well as the Gomerites, Greeks, Tibareni, Moschi, etc., descended from Japhet. Modern science has found that, both in physical type and in language, the Medes belong to that family of the human race which embraces the Cymry and the GrecoRomans" (see Prichard's *Phys. Hist. of Mankind*, 4:650; chap. x, § 2-4; and comp. the article on MEDIA). For "Darius the Mede," *SEE DARIUS.*'

## Mede, Joseph, BD.

a learned English divine, was descended from a respectable family at Berden, in Essex, and was born in 1586. When but a boy ten years old he lost his father, but his education was provided for by friends. He became a commoner of Christ Church, Cambridge, in 1602, where he took the degree of master of arts in 1610, having made such progress in all kinds of learning that he was universally esteemed an accomplished scholar. He was appointed Greek lecturer on Sir Walter Mildmay's foundation, and particularly employed himself in studying the history of the Chaldaeans and Egyptians. He appears to have had many offers of preferment, but unhesitatingly declined them 'all in favor of this position, which afforded him leisure for favorite studies. He died in 1638. "Mr. Mede," says his biographer, "was an acute logician, an accurate philosopher, a skilful mathematician, an excellent anatomist, a great philologist, a master of many 'languages, and a good proficient in history and chronology." His principal production, worthy the labors of a lifetime, he sent 'forth in 1627, under the title *Clavis Apocalyptica* (Cambridge, 1627, 4to); to which he added in 1632, *In Sancti Joannis Apocalypsin Commentarius, ad amussim Clavis Apocalypticce*. An English translation of this celebrated work was published in London in 1650, entitled *The Key of Revelation searched and demonstrated out of the natural and proper Characters of the Visions, etc.; to which is added a Conjecture concerning Gog and Magog*. This work has been honored with high commendation from the learned Dr. Hurd, in his' *Introduction to the Study of the Prophecies* (ii. 122, etc.), where Mede is spoken of as "a sublime genius, without vanity, interest, or spleen, but with a single, unmixed love of truth, dedicating his great talents to the study of the prophetic Scriptures, and unfolding the mysterious prophecies of the Revelation." A collection of the whole of Mede's writings was published in 1672, in 2 vols. folio, by Dr. Worthington, who added to them a life of the author. He was a pious and profoundly learned man; and in every part of his works the talents of a sound and learned divine are eminently conspicuous. He was distinguished for his meekness, modesty, and prudence, and for unbounded liberality towards the needy. A very full account of Mede is given in Allibone's *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v. See also *English Cyclop.* s.v.; *Genesis Biog. Dict.* s.v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* 1:2028; Horne, *Bibl. Bibl.* 1839, p. 331; Orme, *Biblioth. Biblia*, s.v.; Hunt, *Hist. of Religious Thought in England*, 1:167.

## Med'eba

(Hebrews *Meydeba'*, *abdyne* water of quiet; Sept. Μηδαβά in Chron., Μαιδαβά in Josh., Μωάβ in Numb., and Μωαβίτις v. r. Μηδαβά, Μηδαμά, Μιδαβά in Isa.; Vulg. *Medaba*; Joseph. Μηδάβα and Μεδάβη), a town east of the Jordan, in a plain of the same name in the southern border of the tribe of Reuben (<sup><1310></sup>Joshua 13:9, 16), before which was fought the great battle where Joab defeated the Ammonites and their allies (<sup><1310></sup>1 Chronicles 19:7; comp. with <sup><1010></sup>2 Samuel 10:8,14, etc.). In the time of Ahaz, Medeba was a sanctuary of Moab (<sup><2310></sup>Isaiah 15:2); but in the denunciation of Jeremiah (48), often parallel with that of Isaiah, it is not mentioned. It originally belonged to the Moabites (<sup><1010></sup>Numbers 21:30), from whom it was conquered by Sihon the Amoritish king (Josephus, *Ant.* 13:1, 2, and 4); but upon the captivity of the tribes beyond the Jordan, the Moabites again took possession of it (<sup><2310></sup>Isaiah 15:2), and retained it after the return from exile (Macc. 9:36). **SEE JAMBRI**. It was the scene of the capture and possibly the death of John Maccabseus, and also of the revenge subsequently taken by Jonathan and Simon (Josephus, *Ant.* 13:1,4; the name is omitted in Maccabees on the second occasion, see ver. 38). About BC. 110 it was, taken, after a long siege, by John Hyrcanus (*Ant.* 13:9, 1; *War*, 1:2, 4), and then appears to have remained in the possession of the Jews for at least thirty years, till the time of Alexander Jannseus (13:15, 4); and it is mentioned as one of the twelve cities by the promise of which Aretas, the king of Arabia, was induced to assist Hyrcanus II to recover Jerusalem 'from his brother, Aristobulus (*Ant.* 14:1,4). Ptolemy calls it *Medaua* (Μήδωνα), in Arabia Petraea, in long. 68° 30', lat. 300 45' (v. 17, 6). Stephen of Byzantium (p. 566) assigns it to Nabatene. The *Onomasticon* places it near Heshbon; and it was once the seat of one of the thirty-five bishoprics of Arabia (Reland, *Palaestina*, p. 217, 223, 226). The place, 'although in ruins, still retains the name *Madeba*, and is 'situated upon a round hill seven miles south of Heshbron. The ruins are about a mile and a half in circuit, but not a single edifice remains perfect, although the remains of the walls of private houses are traceable, and an immense tank (Irby and Mangles, p. 471) is visible (Seetzen, in Zach's *Monat. Corresp.* 18:431; Burckhardt, *Trav. in Syria*, p. 365 sq.). The foundations of an-ancient temple observed by these travellers on the west of the town are perhaps those of the Christian church which it once contained (ἡ πόλις Μηδάβων, Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, 769-772). A large tank, columns, and other marks of former structures are still to be seen; the

remains of a Roman road exist near the town, which seems formerly to have connected it with Heshbon. "Taken as a Hebrew word, Me-deba means 'waters' of quiet; but, except the above tank, what waters can there ever have been on that high plain? The Arabic name, though similar in sound, has a different signification."

The *plain* (רְחוֹמַיִם) from Medeba to Dibon, given in <sup>(-0639)</sup>Joshua 13:9 as the southern portion of the territory of the Amorites, is the modern *Belka*, a fertile tract thus described by Raumer (*Palastina*, p. 70): "Southwards from Rabbath Ammon as far as the Arnon the country is mostly table-land, in some places for a considerable distance without a tree, but covered with the ruins of cities that have been destroyed. Towards the east it stretches away into the desert of Arabia, and on the west it slopes away to the Jordan." The part of this plateau here referred to is elsewhere (<sup>(-0217)</sup>Numbers 21:20) called, after its former inhabitants, "the field of Moab," or (<sup>(-0234)</sup>Numbers 23:14) "the field of the watchmen" (comp. Hengstenberg, *Bileam*, p. 241, 243). *SEE MISHOR*.

### Medhurst, Walter Henry, DD.

an English missionary and Chinese scholar, was born in London in 1796. He first entered the missionary field of labor in 1816, when he was sent to China by the London Missionary Society to ascertain if the country was open to the Gospel, and, if so, to furnish this people with a correct version of the Scriptures in Chinese. After having labored successfully in India, on the island of Malacca, and other Asiatic countries, he was again sent to China in 1835, with the Revelation Edwin Stevens; but he did not commence active missionary work in that country until 1845, when he was joined by Lockhart, and settled at Shanghai. He had charge of the printing establishment which was owned by this society, and had up to this time been operated at Batavia; he now removed it to Shanghai, and began the publication of sermons and tracts. In spite of the opposition of the numerous Romanists, the mission grew so rapidly that in the year 1847 34,000 copies of different works were printed, and 500 tracts were weekly distributed. This same year delegates from several stations convened in Shanghai for the revision of the New Testament in Chinese. Medhurst was engaged in this important labor until 1850, when he withdrew, and gave his whole time to the revision of the Old Testament. He died Jan. 24, 1857, a few days after his return to England, closing a life of valuable service spent in the interests of Christian missions. 'Medhurst founded several

orphan asylums, and did much good among the Asiatics in various ways. His works of special interest are, *China, its State and Prospects, with especial Reference to the Diffusion of the Gospel* (Lond. 1838, 8vo):-*Dissertation on the Theology of the Chinese* (8vo):-*The Chinese Version of the Scriptures* (1851, 8vo):-also a *Chinese Dictionary* (1838, 4to), and a *Japanese and English Vocabulary*. See Vapereau, *Dictionnaire des Contemporains*, s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, vol. ii, s.v.

## Me'dia

(ydm). The same Hebrew word is used in the O.T. as the name of a son of Japhet, of the nation which he founded, and of their country. Hence we find it rendered in four different ways in our AV. In most cases these renderings are arbitrary, and tend to confuse rather than explain

(1.) *Madai*, the proper rendering (<sup><0100></sup>Genesis 10:2; Μαδοί; Alex. Μαδαί *Madai*; <sup><0006></sup>1 Chronicles 1:5, Μαδαΐμ);

(2.) *Medes* (Μήδοι. <sup><1706></sup>2 Kings 17:6; 18:11; <sup><1709></sup>Esther 1:19; <sup><2337></sup>Isaiah 13:17; <sup><2525></sup>Jeremiah 25:25; <sup><2700></sup>Daniel 9:1; 5:28; Μηδεια, <sup><1662></sup>Ezra 6:22; *Medo*;

(3.) *Media* (Μήδοι, *Medoi*, <sup><1003></sup>Esther 1:3; 10:2; <sup><2902></sup>Isaiah 21:2; <sup><2080></sup>Daniel 8:20);

(4.) *Mede*, only in <sup><2700></sup>Daniel 11:1. In the following account we chiefly refer of course to ancient territorial distributions and descriptions.

**I. Geography.** The general situation of the country is abundantly clear, though its limits may not be capable of being precisely determined. Media lay northwest of Persia Proper, south and south-west of the Caspian, east of Armenia and Assyrian west and north-west of the great salt desert of Iran. Its greatest length was from north to south, and in this direction it extended from the 32d to the 40th parallel, a distance of 550 miles. In width it reached from about long. 45° to 53°; but its average breadth was not more than from 250 to 300 miles. Its area may be reckoned at about 150,000 square miles, or three fourths of that of modern France. The natural boundary of Media on the north was the river Aras; on the west Zagros, and the mountain-chain which connects Zagros with Ararat; on the south Media was probably separated from Persia by the desert which now

forms the boundary between Farsistan and Irak Ajemi; on the east its natural limit was the desert and the Caspian Gates. West of the gates it was bounded, not (as is commonly said) by the Caspian Sea, but by the mountain range south of that sea, which is the natural boundary between the high and the low country. It thus comprised the modern provinces of Irak Ajemi, Persian Kurdistan, part of Luristan, Azerbaijan, perhaps Talish and Ghilan, but not Mazanderan or Asterabad.

The division of Media commonly recognised by the Greeks and Romans was that into Media Magna and Media Atropatene (Strabo, 11:13, § 1; comp. Polyb. v. 44; Pliny, *H. N.* 6:13; Ptolem. 6:2, etc.).

**1.** *Media Atropatene*, so named from the satrap Atropates, who became independent monarch of the province on the destruction of the Persian empire by Alexander (Arrian, *Exped. Alex.* iii,8; 6:29; Diod. Sic. 18:3), corresponded nearly to the modern Azerbaijan, being the tract situated between the Caspian and the mountains which run north from Zagros, and consisting mainly of the rich and fertile basin of Lake Urumiyeh, with the valleys of the Aras, and the Sefid Rud. This is chiefly a high tract, varied between mountains and plains, and lying mostly three or four thousand feet above the sea level. The basin of Lake Urumiyeh (the Spanta of Strabon) has a still greater elevation, the surface of the lake itself, into which all the rivers run, being as much as 4200 feet above the ocean. The country is fairly fertile, well-watered in most places, and favorable to agriculture its climate is temperate, though occasionally severe in winter; it produces rice, corn of all kinds, wine, silk, white wax, and all manner of delicious fruits. Tabriz, is modern capital, forms the summer residence of the Persian kings, and is a beautiful place, situated in a forest of orchards. The ancient Atropatene may have included also the countries of Ghilan and Talish, together with the plain of Moghan, at the mouth of the combined Kur and Aras rivers. These tracts are low and flat; that of Moghan is sandy and sterile; Talish is more productive; while Ghilan (like Mazanderan) is rich and fertile in the highest degree. The climate of Ghilan, however, is unhealthy, and at times pestilential; the streams perpetually overflow their banks; and the waters which escape stagnate in marshes, whose exhalations spread disease and death among the inhabitants.

**2.** *Media Magna* lay south and east of Atropatene. Its northern boundary was the range of Elburz from the Caspian Gates to the Rudbar pass, through which the Sefid Rud reaches the low country of Ghilan. It then

adjoined upon Atropatene, from which it may be regarded as separated by a line running about south-west by west from the bridge of Menjil to Zagros. Here it touched Assyria, from which it was probably divided by the last line of hills towards the west, before the mountains sink down upon the plain. On the south it was bounded by Susiana and Persia Proper, the former of which it met in the modern Luristan, probably about lat.  $33^{\circ} 30'$ , while it struck the latter on the eastern side of the Zangros range, in lat.  $32^{\circ}$  or  $32^{\circ} 30'$ . Towards the east it was closed in by the great salt desert, which Herodotus reckons to Sagartia, and later writers to Parthia and Carmania. Media Magna thus contained a great part of Kurdistan and Luristan, with all Ardelan and Irak Ajemi. The character of this tract is very varied. Towards the west, in Ardelan, Kurdistan, and Luristan, it is highly mountainous, but at the same time wellwatered and richly wooded, fertile and lovely; on the north, along the flank of Elburz, it is less charming, but still pleasant and tolerably productive; while towards the east and south-east it is bare, arid, rocky, and sandy supporting with difficulty a spare and wretched population. The present productions of Zagros are cotton, tobacco, hemp, Indian corn, rice, wheat, wine, and fruits of every variety; every valley is a garden; and besides valleys, extensive plains are often found, furnishing the most excellent pasturage. Here were nurtured the valuable breed of horses called Nisaeen, which the Persians cultivated with such especial care, and from which the horses of the monarch were always chosen. The pasture grounds of Khawah and Alishtar, between Behistun and Khorram-abad, probably represent the "Nisean plain" of the ancients, which seems to have taken its name from a town Nisaea (Nisaya), mentioned in the cuneiform inscriptions.

Although the division of Media into these two provinces can only be distinctly proved to have existed from the time of Alexander the Great, yet there is reason to believe that it was more ancient, dating from the settlement of the Medes in the country, which did not take place all at once, but was first in the more northern and afterwards in the southern country. It is indicative of the division, that there were two Ecbatanas-one, the northern, at Takht-i-Suleiman; the other, the southern at Hamadan, on the flanks of Mount Orontes (Elwand) -respectively the capitals of the two districts. *SEE ECBATANA.*

Next to the two Ecbatanas, the chief town in Media was undoubtedly Rhages-the Raga of the inscriptions. Hither the rebel Phraortes fled on his defeat by Darius Hystaspis, and hither, too, came Darius Codomannus after

the battle of Arbela, on his way to the eastern provinces (Arrian, *Exped. Alex.* 3:20). The only other place of much note was Bagistana, the modern Behistun, which guarded the chief pass connecting Media with the Mesopotamian plain.

No doubt both parts of Media were further subdivided into provinces, but no trustworthy account of these minor divisions has come down to us. The tract about Rhages was certainly called Rhagiana, and the mountain tract adjoining Persia seems to have been known as Paraetacene; or the country of the Parsetacae. Ptolemy gives as Median districts Elymais, Choromithrene, Sigrina, Daritis, and Syromedia; but these names are little known to other writers, and suspicions attach to some of them. On the whole, it would seem that we do not possess materials for a minute account of the ancient geography of the country, which is very imperfectly described by Strabo, and almost omitted by Pliny.

In Great Media lay the metropolis of the country, the Ecbatana of that district (Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 6:17), as well as the province of Rhagiana and the city Rhagae, with the above Nissean plain, celebrated in the time of the Persian empire for its horses and horse-races (Herod. 3:106; Arrian, 7:13; Heeren, *Ideen*, 1:1. 305). This plain was near the city Nisaea, around which were fine pasture lands producing excellent clover (*Herba Medica*). The horses were entirely white, and of extraordinary height and beauty, as well as speed. They constituted a part of the luxury of the great, and a tribute in kind was paid from them to the monarch, who, like all Eastern sovereigns, used to delight in equestrian display. Some idea of the opulence of the country may be had when it is known that, independently of imposts rendered in money, Media paid a yearly tribute of not less than 3000 horses, 4000 mules, and nearly 100,000 sheep. The breeds, once celebrated through the world, appear to exist no more; but Ker Porter saw the shah ride on festival occasions a splendid horse of pure white. Cattle abounded, as did the richest fruits, as pines, citrons, oranges, all of peculiar excellence, growing as in their native land. Here also was found the silphium (probably assafoetida), which formed a considerable article in the commerce of the ancients, and was accounted worth its weight in gold.

## II. History. —

1. *Its Early Stages.* In <sup>OLD</sup>Genesis 10:2 we are told that Madai was the third son of Japhet (comp. <sup>NEW</sup>1 Chronicles 1:5). The names in that invaluable ethnological summary were not merely those of individuals but

of the nations which descended from them; for the historian says, “By these Were the isles of the Gentiles divided in their lands, every one after his tongue, after their families, in their nations” (ver. 5). For a period of fifteen centuries the Medes are not again mentioned in Scripture. Then Isaiah, in pronouncing the prophetic doom of Babylon, says, “I will stir up the Medes against them” (<sup>231317</sup> Isaiah 13:17). This prophecy was uttered about BC. 720. There is no direct evidence connecting Madai, the son of Japhet, and the nation he founded, with the Medes (*Madai*) of whom Isaiah speaks; but the names are identical in Hebrew; and the genealogical tables of Genesis appear to have been intended to show the origin of those nations which afterwards bore an important part in the history of God’s people.

Berosus, the Babylonian priest and historian, states that at a very remote period (BC. cir. 2000) the Medes ruled in Babylon (Eusebius, *Chron.* 1:4). Though we may not be able to rely upon either his dates or his facts, yet we may infer from his words and references that the Medes were one of the great primeval races which established themselves in Central Asia. Herodotus gives a very graphic and circumstantial account of the early history of the Medes, and the establishment of the empire: “The Medes were called anciently by all people Arians; but when Medda, the Colchian, came to them from Athens, they changed their name. Such is the ‘account which they themselves give’” (vii. 62). This is opposed to what appears to be the opinion of the sacred writers; but there can be no doubt that during the time of ascendancy of Greek arms, literature, and -art, Eastern nations were all anxious to claim some sort of connection with Greece, and this may account for Herodotus’s story (comp. Rawlinson’s *Herod.* 4:61, 1st ed.).

The Medes appear, however, to have been a branch of the Arian family, who probably had their primitive seat on the east bank of the Indus, and thence sent their colonies eastward into India, and westward to Media, Persia, Greece, etc. (Muller, *Science of Language*). There are independent grounds for thinking that an Arian element existed in the population of the Mesopotamian valley, side by side with the Cushite and Shemitic elements, at a very early date. It is therefore not at all impossible that the Medes may have been the predominant race there for a time, as Berosus states, and may afterwards have been overpowered and driven to the mountains, whence they may have spread themselves eastward, northward, and westward, so as to occupy a vast number of localities from the banks of the

Indus to those of the middle Danube. The term Arians, which was by the universal consent of their neighbors applied to the Medes in the time of Herodotus (Herod. 7:62), connects them with the early Yedic settlers in Western Hindustan; the *Matieni* of Mount Zagros, the Sauro *Matae* of the steppe-country between the Caspian and the Euxine, and the *Maetae* or *Maetotae* of the Sea of Azov, mark their progress towards the north; while the *Maedi* or *Medi* of Thrace seem to indicate their spread westward into Europe, which was directly attested by the native traditions of the Siginnae (Herod. v. 9). It has been supposed by some that there was a Scythic tribe of Madai who conquered and held Babylonia long previous to the irruption of the Arian family, and that it is to them Berosus alludes. There are no good grounds for this belief; and it is worthy of note as tending to disprove the theory that the name "Mede" does not appear upon the Assyrian monuments before the year BC. 880 (Rawlinson's *Commentary on Assyrian Inscriptions*). To that date is assigned the inscription, on the famous black obelisk, discovered by Layard at Nimrud, which contains a record of the victories of Temen-bar, the Assyrian monarch. In the twenty-fourth year of his reign he invaded the territory of the Medes (Vaux, *Nineveh and Persepolis*, p. 263, where a translation of the inscription is given). At that time the Medes were independent, occupying an extensive country with many cities, and divided, like the Persians, into a number of tribes having each a chief. This remarkable monument thus fixes the date of the first conquest of the Medes by the Assyrians; but it does not determine the date of the settlement of the former in Media. Sir H. Rawlinson thinks that the way in which the nations are grouped in that inscription seems to indicate that the Medes when attacked were in the act of migrating (*Commentary*). This, however, is very uncertain.

The invasion of Temen-bar was probably more like an Arab raid than a military conquest. His successors on the Assyrian throne were almost incessantly engaged in hostilities with the Medes (Rawlinson's *Herodot. 1. 404*); and Sargon appears to have been the first who attempted to occupy the country with regular garrisons. He built cities in Media, and reduced the people to tribute (Rawlinson's *Herod. 1. c.*; and *Comment.*). Sargon was that king of Assyria "who took Samaria, and carried Israel captive," and placed some of them "in the cities of the Medes" (<sup><2276></sup>2 Kings 17:6; comp. 18:17; <sup><2311></sup>Isaiah 20:1). The truth of Scripture history is here strongly confirmed by monuments recently disintombed from the ruins of Sargon's palace at Khorsabad. On its walls are inscribed the records of his

conquests, in which both Media and Judaea are mentioned—the former as on the eastern, and the latter on the western limits of his vast empire (Rawlinson's *Comment.* p. 61; Rawlinson's *Herodot.* 1:405). *SEE SARGON.*

Media was not yet a kingdom. It was occupied by a number of petty chiefs, each ruling his own tribe. From these chiefs the Assyrian monarchs exacted tribute. The tribes increased in numbers, influence, and power. They held a country naturally strong. The Assyrian yoke was galling to their free spirits, and probably this first induced them to unite their forces, elect a common leader, and assert their independence. The exact date of this revolution cannot now be fixed, but the fact of it is certain. Herodotus's account of it is as follows: "The Assyrians had held the empire of Upper Asia for a space of 520 years, when the Medes set the example of revolt. They took arms for the recovery of their freedom, and fought a battle with the Assyrians, in which they behaved with such gallantry as to shake off the yoke of servitude" (i. 95). He then tells how the empire was formed by a certain Deioces, who, in consequence of his wisdom and justice, was elected monarch by the six tribes composing the nation (i. 96-101). Deioces built the great city of Ecbatana; and, after a prosperous reign of fifty-three years, left the throne to his son Phraortes. Phraortes conquered Persia, vastly enlarged the Median empire, and reigned twenty-two years. He was succeeded by his son Cyaxares. During his reign, while engaged in a war against Nineveh, Media was overrun by a horde of Scythians, who held a great part of Western Asia for twenty-eight years. The Scythian leaders were at length treacherously murdered by Cyaxares, and the Median monarchy re-established. He ruled forty years, and then left the kingdom to his son Astyages, whose daughter Mandane was married to a Persian noble, and became the mother of the great Cyrus. According to this narrative, the Median monarchy was established about BC. 708 (Rawlinson's *Herodot.* 1:407). There is good reason to believe, however, that the early portion of the narrative is apocryphal, and that Cyaxares was the real founder of the Median empire. He is so represented by most ancient historians (Diodori's *Sic.* 2:32; }Aeschylus, *Persae*, 761; see Grote's *History of Greece*, vol. iii). The Assyrian monumental annals are almost complete down to the reign of the son of Esarhaddon (BC. 640), and they contain no mention of any Median irruptions; on the contrary, they represent the Median chiefs as giving tribute to Esarhaddon (Rawlinson's *Herodot.* 1:405, 408).

## Picture for Media

Ctesias, as quoted by Diodorus Siculus (ii. 32), assigns to the Median monarchy a still older date than Herodotus. He gives a list of eight kings who ruled before Astyages, for an aggregate period of 282 years, which would fix the establishment of the monarchy about BC. 875. The names of the kings are different from those of Herodotus; and it is vain to attempt to reconcile the narratives (see, however, Hales's *Analysis of Chronology*, 3:84; Heeren, *Manual of Ancient Hist.*). Rawlinson has clearly shown that Ctesias's narrative is fabulous (*Herodot.* 1:406).

### 2. The Median Empire.

(1.) *Its Establishment.*—From the foregoing notices we may conclude that the Medes migrated from beyond the Indus to the country on the southern shores of the Caspian Sea not later than the 9th century BC.; that they settled there as a number of distinct tribes (probably *six*, as Herodotus states, *l. c.*), and so remained during a period of three or four centuries; that some Scythian tribes either occupied the country with them or invaded it at a later date; and that (about BC. 633) Cyaxares rose suddenly to power, united the Medes under his sway, drove out the Scythians, and established the monarchy. Before this time the Medes are only once mentioned in Scripture, and then, as has been seen their country was subject to Assyria (<sup>4276</sup>2 Kings 17:6).

A few years after the establishment of his empire Cyaxares made a league with the Babylonian monarch, and invaded Assyria. Nineveh was captured and destroyed, BC. 625. The incidents of the siege and capture, as related by Diodorus Siculus (ii. 27, 28), contain a remarkable fulfilment of the prophecies uttered by Nahum (<sup>3408</sup>Nahum 1:8; 2:5, 6; 3:13, 14) nearly a century previously; and recent excavations' by Layard illustrate both (*Nineveh and Babylon*, p. 71, 103, etc.). **SEE NINEVEH.** The Assyrian monarchy was then overthrown (Rawlinson, *Ancient Monarchies*, 2:521).

Abydenus (probably following Berosus) informs us that in his Assyrian war Cyaxares was assisted by the Babylonians under Nabopolassar, between whom and Cyaxares an intimate alliance was formed, cemented by a union of their children; and that a result of their success was the establishment of Nabopolassar as independent king on the throne of Babylon, an event which we know to belong to the above-mentioned year. It was undoubtedly after this that Cyaxares endeavored to conquer Lydia.

His conquest of Assyria had made him master of the whole country lying between Mount Zagros and the river Halys, to which he now hoped to add the tract between the Halys and the AEGæan Sea. It is surprising that he failed, more especially as he seems to have been accompanied by the forces of the Babylonians, who were perhaps commanded by Nebuchadnezzar on the occasion. *SEE NEBUCHADNEZZAR*. After a war which lasted six years he desisted from his attempt, and concluded the treaty with the Lydian monarch of which we have already spoken. The three great Oriental monarchies- Media, Lydia, and Babylon-were now united by mutual engagements and intermarriages, and continued at peace with one another during the remainder of the reign of Cyaxares, and during that of Astyages, his son and successor.

(2.) *Extent of the Empire.*-The conquest of Assyria produced a great change in the Median empire, and on the whole of Western Asia. Babylon then regained its independence, and formed a close alliance with Media. The Israelites, who had been led captive by the Assyrians, were placed under new rulers. Cyaxares led his victorious armies into Syria and Asia Minor (Herod. 1:103). When Pharaoh-necho marched to the banks of the Euphrates against Babylon, the Babylonians were aided by the Medes (Joseph. *Ant.* 10:5, 1). It was in attempting to oppose this expedition of the Egyptian monarch that king Josiah was slain at Megiddo (<sup>2440</sup>Jeremiah 46:2; <sup>4850</sup>2 Chronicles 35:20; <sup>1239</sup>2 Kings 23:29). We also learn that Nebuchadnezzar was aided by the Medes in the conquest of the Jews and capture of Jerusalem (Eusebius, *Pr. Evang.*; comp. <sup>1241</sup>2 Kings 24:1; <sup>4865</sup>2 Chronicles 36:5). Media was now the most powerful monarchy in Western Asia.

The limits of the Median empire cannot be definitely fixed, but it is not difficult to give a general idea of its size and position. From north to south its extent was in no place great, since it was certainly confined between the Persian Gulf and the Euphrates on the one side, and the Black and Caspian seas on the other. From east to west it had, however, a wide expansion, since it reached from the Halys at least as far as the Caspian Gates, and possibly farther. It comprised Persia, Media Magna, Northern Media, Matiene or Media Mattiana, Assyria, Armenia, Cappadocia, the tract between Armenia and the Caucasus, the low tract along the south-west and south of the Caspian, and possibly some portion of Hyrcania, Parthia, and Sagartia. It was separated from Babylonia either by the Tigris, or more probably by a line running about half-way between that river and the

Euphrates, and thus did not include Syria, Phoenicia, or Judaea, which fell to Babylon on the destruction of the Assyrian empire. Its greatest length may be reckoned at 1500 miles from north-west to south-east, and its average breadth at 400 or 450 miles. Its area would thus be about 600,000 square miles, or somewhat greater than that of modern Persia.

**(3.) *Its Character.***-With regard to the nature of the government established by the Medes over the conquered nations, we possess but little trustworthy evidence. Herodotus in one place compares, somewhat vaguely, the Median with the Persian system (i. 134), and Ctesias appears to have asserted the positive introduction of the satrapial organization into the empire at its first foundation by his Arbaces (Diod. Sic. 2:28); but, on the whole, it is perhaps most probable that the Assyrian organization was continued by the Medes, the subject nations retaining their native monarchs, and merely acknowledging subjection by the payment of an annual tribute. This seems certainly to have been the case in Persia, where Cyrus and his father Cambyses were monarchs, holding their crown of the Median king before the revolt of the former and there is no reason to suppose that the remainder of the empire was organized in a different manner. The satrapial organization was apparently a Persian invention, begun by Cyrus, continued by Cambyses, his son, but first adopted as the regular governmental system by Darius Hystaspis.

**(4.) *Its Duration.***-Of all the ancient Oriental monarchies the Median was the shortest in duration. It commenced, as we have seen, after the middle of the 7th century BC., and it terminated BC. 558. The period of three quarters of a century, which Herodotus assigns to the reigns of Cyaxares and Astyages, may be taken as fairly indicating its probable length, though we cannot feel sure that the years are correctly apportioned between the monarchs. Its rise was rapid, and appears to have been chiefly owing to the genius of one man Cyaxares. The power of Media was short-lived. With Cyaxares it rose, and with him it passed away. At his death he left his throne to Astyages, of whom little is known except the stories told by Herodotus (i. 110-129) and Nicolaus of Damascus (*Frag. Hist. Gr.* 3:404-6), who probably borrowed from Ctesias; and on these little reliance can be placed. They are founded on fact, and we may infer from them that during the reign of Astyages a war broke out between the Medes and Persians. in which the latter were victorious, and Cyrus, the Persian king, who was himself closely related to Astyages, united the two nations under one

sceptre (BC. 558). The life of Astyages was spared, and even the title of king continued with him.

This is as far as the authorities we have followed carry us. But Xenophon, in his *Cyclopaedia*, gives us a very different account of the relationship of Cyrus to the Median king, at the time of the capture of Babylon by their allied arms. *SEE DARIUS THE MEDE.*

**(5.) Coalescence with the Persian Empire.**-It is universally allowed that the Median king who succeeded Cyaxares was his son Astyages; but of the character of this king and the events and duration of his reign there exists an absolute contradiction. In so far as Scripture is concerned, the accounts are chiefly of importance from their relation to Cyrus and Darius, the only personages mentioned in Scripture as connected with this period of Median history. But having already been considered under the two names in question, it becomes unnecessary to relate the circumstances afresh here. From chronological considerations we have leaned to the authority of Xenophon in those previous articles, but it is impossible to arrive at certainty. We simply state that whichever account be preferred of the birth and relations of Cyrus, the notices in Daniel oblige us to hold that at the time of the capture of Babylon there was a superior in rank, though not in power, to Cyrus; and this can only have been either Astyages or Cyaxares II. If it were the latter, the description given us by Xenophon of his vain, capricious, and fickle disposition perfectly accords with the idea suggested respecting him by the narrative in Daniel 6.

Whether we suppose Cyrus himself to have been king of Persia at the period of the conquest of Babylon, or Cambyses his father to have still reigned there, the Darius of Daniel would properly be head only of the Median kingdom; and it was not until Cyrus came to the throne that the great empire was united under one head. Cyrus was consequently the first king of the Medo-Persian dominions, without any discredit to Daniel's statement that Darius, the head of the older kingdom of Media, and the uncle and father-in-law. according to Xenophon, of Cyrus, received during his brief reign the rank that gratified his excessive vanity. In regard to the position and character of Cyrus, this is not the place for any detailed account. He was the real founder of the vast empire which ruled Asia and threatened Europe until the time of Alexander. He is the hero whom the poets and historians of Persia delighted to celebrate, and whose real character doubtless was of the grand and heroic cast. The praises of

Xenophon had been anticipated in that sublime address in which Jehovah, nearly 200 years before, calls upon Cyrus his shepherd to advance on his career of conquest (<sup><246B></sup>Isaiah 45:1-6). The statement of Xenophon that the Medes voluntarily submitted to Cyrus (*Cyrop.* 1:1) seems much more agreeable to the scriptural accounts of things after the conquest of Babylon, and to the manner in which foreign nations regarded the newly-risen empire, than is the narrative of Herodotus, who relates that Media was conquered by Cyrus, and held in subjection by force (Herodotus, 1:125, 130). The accession of Darius the Mede (<sup><216B></sup>Daniel 5:31) seems inconsistent with' this latter view. Throughout his reign we always find the Medes mentioned first in rank, which they would scarcely be if they were a conquered people (<sup><216B></sup>Daniel 5:28; 6:8,12, 15). At a subsequent period, when the Persian line of kings had succeeded to the throne, while we find the Medes ever ranked side by 'side with the Persians, we find, as was natural, that the language of the court placed Persia, the country of the reigning king, first in rank (<sup><170B></sup>Esther 1:3, 18, 19. etc.). We have, however, in the conclusion of this book an indication that while the language of the court gave the preference to Persia, the state chronicles still ran under their ancient title, "the chronicles of the kings of Media and Persia"-pointing plainly to the original superiority of rank of Media over Persia, quite inconsistent with the idea of a conquered race (<sup><170B></sup>Esther 10:2). With this view of Scripture the notions entertained by foreign nations of the new empire agree. So far from looking on the Medes as a conquered dependency of Persia, both the Greeks of Europe and the barbarians of Asia look on the Median as the preponderant element, quite obscuring the more recent power of Persia. The queen of the Massagetse addresses Cyrus as the "sovereign of the Medes," ignoring the Persian nation (Herodotus, 1:206). Thucydides, who ranks in the foremost place of Grecian history, invariably styles the barbarous power that had nearly conquered Greece Median, and never calls it Persian (bk. i). All this points to the original superiority of the Median kingdom-a superiority which still belonged to it in foreign eyes, but which could not well have attached to it if Media had been violently subdued to the rule of Persia. Scripture, which in its early silence as to the very existence of Persia was true to the political obscurity of this latter power, is also the first to recognise the superiority to which it rose under Cyrus. Before the allied armies had marched through the empty bed of the Euphrates into the heart of Babylon, prophecy described the rising empire as a ram with two horns, one of which was higher than the other, and the higher came up last (<sup><208B></sup>Daniel 8:3).

Scripture history, penetrating the veil of tradition, and looking through the thin disguise which the assumption of Median dress and manners by the Persians had cast over reality, was the first to recognise that Persia, not Media, had become the ruler of Asia. It is Persia that is spoken of throughout the book of Ezra, the Jewish scribe being better acquainted with the facts of history than Thucydides was. Nor are the subsequent revolts of the Medes against Persian rule any argument that at the first rise of the empire they were not one of two great nations united together on friendly and equal terms. So long as Cyrus and Cambyses his son, descended from the Median as from the Persian dynasty, sat on the throne, Media made no attempt at revolt. Nor did they do so under the foreign the pseudo Smerdis, who was supposed to be the son of Cyrus. It was not until the discovery of the imposture practiced by Smerdis, and the elevation of a purely Persian family in the person of Darius Hystaspis to the throne, that Media sought for a separate existence. Her ancient line of kings no longer ruled over the mountains of Media, and hence probably she sought to return to that independence which had been her pride during the centuries when Assyria vainly sought to rule over Median land.

According to some writers (as Herodotus and Xenophon) there was a close relationship between Cyrus and the last Median monarch, who was therefore naturally treated with more than common tenderness. The fact of the relationship is, however, denied by Ctesias; and whether it existed or no, at any rate the peculiar position of the Medes under Persia was not really owing to this accident. The two nations were closely akin; they had the same Arian or Iranian origin, the same early traditions, the same language (Strabo, 15:2,8), nearly the same religion, and ultimately the same manners and customs, dress, and general mode of life. It is not surprising therefore that they were drawn together, and that, though never actually coalescing, they still formed to some extent a single privileged people. Medes were advanced to stations of high honor and importance under Cyrus and his successors, an advantage shared by no other conquered people. The Median capital was at first the chief royal residence, and always remained one of the places at which the court spent a portion of the year; while among the provinces Media claimed and enjoyed a precedence, which appears equally in the Greek writers and in the native records. Still it would seem that the nation, so lately sovereign, was not altogether content with its secondary position. On the first convenient opportunity Media rebelled, elevating to the throne a certain Phraortes (*Frawartish*),

who called himself. Xathrites, and claimed to be a descendant from Cvaxares. Darius Hystaspis, in whose reign this rebellion took place, had great difficulty in suppressing it. After vainly endeavoring to put it down by his generals, he was compelled to take the field himself. He defeated Phraortes in a pitched battle, pursued and captured him near Rhages, mutilated him, kept him for a time “chained at his door,” and finally crucified him at Ecbatana, executing at the same time. his chief followers (see the *Behistun Inscription*, in Rawlinson’s *Herodotus*, 2:601, 602). The Medes thereupon submitted, and quietly bore the yoke for another century, when they made a second attempt to free themselves, which was suppressed by Darius Nothus (Xenophon, *Hell.* 1:2, 19). Thenceforth they patiently acquiesced in their subordinate position, and followed through its various shifts and changes the fortune of Persia.

Media, with the rest of the Persian empire, fell under the sway of Alexander the Great. At his death the northern province was erected by the satrap Atropates into an independent state, and called Atropatene. The southern province, Media Magna, was attached with Babylon to the kingdom of the Seleucide. The whole country eventually passed over to the Parthian monarchy (Strabo, 16:745). It is now included in the dominions of the shah of Persia.

### III. Antiquities.-

**1. Internal Divisions.**-According to Herodotus the Median nation was divided into six tribes (ἔθνη), called the Busse, the Paretaceni, the Struchates, the Arizanti, the Budii, and the Magi. It is doubtful, however, in what sense these are to be considered as ethnic divisions. The Paretaceni appear to represent a geographical district, while the Magi were certainly a priest caste; of the rest we know little or nothing. The Arizanti, whose name would signify “of noble descent,” or “of Arian descent,” must (one would think) have been the leading tribe, corresponding to the Pasargadse in Persia; but it is remarkable that they have only the *fourth* place in the list of Herodotus. The Budii are fairly identified with the eastern *Phut*-the *Putiya* of the Persian inscriptions-whom Scripture joins with Persia in two places (-<sup>3270</sup>Ezekiel 27:10; 38:5). Of the Buse and the Struchates nothing is known beyond the statement of Herodotus. We may perhaps assume, from the order of Herodotus’s list, that the Buse, Paretaceni, Struchates, and Arizanti were true Medes, of genuine Arian descent, while the Budii and Magi were foreigners admitted into the nation.

**2. Character, Manners, and Customs.**- The ancient Medes were a warlike people, particularly celebrated, as Herodotus (vii. 61) and Strabo (xi. 525) inform us, for their skill in archery. Xenophon says their bows were three ells long. This illustrates the language of Isaiah describing the attack of the Medes on Babylon: "Their bows also shall dash the young men to pieces" (xiii. 18). Their cavalry was also excellent, their horses being fleet 'and strong, and their men skilful riders. It is doubtless in reference to this fact that Jeremiah, speaking of the overthrow of Babylon, says, "They (the enemies) shall hold the bow and the lance... and they shall ride upon horses" (1, 42). Strabo states that the province of Atropatene alone was able to bring into the field an army of 10,000 horse (11. 523). Xenophon affirms that the Medes did not fight for plunder. Military glory was their great ambition, and they would never permit gold or silver to turn them aside from their object. How striking do the words of Isaiah thus appear "Behold I will stir up the Medes against them, which shall not regard silver, and as for gold, they shall not delight in it" (13. 18). The wealth of Babylon could not save it, for the Medes could not be bought off (Rosenmuller, *Bib. Geog.* 1:176). The conquests of the Medes, and their intercourse with other nations, produced a marked change upon their character. They became fond of dress and display; those settled in cities engaged in commerce, and lost their hardy habits and bravery. The splendor of the Median robes became proverbial, and their princes and nobles ruled the fashion in the East. They were imitated by the Persian court (Herodot. 6:112; Xenoph. *Cyrop.* 1:3, 2; Strabo, xi, p. 525). It was this dress, that is, of the highest class, which seems to have gained a sort of classical authority, and to have been at a later period worn at the Persian court, probably in part from its antiquity. This dress the Persian monarchs used to-present to those whom they wished to honor, and no others were permitted to wear it. It consisted of a long white loose robe or gown, flowing down to the feet, and enclosing the entire body, specimens of which, as now used in those countries, may be seen in plates given in Perkin's *Residence in Persia* (NY. 1843). The nature and the celebrity of this dress combine with the natural richness of the country to assure us that the ancient Medians had made no mean progress in the. arts; indeed, the colors of the Persian textures are known to have been accounted second only to those of India. If these regal dresses were of silk, then was there an early commerce between Media and India; if not, weaving, as well as dyeing, must have been practiced and carried to a high degree of perfection in the former country (Ammian. Marcell. 24:6, p. 353, ed. Bip.; Athen. xii,

p. 512, 514 sq.; Heeren, *Ideen*, 1:205, 307; Herod. 6:112; ~~2121~~ Daniel 3:21). The Medes thus gave way to luxury and its consequent vices, and they; soon became an easy prey to their more warlike neighbors. The northern mountaineers retained their primitive habits, and consequently their independence, for a much longer period.

## Picture for Media 2

**3. Religion.**-The ancient religion of the Medes must undoubtedly have been that simple creed which is placed before us in the earlier portions of the Zendavesta. Its peculiar characteristic was Dualism, the belief in the existence of two opposite principles of good and evil, nearly if not quite on a par with one another. Ormazd and Ahriman were both self-caused and self-existent, both indestructible, both potent to work their will their warfare had been from all eternity, and would continue to all eternity, though on the whole the struggle was to the disadvantage of the Prince of Darkness. Ormazd was the God of the Arians, the object of their worship and trust; Ahriman was their enemy, an object of fear and abhorrence, but not of any religious rite. Besides Ormazd, the Arians worshipped the sun and moon, under the names of Mithra and Homa; and they 'believed in the existence of numerous spirits or genii, some good, some bad, the subjects and ministers respectively of the two powers of Good and Evil. Their cult was simple, consisting in processions, religious chants and hymns, and a few plain offerings, expressions of devotion and thankfulness. Such was the worship and such the belief which the whole Arian race brought with them from the remote east when they migrated westward. Their migration brought them into contact with the fire-worshippers of Armenia and Mount Zagros, among whom Magism had been established from a remote antiquity. The result was either a combination of the two religions, or in some cases an actual conversion of the conquerors to the faith and worship of the conquered. So far as can be gathered from the scanty materials in our possession, the latter was the case with the Medes. While in Persia the true Arian creed maintained itself, at least to the time of Darius Hystaspis, intolerable purity, in the neighboring kingdom of Media, it was early swallowed up in Magism, which was probably established by Cyaxares or his successor as the religion of the state. The essence of Magism was the worship of the elements, fire, water, air, and earth with a special preference of fire to the remainder. Temples were not allowed, but fire-altars were maintained on various sacred sites, generally mountain-tops, where sacrifices were continually offered, and the flame was never suffered to go

out. A hierarchy naturally' followed, to perform these constant rites, and the magi became recognised as a sacred caste entitled to the veneration of the faithful. They claimed in many cases a power of divining the future, and practiced largely those occult arts which are still called by their name in most of the languages of modern Europe. The fear of polluting the elements gaverise to a number of curious superstitions among the professors of the Magian religion (Herod. 1:138); among the rest to the strange practice of neither burying nor burning their dead, but exposing them to be devoured by beasts or birds of prey (Herod. 1:140; Strabo, 15:3, § 20). This custom is still observed by their representatives, the modern Parsees. See Rhode, *Heil. Sage der Baktr. Meder und' Perser*, p. 820; *Abbildungen aus der Mythol. der Alten Welt; Pers. Med.* plate 10,11.

**4.** *The language* of the ancient Medes was not connected with the Shemitic, but with the Indian, and divided itself into two chief branches, the Zend, spoken in North Media, and the Pehlvi, spoken in Lower Media and Parthia, which last was the dominant tongue among the Parthians (Adelung, *Mithridates*, 1:256 sq.; Eichhorn, *Gesch. der Lit.* v. 1,294 sq.).

**5.** *References to the Medes in Scripture.*—The references to the Medes in the canonical Scriptures are not very numerous, but they are striking. ‘We first hear of certain “cities of the Medes,” in which the captive Israelites were placed by “the king of Assyria” on the destruction of Samaria, BC. 721 (<sup>2776</sup>2 Kings 17:6; 18:11). This implies the subjection of Media to Assyria at the time of Shalmaneser, or of Sargon, his successor, and accords (as we have shown) very closely with the account given by the latter of certain military colonies which he planted in the Median country. Soon afterwards Isaiah prophesies the part which the Medes should take in the destruction of Babylon (<sup>2937</sup>Isaiah 13:17; 21:2), and this is again still more distinctly declared by Jeremiah (<sup>2510</sup>Jeremiah 51:1 and 23) who sufficiently indicates the independence of Media in his day (<sup>2925</sup>Jeremiah 25:25). Daniel relates, as a historian, the fact of the Medo-Persic conquest (<sup>2763</sup>Daniel 5:28, 31), giving an account of the reign of Darius the Mede who appears to have been made viceroy by Cyrus (6:1-28). In Ezra we have a mention of Achmetha (Ecbatana), “the *palace* in the province of the Medes,” where the decree of Cyrus was found (6:2-5) a notice which accords with the known facts that the Median capital was the seat of government under Cyrus; but a royal residence only and not the seat of government under Darius Hystaspis. Finally, in Esther, the high rank of

Media under the Persian kings is marked by the frequent combination of the two names in phrases of honor.

In the apocryphal Scriptures the Medes occupy a more prominent place. The chief scene of one whole book (Tobit) is Media, and in another (Judith) a very striking portion of the narrative belongs to the same country. But the historical character of both these books is with reason doubted, and from neither can we derive any authentic or satisfactory information concerning the people. From the story of Tobias little could be gathered, even if we accepted it as true, while the history of Arphaxad (which seems to be rierely a distorted account of the struggle between the rebel Phraortes and Darius Hystaspis) adds nothing to our knowledge of that contest. The mention of Rhages in both narratives as a Median town and region of importance is geographically correct, and it is historically true that Phraortes suffered his overthrow in the Rhagian district. But beyond these facts the narratives in question contain little that even illustrates the true history of the Median nation.

**IV. Literature.**-The ancient authorities for the history and geography of Media and the Medes are Herodotus, especially when read with the learned and valuable notes of Rawlinson; Strabo, Xenophon, Ptolemy, Diodorus Siculus, Arrian, and Josephus. The monuments and inscriptions discovered, and in part deciphered, within the last few years, add vastly to our stores of information. The various works and articles of Sir H. Rawlinson referred to in the body of this article serve to set forth: and illustrate their contents. Among modern writers the student may consult Bochart, Cellarius, Ritter; Grote's *History of Greece*, 3:301-312; Prof. Rawlinson's *Ancient Monarchies*; Bosanquet's *Chronology of the Medes*, read before the Royal Asiatic Society, June 5, 1858; Brandis, *Rerum Assyriarum tempora emendata*, p. 1-14; and Hupfeld's *Exercitationum Herodotearum Specimina duo*, p. 56 sq. For the present state of the country, see Sir K. Porter's *Travels*; Kinnier's *Persian Empire*; Layard's *Nineveh and Babylon*; Chesney's *Euphrates Expedition*; Sir H. Rawlinson's articles in the *Journal of R. G. S.* vols. ix and x; and the valuable dissertations in Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, vol. i.

## Me'dian

(Chald. *Mladaya'*, aydm; marg. hadm; Sept. ὁ Μῆδος, Vulg. *Medus*), a patrial epithet of Darius, "the son of Ahasueras, of the seed of the Medes"

(~~2001~~ Daniel 9:1), or “the Mede” (11:1), as described in Daniel v. 31. *SEE MEDE.*

## Mediation

in the Christian sense, is the intervention of Jesus Christ between God and sinners. It implies a condition of alienation and hostility on the part of man towards God, and a corresponding state of disfavor and condemnation in the divine mind with respect to man. Such a mutual relation of dissatisfaction lies at the basis of the whole remedial scheme of salvation, originating in the fall (q.v.), and provided for in the atonement (q.v.). It is presumed in every form of religion and worship, whether heathen, Jewish, or any other; and has its natural exponents in sacrifice (q.v.), the priesthood (q.v.), and ritual (q.v.). In addition to the considerations adduced under the head Mediator (q.v.), there remain certain fundamental aspects of this question which we propose here briefly to discuss. *SEE EXPIATION.*

**1. Man's Enmity towards God.**-This is a fact too apparent to require detailed proof. Its historical origin is given: in the Bible in the account of Eden, its record is engraven in the whole course of human conduct, and its conclusive attestation is found in the deepest consciousness of man's nature. The sense of guilt and condemnation, to which it inevitably and legitimately gives rise in the human conscience, is a testimony so universal, so profound, and so overwhelming as to call for little if any external corroboration.

**2. God's Displeasure towards Man.**-This is a doctrine ‘which of necessity results from the preceding one. If God be holy, as the Scriptures represent him, and as the purest forms of faith depict him, he cannot but regard all sin with the utmost abhorrence, and he cannot be supposed to entertain amicable emotions towards those who commit and delight in sin. This feeling in the divine mind, however, must not be regarded as one of vindictiveness or personal hatred. A pure and unselfish being, raised above the petty jealousies and hazards of earth, cannot be conceived as entertaining sentiments of *malice*. Such a view of the divine nature is inconsistent with the emphatic statements of Scripture (such as that “God is love,” etc.), with the interest he still takes in fallen humanity (“God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son,” etc.), and even with the benevolent provision which he makes in nature for the continuation and

comfort of the race. In like manner Christians are forbidden to indulge any malevolence towards their own personal enemies, much more towards their fellow-creatures at large. That view of the Almighty which represents or imagines him as taking any delight in human suffering is characteristic of heathenism, not of Bible truth. *SEE LOVE.*

Nevertheless the purest ethics, as well as the soundest theology, demands a place in the divine mind for that sense of indignation with moral evil, and that call for its punishment, which are instinctive in 'the human breast. In this light, are to be interpreted the many and pointed declarations of the Bible respecting God's anger against sin, and his inexorable determination to inflict vengeance upon its perpetrators. Justice, no less than mercy, is one of the indispensable attributes of a holy deity. The ultimate grounds of this doctrine are not to be sought so much in any considerations of administrative policy or governmental consistency—mere views of expediency and safety—as in the essential contradiction of the divine nature itself to all that is inconsistent with its own character.

**3.** These premises being settled as the actual relations between the parties, the grand problem arises, How can this mutual disagreement be removed? That the change, if any, must take place in man, is obvious, not only because God is immutable, but because he certainly has not been at fault. The offender alone must make the amends. The Being offended against may indeed propose advances towards reconciliation, as, it belongs to him to lay down the terms of satisfaction, but these cannot involve any concession nor imply any retraction. The standard of righteousness must not be lowered, nor wrong exculpated. The case presents a difficulty in two aspects, neither of which can be overlooked in any scheme proposing its settlement. They relate respectively to the *past* and the *future*. Two questions therefore arise: 1. How can the sinful acts already committed be properly forgiven? 2. How can their recurrence be most effectively prevented in time to come? These two subordinate problems must be wrought out together, as the omission to solve the latter would render the solution of the former nugatory. The mediation of Jesus Christ exactly meets all the conditions of both these problems. It is spontaneous on the part of God, voluntary on the part of the Mediator, and does not infringe on the freedom of man. It cancels the past debt, takes away the sense of present guilt, and removes the disposition to transgress thereafter. It releases, reconciles, and renews at once. Pardon, peace, purity are its harmonious results. Justification, regeneration, sanctification are its

immunities. The first frees from the judicial sentence, the second restores to the heavenly family, and the, third fits for life here and forever. All this is due to the *vicarious* principle of the atonement. It remains to show more particularly how the substitution of Christ as a victim for man in undergoing the penalty accomplishes these ends successfully and satisfactorily. The transfer of the punishment due to human crimes, as effected in the life and death of our Saviour, is not a mere forensic device, nor simply a diplomatic artifice; it is no stratagem invented to elude justice, nor a pretence set up to screen impunity. If, with regard to its individual objects, it was unconditional and absolute, as Universalism generally on the one hand represents it by extension, and strict Predestinarianism on the other by limitation, it would justly be liable to this charge. But inasmuch as it secures the permanent reformation of the culprit in the very process of amnesty, it is not purely penal, but also prophylactic; it changes the relations of the sinner by converting him into a saint.

(1.) The chief, if not the only difficulty in our conceptions of the method of Christian redemption relates to the justice of substituting an innocent for a guilty person in the expiation of crime. This is, to be sure, an abstract question, but it is a fundamental one. Its determination, however, rests with the Being to be placated, and with the individual submitting to become the victim, rather than with ourselves, the beneficiaries of the arrangement, or with any other intelligences who may be merely spectators. As the compact, in pursuance of which this mediation is effected, was confined to the bosom of the Godhead, we might fairly be excused from attempting its vindication; especially as the Father and the Son, regarded as the contracting parties, are so identified in nature and action that any moral discrepancy or personal disagreement, such as this question implies, is necessarily excluded. Indeed, if they two freely consent, as the plan presupposes, it is hard to see who can have a right to raise a doubt or utter complaint on the subject. Still, to obviate all cavil, it may not be amiss to pursue this point as far as we may without presumption or arrogance.

Instances of a similar but far less extensive vicarious suffering have occurred in human history, and are often pointed to as rare but striking illustrations of this principle. These were applauded at the time of their occurrence, and have been commended ever since by the common voice of mankind without incurring the imputation of unfairness or compromise. If we look into the design of judicial exactions, so far as human legislation and administration enable us to discern it, we find it to be fourfold:

- 1, the appeasement of the wrath of the injured party;
- 2, the moral cure of the offending party;
- 3, the allaying of the sense of wrong in the convictions of the community; and,
- 4, the deterring of others from similar crimes.

Most laws for earthly retribution have chiefly in view the pecuniary reparation of the wrong, and the protection of society against its recurrence; and in these respects Christ's atonement is as parallel as possible. In cases of capital punishment, with which the present is most analogous, the first two ends of penal infliction are necessarily excluded, by the death of the murdered and the execution of the murderer; so that there remain only the moral influence and the preventive effect upon others as the essential objects to be attained. *SEE PUNISHMENT*. But, in the case in hand, these external and disinterested observers can consist only of the angels and inhabitants of other worlds, inasmuch as our own race is wholly included in the culprit himself. Of the moral constitution or even existence of the latter of these two classes of presumed spectators we have absolutely no knowledge, nor any reason to suppose that they could become informed of the transaction. Of the former we know but little more, and that little leads us to the belief that they have already passed their probation, and are therefore incapable of being influenced by example, while the interest which they take in the scene is that of intense satisfaction at its progress and consummation. All objectors are thus removed, and the substitution is ratified by common consent.

We have assumed that man's demurral to this procedure is silenced by the fact of his being himself the convict. Yet a prisoner may be imagined to have a right to protest against another's taking his place as accused or condemned. This, however, he can only be allowed in court to do when he confesses his crime, and demands to bear its penalty in person. Both these privileges, if such they can be called, are reserved to him by the scheme under consideration. Nay, he is required to make confession before he can avail himself of the benefits of Christ's mediation, and that with a sincerity and fulness which admit of no retraction; and he is at last compelled to undergo the penalty himself unless he voluntarily and actively apply for the exemption offered him. These provisions are the saving clauses of the bill of amnesty, and by virtue of them the vicarious redemption receives its final approval.

(2.) Nevertheless the sinner realizes a partial effect of the atonement unconditionally, in the respite from punishment till the close of his earthly career. But for this the whole race had been cut off in embryo at the first transgression. Hence there is an opportunity for the exercise of the remedial or curative as well as preventive influence of that penal retribution, which is temporarily suspended and may be -wholly averted from himself. The only problem here arising is, How can impunity be allowed without encouraging vice? or rather, to state it more radically, How can the criminal go scot-free and yet be reformed? It has of late years only been discovered in families, schools, armies, and diplomacy that pardon is often the best discipline; but God knew long ago the true philosophy of the prevention of crime. The spectacle of another suffering the penalty due to ourselves has been found to be the most effectual softener of the rebel heartland the condition of genuine contrition is the best. safeguard against the abuse of clemency. In this light the scheme of Christian mediation is most abundantly sanctioned by actual experiment, and the Cross becomes the glory of the redeemed. *SEE REDEMPTION.*

(3.) It is not to be imagined, however, that in this vicarious atonement Jesus Christ actually experienced the aggregate amount of suffering due for the sins of every human being. In the first place, this was *unnecessary*. The object to be attained was not a given amount of penal infliction, whether to placate the Almighty, to reform the offender, or to vindicate the statutes infringed. This is obvious from the foregoing discussion. Had these ends rigidly required an exact balance-sheet of debit and credit on this basis, no substitution or vicarious satisfaction had been admissible at all. The strict terms of the law are, "The soul that sinneth, *it* shall die." The mediation under consideration, was an equivalent, such as met the *moral* design of the penalty. Nor is it correct to argue that as man incurred *infinite* guilt by sinning against infinite holiness, so Christ offered an infinite satisfaction by reason of his divine and perfect nature. Neither part of this proposition is tenable. No finite creature is capable of infinite guilt, of even the sum total of all humanity, for it is limited both in its numbers and nature, and so is likewise the sum of its sins. Christ therefore did not need to make an infinite atonement, but only an adequate or commensurate one. His expiation was sufficient, not because it was made by his divine nature-for that was by hypothesis incapable and incompetent-but because it contained such a degree of merit, in view of its completeness and the exalted character of the offerer, that the divine Being could consistently accept it *in*

*lieu* of the actual obedience of the race represented, and thus remit the penalty due them. In the next place, an absolute equality or identity of retribution was *impossible* in the remedial scheme. The supposition that Jesus endured—whether during his whole lifetime, or in the brief agonies of the garden and the cross—the sum total of the torments that will be and that would have been’ experienced by the eternally damned, is simply preposterous. Not only had he no opportunity for this, but he was not capable of it, either physically or spiritually. His bodily pain was such, indeed, as to take his life, but other men have known as great, if not greater. His mental anguish, especially the hiding of his Father’s face, was so intense as to literally break his heart; but it cannot have been the same, either in character; extent, or continuance, as the everlasting pangs of conscious guilt. All that was practicable, in him as a substitute forman, was to undergo an ordeal as similar in kind and degree as his pure human nature would admit. In this sense he drank the bitter cup of atonement to its very dregs, but it was not the identical draught intended for mankind. Finally, such an absolute vicariousness would have been *useless*, and that in two most vital respects it would so fully have exhausted the penalty for all possible or foreseen human transgression as to render the personal punishment of any offender thereafter impossible, because unjust; and it would have been no gain or saving of suffering on the whole, but a mere shifting of a specific load from the shoulders of one being to those of another. No larger average of happiness could have resulted; nor any greater glory redounded to God. Such an atonement would have defeated instead of furthering the main design of its merciful Projector. It would have been fatal to all the advantages seen above to be secured by Christ’s mediation. *SEE VICARIOUS SUFFERING.*

### Mediator

a person who intervenes between two parties at variance, in order to reconcile them. The term does not occur in the Old Test., but the idea is contained in that’ remarkable passage (~~Job~~ Job 9:33) which is rendered in the AuthVers. “Neither is there any *daysman* betwixt us, that might lay his hand upon’ us both.” The Hebrew words are, *tve;j jkwa WnyneBAnveab WnyneAl [iwdy*; literally, “ There is not *between us* a reprover he shall place his hand upon us both.” This the Sept. translates, or rather paraphrases, *εἴθε ἦν ὁ μεσίτης ἡμῶν, καὶ ἐλέγχων, καὶ διακούων ἀναμέσον ἄμφοτέρων.* *SEE DAYSMAN.* In the New Test. it is the invariable

rendering of **μεσίτης**, a word which is rather rare in classical Greek—Polybius and Lucian being, it would appear, nearly the only classical authors who employ it (see Robinson, *N.T. Lex.* s.v.). Its meaning, however, is not difficult to determine. This seems evidently to be, *qui medio inter duo stat* — he who takes a middle position between two parties, and principally with the view of removing their differences. Thus Suidas paraphrases the word by **μεσέγγος**. and also by **ἐγγυητής, μέσος δύο μερῶν**. In the Sept. the word appears to occur only once, namely, in the above passage of Job.

**1.** It is used, in an accommodated sense, by many of the ancient fathers, to denote *one who intervenes between two dispensations*. Hence it is applied by them to John the Baptist, because he came, as it were, between the Mosaic and Christian dispensations. Thus Greg. Nazianzen (*Orat.* xxxix, p. 633) calls him **ὁ παλαιᾶς καὶ νέας μεσίτης**. Theophylact, commenting on Matthew iii, gives him the same denomination.

**2.** Again, it signifies, in its more proper sense, an *internunciatus*, or ambassador, one who stands as the channel of communication between two contracting parties. Thus most commentators think that the apostle Paul, in ~~<819>~~Galatians 3:19, calls Moses *mediator*, because he conveyed the expression of God's will to the people, and reported to God their wants, wishes, and determinations. In reference to this passage of Scripture, Basil (*De -Spiritu Sancto*, cap. xiv), says, “Mosen figuram representasse quando inter Deum et populum intermedius extiterit.” Many ancient and modern divines, however, are of opinion that Christ himself, and not Moses, is here meant by the apostle, and this view would seem to be confirmed by comparing ~~<819>~~Deuteronomy 33:2 with ~~<478>~~Acts 7:38-52. Christ it was who, surrounded by angelic spirits, communicated with Moses on Mount Sinai. On this point, the words of the learned and pious Chrysostom, on Galatians 3, are very express: “Here,” says he, “Paul calls Christ Mediator, declaring thereby that he existed before the law, and that by' him the law was revealed.” This application of the passage will be the more evident if we consider the scope of the apostle's argument, which evidently is to point out the dignity of the law. How could he present a clearer demonstration of this than by showing that it was the second person of the ever blessed Trinity who stood forth on the mount to communicate between God the Father and his creature man! Moreover, to contradistinguish Christ's mediation from that of Moses, the former is emphatically styled **μεσίτης κρείττονος διαθήκης** (~~<816>~~Hebrews 8:6). This, however, implies that

Moses was the mediator of the former covenant, and Eadie, in his *Commentary on Galatians* (ad loc.), shows at length that this is the meaning of the passage, in opposition to all other views. Moses is likewise often styled **רַשְׁרָשִׁי** or mediator, in the rabbinical writings (see Schottgen and Wetstein, ad loc.). But bethis as it may, far more emphatically and officially

**3.** CHRIST is called Mediator (<sup><5406></sup>1 Timothy 2:5; <sup><5886></sup>Hebrews 8:6; 9:15; 12:24) by virtue of the reconciliation he has effected between a justly-offended God and his rebellious creature man (see Grotius, *De Satisfactione Christi*, cap. viii). In this sense of the term Moses was, on many occasions, an eminent type of Christ. The latter, however, was not. *Mediator* merely by reason of his coming between God and his creatures, as certain heretics would affirm (see Cyril. Alex. *Dial, I de Sancta Trinitate*, p. 410), but because he appeased his wrath, and made reconciliation for iniquity. “Christ is the Mediator,” observes Theophylact, commenting on Galatians 3, “of two, be of God and man. He exercises this office between both by making peace, and putting a stop to that spiritual war which man wages against God. To accomplish this he assumed our nature, joining in a marvellous, manner the human, by reason of sin unfriendly, to the divine nature.” “Hence,” he adds, “he made reconciliation.” OEcumenius expresses similar sentiments on the same passage of Scripture. Again, Cyril, in his work before quoted, remarks: “He is esteemed Mediator because the divine and human nature being disjointed by sin, he has shown them united in his own person; and in this manner he reunites us to God the Father.” If, in addition to the above general remarks, confirmed by many of the most ancient and orthodox fathers of the Church, we consider the *three great offices* which holy Scripture assigns to Christ as Saviour of the world, viz. those of *prophet, priest, and king*, a further and more ample illustration will be afforded of his Mediatorship.

**(1.)** One of the first and most palpable predictions which we have of the prophetic character of Christ is that of Moses (<sup><6185></sup>Deuteronomy 18:15): “The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken.” That this refers to Christ we are assured by the inspired apostle Peter (<sup><4492></sup>Acts 3:22). Again, in <sup><2361></sup>Isaiah 61:1, 3, Christ’s consecration to the prophetic office, together with its sacred and gracious functions, is emphatically set forth (see <sup><4016></sup>Luke 4:16-21, where Christ applies this passage to himself). In order, then, to sustain this part of his mediatorial office, and thus work

out the redemption of the world, we may see the necessity there was that Messiah should be both *God* and *man*. It belongs to a prophet to expound the law, declare the will of God, and foretell things to come: all this was done, and that in a singular and eminent manner, by Christ, our prophet (<sup><415></sup>Matthew 5:21, etc.; <sup><408></sup>John 1:8). All light comes from this prophet. The apostle shows that all ministers are but stars which shine by a borrowed light (<sup><416></sup>2 Corinthians 3:6, 7). All the prophets of the Old, and all the prophets and teachers of the New Testament, lighted their tapers at this torch (<sup><215></sup>Luke 21:15). It was Christ who preached by Noah (<sup><409></sup>1 Peter 3:19), taught the Israelites in the wilderness (<sup><405></sup>Acts 7:37), and still teaches by his ministers (<sup><411></sup>Ephesians 4:11, 12). On this subject bishop Butler (*Analogy*, part ii, ch. v) says: He was, by way of eminence, *the prophet*, the prophet that should come into the world' (<sup><404></sup>John 6:14) to declare the divine will. He published anew the law of nature, which men had corrupted, and the very knowledge of which, to some degree, was lost among them. He taught mankind. taught us authoritatively, to live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world, in expectation of the future judgment of God. He confirmed the truth of this moral system of nature, and gave us additional evidence of it, the evidence of testimony. He distinctly revealed the manner in which God would be worshipped, the efficacy of repentance, and the rewards and punishments of a future life. Thus he was a prophet in a sense in which no other ever was." Hence the force of the term  $\acute{\omicron}$   $\lambda\acute{\omicron}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ , by Which John designates Christ. **SEE** **PROPHET**.

But, on the other hand, had the second person of the Trinity come to us in all the majesty of his divine nature, we could not have approached him. as our instructor. The Israelites, terrified at the exhibitions of Deity, cried out that the Lord might not so treat with them again ; it was then that he, in gracious condescension to their feelings, promised to communicate with them in future through a prophet like unto Moses. The son of God, in assuming the form of an humble man, became accessible to *all*. This condescension, moreover, enabled him to sympathize with his clients in all their trials (<sup><307></sup>Hebrews 2:17, 18; 4:14, 15). Thus we perceive the connection of Christ's prophetic office-he being both God and man-with the salvation of man. On this subject Chrysostom (*Homil.* 134, tom. v, p. 860) remarks: "A mediator, unless he has a union and communion with the parties for whom he mediates, possesses not the essential qualities of a mediator. When Christ, therefore, became mediator between God and man

(1 Timothy 2, etc.), it was indispensable that he should be both God and man.” Macarius, also (*Homil.* 6:97), on this question more pointedly observes: “The Lord came and took his body from the virgin; for if he had appeared among, us in his naked divinity, who could bear the sight? But he spoke as man to us men.”

Again, the Redeemer was not only to propound, explain, and enforce God’s law, but it was needful that he. should give a practical proof of obedience to it in his own person (comp. <sup><859></sup>Romans 5:19). Now, if he had not been *man*, he could not have been subject to the law; hence it is said, <sup><804></sup>Galatians 4:4, ““When the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his son, made of a woman, made under the law.,”” and if he had not been God, he could not, by keeping the law, have *merited* forgiveness for us, for he had done but what was required of him. ‘It was the fact of his being *very God* and *very man* which constituted the merit of Christ’s obedience.

(2.) Moreover, in working out the mighty scheme of redemption the mediator must assume the office of *priest*. To this office he was solemnly appointed by God (<sup><804></sup>Psalm 110:4; <sup><850></sup>Hebrews 5:10), being qualified for it by his incarnation (<sup><806></sup>Hebrews 10:6, 7), and he accomplished all the ends thereof by his sacrificial death (<sup><801></sup>Hebrews 9:11, 12); as in sustaining his *prophetic* character, *so in this*, his Deity and humanity will be seen. According to the exhibition of type and declaration of prophecy, the mediator must die, and thus rescue us sinners from death by destroying him who had the power of death. “But we see Jesus,” says the apostle (<sup><809></sup>Hebrews 2:9), “who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor, that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man. Forasmuch, then, as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same, that through death he might destroy him who had the power of death, that is, the devil.” On the other hand, had he not been *God* he could not have raised himself from the dead. “I lay down my life (saith he, <sup><807></sup>John 10:17, 18), and take it up again.” He had not had a life to lay down if he had not been man, for the Godhead could not die; and if he had not been God, he could not have acquired *merit* by laying it down: it must be his own, and not in the power of another. else his voluntarily surrendering himself unto death-as he did on the charge. that he, being only man, made himself equal with God-was an act of *suicide*, and consequently an act of blasphemy against God! It was, then, the mysterious union of both natures in the one

person of Christ which constituted the *essential glory* of his vicarious obedience and death.

Nor are the two natures of Christ more apparent in his *death* than they are in the *intercession* which he ever liveth to make in behalf of all who come unto God by him (<sup><3025></sup>Hebrews 7:25). The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews teaches us (chaps. 7, 9) that the high-priest under the Levitical dispensation typified Christ in his intercessory character: as the high-priest entered *alone* within the holiest place of the tabernacle once a year with the blood of the sacrifice in his hands, and the names of the twelve tribes upon his heart, so Christ, having offered up himself as a lamb without spot unto God, has gone into glory bearing on his *heart* the names of his redeemed. We may then ask with the apostle (<sup><4833></sup>Romans 8:33), “Who shall lay anything to the charge of God’s elect? It is God that justifieth, who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh *intercession* for us.” In this part of his mediatorial work God’s *incommunicable* attributes of *omniscience*, *omnipresence*, and *omnipotence* are seen. He must therefore have been God, and on the ground of his being able from personal experience to sympathize with the suffering members of his mystical body, he must have been man; being perfect God and perfect man, he is then a perfect *intercessor*.

**(3.)** We come, lastly, to notice Christ’s mediatorial character *as king*. The limits of this article will not admit of our even alluding to the varied and multiplied passages of Scripture which delineate Christ as “Head over all things to the Church” (see <sup><3016></sup>Psalms 2:6; 70; <sup><2311></sup>Isaiah 32:1; <sup><27025></sup>Daniel 9:25; <sup><5017></sup>Colossians 1:17, 18, etc.). Suffice it here to say that Christ could not, without the concurrence of his *divine* nature, gather and govern the Church, protect and defend it against all assailants open and secret, and impart to it his Holy Spirit, to enlighten and renew the minds and hearts of men and subdue Satan—all these are acts of his kingly office.

Such, then, is the work of Christ’s mediatorship salvation revealed by him as prophet, procured by him as priest, and applied by him as king—the work of the whole person wherein both natures are engaged. Hence it is that some of the ancients speaking of it, designate it **θεανδρική ἐνεργεία**, “a divine-human operation” (see Dionys. Areopag. *Epist. IV ad Caiam Damascenum*, iii 19).

Thus Jesus Christ is the mediator between an offended God and sinful man (<sup><541F5></sup>1 Timothy 2:5). Both Jews and Gentiles have a notion of a mediator: the Jews call the Messiah  $\alpha[\chi\mu\alpha$ , the Mediator, or Middle One. The Persians call their god Mithras  $\mu\epsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\tau\eta\varsigma$ , a mediator; and the daemons, with the heathens, seem to be, according to them, mediators between the superior gods and men. Indeed, the whole religion of paganism was a system of mediation and intercession. The idea, therefore, of salvation by a mediator is not so novel or restricted as some imagine; and the Scriptures of truth inform us that it is only by this way human beings can arrive to eternal felicity (<sup><404I2></sup>Acts 4:12; <sup><614I6></sup>John 14:6). Man, in his state of innocence, was in friendship with God; but, by sinning against him, he exposed himself to his just displeasure; his powers became enfeebled, and his heart filled with enmity against him (<sup><618I6></sup>Romans 8:6); he was driven out of his paradisaical Eden, and was totally incapable of returning to God, and making satisfaction to his justice. Jesus Christ, therefore, was the appointed mediator to bring about reconciliation (<sup><01C12></sup>Genesis 3:12. <sup><302I></sup>Colossians 1:21); and in the fulness of time he came into this world, obeyed the law, satisfied justice, and brought his people into a state of grace and favor; yea, into a more exalted state of friendship with God than was lost by the fall (<sup><412I8></sup>Ephesians 2:18).

We have seen above some of the reasons why in order to accomplish this work it was necessary that the Mediator should be God and man in one person. We may specify, the following in addition.

**(a)** It was necessary that he should be man:

- 1.** That he might be related to those to whom he was to be a mediator and redeemer (<sup><124I8></sup>Philippians 2:8; <sup><821I></sup>Hebrews 2:11-17).
- 2.** That sin might be atoned for, and satisfaction made in the same nature which had sinned (<sup><617I></sup>Romans 5:17-21; 8:3).
- 3.** It was meet that the mediator should be man, that he might be capable of suffering death; for, as God, he could not die, and without shedding of blood there was no remission (<sup><821I></sup>Hebrews 2:10, 15; 8:3-6; 9:15-28; <sup><118I8></sup>1 Peter 3:18).
- 4.** It was necessary that he should be a-holy and righteous man, free from all sin, that he might offer himself without spot to God (<sup><302I></sup>Hebrews 7:26; 9:14; 1:19; <sup><402I></sup>1 Peter 2:22).

**(b)** But it was not enough that the mediator should be truly man, and an innocent person; he must be more than a man; it was requisite that he should be really God.

- 1.** No mere man could have entered into a covenant with God to mediate between him and sinful men (~~806~~Romans 9:5; ~~8008~~Hebrews 1:8; ~~5486~~1 Timothy 3:16; ~~5023~~Titus 2:13).
- 2.** He must be God, to give virtue and value to his obedience and sufferings (~~4218~~John 20:28; ~~4408~~Acts 20:28; ~~6000~~2 Peter 2:1; ~~5045~~Philippians 2:5-11).
- 3.** The Mediator being thus God and man, we are encouraged to hope in him. In the person of Jesus Christ the object of trust is brought nearer to ourselves. If he were God and not man, we should approach him with fear and dread; and if he were man and not God, we should be guilty of idolatry to worship and trust in him at all (~~2475~~Jeremiah 17:5). The plan of salvation by such a Mediator is therefore the most suitable to human beings; for here “Mercy and truth are met together, righteousness and peace have kissed each other” (~~4850~~Psalm 85:10).

The properties of Christ as Mediator are these:

- 1.** He is the only Mediator (~~5404~~1 Timothy 2:4). Praying, therefore, to saints and angels is an error of the Church of Rome, and has no countenance from Scripture.
- 2.** Christ is a Mediator of men only, not of angels; good angels need not any; and as for evil angels, none is provided nor admitted.
- 3.** He is the Mediator both for Jews and Gentiles (~~4428~~Ephesians 2:18; ~~6111~~1 John 2:2).
- 4.** He is the Mediator both for Old and New Testament saints.
- 5.** He is a suitable, constant, willing, and prevalent Mediator; his mediation always succeeds, and is infallible.

For a more ample view of this important subject, see Flavel. *Panstratia of Shamier*, vol. iii (Geneva, folio), 7:1, in which the views of the Romish Church are ably controverted. See also Brinsley (John), *Christ's Mediation* (Lond. 1657, 8vo); Gill's *Body of Divinity*, 1:336; Witsii (*Econ. Faed.* lib. ii, c. 4; Fuller's *Gospel its own Witness*, ch. iv, p. 2; Hurrion's *Christ Crucified*, p. 103, etc.; Owen, *On the Person of Christ*; Goodwin's *Works*,

b. iii; M'Laughlan, *Christ's Mediatorship* (Edinb. 1853); Kitto, *Bibl. Cyclop.* s.v.; Buck, *Theol. Dict.* s.v.; *Amer. Presb. Revelation* 1863, p. 419. **SEE ATONEMENT.**

## Medicamentum

or *MEDICINA CORPORIS ET MENTIS*, a name occasionally found in the writings of the Church fathers as asynonym of our term "the Lord's Supper." Ignatius and others not unusually speak of "the medicine of immortality" "medicini or preservative of the soul." See Riddle *Christian Antiquities*, p. 551.

## Medici, The House Of

one of the most noted families of Italy's nobility, figures largely in the ecclesiastical history of mediæval times and the days of the Renaissance that we cannot pass it without a somewhat detailed account of its different members.

**1.** The early history of the family of the Medici is obscure, although some authors have traced their genealogy from the age of Charlemagne. But it must be remembered that these genealogies were made after the elevation of this family to supreme power in the republic of Florence—a position which they attained only by degrees, after the accumulation of wealth sufficient to control the affairs of the Italian nation. It appears, however, from authentic monuments, that many individuals of this family had signalized themselves on various important occasions even in early times. Giovanni de' Medici in the year 1251, with a body of only one hundred Florentines, forced his way through the Milanese army, then besieging the fortress of Scarperia, and entered the place with the loss of twenty lives. Francesco de' Medici was at the head of the magistracy of Florence in 1348, at the time when the black plague, which had desolated so large a portion of the world, extended its ravages to that city: Salvstro de' Medici acquired great reputation by his temperate but firm resistance to the nobles, who, in order to secure their power, accused those who opposed them of being attached to the party of the Ghibelins, then in great odium at Florence. The persons so accused, were said to be *ammoniti* (admonished), and by that act were excluded from all offices of government. In the year 1379, Salvstro, being chosen chief magistrate, exerted his power to reform this abuse, which was not, however, effected without a violent commotion, several of the nobility losing their lives in the attempt. It is from this time that we date the rise of

the Medici to prominence in political, and finally also in ecclesiastical affairs.

2. The founder, however, of that almost regal greatness which the Medici enjoyed for more than two centuries was not Salvestro, who first received great public distinctions, but Giovanni de' Medici. His immense wealth, honorably acquired by commercial dealings, which had already rendered the name of *Medici* celebrated in Europe, was expended with liberality and magnificence. Of a mild temper and averse to cabals, Giovanni de' Medici did not attempt to set up a party, but contented himself with the place in the public councils to which even his enemies declared him entitled in virtue of his eminence, his acquirements, and the purity of his character. He died in 1429, leaving to his sons, Cosmo and Lorenzo, a heritage of wealth and honors hitherto unparalleled in the republic.

Cosmo (born 1389, died 1464), on whom was gratefully bestowed the honored title of Father of his country," really began the glorious epoch of the Medici. Cosmo's life, except during a short period, when the Albizzi and other rivals re-established a successful opposition against the policy and credit of the Medici, was one uninterrupted course of prosperity; at once a munificent patron and a successful cultivator of art and literature, he did more than any other sovereign in Europe to revive the study of the ancient classics, and to foster a taste for mental culture. He assembled around him learned men of every nation, and gave liberal support to numerous Greek scholars, whom the subjection of Constantinople by the Turks had driven into exile; and by his foundation, of an academy for the study of the philosophy of Plato, and of a library of Greek, Latin, and Oriental MSS he inaugurated a new sera in modern learning and art. In the lifetime of his father, Cosmo had engaged not only in the extensive business by which the family had acquired its wealth, but also in the affairs of state. Such was his authority and reputation that in the year 1414, when Balthasar Cossa, who had been elected pope, and had assumed the name of John XXIII, was summoned to attend the Council of Constance, he chose to be accompanied by Cosmo de' Medici, among other men of eminence, whose characters might countenance his cause. By this council, which continued nearly four years, Balthasar was deprived of his pontifical dignity, and Otto Colonna, who took the name of Martin V, was elected pope. Cosmo did not desert in adversity the mal to whom he had attached himself in prosperity. At the expense of a large sum of money, he redeemed him from the hands of the duke of Bavaria, who had seized upon his

person; and afterwards gave him a hospitable shelter at Florence during the remainder of his life. The successful pontiff, instead of resenting the kindness shown to his rival, soon afterwards paid a public visit to Florence, where, on the formal submission of Balthasar, and at the request of the Medici, he created the ex-pope a cardinal, with the privilege of taking the first place in the sacred college. The new-made cardinal died in 1419, and it was rumored that the Medici at his death possessed themselves of immense wealth which he had acquired during his pontificate. This rumor was afterwards encouraged by those who well knew its falsehood. The true source of the wealth of the Medici was their superior talents and application to business, and the property of the cardinal was scarcely sufficient to discharge his debts and legacies. During the retirement of his latter days, his happiest hours were devoted to the study of letters and philosophy, and the conversation of learned men. He also endowed numerous religious houses, and built a hospital at Jerusalem for the relief of distressed pilgrims.

**3.** Cosmo's grandson, Lorenzo, afterwards surnamed the "Magnificent" (born Jan. 1, 1448, died April 8, 1492), was introduced to a knowledge of public affairs, on account of the infirmities of his father, immediately upon the decease of Cosmo. Though only a youth, he was at once pushed forward to take upon himself the work supposed to belong to a much maturer mind. To afford him a clearer insight into political affairs than he could secure at home, he was sent to visit the principal courts in Italy. Upon the accession of Sixtus IV to the papal throne, he went with other citizens of Florence, to congratulate the new pope, and was invested with the office of treasurer of the holy see; and while at Rome embraced the opportunity to add to the remains of ancient art which his family had collected. One of the first events after he undertook the administration of affairs was a revolt of the inhabitants of Volterra, on account of a dispute with the Florentine republic. By the recommendation of Lorenzo, force was used, and the result was the sack of Volterra. Like his grandfather, he encouraged literature and the arts, employed learned men to collect choice books and antiquities for him from every part of the known world, established printing-presses in his dominions as soon as the art was invented but, above all, he deserves special commendation for his re-establishment of the Academy of Pisa, to which city he removed in order to complete the undertaking: he selected the most eminent professors, and contributed a large sum from his private fortune, in addition to that granted

by the state of Florence. In another respect also Lorenzo resembled his grandfather Cosmo. He was or affected to be, an admirer of Plato, took an active part in the establishment of an academy for the cultivation of the Platonic philosophy, and instituted an annual-festival in honor of Plato.

While Loreiuo was dividing his time between the administration of the state and the promotion of literature, the Pazzi, a numerous and distinguished family in Florence, of all the opponents of the Medici the most inveterate, formed a conspiracy to assassinate Lorenzo and his brother experience having taught them the impossibility of overthrowing the reign of the Medici in any other way. Giuliano was killed, but Lorenzo escaped. "A horrible transaction this, which has been justly quoted as an incontrovertible proof of the practical atheism of the times in which it took place-one in which a pope, a cardinal, an archbishop, and several other ecclesiastics, associated themselves with a band of ruffians to destroy two men who were an honor to their age and 'country; and purposed to perpetrate their crime at a season of hospitality, in the sanctuary of a Christian Church, and at the very moment of the elevation of the host, when the congregation bowed down before it, and the assassins were presumed to be in the immediate presence of their God. The plan was concocted at Rome, with the participation of pope Sixtus IV. On the 6th of April, 1478, in the church of the Reparata, during the mass, while the host was elevated and the multitude were kneeling, the murderous blow was struck, the very mass-bell itself sounding the signal to the other conspirators to possess themselves of the palace and government." The failure of this dastardly scheme only made the Medici the more invincible. The people, who had always been attached to them, exasperated by this open and daring attempt to rob them of those whom they conceived to be their best friends, now took the execution of the law in their own hands, and put to death or apprehended the assassins. Salviati, archbishop of Pisa, was hung through the windows of the palace, and was not allowed to divest himself even of his robes and Jacopo de' Pazzi, with one of his nephews, shared the same fate. The name and arms of the Pazzi family were suppressed, its members were banished, and Lorenzo rose still higher in the regard of his fellow-citizens. The troubles of the Medici, however, did not stop here. For them yet remained the punishment at the disposal of the papal party, and the latter, maddened by the failure of their plot, determined now to vail themselves of the advantages which Rome could afford as "ecclesiastical thunderer." Sixtus IV promptly excommunicated

Lorenzo and the magistrates of Florence, laid an interdict upon the whole territory, and, forming a league with the king of Naples, prepared to invade the Florentine dominions. Lorenzo appealed to all the surrounding potentates, and, zealously supported by his fellow-citizens, commenced hostilities, and carried on two campaigns. At the close, of 1479, Lorenzo took the bold resolution of paying a visit to the king of Naples, and, without obtaining any previous promise of security, trusted himself to the mercy of his enemy. The result of this confidence was a treaty of mutual defence and friendship between the king of Naples and Florence, and this finally forced Sixtus to consent to a treaty of peace. In 1484 Sixtus IV died, and his successor on the papal throne, Innocent VIII, manifesting a determination to re-establish friendly relations with the different Italian princes, *SEE INNOCENT VIII*, the contest of the Medici with the Church seemed to have come to a happy close. There was, however, still one dark cloud on the firmament of the heavens, and it threatened sooner or later to bring trouble and discomfiture to the Medici we refer to Savonarola, the great Italian reformer, who was in the very strength of his manhood at this time. The Italian monk had long opposed the licentious habits of the court and the nobility. He was opposed, moreover, to the display of regal splendor, and boldly preached in favor of democracy and republican institutions. Lorenzo sought in more than one way to conciliate the sturdy reformer, but all efforts proved futile. Not even the cardinalate could tempt him *SEE SAVONAROLA* and Lorenzo was forced to admit himself, "Besides this man, I have never seen a true monk." Gradually Savonarola gave system to his republican ideas, and, gathering about him a host of followers, these opponents of the ruling administration came to be known by the name of *Piagnoni* (q.v.) or "weepers," so called because of their determination to stem the progress of the voluptuous refinement of the day by ascetic severity of morals. Lorenzo himself saw clearly the inherent insufficiency of art and philosophy alone for the security of a state; but while he sighed for a purely religious influence, he feared the dangerous tendency of the *Piagnoni* towards a popular and democratic form of government, and he had failed to extinguish or abate his opposition when suddenly cut down by disease and death, April 8, 1492.

Lorenzo is credited with even greater love and devotion to the development of literary life and the study of the fine arts than any of his predecessors. His own productions are sonnets, canzoni, and other lyric pieces; some longer works in stanzas, some comic satires, carnival songs,

and various sacred poems. Many of the lighter kind were popular in their day. Although the ancestors of Lorenzo laid the foundation of the immense collection of manuscripts contained in the Laurentian library Lorenzo has the credit of adding most largely to the stock. For the purpose of enriching his collection of books and antiquities, he employed learned men in different parts of Italy, and especially his intimate friend Politian, who made several journeys in order to discover and purchase the valuable remains of antiquity. Two journeys were undertaken at the request of Lorenzo into the East by John Lascaris and the result was the acquisition of a great number of manuscripts. On his return from his second expedition, Lascaris brought two hundred manuscripts, many of which he had procured from a monastery at Mount Athos; but this treasure did not arrive till after the death of Lorenzo, who in his last moments expressed to Politian and Pico of Mirandola his regret that he could not live to complete the collection which he was forming. On the discovery of the art of printing, Lorenzo quickly saw and appreciated its importance. At his suggestion, several Italian scholars devoted their attention to collating the manuscripts of the ancient authors, for the purpose of having them accurately printed. On the capture of Constantinople by the Turks, many learned Greeks took refuge in Italy; and an academy was established at Florence for the purpose of cultivating the Greek language, partly under the direction of native Greeks, and partly under native Italians. The services of these learned men were procured by Lorenzo, and were amply rewarded by his bounty. "Hence," as Roscoe observes (in *his Life of Lorenzo del Medici*. 1795, 2 vols. 4to Bohn's edit. Lond. 1851, 12mo), succeeding scholars have been profuse of their acknowledgments to their great patron, who first formed that establishment, from which (to use their own scholastic figure), as from the Trojan horse, so many illustrious champions have sprung, and by means of which the knowledge of the Greek tongue was extended, not only through Italy, but through France, Spain, Germany, and England, from all which countries numerous pupils attended at Florence, who diffused the learning they had there acquired throughout the rest of Europe." Lorenzo also augmented his father's collection of the remains of ancient art. He appropriated his gardens in Florence to the purpose of an academy for the study of the antique, which he furnished with statues, busts, and other works of art, the best of their kind that he could procure. The higher class of his fellow-citizens were incited to these pursuits by the example of Lorenzo, and the lower class by his liberality. To the latter he not only allowed competent stipends while

they attended to. their studies, but gave considerable premiums as rewards of their proficiency. To this institution. more than to any other circumstance, Roscoe ascribes. the sudden and astonishing advance which, towards the close of the 15th century, was evidently made in the arts, and which, commencing at Florence, extended itself to the rest of Europe.

4. Lorenzo's successor in the government of Florence was his eldest son Pietro; but of far greater interest to the ecclesiastical student is the history of his younger son Giovanni, and that of his nephew Giulio. The former of the two last named, Giovanni, was honored, by the prudent manipulations of Lorenzo, with the cardinal's hat when only a boy of thirteen years, at the hands of Innocent VIII, and on the death-of Julius II, brought credit upon the name of Medici by his accession to the papal throne. *SEE LEO X.* Of Giulio's history we have the following from Roscoe Shortly after the attempt at assassination, he says, Uprezzo received a visit from Antonio da San Gall, who informed him that. the untimely death of Giuliano had prevented his disclosing to Lorenzo a circumstance with which it was now become necessary that he should be acquainted: this was the birth of a son, whom a lady of the family of Gorini had borne to Giuliano about twelve months before his death, and whom Antonio had held over the baptismal font, where he received the name of Giulio. Lorenzo immediately repaired to the place of the infant's residence, and, taking him under his protection, delivered him to Antonio, with whom he remained until he had arrived 'at the seventh year of his age. This concealed offspring of illicit love, to whom the kindness of Lorenzo supplied the untimely loss of a father, was destined to act an important part in the affairs of Europe. The final extinction of the liberties of Florence, the alliance of the family of Medici with the royal house of France, the expulsion of Henry VIII of England from the bosom of the Roman Church, and the consequent establishment of the doctrines of the Reformers in Great Britain, are principally to be referred to this illegitimate so of Giuliano de' Medici, who through various vicissitudes of fortune at length obtained the supreme direction of the Roman see, and, under the name of Clement VII guided the bark of St. Peter through a succession of the, severest storms which it has ever experienced."

Pietro possessed neither capacity nor prudence, and in the troubles which the ambition of her princes and the profligacy of her popes brought upon Italy, by plunging her into civil and foreign war, he showed himself treacherous and vacillating alike to friends and foes. Lodovico Sforza,

surnamed the “Moor,” relying on the friendship which, from the middle of the 15th century, had prevailed between the Sforza family of Milan and the Medici, applied to him for assistance in establishing his claim to the duchy of Milan; but, seeing that no reliance could be placed on Pietro, he threw himself into the arms of Charles VIII of France. The result was the invasion of Italy by a French army of 32,000 men. Pietro, in hopes of conciliating the powerful invader, hastened to meet the troops on their entrance into the dominions of Florence, and surrendered to Charles the fortresses of Leghorn and Pisa, which constituted the keys of the republic. The magistrates and people, incensed at his perfidy, drove him from the city, and formally deposed the family of the Medici from all participation of power in 1494.

The attempts of Giovanni, then a cardinal, to uphold the Medician authority, and his success in the reestablishment of his house in 1512, we have narrated in our article on Leo X. Pietro was slain in 1503, while fighting in the French ranks.

It was during the invasions of the French in Italy, in the days of Pietro, that Florence was robbed of one of her greatest treasures the invaluable library which had been collected by the care of his father and grandfather. “The French troops, which had entered the city without opposition, led the way to this act of barbarism, in which they were joined by the Florentines themselves, who openly carried off or purloined whatever they could discover that was rare or valuable. Besides the numerous manuscripts, the plunderers carried off the inestimable specimens of the arts which the palace of the Medici contained, and which had long made it the admiration of strangers and the chief ornament of the city. Exquisite pieces of ancient sculpture, vases, cameos, and gems of various kinds, were lost amid the indiscriminate plunder, and the rich accumulations of half a century were destroyed or dispersed in a single day.” During the interregnum, the labors of the Piagnoni were suddenly checked by the martyrdom of their beloved leader, Savonarola, in 1498; and, when the Medici came again to rule over Florence, this disposition of some of their strongest opponents threw a weight of power into the hands of the Medici which rendered all attempts to maintain even a show of independence futile on the part of the Florentines. The faintest indication of republican spirit was at once crushed by the combined aid of pope and emperor.

5. The accession of Clement VII only strengthened the Medici in Florence, and, though the legitimate male line of Cosmo was extinct (with the exception of the pope), Clement VII gave, in 1529, to Alessandro, natural son of the last prince Lorenzo II, the rank of duke of Florence; and on his death, by assassination, without direct heirs, in 1537, raised Cosmo I, the descendant of a collateral branch, to the ducal chair.

Cosmo, known as the Great, possessed the astuteness of-character, the love of elegance, and taste for literature, but not the frank and generous spirit that had distinguished his great ancestors; and while he founded the academies of painting and of fine arts, made collections of paintings and statuary, published magnificent editions of his own works and those of others, and encouraged, trade, for the protection of which he instituted the ecclesiastical order of St. Stephen, he was implacable in his enmity. and scrupled not utterly to extirpate the race of the Strozzi, the hereditary foes of his house. His acquisition of Sienna gained for him the title of grand-duke of Tuscany from Pius V; and he died in 1574, leaving enormous wealth and regal power to his descendants, who, throughout the next half century, maintained the literary and artistic fame of their family. In the 17th century the race rapidly degenerated, and, after several of its representatives had suffered themselves to be made the mere tools of Spanish and Austrian ambition, the main line of the Medici family became extinct in 1737. The genealogy of the Medici to the present time is given in a splendid work but little known, entitled *Famiglie celebri Italiane*, by Litta. The Medici and their descendants are comprised in *Fascicolo XVII* (in seven parts, Milan, 1827-30, folio). See also *Modern Universal History*, vol. xxxvi; Noble, *Memoirs of the House of Medici*, illustrated with genealogical tables; Tenhove, *Memoirs of the House of Medici*, translated from the French by Sir R. Clayton (Bath, 1797, 2 vols. 4to); Roscoe, *Life of Lorenzo de' Medici*, and his *Life and Pontificate of Leo X* (Liverp. 1805, 4 vols. 4to); Guicciardini, *Storia d'Italia*; Botta, *Storia d'Italia*; Sismondi. *Hist. des Republiques Italiennes*; Leo, *Gesch. v. Italien*; Trollope, *Hist. of Florence* (Lond. 1865, 4 vols. 8vo); Hallam, *Middle Ages* (Smith's ed., Harpers, 1872), p. 229 sq.; *National Quart. Revelation* Dec. 1863, art. iii; *Foreign Quart. Revelation* v. 475; and the excellent article in the *English Cyclopaedia*, s.v.

## Medicine

(**hpꞤrT**) *terupahh* a medical powder, <sup>אֶרְפָּה</sup>Ezekiel 47:12; Sept. **ὕγεια**, comp. **θεραπεία** of <sup>אֶרְפָּה</sup>Revelation 22:2; Vulg. *medicina*; also the plur. **t/apꞤ**, *rephuoth*, *medicaments*, or remedies for wounds, <sup>אֶרְפָּה</sup>Jeremiah 30:13; 46:11; “healed,” <sup>אֶרְפָּה</sup>Ezekiel 30:21; but **hhꞤgehah**, in <sup>אֶרְפָּה</sup>Proverbs 17:12, is properly the *removal* of the bandages from a sore, hence its *healing*; therefore render, “a joyful heart perfects a cure “). “In the following article we endeavor as far as possible to treat the subject from the modern scientific point of view. **SEE HEAL**

### I. Sources of Medical Science among the Hebrews.-

**1. Natural.** — Next to care for food, clothing, and shelter, the curing of hurts takes precedence even among savage nations. At a later period comes the treatment of sickness; and recognition of states of disease, and these mark a nascent civilization. Internal diseases, and all for which an obvious cause cannot be assigned, are in the most early period viewed as the visitation of God, or as the act of some malignant power, human — as the evil eye or else superhuman, and to be dealt with by sorcery, or some other occult supposed agency. The Indian notion is that all diseases are the work of an evil spirit (Sprengel, *Gesch. der Arzneikunde*, 2:48). But among a civilized race the pre-eminence of the medical art is confessed in proportion to the increased value set on human life, and the vastly greater amount of comfort and enjoyment of which civilized man is capable.

**2. Egyptian.** — It would be strange if their close connection historically with Egypt had not imbued the Israelites with a strong appreciation of the value of this art, and with some considerable degree of medical culture. From the most ancient testimonies, sacred and secular, Egypt, from whatever cause, though perhaps from necessity, was foremost among the nations in this most human of studies purely physical. Again, as the active intelligence of Greece flowed in upon her, and mingled with the immense store of pathological records which must have accumulated under the system described by Herodotus, Egypt, especially Alexandria, became the medical repertory and museum of the world. Thither all that was best worth preserving amid earlier civilizations, whether her own or foreign, had been attracted, and medicine and surgery flourished amid political decadence and artistic decline. The attempt has been made ‘by a French

writer (Renouard, *Histoire de' Medicine depuis son Origine*, etc.) to arrange in periods the growth of the medical art as follows

**1st.** The Primitive or Instinctive Period, lasting from the earliest recorded treatment to the fall of Troy.

**2dly.** The Sacred or Mystic Period, lasting till the dispersion of the Pythagorean Society, BC. 500.

**3dly.** The Philosophical Period, closing with the foundation of the Alexandrian Library, BC. 320.

**4thly.** The Anatomical Period, which continued till the death of Galen, AD. 200.

But these artificial lines do not strictly exhibit the truth of the matter. Egypt was the earliest home of medical and other skill for the region of the Mediterranean basin, and every Egyptian mummy of the more expensive and elaborate sort involved a process of anatomy. This gave opportunities of inspecting a vast number of bodies, varying in every possible condition. Such opportunities were sure to be turned to account (Pliny, *N. H.* 19:5) by the more diligent among the faculty, for ‘ the physicians’ embalmed (Genesis 1,2). The intestines had a separate receptacle assigned them, or were restored to the body: through the ventral incision (Wilkinson, v. 468); and every such process which we can trace in the mummies discovered shows the most minute accuracy of manipulation. Notwithstanding these laborious efforts, we have no trace of any philosophical or rational system of Egyptian origin, and medicine in Egypt was a mere art or profession. Of science the Asclepiadae of Greece were the true originators. Hippocrates, who wrote a book on “Ancient Medicine,” and who seems to have had many opportunities of access to foreign sources, gives no prominence to Egypt. It was no doubt owing to the repressive influences of her fixed institutions that this country did not attain to a vast and speedy proficiency in medical science, when *post mortem* examination was so general a rule instead of being a rare exception. Still it is impossible to believe that considerable advances in physiology could have failed to be made there from time to time, and similarly, though we cannot so well determine how far, in Assyria. Recent researches at Kuyunjik have given proof, it is said of the use of the-microscope in minute devices, and yielded up even specimens of magnifying lenses. A cone engraved with a table of cubes, so small as to be unintelligible without a lens, was brought home by Sir H.

Rawlinson, and is now in the British Museum. As to whether the invention was brought to bear on medical science, proof is wanting. Probably such science had not yet been pushed to the point at which the microscope becomes useful. Only those who have quick keen eyes for the nature world feel the want of such spectacles. The best guarantee for the advance of medical science is, after all, the interest which every human being has in it, and this is most strongly felt in large gregarious masses of population. Compared with the wild countries around them, at any rate, Egypt must have seemed incalculably advanced. Hence the awe with which Homer's Greeks speak of her wealth, resources, and medical skill (*II* 9:3 1; *Od.* 4:229. See also Herod. 2:84, and 1:77). The simple heroes had reverence for the healing skill which extended only to wounds. There is hardly any recognition of disease in Homer. There is sudden death, pestilence, and weary old age, but hardly any fixed morbid condition, save in a simile (*Od.* v. 395). See, however, a letter *De rebus ex Homnero medicis*, D. G. Wolf (Wittenberg, 1791). So likewise even the visit of Abraham, though prior to this period, found Egypt no doubt in advance of other countries. Representations of earl, Egyptian surgery apparently occur on some of the monuments of Beni-Hassan. Flint knives used for embalming have been recovered; the "Ethiopic stone" of Herodotus (2. 86; comp. <sup><301D></sup>Ezekiel 4:25) was probably either black flint or agate **SEE KNIFE**, and those who have assisted at the opening of a mummy have noticed that the teeth exhibit a dentistry not inferior in execution to the work of the best modern experts. | This confirms the statement of Herodotus that every part of the body was studied by a distinct practitioner. Pliny (7. 57) asserts that the Egyptians claimed the invention of the healing art, and (26. 1) thinks them subject to many diseases. Their "many medicines" are mentioned (<sup><346I></sup>Jeremiah 46:11). Many valuable drugs may be derived from the plants mentioned by Wilkinson (iv. 621). and the senna of the adjacent interior of Africa still excels all other. Athothmes II, king of the country, is said to have written on the subject of anatomy. Hermes (who may perhaps be 'the same as Athothmes, intellect personified, only disguised as a deity instead of a legendary king), was said to have written six books on medicine, in which an entire chapter was devoted to diseases of the eye (Rawlinson's *Herod.* note to 2:84), and the first half of which related to anatomy. The various recipes known to have been beneficial were recorded, with their peculiar cases, in the memoirs of physic, inscribed among the laws, and deposited in the principal temples of the place (Wilkinson, 3:396, 397). The reputation of its practitioners in historical times was such that both

Cyrus and Darius sent to Egypt for physicians or surgeons (Herod. 3:1, 129-132); and by one of the same country, no doubt, Cambyses's wound was tended, though not, perhaps, with much zeal for his recovery.

## Picture for Medicine

Of midwifery we have a distinct notice (<sup>Exodus</sup> Exodus 1:15), and of women as its practitioners, which fact may also be verified from the sculptures (Rawlinson's note on Herod, 2:84). The sex of the practitioners is clear from the Hebrews grammatical forms. The names of two, Shiphrah and Puah are recorded. The treatment of new-born Hebrew infants is mentioned (<sup>Ezekiel</sup> Ezekiel 16:4) as consisting in washing, salting, and swaddling-this last was not used in Egypt (Wilkinson). The physicians had salaries from the public treasury, and treated always according to established precedents, or deviated from these at their peril, in case of a fatal termination if, however, the patient died under accredited treatment, no blame was attached. They treated gratis patients when travelling or 'on military service. Most diseases were by them ascribed to indigestion and excessive eating (Diod. Sicul. 1:82), and when their science failed them magic was called in. On recovery it was also customary to suspend in a temple an exvoto, which was commonly a model of the part affected; and such offerings doubtless, as in the Coan Temple of Esculapius, became valuable aids to the pathological student. The Egyptians who lived in the corn-growing region are said by Herodotus (ii. 77) to have been specially attentive to health. The practise of circumcision is traceable on monuments certainly anterior to the age of Joseph. Its antiquity is involved in obscurity, especially as all we know of the Egyptians makes it unlikely that they would have borrowed such a practice, so late as the period of Abraham, from any mere sojourner among' them. Its beneficial effects in the temperature of Egypt and Syria have often been noticed, especially as a preservative of cleanliness, etc. The scrupulous attention paid to the dead was favorable to the health of the living. Such powerful drugs as asphaltum, natron, resin, pure bitumen, and various, aromaticgums, suppressed or counteracted all noxious effluvia from the corpse; even the saw-dust of the floor, on which the body had been cleansed, was collected in small linen bags, which, to the number of twenty or thirty, were deposited in vases near the tomb (Wilkinson, v. 468, 469). For the extent to which these practices were imitated among the Jews, *SEE EMBALMING*. At any rate, the uncleanness imputed to contact with a corpse was a powerful preservative against the inoculation of the livings

frame with morbid -humors: But, to pursue to later times this merely general question, it appears (Pliny, *N. H.* 19:5) that the Ptolemies themselves practiced dissection, and that, at a period when Jewish intercourse with Egypt was complete and reciprocal, there existed in Alexandria a great deal for anatomical study. The only influence of importance which would tend to check the Jews from sharing this was the ceremonial law, the special reverence of Jewish feeling towards human remains, and the abhorrence of “uncleanness.” Yet those Jews and there were, at all times since the Captivity, not a few, perhaps who tended to foreign laxity, and affected Greek. philosophy and. culture, would assuredly, as we shall have further occasion to notice that they in fact did, enlarge their anatomical knowledge from sources which repelled their stricter brethren, and the result would be apparent in the general elevated standard of that profession, even as practiced in Jerusalem. The diffusion of Christianity in the 3d and 4th centuries exercised a similar but more universal restraint on the dissecting-room; until anatomy as a pursuit became extinct, and, the notion of profaneness quelling everywhere such researches, surgical science became stagnant to a degree to which it had never previously sunk within the memory of human records.

**3. Grecian.**-In comparing the growth of medicine in the rest of the ancient world, the high rank of its practitioners — princes and heroes-settles at once the question as to the esteem in which it was held in the Homeric and preHomeric period. To descend to the historical, the story of Democedes at the court of Darius illustrates the practice of Greek surgery before the period of Hippocrates anticipating, in its gentler waiting upon nature, as compared (Herod. 3:130) with that of the Persians and Egyptians, the methods, and maxims of that father of physic, who wrote against the theories and speculations of the so-called Philosophical school, and was a true empiricist before that sect was formularized. The Dogmatic school was founded after his time by his disciples,. who departed from his eminently practical and inductive method. It recognized hidden causes of health and sickness arising from certain supposed principles or elements, out of which bodies were composed, and by virtue of which all their parts and members were tempered together and became sympathetic. Hippocrates has some curious remarks on the sympathy of men with climate, seasons, etc. He himself rejected supernatural accounts of disease, and especially demoniacal possession. He refers, but with no mystical sense, to numbers as furnishing a rule for cases. It is remarkable that he

extols the discernment of Orientals above Westerns, and of Asiatics above Europeans, in medical diagnosis. The Empirical school, which arose in the 3d century BC., under the guidance of Acron of Agrigentum, Serapion of Alexandria, and Philinus of Cos, waited for the symptoms of every case, disregarding the rules of practice based on dogmatic principles. Among its votaries was a Zachalias (perhaps Zacharias, and possibly a Jew) of Babylon, who (Pliny, *N. H* 37:10; comp. 36:10) dedicated a book on medicine to Mithridates the Great; its views were also supported by Herodotus of Tarsus, a place which, next to Alexandria, became distinguished for its schools of philosophy and medicine; as also by a Jew named Theodas, or Theudas, of Laodicea (see Wunderbar, *Biblisches-Talmudische Medicin*, 1:25), but a student of Alexandria, and the last, or nearly so, of the empiricists whom its schools produced. The remarks of Theudas on the right method of observing, and the value of experience, and his book on medicine, now lost, in which he arranged his subject under the heads of *indicatoria*, *curatoria*, and *salubris*, earned him high reputation as a champion of empiricism against the reproaches of the dogmatists, though they were subsequently impugned by Galen and Theodosius of Tripoli. His period was that from Titus to Hadrian., The empiricists held that observation and the application of known remedies in one case to others presumed to be similar constitute the whole art of cultivating medicine. Though their views were narrow, and their information scanty when compared with some of the chiefs of the other sects, and although they rejected as useless and unattainable all knowledge of the causes and recondite nature of diseases, it is undeniable that, besides personal experience, they freely availed themselves of historical detail, and of a strict analogy founded upon observation and the resemblance of phenomena” (Dr. Adams, *Paul. Aegin.* ed. Sydenham Soc.).

This school, however, was opposed by another, known as the Methodic, which had arisen under the leading of Themison, also of Laodicea, about the period of Pompey the Great. Asclepiades paved the way for the “method” in question, finding a theoretic basis in the corpuscular or atomic theory of physics which he borrowed from Heraclides of Pontus. He had passed some early years in Alexandria, and thence came to Rome shortly before Cicero’s time (Quo nos medico amicoque usi sumus,” *Cicero, de Orat.* 1:14).: He was a transitional link between the Dogmatic and Empiric schools and this later, or Methodic (Sprengel, *ut sup.* pt. v. 16), that sought to rescue medicine from the bewildering mass of particulars into

which empiricism had plunged it. He reduced diseases to: two classes, chronic and acute, and endeavored likewise to simplify remedies. In the meanwhile, the most judicious of medical theories since Hippocrates, Celsus, of the Augustan period had reviewed medicine in the light which all these schools afforded, and, not professing any distinct teaching, but borrowing from all, may be viewed as eclectic. He translated Hippocrates largely *verbatim*; quoting in a less degree Asclepiades and others. Antonius Musa, whose "cold-water cure," after its successful trial on Augustus himself, became generally popular, seems to have had little of scientific basis, but by the usual method, or the usual accidents, became merely the fashionable practitioner of his day in Rome. Attalia, near Tarsus, furnished also, shortly after the period of Celsus, Athenaeus, the leader of the last of the schools of medicine which divided the ancient world, under the name of the "Pneumatic," holding the tenet "of an ethereal principle  $\rho$  (πνεῦμα) residing in the microcosm, by means of which the mind performed the functions of the body." This is also traceable in Hippocrates, and was an established opinion of the Stoics. It was exemplified in the innate heat, θερμὴ ἔμφυτος (Aret. *de Caus. et Sign. Morb. Chron.* ii; 13), and the *calidum innatum* of modern physiologists, especially in the 17th century (Dr. Adams, *Pref. Aretceus*, ed. Sydelh. Soc.).

**4. Effect of these Systems.**-It is clear that all these schools may easily have contributed to form the medical opinions current at the period, of the N.T.; that the two earlier among them may have influenced rabbinical teaching on that subject at a much earlier period; and that, especially at the time of Alexander's visit to Jerusalem, the Jewish people, whom he favored and protected, had an opportunity of largely gathering from the medical lore of the West. It was necessary, therefore, to pass in brief review the growth of the latter, and especially to note the points at which it intersects the medical progress of the Jews. Greek Asiatic medicine culminated in Galen, who was, however, still but a commentator on his Western predecessors, and who stands literally without rival, successor, or disciple of note, till the period when Greek learning was reawakened by the Arabian intellect. The Arabs, however, continued to build wholly upon Hippocrates and Galen, save in so far as their advance in chemical science improved their pharmacopoeia: this may be seen on reference to the works of Rhazes, AD. 930, and Haly Abbas. AD. 980. The first mention of small-pox is ascribed to Rhazes, who, however, quotes several earlier writers on the subject. Mohammed himself is said to have been versed in medicine, and to have

compiled some aphorisms upon it; — and a herbalist literature was always extensively followed in the East from the days of Solomon downwards (Freind's *History of Medicine*, 2:5,:27). Galen himself belongs to the period of the Antonines, but he appears to have been acquainted with the writings of Moses, and to have travelled in quest of medical experience over Egypt, Syria, and Palestine, as well as Greece, and a large part of the West, and, in particular, to have visited the banks of the Jordan in quest of opobalsamum, and the coasts of the Dead Sea to obtain samples of bitumen. He also mentions Palestine as producing a watery wine, suitable for the drink of feeble patients.

**II. Historical Notices.**— Having thus described the external influences which, if any, were probably most potent in forming the medical practice of the Hebrews, we may trace next its internal growth. The cabalistic legends mix up the names of Shem and Heber in their fables about healing, and ascribe to those patriarchs a knowledge of simples and rare roots, with, of course, magic spells and occult powers, such as have clouded the history of medicine from the earliest times down to the 17th century.

**1. In the Old Testament.** — So to Abraham is ascribed a talisman, the touch of which healed all disease. We know that such simple surgical skill as the operation for circumcision implies was Abraham's; but severer operations than this are constantly required in the flock and herd, and those who watch carefully the habits of animals can hardly fail to amass some guiding principles applicable to man and beast alike. Beyond this, there was probably nothing but such ordinary obstetrical craft as has always been traditional among the women of rude tribes, that could be classed as medical lore in the family of the patriarch, until his sojourn brought him among the more cultivated Philistines and Egyptians. The only notices which Scripture affords in connection with the subject are' the cases of difficult midwifery in the successive households of Isaac, Jacob, and Judah (<sup><025></sup>Genesis 25:26; 24:17; 38:27), and so, later, in that of Phinehas <sup><001></sup>2 Samuel 4:19). :Doubts have been raised as to the possibility of twins being born, one holding the other's heel; but there does not seem to be any such limit to the operations of nature as an objection on that score would imply. After all it was perhaps only just such a relative position of the limbs of the infants at the mere moment of birth as would suggest the "holding by the heel." The midwives, it seems, in case of twins, were called upon to distinguish the first-born, to whom important privileges appertained. The tying on of a thread or ribbon was an easy way of preventing mistake, and

the assistant in the case of Tamar seized the earliest possible moment for doing it. "When the hand or foot of a living child protrudes, it is to be pushed up, and the head made to present" (*Paul. AEGIN.* ed Sydenh. Soc. 1:648, Hippocr. quoted by Dr Adans). This probably the midwife did, at the same time marking him as first-born in virtue of being thus "presented" first. The precise meaning of the doubtful expression in <sup><10827></sup>Genesis 38:27 and mag. is discussed by Wunderbar, *ut sup.* p. 50, in reference both to the children and to the mother. Of Rachel a Jewish commentator says, "Multis etiam ex itinere difficultatibus praegressis, viribusque post diu protractos dolores exhaustis, atonia uteri, forsan quidem hemorrhagia in pariendo mortua est" (*ibid.*). The traditional value ascribed to the mandrake, in regard to generative functions, relates to the same branch of natural medicine; but throughout this period there occurs no trace of any attempt to study, digest, and systematize the subject.

But, as Israel grew and multiplied in Egypt, they doubtless derived a large mental cultivation from their position until cruel policy turned it into bondage; even then Moses was rescued from the lot of his brethren, and became learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, including, of course, medicine and cognate sciences (Clem. Alex. i, p. 413), and those attainments, perhaps, became suggestive of future laws. Some practical skill in metallurgy is evident from <sup><12320></sup>Exodus 32:20. But, if we admit Egyptian learning as an ingredient, we should also notice how far exalted above it is the standard of the whole Jewish legislative fabric, in its exemption from the blemishes of sorcery and juggling pretences. The priest, who had to pronounce on the cure, used no means to advance it, and the whole regulations prescribed exclude the notion of trafficking in popular superstition. We have no occult practices reserved in the hands of the sacred caste. It is God alone who doeth great things, working by the wand of Moses, or the brazen serpent; but the very mention of such instruments is such as to expel all pretence of mysterious virtues in the things themselves. Hence various allusions to God's "healing mercy," and the title "Jehovah that healeth" (<sup><12536></sup>Exodus 15:26; <sup><24714></sup>Jeremiah 17:14; 30:17; <sup><19438></sup>Psalms 103:3; 147:3; <sup><23106></sup>Isaiah 30:26). Nor was the practice of physic a privilege of the Jewish priesthood. Any one might practice it, and this publicity must have kept it pure. Nay, there was no scriptural bar to its practice by resident aliens. We read of "physicians," "healing," etc., <sup><12119></sup>Exodus 21:19; <sup><12189></sup>2 Kings 8:29; <sup><14162></sup>2 Chronicles 16:12; <sup><24822></sup>Jeremiah 8:22. At the same time the greater leisure of the Levites and their other

advantages would make the the students of the nation, as a rule, in all science, and their constant residence in cities would give. them the opportunity, if carried out in fact, of a far wider field of observation.

The reign of peace in Solomon's days must have opened, especially with renewed. Egyptian intercourse new facilities for the study. He himself seems to have included in his favorite natural history some knowledge of the medicinal uses of the creatures. His works show him conversant with the motion of; remedial treatment (<sup><1188></sup>Proverbs 3:8; 6:15; 12:18; 12:22; 20:30; 29:1; <sup><2018></sup>Ecclesiastes 3:3); and one passage (<sup><2118></sup>Ecclesiastes 12:3,4) indicates considerable knowledge of anatomy. His repute in magic is the universal theme of Eastern story. It has even been thought he had recourse to the shrine of Esculapius at Sidon, and enriched his resources by its records-or relics; but there is some doubt whether this temple was of such high antiquity. Solomon, however, we cannot doubt, would have turned to the account, not only of wealth but of knowledge, his peaceful reign, wide dominion, and wider renown, and would have sought to traffic in learning as well as in wheat and gold. To him the Talmudists ascribe all volume of cures" (*twawpr rps*), of which they make frequent mention (Fabricius, *Cod. Pseudep. V. T.* p. 1043). Josephus (*Ant.* 8:2) mentions his knowledge of medicine, and the use of spells by him to expel daemons who cause sicknesses," which is continued among us," he adds, "to this time." The dealings of. various prophets with quasimedical agency cannot be regarded as other than the mere accidental torn which their miraculous gifts took (<sup><1136></sup>1 Kings 13:6; 14:12; 17:17; <sup><2004></sup>2 Kings 1:4 20:7; <sup><2382></sup>Isaiah 38:21). Jewish tradition has invested Elisha it would seem, with a function more largely medicinal than that of the other servants of God; but the scriptural evidence on the point is scanty, save 'that he appears to have known at once the proper means to apply to heal the waters, and temper the noxious pottage (<sup><1121></sup>2 Kings 2:21; 4:39-41). His healing the Shinammite's son has been discussed as a case of suspended animation and of animal magnetism applied to resuscitate it; but the narrative clearly implies that the death was real As regards the lepros, had the Jordan commonly possessed the healing power which Naaman's faith and obedience found in it, would there have been "many lepers in Israel in the days of Eliseus the prophet," or in any other- days? Further, if our Lord's words (<sup><0027></sup>Luke 4:27) are to be taken literally, Elisha's reputation could not have; been founded on any succession of lepers healed.: The washing was a part of the enjoined illustration of the leper *after* his cure was

complete; Naaman was to act as though clean, like the ten men that were lepers,"bidden to "go and show themselves to the priest" in either case it, Was "as thou hast believed, so be it done unto thee." The sickness of Benhadad is certainly so described as to imply treachery on the part of Hazael (~~1785~~ 2 Kings 8:15). Yet the observation of Bruce, upon a "cold-water cure" practiced among the! people near the Red Sea, has suggested a view somewhat different. The bed-clothes -are. soaked with cold water, and kept thoroughly wet, and the patient drinks cold water freely. But the crisis, it seems occurs on the third day, and not till the fifth is it there usual to apply this treatment. If the chamberlain, through 'carelessness,' ignorance, or treachery, precipitated the application, a fatal issue may have suddenly resulted. The "brazen serpent," once the means of healing, and worshipped idolatrously in Hezekiah's reign, is supposed to have acquired those honors under its Esculapian aspect. This notion is not inconsistent with the Scripture narrative, though not therein traceable. It is supposed that something in the "volume of cures," current under the authority of Solomon, may have conduced to the establishment 'Of these rites, and drawn away the popular homage, especially in prayers during sickness, or thanksgivings after recovery from Jehovah. The statement that king Asa (~~4462~~ 2 Chronicles 16:12) "sought *not* to Jehovah *but* to the physicians," may seem to countenance the notion that a rivalry of actual worship, based on some medical fancies, had beer set up, and would so far support the Talmudical tradition.

The captivity of Babylon brought the Jews into contact with a new sphere of thought. Their chief men rose to thy highest honors, and an improved mental culture among a large section of the captives was no doubt the result which they imported on their return. Wunderbar regards the Babylonian captivity as parallel it its effects to the Egyptian bondage, and seems to think that the people would return debased from its influence. On the contrary, those whom subjection had made ignoble and unpatriotic would remain. If any returned it was a pledge that they were not so impaired; and, if not impaired, they would certainly be improved by the discipline they had undergone. He also thinks that sorcery had the largest share in any Babylonian or Persian system of medicine. This is assuming too much there were magicians in Egypt, but physicians also (see above)of high cultivation. Human nature has so great an interest in human life that only in the savage, rudimentary societies is its economy left thus involved in phantasms. The earliest steps of civilization include something of

medicine. Of course 'superstitions' are found copiously involved in such medical tenets, but this is not equivalent to abandoning the study to a class of professed magicians. Thus in the *Ueberreste de;- altbabylonischen Literatur*, p. 123, by D. Chwolson, St. Petersburg. 1859 (the value of which is not, however, yet ascertained), a writer on poisons claims to have a magic antidote, but declines stating what it is, as it is not his business to mention such things, and he only does so in cases where the charm is in connection with medical treatment and resembles it; the magicians, adds the same writer on another occasion, use a particular means of cure, but he declines to impart it, having a repugnance to witchcraft. So (p. 125-6) we find traces of charms introduced into Babylonian treatises on medical science, but apologetically; and as if against sounder knowledge. Similarly, the opinion of fatalism is not without its influence on medicine; but it is chiefly resorted to where, as often happens in pestilence, all known aid seems useless. We know, however, too little of the precise state of medicine in Babylon, Susa; and the "cities of the Medes," to determine the direction in which the impulse so derived would have led the exiles; but the confluence of streams of thought from opposite sources, which impregnate each other, would surely produce a tendency to sift established practice and accepted axioms, to set up a new standard by which to try the current rules of art, and to determine new lines of inquiry for any eager spirits disposed to search for truth. Thus the visit of Democedes to the court of Darius, though it seems to be an isolated fact, points to a general opening of Oriental manners to Greek influence, which was not too late to leave its traces in some—perhaps of the contemporaries of Ezra. That great reformer, with the leaders of national thought gathered about him, could not fail to recognise medicine among the salutary measures which distinguished his epoch. Whatever advantages the Levites had possessed in earlier days were now speedily lost even as regards the study of the divine law, and much more therefore as regards that of medicine; into which competitors would crowd in proportion to its broader and more obvious human interest, and effectually demolish any narrowing barriers of established privilege, if such previously existed.

**2. In the Interval between the Old and the New Testament.**—It may be observed that the priests in their ministrations, who performed at all seasons of the year barefoot on stone pavement, and without perhaps any variation of dress to meet that of temperature, were peculiarly liable to sickness (Kall, *De Morbis Sacerdotum*, Hafn. 1745). Hence the permanent

appointment of a Temple physician has been supposed by some, and a certain Ben-Ahijah is mentioned by Wunderbar as occurring in the Talmud in that capacity. But it rather appears as if such an officer's appointment were precarious, and varied with the demands of the ministrants.

The book of Ecclesiasticus shows the increased regard given to the distinct study of medicine by the repeated mention of physicians, etc., which it contains, and which, as probably belonging to the period of the Ptolemies, it might be expected to show. The wisdom of prevention is recognised in Ecclus. 18:19; perhaps also in 10:10. Rank and honor are said to be the portion of the physician, and his office to be from the Lord (38:1, 3, 12). The repeated allusions to sickness in 7:35; 30:17; 31:22; 37:30; 38:9, coupled with the former recognition of merit, have caused some to suppose that this author was himself a physician. If he was so, the power of mind and wide range of observation shown in his work would give a favorable impression of the standard of practitioners; if he was not, the great general popularity of the study and practice may be inferred from its thus becoming a common topic of general advice offered by a non-professional writer. In Wisd. 16:12, plaister is spoken of; anointing, as a means of healing, in Job. 6:8.

**3. In the New Testament.** — Luke, “the beloved physician,” who practiced at Antioch while the body was his care, could hardly have failed to be conversant with all the leading opinions current down to his own time. Situated between the great schools of Alexandria and Cilicia, within easy sea-transit of both, as well as of the Western homes of science, Antioch enjoyed a more central position than any great city of the ancient world, and in it accordingly all the streams of contemporary medical learning may have probably found a point of confluence. The medicine of the New Test. is not solely, nor even chiefly, Jewish medicine; and even if it were, it is clear that the more mankind became mixed by intercourse, the more medical opinion and practice must have ceased to be exclusive. The great number of Jews resident in Rome and Greece about the Christian aera, and the successive decrees by which their banishment from the former was proclaimed, must have imported, even into Palestine, whatever from the West was best worth knowing; and we may be as sure that it's medicine and surgery expanded under these influences as that, in the writings of the Talmudists, such obligations would be unacknowledged. But, beyond ‘this, the growth of large mercantile communities, such as existed in Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and Ephesus. of itself involves a peculiar sanitary

condition from the mass of human elements gathered to a focus under new or abnormal circumstances. Nor are the words in which an eloquent modern writer describes the course of this action less applicable to the case of an ancient than to that of a modern metropolis. Diseases once indigenous to a section of humanity, are slowly but surely creeping up to commercial centres, whence they will be rapidly propagated. One form of Asiatic leprosy is approaching the Levant from Arabia. The history of every disease which is communicated from man to man establishes this melancholy truth, that ultimately such maladies overleap all obstacles of climate, and demonstrate a solidarity in evil as well as in good among the brotherhood of nations” (Dr. Ferguson, *Pref. Essay to Gooch on Diseases of Women*, New Sydenham Society, London, 1859, p. xlvi)., In proportion as this “melancholy truth” is perceived would an intercommunication of medical science prevail also.

**4. In Contemporary Heathen Writers.** — The medicine and surgery referred to in the New Test., then, was probably not inferior to that commonly in demand among educated Asiatic Greeks, and must have been, as regards its basis Greek medicine, and not Jewish. Hence a standard Gentile medical writer, if any is to be found of that period, would best represent the profession to which the evangelist belonged. Without absolute certainty as to date, we seem to have such a writer in Areteus, commonly called “the Cappadocian,” who wrote certainly after Nero’s reign began, and probably flourished shortly before and after the decade in which Paul reached Rome and Jerusalem fell. If he were of Luke’s age, it is striking that he should also be perhaps the only ancient medical authority. in favor of daemonic possession as a possible account of epilepsy. If his country be rightly indicated by his surname, we know that it gave him the means of intercourse with both the Jews and the Christians of the apostolic period (~~Acts~~ Acts 2:9; ~~1 Peter~~ 1 Peter 1:1). It is very likely that Tarsus, the nearest place of academic repute to that region, was the scene of, at any rate, the earlier studies of Areteus, nor would any chronological difficulty prevent his having been a pupil in medicine there when Paul and also, perhaps, Barnabas Were, as is probable, pursuing their early studies in other subjects at the same spot. Aretseus, then, assuming the date above indicated, may be taken as expounding the medical practice of the Asiatic Greeks in the latter half of the first century. There is, however, much of strongly-marked individuality in his work, more especially in the minute verbal portraiture of disease. That of pulmonary consumption in particular,

is traced with the careful description of an eye-witness, and represents with a curious exactness the curved nails, shrunken fingers, slender, sharpened nostrils, hollow, glazy eye, cadaverous look and hue; the waste of muscle and startling prominence of bones, the scapula standing 'off like the wing of a bird; as also the habit of body marking predisposition to the malady, the thin, veneer-like frames, the limbs like pinions, the prominent throat and shallow-chest, with a remark that moist and cold climates -are the haunts of it (*Αρετ. φθίσεως*). His work exhibits strong traits here and there of the 'Pneumatic school, as in his statement regarding lethargy, that it is frigidity implanted by nature; concerning elephantiasis even more emphatically, that it is a refrigeration of the innate heat, "or, rather, a congregation as it were one great winter of the system." The same views betray themselves in his statement regarding the blood, that it is the warming principle of all the parts; that diabetes is a sort of dropsy, both exhibiting the watery principle; and that the effect of white hellebore is as that of fire: "so that whatever fire does by burning, hellebore effects still more by penetrating inwardly." The last remark shows that he gave some scope to his imagination, which indeed we might illustrate from some of his pathological descriptions; e.g. that of elephantiasis, where the resemblance of the beast to the afflicted human being is wrought to a fanciful parallel. Allowing for such overstrained touches here and there, we may say that he generally avoids extravagant crotchets, and rests chiefly on wide observation, and on the common-sense which sobers theory and rationalizes facts. 'He hardly ever quotes an authority; and though much of what he states was taught before, it is dealt with as the common property of science, or as become *sui juris* through being proved by his own experience. The freedom with which he follows or rejects earlier opinions has occasioned him to be classed by some among the Eclectic school. His work is divided into-I, the causes and signs of (1) acute and (2) chronic diseases; and, II, the curative treatment of (1) acute and (2) chronic diseases. His boldness of treatment is exemplified in his selection of the vein to be opened in a wide range of parts the arm, ankle, tongue, nose, etc. He first has a distinct mention of leeches, which Themison is said to have introduced; and in this respect his surgical resources appear to be in advance of Celsus. He was familiar with the operation for the stone in the bladder, and prescribes, as Celsus also does, the use of the catheter, where its insertion is not prevented by inflammation, then the incision into the neck of the bladder, nearly as in modern lithotomy. His views of the internal economy were a strange mixture of truth and error, and the disuse

of anatomy was no doubt the reason why this was the weak point of his teaching. He held that the work of producing the blood pertained to the liver, "which is the root of the veins;" that the bile was distributed from the gall-bladder to the intestines; and, if this vesica became gorged, the bile was thrown back into the veins, and by them diffused over the system. He regarded the nerves as the source of sensation and motion; and had some notion of them as branching in pairs from the spine. Thus he has a curious statement as regards paralysis, that in the case of any sensational point *below* the head, e.g. from the membrane of the spinal marrow being affected injuriously, the parts on the right side will be paralyzed if the nerve towards the right side be hurt, and similarly, conversely, of the left side; but that if the head itself be so affected, the inverse law of consequence holds concerning the parts related, since each nerve passes over to the other side from that of its origin, decussating each other in the form of the letter X. The doctrine of the Pneuma, or ethereal principle existing in the microcosm by which the mind performs all the functions of the body, holds a more prominent position in the works of Aretaeus than in those of any of the other authorities (Dr. Adams's *Preface to Aret.* p. x, xi). He was aware that the nervous function of sensation was distinct from the motive power; that either might cease and the other continue. His pharmacopoeia is copious and reasonable, and the limits of the usefulness of this or that drug are laid down judiciously. He makes large use of wine, and prescribing the kind and the number of *cyathi* to be taken; and some words of his on stomach disorders (*περὶ καρδιαλγίης*) forcibly recall those of Paul to Timothy (<sup>5:23</sup>1 Timothy 5:23), and one might almost suppose them to have been suggested by the intenser spirituality of his Jewish or Christian patients. "Such disorders," he says, "are common to those who toil in teaching, whose yearning is after divine instruction, who despise delicate and varied diet, whose nourishment is fasting, and whose drink is water." As a purge of melancholy, he prescribes "a little wine, and some other more liberal sustenance." In his essay on *causus*, or "brain" fever, he describes the powers acquired by the soul before dissolution in the following remarkable words: "Every sense is pure, the intellect acute, the gnostic powers prophetic; for they prognosticate to themselves in the first place their own departure from life; then they foretell what will afterwards take place to those present, who fancy sometimes that they are delirious: but these persons wonder at the result of what has been said. Others also talk to certain of the dead, perchance they alone perceiving them to be present, in virtue of their acute and pure sense, or perchance from their

soul seeing beforehand, and announcing the men with whom they are about to associate. For formerly they were immersed in humors, as if in mud and darkness; but when the disease has drained these off, and taken away the mist from their eyes, they perceive those things which are in the air, and, through the soul being unencumbered, become true prophets.” To those who wish further to pursue the study of medicine at this sera, the edition of Aretaeus by the Sydenham Society, and in a less degree that by Boerhaave (Lugd. Bat. 1735). to which the references have here been made, may be recommended.

As the general science of medicine and surgery of this period may be represented by Aretaeus, so we have nearly a representation of its *Materia Medica* by Dioscorides. He too was of the same general region—a Cilician Greek—and his first lessons were probably learnt at Tarsus. His period is tinged by the same uncertainty as that of Aretaeus; but he has usually been assigned to the end of the first or beginning of the second century (see Smith, *Dict. of Class. Biog.* s.v.). He was the first author of high mark who devoted his attention to *Materia Medica*. Indeed, this branch of ancient science remained as he left it till the times of the Arabians; and these, though they enlarged the supply of drugs and pharmacy, yet copy and repeat Dioscorides, as, indeed, Galen himself often does, on all common subject-matter. Above 90 minerals, 700 plants, and 168 animal substances are said to be described in the researches of Dioscorides, displaying an industry and skill which has remained the marvel of all subsequent commentators. Pliny, copious, rare, and curious as he is, yet, for want of scientific medical knowledge, is little esteemed in this particular branch, save when he follows Dioscorides. The third volume of *Paulus Aegin.* (ed. Sydenham Soc.) contains a catalogue of medicines simple and compound, and the large proportion in which the authority of Dioscorides has contributed to form it will be manifest at the most cursory inspection. To abridge such a subject is impossible, and to transcribe it in the most meagre form would be far beyond the limits of this article.

**III. Pathology in the Bible.**—Before proceeding to the examination of diseases in detail, it may be well to observe that the question of identity between any ancient malady known by description and any modern one known by experience is often doubtful. Some diseases, just as some plants and some animals, will exist almost anywhere; others can only be produced within narrow limits depending on the conditions of climate, habit, etc.—and were only equal observation applied to the two, the *habitat* of a disease

might be mapped as accurately as that of a plant. It is also possible that some diseases once extremely prevalent may run their course and die out, or occur only casually; just as it seems certain that, since the Middle Ages, some maladies have been introduced into Europe which were previously unknown. See *Biblioth. Script. Med.* (Geneva, 1731), s.v.; Hippocrates, Celsus, Galen; Leclerc's *History of Medicine* (Paris, 1723; transl. London, 179f); Freind's *History of Medicine*.

**1. General Maladies.** — Eruptive diseases of the acute kind are more prevalent in the East than in colder climes. They also run their course more rapidly; e.g. common itch, which in Scotland remains for a longer time vesicular, becomes, in Syria, pustular as early sometimes as the third day. The origin of it is now supposed to be an acarus, but the parasite perishes when removed from the skin. Disease of various kinds is commonly regarded as a divine infliction, or denounced as a penalty for transgression; “the evil diseases of Egypt” (perhaps in reference to some of the ten plagues) are especially so characterized (<sup><0208></sup>Genesis 20:18; <sup><0256></sup>Exodus 15:26; <sup><0336></sup>Leviticus 26:16; <sup><0775></sup>Deuteronomy 7:15; 28:60; <sup><4133></sup>1 Corinthians 11:30); so the emerods *SEE HAEMORRHOIDS* of the Philistines (<sup><0866></sup>1 Samuel 5:6); the severe dysentery (<sup><4215></sup>2 Chronicles 21:15,19) of Jehoram, which was also epidemic *SEE BLOOD, ISSUE OF*; and *SEE FEVER*, the peculiar symptom of which may perhaps have been prolapsus ani (Dr. Mason Good, 1:311-13, mentions a case of the entire colon exposed); or, perhaps, what is known as *diarrhaea tubularis*, formed by the coagulation of fibrine into a membrane discharged from the inner coat of the intestines, which takes the mould of the bowel, and is thus expelled; so the sudden deaths of Er, Onan (<sup><0337></sup>Genesis 38:7, 10), the Egyptian first-born (<sup><0204></sup>Exodus 11:4, 5), Nabal, Bathsheba's son, and Jeroboam's (<sup><0258></sup>1 Samuel 25:38; <sup><0215></sup>2 Samuel 12:15; <sup><1140></sup>1 Kings 14:1, 5), are ascribed to the action of Jehovah immediately, or through a prophet. Pestilence (<sup><3935></sup>Habakkuk 3:5) attends his path (comp. <sup><0245></sup>2 Samuel 24:15), and is innocuous to those whom he shelters (<sup><0903></sup>Psalms 91:3-10). It is by Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Amos associated (as historically in <sup><0243></sup>2 Samuel 24:13) with “the sword” and “famine” (<sup><2442></sup>Jeremiah 14:12; 15:2; 21:7, 9; 24:10; 27:8,13; 28:8; 29:17,18; 32:24,36; 34:17; 38:2; 42:17,22; 44:13; <sup><4652></sup>Ezekiel 5:12,17; 6:11, 12; 7:15; 12:16; 14:21; 33:27; <sup><0406></sup>Amos 4:6, 10). The sicknesses of the widow's son of Zarephath, of Ahaziah, Benhadad, the leprosy of Uzziah, the boil of Hezekiah, are also noticed as diseases sent-by Jehovah, or in which he interposed (<sup><1177></sup>1 Kings 17:17, 20; <sup><1003></sup>2

Kings 1:3; 20:1). In <sup><1023></sup>2 Samuel 3:29, disease is invoked as a curse, and in Solomon's prayer (<sup><1037></sup>1 Kings 8:37; comp. <sup><409></sup>2 Chronicles 20:9) anticipated as a chastisement. Job and his friends agree in ascribing his disease to divine infliction; but the latter urge his sins as the cause. So, conversely, the healing character of God 'is invoked or promised (<sup><918></sup>Psalm 6:2; 41:3; 103:3; <sup><307></sup>Jeremiah 30:17). Satanic agency appears also as procuring disease (<sup><807></sup>Job 2:7; <sup><231></sup>Luke 13:11, 16). Diseases are also mentioned as ordinary calamities; e.g. the sickness of old age, headache (perhaps by sunstroke), as that of the Shunammite's son, that of Elisha, and that of Benhadad, and that of Joram (<sup><040></sup>Genesis 48:1; <sup><0013></sup>1 Samuel 30:13; <sup><1040></sup>2 Kings 4:20; 8:77, 29; 13:14; <sup><4276></sup>2 Chronicles 22:6).

**2.** Among *special* diseases mentioned in the Old Test. are, ophthalmia (<sup><0297></sup>Genesis 29:17, *μυᾶξ et wōkīm*), which is perhaps more common in Syria and Egypt than anywhere else in the world, especially in the fig season, the juice of the newly-ripe fruit having the power of giving it. It may occasion partial or total blindness (<sup><1768></sup>2 Kings 6:18). The eye-salve (*κολλύριον*, <sup><618></sup>Revelation 3:18; Hor. Sat. i) was a remedy common to Orientals, Greeks, and Romans (see Hippocr. *κολλούριον*; Celsus, 6:8, *De oculorum morbis*, [2] *De diversis collyriis*). Other diseases are—barrenness of women, which mandrakes were supposed to have the power of correcting (<sup><0208></sup>Genesis 20:18; comp. 12:17; 30:1, 2, 14-16); “consumption,” and several, the names of which are derived from various words, signifying to burn or to be hot (<sup><036></sup>Leviticus 26:16; <sup><532></sup>Deuteronomy 28:22) **SEE FEVER**; compare the kinds of fever distinguished by Hippocrates as *καῦσος* and *πῦρ*. The “burning boil,” or “of a boil” (<sup><0823></sup>Leviticus 13:23, *tbrx; ʿyj æhi* Sept. οὐλή τοῦ ἔλκουσ), is again merely marked by the notion of an effect resembling -that of fire, like the Greek *φλεγμονή*, or our “carbuncle;” it may possibly find an equivalent in the Damascus boil of the present time. The “botch (*ʿyj æ*) of Egypt” (<sup><532></sup>Deuteronomy 28:27) is so vague a term as to yield a. most uncertain sense; the plague, as known by its attendant *bubo*, has been suggested-by Scheuchzer. It is possible that the *Elephantiasis Graecorum* may be intended by *ʿyj æ* understood in the widest sense of a continued ulceration until the whole body, or the portion affected, may be regarded as one *ʿyj æ* Of this disease some further notice will be taken below; at present it is observable that the same word is used to express the “boil” of Hezekiah. This was certainly a single locally-confined eruption, and was

probably a carbuncle, one of which may well be fatal, though a single “boil” in our sense of the word seldom is so. Dr. Mead supposes it to have been a fever terminating in an abscess. The diseases rendered “scab” and “scurvy” in <sup>(1911)</sup>Leviticus 21:20; 22:22; <sup>(1827)</sup>Deuteronomy 28:27, may be almost any skin-disease, such as those known under the names of lepra, psoriasis, pityriasis, ichthyosis, favus, or common itch. Some of these may be said to approach the type of leprosy as laid down in Scripture, although they do not appear to have involved ceremonial defilement, but only a blemish disqualifying for the priestly office. The quality of ‘being incurable’ is added as a special curse, for these diseases are not generally so, or at any rate are common in milder forms. The “running of the reins” (<sup>(1812)</sup>Leviticus 15:2, :3 ; 22:4, marg.) may perhaps mean *gonorrhoea*, or more probably *blennorrhoea* (mucous discharge). If we compare <sup>(1828)</sup>Numbers 25:1, 31:7, with <sup>(16217)</sup>Joshua 22:17, there is ground for thinking that some disease of this class ‘derived from polluting sexual intercourse, remained among the people. The existence of *gonorrhoea* in early times -save in the mild form- has been much disputed. Michel Levy (*Traiti d’Hygiene*, p. 7) considers the affirmative as established by the above passage, and says of syphilis, “Que pour notre part, nous n’avons jamais pu considerer comme une nouveaute du xve siecle.” He certainly gives some strong historical evidence against the view that it was introduced into France by Spanish troops under Gonzalvo de Cordova’ on their return from the New World, and so into the rest of Europe, where it was ‘known as the *morbis Gallicus*. He adds, “La syphilis est perdue confusdment dans la pathologie ancienne par. la diversite de ses symptomes et de ses aldrations; leur interpretation collective, et leur redaction en une seule unite morbide, a fait croire a l’introduction d’une maladie nouvelle.” See also Freind’s *History of Med.*, Dr. Mead, Michaelis, Reinhart (*Bibelkrankheiten*), Schmidt (*Biblisch. Med.*), and others. Wunderbar (*BibTalm. Med.* 3:20, commenting on Leviticus 15, and comparing Mishna, *Zabim.* 2:2, and Maimonides, ad loc.) thinks that *gonorrhoea benigna* was in the mind of the latter writers. Dr. Adams, the editor of *Paul. Aegin.* (Sydenh. Soc. 2:14), considers syphilis a modified form of elephantiasis. For all ancient notices of the cognate diseases, see that work, 1:593 sq. The “issue” of 15:19, may be the *menorrhagia*, the duration of which in the East is sometimes, when not checked by remedies, for an indefinite period (<sup>(1191)</sup>Matthew 9:20), or uterine hemorrhage from other causes.

In ~~Exo~~ Deuteronomy 28:35 is mentioned a disease attacking the “knees and legs,” consisting in a “sore botch which cannot be healed,” but extended, in the sequel of the verse, from the “sole of the foot to the top of the head.” The latter part of the quotation would certainly accord with *Elephantiasis Graecorum*; but this, if the whole verse be a mere continuation of one described malady, would be in contradiction to the fact that this disease commences in the face, not in the lower members. On the other hand, a disease which affects the knees and legs, or more commonly one of them only—its principal feature being intumescence, distorting and altering all the proportions — is by a mere accident of language known as *Elephantiasis Arabum*, *Bucnemia Tropica* (Rayer, 3:820-841), or “Barbadoes leg,” from being well known in that island. Supposing, however, that the affection of the knees and legs is something distinct, and that the latter part ‘of the description applies to the *Elephantiasis Graecorum*, the incurable and all-pervading character of the malady are well expressed by it. This disease is what now passes under the name of “leprosy” (Michaelis, 3:259)—the lepers, e.g. of the huts near the Zion gate of modern Jerusalem are elephantiacs. It has been asserted that there are two kinds, one painful, the other painless; but, as regards Syria and the East, this is contradicted. There the parts affected are quite benumbed and lose sensation. It is classed as a tubercular disease, not confined to the skin, but pervading the tissues and destroying the bones. It is not confined to any age or either sex. It first appears in general, but not always, about the face, as an indurated nodule (hence it is improperly called tubercular), which gradually enlarges, inflames, and ulcerates. Sometimes it commences in the neck or arms. The ulcers will heal spontaneously, but only after a long period, and after destroying a great deal of the neighboring parts. If a joint be attacked, the ulceration will go on till its destruction is complete, the joints of finger, toe, etc., dropping off one by one. Frightful dreams and fetid breath are symptoms mentioned by some pathologists. More nodules will develop themselves, and, if the face be the chief seat of the disease, it assumes a leonine aspect (hence called also *Leontiasis*), loathsome and hideous; the skin becomes thick, rugose, and livid; the eyes are fierce and staring, and the hair generally falls off from all the parts affected. When the throat is attacked the voice shares the affection, and sinks to a hoarse, husky whisper. These two symptoms are eminently characteristic. The patient will become bed-ridden, and, though a mass of bodily corruption, seems happy and contented with his sad condition, until, sinking exhausted under the ravages of the disease, he is generally carried off, at least in

Syria, by diarrhoea. It is hereditary, and may be inoculated, but does not propagate itself by the closest contact; e.g. two women in the aforesaid leper-huts remained uncontaminated though their husbands were both affected, and yet the children born to them were, like the fathers, elephantiasic, and became so in early life. On the children of diseased parents a watch for the appearance of the malady is kept; but no; one is afraid of infection, and the neighbors mix freely with them, though, like the lepers of the Old Test., they live “in a several house.” Many have attributed to these wretched creatures a *libido inexplibilis* (see *Proceedings of Med. and Chirurg. Soc. of London*, Jan. 1860, 3:164, from which some of the above remarks are taken). This is denied by Dr. Robert Sim (from a close study of the disease in Jerusalem), save insd’ far ‘as idleness and inactivity, with animal wants supplied, may conduce to it. It became first prevalent in Europe during the crusades, and by their means was diffused, and the ambiguity of designating it leprosy then originated, and has been generally since retained. Pliny (*Nat. Hist.* xxvi, 5) asserts that it was unknown in Italy till the time of Pompey the Great, when it was imported from Egypt, but soon became extinct (*Paul. Aegin.* ed. Sydenh. Soc. 2:6). It is, however, broadly distinguished from the *λέπρα, λεύκη* etc. of the Greeks by name and symptoms, no less than by Roman medical and even popular writers; comp. Lucretius, whose mention of it’ is the earliest —

*”Est elephas morbus, qui propter flumina Nili,  
Gignitur AEgypto in media, neque piretelrea usquam.”*

It is nearly extinct in Europe, save in Spain and Norway. A case was seen lately in the Crimea, but may have been produced elsewhere. It prevails in Turkey and the Greek Archipelago. One case, however, indigenous in England, is recorded among the medical facsimiles at Guy’s Hospital. In Granada it was generally fatal after eight or ten years, whatever the treatment. This favors the correspondence of this disease with one of those evil diseases of Egypt, possibly its botch,” threatened in <sup>(6837)</sup>Deuteronomy 33:27, 35. This “botch,” however, seems more probably to mean ‘the foul ulcer mentioned by Areteus (*De Sign. et Caus. Maor. Acut.*i, 9), and called by him ἄφθα or ἐσχάρη. He ascribes its frequency in Egypt to the mixed vegetable diet there followed, and to the use of the turbid water of the Nil:’ but adds that it is common in Coele-Syria.’ The Talmud speaks of the elephantiasis (*Baba Kama*, 80 b) as being “moist without and dry within” (Wunderbar, *Biblich-Talmudische Med.* Mes Heft, 10, 11). ‘Advanced

cases are said to have: a cancerous aspect, and some even class it as a form of cancer; a disease dependent on faults of nutrition;

It has been asserted that this, which is perhaps the most dreadful disease of the East, was Job's malady. Origen, *Hexapla* on ~~Job~~ Job 2:7, mentions that one of the Greek versions gives it, *loc. cit.*, as the affliction which befel him. Wunderbar (*ut sup.* p. 10) supposes it to have been the Tyrian leprosy, resting chiefly on the itching implied, as he supposes, by ~~Job~~ Job 2:7,8. Schmidt (*Biblischer Med.* 4:4) thinks the "sore boil" may indicate some graver disease, or complication of diseases. But there is no need to go beyond the statement of Scripture, which speaks not only of this "boil," but of "kin loathsome and broken," "covered with worms and clods of dust;" the second symptom is the result of the 'first' and the "worms" are probably the larvae of some fly, known so to infest and make its *nidus* in any wound or sore exposed to the air, and to increase rapidly in size. The "clods of dust" would of course follow from his "sitting in ashes." The "breath strange to his wife," if it be not a figurative expression for her estrangement from him, may imply a fetor, which in such a state of body hardly requires explanation. The expression my "bowels boiled" (xxx. 27) may refer to the burning sensation in the stomach and bowels, caused by acrid bile, which is common in ague. - Aretaeus (*De Cur. Morb. Acut.* 2:3) has a similar expression, **θερμασίη τῶν σπλάγγνων οἶον ἀπὸ πυρός**, as attending syncope. The "scaring dreams" and "terrifying visions" are perhaps a mere symptom of the state of mind bewildered by unaccountable afflictions. The intense emaciation was (33:21) perhaps the mere result of protracted sickness.

The disease of king Antiochus (2 Macc. 9:5-10, etc.) is that of a boil breeding worms (*ulcus verminosum*). So Sulla, Pherecydes, and Alcman, the poet, are mentioned (Plut. *Vita Sullae*) as similar cases. The examples of both the Herods (Josephus, *Ant.* 17:6,5;; *War.* 1:33, 5) may also be adduced, as that of Pheretime (Herod. 4:205). There is some doubt whether this disease be not allied to phthiriasis, in which lice are bred, and cause ulcers. This condition may originate either in a sore, or in a morbid habit of body brought on by uncleanness, suppressed perspiration, or neglect; but the vermination, if it did not commence in a sore, would produce one. 'Dr. Mason Good (iv. 504-6), speaking of **μάλις**, **μαλιασμός** =cutaneous vermination, mentions a case in the Westminster Infirmary, and an opinion that universal phthiriasis was no unfrequent disease among the ancients; he also states (p. 500) that in gangrenous

ulcers, especially in warm climates, innumerable grubs or maggots will appear almost every morning. The camel and other creatures, are known to be the habitat of similar parasites.” There are also cases of vermination without any wound or faulty outward state, such as the *Vena :Medinensis*, known in Africa as the “Guinea worm,” of which Galen had heard only, breeding under the skin, and needing to be drawn out carefully by a needle, lest it break, when great soreness and suppuration succeed (Freind, *Hist. of Med.* i, 49; De Mandelslo’s *Travels*, p.-4; and *Paul. Aegin.* t. iv, ed. Sydenh. Soc.). Rayer (iii. 808-819) gives a list of parasites, most of them in the skin. This “Guinea-worm,” it appears, is also found in Arabia Petraea, on the coasts of the Caspian and Persian Gulf, on the Ganges, in Upper Egypt and Abyssinia (ib. 814). Dr. Mead refers Herod’s disease to **ἐντοζῶα**, or intestinal worms. Shapter, without due foundation, objects that the word in that case should have been not **σκόληξ**, but **εὐλή** (*Medica Sacra*, p. 188).

In <sup><1526></sup>Deuteronomy 28:65 it is possible that a palpitation of the heart is intended to be spoken of (comp. <sup><1453></sup>Genesis 45:26). In <sup><1017></sup>Mark 9:17: (comp. <sup><1188></sup>Luke 9:38) we have an apparent case of epilepsy, shown especially in the foaming, falling, wallowing, and similar violent symptoms mentioned; this might easily be a form of demoniacal manifestation. The case of extreme hunger recorded in 1 Samuel 14 was merely the result of exhaustive fatigue; but it is remarkable that the bulimia of which Xenophon speaks (*Anab.* iv 5, 7); was remedied by an application in which “honey” (compr.; <sup><1047></sup>1 Samuel 14:27) was the chief ingredient.

Besides the common injuries of wounding, bruising, striking out eye, tooth, etc., we have in <sup><1212></sup>Exodus 21:22 the case of miscarriage produced by a blow, push, etc., damaging the foetus.

The plague of “boils and blains” is *not* said to have been fatal to man, as the murrain preceding was to cattle; this alone would seem to contradict the notion of Shapter (*Medica Sacra*, p. 113), that the disorder in question was small-pox, which, wherever it has appeared, until mitigated by vaccination, has been fatal to a great part perhaps a majority of those seized. The small-pox also generally takes some days to pronounce and mature, which seems opposed to the Mosaic account. The expression of <sup><1191></sup>Exodus 9:10, a “boil” flourishing, or ebullient with blains, may perhaps be a disease analogous to phlegmonous erysipelas, or even common erysipelas, which is often accompanied by vesications such as the word

“blains” might fitly describe. This is Dr. Robert Sim’s opinion. On comparing, however, the means used to produce the disorder (<sup><0008></sup>Exodus 9:8), an analogy is perceptible to what is called “bricklayer’s itch,” and therefore to leprosy. A disease involving a white spot breaking forth from a boil related to leprosy, and clean or unclean according to symptoms specified, occurs under the general *locus* of leprosy (<sup><0E38></sup>Leviticus 13:18-23).

The “withered hand” of Jeroboam (<sup><0130></sup>1 Kings 13:4-6), and of the man (<sup><0120></sup>Matthew 12:10-13; comp. <sup><0160></sup>Luke 6:10), is such an effect as is known to follow from the obliteration of the main artery of any member, or from paralysis of the principal nerve, either through disease or through injury. A case with a symptom exactly parallel to that of Jeroboam is mentioned in the life of Gabriel, an Arab physician. It was that of a woman whose band had become rigid in the act of swinging, and remained in the extended posture. The most remarkable feature in the case, as related, is the remedy, which consisted in alarm acting on the nerves, inducing a sudden and spontaneous effort to use the limb—an effort which, like that of the dumb son of Croesus (Herod. 1:85), was paradoxically successful. The case of the widow’s son restored by Elisha (<sup><0149></sup>2 Kings 4:19), was probably one of sunstroke. The disease of Asa” in his feet” (Schmidt, *Biblischer Med.* 3:5, 2), which attacked him in his old age (<sup><0153></sup>1 Kings 15:23; <sup><0462></sup>2 Chronicles 16:12), and became exceeding great, may have been either *adema*, dropsy, or *podagra*, gout. The former is common in aged persons, in whom, owing to the difficulty of the return upwards of the sluggish blood, its watery part stays in the feet. The latter, though rare in the East at present, is mentioned by the Talmudists (*Sotah*, 10 a, and *Sanhedrin*, 48 b), and there is no reason why it may not have been known in Asa’s time. It occurs in Hippocr. *Aphor.* vi, *Prognost.* 15; Celsus, 4:24; Aretseus, *Morb. Chron.* 2:12, and other ancient writers.

In I Macc. 6:8, occurs a mention of “sickness of grief;” in Ecclus. 37:30, of sickness caused by excess, which require only a passing mention. The disease of Nebuchadnezzar has been viewed by Jahn as a mental and purely subjective malady. It is not easy to see how this satisfies the plain, emphatic statement of <sup><0703></sup>Daniel 4:33, which seems to include, it is true, mental derangement, but to assert a degraded bodily state to some extent, and a corresponding change of habits. The “eagles’ feathers” and “birds’ claws” are probably used only in illustration, not necessarily as describing a new type to which the hair, etc., approximated. (Comp. the simile of <sup><09A5></sup>Psalm

103:5, and that of <sup><1754></sup>2 Kings 5:14.) We may regard it as Mead (*Med. Sacr.* vol. vii), following Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*, does, as a species of -the melancholy known as *Lycanthropia* (Paulus JEGin. 3:16; Avicenna, 3:1, 5, 22). Persons so affected wander like wolves in sepulchres by night, and imitate the howling of a wolf or a dog. Further, there are well-attested accounts of wild or half-wild human creatures, of either sex, who have lived as beasts, losing human consciousness, and acquiring a superhuman ferocity, activity, and swiftness. Either the lycanthropic patients or these latter may furnish a partial analogy to Nebuchadnezzar in regard to the various points of modified outward appearance and habits ascribed to him. Nor would it seem impossible that a sustained lycanthropia might produce this latter condition.

Here should be noticed the mental malady of Saul. His melancholy seems to have had its origin in his sin; it was therefore grounded in his moral nature, but extended its effects, as commonly, to the intellectual. The "evil spirit from God," whatever it mean, was no part of the medical features of his case, and may therefore be excluded from the present notice. Music, which soothed him for a while, has entered largely into the milder modern treatment of lunacy.

The palsy meets us in the New Test. only, and in features too familiar to need special remark. The words "grievously tormented" (<sup><4086></sup>Matthew 8:6) have been commented on by Baier (*De Paral.* p. 32), to the effect that examples of acutely painful paralysis are not wanting in modern pathology, e.g. when paralysis is complicated with neuralgia. But if this statement be viewed with doubt, we might understand the Greek expression (**βασανιζόμενος**) as used of paralysis agitans, or even of chorea (StVitus's dance), in both of which the patient, being never still for a moment save when asleep, might well be so described. The woman's case who was "bowed together" by "a spirit of infirmity" may probably have been paralytic (<sup><2131></sup>Luke 13:11). If the dorsal muscles were affected, those of the chest and abdomen, from want of resistance, would undergo contraction, and thus cause the patient to suffer as described.

Gangrene (**γάγγραινα**, Celsus, 7:33, *de gangrena*), or mortification in its various forms, is a totally different disorder from the "canker" of the AV. in <sup><5117></sup>2 Timothy 2:17. Both gangrene and cancer were common in all the countries familiar to the scriptural writers, and neither differs from the

modern disease of the same name (Dr. M. Good, 2:669, etc., and 579, etc.).

In <sup><2368></sup>Isaiah 26:18; <sup><1074></sup>Psalms 7:14, there seems an allusion to false conception, in which, though attended by pains of quasi-labor and other ordinary symptoms, the womb has been found unimpregnated, and no delivery has followed. The medical term (Dr. M. Good, 4:188) <sup><1074></sup>ἐμπνευμάτωσις, *mola ventosa*, suggests the scriptural language, “We have, as it were, brought forth wind ;” the whole passage is figurative for disappointment after great effort.

Poison, as a means of destroying life, hardly occurs in the Bible, save as applied to arrows (<sup><1804></sup>Job 6:4). In <sup><3812></sup>Zechariah 12:2, the marg. gives “poison” as an alternative rendering, which does not seem preferable, intoxication being probably meant. In the annals of the Herods poisons occur as the resource of stealthy murder.

The bite or sting of venomous beasts can hardly be treated as a disease, but in connection with the “fiery (i.e. venomous) serpents” of <sup><1216></sup>Numbers 21:6, and the deliverance from death of those bitten, it deserves a notice. Even the Talmud acknowledges that the healing power lay not in the brazen serpent itself, but “as soon as they feared the Most High, and uplifted their hearts to their heavenly Father, they were healed, and in default of this were brought to naught.” Thus the brazen figure was symbolized only; or, according to the lovers of purely natural explanation, was the stage-trick to cover a false miracle. It was customary to consecrate the image of the affliction, either in its cause or in its effect, as in the golden emerods, golden mice, of <sup><1004></sup>1 Samuel 6:4, 8, and in the ex-votos common in Egypt even before the exodus; and these may be compared with the setting up of the brazen serpent. Thus we have in-it only an instance of the current custom, fanciful or superstitious, being sublimed to a higher purpose. The bite of a white she-mule, perhaps in the rutting season, is, according to the Talmudists, fatal; and they also mention that of a mad dog, with certain symptoms by which to discern his state (Wunderbar, *ut sup.* p. 21). The scorpion and centipede are natives of the Levant (<sup><1015></sup>Revelation 9:5,10), and, with a large variety of serpents, swarm there. To these, according to Lichtenstein, should be added a venomous solpuga, or large spider, similar to the Calabrian tarantula; but the passage in Pliny adduced (*H. N.* 29:29) gives no satisfactory ground for the theory based upon it, that its bite was the cause of the emerods. It is, however,

remarkable that Pliny mentions with some fulness a *mus araneus*-not a spider resembling a mouse, but a mouse resembling a spider-the shrewmouse, and called *araneus*, Isidore says from this resemblance, or from its eating spiders. Its bite was venomous, caused mortification of the part, and a spreading ulcer attended with inward griping pains, and when crushed on the wound it was its own best antidote. *SEE DISEASE*.

The disease of old age has acquired a place in Biblical nosology chiefly owing to the elegant allegory into which "The Preacher" throws the succeeding tokens of the ravage of time on man (Ecclesiastes 12). The symptoms enumerated have each their significance for the physician; for, though his art can do little to arrest them, they yet mark an altered condition calling for a treatment of its own. "The Preacher" divides the sum of human existence into that period which involves every mode of growth, and that which involves every mode of decline. The first reaches from the point of birth or even of generation, onwards to the attainment of the "grand climacteric," and the second from that epoch backwards through a corresponding period of decline till the point of dissolution is reached. These are respectively called the *hyl* [æy<sup>m</sup>y and the *hdym*[ h ymy of the rabbins (Wunderbar, 2tes. Heft). This latter course is marked in metaphor by the darkening of the great lights of nature, and the ensuing season of life is compared to the broken weather of the wet season, setting in when summer is gone, when after every shower fresh clouds are in the sky, as contrasted with the showers of other seasons, which pass away into clearness. Such he means are the ailments and troubles of declining age, as compared with those of advancing life. The "keepers of the house" are perhaps the ribs which support the frame, or the arms and shoulders which enwrap and protect it. Their "trembling," especially that of the arms, etc., is a sure sign of vigor past. The "strong men" are its supporters, the lowerlimbs bowing themselves" under the weight they once so lightly bore. The "grinding" hardly needs to be explained of the teeth, now become "few." The "lookers from the windows" are the pupils of the eyes, now "darkened," as Isaac's were, and Eli's; and Moses, though spared: the dimness, was yet in that very exemption a marvel (Genesis 27; comp. 48:10; <0045>1 Samuel 4:15; <0307>Deuteronomy 34:7). The " doors shut" represent the dulness of those other senses which are the portals of knowledge; thus the taste and smell, as in the case of Barzillai, became impaired, and the ears stopped against sound. The "rising up at the voice of

a bird” portrays the light, soon-fleeting, easily broken slumber of the aged man; or rather “to the voice of the bird,” i.e. the high key, the

— *“big, manly voice*  
*Now turn’d again to childish treble.”*

The “daughters of music brought low” suggest the cracked voice of age, or, as illustrated again by Barzillai, the failure in the discernment and the utterance of musical notes. The fears of old age are next noticed: “They shall be afraid of *that which is high* ;” an obscure expression, perhaps, for what are popularly called “nervous” terrors, exaggerating and magnifying every object of alarm, and “making,” as the saying is, “mountains of mole-hills.” Or, even more simply, these words may be understood as meaning that old men have neither vigor nor breath for going up hills, mountains, or anything else that is “high” nay, for them the plain, even the road has its terrors—they walk timidly and cautiously even. along that. “Fear in the way” is at first less obvious; but we observe that nothing unnerves and agitates an old person more than the prospect of a long journey. Thus regarded, it becomes a fine and subtle touch in the description of decrepitude. All readiness to haste is arrested, and a numb despondency succeeds. The “flourishing” of the “almond-tree” is still more obscure; but we observe this tree in Palestine blossoming when others show no sign of vegetation, and when it is dead winter all around—no ill type, perhaps, of the old man who has survived his own contemporaries and many of his juniors. Youthful zest dies out, and their strength, of which “the grasshopper”? is probably a figure, is relaxed. The “silver cord” has been thought to be that of nervous sensation, or motion, or even the spinal marrow itself. Possibly some incapacity of retention may be signified by the “golden bowl broken;” the “pitcher broken at the well” suggests the vital supply stopping at the usual source — derangement perhaps of the digestion or of the respiration; the “wheel shivered at the cistern” has been imagined to convey, through the image of the water-lifting process familiar in irrigation, the notion of the blood, pumped, as it were, through the vessels, and fertilizing the whole system; for “the blood is the life.”

**IV. Hebrew Therapeutics.** — This careful register of the tokens of decline might lead us to expect great care for the preservation of health and strength; and this indeed is found to mark the Mosaic system, in the regulations concerning diet, the “divers washings,” and the pollution imputed to a corpse—nay, even in circumcision itself. These served not only

the ceremonial purpose of imparting self-consciousness to the Hebrew, and keeping him distinct from alien admixture, but had a sanitary aspect of rare wisdom, when we regard the country, the climate, and the age. The laws of diet had the effect of tempering, by a just admixture of the organic substances of the animal and vegetable kingdoms, the regimen of Hebrew families, and thus providing for the vigor of future ages, as well as checking the stimulus which the predominant use of animal food gives to the passions. To these effects may be ascribed the immunity often enjoyed by the Hebrew race amid epidemics devastating the countries of their sojourn. The best and often the sole possible exercise of medicine is to prevent disease. Moses could not legislate for cure, but his rules did for the great mass of the people what no therapeutics, however consummate, could do—they gave the best security for the public health by provisions incorporated in the public economy. Whether we regard the laws which secluded the leper as designed to prevent infection or repress the dread of it, their wisdom is nearly equal, for of all terrors the imaginary are the most terrible. The laws restricting marriage have in general a similar tendency, degeneracy being the penalty of a departure from those which forbid commixture of near kin. Michel Ldvy remarks on the salubrious tendency of the law of marital separation (Leviticus 15) imposed (Levy, *Traite de Hygiene*, p. 8). The precept also concerning purity on the necessary occasions in a desert encampment (Dent. 23:12-14), enjoining the return of the elements of productiveness to the soil, would probably become the basis of the municipal regulations having for their object a similar purity in towns. The consequences of its neglect in such encampments is shown by an example quoted by Michel Levy, as mentioned by M. de Lamartine (*ib.* 8, 9). Length of life was regarded as a mark of divine favor, and the divine legislator had pointed out the means of ordinarily insuring a fuller measure of it. to the people at large than could, according to physical laws, otherwise be hoped for. Perhaps the extraordinary means taken to prolong vitality may be referred to this source (~~1~~1 Kings 1:2), and there is no reason why the case of David should be deemed a singular one. We may also compare the apparent influence of vital warmth enhanced to a miraculous degree, but having, perhaps, a physical law as its basis, in the cases of Elijah, Elisha, and the sons of the widow of Zarephath, and the Shunammite. Wunderbar has collected several examples of such influence similarly exerted, which, however, he seems to exaggerate to an absurd pitch. Yet it would seem not against analogy to suppose that, as pernicious exhalations, miasmata, etc., may pass from the sick and affect the healthy,

so there should be a reciprocal action in favor of health. The climate of Palestine afforded a great range, of temperature within a narrow compass—e.g. a long sea coast, a long, deep valley (that of the Jordan), a broad, flat; plain (Esdraelon), a large portion of table-land (Judah and Ephraim), and the higher elevations of Carmel, Tabor, the lesser and greater Hermon, etc. Thus it partakes of nearly all supportable climates. In October its rainy season begins with moist westerly winds. In November the trees are bare. In December snow and ice are often found, but never lie long, and only during the north wind's prevalence. The cold disappears at the end of February, and the "latter rain" sets in, lasting through March to the middle of April, when thunder-storms apt common, torrents swell, and the heat rises in the low grounds. At the end of April the hot season begins, but preserves moderation till June, thence till September becomes extreme; and during all this period rain seldom occurs, but often heavy dews prevail. In September it commences to be cool, first at night, and sometimes the rain begins to fall at the end of it. The migration with the season from an inland to a sea-coast position, from low to high ground, etc., was a point of social development never systematically reached during the scriptural history of Palestine. But men inhabiting the same regions for centuries could hardly fail to notice the connection between the air and moisture of a place and human health, and those favored by circumstances would certainly turn their knowledge to account. The Talmudists speak of the north wind as preservative of life, and the south and east winds as exhaustive, but the south as the most insupportable of all, coming hot and dry from the deserts, producing abortion, tainting the babe yet unborn, and corroding the pearls in the sea. Further, they dissuade from performing circumcision or venesection during its prevalence (*Jebamoth, 72 a, ap Wunderbar, 2tes Heft, vol. ii, A*). It is stated that "the marriage-bed placed between north and south will be blessed with male issue" (*Berachoth, 15, ib.*), which may, Wunderbar thinks, be interpreted of the temperature when moderate, and in neither extreme (which these winds respectively represent), as most favoring fecundity. If the fact be so, it is more probably related to the phenomena of magnetism, in connection with which the same theory has been lately revived. A number of precepts are given by the same authorities in reference to health; e.g. eating slowly, not contracting a sedentary habit, regularity in natural operations, cheerfulness of temperament, due sleep (especially early morning sleep is recommended), but not somnolence by day (Wunderbar, *ut sup.*). We may mention likewise in this connection that possession of an abundance of *salt* tended to banish much disease

(~~391D~~ Psalm 60:2; ~~1083~~ 2 Samuel 8:13; ~~3182~~ 1 Chronicles 18:12). Salt-pits (~~391D~~ Zephaniah 2:9) are still dug by the Arabs on the shore of the Dead Sea. For the use of salt to a new-born infant, ~~3914~~ Ezekiel 16:4; comp. Galen, *De Sanit.* lib. i, cap. 7.

The rite of circumcision, besides its special surgical operation, deserves some notice in connection with the general question of the health, longevity, and fecundity of the race with whose history it is identified. Besides being a mark of the covenant and a symbol of purity, it was perhaps also a protest against the phallus-worship, which has a remote antiquity in the corruption of mankind, and of which we have some trace in the Egyptian myth of Osiris. It has been asserted also (Wunderbar, 3tes Heft, p. 25) that it distinctly contributed to increase the fruitfulness of the race, and to check inordinate desires in the individual. Its beneficial effects in such a climate as that of Egypt and Syria, as tending to promote cleanliness, to prevent or reduce irritation, and thereby to stop the way against various disorders, have been the subject of comment to various writers on hygiene. In particular a troublesome and sometimes fatal kind of boil (*phymosis* and *paraphymosis*) is mentioned as occurring commonly in those regions, but only to the uncircumcised. It is stated by Josephus (*Cont. Ap.* 2:13) that Apion, against whom he wrote, having at first derided circumcision, was circumcised of necessity by reason of such a boil, of which, after suffering great pain, he died. Philo also appears to speak of the same benefit when he speaks of the “anthrax” infesting those who retain the foreskin. Medical authorities have also stated that the capacity of imbibing syphilitic virus is less, and that this has been proved experimentally by comparing Jewish with other, e.g. Christian populations (Wunderbar, 3tes Heft, p. 27). The operation itself consisted of originally a mere incision, to which a further stripping off the skin from the part, and a custom of sucking the blood from the wound, was in a later period added, owing to the attempts of Jews of the Maccabaeen period, and later (1 Macc. 1:15; Josephus, *Ant.* 12:5,1; comp. ~~4008~~ 1 Corinthians 7:8), to cultivate heathen practices. The reduction of the remaining portion of the *praeputium* after the more simple operation, so as to cover what it ‘had exposed, known as *epispasmus*, accomplished by the elasticity of the skin itself, was what this anti-Judaic practice sought to effect, and what the later, more complicated and severe, operation. frustrated. To these were subjoined the use of the warm-bath, before and after the operation, pounded cummin as a styptic, and a mixture of wine and oil to heal the

wound. It is remarkable that the tightly-swathed rollers, which formed the first covering of the new-born child (<sup><1007></sup>Luke 2:7), are still retained among modern Jews at the circumcision of a child, effectually preventing any movement of the body or limbs (Wunderbar, p. 29). *SEE CIRCUMCISION.*

No surgical operation beyond this finds a place in holy Scripture, unless, indeed, that adverted to under the article *SEE EUNUCH.* The Talmudists speak of two operations to assist birth, one known as <sup>ˆ</sup>pwdh t [yrq (*gastrotomia*), and intended to assist parturition, not necessarily fatal to the mother; the other known as <sup>ˆ</sup>mbh t [yrq (*hysterotomia, sectio caesarea*), which was seldom practiced save in the case of death in the crisis of labor, or, if attempted on the living, was either fatal, or at least destructive of the powers of maternity. An operation is also mentioned by the same authorities having for its object the extraction piecemeal of an otherwise inextricable foetus (*ibid.* p. 53, etc.).

Wunderbar enumerates from the Mishna and Talmud fifty-six surgical instruments or pieces of apparatus; of these, however, the following only are at all alluded to in Scripture. A cutting instrument, called *ryx*, supposed to be a “sharp stone” (<sup><1005></sup>Exodus 4:25). Such was probably the “Ethiopian stone” mentioned by Herodotus (2, 86), and Pliny speaks of what he calls *Testa samia*, as a similar implement. Zipporah seems to have caught up the first instrument which came to hand in her apprehension for the life of her husband. The “knife” (*tl kam*) of Joshua v. 2 was probably a more refined instrument for the same purpose. An “awl” (*[xrm*) is mentioned (<sup><1006></sup>Exodus 21:6) as used to bore through the ear of the bondman who refused release, and is supposed to have been a surgical instrument. A seat of delivery; called in Scripture *µynba*, <sup><1016></sup>Exodus 1:16, by the Talmudists *ybc̄m* (comp. <sup><219></sup>2 Kings 19:3), “the stools;” but some have doubted whether the word used by Moses does not mean rather the uterus itself, as that which moulds and shapes the infant. Delivery upon a seat or stool is, however, a common practice in France at this day, and also in Palestine. The “roller to bind” of <sup><3521></sup>Ezekiel 30:21 was for a broken limb, as still used. Similar bands, wound with the most precise accuracy, involve the mummies. A scraper (*srj*), for which the “potsherd” of Job was a substitute (<sup><1818></sup>Job 2:8).

Exodus 30:23-5 is a *prescription* in form. It may be worth while also to enumerate the leading substances which, according to Wunderbar, composed the pharmacopeia of the Talmudists—a much more limited one which will afford some insight into the distance which separates them from the leaders of Greek medicine. Besides such ordinary appliances as water, wine (<sup>2104</sup>Luke 10:34), beer, vinegar, honey, and milk, various oils are found; as opobalsamim (“balm of Gilead”), the oil of olive, myrrh, rose, palma christi, walnut, sesamum, colocynth, and fish; figs (<sup>2107</sup>2 Kings 20:7), dates, apples (<sup>2105</sup>Song of Solomon 2:5), pomegranates, pistachio-nuts, and almonds (a produce of Syria, but not of Egypt, <sup>0481</sup>Genesis 43:11); wheat, barley, and various other grains; garlic, leeks, onions, and some other common herbs; mustard, pepper, coriander seed, ginger, preparations of beet, fish, etc., steeped in wine or vinegar, whey, eggs, salt, wax, and suet (in plasters), gall of fish (Tob. 6:8; 11:11), ashes, cow dung, etc.; fasting-saliva, urine, bat’s blood, and the following rarer herbs, etc.; *ammesision*, *menta gentilis*, saffron, mandragora, *Lawsonia spinosa* (Arab. *alhenna*), juniper, broom, poppy, acacia, pine, lavender or rosemary, cloverroot, jujub, hyssop, fern, *sampsuchum*, milk-thistle, laurel, *Eruca muralis*, absynth, jasmine, narcissus, madder, curled mint, fennel, endive, oil of cotton, myrtle, myrrh, aloes, sweet cane (*acorus calamus*), cinnamon, *canella alba*, cassia, *ladanum*, *galbanum*, frankincense, *storax* nard, gum of various trees, musk, *blatta byzantina*; and these minerals-bitumen, natrum, borax, alum, clay. aetites, quicksilver, litharge, yellow arsenic. The following preparations were also well known: *Theriacas*, an antidote prepared from serpents; various medicinal drinks, e.g. from the fruit-bearing rosemary; decoction of wine. with vegetables; mixture of wine, holiey, and pepper; of oil, wine, and water; of asparagus and other roots steeped in wine; emetics, purging draughts, soporifics, potions to produce abortion or fruitfulness; and various salves, some used cosmetically, e.g. to remove hair; some for wounds and other injuries. The forms of medicaments were cataplasm, electuary, liniment. plaster (<sup>2306</sup>Isaiah 1:6; <sup>2482</sup>Jeremiah 8:22; 46:11; 51:8; Josephus, *War*, 1:33,5), powder, infusion, decoction, essence, syrup, mixture.

An occasional trace occurs of some chemical knowledge, e.g. the calcination of the gold by Moses; the effect of “vinegar upon nitre” (<sup>0320</sup>Exodus 32:20; <sup>2150</sup>Proverbs 25:20; comp. <sup>2422</sup>Jeremiah 2:22). The mention of “the apothecary” (<sup>0335</sup>Exodus 30:35; <sup>2100</sup>Ecclesiastes 10:1), and of the merchant in “powders” (<sup>2106</sup>Song of Solomon 3:6), shows that a

distinct and important branch of trade was set up in these wares, in which, as at a modern druggist's, articles of luxury, etc., are combined with the remedies of sickness (see further, Wunderbar, *stes Heft*, p. 73, ad fin.).

Among the most favorite of external remedies has always been the bath. As a preventive of numerous disorders its virtues were known to the Egyptians, and the scrupulous Levitical bathings prescribed by Moses would merely enjoin the continuance of a practice familiar to the Jews, from the example especially of the priests in that country. Besides the significance of moral purity which it carried, the use of the bath checked the tendency to become unclean by violent perspirations from within and effluvia from without; it kept the porous system in play, and stopped the outset of much disease. In order to make the sanction of health more solemn, most Oriental nations have enforced purificatory rites by religious mandates-and so the Jews. A treatise collecting all the dicta of ancient medicine on the use of the bath has been current ever since the revival of learning, under the title *De Balneis*. According to it, Hippocrates and Galen prescribe the bath medicinally in peripneumonia rather than in burning fever, as tending to allay the pain of the sides, chest, and back, promoting various secretions, removing lassitude, and suppling joints. A hot bath is recommended for those suffering from *lichen* (*De Baln.* p. 464). Those, on the contrary, who have looseness of the bowels, who are languid, loathe their food, are troubled with nausea or bile, should not use it, as neither should the epileptic. After exhausting journeys in the sun, the bath is commended as the restorative of moisture to the frame (p. 456-458). The four objects which ancient authorities chiefly proposed to attain by bathing are

**1**, to warm and distil the elements of the body throughout the whole frame, to equalize whatever is abnormal, to rarefy the skin, and promote evacuations through it;

**2**, to reduce a dry to a moister habit;

**3** (the cold bath), to cool the frame and brace it;

**4** (the warm bath), a sudorific to expel cold. Exercise before bathing is recommended, and in the season from April till November inclusive it is the most conducive to health; if it be kept up in the other months, it should then be but once a week, and that fasting. Of natural waters some are nitrous, some saline, some aluminous, some sulphureous, some bituminous,

some copperish, some ferruginous, and some compounded of these. Of all the natural waters the power is, on the whole, desiccant and calefacient, and they are peculiarly fitted for those of a humid and cold habit. Pliny (*H. N.* xxxi) gives the fullest extant account of the thermal springs of the ancients (*Paul. Aegin.* ed. Sydenh. Soc. 1:71). Avicenna gives precepts for salt and other mineral baths; the former he recommends in case of scurvy an ditching, as rarefying the skin, and afterwards condensing it. Waters medicated with alum, natron, sulphur, naphtha, iron, litharge, vitriol, and vinegar, are also specified by him. Friction and unction are prescribed, and a caution given against staying too long in the water (*ibid.* p. 338-340; comp Aetius, *De Baln.* 4:484). A sick bather should lie quiet and allow others to rub and anoint him, and use no strigil (the common instrument for scraping the skin). but a sponge (p. 456). Maimonides, chiefly following Galen, recommends the bath, especially for phthisis in the aged, as being a case of dryness with cold habit, and to a hectic-fever patient as being a case of dryness with hot habit; also in cases of ephemeral and tertian fevers, under certain restrictions, and in putrid fevers, with the caution not to incur shivering. Bathing is dangerous to those who feel pain in the liver after eating. He adds cautions regarding the kind of water, but these relate chiefly to water for drinking (*De Baln.* p. 438, 439). The bath of oil was formed, according to Galen and Aetius, by adding the fifth part of heated oil to a waterbath. Josephus speaks (*War.* 1:33, 5) as though oil had, in Herod's case, been used pure. There were special occasions on which the bath was ceremonially enjoined after a leprous eruption healed, after the conjugal act, or an involuntary emission, or any gonorrhoea discharge, after menstruation, childbed, or touching a corpse; so for the priests before and during their times of office such a duty was prescribed. The Pharisees and Essenes aimed at scrupulous strictness of all such rules: (<sup>400E</sup>Matthew 15:2; <sup>400F</sup>Mark 7:5; <sup>411B</sup>Luke 11:38). Riverbathing was common, but houses soon began to include a bath-room (<sup>485E</sup>Leviticus 15:13; <sup>426D</sup>2 Kings 5:10; <sup>401D</sup>2 Samuel 11:2; Susanna 15). Vapor-baths, as among the Romans, were latterly included in these, as well as hot and cold bath apparatus, and the use of perfumes and oils after quitting it was everywhere diffused (*Wunderbar*, 2tes Heft, vol. ii, B). The vapor was sometimes sought to be inhaled, though this was reputed mischievous to the teeth. It was deemed healthiest after a warm to take also a cold bath (*Paul. Aegin.* ed. Sydenh. Soc. 1:68). The Talmud has it—"Whoso takes a warm bath, and does not also drink thereupon some warm water, is like a stove hot only from without, but not heated also from within. Whoso bathes, and does not

withal anoint, is like the liquor outside a vat. Whoso having had a warm bath does not also immediately pour cold water over him, is like an iron made to glow in the fire, but not thereafter hardened in the water." This succession of cold water to hot vapor is commonly practiced in Russian and Polish baths, and is said to contribute much to robust health (Wunderbar, *ibid.*). *SEE BATHE.*

**V. Literature.**-Besides the usual authorities on Hebrew antiquities, Talmudical and modern, Wunderbar 2stes Heft, p. 57-69) has compiled a collection of writers on the special subject of scriptural, etc., medicine, including its psychological and botanical aspects, as also its political relations; a distinct section of thirteen monographs treats of the leprosy; and every various disease mentioned in Scripture appears elaborated in one or more such short treatises. Those out of the whole number which appear most generally in esteem, to judge from references made to them, are the following, which include a few from other sources: Rosenmuller's *Natural History of the Bible (in the Biblical Cabinet, vol. xxvii)*; De Wette, *Hebraisch-judische Archdologie*, § 271 b; Calmet (Augustin), *La Mgdécine et les Medecins des anc. Hebreux (in his Comm. litrale, Paris, 1724, vol. v)*; idem, *Dissertation sur la Sueur du Sang* (~~1726~~ Luke 22:43, 44); Pruner, *Krankheiten des Orients*; Sprengel (Kurt), *De medic. Ebrceorum* (Halle, 1789, 8vo); idem, *Beitrag zur Geschichte der Medicin* (Halle, 1794, 8vo); idem, *Versuch einer pragm. Geschichte der Arzneikunde* (Halle, 1792, 1803, 1821; the last edition by Dr. Rosenbaum, Leipsic; 1846, 8vo, vol. i, § 37-45); idem, *Histor. Rei Herbar.* (lib. i, cap. i, *Flora Biblica*); Bartholini (Thom.), *De morbis biblicis, miscellanea medica* (in Ugolini, 30:1521); idem, *Paralytici novi Testamenti* (in Ugolini, 30:1459), Schmidt (Joh. Jac.), *Biblischer Medicus* (Ziillichau, 1743, 8vo, p. 761); Kall, *De morbis sacerdot. V. T.* (Hafn. 1745, 4to); Reinhard (Chr. Tob. Ephr.), *Bibelkrankheit., welche inn alten Testam. vorkommen* (i and 2:1767, 8vo, p. 384; v. 1768, 8vo, p. 244); Shapter (Thomas), *Medica sacra, or Short Expositions of the more important Diseases mentioned in the Sacred Writings* (London, 1834); Wunderbar (R. J.), *Biblisches-Talmudische Medicin* (in 4 parts, Riga, 1850-1853, 8vo; new series, 1857); Celsius (Ol.), *Hierobofanicon, s. deplantis sacre scripture dissertationes breves* (2 parts, Upsal, 1745, 1747, 8vo; Amstelod. 1748); Bochart (Samuel), *Hierozoicon, s. bipartitum, opus de animulibus sacre scripture* (London, 1665, fol.; Frankfort, 1675, fol.; edited by, and with the notes of Ern. F. G. Rosenmuller, Lips. 1793, 3 vols. 4to);

Spencer, *De legibus Hebroeorum ritualibus* (Tiibingen, 1732, fol.); Reinhard (Mich. H.), *-De cibis Hebrceorum prohibitis; Diss. I respon. Seb. Muller* (Viteb. 1697, 4to); *Diss. II respon. Chr. Liske* (ibid. 1697, 4to); Eschenbach (Chr. Ehrenfr.), *Progr. de lepra Judceorum* (Rostock, 1774, 4to; in his *Scripta medic. bibl* p. 17-41); Schilling (G. G.), *De lepra commentationes*, rec. J. D. Hahn (Lugd. Bat. 1788, 8vo); Chamseru (R.), *Recherches sur le veritable caractere de la lepre des Hebreux* (in *Mem. de la Soc. medic. d'emulation de Paris*, 1810, 3:335); *Relation Chirurgicale de l'Armee de l'Orient* (Paris, 1804); Wedel (GeoW.), *De lepra in sacris* (Jena, 1715, 4to; in his *Exercitat. med. philolog.* Cent. II, dec. 4, p. 93-107); idem, *De morb. Hiskie* (Jena, 1692, 4to; in his *Exercitat. med. philolog.* Cent. I, dec. 7); idem, *De morbo Jorazmi exercitat.* I, II (Jena, 1717, 4to; in his *Exercitat. med. philolog.* Cent. II, dec. 5); idem, *De Saulo energumeno* (Jena, 1685; in his *Exercitat. med. philolog.* Cent. I, dec. 2); idem, *De morbis senumn Solomonceis* (Jena, 1686, 4to; in his *Exercitat. med. philolog.* Cent. I, dec. 3); Lichtenstein, Versuch, etc. (in Eichhorn's *Allgem. Bibliothek*, 6:407-467); Mead (Dr. R.), *Medica Sacra* (London, 4to); Gudius (G. F.), *Exercitatio philologica de Hebraica obstetricum origine* (in Ugolini, 30:1061); Kall, *De obstetricibus matsrum Hebrearum in AEgypto* (Hamburg, 1746, 4to); Israels (Dr. AH.), *Tentamene historico-medicum, exhibens collectanea Gyncecologica, quee ex Talmude Babylonico depromsit* (Griningen, 1845, 8vo); Borner (F.), *Dissert. de statu -Medicinoe ap. Vett. Hebr.* (1735); Norberg, *De Medicina Arabum* (in *Opusc. Acad.* 2:404); Aschkenazei (Mos.), *De ortu etprogressu Medicinee inter Hebrceos* (Hamburg, 17., 8vo); Ginsburger (B. W.), *De Aledica ex Talnudis illustrata* (Gotting. 1743, 4to); Goldmann, *De rebus medices Vet. Test.* (Bresl. 1846, 4to); Leutenschliger (J. H.), *De medicis veterum Hebr.* (Schleiz. 1786, 8vo); Lindlinger (J. S.), *De Hebr. vett. medica de Dcemoniacis* (Wittenb. 1774, 2 vols. 8vo); Reineccius (Chr.), *Dictum Talmudieum de optimo nedico, Gehenne digno* (Weissenb. 1724, fol.). **SEE PHYSICIAN.**

## Medicine, Heathen.

**SEE SUPERSTITION.**

## Mediety

(or Portion) is the name given to the division of a rectory church into several parsonages or vicarages.

## Medigo, Elia Ben-Mose, Abba Del

a noted Jewish savan of the 15th century, celebrated for his attainments as a philosopher, flourished at Padua, Italy, as teacher of metaphysics. He died in 1493. For his works, see Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* 2:338.

## Medigo, Joseph Salomo Del

another Jewish writer of note, and of the same family as the preceding, was born at Candia in 1591. He was highly educated, and though busily engaged in the practice of medicine as one of the most eminent of his profession, he nevertheless devoted much time and attention to the study of Jewish philosophical productions and the writings of Jewish mystics. He published dissertations on different philosophical subjects and on the Cabala, and biographies of several eminent Hebrew literati. He died at Prague in 1655. See Fiurst, *Bibl. Judaica*, 2:338 sq.

## Medina

(Arab. *city*), or, more fully, MEDINAT ALNABI (City of the Prophet), also called *Tabah*, *Tibah*, etc. (the Good, Sweet, etc.), and mentioned by Ptolemy as *Jathrippa*: the holiest city of Mohammedan countries, next to Mecca, and the second capital of Hejaz in Western Arabia, is situated about 270 miles north of Mecca, and 140 north by east of the port of Jembo, on the Red Sea, and contains about 16,000 inhabitants (Burton). Medina is about half the size of Mecca. The streets, between fifty and sixty in number, are deep and narrow, paved only in a few places. The houses are flat-roofed and double-storied, and are built of a basaltic scoria, burned brick, and palm-wood. Very few public buildings of any importance are to be noticed besides the great' mosque Al-Haram (the Sacred), supposed to' be erected on the spot where Mohammed died, and to enclose his tomb. It is of smaller dimensions than that of Mecca, being a parallelogram, 420 feet long and 340 feet broad, with a spacious central area, called El-Sahn, which is surrounded by a peristyle, with numerous rows of pillars. The Mausoleum, or Hujrah, itself is an irregular square, 50-55 feet in extent, situated in the southeast corner of the building, and separated from the walls of the mosque by a passage about 26 feet broad. A large gilt crescent above the "Green Dome," springing from a series of globes, surmounts the Hujrah, a glimpse into which is only attainable through a little opening, called the Prophet's Window; but nothing more is visible to the profane eye than costly carpets or hangings, with three inscriptions in large gold

letters, stating that behind them lie the bodies of the Prophet of Allah and: the two caliphs-which curtains, changed whenever worn out, or when a new sultan ascends the throne, are supposed to cover' a square edifice of black marble, in the midst of which stands Mohammed's tomb. Its exact place is indicated by a long pearly rosary (Kaukab al-Durri)-still seen-suspended to the curtain. The Prophet's body is supposed to lie (undecayed) stretched at full length on the right side, with the right palm supporting the right cheek, the face directed towards Mecca. Close behind him is placed, in the same position, Abubekr, and behind him Omar. The fact, however, is that when the mosque, which had' been struck by lightning, was rebuilt in 892, three deep graves were found in the interior, filled only with rubbish. Many other reasons, besides, make it more than problematic whether the particular spot at Medina really contains the Prophet's remains. That his coffin, said to be covered with a marble slab, and cased with silver (no European has ever seen it), rests suspended in the air, is a stupid story, invented by Christians, and long exploded. Of the fabulous treasures which this sanctuary once contained, little now remains. As in Mecca, a great number of ecclesiastical officials are attached in some capacity or other to the Great Mosque, as ulemas, mudarisin, imaums, khatibs, etc.; and not only they, but the townspeople themselves live to a great extent only on the pilgrims' alms. There are few other noteworthy spots to be mentioned in Medifia, save the minor mosques of Abubekr, Ali, Omar, Balal] etc.

## Mediolanum.

SEE MILAN.

## Mediocres

or SECOND GRADE, an epithet of that class of monks, from the age of twenty-four to forty, who were exempted from being taper-bearers, from the reading of the epistle, gospel, martyrology, collation in chapter, parva cantaria, and chanting the offices. See Walcott, *Sacred Archaeology*, s.v.

## Mediterranean

SEA, a later name (Solin. 22:18; see Forbiger, *Handb. de alt. Geogr.* 2:13 sq.) for the usual Roman title (*Mare Internum*) of that immense body of water between Europe, Asia, and Africa, styled by the Hebrews "the Great Sea" **יָם הַגָּדוֹל** Numbers 34:6 sq.; **יָם הַגָּדוֹל** Joshua 1:4; **יָם הַגָּדוֹל** Ezekiel 47:10,

etc.; likewise in the Talmud, *abr amy*; so ἡ μεγάλη θάλασσα, Hecat. *Fragm.* p. 349), or “the hinder (i.e. Western) sea” (רְ/רַי אֲחֵרָה; <sup><61224></sup>Deuteronomy 12:24; in distinction from “the forward [i.e. Eastern] sea,” i.e. the Dead Sea, <sup><3848></sup>Zechariah 14:8, etc.), “sea of the Philistines” (μυτᾶδ ἑθιμυ; <sup><1231></sup>Exodus 23:31), and also simply “the Sea” (Joshua 19:6; as likewise in the Greek, ἡ θάλασσα, 1 Macc. 14:34; 15:11; <sup><4106></sup>Acts 10:6, 32), and bounding Palestine on the west. It has, from Tyre to Ptolemais, a high and rocky shore, which farther south becomes low and sandy (Strabo, 16:758 sq.; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 15:9, 6; *War.* 1:21, 5; see Scholz, *Reise*, p. 130); it makes at Mount Carmel a great bay (that of Accho or Ptolemais), but elsewhere it affords very few good harbors (chiefly those of Caesarea, Joppa, and Gaza). Its surface lies higher than that of the Dead Sea. The ebb and flow of the tide in the Mediterranean is irregular, and noticeable only in particular localities, and unimportant on the coast of Palestine (see Michaelis, *Einleit. ins A. T.* 1:74, anm.). The current of the sea is regularly from south to north, and is doubly strong at the time of the Nile freshet, so as to carry the deposit of mud and sand against the southern (Philistian) shore, which accordingly is continually pushing farther and farther into the sea (see Ritter, *Erdk.* 2:460, 462). Under the water there are found at the coast from Gaza to Jaffa large coral reefs (Volney, *Voyage*, 2:246); and the sea abounds in fish. Commerce finds on it a great sphere; but the Phoenicians and Egyptians had-nearly a monopoly of this, as the Mosaic legislation was unfavorable even to coast trading. Particular portions of this vast body of water were designated by special names, but of these only the Adriatic (οἰθραίς) is distinctively named in the Bible (<sup><4277></sup>Acts 27:27). **SEE ADRIA.** Vague mention, however, is made likewise of the Egman Sea, the modern Archipelago (<sup><4174></sup>Acts 17:14, 18), the sound between Cilicia and Cyprus (<sup><4216></sup>Acts 27:5), and the Syrtis of the Lybian Sea (<sup><4277></sup>Acts 27:17). See generally Bachiene, *Palast.* I, 1:87 sq.; Hamesveld, *Bibl. Geogr.* 1:440 sq; Winer, 2:70. **SEE SEA.** The whole of the coast, from the Nile to Mount Carmel, was anciently called the Plain of the Mediterranean Sea. The tract between Gaza and Joppa was simply called the Plain; in this stood the five principal cities of the Philistine satrapies -Ascalon, Gath, Gaza, Ekron or Accaron, and Azotus or Ashdod. The countries bordering on the Mediterranean were unquestionably the cradle of civilization, and they have in all ages been the scene of mighty changes and events, the investigation of which belongs to the general historian; all, however, that has relation to scriptural

subjects will be found stated under the heads *SEE CYRENE, SEE EGYPT, SEE GREECE, SEE SYRIA*, etc., and therefore to enter into the detail here would be superfluous, as would any lengthened notice of the sea itself, the Hebrews having never been a maritime people. See Smith, *Dict. of Class. Geogr.* s.v. Internum Mare; M'Culloch, *Dict. of Geogr.* s.v. *SEE PALESTINE*.

### Medler, Nicholas

one of the three principal disciples of Luther, was born at Hof, in Saxony, in 1502. He studied at Erfurt and Wittenberg, where he held conferences on the Old Test. and mathematics. He afterwards opened a school at Eger, but came into conflict with the authorities of that city for teaching the doctrines of Luther to his pupils. He then took a situation as teacher in his native city, and was appointed pastor there in 1530, but preached such violent sermons that he was obliged to leave in 1531. Retiring to Wittenberg, he remained there six years as deacon. Luther often allowed him to supply his place in the pulpit, as he highly esteemed Medler for his great talents as well as zeal. He was made chaplain of the wife of Joachim I, who had fled to Wittenberg. In 1535 he was, together with Jerome Weller, made DD., and in 1536 superintendent at Naumburg. Here he engaged in numerous controversies, but was much beloved and respected both by the people and by the authorities. Maurice of Saxony succeeded in attracting him to the University of Leipsic. In 1541, as he went by order of the elector to hold the first evangelical worship in the cathedral of Naumburg, he found that the canon regulars had closed the doors: Medler caused one of them to be broken open and another he burned down. In the same year he got into a controversy with Sebastian Schwebinger, who was surnamed the Greek, on account of his philosophical acquirements and his devotion to the cause of the canons. He also quarrelled with his colleague Amsdorf, and with the senate of Naumburg particularly with Mohr, to whom he addressed the reproach, "Quod numquam palam et expresse taxarit vel errores papisticae doctrinae et cultus impios, vel manifestis scandala in vita illius gregis." The faculty of Wittenberg approved the accusation, and deposed Mohr, but Medler himself was also obliged to resign. Medler now went to Spandau, near Berlin, where the Reformed doctrines were becoming established, and in 1546 finally became superintendent of Brunswick, after having three times declined the appointment, notwithstanding the advice of Melancthon and Luther. In Brunswick he succeeded, after great efforts, in establishing a school, where

afterwards Melancthon, Urbanus Regius, Justus Jonas, and Flacius taught for a while after the downfall of Wittenberg in 1547. In 1551 he left Brunswick on account of his health, and went to Leipsic, where he was made superintendent of Bernburg, but on his first preaching he was struck with apoplexy, and died shortly after at Wittenberg. He was full of controversial zeal for the doctrines of Luther. His works are enumerated by Streitperger, v. 4, and by Schamelius, *Numburgum literatum*, p. 19, 37. A sermon of his against the Interim of Leipsic (q.v.) was often reprinted; also in Schamelius, *Numburgum literatur*. See M. A. Streitperger, *De vita D. N. Medl.* (in *Actus promotionis-per A mbrosium Reudenium*, fol. O sq., Jena, 1591); Hummel, *Neue Bibliothek*, 3:536 sq.; Rethmeyer, *Kirchengesch. v. Braunschweig*, 3:173, 194; Danz, *Epistolok P. Melanch. ad N. Medl.*; Dollinger, *Reformationsgesch.* 2:74 sq.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie*, 9:234. (J. N. P.)

## Mee'da

(Μεεδδᾶ v. r. Δεδδᾶ), a Graecized form (1 Esdr. v. 32) of the MEHIDA *SEE MEHIDA* (q.v.) of the Hebrews lists (<sup><4152></sup>Ezra 2:52; <sup><41754></sup>Nehemiah 7:54).

## Meekness

(ἡωη[ι] πρᾶότης), a calm, serene temper of mind, not easily ruffled or provoked to resentment (<sup><3917></sup>James 3:7, 8). Where the great principles of Christianity have disciplined the soul, where the holy grace of meekness reigns, it subdues the impetuous disposition, and causes it, trusting in God, both to submit and to forgive. It teaches us to govern our own anger whenever we are at any time provoked, and patiently to bear' the anger of others, that it may not be a provocation to us. The former is its office, especially in superiors; the latter in inferiors, and both in equals (<sup><3913></sup>James 3:13). The excellency of such a spirit appears, if we consider that it enables us to gain a victory over corrupt nature (<sup><3062></sup>Proverbs 16:32); that it is a beauty and an ornament to human beings (<sup><4104></sup>1 Peter 3:4); that it is obedience to God's word, and conformity to the best patterns (<sup><4011></sup>Ephesians 5:1 2; <sup><3048></sup>Philippians 4:8). It is productive of the highest peace to the professor (<sup><4219></sup>Luke 21:19; <sup><40128></sup>Matthew 11:28, 29). It fits us for any duty, instruction, relation, condition, or persecution (<sup><30111></sup>Philippians 4:11, 12). To obtain this spirit, consider that it is a divine injunction (<sup><30113></sup>Zephaniah 2:3; <sup><30112></sup>Colossians 3:12; <sup><30111></sup>1 Timothy 6:11). Observe the

many examples of it: Jesus Christ (<sup><4128></sup>Matthew 11:28), Abraham (Genesis 13, 16:5, 6), Moses (<sup><4113></sup>Numbers 12:3), David (<sup><3828></sup>Zechariah 12:8; <sup><1060></sup>2 Samuel 16:10, 12; <sup><4100></sup>Psalms 131:2), Paul (<sup><4199></sup>1 Corinthians 9:19). Note how lovely a spirit it is in itself, and how it secures us from a variety of evils; that peculiar promises are made to such (<sup><4075></sup>Matthew 5:5; <sup><2860></sup>Isaiah 66:2); that such give evidence of their being under the influence of divine grace, and shall enjoy the divine blessing (<sup><2575></sup>Isaiah 57:15). See Henry, *On Meekness*; Dunlop, *Sermons*, 2:434; Evans, *Sermons on the Christian Temper*, ser. 29; Tillotson, *Sermon on I Pet. 2:21*, and *on Matthew v. 44*; Logan, *Sermons*, vol. i, ser. 10; Jortin, *Sermons*, vol. iii, ser. 11.

### Meene, Heinrich

a German theologian, was born at Bremen April 11, 1710, and was educated at the universities of Helmstadt and Leipsic. In 1734 he entered the ministry as pastor at Volkersheim, near Hildesheim, and in 1737 removed to Quedlinburg, where, in addition to his pastoral labors in town, he served as court preacher. He was honored at this time with the title of "Consistorial-Rath." In 1758 he accepted a call to Jever, and there he flourished until his death, May 20, 1782; Besides many contributions to different periodicals, to Sinceri's *Sanzmlung -lamburgischer Kanzelraden*. and to Cramer's *Sammlungen zur Kirchengesch. u. theol. Gelehrensank.*, etc., Meene published a large number of books in the department of religious literature. His works of special interest are, *Die tretqfiche Eirsprache des heiligen Geistesfür die Glaubigen* (Helmstadt, 1745, 8vo; 2d edition much enlarged, 1754, 8vo) :-*Unpartheiische Prufung der Abhandlung: Schrift und Vernunftmaszige Ueberlegung der beiderseitigen Griindefur und wider die ganz unendliche Ungiickseligkeit der Verbrecher Gottes und deren endliche selige Wiederbringung, angestellt, und zur Rechtfertigung der Gedanken des hochwüirdigen Berrn Abts Mosheim von denn Ende der Hollenstran* (Helmstadt, 1747-1748, 3 vols, 8vo; also published under the title, *Die gute Suche der Lehre von der unendlichen Dauer der Hollenstrafen*. See Doring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, 2:458 sq.

### Meerza.

SEE MIRZA.

## Meeting

The Society of Friends, vulgarly called Quakers, have adopted the use of this word to designate their official gatherings for various purposes.

**(1.) *Meeting for Sufferings.***-Its origin and purpose are thus given: "The yearly meeting of London, in the year 1675, appointed a meeting to be held in that city, for the purpose of advising and assisting in cases of suffering for conscience sake, which hath continued with great use to the society to this day. It is composed of Friends, under the name of correspondents, chosen by the several quarterly meetings, and residing in or near the city. The same meetings also appoint members of their own in the country as correspondents, who are to join their brethren in London on emergency. The names of all these correspondents, previously to their being recorded, are submitted to the approbation of the yearly meeting. Such men as are approved ministers and appointed elders are also members of this meeting, which is called the 'Meeting for Sufferings,' a name which arose from its original purpose, and has not yet become entirely obsolete. The yearly meeting has intrusted the Meeting for Sufferings with the care of printing and distributing books, and with the management of its stock; and, considered as a standing committee of the yearly meeting, it hath a general care of whatever may arise, during the intervals of that meeting, affecting the society, and requiring immediate attention, particularly of those circumstances which may occasion an application to government." *SEE FRIENDS.*

**(2.) *Monthly Meeting,*** a gathering of Friends of several particular congregations, situated within a convenient distance of one another. The business of the monthly meeting is to provide for the subsistence of the poor, and for the education of their offspring; to judge of the sincerity and fitness of persons appearing to be convinced of the religious principles of the society, and desiring to be admitted into membership; to excite due attention to the discharge of religious and moral duty; and to deal with disorderly members. Monthly meetings also grant to such of their members as remove into the limits of other monthly meetings certificates of their membership and conduct. It is likewise the duty of this body to appoint overseers for the proper observance of the rules of discipline, and for the disposal of difficulties among members by private admonition, agreeably to the Gospel rule (<sup>4085</sup> Matthew 18:15-17), so as to prevent if possible, their being laid before the monthly meeting. When a case, however, is

introduced to the monthly meeting, it is usual for a small committee to be appointed to visit the offender, in order to endeavor to convince him of his error, and induce him to forsake and condemn it. Time is allowed to judge of the effect of this labor of love, and if needful the visit is repeated. If these endeavors prove successful, the person is by minute declared to have made satisfaction for the offence; if not, he is disowned by the society. In disputes between individuals, it has long been the decided judgment of the society that its members should not sue each other at law. It therefore enjoins all to end their differences by speedy and impartial arbitration, agreeably to rules laid down. If any refuse to adopt this mode, or, having adopted it, to submit to the award, it is the direction of the yearly meeting that such be disowned. To monthly meetings also belongs the allowing of marriages; for the society has ‘always scrupled to acknowledge the exclusive authority of the priests in the solemnization of marriage. A record of marriages is kept by the monthly meeting, as also of the births and burials of its members. A certificate of the date, of the name of the infant, and of its parents, is the subject of one of these last-mentioned records; and an order for the interment, countersigned by the gravemaker, of the other.

**(3.)** *Quarterly Meeting*, among the Society of Friends, is an assembly composed of several monthly meetings. At the quarterly meeting are produced written answers from the monthly meetings to certain queries respecting the conduct of their members, and the meetings’ care over them. The accounts thus received are digested into one, which is sent, also in the form of answers to queries, by representatives to the yearly meeting. Appeals from the judgment of monthly meetings are brought to the quarterly meetings, whose business also is to assist in any difficult case, or where remissness appears in the care of the monthly meetings over the individuals who compose them. *SEE QUARTERLY MEETING.*

**(4.)** *Yearly Meeting*, an annual meeting of the Society of Friends. “The yearly meeting has the general superintendence of the society in the country in which it is established; and therefore, as the accounts which it receives discover the state of inferior meetings, as particular exigencies require, or as the meeting is impressed with a sense of duty, it gives forth its advice, makes such regulations as appear to be requisite, or excites to the observance of those already made, and sometimes appoints committees to visit those quarterly meetings which appear to be in need of immediate advice.” At the yearly meeting another meeting (a sort of subcommittee) is appointed, bearing the name of the *morning meeting*, for the purpose of

revising the denominational manuscripts previous to publication; and also the granting, in the intervals of the yearly meeting, of certificates of approbation to such ministers as are concerned to travel in the work of the ministry in foreign parts, in addition to those granted by their monthly and quarterly meetings. When a visit of this kind does not extend beyond Great Britain, a certificate from the monthly meeting of which the minister is a member is sufficient. If to Ireland, the concurrence of the quarterly meeting is also required. Regulations of similar tendency obtain in other yearly meetings. The “stock” of the yearly meeting consists of occasional voluntary contributions, which is expended in printing-books, salary of a clerk for keeping records, the passage of ministers who visit their brethren beyond sea, and some small incidental charges; but not, as has been falsely supposed, the reimbursement of those who suffer distraint for tithes and other demands with which they scruple to comply. Appeals from the quarterly meetings are heard at the yearly meetings. There are ten yearly meetings—namely, one in London, to which representatives from Ireland are received; one in Dublin; one in New England; one in New York; one in Pennsylvania; one in Maryland; one in Virginia; one in the Carolinas; one in Ohio; and one in Indiana. Reports of each of these may be found in the *Annual Monitor*.

### Meeting, Quarterly.

Among the Methodists, the quarterly meeting is a general meeting of the stewards, leaders, and other officers, for the purpose of transacting the general business of the “circuit” or “district;” in the Methodist Episcopal Church presided over by the “presiding elder,” or the minister in charge. Its special object is, besides the celebration of the *Love-feast* (qv.), to examine the spiritual and financial conditions of the Church. See *Discipline*, chap. ii, sect. 1:3. *SEE CONFERENCE, QUARTERLY*.

### Meeting-House

a place appropriated for the purpose of public Christian worship. In England the churches of Dissenters are so called by the Anglican communicants, and in the United States the Quakers thus name their places of public worship. *SEE CHURCH; SEE CHAPEL*.

## Meganck, Francois Dominique

a noted Dutch theologian and valiant defender of the cause of the Jansenists, was born at Menin about 1683; studied at the University of Louvain, and then devoted himself wholly to the polemical field of theology. At first he wielded his pen only, but after a time he entered the pulpit also, determined to combat the Romanism of the Ultramontanes. He was a member at the council, in 1763, at Utrecht. He died at Leyden, Oct. 12, 1775. His principal works are, *Refutation abregee du Traite du Schisme* (1718, 12mo; Paris, 1791, 8vo) :-*Defense des contrats de vente rachetables des deux cotes* (1730, 4to) :-*Primaute de Saint Pierre et de ses Successeurs* (1763 and 1772, 12mo). In the last-named work he questions the pope's supremacy over a council.

## Megander

(also known under the name of *Grosman*), CASPAR, was born at Zurich in 1495. He was educated at the University of Basle, where he secured the degree of MA. in 1518, and soon after was appointed chaplain of the hospital at Zurich. Here he early espoused the doctrines of Zwingli, and with him, in 1525, publicly demanded the suppression of the mass and the evangelical celebration of the Lord's Supper. After the Berne disputation, in 1528, he was called as professor of theology to Berne, where he soon obtained the first position among the leading personalities, and zealously labored in this place for the advance of Zwinglian doctrines. In 1532, at Zofingen, he took part in the deliberations of the Anabaptists; and again, as deputy of the council, at the disputes at Lausanne in 1536, and of the synod at the same place in 1537. He also compiled the Berne Catechism in 1536. His Zwinglianism involved him in many serious disputes with Bucer in the latter's attempts at union. As one of the originators of the Helvetic Confession of 1536, he successfully defended the Wittenberg Formula of Concord at the convent at Berne Oct. 19, 1536, and in consequence Bucer was dismissed. In 1537, however, Bucer's justification of his conduct was finally accepted, and Megander was charged to modify his Catechism in conformity with the Formula of Concord. Megander no longer opposed the alteration, the revised Catechism was at once prepared by Bucer, and was accepted by the Council of Berne in 1537. Megander, however, refusing to be governed by these alterations, was deposed from office, and returning to Zurich was there reappointed archdeacon at the cathedral, and in this position he arduously labored to oppose the efforts of Bucer. Megander

died in 1545. Of his works, the Anmerkungen to Genesis and Exodus, Hebrews and Epistles of John, deserve special mention. See Hundeshagen, *Conflicte des Zwingl., Luterth. und Cau., in Berne* (Berne, 1842),

### Megapolensis, Joannes

a minister of the (Dutch) Reformed Church, was the second clergyman sent out by the Classis of Amsterdam to this country, under the patronage of the Dutch West India Company and the patroon Van Rensselaer (in 1642). He was also *the first missionary to the Indians*, preceding the celebrated "apostle to the Indians," John Eliot, some three years. His original family name was VAN MEKELENBURG, which, after the pedantic fashion of the age, was Hellenized into Megapolensis. Leaving his two congregations in Holland, he engaged with the patroon to serve for six years, his outfit and expenses of removal to be paid, and at a salary of eleven hundred guilders per year (\$440). In addition to the usual duties of a missionary pastor at an outpost of civilization, like Rensselaerwvck, he soon interested himself in the Indians who came thither to trade, and learned what he called "their heavy language" so as to speak and preach fluently in it. The early records of the First Reformed Church in Albany contain many names of Indians converted, baptized, and received into the communion of the Church under his labors. Thus completely were the home and foreign missionary work and spirit combined in this apostolic man. In 1644 he wrote a tract (which was published in 1651 in Holland) *on the Mohawk Indians in New Netherlands*, (now translated in the New York Historical Society's Collections, vol. ii, series i, p. 158). While our subject was residing in Albany, the celebrated Jesuit missionary, father Isaac Jogues, was captured on the St. Lawrence- by the Mohawks, and subjected to horrible cruelties by the savages. The Dutch at Fort Orange tried to ransom him. At length, escaping from his captors, he remained in close concealment for six weeks. During this time Megapolensis was his constant friend, and rendered him every kindness that was in his power. The Jesuit father was at length ransomed by the Dutch, and sent to Manhattan, whence he returned to Europe. But in 1646 he came back again to Canada, and revisited the Mohawks, who put him to a cruel death. Another Jesuit, father Simon le Moyne, who discovered the salt springs at Onondaga in 1654, also became intimate with the dominie of Fort Orange, and wrote "three polemical essays" to convert his ' Dutch clerical friend to the Romish doctrine." But the stanch minister wrote a vigorous and elaborate reply, which, however, was lost in the wreck of the ship by which he sent it

to Canada. At the close of his stipulated term of service Megapolensis proposed to return to Holland, but governor Stuyvesant persuaded him to remain in New Amsterdam (now New York) as pastor of the Dutch Church. Here, for twenty years, he labored as senior pastor, being assisted from 1664 to 1668 by his son Samuel. He died in 1670. in the sixty-seventh year of his age, retaining his pastoral relation to the last. "He was a man of thorough scholarship, energetic character, and devoted piety, and he is entitled to a high, if not pre-eminent position in the roll of early Protestant missionaries among the North American savages. For nearly a quarter of a century he exercised a marked influence in the affairs of New Netherlands. He saw the infancy of the Dutch province, watched its growth, aid witnessed its surrender to overpowering English force. His name must ever be associated with the early history of New York, towards the illustration of which his correspondence with the Classis of Amsterdam, now in the possession of the General Synod of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church, and his sketch of the Mohawk Indians, form original and very valuable contributions." See J. Ronevn Brodhead, in the *N. Y. Hist. Society's Coll.* vol. iii;, Revelation E. P. Rogers, DD., *Historicale Discourse*; Sprague, *Annals*, vol. 9:(W. J. R. T.)

### Megapolensis, Samuel

son of the above, was born in 1634, and was educated at Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass., where he spent three years; afterwards went to the University of Utrecht, Holland, and there he graduated in 1659, having pursued a full theological course. He next went to Leyden University; and, after a complete course in that most celebrated medical school of Europe, obtained the degree of doctor of medicine. Returning to America, he was associate pastor of the Church of New Amsterdam with his venerable father for over four years-1663-68. In 1664 he was appointed one of the Dutch commissioners who prepared the terms of surrender to the English government. "Probably it was through his influence that the rights of the Reformed Church were so carefully guarded." In 1668 he returned to Holland, and settled at Wernigerode, where he ministered seven years, 1670 to 1677. Afterwards, "being well skilled in both the English and Dutch languages," he served the English or Scotch churches of Flushing (1677-85) and Dordrecht (1685-1700), when he was declared *emeritus*, or honorably laid aside from his work, after a ministry of thirty-seven years. The date of his death is not known. See Revelation Dr. DeWitt, in

Sprague's *Annals*, vol. ix.; Corwin's *Manual of the Ref. Church*, sv. (W.J.R.T.)

## Megara, School Of

one of the schools founded by disciples of Socrates, but so modified in position from their teacher as to deserve the name of a peculiar society. Its principal supporter was Euclid of-Megara, who was born about 440 BC., and was himself a pupil of Parmenides, one of the most prominent leaders in the *Eleatic School* (q.v.). After the death of Socrates, his disciples, fleeing for safety from Athens. found a pleasant home in the house of Euclid, and there, guided by him, finally established principles which gave them the name of *Megarists*. They taught that ethics stands in the service of dialectics. The essence of good is unity-unity so entire as to embrace immobility, identity, and permanence. Hence the sensible world has no part in existence. Being and good are thus the same thing, viz. unity; good therefore alone exists, and evil is but the absence of existence. It does not follow, however, that there is but a single being and a single sort of good, for unity may be found contained in various things. Euclid expressly taught that, in spite of their unity, being and good clothe themselves in different forms, present themselves under different points of view, and receive different names, as wisdom, God, intelligence, and the like. Euclid also anticipated Aristotle in distinguishing the act from the power, and resolved, according to his ideas of being, the relation between the two. Other supporters of this school were Eubulicles, Alexinos, Diodorus, Chronos, Philo, and Stilpo. See Dyck, *De Megaricorum doctrina* (Bonn, 1827); Ritter, *Ueber die Philosophie der Megarischen Schule*; Ueberweg, *History of Philosophy*, vol. i.

## Megerlin, David Friedrich

a noted German Orientalist and mystic, was born at Stuttgard near the opening of the 18th century. After holding for some time a professorship at the gymnasium at Montbelliard, he preached at Laubach, whence, in 1769, he removed to Frankfort-on-the-Main to continue in the pastorate. He died in August, 1769. Megerlin took a lively interest in the welfare of the Jews, and labored earnestly for their conversion. In 1756 he gained great notoriety by his public intercession in behalf of rabbi Eibeschiitz, who had published a cabalistic work containing many points to which his brethren had taken decided exception, particularly the favorable allusions to

Sabbathai Zewi (q.v.). The Jews were greatly provoked with Eibeschiitz because they had found him a believer in the messiahship of the pretender Sabbathai, but Megerlin insisted that Eibeschutz had been misinterpreted, and that the rabbi was a believer in Jesus Christ. He made these views public in his *Geheime Zeugnisse fir die Wahrheit der christlichen Religion* (Leipsic, 1756, 4to); and in *Neue Erweckung der Zerstreuten Judenschaft* (1756), and *Christlicher Zuruf an die Rabbinen* (1757). His other valuable works are, *De scriptis et collegiis orientalibus; item Observationes critico-theologicce* (Tubing. 1729, 4to) :-*Hexas orientalium. collegiorum philologicorum* (1729, 4to) :-*De Bibliis Latinis Moguntice primo impressis 1450-1462* (1750, 4to); and a translation of the Koran into German. See Meusel, *Gelehrten-Lexikon*, s.v.; Gratz, *Gesch. der Juden*, 10:416.

## Megethius

SEE MARCION.

## Megid' do

(Hebrews *Megiddo'*, /Dgæpæ according to Gesenius, perh. *place of troops*, according to: Ffirst, *rich in ornaments*, i.e. *noble, fruitful*; Sept. Μαγεδδῶ, but Μαγεδῶ in <0027>Judges 1:27, Μαγδῶ, in <1001>1 Kings 9:11, and Μαγεδών v. r. Μαγεδδών and Μαγεδδῶ in <4852>2 Chronicles 35:22; Vulg. *Mageddo*), once in the prolonged form MEGIDDON (<3821>Zechariah 12:11, Hebrews *Megiddon'*, ^/Dgæpæ Sept. renders ἐκκοπτόμενος, -Vulg. *Mageddon*), a town belonging to Manasseh (<0027>Judges 1:27), although at first within the boundaries of Issachar (<6171>Joshua 17:11), and commanding one of those passes fr om the north into the hill-country which were of such critical importance on various occasions in the history of Judah (Judith 4:7). It had originally been one of the royal cities of the Canaanites (<6122>Joshua 12:21). This tribal arrangement was made partly to supplement the mountain-territory of Manasseh, and partly to give those strongly-fortified places to a tribe who, from their courage and their alliance with Ephraim, might be able to drive out the old inhabitants. The task, however, proved too great even for the warlike Manassites; but when the power of Israel was fully established, the Canaanites were reduced to slavery (<6173>Joshua 17:13-18; <0027>Judges 1:27, 28). Indeed, we do not read of Megiddo being firmly in the occupation of the Israelites till the time of Solomon. That monarch placed one of his twelve commissariat officers,

named Baana, over “Taanach and Megiddo,” with the neighborhood of Beth-shean and Jezreel (<sup><10412></sup>1 Kings 4:12). In this reign it appears that some costly works were constructed at Megiddo (9:15). These were probably fortifications, suggested by its important military position. Nearly all the notices of the place are connected with military transactions. Of these there were three notable ones, the sacred records of which, and perhaps some profane or monumental reminiscences, remain. *SEE ESDRAELON.*

(1.) The first was the victory of Barak. The song of Deborah brings the place, vividly before us, as the scene of the great conflict. Jabin, king of Hazor, successor of the prince who had organized the northern confederation against Joshua, was now the oppressor of Israel, and Sisera was his general. The army of Jabin, with its 900 chariots of iron, was led down into the great plain, and drawn up at Megiddo, in a position to afford the best ground for the terrible war-chariots. With much difficulty Deborah the prophetess induced Barak to collect the warriors of the northern tribes. They assembled on Tabor. Deborah gave the signal, and the Israelites marched down to attack the enemy, full of hope and enthusiasm. At this moment a hail-storm from the east burst over the plain, and drove full in the faces of the advancing Canaanites (Josephus, *Ant.* v. 4). “The stars in their courses fought against Sisera.” His army was thrown into confusion. The waters of the Kishon rose rapidly, the low plain became a morass; chariots, horses, soldiers, all together were engulfed (Judges 4 and 5). Those who have visited Megiddo and traversed its plain in the spring, after a heavy fall of rain, have found the Kishon greatly swollen, its banks quagmires, and all the ordinary roads impassable. *SEE KISHON.*

(2.) To this place Ahaziah fled when his unfortunate visit to Joram had brought him into collision with Jehu, and here he died (<sup><1107></sup>2 Kings 4:27), within the confines of what is elsewhere called Samaria (<sup><1219></sup>2 Chronicles 22:9). As there are some difficulties in the history, we give the texts at length:

*Short* (<sup><1191></sup>2 Kings 9:21).

“And when Ahaziah the king of Judah saw this, he fled by the way of the garden-house. And Jehu followed after him, and said, Smite him also in the chariot. And they did so at the going up to Gur, which is by Ibleam. And he fled to Megiddo, and died there. And his servants carried him in a chariot to Jerusalem, and buried him in his sepulchre with his fathers in the city of David.”

Full (~~1421F~~ 2 Chronicles 22:7-9).

“And the destruction of Ahaziah was of God by coming to Joram: for when he was come, he went out with Jehoram against Jehu the son of Nimshi, whom the Lord had anointed to cut off the house of Ahab. And it came to pass that when Jehu was executing judgment upon the house of Ahab, and found the princes of Judah, and the sons of the brethren of Ahaziah, that ministered to Ahaziah, he slew them. And he sought Ahaziah: and they caught him (for he was, hid in Samaria), and they brought him. to Jehu and when they had slain him, they buried him: Because, said-they, he is the son of Jehoshaphat, who sought the Lord with all his heart. So the house of Ahaziah had no power to keep still the kingdom.”

With reference to the above two accounts of the death of Ahaziah, which have been thought irreconcilable (Ewald, 3:529; Parker's De Wette, p. 270; Thenius, etc.), it may be here remarked that the order of the events is sufficiently intelligible if we take the account in Chronicles, where the kingdom of Judah is the main subject, as explanatory of the brief notice in Kings, where it is only incidentally mentioned in the history of Israel. The order is clearly as follows: Ahaziah was with Jehoram at Jezreel when Jehu attacked and killed him. Ahaziah escaped and fled by the Beth-gan road to Samaria, where the partisans of the house of Ahab were strongest, and where his own brethren were, and there concealed himself. But when the sons of Ahab were all put to death in Samaria, and the house of Ahab had hopelessly lost the kingdom, he determined to make his submission to Jehu, and sent his brethren to salute the children of Jehu (~~1200B~~ 2 Kings 10:13), in token of his acknowledgment of him as king of Israel (not, as Thenius and others, to salute the children of Jehoram, and of Jezebel, the queen-mother). Jehu, instead of accepting this submission, had them all put to death, and hastened on to Samaria to take Ahaziah also, who he had probably learned from some of the attendants, or as he already knew, was at Samaria. Ahaziah again took to flight northwards, towards Megiddo, perhaps in hope of reaching the dominions of the king of the Sidonians, his kinsman, or more probably to reach the coast where the direct road from Tyre to Egypt would bring him to Judah. *SEE CAESAREA*. He was hotly pursued by Jehu and his followers, and overtaken near Ibleam, and mortally wounded, but managed to get as far as Megiddo, where it would seem Jehu followed in pursuit of him, and where he was brought to him as his prisoner. There he died of his wounds. In consideration of his descent from

Jehoshaphat, “who sought Jehovah with all his heart,” Jehu, who was at this time very forward in displaying his zeal for Jehovah, handed over the corpse to his followers, with permission to carry it to Jerusalem, which they did, and buried him in the city of David. The whole difficulty arises from the account in Kings being abridged, and so bringing together two incidents which were not consecutive in the original account. But if <sup><1127></sup>2 Kings 9:27 had been even divided into two verses, the first ending at “garden-house,” and the next beginning “and Jehu followed after him,” the difficulty would almost disappear. ‘Jehu’s pursuit of Ahaziah ‘would only be interrupted by a day or two, and there would be nothing the least unusual in the omission to notice this interval of time in the concise abridged narrative. We should then understand that the word *also* in the *original* narrative referred, not to Jehoram, but-to the brethren of Ahaziah, who had just before been smitten, and the death of Ahaziah would fall under <sup><1217></sup>2 Kings 10:17. If Beth-gan (A. V. “garden-house”) be the same as En-gannim, now Jenin, it lay directly on the road from Jezreel to Samaria, and is also the place at which the road to Megiddo and the coast, where Caesarea afterwards stood, turns off from the road between Jezreel and Samaria. In this case the mention of Beth-gan in Kings as the direction of Ahaziah’s flight is a confirmation of the statement in Chronicles that he concealed himself in Samaria. This is also substantially Keil’s explanation (p. 288, 289). Movers proposes an alteration of the text’ (p. 92, note), but not very successfully (~~hdwhyl æwh abwhi~~ instead of ~~Whyel a, Whabwhi~~).

### SEE JEHU.

**(3.)** But the chief historical interest of Megiddo is concentrated in Josiah’s death. On this occasion Megiddo saw a very different sight from the first, and heard, instead of a song of triumph, a funeral wail from the vanquished host of Israel (<sup><3217></sup>Zechariah 12:11). Pharaoh Necho was on his march against the king of Assyria. He passed up the plains of Philistia and Sharon, and king Josiah foolishly attempted to stop him while defiling through the glens of Carmel into the plain of Megiddo. He was defeated, and as he fled the Egyptian archers shot him in his chariot. He was taken to Jerusalem, but appears to have died on the road (<sup><1229></sup>2 Kings 23:29). ‘The story is told in the Chronicles in more detail (<sup><4452></sup>2 Chronicles 35:22-24). There the fatal action is said to have taken place “in the valley of Megiddo” (Sept. ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ Μαγεδδών). This calamity made a deep and permanent impression on the Jews. It is recounted again in 1 Esd. 1:25-31, where in the A. V. “the plain of Magiddo” ‘represents the same Greek words. The

lamentations for this good king became ‘an ordinance in Israel’ (<sup><4825></sup>2 Chronicles 35:25). “In all Jewry” they mourned for him, and the lamentation was made perpetual “in all the nation of Israel” (1 Esd. 1:32). “Their grief was no land-flood of present passion, but a constant channel of continued sorrow, streaming from an annual fountain” (Fuller’s *Pisgah Sight of Palestine*, p. 165). Thus, in the language of the prophets (Zech. 12:11), “the mourning of Hadadrimmon in the valley (Sept.  $\pi\epsilon\delta\acute{\iota}\omega$ ) of Megiddon” becomes a poetical expression for the deepest and most despairing grief; as ‘in the Apocalypse (<sup><4816></sup> Revelation 16:16) *sEE ARMAGEDDON*, in continuance of the same imagery, is presented as the scene of terrible and final conflict. For the Septuagint version of this passage of Zechariah, we may refer to Jerome’s note on the passage. “Adadremmon,” pro quo LXX transtulerunt  $\rho\omicron\omega\nu\omicron\varsigma$  urbs est juxta Jesraelem, quae hoc olim vocabulo nuncapataest. et hodie vocatur Maximianopolis in Campo Mageddon.” *Ar-Mageddon* may be for  $\omega\Delta\gamma\alpha\epsilon\ ] r [ i$  that is, “the city of Megiddo;” or if we regard the aspirated ap as equivalent to the Hebrew  $rhi$  then the meaning will be “mountain of Megiddo,” which would likewise be appropriate (Alford, ad loc.). That the prophet’s imagery is drawn from the occasion of Josiah’s death there can be no doubt. In Stanley’s *S. and P.* (p. 347) this calamitous event is made very vivid to us by an allusion to the” Egyptian archers, in their long array, so well known from their sculptured monuments.” For the mistake in the account of Pharaoh-Necho’s campaign in Herodotus, who has evidently put Migdol by mistake for Megiddo (ii. 159), it is enough to refer to Bahr’s *excursus* on the passage (see below). The Egyptian king may have landed his troops at Acre; but it is far more likely that he marched northwards along the coast-plain, and then turned round Carmel into the plain of Esdraelon, taking the left bank of the Kishon, and that there the Jewish king came upon him by the gorge of Megiddo.

Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.*) do not attempt to mark the situation of the place, and it appears that the name Megiddo was in their time already lost. They often mention a town called *Legio* ( $\Lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\acute{\omega}\nu$ ), which must in their day have been an important and well-known place, as they assume it as a central point from which to mark the position of several other places in this quarter (e.g. fifteen miles west of Nazareth, and three or four from Taanach). This has been identified (Reland, *Palaest.* p. 873; comp. Benjamin of Tudela, 2:433) with the village now called *Lejjun*, which is situated upon the western border of the great plain of Esdraelon, where it

begins to rise gently towards the low range of wooded hills that connect Carmel with the mountains of Samaria (*Onomast.* s.v. Gabathon). This place was visited by Maundrell, who speaks of it as an old village near a brook, with a khan then in good repair (*Journey*, March 22). This khan was for the accommodation of the caravan on the route between Egypt and Damascus, which passes here. Having already identified the present village of Taannuk with the ancient Taanach, the vicinity of this to Lejjun induced Dr. Robinson (*Bibl. Researches*, 3:177-180; also new ed. 3:116-118) to conceive that the latter might be the ancient Megiddo, seeing that Taanach and Megiddo are constantly named together in Scripture (<sup><1042></sup>1 Kings 4:12; . Chron. 7:29)'; and to this a writer in a German review (Grosse, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1845, 1:252 sq.) adds the further consideration that the name of Legio was latterly applied to the plain or low valley along the Kishon, as that of Megiddo had been in more ancient times (/Dgæ]qm[ , <sup><482></sup>2 Chronicles 35:22; ^/Dgæ]t [q]Bæ<sup><3821></sup> Zechariah 12:11; τό πεδίον Μαγεδδῶ, 3 Esdr. 1:27). **SEE ESDRAELON.** Herodotus (ii. 159) appears to allude to the overthrow of Josiah at this place (<sup><1022></sup>2 Kings 9:23, 29), but -instead of Megiddo he names the town *Magdolum* (Μάγδολον), the MIGDOL of Egypt (see Harenberg, *Bibl. Brem.* 6:281; Rosenmiller, *Alterth.* II, 2:99). Rosellini (*Monum. stor.* ii, p. 133) thinks that Herodotus may still refer to the Palestinian locality, and he imagines that he finds traces of the name on the monuments (*Makato*, i.e. Magdo, *ib.* iv, p. 158), but Ewald (*Isr. Gesch.* 3:406) finds the Magdolum of Herodotus in *el-Mejdel* (the MIGDAL of <sup><6628></sup>Joshua 19:38), between the Kishon and Acco (comp. Hitzig, *Philist.* 1:96). Megiddo or Lejjun is probably the place mentioned by Shaw as the *Ras el-Kishon*, or the head of the Kishon, under the south-east brow of Carmel (*Trav.* p. 274). It was visited and described by Mr. Wolcott in 1842, who found it to be an hour and forty minutes distant from Taanach. The Nahr Lejjun is a stream five or six feet wide, running into the Kishon, and feeding three or four mills. A little distance up it is situated the Khan el-Lejjun, and on a small eminence on the opposite side the remains of the ancient Legio. Among the rubbish are the foundations of two or three buildings, with limestone columns mostly worn away; and another with eight or ten polished columns still remaining, and others of limestone among them. The finest structure appears to have been in the south-west corner of the ruins, by the side of the brook. Among its foundations are two marble columns with Corinthian capitals, and several of granite. A gateway with a pointed arch is still standing. A small bridge is thrown over the stream, and leads to the khan, which is of Saracenic

structure (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1843, p. 77). Van de Velde visited the spot in 1852, approaching it through the hills from the south-west. He describes the view of the plain as seen from the highest point between it and the sea, and the huge *tells* which mark the positions of the “key-fortresses” of the hills and the plain, Taanulk and el-Lejjan, the latter being the most considerable, and having another called Tell Metzellim, half an hour to the north-west (*Syr. and Pal.* 1:350-356). About a month later in the same year Dr. Robinson was there, and convinced himself of the correctness of his former opinion. He, too, describes the view over the plain, northwards to the wooded hills of Galilee, eastwards to Jezreel, and southwards to Taanach, Tell Metzellim being also mentioned as on a projecting portion of the hills which are continuous with Carmel, the Kishon being just below (*Bib. Res.* 2:116-119). Both writers mention a copious stream flowing down this gorge (March and April), and turning some mills before joining the Kishon. Here are probably the “waters of Megiddo” (*Dgææm*) of ~~1159~~ Judges 5:19, though it should be added that by professor Stanley (*S. and P.* p. 339) they are supposed rather to be “the pools in the bed of the Kishon” itself, which has its springs in Tabor (ver. 21; see Hollman, *Commentar. in carm. Deborce*, Lips. 1818, p. .42 sq.), and not (as in Michaelis, *Suppl.* p. 339; Hames-: veld, 3:138) the Sea of *Cendevia* (Pliny, v. 17; 36:65), at the foot of Carmel. The same author regards the “plain (or valley) of Megiddo” as denoting not the whole of the Esdraelon level, but that broadest part of it which is immediately opposite the place. we are describing (p.335,336). The supposition of Raumer (*Palastina*, p. 402), that Legio represented the ancient *Maximianopolis* (which is given by Jerome as the later name for *Hadadrimmon*), based’ upon the presumption that the remains of a Roman road said to be still visible to the south of Lejjan are those of the thoroughfare between Caesarea and Jezreel, is without good foundation (see *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1844, p. 220). Yet Van de Velde (*Memoir*, p. 333) holds this view to be correct. He thinks he has found the true Hadadrimmon in a place called *Runmmaneh*, “at; the foot of the Megiddo hills, in a notch or valley about an hour and a half south of Tell Metzellim,” and would place the old fortified Megiddo on. this tell itself, suggesting further that its name, “the Tell of the Governor,” may possibly retain a reminiscence of Solomon’s officer, Baana the son of Ahilud. Porter believes this tell was the site of the stronghold of Megiddo itself (*Family Treasury*, Dec. 1864).

## Megid'don

(<sup><311></sup>Zechariah 12:1). *SEE MEGIDDO.*

## Megillah

*SEE TALMUD.*

## Megilloth

(<sup><110></sup>rolls, from <sup><110></sup>lll). The Hebrew MSS. were on rolls of parchment, usually written on one side, though sometimes also. on both (<sup><311></sup>Ezekiel 2:10). Afterwards the term <sup><110></sup>hl gm was used of a *book* consisting of several leaves fastened together (<sup><311></sup>Jeremiah 36:23, 24); once it occurs in Scripture as designating the Pentateuch (<sup><311></sup>Psalm 40:8 [7]). In later Jewish usage the term Megilloth was applied to the five books, viz. Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther, which were read on certain festivals in the synagogue. *SEE HAPHTHARAH.* The title of Megillah was used <sup><110></sup>καὶ ἐξοχὴν of the book of Esther, *SEE ESTHER, BOOK OF*; and from this it is supposed it was transferred to the others. To the reading of this at the Feast of Purim special importance was attached by the Jews (Talmud, Tr. *Megillah*, ed. Surenhus. 2:387). *SEE ROLL.*

## Megma, The

a Mohammedan name for an assembly or council specially convened to judge of the merits or demerits of their highest functionary. The members of the Megma are the *imams*, or “doctors of the law.” *SEE IMAM.*

## Mehadu

is the name of a Hindu deity of inferior rank, supposed to have been created before the world, and which they hold will be used when the end of the world shall come as an instrument to destroy all created things. See Broughton, *Biblioth. Hist. Sac.* 2:78.

## Mehemet Ali

one of the most noted of Egypt's sovereigns, who filled the viceroyalty from 1804 to 1848, deserves a place here for his philanthropic acts towards the Christians, and his beneficence towards all men, without distinction of creed. He was born in 1769, and died at Cairo Aug. 3, 1849. Mehemet Ali

was particularly noted for his successful wars against the Mamelukes, and for his reduction of Syria, which he. conquered in 1830. “As a ruler,” says a contemporary,” Mehemet Ali displayed talents of a very high order, and few princes have founded more beneficent institutions or shown a more just and liberal spirit. He established schools and colleges, created an army and navy, and introduced the manufactures of Europe. He protected his Christian subjects, and aided by his liberality the researches of Champollion, Lepsius, and other eminent savants.” See F. Mengin, *Histoire de l’Egypte sous le Gouvernement de -Mohammed Ali* (1839); A. de Vulaballe, *Histoire. de l’Egypte*; Creasy, *Hist. of the Ottoman Turks*, 2:392.

### Mehet’abeel

(<sup><1660></sup>Nehemiah 6:10). *SEE MEHETABEL.*

### Mehet’abel

(Hebrews *Meheytabel’*, **I aḅf̄yh̄a]** whose *benefactor* is *God*; or, according to Gesenius, a Chald. form for **I aḅyf̄am**, *blessed by God*; Vulg. *Metabee*), the name of a man and of a woman.

**1.** (Sept. **Μετεβεήλ, Μεταβεήλ**) The daughter of Matred, and wife of Hadad, the last named of the original kings of Edom, whose native or regal city was Pai or Pan (<sup><1639></sup>Genesis 36:39; <sup><1305></sup>1 Chronicles 1:50). BC. prob. cir. 1619.

**2.** (Sept. **Μηταβεήλ** v. r. **Μεταβεήλ**, Auth. Vers. “Mehetabeel.”) The father of Delaiah, and grandfather of the Semaiah who connived with Sanballat in his attempts to decoy Nehemiah into signs of fear (<sup><1660></sup>Nehemiah 6:10). BC. considerably ante 446.

### Mehi’da

(Hebrews *Mechida’*, **adj̄j æ]** prob. *joining*; Sept. in Ezra **Μειδά** v. r. **Μαουδά**, in Nehemiah **Μειδά** v. r. **Μιδά**; Vulg. *Mahida*), a name given in <sup><1652></sup>Ezra 2:52; <sup><1674></sup>Nehemiah 7:54, apparently as that of a person whose descendants (or possibly a place whose inhabitants) were among the Nethinim of the “children” (i.e. probably residents) of Bazlith, after the exile. BC. ante 536.

## Me'hir

(Hebrews *Mechir'*, **רַיָּךְ אֶפְרַיִם** *price*, as often; Sept. **Μαχείρ** vr. **Μαχίρ**), the son of Chelub and father (?founder) of Eshton, of the tribe of Judah (<sup><13041></sup>1 Chronicles 4:11), but of what particular family does not clearly appear. BC. perhaps cir. 1618.

## Meholah

*SEE ABEL-MEHOLAH.*

## Meho'lathite

(Hebrews *Mecholathi'*, **יִתְבֵּי אֲרָם** Gentile adj. from *Meholah*; Sept. **Μουλαθίτης, Μουλαθί**), a native doubtless of ABEL-MEHOLAH (<sup><0188></sup>1 Samuel 18:19; <sup><1218></sup>2 Samuel 21:8).

## Mehu'jael

(Hebrews *Mechuyael'*, **אֲרָם אֲרָם** *smitten by 'God; v.'r. in the same verse Mechiyael; אֲרָם אֲרָם Sept. has **Μαλελεήλ** v. r. **Μαίήλ**; Vulg. *Maniael*), the son of Irad and father of Methusael, third antediluvian patriarch in descent from Cain (<sup><0048></sup>Genesis 4:18). BC. cir. 3840.*

## Mehu'man

(Hebrews *Mehuman'*, **אֲרָם אֲרָם** either from the Syr. *faithful*, or from some unknown Persian word; Sept. **Αμάν**, Vulg. *Mehunzam*), the first named of the seven eunuchs whom Xerxes commanded to bring in Vashti to the royal presence (Esth. 1:10). BC. 483.

## Mehu'nim

(Heb. *Meunim*, **מְעֻנִים** *habitations*, as in <sup><13041></sup>1 Chronicles 4:41, etc.; Sept. in Ezra, **Μουυνείμ** v. r. **Μουυνίμ**, Auth Vers. “Meunim;” in Nehemiah **Μεεινόμε** v. r. **Μεϊνών**; Vulg. constantly Auninz), apparently a person whose “children” returned among the Nethinim from Babylon (<sup><1320></sup>Ezra 2:50; <sup><1075></sup>Nehemiah 7:52); but rather, perhaps, to be regarded as indicating the inhabitants of some town in Palestine where they settled after the exile, and in that case probably identical with the inhabitants of MAON (or possibly the “Mehunims” [below] of <sup><1307></sup>2 Chronicles 26:7). *SEE MAONITE.*

## Mehunims, The

(~~μυν~~ ~~Μη~~ ~~ἱ~~ i.e.. the *Meznim*; Sept. οἱ Μεινάιοι v. r. οἱ Μινάιοι; Vulg. *Ammonitae*), a people against whom king Uzziah waged a successful war (~~2~~ 2 Chronicles 26:7). Although so different in its English dress, yet the name is in the original merely the plural of MAON ( ~~ῶ~~ ~~φ~~ ~~ῆ~~ ~~μ~~ ), a nation named among those who in the earlier days of their, settlement in Palestine harassed and oppressed Israel. Maon, or the Maonites, probably inhabited the country at the back of the great range of Seir, the modern esh-Sherah, which forms the eastern side of the Wady el-Arabah, where at the present day there is still a town of the same name (Burckhardt, *Syria*, Aug. 24). This is quite in accordance with the terms of ~~2~~ 2 Chronicles 26:7, where the Mehunim are mentioned with “ the Arabians of Gur-baal,” or, as the Sept. renders it, Petra. Another notice of the Mehunims in the reign of Hezekiah (BC. cir. 726-697) is found in ~~1~~ 1 Chronicles 4:41. Here they are spoken of as a pastoral people, either themselves Hamites, or in alliance with Hamites, quiet and peaceable, dwelling in tents. They had been settled from “ of old,” i.e. aboriginally, at the east end of the valley of Gedor or Gerar, in the wilderness south of Palestine. A connection with Mount Seir is hinted at, though obscurely (ver. 42). Here, however, the Auth. Vers. probably following the translations of Luther and Junius, which in their turn follow the Targum-treats the word as an ordinary noun, and renders it “ habitations;” a reading now relinquished by scholars, who understand the word to refer to the people in question (Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 1002 a, and *Notes on Burckhardt*, p. 1069; Bertheau, *Chronik*). A third notice of the Mehunim, corroborative of those already mentioned, is found in the narrative of 2 Chronicles 20, There is every reason to believe that in ver. 1 “ the Ammonites” should be read as “the Maonites,” who in that case are the “men of Mount Seir” mentioned later in the narrative (ver. 10, 22).

In all these passages, including the last, the Sept. renders the name by οἱ Μεινάιοι -the Minaeans a nation of Arabia renowned for their traffic in spices, who are named by Strabo, Ptolemy, and other ancient geographers, and whose seat is now ascertained to have been the south-west portion of the great Arabian peninsula, the western half of the modern Hadramaut (Smith, *Dict. of Geography*, s.v. Minaei). Bochart has pointed out (*Phaleg*, vol. ii, cap. xxii), with reason, that distance alone renders it impossible that these Minseans can be the Meunim of the Bible, and also that the people of the Arabian peninsula are Shemites, while the Meunim appear to have been

descended from Ham (<sup><1341></sup>1 Chronicles 4:41). But, with his usual turn for etymological speculation, he endeavors nevertheless to establish an identity between the two, on the ground that *Carn al-Manasil*, a place two days' journey south of Mecca, one of the towns of the Minaeans, signifies the "horn of habitations," and might therefore be equivalent to the Hebrew *Meonim*. Josephus (*Ant.* 9:10,3) calls them "the Arabs who adjoined Egypt," and speaks of a city built by Uzziali on the Red Sea to overawe them. Ewald (*Geschichte*, 1:323, note) suggests that the southern Minueans were a colony from the Maonites of Mount Seir, who in their turn he appears to consider a remnant of the Amorites (see the text of the same page). That the Minaeans were familiar to the translators of the Sept. is evident from the fact that they not only introduce the name on the occasions already mentioned, but that they further use it as equivalent to NAAMATHITE. Zophar the Naamathite, one of the three friends of Job, is by them presented as "Sophar the Minaean," and "Sophar king of the Minaeans." In this connection it is not unworthy of notice that as there was a town called Maon in the mountain-district of Judah. so there was one called Naamah in the lowland of the same tribe. El Minyay, which is or was the first station south of Gaza, is probably identical with Minois, a place mentioned with distinction in the Christian records of Palestine in the 5th and 6th centuries (Reland, *Palest.* p. 899; Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.* 3:669), and both may retain a trace of the Minneans. BAAL-MEON' a town on the east of Jordan, near Heshbon, still called *Ma'in*, probably also retains a trace of the presence of the Maonites or Mehunim north of their proper locality.

The latest appearance of the name MEHUNIMS in the Bible is in the lists of those who returned from the captivity with Zerubbabel. Among the non-Israelites from whom the Nethinim—following the precedent of what seems to have been the foundation of the order—were made up, we find their name (<sup><1320></sup>Ezra 2:50, AV. "Mehunim;" <sup><1072></sup>Nehemiah 7:52, AV. "Meunim"). Here they are mentioned with the Nephishim, or descendants of Naphish, an Ishmaelitish people whose seat appears to have been on the east of Palestine (<sup><1359></sup>1 Chronicles 5:19), and therefore certainly not far distant from Ma'an, the chief city of the Maonites.

### Meichelbeck, Charles

a German monastic and scholar, was born May 29, 1669, at Oberndorf, in Algau. He was admitted in 1687 to the Order of the Benedictines of Buren,

in Bavaria. From 1697 he taught Latin, and-subsequently theology, in the different-convents of his order. After having prepared a history of the abbey of Buren-*Chronico Benedicto-Buranum*, (Buren, 1752, fol.)-he was commissioned in 1722, by the chief bishop of Freisingen, to write one of that city *„Historia Frisingensis, ab anno 724* (Augsburg, 1724-29, 2 vols. fol.); the numerous diplomas contained in, this work render it very valuable as a history of Germanic institutions. Called later to Vienna to write the annals of the house of Austria, he declined the task on account of the bad state of his health. He died at Freisingen April 2, 1734. P. Haidenfeld prepared a life of Meichelbeck, but it was never published. See Hirsching, *Hist. liter. Handbuch*; Zapf, *Literarische Reisen*, vol. i; Meucel, *Gelehrten-Lexikon*, s.v.

### Meier, Ernst Heinrich

a German Orientalist, was born at Rusbendt, in Schaumburg-Lippe, May 17, 1813. He studied at the University of Tubingen, and was appointed professor there in 1848. He died March 2, 1866. Of his writings, the following deserve especial mention: *Uebersetzung und Erklärung des Proph. Joel* (Tubing. 1840) :-*Hebraisches Wurzel wörterbuch* (Manh. 1845) : — *Ueber die Bildung und Bedeutung des Plural in den sem. und ge-manischen Sprachen* (ibid. 1846) :-*Die ursp-iingliche Form des Dekalogs* (1846):-*Commentar zu Jesaia*, vol. i (Pforzh. 1850):-*Die Form der hebr. Poesie* (Tubing. 1853):-*Geschichte der poetischen Nationalliteratur der Hebsraer*-(ibid. 1856). This last-named work was an attempt to transform the introduction of the Old Test. into a history of the literature of the Hebrews.

### Meier, Friedrich Karl

a German theologian, was born Aug. 11, 1808. He became privat-docent in 1832, and professor of theology at Jena in 1835. In 1836 he removed to Giessen to labor in the same capacity, and there he died, Feb. 13, 1841. His principal writings are, *Geschichte der Transsubstantionslehre* (Heidelb. 1832):-*Commentar zum Briefe an die Ephesier* (Berlin, 1834):-*Girolamo Savonarola* (ibid. 1836):-*Lehrbuch der Dogmenigeshichte* (Giess. 1840).

### Meier, Georg Friedrich

a German philosopher, was born in 1718 at Ammendorf; was a student, and in 1746 was appointed professor of philosophy, at Halle. He died there

in 1777. His writings are, *Anfangsgriinde der schonen Wissenschaften* (Halle, 1748, 3 vols.; 2d edit. *ibid.* 1754):-*Betrachtungen iiber den ersten Grundsatz aller schoner Kiinste und Wissenschaften* (*ibid.* 1757):-*Metaphysik* (*ibid.* 1756, 4 vols.) :-*Philosophische Sittenlehre* (*ibid.* 1756-61, 5 vols.):-*Recht der Natur* (*ibid.* 1767):-*Versuch eines neuen Lehrgebdues von den Seelen der Thiere* (*ibid.* 1756):-*Versuch einer allgemeinen Auslegungskunst* (*ibid.* 1756) :- *Untersuchung verschiedener Materien aus der Philosophie* (*ibid.* 1768-71, 4 vols.). See his biography by S. G. Lange (*ibid.* 1778).

### Meier, Gerhard

a German theologian, was born at Hamburg Aug. 26, 1664. He received his first instruction in the schools of his native city; studied theology at the university at Leipsic and at Wittenberg. In 1684 he received his degree, and in 1687 was appointed adjunct to the faculty of philosophy. In 1692 he received his degree of licentiate of theology. His dissertation at this time was *De mysteriis pentecostalibus in Paradiso revelatis*. In December of the same year he was called to the gymnasium of his native city as :professor of logic and metaphysics. He was next appointed pastor of St. Benedict's Church, and later was made superintendent and a Church councillor. In 1698 he went to Wittenberg to receive the degree of doctor of divinity. In 1700 he accepted a call to Bremen as councillor of the consistory, and superintendent and pastor of the cathedral In 1715 the position of general superintendent and professor of theology at Greifswalde was offered him, but he declined it. He died Feb. 25, 1723. Meier was esteemed for his sound theological research, which he displayed in several dissertations, mostly of a dogmatic character. A complete list of his works is given by Doring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, 2:462.

### Meier, Johann Christian Wilhelm

a German theologian, was born at Engter July 5, 1731. He received his first instruction in languages and sciences at home, and afterwards at the gymnasium at Osnabruck. He studied theology in Jena and Gottingen. In 1753 he returned home, a candidate of theology, and was soon assigned a place as assistant to an aged pastor at Westen, near Nienburg. In this position he secured for himself the respect of his superior, and added to his literary fame by contributions to a theological periodical In 1756 he formed the acquaintance of major Von Busch at Nienburg, who appointed him

field chaplain to his regiment. In this capacity he accompanied the regiment to Canterbury, England. During his stay there he collected material for a history of the Methodists. After having travelled much for this purpose, he returned to Nienburg with his regiment in February, 1757. The history, we are sorry to say, was never published. Some of his dissertations, but particularly one, crowned with a prize, *Schrift und Vernunige A handlung von dem versohnen der Zeitpunkte im Leben Jesu*, published in 1756, recommended him to the favor of the count of Schaumburg-Lippe. With the title of a councillor of consistory, he became presiding superintendent of Buckeburg and supreme pastor at Stadthagen. At Rinteln he obtained the degree of a doctor of divinity by the defence of his dissertation *De effectibus concionum Methodisticarum haud Miraculosis nec mirabilibus* (Rintelii. 1758, 4to). He died in 1775. Meier was esteemed a theologian of great learning and sincere piety, and was untiring in his endeavors to elevate the moral qualities of the heart. (J. H. W.)

### Meigs, Benjamin Clark, DD.

a missionary of the American board in Ceylon, was born at Bethlehem, Conn., Aug. 9, 1789; was educated at Yale College (class of 1809), and while a student there he was hopefully converted, and united with the college Church in 1809. His religious exercises were very deep and marked. He taught for a time in an academy at Bedford, New York, and then spent two and a half years at the Andover Theological Seminary. During his course there he attended, in connection with Samuel J. Mills and others, those select meetings of inquiry and prayer in reference to the subject of missions to the heathen which were commenced with the formation of the American board, Mr. Meigs, determined to devote himself to a missionary's life, was ordained at Newburyport, Mass., June 21, 1815, and sailed from that place October 23 following, to found the Ceylon mission at Jaffa. In connection with this mission he labored more than forty years, sharing in its toils and trials, its fears and hopes. In 1840, after an absence of twenty-five years, he returned to his native land, and sailed again from Boston Oct. 17, 1841, to continue his missionary labors. In 1858 the failure of his health compelled him to return again to America, and relinquish the work to which his life had been devoted. He died from a disease contracted by his long residence in India, at New York City, May 12, 1862. See *Missionary Herald*, July, 1862.

## Meilah

SEE TALMUD.

## Meindaerts, Peter John

a Dutch theologian of note, was born Nov. 7, 1684, at Groningen. After having concluded his studies at Malines and Louvain, he became attached to the cause of Peter Codde, a Jansenistic prelate, who had just been dismissed by the pope from the vicarship of the United Provinces. Meindaerts was therefore obliged to go to Ireland to receive his sacerdotal ordination (1716). On his return he was made pastor of Leuwarden. In 1739 he was elected archbishop of Utrecht, in the place of Theodore van der Croon, and occupied the see until his death. Like his predecessors, Meindaerts was often obliged to defend the rights of his see against the encroachments of the court of Rome. Censured by Clement XII, he appealed from him to the first council, and executed the project, a long time meditated, of filling the vacant sees of his metropolis. It was thus that he revived the extinct bishoprics of Harlem and Deventer, by giving them, one to Jerome de Bock (1742), the other to Jean Byeveld (1758). These acts of authority drew upon him new censures from Benedict XIV and Clement XIII. In 1763. Meindaerts held a council at Utrecht, in which were seated his suffragans, his clergy, and many French Jansenists. This act further provoked the most animated controversies. He died at Groningen Oct. 31, 1767, after having presided many times at Utrecht over a religious assembly, to which he gave the name of Provincial Synod. His principal writings are, *Recueil de temoignages en faveur de l'eglise d'Utrecht* (Utrecht, 1763, 4to; reprinted in 2 vols. 12mo) :-the *Actes* of the Council of Utrecht, in Latin, translated into French, 4to: — *Lettre a Clement XIII* (Utrecht, 1768, 12mo). See Chalnot, *Biograph. Woordenbock*, s.v.; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

## Meineke, Johann Heinrich Friedrich

a German theologian, was born at Quedlinburg Jan. 11, 1745, and was educated at the University of Helmstadt, which he entered, when in his nineteenth year, as a student of divinity; later he studied at Halle. He returned to Quedlinburg in 1767, and was two years after appointed to a position in the high-school of that city. He gave himself up to the study of literature and philosophy, especially Kant's system, which he studied diligently for several years. Though much engaged in his profession as a

teacher, he yet wished, as he advanced in years, to leave the pedagogical sphere, and he very readily accepted an appointment as minister at St. Blasius' Church at Quedlinburg. In the beginning of 1825 he was taken ill, and died July 25, 1825. Meineke united a perfect knowledge of theology, philosophy, and ancient languages, with a talent for the practical application of his knowledge. Though liberal in sentiment, he yet displayed the most decided abilities of a polemic who gave no quarter. He knew only one cause, that of his God and of his Church, and to serve it faithfully was his only endeavor. His best polemical production, entitled *Finstertage unserer Zeit*, he published under the nom de plume of Aloysius Frey (in 1822). For the use of ministers, he published in 1811 *Repertorium für alle Kanzelbedürfnisse der Prediger an Sonn- und Festtagsfrühpredigten oder in der Woche* (Quedlinburg, 1811, 8vo), vol. i; the second volume was never published, but an appendix to this he published in 1817: *-Tagliches Handbuch-für Prediger und Predigamts-Candidaten zur leichtern Auffindung der Materialien zu ihren Kanzelvortragen* (ibid. 1817, 8vo). But perhaps the most valuable production of his life was *Die Bibel ihrem Gesamtinhalte nach summarisch erklart zurichtiger Beurtheilung und zweckmassigem Gebrauche derselben für Lehrer in Bürger und Landschulen* (Quedlinburg, 1819, 2 vols. 8vo). See Doring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, s.v.

### Meiners, Christoph

a celebrated German philosopher, was born at Otterndorf, Hanover, in 1747. About his early life but little is known. He studied at the University of Göttingen, and became a professor at his alma mater in 1772. He died in 1810. He wrote, *Revision der Philosophie* (Göttingen, 1772) :- *Versuch einer Religionsgeschichte der ältesten Völker besonders Aegyptens* (ibid. 1775) :- *Historia doctrine de vero. Deo* (Lemgo, 1780, 2 vols.) :- *Geschichte des Ursprungs der Wissenschaften in Griechenland und Rom* (ibid. 1781, 2 vols.) :- *Geschichte des Verfalls der Sitten und Staatsverfassung der Römer* (Leips. 1782) :- *Geschichte des Verfalls der Sitten, Wissenschaften und Sprache der Römer* (Wien, 1791) :- *Geschichte aller Religionen* (Hanover, 1806, 2 vols.) :- *Geschichte der Ethik* (ibid. 1800, 2 vols.) :- *Untersuchungen über die Denk- und Willenskrafte* (Götting. 1806) :- *Geschichte der Entstehung und Entwicklung der hohen Schulen* (ibid. 1802, 4 vols.) :- *Geschichte des weiblichen Geschlechts* (Hanov. 1798, 4 vols.) :- *Lebensbeschreibungen von Mannein aus der Zeit 'der Wiederherstellung der Wissenschaften* (Zurich, 1796) :- *Historische*

*Vergleichung der Sitten des Mittelalters mit denen unseres Jahrhunderts* (Hanov. 1793, 3 vols.). Besides these, his own works, he edited, in connection with T. G. Feder, *Philosophische Bibliothek* (Getting. 1788-91, 4 vols.); in connection with Spittler, *Göttingisches historisches Magazin* (Hanov. 1787-90); *Neueres Magazin* (ibid. 1791-92, 3 vols.).<sup>7</sup> Meiners's literary works evince great activity, and at the same time a great variety in his themes; the most of his writings, however, are devoted to show the difference between past and present morals.

### Meinhold, Johann Wilhelm

a German theologian, was born Feb. 27, 1797, at Netzelkow, on the isle of Usedom, and was educated at Greifswalde. In 1820 he was appointed rector of the school at Usedom, and soon after minister at Koserow, near the Baltic; in 1826 at Krummin, and in 1844 at Rehwinkel, near Stargard. He resigned this position in 1850, and joined the Roman Catholic confession. He died in 1851 at Charlottenburg. He published *Athanasia oder die Verklärung Friedrich Wilhelm III* (1844): — *Die babylonische Sprachen und Ideenverwirrung der modernen Presse* (Leips. 1848). His works were collected and published at Leipsic (1846-52), entitled *Gesammelte Schriften*.

### Meinrad, St.

a German Roman Catholic ascetic, was born towards the close of the 8th century. He was educated at the abbey of Reichenau. He secluded himself in a desert near the Etzel Mountains, and afterwards near the spot where now stands the Benedictine convent of Einsiedeln, which was built in 934 by the canon Benedictus of Strasburg. Meinrad was murdered Feb. 21, 863.

### Meintel, Conrad Stephen

a German theologian, was born at Schwabach, Bavaria, in the early part of the 18th century. In his very youth he made such rapid progress in old and modern languages that he had finished in his twelfth year the reading of the Bible in the original. He studied theology at the university at Altdorf in 1745; continued in 1746 at Jena; went in 1747 home to Peternaurach, where his father was then installed as a minister of the Gospel. In 1751 he returned to Altdorf. He gained great notoriety in 1751 by means of his

dissertation *De locis quibusdam Jobi, in quibus celeberr. Schultens majorem lucem desideravit.*

In the latter part of 1751 he went home to assist his father, and stayed there till 1754, when he went to Erlangen, and then gained great distinction by his defence of the dissertation *Observationes philologico-philosophicce in Ecclesiastis septemprioeres versus.* He was given the privilege of holding public lectures. He had hopes of a professorship, but love for his home made him return to it again, and he became an assistant of his father. He finally accepted a call from St. Petersburg, Russia, and died, as minister of the Protestant congregations at Wags sili-Ostrow, Aug. 13, 1764. A short time before his death the doctorate in divinity was given to him by the University of Krnigsberg. Besides several literary essays, he published the following.: *Notae selectissimorum commentatorum Judaicorum in Psalmos Davidi ex collectione Hebraica celeberr. H. J. v. Bashuysen, Latine redditae* (Suabaci. 1744, 8vo):-*Cento quattro historic scelte della Biblia raccolte dal fee Sgr. Giov. Hubner ed hora tradfite de original Tedesco in Italiano* (ibid. 1745, 4to).

## Meir

*Rabbi* (surnamed “*illuminator*,” i.e. the *enlightener*, from the estimate which his contemporaries had formed of his merit), lived about 120. He was a native of Asia Minor. Legend traces his origin to the emperor Nero. He was a disciple of the famous rabbi Akiba (q.v.), and was very intimate with Elisa ben Abua, who, after his apostasy and subserviency to the Romans, was called *Acher*, i.e. the other one. Meir’s talents early procured him ordination from his teacher Akiba. As an instructor, he was remarkable for a thorough and effective investigation of his subject. The rabbins used to say, in their Oriental manner, that he dealt with difficulties of the law as a giant would uproot the mountains, and shatter them against each other. So replete was he with knowledge, and so successful in the communication of it, that “were a man even to touch the staff of rabbi Meir, he would become wise.” His wife was Beruria, the talented and accomplished daughter of Chananja ben-Teradion, who was burned, wrapped-in the roll which he had been discovered studying, during the persecution under Hadrian. Meir supported himself by making copies of the Scriptures. This occupation required not only considerable learning, but especially scrupulous exactness, a quality for which Meir was not particularly distinguished. His teacher, the conscientious Ishmael, anxiously set these

things before him, representing the danger which must result from any neglect on his part. But Meir, who felt no peculiar scruples, and was vain of his excellent memory, which on one occasion had enabled him to copy the whole book of Esther, set these prudent counsels aside. It was the practice of Jewish copyists to use an ink which, in case of any mistake, could easily be obliterated. On the other hand, Meir, confident of his accuracy, used an indelible ink prepared from sulphate of copper (Chalcanthon). Referring to this, he replied to Ishmael's admonitions in his usual off-hand manner, "Oh, I have a remedy at hand against all mistakes: I use sulphate of copper." As has already been -said, his talents had procured him ordination from Akiba. The youthful appearance of the rabbi excited the jealousy of some, whom he reminded that, as it was not the vessel but its contents which were precious, it might happen that, while a new vessel contained old, an old-looking vessel might only enclose new wine. Meir was very fond of illustrating his doctrine by apologue and parable, and is reported to have invented no less than three hundred fables about foxes (*Sanh.* 38, *b*; *Sota*, 49, *a*). The only lasting merit of rabbi Meir was his continuation of the labors of Akiba in the arrangement of the *Ilalacha*. This he carried a stage further, by dividing, according to their contents, the traditions which had hitherto been only strung 'together according to their number. In this respect Jehuda Hakkodesh, the compiler of the Mishna, was much indebted to his tuition.

The domestic history of Meir is in many respects touching. "It has already been stated that our rabbi was married to Beruria, so famed for her talents and rabbinical lore; as, in the opinion of contemporaries, to occupy a high place among the sages of the time. Her sister had, after the martyrdom of their parents, been carried to Rome for the purpose of public prostitution. But there Providence had watched over her honor. When the persecutions ceased, Beruria found no rest till Meir went to Rome to rescue his sister-in-law from infamy. Before entering on the dangerous undertaking, he resolved to try whether her principles had remained unshaken. Disguising himself as a Roman, he approached her, and, having satisfactorily ascertained her steadfastness, he bribed the attendants and procured her escape, though in the attempt he himself escaped capture only by disguise and feigning to eat forbidden meat... Beruria, throughout all these trials, proved herself not only an attached, but a devoted wife. She had shared his trials when, during the persecutions, Meir had fled from Palestine. On his return she cheered and encouraged him, and by her conduct softened the

domestic afflictions, with which he was visited. For example, while on a certain Sabbath the rabbi was engaged in the college, his two sons were suddenly taken ill and died. To spare her husband some hours of grief, and especially not to commute the festivities of the Sabbath into a season of mourning, the mother carefully repressed her own feelings and concealed the sad tidings. The Sabbath had been spent as usual, and its holy exercises and stillness were ended with the evening, when Beruria asked her husband whether it were not duty readily and cheerfully to restore to its owner any property, however pleasant, which had been intrusted for safe-keeping. When the astonished rabbi answered the strange inquiry in the affirmative, his weeping wife took him by the hand, and led him to the bed on which the lifeless remains of their two children were stretched, reminding him that he whose two children these right fully were had taken back what for a time he had intrusted to their keeping." Unfortunately Beruria afterwards compromised her character and committed suicide. Her death appears to have unsettled Meir's tranquillity. He left Palestine and resided some time in Babylonia, whence he returned to his colleagues with another and less learned bride.

Meir, besides cultivating intercourse with the most noted theologians of his own time, was also on friendly and even intimate terms with heathen sages, especially with Naumenius the philosopher, of Apamea, in Syria. The principles of this philosopher were essentially those of Neo-Platonism, in the peculiar modification of that philosophy which the influx of Eastern elements had brought about. The most noted, if not the most sophistical, among Meir's numerous pupils, was Symmachus, of Samaritan origin, known as a translator of the Bible into Greek. He had attended Meir's prelections, and thoroughly imbibed his method. It is said that this dialectician on one occasion undertook by forty-nine arguments to prove that the touch of a certain dead reptile could not defile a person. It was opprobriously said of Symmachus by his contemporaries that his ancestors could not have heard the law on Mount Sinai. Symmachus afterwards joined the Christian sect of the Ebionites. His translation of the Bible is stated to have been more free from errors and more faithful than that of Aquila. According to Grttz, this Symmachus is not the translator of the Bible.

Meir had frequently changed his residence. 'When the Sanhedrim was restituted under Simeon (q.v.), he returned to the Holy Land, and was elected vicar of the rabbinical see; but his continual disagreements with the

Nasi induced him at last to leave Palestine for Asia Minor, where he died, bequeathing to his countrymen the following proud and characteristic message: "Tell the children of the Holy Land that their Messiah has died in a strange country." According to his expressed wish, the tabernacle of his unquiet spirit found its last resting-place by the sea-shore, where his grave was washed by the waves, and looked out upon the wide, storm-tossed ocean. See Etheridge, *Intr. to Hebr. Literature*, p. 79 sq.; Griitz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 4:188-196, 468-470; Edersheim, *Hist. of the Jewish Nation* (Edinburgh, 1857), p. 251-259. (B. P.)

### Meir, Abulafia El-Lewi Ben-Todros,

a Jewish savant of note, was born about 1180, and was a native of Burgos. He taught the law at Toledo, where he died in 1244. He wrote various cabalistical works, such as the *ḥofeṣ ḥayim* a part of which was published in Hebrew and Latin by Rittangel in the *hryxōrpsē* (Amst. 1662). He wrote also a letter against Maimonides's *t/rghā* a treatise on the Masorah, entitled "The Fence of the Law," *hrwōl igys]trsm*; and some novellas on parts of the Mishna. See Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* 1:16; Etheridge, *Introd. to Hebr. Literature*, p. 276, 277; Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 7:33 sq.; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenthums*, iii,'8, 9; Lindo, *History of the Jews of Spain and Portugal*, p. 81; Finn, *Sephardim, or the History of the Jews in Spain and Portugal*, p. 193 (Lond. 1841). (B. P.)

### Meir Ben-Baruch

(also called by the Jews *Mahaaram*, from the initial letters = *ryam brh wnrwm ḥm*, *our teacher the rabbi Meir*), one of the most distinguished Jewish literati during the Middle Ages, was born in 1230. He was the first official chief rabbi in the German empire, to which dignity he was nominated by the emperor Rudolph I of Hapsburg. He had his seat and college at Rottenburg-an-der-Tauber, whence he is also called *Meir of Rottenburg* or *Meier Rottenburg*. The unsettled condition of the Jews in the German empire, especially the oppressions and persecutions which threatened them every year, obliged Meir to leave the country. In the spring of 1286 he prepared to go to Syria. There, it was said, a Messiah had appeared to deliver the unhappy people. When about to enter the vessel which would convey him and his co-religionists who had followed him from Italy to the East, he was recognised by a former co-religionist,

named Knippe, who was in the suite of the bishop of Basle. Rabbi Meir was imprisoned by the emperor, not so much for punishment as for the purpose of extorting from him or his co-religionists a sum of money. Meir died in 1293 in prison at Worms, where his tombstone was discovered a few years since in the "Gottesacker," or cemetery. The Ashkenazim, or German Jews, venerate him as a saint. Meir wrote *Theological Decisions*, or *Questions and Answers* (twbwçtw twl aç), which have been published at Cremona, 1557; Prague, 1603. He also wrote *Commentaries on the Masorah* (trsm yryab), which are still in MS. in the public libraries. He also wrote some liturgical pieces, which are still in use among the Jews; among other pieces, the famous lamentation yl aç çab hpwrç, in commemoration of the burning of the law at Paris in 1242. See Etheridge, *Introd. to Hebrews Literature*, p. 288; Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 7:107, 170-172, 188-191, 445, 456-60 (new edit. Leipsic, 1873); Jost, *Geschichte des Judenthums u. s. Sekten*, 3:32, 58; Furst, *Biblioth. Jud.* 3:176, 177; Zunz, *Geschichte und Literatur*, p. 40, .2,' 128 (Berlin, 1845); *Literatnurgeschichte der Synagogales Poesie*, p. 357-62,623 (Berlin, 1865). (B. P.)

### Meir Ibn-Gabbai

a Jewish writer, was born in 1481 in Spain. When eleven years old he was obliged to leave his country on account of the edict of Ferdinand and Isabella, which banished all Jews from the land. Little is known of his personal history after this time. He wrote several cabalistical works: hnllma, ÊrD, i.e. *the way of truth*, ten sections on the ten Sephiroth (Padua, 1563; Berlin, 1850, by N. A. Goldberg):— tdbç}vdQbi also pyhæ t/arjñi in four sections: a, *on the unity of God*; b, *on the mysteries of the adoration of God*; c, *on the end of the higher and lower creatures*; d, *on the mysteries of the law* (Mantua, 1545, folio; Venice, 1567; Krakau, 1578); and a work on *prayer*, entitled bqçyi t [i /T (Kstpl. 1560; Zolkiew, 1799). See Fitrst, *Bibloth. Jud.* 1:311, 312; Jost, *Geschichte des Judenthums*, 3:138; Griitz, *Geschichte d. Juden*, 9:239 (Berl. 1866). (B. P.)

### Meir Joseph Ben-Joshua

surnamed *Ha-Sephardi*, i.e. the Spaniard, a Jewish savant of note, flourished in the early part of the 16th century. He was born in 1496 at

Avignon, whither his father had retired on leaving Spain. He is the author of a most valuable historic work, entitled *Chronicles of the Kings of France and the Ottoman Sovereigns*, in two parts; the first from the creation till 1520, and the second of transactions from that time till 1553 (Venice, 1554; Amsterd. 1733). The value of the work consists in the fact that it throws aside much of the fable and wild imagination which render almost worthless all other rabbinical histories. Though contemporary with those events, the chronicler must be regarded as an impartial historian. A part of this work has been translated into Latin by L. Ferrand (Paris, 1670). To English readers this work is made accessible by C. H. Bialloblotzky's translation, *The Chronicles of R. Joseph ben-Joshua Meir, the Se-phardi* (Lond. 1836-38). See Furst, *Biblioth. Jud.* 2:115; Etheridge, *Introd. to Hebrews Literat.* p. 453; Lindo, *'ist. of the Jews of Spain and Portugal*, p. 451; Jost, *Geschichte des Judenthums*, 3:124; Milman, *History of the Jews*, 3:461 (New York, 1870); Da Costa, *Israel and the Gentiles*, p. 397 sq. (New York, 1855). (B. P.)

### Meir Rofe Of Hebron.

Like his father Chija Rofe, he was a physician. Little is known of his life, except that he was one of the adherents of Sabbathai Zewi (q.v.), or Aga Mohammed Effendi, the Messiah, who during the 17th century excited the whole of Europe and Asia. (B. P.)

### Meiri

(*ryametybe*) or *ryam*, MENACHEM BENSALOMO, also: called *Don Vidal Salomo*, also *Menachem bei-Salomo*, a Jewish savant, was born at Perpignan, in Franie, in 1249. He was a man of great learning, and, like Maimonides, he tried to harmonize philosophy with the Talmud. He wrote in a lucid style, and in this respect made an exception to that bombastic method which was prevalent in his times. In his explanations of the holy Scriptures he kept aloof from the philosophical and mystical interpretation, and, though he acknowledged that some passages contain a higher hidden sense, he nevertheless adhered to the literal interpretation of the Word. He died between 1317 and 1320. Besides a commentary on the book of Proverbs, he wrote commentaries on the Talmudical tract *Megilla* (*l [i hryj BñityBehLgæ]* new edition Königsberg, 1860, 4to); on *Joma*, printed with Isaiah Nufies-Vaez's *qj xyæjycæ* Livorno, 1760); on

*Jebamoth, Sabbath, Nedarian, Nazir, Sota* (Livorno and Salonica, 1794 and 1795). But his greatest commentary is on the tract *Aboth* (**twba; tyBe** or **vW rPetwba ]**) with an introduction to the Talmud, etc. This latter work has been edited by M. Stern (Vienna, 1854), with biographical and bibliographical matter. See Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 7:240-42 (Leipsic, 1873); Jost, *Gesch. des Judenthums u. s. Sekten.*, 3:57; Furst, *Biblioth. Jud.* 2:345, 346; Zunz, *Zur Gesch. u. Literatur*, p. 476-481 (Berl. 1845). (B. P.)

### Meisel, Marco Or Mordechai

a great Jewish philanthropist, was born in 1528 and died in 1601. Little is known of his life, except that he was one of the wealthiest men at that time in Germany, and that he used his means for philanthropic purposes. He built homes, hospitals, synagogues, colleges, and did all in his power to elevate the condition of his brethren, especially at Prague. The German emperor. Rudolph I, honored him by the appointment of councillor. See Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 9:497-99 (Leipsic, 1866); Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenthums*, 3:281. (B. P.)

### Meisels, Bar

a celebrated rabbi, was born in 1797, and died on the 15th of February, 1871, at Warsaw, where for many years he had ably filled the eminent distinction of a leader in Israel. A decided republican in politics, he was long the eyesore of the Russian government, but the very eye-apple of the Poles. Of his life we hardly know anything, because the papers were prohibited by the police from giving any biographical notices of the deceased, or any description of the demonstration at his funeral. That Meisels's death was felt as a loss to the community at large, we may gather from the fact that forty thousand people, representing all creeds, nationalities, and races, attended his funeral. In him the Poles lost one of their stanchest patriots, a man who was never afraid to utter his political sentiments. In 1861 he suffered imprisonment for six months on account of his political activity. (B. P.)

### Meisner, Balthazar

one of the most eminent German Protestant theologians of the early part of the 17th century, was born in 1587. He studied at Wittenberg, Giessen, Strasburg, and Tbingen, and in 1613 became professor at Wittenberg. In

connection with B. Mentzer (q.v.) of Giessen, and J. Gerhard of Jena, he perceived the requirements of the Church, and did his utmost to satisfy them. This we see in a remarkable sketch of his on the subject, published anonymously at Frankfort in 1679, under the title *B. Meisneri pia desideria paulo ante beatum 'obitum ab ipso manifestata*.

The principal passages of it were also published in Tholuck's *Wittenberger Theologen*, p. 96. He had made himself known in the literary world when but twenty-four years of age by his *Philosophia sobria* (Giessen, 1611), which passed through several editions. This work involved him in a controversy with Cornelius Martin of Helmstadt, the champion of the Aristotelian school (see Henke, *Calixtus*, 1:258). His merits as a theologian have lately been fully recognised by Kaltenborn, in his *Vorluffer d. Grotius auf dem Gebiete des "Jus nature gentium"* (1848), p. 220. Meisner died Dec. 29, 1626. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 9:251. (J. N. P.)

### Meisnic Interim

is the former name for the first formula of the *SEE LEIPSIK INTERIM* (q.v.).

### Meister, Christoph Andreas

a German theologian, was born at Ahornberg Aug. 23, 1671. He was the son of a minister, who gave him his first education. Afterwards he attended school at Mbnchberg, Hof, and Bayreuth, where he excelled in the study of the ancient languages. He went to Wittenberg to study theology, and, thanks to several influential men, he became in 1693 minister at Langensteinach, but resigned in 1701, when he was appointed minister at the court of Limburg-Speckfeld, and located at Mark Eimersheim. In 1704 he became chief minister and inspector at Sommerhausen, and in 1709 minister at the court of Hohenlohe; also superintendent and counsellor of the consistory at Weikersheim, where he died Oct. 31, 1728. Meister bore the reputation of one thoroughly acquainted with the theology of his time. He was above all things tolerant towards those who differed from him in their religious opinions. Several of his sermons were published. A list of them is given by Doring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, s.v.

### Meister, Christoph Georg Ludwig

a German theologian, was born at Halle Aug. 12, 1738, where he began his education at Franke's orphan school; in riper years he was a student at the

university of his native town. In 1763 he was appointed second minister at Ballenstedt. In 1784 he was called to Duisburg, on the Rhine, where he filled, besides the office of a minister, a professorship of theology. In the autumn of 1784 he was called to Bremen, and was there installed as third minister of the Liebfrauen Kirche, at the same time serving also as professor of theology at the highschool; he became in 1789 second minister of the same church, and in 1795 first minister. He died Jan. 26, 1811, holding in his hands the manuscript of a sermon which he was to deliver the day after. Meister was highly esteemed by his contemporaries as the author of several ascetic works. He published also *J. L. von Mosheim's Ersklung wichtiger Stellen der heiligen Schrift, aus dessen Werken gezogen und mit practischen Zusätzen für die häusliche Andacht begleitet* (Leipsic and Wesel, 1777, 8vo); and *Kleine theologische Schriften* (Brem. 1790, 8vo).

### Me-Jar'kon

(Hebrews *Mey-Hay-yarkon* <sup>~</sup>/qrʾhiymē waters of yellowness, or clear water; Sept. θάλασσα Ἰαρκών, Vulg. *Mejarcon*), a town in the tribe of Dan, mentioned between Gath-rimmon and Rakkon (~~1696~~ Joshua 19:46); probably so called from a spring in its vicinity. Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 141) regards the name as equivalent to *river of disease* (lit. *of paleness*), and states that there is a “*Wady Udshi* which descends from the mountains of-Lod” (probably referring to the ravine in the south rear of Ludd), a nearly synonymous epithet, according to him, on the strength of which he is disposed to identify the locality. “It is difficult not to suspect that the name following that of Me-hajjarkon, har-Rakon (A. V. Rakkon), is a mere corrupt repetition thereof, as the two bear a very close similarity to each other, and occur nowhere else”.

### Mekhitar Kosh

surnamed *the Beardless*, a learned Armenian ecclesiastic, who was born about 1140, founded a monastery in the valley of Dandsoud, in Eastern Armenia, in 1191, and became its first abbot. He died in 1213. Mekhitar Kosh left several works, but they still continue in MS. form, and are of minor value. See Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 34:786.

## Meko'nah

(Hebrews *Mekonah'*, מֶכֹּנָה) a *base*, as in <sup><1072></sup>1 Kings 7:27, etc.; Sept. in most editions omits, but v. r. Μοχινό and Μοβνή, Vulg. *Mochona*), a town in the southern part of the tribe of Judah, and inhabited after the exile (<sup><1012></sup>Nehemiah 11:28). From its being coupled (in that passage) with Ziklag, we should infer that it was situated far to the south, while the mention of the "daughter towns" (τῶν θυγατρῶν AV. "villages") dependent on it, seem to show that it was a place of some magnitude. Reland (*Palest.* p. 892) thinks it may be identical with *Mechanum*, a village located by Jerome between Eleutheropolis and Jerusalem, eight miles from the former (*Onomast.* s.v. Bethmacha). It seems strange that Jerome should speak of a village south of Jerusalem when describing Beth-maachah, which lay at the northern extremity of Palestine (<sup><1014></sup>2 Samuel 20:14). The only unappropriated site at about the required distance is *Jerash*, not far north-east of Beit Nettif (Robinson, *Researches*, 2:342, note).

## Mekshirim

SEE TALMUD.

## Mel (Or Mell), Conrad

a German theologian, was born Aug. 14, 1666, at Gudensberg (Hesse). He was the son of a Protestant minister, studied theology at the Dutch University of Groningen, then returned to Germany, and performed pastoral duties at Mittau, Memel, and Königsberg. In 1705 he was called to take charge of the Gymnasium of Hersfeld as director, and later received due recognition for his services from his prince, the landgrave, in the position of superintendent of the churches of Hesse. He died at Cassel, May 3, 1733. Mel had made sacred antiquity a special study, and, if his works were written too hastily, it must be attributed to the necessity of providing for the support of a large family. Mel belonged to the Royal Societies of London and Berlin. Of his works we notice *Die Posaune der Ewigkeit*-sermons (Königsb. 1697, 4to; 7th edit. Cassel, 1755, 4to); there is a kind of sequel, under the title *Der Herold der Ewigkeit* (Berlin, 1729, 4to); *-Legatio orientalis Sinensium, Samaritanorum, Chaldeorum, et Hebraeorum, cum interpretationibus* (Königsberg, 1760, fol); *-Omina bruta* (1704, 8vo); inserted in D'Haubert's *Bibl. magica* :- *Der würdige Gast an des Herrn Tafel*-sermons (Königsberg, 1704, 4to, eight

editions):-*Antiquarius sacer, seu de usu antiquitatum Judaicarum, Grecarum, et Romanarum in explicandis obscurioribus Scripturæ dictis* (Schleusingen, 1707, 8vo; the edition of Frankfort, 1719, 4to, is augmented by the addition of four small works):-*Pantometsrum nauticum*'(Hersfeld, 1707, fol.). He invented a machine by which he pretended to measure longitude at sea with great exactness, and offered models to several academies; those of London and Berlin presented several objections, to which he replied in the *Pharus illustrans* (ibid. 1709, fol.): *Der Tabernackel oder gründliche Beschreibung der Stiftshütte, sammt allen ihren Theilen und heiligen Gerathen* (Frankfort, 1709, 1711, 4to; Cassel. 1720, 4to): -*Missionarius evangelicus* (Hersfeld, 1711, 8vo) :- *Zion's Lehre und Wunder* — sermons (Frankfort, 1713, 4to, eight editions) :-*Das Leben' der Patriarchen* (Frankfort, 1715, 1716, 2 vols. 4to)' :-*Die Lust der Heiligen* (Cassel, 1715, 8vo; 15th edit. ibid. 1779) :- *Salomon's Ternpel* (Frankfort, 1724, 4to; Cassel, 1726, 4to). The manuscripts of Mel are preserved in the library of Cassel, among which is a *Histoire litteraire de la Hesse*. See *Acta Histor.* <sup><2010></sup>*Ecclesiastes* 1:105; J. H. Lederhose, *Ehrengedchniss Conrad Mel* (Cassel, 1733, 4to); Streides, *Grundl. zu einer Hess. Gelehrten Geschichte*, 8:391. - (J. H. W.)

## Melach

SEE SALT.

## Melah

SEE TEL-MELAH.

## Melancholy

in so far as it is a mental disease, and must more or less affect the religious state of the believer, demands our consideration. It is generally held that melancholy is the exaggeration of the natural and legitimate feelings of grief, despondency, and apprehension, which become morbid where the emotion is without a cause, or is disproportioned to the actual cause, or is so intense as to disturb and destroy the exercise of the other mental powers. This dejection and suffering is found associated with exalted sensations, or delusions as to the personal or physical condition of the individual, which originate in habitually cherishing certain impressions, in fixing the attention upon certain vital processes, which maybe unhealthy, or become so by the very concentration of thought bestowed upon them. The

patient lives in fear of death, in the conviction that he is differently or more exquisitely constructed than those around; that he labors under some foul or fatal disease; that he is destitute of strength or comeliness. This has been regarded as hypochondriacal melancholy — the *maladie Anglaise*, and affects ‘the ‘opening of life. Similar feelings are called forth in reference to the social position. There arises a dread of poverty and want. The victim is haunted by imaginary debts, obligations, speculations. He feels incapable of extricating himself. The poor, as well as the rich, entertain such doubt and dread. They starve in order to husband their resources. This affection prevails at maturity at the period of greatest activity and usefulness. Towards the decline of life although encountered at every age—morbid depression assumes the form of religious anxiety, despair, remorse. Moral statistics show that among the inhabitants of Northern Europe the number of cases of melancholy exceeds those of mania; and it has been supposed that the rudiments of the malady may be detected in the original character, the temperament and habits of the race, as well as in ‘the climate, domestic condition, and diet, by which these are modified. Defective blood nutrition, or anaemia, appears to be the physical state with which the great majority of cases of melancholy are connected, and to which all modes, of treatment are directed. Powerful and permanent and depressing moral emotions act as effectively in arresting healthy digestion and alimentation as the use of injudicious food, or the use of proper nourishment under circumstances such as the respiration of impure air, or indulgence in intemperate or degraded tendencies, which render assimilation impossible. The aspect of the melancholiac corroborates the view of inanition and exhaustion. The surface is pale, dry, cold, attenuated, even insensible; the muscles are rigid; the frame is bent; the eyes sunk, and fixed or flickering; the lips parched and colorless. There is a sense of exhaustion or pain, or impending dissolution. It has been remarked that in proportion to the intensity of the internal agony is there an obtuseness or anesthesia to wounds or external injuries. Such an immunity causes in lunatics an indifference to the most grievous forms of suffering, and has given rise to the supposition, on the part of those scientists who cannot see any virtue in religion, that Christian martyrs displayed at the stake a fortitude inspired rather by a lunatic condition than by heroic faithfulness to their convictions.—Chambers, *Cyclop. sv.*

To remove the oppressiveness of melancholy the following remedies may be applied:

- 1, early rising;
- 2, plain, nourishing food;
- 3, strict temperance;
- 4, exercise in the open air.

Or, if it arises particularly from the mind:

- 1, associate with the cheerful;
- 2, study the Scriptures;
- 3, Consider the amiable character of God, and the all-sufficient atonement of his Son;
- 4, avoid all sin;
- 5, be much in prayer, so as to enjoy the promised presence of the Holy Spirit, the infallible Comforter;
- 6, be constantly engaged in such employments as combine the sense of duty and the feelings of benevolence

See Burton, Baxter, and Rogers, *On Melancholy*; Cecil, *Remains*; Fuller, *Works*; Haslam, *Observations on Madness and Melancholy*; Esquirol, *Maladies Mentales*, 1:398; Crichton, *Inquiry into the Nature and Origin of Mental Derangement*. **SEE ALSO MIND**; **SEE MONOMANIA**.

### Melancthon, Philip

the most noted associate of Luther in the German Reformation.

*Life*. — Philip was born at Bretten, then in the Lower Palatinate, but now in the grand-duchy of Baden, Feb. 16, 1497. His father, George *Schwartzerd*, was a skilful armorer, and an earnest, pious man, whose personal worth and success in his art had gained for him the patronage and esteem of many of the princes of Germany. His mother, Barbara Reuter, was a frugal, industrious, and energetic woman, the daughter of the burgomaster of the village, and the supposed authoress of several household rhymes still popular in Germany. His education was begun, under the superintendence of his grandfather Reuter, at his native place. Among his earliest teachers was John Unger, to whose thoroughness Melancthon, in later years, paid the tribute “ He made me a grammarian.” Already, under Unger his quickness of comprehension, the facility with

which he memorized, the readiness with which he clearly explained what he knew, his deep interest in his studies, and his eagerness to converse upon them, marked the young pupil as a boy of rare promise. Upon the death of his grandfather, he was removed in 1508 to Pforzheim, in Baden, where he attended a Latin school, and made his home with a female relative (according to some authorities, his grandmother), who was a sister of the renowned Reuchlin. Here he became a favorite of this great classical scholar, who presented him with books, and in recognition of his extraordinary attainments, according to a custom of the times, translated his German name *Schwartzerd* into the Greek *Melanchthon* (μέλας, black; γῆ, earth)-a name retained throughout his life, although he usually spelled it Melanthon; at present many writers have come to adopt the spelling Melancthon, and, as this is the orthography of this Cyclopaedia, we have conformed to it. In October, 1509, he entered the University of Heidelberg, where, notwithstanding his extreme youth, he soon gained great distinction as a linguist, being known among his fellow-students as "the Grecian." When only a few months over fourteen he received the degree of bachelor of arts, became private tutor to the sons of count Lowenstein, and composed the Greek Grammar which was published several years afterwards. The severity of the climate occasioning repeated attacks of fever, and the refusal of the faculty, on account of his youth, to admit him to the master's degree, induced him in 1512 to remove to Tübingen. Here he devoted himself to a wide range of study, embracing Greek and Latin literature, philosophy, history, rhetoric, logic, mathematics, medicine, jurisprudence, and theology. In theology he attended the lectures of Lempan, and read William Occam. In medicine, he studied Galen with such diligence that he could repeat the most of that author from memory. In 1514 he received his master's degree, and began to lecture on Virgil and Terence. The next year found him aiding Reuchlin in the controversy with the monks. About the same time (1515) Erasmus expressed his unqualified admiration of the young master's attainments. "What promising hopes does Philip Melancthon give us, who, yet a youth, yes, almost a boy, deserves equal esteem for his knowledge of both languages. "What sagacity in argument, what purity of expression, what a rare and comprehensive knowledge, what extensive reading, what delicacy and elegance of mind does he not display !" Three years later he wrote: "Christ designs this youth to excel us all: he will totally eclipse Erasmus." In 1516 he lectured on rhetoric, and expounded Livy and Cicero; and before leaving Tübingen had published his Greek Grammar.

Of the spiritual struggles of Melancthon during this period we know nothing. His great modesty prevented him from giving publicity to the details of his inner history. Whatever was the mode in which God was preparing this chosen vessel for his service we cannot discern, as in the case of Luther, any crisis, marked on the one side by the anguish of felt guilt and agonizing efforts to satisfy. God's law, and on the other by rest in the merits of Christ and joy in the assurance of personal salvation. From his earliest youth God's Spirit seems to have sanctified his mind through the principles of the divine Word, which he had made the object of the most conscientious study; so that when he was called to the assistance of Luther, by his personal experience of the grace of God, he had already apprehended the great doctrine of justification by faith, which he was summoned to expound and defend. Called in 1518, upon the recommendation of Reuchlin, to the Greek professorship at Wittenberg, he declined, on his way thither, invitations from both Ingolstadt and Leipsic. At his arrival, his boyish appearance, and his timid and retiring manners, caused a feeling of disappointment; but when, four days later (Aug. 29), he delivered his inaugural lecture, "*On reforming the Studies of Youth,*" he won the enthusiastic applause of all his hearers. Luther, especially, was delighted. Two days afterwards he wrote: "We quickly forgot all our thoughts about his person and stature, and rejoiced and wondered at his treatment of his theme.. -I really desire no other teacher of Greek so long as he lives." And again, Sept. 2, "Philip has his lecture-room crowded with students. He has especially infused an enthusiasm for the study of Greek into the students of theology of all classes." This favorable opinion was only strengthened by further intimacy, which revealed the extensive erudition of Melancthon, and called forth eulogiums still more ardent. "A wonderful man, in whom everything is almost supernatural, yet my most cherished and intimate friend" (Luther to Reuchlin, Dec. 14, 1518). Although repeatedly called elsewhere, even to France and England, he remained at Wittenberg until the close of his life, exerting, by his varied attainments, marvellous industry, and simple piety, an influence second only to that of the great Reformer. Married in 1520 to Catharine Krapp, daughter of the burgomaster of Wittenberg, whom his friend Camerarius describes as a pious and devoted wife and mother, Melancthon enjoyed in his domestic life much happiness, but during his later years suffered great trouble and anxiety. Of his two sons, one died in infancy; Philip died in 1603, a pious but not a gifted man, at one time secretary of the Consistory. Of his two daughters, Anna married the learned but erratic and

unprincipled George Sabinus, provost of the University of Königsberg, and died in 1547; while Magdalena became the wife of Dr. Caspar Reucer, afterwards professor at Wittenberg, and survived her father.

Melancthon's last years were embittered not only by domestic griefs, but also by the distracted condition of the Church. He longed to be delivered, as he said, from the "*rabies theologica*." A violent cold, contracted in travelling, April, 1560, terminated in a fever, which eventually proved fatal. Although in much feebleness, he continued to lecture until a week before his death, which occurred April 19. Almost his last words were, "Nothing but heaven." Two days afterwards his body was laid by the side of that of Luther, where, on the anniversary of his death, in 1860, the corner-stone of a monument to his memory was laid with appropriate ceremonies. It has since been reared, in 1869.

*Melancthon as a Teacher.* - His reputation as a teacher gave him the title of *Proceptor Germazice*, and attracted to Wittenberg crowds of students not only from all parts of Germany, but also from England; France, Poland, Hungary, Denmark, and even Italy and Greece. He frequently lectured to an audience of 2000. His lectures covered Old and New Testament exegesis, dogmatic theology, the explanation of the principal Latin and Greek classics, ethics, logic, physics, and occasionally metaphysics. In addition, he received private pupils at his house, and exercised over them a truly paternal oversight. By his work in the organization of many of the schools of Germany, and more especially by his valuable text-books, he continued for many years after his death to exert a more powerful influence than any living teacher, and became, as Hallam (*Hist. of Lit.* 1:145) remarks, "far above all others, the founder of general learning throughout Europe." His *Latin Grammar*, prepared originally for his private pupils, was almost universally adopted in Europe, running through fifty-one editions, and continuing until 1734 to be the text-book even in the Roman Catholic schools of Saxony. His *Greek Grammar* also enjoyed great popularity. Of his *Terence*, 73 editions had been published within 106 years of its first publication. He also published either scholia upon or expositions or paraphrases of the *De Officiis*, *Laelius*, *De Oratore*, *Orator*, *Topicce*, *Epistles*, and 19 *Orations* of Cicero, Porcius Latro, Sallust, the *Germania* of Tacitus, Pliny, Quintilian, 1. xii, six orations of Demosthenes, one of AEschines, Lycurgus, Stobeeus, Aelian, Lucian, Thucydides, Xenophon, Plutarch, Lysis, Ptolemaeus, selections from Homer and Sophocles, 18 tragedies of Euripides, Aristophanes, Menander, 19th Idyl of

Theocritus, Tyrteus, Solon, Theognis, Calimachus, Pindar, Empedocles, Virgil, Ovid, the *Miles* of Plautus, and the *Theognis* of Seneca, in addition to composing 391 Latin and Greek odes. His style (*genus dicendi Philippicum*), which is said, in purity of diction and correctness of classical taste, to excel even that of Erasmus, for a time was regarded in the schools as a model, even to the exclusion of Cicero and Quintilian.

In philosophy, although, in his first edition of his *Loci Communes*, he sympathizes with Luther's antagonism to Aristotle, yet he soon learned to distinguish between the use and the abuse of that author, and, while condemning Aristotle as perverted by Romish scholasticism, he effectually employed him in his true meaning as an important aid to the student of theology for the detection of sophistry and the attainment of a clear method of thought. He declared that he had never understood the use of philosophy until he had apprehended the pure doctrine of the Gospel.: Among his philosophical works were an *Epitome of Moral Philosophy*; *Elements of Ethics*; *Explanation of Aristotle's Ethics*; *Commentary on Aristotle's Politics*; *Elements of Rhetoric*; *Logical Questions*; and dissertations on various ethical subjects, such as oaths, contracts, etc. For many years instruction in these works was the regular course in ethics in most of the schools of Protestant Germany. A writer before quoted pronounces them "more clear, elegant, and better. arranged than those of Aristotle himself or his commentators" (Hallam's *Literature*, 2:50). He was the author, also, of an elementary text-book of physics, and a sketch of universal history, from the creation to the Reformation (*Chronicon Carionis*). His miscellaneous orations, lectures, and essays fill over two volumes of the *Corpus Reformatorum*.

*Melancthon as a Theologian and Reformer.* — But it is with Melancthon as a theologian that we have chiefly to do. He never entered the ministry, and therefore performed his work in the Church entirely in the capacity of a layman. Immediately upon going to Wittenberg he identified himself with the Reformation, which had begun the preceding year. During his first fall and winter there he delivered lectures on Titus, following them by a course on the Psalms, Matthew, and Romans. His published exegetical lectures embrace, in addition, Genesis, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Daniel, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, John, Corinthians, Colossians, and Timothy. His lectures on Romans and Corinthians were published by Luther without the author's knowledge. Extemporaneous explanations of the Gospels, during a later period of his life, delivered on

Sundays at his residence, were committed to writing by some of his hearers, and, after revision by Pezel, were published under the title of *Postils*.

He accompanied Luther to the Leipsic Disputation (1519), at which he remained a mere spectator, but afterwards published a letter to OEcolampadius, in which he gave a succinct account of the discussion. Though written in the best spirit, it provoked a very bitter reply from Dr. Eck, in which, while acknowledging Melancthon's pre-eminence as a grammarian, he expressed the utmost contempt for his theological attainments, and advised him thereafter to confine his attention to classical pursuits, and not to attempt to enter a higher sphere. The reply of Melancthon is brief and modest, but the indignation of Luther manifested itself in a severer answer, in which he pronounced Melancthon better versed in Scripture than all the Ecks together. During the same year Melancthon received the degree of BD.

Early in 1521, under the assumed name of Didymus Faventinus, he published an apology for the Reformation, in reply to Emser (Rhadinus). About Easter of the same year he laid the foundation of Protestant systematic theology by the publication of his *Loci Communes seu Hypotyposes Theologicce*. It originated from a very brief summary of doctrine, prepared for his private use, which was afterwards delivered to his pupils, as an introduction to his lectures on Romans, and published by them without his consent or revision. The *Loci Communes* were intended to take the place of this meagre, and, to its author, very unsatisfactory sketch. They are marked by the clearness of method and purity of style for which Melancthon was distinguished. Luther declared that the little book could not be refuted, and that it was worthy not only of immortality, but even of canonical authority. Chemnitz affirms that Luther often remarked in private conversation that there was more solid doctrine contained in it than in any other volume since the days of the apostles. The same author quotes the Romish theologian, Alphonso de'Zamara, as declaring: "It explains its doctrinal statements in such appropriate and accurate terms, and, by a methodical treatment, renders them so clear and strong, that it is injuring the papal power more than all other writings of the Lutherans." Erasmus termed it "a wondrous army, ranged in order of battle against the Pharisaic tyranny of false teachers;" and Calvin, "So beautiful is the proof that it affords, that the most perfect simplicity is the noblest method of

handling the Christian doctrine.” The couplet of Selnecker was often repeated:

*“Non melior liber est ullus post biblia Christi,  
Quam qui doctrinæ, corpusque, locique vocatur.”*

During the author’s life it passed through over sixty editions, but was subjected to constant changes. The only exception of any moment taken within the Lutheran Church to the first edition is against its statement of the doctrine of the freedom of the will, to which Hutter and others have objected that it inclines towards fatalism. Seckendorf, on the contrary, claims that on this point it was misunderstood. In 1535 the objectionable sentence, “All things happen necessarily,” was omitted. After 1543 the work was greatly enlarged, and so far changed on that subject as to seem far more in harmony with the teaching of Erasmus than that of Luther. It was repeatedly translated into the German. The translation of Justus Jonas was revised by Luther, who suggested that, while the articles on justification and the holy supper were well treated, they were not sufficiently full. A French translation appeared, with the commendation of Calvin, in 1546, and one into Italian (1534 or 1535) found eager readers even at Rome. There were also Dutch and Wendic versions. Portions of it have been translated into English—” On the Divine Essence,” by Dr. J. A. Seiss, in the *Evangelical Review*, 12:1-46; “On the Nature of Sin,” *Theological Essays from the Princeton Review*, p. 218-228. It was attacked by the papist, Richard Smyth, of England, and defended by Paulus ab Eitren, a Hamburg theologian, who prepared an edition’ with additional notes, and citations from the fathers. The renowned *Loci Theologici* of Chemnitz is a commentary upon it. Similar commentaries were written by Preetorius, Pezel, Strigel, and Fabricius, while Spangenberg, Sohn, Mayer, and Hemmingius have prepared abridgments. For many years it continued to be a text-book in the Lutheran schools,’ until-supplanted by Hutter’s Compend.

During Luther’s absence at the Wartburg, the care of the Reformation rested mainly upon Melancthon, With great ability he defended Luther against the theologians of Paris, but found himself unable to withstand the storm of fanaticism which arose among some of his former friends. He was even for a time greatly in doubt as to whether the pretensions of Carlstadt and the Zwickau prophets might not be true, and received from Luther a reproof because he dealt with them with so much mildness. Without any

reserve, he insisted on his own inability to meet the crisis, and urged the return of Luther as the only solution of the difficulty.

After Luther's return, he was diligently occupied in revising the translation of the Bible—a work in which his philological attainments were at several periods of invaluable service to the Church. In 1522 Luther wrote to Spalatine, asking that Melancthon might be relieved of teaching the classics, in order to devote his entire time to theology, but the latter objected, and preferred even to cease his theological instructions. In 1526, however, he was formally appointed professor of theology. During the two succeeding years he was the principal member of the commission to visit the churches and church-schools of Thuringia. *The Articles of Visitation*, prepared in connection with this commission, to give the ministers some directions concerning their preaching and teaching, are sometimes regarded as the earliest confession of the Lutheran Church. The importance which they attach to the preaching of the law, in order to guard against the abuse of the doctrine of justification by faith, excited the opposition of Agricola and others, and led to a conference at Torgau (q.v.), November, 1527, in which the position of Melancthon was approved. In February, 1529, he accompanied his prince to the Diet of Spires, and assisted in the preparation of the Protest, presented April 19th, from which the friends of the Reformation obtained the name Protestants. A few months later, October 1-3, he participated, together with Luther, Brentius, and others, in the Colloquy at Marburg (q.v.) with Zwingle and his adherents. In 1530 he accompanied the evangelical princes to the Diet of Augsburg, and there, on the basis of the seventeen articles prepared by Luther at Schwabach, elaborated the *Augsburg Confession*, which was presented to the emperor June 25. During its preparation the work was repeatedly revised by Luther, then at Coburg, in almost daily correspondence with Melancthon. “Melancthon, then, was by pre-eminence the composer of the Confession, not as a private individual, but as chief of a body of advisers, without whose concurrence nothing was fixed; Luther, by pre-eminence, as the divinely called representative of the Church, its author.” For a thorough examination of the relation which Melancthon sustained to the Augsburg Confession, the reader is referred to Krauth's *Conservative Reformation*, p. 201-267. The hypothesis of the rationalist Ruckert, that Melancthon intended by it to effect a compromise with Rome, and that, for this purpose, a conspiracy was formed to keep Luther in ignorance of the plan, is there completely overthrown. Melancthon's excessive love of peace, and

his desire to bring together into an organic union all the Protestant churches, caused him in after years to forget that the Augsburg Confession was the work of the Church, and not his own; for he felt himself at liberty to publish numerous revised editions, in which he made frequent changes. These changes, originating the distinction between the *Variata* and *Invariata*, almost caused a rupture with Luther, and ultimately resulted in controversies which imperilled the life of the Lutheran churches. Notwithstanding these changes, it cannot be proved that his personal convictions were at any succeeding period actually different from the teaching of the unaltered Confession. He repeatedly declared, until the close of his life, that his faith was unchanged. His object in the alterations was simply to generalize those statements which were so specific in their declaration of the Lutheran faith as to prevent the endorsement of the adherents of Calvin and others. He was constantly seeking for a generic form of agreement in which the specific differences might be lost sight of. He remained at Augsburg until late in September, employed in fruitless negotiations with the Romish theologians. The confutation of the Augsburg Confession, presented August 3, led him in reply to prepare the Apology—a masterpiece which the Lutheran Church has prized so highly as to number it among her symbols.

His Catechism (*Catechesis Puerilis*) appeared in 1532. In 1535 and 1536 he was actively engaged in negotiations with Bucer to secure a union of the Protestant churches on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. As the result of these efforts, the Wittenberg Concord was signed May 28, 1536. In February, 1537, he was a member of the convention at Smalcald, and signed the *Articles*, with the proviso that he would acknowledge the supreme authority of the pope, *jure humano*, if the latter would permit the preaching of the pure Gospel. In the negotiations with the papists at Worms (1540), and at Ratisbon (1541), he was the principal theologian of the Protestants. At the latter conference his compromising spirit acceded to articles clothed in such ambiguous language as to admit the interpretation either of an affirmation or a denial of the doctrine of justification by faith; but the object of the conference failed, because of an irreconcilable difference concerning the externals of religion, in which Melancthon displayed more than his ordinary firmness. In 1542 and 1543 he was employed by the archbishop and elector of Cologne to superintend the introduction of the Reformation into his territories. The book of instruction prepared in connection with this work excited the indignation of Luther

against Melancthon, until the latter assured him that Bucer was alone responsible for the article on the Lord's Supper. Early in 1545, at the request of the elector, he prepared a pamphlet *on The Reformation of Wittenberg*, which was sent to the Council of Trent as a summary of the doctrines of the Lutheran Reformers. After the death of Luther, in 1546, he was the acknowledged head of the Reformation, but unfortunately became again involved in negotiations with the papists, to whom he made the most remarkable concessions. His connection with the Leipsic Interim (1548) was the most unfortunate act of his life. Under the form of an apparent compromise, he yielded to the papists many of the most essential points of difference between them and the Protestants. "He was willing to tolerate both a popedom and a hierarchy, stripped, however, of divine rights, and deprived of all power in matters of faith. The relation of faith to works, and the doctrine of the sacraments, might, in his estimation, be veiled in a judicious obscurity of phrase." In every part of the evangelical Church the *Interim* was most violently resisted, and his connection with it strongly condemned. In addition to private rebukes from Calvin and Brentius, Agricola, Flacius, and others publicly attacked him. In 1550' he published his *Explanation of the Nicene Creed*, and in the succeeding year the *Confessio Saxonica*, in which he had gained courage to entirely repudiate the concessions of the *Interim*. In 1552 he was engaged in a controversy with Osiander, who had confounded justification with sanctification; in 1553 he published brief treatises against Schwenckfeldt and Stancar, and in 1554 his *Examnen Ordinandorum*, a brief outline of doctrinal, ethical, and polemical theology, for the use of candidates for the ministry. His efforts during his last years to unite the followers of Calvin with those of Luther, and his attendance at another religious conference at Worms (1557) with the papists, were equally unsuccessful.

Melancthon was undoubtedly the great theologian of the Lutheran Reformation. Yet the very gifts which were of such great service in reducing the purified doctrine to a connected system, and organizing the outward form of the Church, constantly tempted him to seek for external union, even at the expense of principles essential to all true inner harmony. This tendency, fostered by his classical tastes and natural amiability and timidity, rendered him very unsafe as a leader, although so strong when under the guidance of a firmer will, as that of Luther. It is to this that Calvin referred when he heard of Melancthon's death: "O, Philip Melancthon! for it is upon thee whom I call, upon thee, who now livest

with Christ in God, and art waiting for us, until we shall attain that blessed rest. A hundred times, worn out with fatigue and overwhelmed with care, thou hast laid thy head upon my breast and said, Would God I might die here. And a thousand times since then I have earnestly desired that it had been granted us to be together. Certainly thou wouldst have been more valiant to face danger, and stronger to despise hatred, and bolder to disregard false accusations.”

*Literature.* — The first edition of his collected work was published at Basle, 15,1; the second, edited by his son-in-law, Peucer, Wittenberg, 1562-64 (4 vols. fol.). The most valuable is that of the *Corpus Reformatorum*, edited by Bretschneider and Bindseil (1834-60, 28 vols. fol.). A complete catalogue of Melancthon's writings, and of their different editions, etc., was published by H. E. Bindseil, entitled *Bibliotheca Melancthoniana* (Halle, 1868, 8vo, 28 pp.). The tercentenary of Melancthon's decease has called forth a large number of addresses and essays to celebrate his memory. Besides the admirable orations of Dorner, Kahnis, and Rothe, are W. Thilo, *Melancthon in the Service of the Holy Scriptures*; F. A. Nitzelnadel, *Philip Melancthon, the Teacher of Germany*; W. Beyschlag, *Philippians Mel., a Sketch in Church History*; FW. Genthe, *Oration at Eisleben*; H. Keil, *Laudatio Philippians Melancthonis*; IH. K. Sack, a *Sermon at Magdeburg*; C. Schlottmann, *De Philippians Mel. reipublicoe literarice Reformnator*; J. Classen, *Melancthon's Relations to Frankfort-on-the-Main*. Other works have been published upon some of the pupils and friends of Melancthon; e.g. J. Classen, on Jacob Miccyllus, rector at Frankfort, and professor in Heidelberg, 1526 to 1558; E. W. Lihn, on Dr. Caspar Creutziger (Cruciger), a pupil of both Melancthon and Luther, Reb. Tagmann, on Petrus Vincentius of Breslau. The earliest life of Melancthon' was written by his friend Camerarius. The *Annales Vita*, in vol. xxviii, Corp. Ref., afford the richest biographical material. Biographies have been written by Camerarius (1566), Strobel (1777), Niemeyer (1817), Kdthe (1829), Facius (1832), Ulenberg (1836), Heyd (1839), Galle (1840), Matthes (1841), Ledderhose (1847), Wohlfahrt (1860), C. Schmidt (1861), Meurer, Plank (1866), and others. Those accessible to English readers are the valuable but brief sketch by Dr. F. A. Cox, and an excellent translation of Ledderhose by Dr. G. F. Krotel (Phila. 1855). See also Krauth's *Conservative Reformation*, p. 220 sq.; Seckendorf's *Historia Lutheranismi*; Ranke, *Hist. Ref.* p. 132; Cunningham, *Reformers*; D'Aubigny, *Hist. Ref.* 1:97,325; Nisard, *Etudes sur la Renaissance*;

Hardwick, *Hist. Ref.* p. 30 sq.; Barnet, *Hist. Ref.*; Gieseler, *Church Hist.* vol. iv, ch. i; Mosheim, *Ecclesiastes Hist.* vol. iii; Hagenbach, *Kirchengesch.* vol. iii; Fisher, *Hist. Ref.* p. 97 sq.; Dorner, *Gesch. der protestant. Theologie*, p. 108, 320, 329; *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1846, p. 301 1864, p. 448; *Jahrbuch deutscher Theol.* vol. x, pt. i, p. 185; 1870, 3:503; 4:615; *Mercersburg Revelation* 1850, p. 325, Kitto, *Journ. Sac. Lit.* 1854, p. 185; 3 *Meth. Qu. Revelation* 1855, p. 163; 1860, p. 676: *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1859, vol. ii; *Brit. and For. Ev. Revelation* 1861, Jan.; 1868, Oct.; *Am. Theol. Revelation* 1861, April; 1860, p. 529; *Amer. Presbyt. Revelation* 1861, p. 261; *Zeitschr. wissensch. Theol.* 1871, vol. ii, art. 8:(H. E. J.)

### Melangists (Or Convulsionists)

is the name of a degenerate sect of Jansenists (q.v.). It originated in 1727, upon the decease of Francois de Paris. He had been noted for his piety and asceticism, and, now that he had left his earthly abode, multitudes flocked to his grave, and there, in various ways, testified their superstitious regard and veneration. Marvellous cures were claimed to be wrought there, and miracles were said to be performed. Strong religious emotions were manifested, and some were seized with convulsions. Some were endowed with the spirit of prophecy, and predicted the overthrow of Church and State. Many of the fanatics themselves claimed that their miraculous doings were divinely inspired, while others ascribed them to evil influences. Those who considered these curious works inspired by evil influences were called "Discernents," while the believers received the name of *Melangists*, because they supposed themselves partly actively, partly passively inspired. "The superstition and fanaticism which prevailed at Francois's grave soon after his death were not wholly confined to the common people, but were shared by a considerable number of men of rank and learning. These religious excesses, however, tended to create a general prejudice against Jansenism, and really ruined the cause—at least in France; or, as Voltaire aptly remarks, "The grave of St. Francois of Paris became the grave of Jansenism."

### Melania, St.

called THE YOUNGER, a Roman lady of a noble family, who was born about AD. 388, became a convert to Christianity and founded a convent in Palestine, and subsequently a monastery near Mount Calvary. She was the

daughter of a Roman consul, and one of the many noble ladies of the Eternal City who joined the cause of the Christians. She died in 439, and her death is commemorated by the Church of Rome Dec. 31. See Mace, *Hist. de Sainte-Melanie* (Paris, 1729, 12mo).

### Melati'ah

(Hebrews *Melatyah'*, **hyf] m]** *deliverance of Jehovah*; Sept. **Μαλταίς**, but most copies omit), a Gibeonite who repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem on the northern side, after the return from Babylon (<sup><407></sup>Nehemiah 3:7). BC. 446.

### Mel'chi

(**Μελχι**, for Hebrews **yKəḥi** *my king*), the name of two of Christ's maternal ancestors. *SEE GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST.*

**1.** The son of Addi and father (maternal grandfather) of Neri or Neriah (<sup><433></sup>Luke 3:28); probably identical with the MAASEIAH of <sup><448></sup>2 Chronicles 34:8).

**2.** The son of Janna and father of Levi, fourth in ascent from the Virgin Mary (<sup><434></sup>Luke 3:24). BC. much ante 22.

### Melchi'ah

(Hebrews *Malkiyah*, **hYKəḥi** *Jehovah's king*; Sept. **Μελχίας**), a priest, the father of Pashur (<sup><210></sup>Jeremiah 21:1); elsewhere called MALCHIAH (<sup><480></sup>Jeremiah 38:1; <sup><6112></sup>Nehemiah 11:12) and MALCHIJAH (<sup><13912></sup>1 Chronicles 9:12).

### Melchi'as

(**Μελχίας**), the Greek form (in'the Apocrypha) of the Hebrews MALCHIAH; namely, (a) 1 Esdr. 9:26; (b) 1 Esdr. 9:32; (c) 1 Esdr. 9:44.

### Mel'chiel

(**Μελχειήλ**), a person whose son Charmis was one of the three governors of Bethulia (Judith 6:15). The Vulgate has a different reading, making Charmis the same as Gothoniel; and the Peshito gives the name *Manshajel*.

## Melchior

the name attributed in Romish legends to one of the wise men who visited the infant Saviour. *SEE MAGI.*

## Melchior, ALBRECHT WILHELM

a German theologian, was born at Herborn March 12, 1685. His father, who died in 1690, was superintendent and professor of theology. Albrecht commenced his academic course at Duisburg, but continued his studies at the university at Franecker. He paid special attention to Oriental languages and literature. He finished his studies at Utrecht, and returned to Duisburg. He was in 1709 installed as minister at Muhlheim, and made professor of theology at Hanau in 1718. Upon taking this position he delivered an essay, *De religione et verce religionis criteriis*. In 1723 he was called to a professorship of theology and Church history at Franecker, where he died. Aug. 11, 1738. Melchior made quite a name for himself in theological literature. He published several dogmatic and exegetical dissertations to prove the authenticity of the miracles of Christ. 'A list of all his productions, of minor value at present, is given by Diring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschl.* s.v.

## Melchis'edec

(Hebrews v-vii). *SEE MELCHIZEDEK.*

## Melchi-Shu'a

(<sup>Q144</sup>1 Samuel 14:49; 31:2). *SEE MALCHISHUA,*

## Melchites

or MELERITES (from *Ēl m*, a king), i.e. *Royalists*, is the name given to those Syriac, Egyptian, and other Christians of the Levant, who acknowledge the authority of the pope and the doctrines of the Church of Rome. Excepting some few points of little or no importance, which relate only to ceremonies and ecclesiastical discipline, the Melchites are in every respect professed Greeks; but they are governed by a particular patriarch, who assumes the title of Patriarch of Antioch. Their origin is referred to the labors of the Jesuits in the 17th century, and the name of *Melchites* was given to them because they agreed with the Greeks who submitted to the Council of Chalcedon, and was designed by their enemies to brand them

with the reproach of having done so merely in conformity to the religion of the emperor. They celebrate mass in the Arabic language, use unleavened bread in the Eucharist, and their priests (not their bishops) are allowed to marry. They have also some monastic establishments, whose inmates follow the rule of St. Basil, the common rule of all the Greek monks. See Farrar, *Ecclesiastes Dict.*; Eadie, *Ecclesiastes Cyclop.*; Neale, *Hist. East. Church*, ch. 2:7; Neander, *Church Hist.* 3:176.

## Melchiz'edek

(Hebrews *Malki'-Tse'dek*, **מלכיצדק**, *king of righteousness*, i.e. righteous king, comp. Hebrews vii 2; Sept. and N.T. **Μελχισεδέκ**, and so Anglicized in the N.T. “Melchisedec;” Josephus, **Μελχισεδέκης**, *Ant.* 1:10, 2), the “priest of the most high God,” and king of Salem, who went forth to meet Abraham on his return from the pursuit of Chedorlaomer and his allies, who had carried Lot away captive. The interview is described as having occurred in the “valley of Shaveh (or the level valley), which is the king’s valley.” He brought refreshment, described in the general terms of “bread and wine,” for the fatigued warriors, and bestowed his blessing upon their leader, who, in return, gave to the royal priest a tenth of all the spoil which had been acquired in his expedition (<sup>OLD</sup>Genesis 14:18,20). BC. cir. 2080. **SEE ABRAHAM**. In one of the Messianic Psalms (cx. 4) it is foretold that the Messiah should be “a priest after the order of Melchizedek;” which the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews (vi. 20) cites as showing that Melchizedek was a type of Christ, and the Jews themselves, certainly, on the authority of this passage of the Psalms, regarded Melchizedek as a type of the regal-priesthood, higher than that of Aaron, to which the Messiah should belong. The bread and wine which were set forth on the table of show-bread, was also supposed to be represented by the bread and wine which the king of Salem brought forth to Abraham (Schottgen, *Hor.* <sup>NEW</sup>*Hebrews* 2:615). In the following discussions respecting his person, office, and locality, we substantially adhere to the traditionary view of this character.

There is something surprising and mysterious in the first appearance of Melchizedek, and in the subsequent references to him. Bearing a title which Jews in afterages would recognise as designating their own sovereign, bringing gifts which recall to Christians the Lord’s Supper, this Canaanite crosses for a moment the path of Abraham, and is unhesitatingly recognised as a person of higher spiritual rank than the friend of God.

Disappearing as suddenly as he came in, he is lost to the sacred writings for a thousand years, and then a few emphatic' words for another-moment bring him into sight as a type of the coming Lord of David. Once more, after another thousand years, the Hebrew Christians are taught to see in him a proof that it was the consistent purpose of God to abolish the Levitical priesthood. His person, his office, his relation to Christ, and the seat of his sovereignty, have given rise to innumerable discussions, which even now can scarcely be considered as settled. Hence the faith of early ages ventured to invest his person with superstitious awe. A mysterious supremacy came also to be assigned to him (" the great high-priest," Philo, *Opp.* 2:34) by reason of his having received tithes from the Hebrew patriarch; and on this point the Epistle to the Hebrews (~~800~~ Hebrews 7:1-10) expatiates strongly. But the Jews, in admitting this official or personal superiority of Melchizedek to Abraham, sought to account for it by alleging that the royal priest was no other than Shem, the most pious of Noah's sons, who, according to the shorter chronology might have lived to the time of Abraham (Bochart, *Phaleg*, 2:1), and who, as a survivor of the deluge, is supposed to have been authorized by the superior dignity of old age to bless even the father of the faithful, and entitled, as the paramount lord of Canaan (~~800~~ Genesis 9:26), to convey (xiv. 19) his right to Abraham. Jerome, in his *Ep.* lxxiii, *ad Evangelium* (in *Opp.* 1:438), which is entirely devoted to a consideration of the person and dwelling-place of Melchizedek, states that this was the prevailing opinion of the Jews in his time; and it is ascribed to the Samaritans by Epiphanius (*Haer.* 55:6, p. 472). It was afterwards embraced by Luther and Melancthon, by H. Broughton, Selden, Lightfoot (*Chor. Marco proem.* ch. 10:1, § 2), Jackson (*On the Creed*, bk. ix, § 2), and by many others. Equally old, perhaps, but less widely diffused, is the supposition, not unknown to Augustine (*Quest. in Genesis* lxxii, in *Opp.* 3:396), and ascribed by Jerome (*l. c.*) to Origen and Didymus, that Melchizedek was an angel. The fathers of the 4th and 5th centuries record with reprobation the tenet of the Melchizedekians that he was a Power, Virtue, or Influence of God (August. *De Hceresibus*, § 34, in *Opp.* 8:11; Theodoret, *Hoeret. fab.* 2:6, p. 332; Epiphan. *Hoer.* 55:1, p. 468; comp. Cyril Alexand. *Glaph. in* ~~800~~ Genesis 2:57) superior to Christ (Chrysost. *Hom. in Melchiz.* in *Opp.* vi, p. 269) and the not less daring conjecture of Hieracas and his followers that Melchizedek was the Holy Ghost (Epiphan. *Hoer.* lxxvii. 3, p. 711, and 55:5, p. 472). Epiphanius also mentions (lv. 7, p. 474) some members of the Church as holding the erroneous opinion that Melchizedek was the Son of God appearing in

human form an opinion which Ambrose (*De Abrah.* i, § 3, in *Opp.* 1:288) seems willing to receive, and which has been adopted by many modern, critics. Similar to this was a Jewish opinion that he was the Messiah (ap. Deyling, *Obs. Sacr.* 2:73; Schittgen, *l. c.*; comp. the book Sohar, ap. Wolf, *Curae Philippians* in <sup><800></sup>Hebrews 7:1). Modern writers have added to these conjectures that he may have been Ham (Jurieu), or a descendant of Japhet (Owen), or of Shem (ap. Deyling, *l. c.*), or Job (Kohlreis), or Mizraim, or Canaan, or even Enoch (Deyling, *Observat. Sacr.* 2:71 sq.; Clayton, *Chronology of the Hebrews Bible*, p. 100). Other guesses may be found in Deyling (*l. c.*) and in Pfeiffer (*De persona Melch.* in *Opp.* p. 51). All these opinions are unauthorized additions to Holy Scripture—many of them seem to be irreconcilable with it. The conjecture, however, which holds Melchizedek to have been Shem (see Jerome, ad *Isaiah* xli), and which we find in Rashi on Genesis as well as in the Jerusalem Targum, and also that of Jonathan (ad loc. Gen.), but not in that of Onkelos, requires an explanation how his name came to be changed, how he is found reigning in a country inhabited by the descendants of Ham, how he came forth to congratulate Abraham on the defeat of one of his own descendants, as was Chedorlaomer, and how he could be said to have been without recorded parentage (<sup><800></sup>Hebrews 7:3), since the pedigree of Shem must have been notorious. In that case, also, the difference of the priesthoods of Melchizedek and Levi would not be so distinct as to bear the argument which the Epistle to the Hebrews founds upon it. Rejecting on such grounds this opinion, others, as we have seen, in their anxiety to vindicate the dignity of Abraham from marks of spiritual submission to, any mortal man, have held that Melchizedek was no other than the Son of God himself. But in this case it would hardly have been said that he was made “like unto the Son of God” (<sup><800></sup>Hebrews 7:3), or that Christ was constituted” a priest” after the order of Melchizedek (<sup><800></sup>Hebrews 6:20), or, in other words, was a type of himself. The best founded opinion seems to be that of Carpzov (*Apparat. Antiq. Sacr. Cod.* chap. iv, p. 52) and most judicious moderns, who, after Josephus (*War.* 6:10), allege that he: was a principal person among the Canaanites and posterity of Noah, and eminent for holiness and justice, and therefore discharged the priestly as well as regal functions among the people; and we may conclude that his twofold capacity of king and priest (characters very commonly muted in the remote ages; see Schwebel, *De causis conjunctce olim c. regno sacerdotii dignitatis*, Onold. 1769; JG. Miller, *De regibus ap. antiq. populos sacerdotibus*, Jen. 1746) afforded Abraham an opportunity of

testifying his thankfulness to God, in the manner usual in those times, by offering a tenth of all the spoil. This combination of characters happens for the first time in Scripture to be exhibited in his person, which, with the abrupt manner in which he is introduced, and the nature of the intercourse between him and Abraham, render him in various respects an appropriate and obvious type of the Messiah in his united regal and priestly character. The way in which he is mentioned in Genesis would lead to the immediate inference that Melchizedek was of one blood with the children of Ham, among whom he lived, chief (like the king of Sodom) of a settled Canaanitish tribe. This was the opinion ‘of most of the early fathers (ap. Jerome, *l. c.*), of Theodoret (*in Genesis* lxiv, p. 77), and Epiphanius (*Hoer.* lxxvii, p. 716), and is now generally received (see Grotius in *Hebr.*; Patrick’s *Commentary in Gen.*; Bleek, *Hebraer.* 2:303; Ebrard, *Hebraer.*; Fairbairn, *Typology*, 2:313, ed. 1854). As Balaam was a prophet, so Melchizedek was a priest among the corrupted heathen (Philo, *Abrah.* 39; Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* 1:9), not self-appointed (as Chrysostom suggests, *Hom. in Genesis* 35, § 5; comp. <sup><S004></sup>Hebrews 5:4), but constituted by a special gift from God, and recognised as such by him.

Melchizedek combined the offices of priest and king, as was not uncommon in patriarchal times. Nothing is said to distinguish his kingship from that of the contemporary kings of Canaan; but the emphatic words in which he is described, by a title never given even to Abraham, as a “priest of the most high God,” as blessing Abraham and receiving tithes from him, seem to imply that his priesthood was something more (see Hengstenberg, *Christol.* Psalm 110) than an ordinary patriarchal priesthood, such as Abraham himself and other heads of families (<sup><S005></sup>Job 1:5) exercised. Although it has been observed (Pearson, *On the Creed*, p. 122, ed. 1843) that we read of no other sacerdotal act performed by Melchizedek, but only that of blessing [and receiving tithes, Pfeiffer]; yet; it may be assumed that he was accustomed to discharge all the ordinary duties of those who are “ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices” (<sup><S006></sup>Hebrews 8:3); and we might concede (with Philo, Grotius, *l. c.*, and others) that his regal hospitality to Abraham was possibly preceded by an unrecorded sacerdotal act of oblation to God, without implying that his hospitality was in itself, as recorded in Genesis, a sacrifice.

The “order of Melchizedek,” in <sup><S001></sup>Psalm 110:4, is explained by Gesenius and Rosenmuller to mean “manner” =likeness in official dignity = a king and priest. The relation between Melchizedek and Christ as type and

antitype is made in the Epistle to the Hebrews to consist in the following particulars:

1. Melchizedek was the priest of the most high God by an immediate divine constitution; so Christ was a priest after his order, and not after that of Aaron.
2. Melchizedek derived his priestly office from no predecessor, and delivered it down to no successor; in this respect Christ also stands alone: “Our Lord sprang from the tribe of Judah, of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood.”
3. Melchizedek was superior to Abraham, consequently his priesthood was superior to that of Levi and his descendants. So Christ’s priesthood was superior to the Aaronic.
4. Melchizedek was *the priest appointed* to exercise his office in behalf of all the worshippers of the true God; so Christ is the universal priest, the only one appointed to make intercession for our guilty race.
5. Melchizedek’s priesthood was limited to no definite time; this circumstance is noticed just as it would have been had his priesthood had neither beginning nor end “Christ is a priest forever” (<sup><B004></sup>Psalm 110:4). 6. Each sustained the high honors of king and priest; and the significant appellations are applied to birth. “Righteous King and King of Peace” (<sup><B301></sup>Isaiah 32:1; 7:6, 7). In the Messianic prediction (<sup><B004></sup>Psalm 110:4), “.Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek,” the phrase “forever” is not to be understood in the absolute sense, either of Melchizedek’s priesthood or of Christ’s. Melchizedek’s priesthood terminated with his life; so Christ’s priestly and kingly office as Mediator will both cease when the work of redemption is fully accomplished (<sup><B52></sup>1 Corinthians 15:24, 28). But in neither case is there any statute which limits the specified accession to office and of egress from it. To these points of agreement, noted by the apostle, human ingenuity has added others which, however, stand in need of the evidence of either an inspired writer or an eye-witness before they can be received as facts and applied to establish any doctrine. Thus J. Johnson (*Unbloody Sacrifice*, 1:123, ed. 1847) asserts on very slender evidence that the fathers who refer to <sup><01418></sup>Genesis 14:18, understood that Melchizedek offered the bread and wine to God; and hence he infers that one great part of our Saviour’s Melchizedekian priesthood consisted in offering bread and wine. Bellarmine asks in what

other respects is Christ a priests after the order of Melchizedek. Waterland, who does not lose sight of the deep significancy of Melchizedek's action, has replied to Johnson in his *Appendix* to "the Christian Sacrifice explained" (ch. iii, § 2, *Works*, v. 165, ed. 1843). Bellarmine's question is sufficiently answered by Whitaker, *Disputation on Scripture* (Quest. ii, ch. x, p. 168, ed. 1849). The sense of the fathers, who sometimes expressed themselves in rhetorical language, is cleared from misinterpretation by bishop Jewel, *Reply to Harding*, art. xvii (*Works*, 2:731, ed. 1847). In Jackson, *On the Creed* (bk. ix, § 2, ch. vi-xi, p. 955 sq.), there is a lengthy but valuable account of the priesthood of Melchizedek; and the views of two different theological schools are ably stated by Aquinas (*Summa*, 3:22, § 6) and Turretin (*Theologia*, 2:443-453).

Another fruitful source of discussion has been found in the site of Salem and Shaveh, which certainly lay in Abraham's road from Hobah to the plain of Mamre, and which are assumed to be near to each other. The various theories may be briefly enumerated as follows:

**(1)** Salem is supposed to have occupied in Abraham's time the ground on which afterwards Jebus and then Jerusalem stood; and Shaveh to be the valley east of Jerusalem through which the Kidron flows. This opinion, abandoned by Reland (*Pal.* p. 833), but adopted by Winer, is supported by the facts that Jerusalem is called Salem in <sup><19712></sup>Psalm 76:2, and that Josephus (*Ant.* 1:10, 2) and the Targums distinctly assert their identity; that the king's dale (<sup><10638></sup>2 Samuel 18:18), identified in <sup><11417></sup>Genesis 14:17, with Shaveh, is placed by Josephus (*Ant.* 7:10, 3), and by mediaeval and modern tradition (see Ewald, *Gesch.* 3:239), in the immediate neighborhood of Jerusalem; that the name of a later king of Jerusalem, Adonizedek (Joshua x,1), sounds like that of a legitimate successor of Melchizedek; and that Jewish writers. (*ap.* Schottgen, *Hor. Hebrews* in <sup><30712></sup>Hebrews 7:2) claim Zedek= righteousness, as a name of Jerusalem.

**(2)** Jerome (*Opp.* 1:446) denies that Salem is Jerusalem, and asserts that it is identical with a town-near Scythopolis or Bethshan, which in his time retained the name of Salem, and in which some extensive ruins were shown as the remains of Melchizedek's palace. He supports this view by quoting <sup><10638></sup>Genesis 30:18, where, however, the translation is questionable; compare the mention of Salem in Judith 4:4, and in <sup><11417></sup>John 3:23.

**(3)** Stanley, (*S. and P.* p. 237) is of opinion that there is every probability that Mount Gerizim is the place where Melchizedek, the priest of the Most

High, met Abraham. Eupolemus (ap. Eusebius, *Prep. Evang.* 9:17), in a confused version of this story, names Argerizim, the mount of the Most High, as the place in which Abraham was hospitably entertained. (4) Ewald, *Gesch.* 3:239) denies positively that it is Jerusalem, and says that it must be north of Jerusalem on the other side of Jordan (i. 410): an opinion which Rodiger (Ges. *Thesaurus*, p. 1422 *b*) condemns. There, too, Stanley thinks that the king's dale was situated, near the spot where Absalom fell. *SEE KING'S DALE.*

Some Jewish writers have held the opinion that Melchizedek was the writer and Abraham the subject of Psalm cx. See Deyling, *Obs. Sacr.* 3:137. It may suffice to mention that there is a fabulous life of Melchizedek printed among the spurious works of Athanasius, 4:189.

Reference may be made to the following works in addition to those already mentioned: two tracts on Melchizedek by M. J. H. von Elswick, in the *Thesaurus Novus Theolog.-philologicus*; L. Borgisius, *Historia Critica Melchisedeci* (Bern. 1706); Quandt, *De sacerdotio Melch.* (Regiom. 1737); Gaillard, *Melchisedecus Christus* (Leyd. 1686); M. C. Hoffman, *De Melchisedeco* (1669); H. Broughton, *Treatise on Melchizedek* (1591); Kirchmaier, *De Melchisedeco* (Rotterd. 1696); Lange, *idem* (Hal. 1713, 1714); Danhauer, *idem* (Strasb. 1684); Pietsch, *idem* (Hale. 1713); Reinhart, *idem* (Wittenb. 1751); Wahner, *idem* (Gitt. 1745); Henderson, *Melchisedek* (Lond. 1839); and other monographs cited in Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliogr.* col. 183, 1607. See also J. A. Fabricius, *Cod. Pseudepigr.* V. T.; P. Molinaeus, *Vates*, etc. (1640), 4:11; J. H. Heidegger, *Hist. Sacr. Patriarcharum* (1671), 2:288; Hottinger, *Ennead. Disput.*; P. Cuneus, *De Republ.* <sup>SCRIB</sup> Hebrews 3:3, apud *Crit. Sacr.* vol. v; Ursini, *Analect. Sacr.* 1:349; Krahmer, in Illgen's *Zeitschr.* 7:4, p. 87; Auberlein, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 3:1857, 453 sq.; *Presb. Quar. Revelation* Oct. 1861.

### Melchizedekians

a sect which arose in the Christian Church about the beginning of the 3d century, and was composed mainly of Jewish converts. They affirmed that Melchizedek was not a man, but a heavenly power superior to Jesus Christ; for Melchizedek, they said, was the intercessor and mediator of the angels; and Jesus Christ was only so for man, and his priesthood only a copy of that of Melchizedek. Similar views were revived among the *Hieracites*. See Theodoret, *Hoeres. Sat.* 2:5, 6.

## Meldenius, Rupertus

a German Protestant theologian of the 17th century, is known especially by his work entitled *Parenesis votivapro pace ecclesice ad Theologos: Augustance Confessionis* s. 1, et a. Very little is known of his life, and it was even at one time supposed that the name was fictitious. Yet the existence of Meldenius appears now well established. He was a warm supporter of the *Formula Concordice*, and did not contemplate a union of the two churches, but at the same time he wished the spirit of scholastic controversy which then ruled the churches to give way to real, practical piety and peace. In the first part of his work he denounces the state of the Lutheran Church, and in the second he presents the remedy for it. He accused theologians of not distinguishing sufficiently between essentials and non-essentials, and maintains that, while they should always be ready to defend their opinions, they ought not to be ceaselessly engaged in controversies. He claims that in order to labor efficiently for the edification of his flock the minister must himself lead a holy life, and nothing, in his opinion, can be worse. than Pharisical hypocrisy, which is the origin of [φιλοδοξία](#), [φιλαργυρία](#), and [φιλονειχία](#). He ends his description of these besetting sins of the Church with the exclamation, *Serva nos Domine, alioqui(n) perimus*. In the second part he contrasts with these faults the opposite virtues of humility, moderation, and peacefulness which the Christian should possess. Want of Christian love he considers as the true cause of the state of affairs; there is enough of science, but a great lack of love. He cannot understand a minister whose sins have been pardoned by God not hiding under the shield of love the faults of his colleague. “*Omnium vero norma,*” says Rupertus, “*sit caritas cum prudentia quadam pia et humilitate non ficta conjuncta.*” He does not wish all controversies to cease, but to be conducted in a more moderate, charitable spirit. He then compares the actual state of religion with its state in the early ages, and concludes by saying, “*Si nos servaremus il necessariis unitatem, in non necessariis libertatem, in utrisque caritatem, optimo certe loco essent res nostrae.*” As essentials, Rupertus considers those principles which refer directly to the articles of faith or principal points in the Catechism, or such as can be clearly established from Scripture, such as were held by the early Church, proved such by the acts of synods or symbolic works, and, finally, those which all orthodox theologians agree upon as such. On the other hand, he holds as non-essential such points as are not clearly demonstrated by Scripture, do not forma an article of the Catechism, were not held by

the ancient Church, or considered necessary by the greater number of orthodox theologians. Rupertus openly declares that he does not hold the views of those who consider purity of doctrine as essential. The work is published by J. G. Pfeiffer in his *Miscellanea Theologica* (Leips. 1736); also by Lücke, *Ueber das Alter, den Verofasser, etc., des Kirchlichen Friedensspruches: In necessariis unitas, in non necessariis libertas, in utrisque caritas* (Getting. 1850). See Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie*, 9:304.

## Mel'ea

(Μελεᾶς, of uncertain signification), u person named as the son of Menan and father of Eliakim, among the maternal ancestry, of Jesus, in the private line of David (<sup><483></sup>Luke 3:31), but the name itself is of doubtful authenticity (see *Meth. Quar. Revelation* 1852, p. 597).

## Me'lech

(Hebrews *Me'lek*, עֵלֶם, king; Sept. Μελάχ and Μαλάχ v. r. Μαλώχ and Μαλώθ), the second named of the four sons of Micah, the grandson of Saul's son Jonathan (<sup><485></sup>1 Chronicles 8:35; 9:41). BC. post 1037. **SEE ALSO HAMMELECH; SEE EBED-MELECH; SEE NATHANMELECH; SEE REGEM-MIELECH.**

## Meletians

ASIATIC. The Arians in 331 had deposed Eustathius, bishop of Antioch, a learned and zealous Nicene; but 'a party who adhered to the Nicene symbol, and who called themselves Eustathians, continued to exist at Antioch. After appointing several successors to Eustathius. the Arians, in 360, transferred Meletius from the bishopric of Sebaste to that of Antioch. Although the Arians found they had made a mistake, and soon deposed him as an enemy of Arianism, yet only a part of the Nicenes at Antioch would acknowledge him as bishop, since the Eustathians regarded an Arian ordination as invalid. In this way two parties were formed among the Nicenes at Antioch—a strict party, the Eustathians; and a moderate party, the Meletians. This schism, after Athanasius had tried in vain to remove it, Lucifer made worse by ordaining as bishop over the Eustathians the presbyter Paulinus, in opposition to the wishes of Eusebius of Vercelli, who had been sent with him to Antioch, by the Alexandrian Synod, as his co-deputy. The entire Nicene portion of Christendom now became divided, in reference to this matter, into two parties; the Occidentals and Egyptians

recognising Paulinus as the true bishop of Antioch, and the majority of the Orientals, whose Nicene proclivities had been somewhat weakened by semi-Arian influences, recognising Meletius. *SEE EUSTATHIANS. SEE MELETIUS OF ANTIOCH.*

### Meletios, M.

an Eastern prelate, was born in the latter part of the 16th century, in Janina, in Epirus, and flourished first as metropolitan at Lepanto and Arta, and in the same position, after 1703, at Athens. He died at Constantinople in 1714. 'He wrote *Kirchengeschichte, aus demn Altgriechischen in's Neugriechische iibertragen* (Wein. 1780, 3 vols., with Notes by JVendoti).

### Meletius Of Antioch,

an eminent Greek ecclesiastic, was born in the beginning of the 4th century at Melitene, in Armenia Minor. His first important appointment was that of bishop of Sebaste (AD. 357), to which office he succeeded Eustathius, who had been deposed. *SEE EUSTATHIANS.* The wilful conduct of the people soon caused Meletius to resign, and he retired to Beroea, in Syria. At this time the Arian controversy caused so much excitement that sectarian zeal was fast displacing true piety. Meletius, however, by confining himself to the essential doctrines of the Gospel and ignoring polemical subjects, succeeded in winning the esteem of all except the extremists of both factions, and by universal assent was raised to the bishopric of Antioch (AD. 360). His new position gave such importance to his opinions that he could no longer remain indifferent to the disputes which were marring the concord of the Christian world. At the request of the emperor Constantius he gave an exposition of ~~1182~~ Proverbs 8:22, in which he expressed himself as being in sympathy. with the orthodox party. At this avowal the Arians became greatly excited, and succeeded in influencing the emperor to banish him to his native Melitene. Euzoius was installed in his place, and the orthodox party separated from the communion of the Arians. Previous to this the most zealous portion of the orthodox had withdrawn on account of the deposition of Eustathius, but the two seceding parties remained separate-the Eustathians adhering at this time to presbyter Paulinus, the intended successor of Eustathius, who had died in the mean while, and the other orthodox gathering around Meletius. On the accession of Julian as emperor (362), Meletius was recalled, and for two years endeavored to reconcile and unite the two factions of the

orthodox party; but the Eustathians refused to recognise him, and elected Paulinus as their bishop, who was duly ordained by Lucifer of Cagliari. On the accession of Valens, Meletius was again banished, but by an edict of Gratian (378) was recalled, and shortly after reinstated. The unrelenting prejudice of Paulinus frustrated all attempts at reconciliation, though Meletius proposed to him a just plan of union. Meletius died at an advanced age while attending the Council of Constantinople in AD. 381. His funeral oration, pronounced by Gregorius Nyssenus, is still extant. The schism in the Church lasted until 413 or 415, when bishop Alexander succeeded in reconciling the old orthodox party with the successor of Meletius. See Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 1:372 and 394; Gieseler, *Ecclesiastes Hist.* 1:201 sq.; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Romans Biog.* vol. ii, s.v.; Walch, *Ketzerhistorie*, vol. 4:**SEE MELETIANS**. (H. W. T.)

### Meletius Of Lycopolis

flourished in the Egyptian district of Thebais in the beginning of the 4th century. He was a prelate in the Church, and the founder of the Meletian sect, or, as they termed themselves, the *Church of the Martyrs*. During the bitter persecutions which the Christians suffered under the reign of Diocletian, he and his superior, Peter, archbishop of Alexandria, were thrown into prison. Many Christians had abjured their religious belief for the sake of freedom from persecution, and some of these, regretting their faithlessness, repaired to the two imprisoned bishops, desiring to receive absolution, and to become reconciled with the Church. Peter was in favor of granting the request of these *lapsi*, provided they would do penance; but Meletius, denouncing them as traitors, refused to have any intercourse with them, until at least all persecution had ceased. A majority of the Christians then in confinement approved of his course. This gave rise to a schism, which gained some prominence after the release of Meletius, who became the leader of the rebels, and from whom they received their name. After regaining his freedom he ordained some twenty-nine bishops, and even encroached upon the diocese of Peter with ordinations and excommunications. He was finally checked by the Council of Nice, who censured him, but allowed him to retain his title. The council also agreed to confirm his appointments, provided they would receive a new ordination from the proper authorities. The sect to which he gave rise, sometimes called *Egyptian Meletians*, lasted 'for nearly a century and a half, when its members made common cause with the Arians. See Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* i,451;

Gieseler, *Ecclesiastes Hist.* 1:166; Stanley, *Hist. of the East. Ch.* p. 256; Mosheim, *Ecclesiastes Hist.* 1:75; Hase, *Ch. Hist.* p. 690. (H.W.T.)

## Mel'icu

(-Hebrews marg. *Meliku'*, Wkyl æ] text *Meloki'*, ykaæ m] Sept. Μαλούχ v. r. Ἀμαλούχ, ulg. *Milicho*; <sup><1624></sup>Nehemiah 12:14). *SEE MALLUCH.*

## Melissus Of Samos,

a Greek philosopher, was born at Samos, and flourished in the 5th century (about 444) before Christ. It is said that he was not less distinguished as a citizen than as a philosopher, and that he commanded the fleet of his country during its insurrection against Athens. Melissus seems to have been the disciple of Parmenides; he studied at least the writings of the philosophers of the Eleatic school, and adopted their doctrines in a modified form; or, as one has it, "He took up the letter rather than the spirit of their system." He made his opinions known in a work written in Ionic prose, probably entitled *Of Being and of Nature*. He treated not of the infinite variety of things produced or engendered, but of eternal nature considered abstractly, apart from all concrete things, and, like Parmenides, called it *being*. Simplicius has preserved some fragments of this treatise, and the author (Aristotle or Theophrastus) of the book on Melissus, Xenophanes, and Gorgias, has made its doctrines well known. Melissus taught the same system of *idealism* as did the leaders of the Eleatic school, Xenophanes and Parmenides, but he is characterized by greater boldness in his way of stating it, and in some respects by profounder views. What really existed, he maintained, could neither be produced nor perish; it exists without having either commencement or end; infinite (differing in this respect from Parmenides), and consequently one; invariable, not composed of parts, and indivisible: which doctrine implies a denial of the existence of bodies, and of the dimensions of space. All that our senses present to us (that is to say, the greater part of things which exist) is nothing more than an *appearance* relative to our senses (τὸ ἐν ἡμῖν), and is altogether beyond the limits of real knowledge. He thus made the first though weak attempt, which was afterwards carried out by Zeno with far more acuteness and sagacity, to prove that the foundations of all knowledge derived from experience are in themselves contradictory, and that the reality of the actual world is inconceivable. As for the relation between real existence and the Deity, we are ignorant of the sentiments of Melissus on this head;

for what is reported by Diogenes Laertius (ix. 24) can be considered as relating only to the *popular* notions. Some important fragments of Melissus have been collected by Brandis in the first part of the *Commentationum Eleaticarum*, pars prima, p. 185 sq., and by M. Mullach in his excellent edition of the treatise *Aristotelis de Melisso, Xenophane, et Gorgia, Disputationes, cum Eleaticorum philosophorum fragmentis* (Berlin, 1846). The same editor inserts them in the *Fragmenta Philosophorum Graecorum* of the Didot collection (1860, 8vo). See Diogenes Laertius, 9:24; Plutarch, *Pericles*, p. 26, 27; Simplicius, *In Arist. Phys. de Celo.*; Ritter, *Gesch. der Philosophie*, vol. i; Tenneman's *Manual of Philosophy*, p. 68, 69; Smith, *Dict. of Class. Biog.* s.v.; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

## Mel'ita

(**Μελίτη**; probably of Phoenician etymology, and signifying *refuge*, otherwise *clay*; but according to Hammeker, *Miscell. Phoenic.* p. 46, so named from its abundance of *ash-trees*), an island in the Mediterranean, on which the ship which was conveying the apostle Paul as a prisoner to Rome was wrecked, and which was the scene of the interesting circumstances recorded in ~~478~~ Acts 27:28 (see J. Ab. Ciantari *Diss. apol. de Paulo in Melitam naufragio ejecto*, Ven. 1738).

## Picture for Melita 1

**I.** *Identification of the Locality.* — Melita was the ancient name of *Malta* (see J. F. Wandalin, *Diss. de Melita Pauli*, Havn. 1707), and also of a small island in the Adriatic, now called *Meleda* (**Μελιτίνη νῆσος**, Ptol. 2:17, 39; comp. Pliny, 3:30; Apollon. Rhod. 4:572), and each of these has found warm advocates for its identification with the Melita of Scripture (see Ciantar's edition of Abela's *Malta Illustrata*, 1:608), the former being the traditionary and long-established opinion (see Ign. Giorgi, *Paulus in mari quod nunc Venetus sinus dicitur, naeafragus*, Ven. 1730; Jac. de Rhoer, *De Pauli ad insul. Melit. naufragio*, Traj. ad R. 1743; comp. *Bibl. Ital.* 11:127; *Nov. Miscell. Lips.* 4:308; Paulus, *Samml.* 4:356), liable only to the objection that the part of the Mediterranean in which it is situated was not properly "the Sea of Adria" (Dr. Falconer's *Dissertation on St. Paul's Voyage*, 1817), which has been shown (see Wetstein's *Comment. ad loc.*) to be without force (see J. Smith, *Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul*, Lond. 1848; also Conybeare and Howson's *Life of St. Paul*, 2:353). As,

however, the controversy on this subject has been somewhat voluminous, we will discuss it in detail, referring to other articles for confirmation of the opinions and conclusions here expressed.

**1. Arguments in Favor of Malta.** —

(1.) We take St. Paul's ship in the condition in which we find her about a day after leaving Fair Havens, i.e. when she was under the lee of Clauda (~~4276~~ Acts 27:16). laid to on the starboard tack, and strengthened with "undergirders" *SEE SHIP*, the boat being just taken on board, and the gale blowing hard from the east-north-east. *SEE EUROCLYDON*.

(2.) Assuming (what every practiced sailor would allow) that the ship's direction of drift would be about west by north, and her rate of drift about a mile and a half an hour, we come at once to the conclusion, by measuring the distance on the chart, that she would be brought to the coast of Malta on the thirteenth day (see ver. 27).

(3.) A ship drifting in this direction to the place traditionally known as St. Paul's Bay, would come to that spot on the coast without touching any other part of the island previously. The coast, in fact, trends from this bay to the south-east. This may be seen on consulting any map or chart of Malta.

(4.) On Koura Point, which is the south-easterly extremity of the bay, there must infallibly have been breakers, with the wind blowing from the north-east. Now the alarm was certainly caused by breakers, for it took place in the night (ver. 27), and it does not appear that the passengers were at first aware of the danger which became sensible to the quick ear of the "sailors."

(5.) Yet the vessel did not strike; and this corresponds with the position of the point, which would be some little' distance on the port side, or to the left of the vessel.

(6.) Off this point of the coast the soundings are twenty fathoms (ver. 28), and a little farther, *in the direction of the supposed drift*, they are fifteen fathoms (ver. 28).

(7.) Though the danger was imminent, we shall find from examining the chart that there would still be time to anchor (ver. 29) before striking on the rocks ahead.

(8.) With bad holding-ground there would have been great risk of the ship dragging her anchors. But the bottom of St. Paul's Bay is remarkably tenacious. In Purdy's *Sailing Directions* (p. 180) it is said of it that "while the cables hold there is no danger, as the anchors will never start."

(9.) The other geological characteristics of the place are in harmony with the narrative, which describes the creek as having in one place a sandy or muddy beach (κόλπον ἔχοντα αἰγιαλόν, ver. 39), and which states that the bow of the ship was held fast in the shore, while the stern was exposed to the action of the waves (ver. 41). For particulars we must refer to the work (mentioned below) of Mr. Smith, an accomplished geologist.

(10.) Another point of local detail is of considerable interest—viz. that, as the ship took the ground, the place was observed to be διθάλασσος, i.e. a connection was noticed between two apparently separate pieces of water. We shall see, on looking at the chart, that this would be the case. The small island of Salmonetta would at first appear to be a part of Malta itself; but the passage would open on the right as the vessel passed to the place of shipwreck.

(11.) Malta is in the track of ships between Alexandria and Puteoli; and this corresponds with the fact that the "Castor and Pollux," an Alexandrian vessel which ultimately conveyed St. Paul to Italy, had wintered in the island (<sup><4381></sup>Acts 28:11).

(12.) Finally, the course pursued in this conclusion of the voyage, first to Syracuse and then to Rhegium, contributes a last link to the chain of arguments by which we prove that Melita is *Malta*.

## Picture for Melita 2

2. *Objections to Malta*. — The case is established to demonstration. Still it may be worth while to notice one or two objections. It is said, in reference to <sup><4277></sup>Acts 27:27, that the wreck took place in the Adriatic or Gulf of Venice. It is urged that a well-known island like Malta could not have been unrecognised (<sup><4273></sup>Acts 27:39), nor its inhabitants called "barbarous" (<sup><4382></sup>Acts 28:2). And as regards the occurrence recorded in 28:3, stress is laid on the facts that Malta has no poisonous serpents, and hardly any wood. To these objections we reply at once that ADRIA, in the language of the period, denotes not the Gulf of Venice, but the open sea between Crete and Sicily; that it is no wonder if the sailors did not recognise a

strange part of the coast on which they were thrown in stormy weather, and that they did recognise the place when they did leave the ship (~~481~~ Acts 28:1); that the kindness recorded of the natives (~~482~~ Acts 28:2, 10), shows that they were not “barbarians” in the sense of being savages, and that the word denotes simply that they did not speak Greek; and, lastly, that the population of Malta has increased in an extraordinary manner in recent times, that probably there was abundant wood there formerly, and that with the destruction of the wood many indigenous animals would disappear.

### Picture for Melita 3

**3. *Objections to Meleda.*** — In adducing positive arguments and answering objections, we have indirectly proved that Melita in the Gulf of Venice was not the scene of the shipwreck. But we may add that this island could not have been reached without a miracle under the circumstances of weather described in the narrative; that it is not in the track between Alexandria and Puteoli; that it would not be natural to proceed from it to Rome by means of a voyage embracing Syracuse: and that the soundings on its shore do not agree with what is recorded in the Acts.

**4. *History of the Controversy.***—An amusing passage in Coleridge’s *Table Talk* (p. 185) is worth noticing as the last echo of what is now an extinct controversy. The question has been set at rest forever by Mr. Smith, of Jordan Hill, in his *Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul*, the first published work in which it was thoroughly investigated from a sailor’s point of view. It had, however, been previously treated in the same manner, and with the same results, by admiral Penrose, and copious notes from his MSS. are given in *The Life and Epistles of St. Paul*. In that work (2d ed. p. 426, *note*) are given the names of some of those who carried on the controversy in the last century. The ringleader on the Adriatic side of the question, not unnaturally, was padre Georgi, a Benedictine monk connected with the Venetian or Austrian *Meleda*, and his *Paulus Naufragus* is extremely curious. He was, however, not the first to suggest this untenable view. We find it, at a much earlier period, in a Byzantine writer, Const. Porphyrog. *De Adm. Imp.* (c. 36, vol. ii, p. 164, of the Bonn ed.).

### Picture for Melita 4

**II. *Description and History of the Locality.*** — (In this portion we chiefly use the statements found in Kitto’s *Cyclopaedia*, s.v.)

**1. *The immediate Scene.*** — The name of St. Paul's Bay has been given to the place where the shipwreck is supposed to have taken place. This, the sacred historian says, was at "a certain creek with a shore," i.e. a seemingly practicable shore, on which they purposed, if possible, to strand the vessel, as their only apparent chance to escape being broken on the rocks. In attempting this the ship seems to have struck and gone to pieces on the rocky headland at the entrance of the creek. This agrees very well with St. Paul's Bay, more so than with any other creek of the island. This bay is a deep inlet on the north side of the island, being the last indentation of the coast but one from the western extremity of the island. It is about two miles deep, by one mile broad. The harbor which it forms is very unsafe at some distance from the shore, although there is good anchorage in the middle for light vessels. The most dangerous part is the western headland at the entrance of the bay, particularly as there is close to it a small island (Salamone), and a still smaller islet (Salmonetta), the currents and shoals around which are particularly dangerous in stormy weather. It is usually supposed that the vessel struck at this point. From this place the ancient capital of Malta (now Citta Vecchia, Old City) is distinctly seen at the distance of about five miles' and on looking towards the bay from the top of the church on the summit of the hill whereon the city stands, it is evident that the people of the town might easily from this spot have perceived in the morning that a wreck had taken place; and this is a circumstance which throws a fresh light on some of the circumstances of the deeply interesting transactions which ensued., *SEE SHIPWRECK.*

**2. *The Island in General.***—The island of Malta lies in the Mediterranean, about sixty miles south from Cape Passaro, in Sicily. It is about seventeen miles in length, and nine or ten in breadth. Near it, on the west, is a smaller island; called Gozo, the ancient Gaulos. Malta has no mountains or high hills, and makes no figure from the sea. It is naturally a barren rock, but has been made in parts abundantly fertile by the industry and toil of man. It was famous for its honey and fruits, for its cotton-fabrics, for excellent building stone, and for a wellknown breed of dogs. A few years before St. Paul's visit, corsairs from his native province of Cilicia made Melita. a frequent resort; and through subsequent periods of its history, Vandal and Arabian, it was often associated with piracy, The Christianity, however, introduced by Paul was never extinct. Melita, from its position in the Mediterranean, and from the excellence of its harbors, has always been important both in commerce and war.

The island was first colonized by the Phoenicians (hence the term “barbarian,” that is, neither Greek nor Roman, used in the sacred narrative, ~~<HERT>~~Acts 28:2), from whom it was taken by the Greek colonists in Sicily, about BC. 736; but the Carthaginians began to dispute its possession about BC. 528, and eventually became entire masters of it. The Phoenician language, in a corrupted form, continued to be spoken there in St. Paul’s day (Gesenius, *Versuch ub. malt. Sprache*, Leips. 1810). From the Carthaginians it passed to the Romans in the Second Punic War, BC. 242, who treated the inhabitants well, making Melita a municipium, and allowing the people to be governed by their own laws. The government was administered by a proprietor, who depended upon the pruetor of Sicily; and this office appears to have been held by Publius when Paul was on the island (~~<HERT>~~Acts 28:7). Its chief officer (under the governor of Sicily) appears from inscriptions to have had the special title of **πρῶτος Μελιταίων**, or *Primus Melitensium*, and this is the very phrase which Luke uses (~~<HERT>~~Acts 28:7). Mr. Smith could not find these inscriptions. There seems, however, no reason whatever to doubt their authenticity (see Bochart, *Opera*, 1:502; Abela, *Descr. Melitca*, p. 146, appended to the last volume of the *Antiquities* of Grsevius; and Bockh, *Corp. Insc.* 3:5754). On the division of the Roman empire, Melita belonged to the western-portion; but having, in AD. 553, been recovered from the Vandals by Belisarius, it was afterwards attached to the empire of the East. About the end of the 9th century the island was taken from the Greeks by the Arabs, who made it a dependency upon Sicily, which was also in their possession. The Arabs have left the impress of their aspect, language, and many of their customs upon the present inhabitants, whose dialect is to this day perfectly intelligible to the Arabians and to the Moors of Africa. Malta was taken from the Arabs by the Normans in AD. 1090, and afterwards underwent other changes till AD. 1530, when Charles V, who had annexed it to his empire, transferred it to the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem, whom the Turks had recently dispossessed of Rhodes. Under the knights it became a flourishing state, and was the scene of their greatest glory and most signal exploits (see Porter, *Malta and its Knights*, Lond. 1872). The institution having become unsuited to modern times, the Order of St. John of Jerusalem, commonly called Knights of Malta, gradually fell into decay, and the island was surrendered to the French under Bonaparte when on his way to Egypt in 1798. From them it was retaken by the English with the concurrence and assistance of the natives; and it was to have been restored to the Knights of Malta by the stipulations of the treaty of Amiens; but as

no sufficient security for the independence of the order (composed mostly of Frenchmen) could be obtained, the English retained it in their hands; and this necessary infraction of the treaty was the ostensible ground of the war which only ended with the battle of Waterloo. The island is still in the hands of the English, who have lately remodelled the government to meet the wishes of the numerous inhabitants. It has recently become the actual seat of an Anglican bishopric, which, however, takes its title from Gibraltar out of deference to the existing Catholic bishopric of Malta. See, in addition to the works above cited, P. Carlo, *Origine della Fede in Malta* (Milan, 1759); Carstens, *De apothesi Pauli in Melita* (Lubec, 1754); L. de Boisgelin, *Malte ancienne et moderne* (Par. 1809); Bartlett's *Overland Route* (Lond. 1851), p. 3-118; Smith's *Dict. of Class. Geogr.* s.v. Melita; M'Culloch's *Gazetteer*, s.v. Malta; also the observations and travels cited by Engelmann, *Bibl. Geog.* (see Index, s.v. Malta); and the monographs cited by Volbeding, Index Program. p. 84. **SEE PAUL.**

### Melito Of Sardis

bishop of the place after which he is named, and a writer of considerable eminence, flourished in the 2d century. So little is known of his personal history that it cannot be determined at what date he was elevated to the episcopacy, though he probably held the bishopric when the controversy arose at Laodicea respecting the observance of Easter, which caused him to write a book on the subject. This took place under Marcus Aurelius, to whom Melito presented an *Apology for Christianity*, according to Eusebius, in his *Chronicon*, in AD. 169-170. In this apology (which, recently re-discovered in a Syriac translation and placed in the British Museum, was lately [1866] rendered into English by the celebrated Cureton) Christianity is described as a philosophy that had indeed originated among the barbarians, but had attained to a flourishing condition under the Roman empire, to the benefit of which it greatly redounded. According to a fragment preserved by Eusebius, he beseeches the emperor "to examine the accusations which were brought against the Christians, and to stop the persecution by revoking the edict which he had published against them. He represents to him that the Roman empire was so far from being injured or weakened by Christianity that its foundation was more firmly established and its bounds considerably enlarged since that religion had taken footing in it. He puts him in mind that the Christian religion had been persecuted by none but the worst emperors, such as Nero and Domitian; that Hadrian and Antoninus had granted privileges in its favor,

and that he hoped from his clemency and goodness that they should obtain the same protection of their lives and property from him.” According to the testimony of Tertullian (in a work now lost, but which Jerome cites), Melito was regarded as a prophet, by many of his contemporaries. The Church of Rome commemorates him as a saint April 1. From a passage in Origen, quoted by Theodoret (*Quest. in Genesim*, c. 20), Melito appears to have believed that God possessed a bodily form, and to have written in support of that doctrine. This assertion of Origen is supported by the testimony of Grenadius of Massilia (*Lib. Dogm. Ecclesiastes* c. 4); and Tillemont, though unwilling to allow this, admits that the early Church may possibly have been withheld from honoring his memory by an appointed office on account of this imputation, or else on account of the ascription to him: of the book *De Transitu Beatae Virginis*. The surnames of *Asianus* and of *Sardensis* given him by Jerome designate rather his see than his birthplace. Polycrates of Ephesus, a somewhat later writer, in a letter to Victor, bishop of Rome, calls him *Eunuchus*; yet this is not to be taken in the literal sense, but rather indicates only that he remained faithful to his vow of chastity. As to the particulars of the death of Melito, scarcely anything is known. Polycrates, in a letter addressed to pope Victor (AD. 196), says, “What shall I say of Melito, whose actions’ were all guided by the operations of the Holy Spirit? who was interred at Sardis, where he waits the resurrection and the judgment.” From this it may be inferred that he had died some time previous to the date of this letter at Sardis, the place of his interment. Melito was especially skilled in the literature of the Old Testament, and was one of the most prolific authors of his time. Eusebius furnishes the following list of Melito’s works: *Περὶ τοῦ πάσχα δύο ; Περὶ πολιτείας καὶ προφητῶν ; Περὶ κυριακῆς ; Περὶ φύσεως ἀνθρώπου ; Περὶ πλάσεως ; Περὶ ὑπακοῆς πίστεως αἰσθητηρίων ; Περὶ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος ; Περὶ λουτροῦ ; Περὶ ἀληθείας ; Περὶ κτίσεως καὶ γενέσεως Χριστοῦ ; ἐπὶ προφηείας ; Περὶ φιλοξενίας ; Ἡ κλείς ; Περὶ τοῦ διαβόλου καὶ τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰωάννου ; Περὶ ἐνσωμάτου θεοῦ ; Πρὸς Ἀντωνῖνον βιβλίδιον ; Ἐκλογαί ; Περὶ σαρκώσεως Χριστοῦ*, against Marcion; *Λόγος εἰς τὸ πάθος*. Although these works are lost, the testimony of the -fathers remains to inform us how highly they were esteemed. Eusebius. gives some important fragments of Melito’s works; some others are found in the works of different ecclesiastical writers. The best collection of these fragments is found in Routh, *Reliquiae Sacrae* (Oxford, 1814, 8vo), 1:109. Dom Pitra published several fragments in the *Spicilegium Solesmense.*, Fragments’ of

his works, found preserved in a Syriac translation, are now stored in the library of the British Museum. Cureton has translated some; others have been published in Kitto's *Journal of Sacred Literature*, vol 15: A satire against monks was published in France under the title *Apocalypse de Meliton*. See Eusebius, *Hist. Ecclesiastes* vol. iv; Jerome, *De Vir illust.*; *Chronon Paschale*; Cave, *Hist. Litteraria*, ad ann. 170; Tillemont, *Mem. pour servir a Hist. eccles.* 2:407 sq., 663 sq.; Ceillier, *Auteurs Sacres*, 2:78 sq.; Lardner, *Credibility*, pt. ii, c. 15; Le Clerc, *Hist. Ecclesiastes duorum prim. sceculor.*; Ittig, *De Heresiarch.* sec. ii, cxi; Woog, *Dissertationes de Melitone* (Leips. 1744-51, 4to); Semler, *Hist. Ecclesiastes selecta capita sculi*, vol. ii, c.:5; Dupin, *Nouvelle Bibliotheque des auteurs eccles.* vol. i; Galland, *Bibl. Patrum*, volii, Proleg.; Pressense, *Histoire des trois premiers siecles*, 2:2, p. 166; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Romans Biog. and Mythol.* 2:1023; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie*, 9:313; Neale, *Hist. of the East. Ch.* Introd. 1:38; Donaldson, *Ch. Literature*; Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 1:166, et al.; *Journal Sacred Lit.* vols. xv, xvi, and xvii; Piper, in *Studien und Kritiken*, 1838; Steitz, *ibid.* 1856 and 1857; Welte, *Tubinger theol.- Quartalschrift*, 1862, p. 302 sq.

## Melitonians

so called from MELITO OF SARDIS (q.v.), a sect who maintained that not the soul, but the body of man, was made after God's image.

## Melius, John Peter

a Hungarian theologian, was born at Horki in 1536. After having embraced Calvinism; he became in 1558 professor in the school of Debresin, and later superintendent. He died in 1572. Melius contributed largely towards propagating the reformed religion among the nobles of Transylvania. He is mainly known, however, by his translations of the New Testament and many parts of the Old into Hungarian. See Gerdes, *Scrinium Antiquarium*, vol. vii; Selig, *Historie der Augsburgischen Confession*, vol. ii.

## Melkart

*SEE HERCULES.*

## Mellen, John (1)

a Unitarian divine, was born at Hopkinton, Mass., in 1722. He graduated at Harvard College in 1741, was pastor of the Church in Lancaster, Mass., and subsequently at Hanover, and died in 1807. Mr. Mellen was the author of *Eight Occasional Sermons*, 1735-95, and *Fifteen Discourses on Doctrinal Subjects*, 1765. See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*. vol. ii, s.v.

## Mellen, John (2),

a Unitarian divine, was born in 1752. He graduated at Harvard College, in 1770, was minister of Barnstable, Mass., and died in 1828. Mr. Mellen published eight-separate *Sermons* and *Discourses* (179-1, '93, '95, '97, '99), and also two *Dudleian Lectures* (1795, '99).

## Mellin, Georg Samuel Albrecht

a German theologian, was born at Halle in 1775. After finishing his education he was appointed minister and counsellor of the consistory at Magdeburg, where he died in 1825. He wrote, *Marginalien und Register zu Kant's Kritik des Erkenntnissverumogens* (Zillichau, 1794, 2 vols. 8vo) : *Encyklopadisches Worterbuch der kritischen Philosophie* (ibid. 1797-1804, 6 vols. 8vo):-*Marginalien und Register zu Kant's metaphysischen Anfangsgrunden der Rechtslehre* (ibid. 1800) : — *Worterbuch der Philosophie* (Magdeburg, 1805-7, 2 vols. 8vo).

## Mellitus

a noted prelate of the Church in the Anglo-Saxon period, flourished in the 7th century. He was sent in AD. 601, by pope Gregory the Great, as missionary to the assistance of Augustine, who was then laboring in England. Mellitus, with other zealous missionaries, proved a valuable help in the promotion of Christianity on the Anglican shores. He brought from Rome all the paraphernalia necessary for the performance of Church services; also a manuscript copy of the Bible in two volumes, two copies of the Psalms, as they were sung in the churches, two copies of the Gospels. Lives of the Apostles and Martyrs, and a Commentary on the Gospels and Epistles. These were the first books ever known among the Saxons. Sebert, king of Essex, permitted Mellitus to preach the Gospel to his subjects, made him first bishop of the Saxons in London, and favored him with a

life-long friendship. At his death Sebert was succeeded by three pagan sons, who did not continue their father's protection. It is related that after the decease of Sebert, Mellitus encountered much opposition, and was finally required to leave the country; and consequently he, with others of the persecuted, crossed over to France. Subsequently Edbald, who succeeded Ethelbert in Kent, embracing Christianity and relenting towards the exiles, Mellitus was recalled, and afterwards labored zealously in the cause of Christianity, which from that time became firmly established in Kent. Mellitus appears to have been endowed with much prudence as well as piety: not making fierce inroads upon paganism, but watching for and seizing the favorable moment for speaking and doing, he effected much for Christianity. He was afterwards made archbishop of Canterbury, and died about the year 625. See Maclear, *Hist. of Missions*, p. 105 sq.; Churton, *Hist. of the Early Engl. Ch.*; Inett, *Hist. of the Engl. Ch.* (see Index).

### Mello, Guillaume De

an ascetic French author. a native of Nantes, flourished in the latter half of the 17th century. He was canon of the collegiate church of Notre Dame of Nantes. He wrote *Les Elvations de l'ame a Dieu par les degres de Creatures*, taken from the Latin of cardinal Bellarmine (Nantes, 1666, 4to):-*Le Devoir des Pasteurs*, translated from the Latin of Barthelemi des Martyr (Paris, 1672, 12mo):-*Les divines Opiations de Jesus* (Paris, 1673, 12mo):-*Le Predicateur evangelique* (Paris, 1685, 7 vols. 12mo). These works are anonymous. It is believed that Mello is also the author of a *Vie des Saints* (Paris, 1688, 4 vols. 8vo).

### Melody

(*hrm*ζα *imrah*'), a *song* or music, of the voice, <sup><2510></sup>Isaiah 51:3 [“ psalm,” <sup><1810></sup>Psalms 81:2; 98:5], or of an instrument, <sup><3102></sup>Amos 5:23; metaphorically, a *song of the land*, i.e. its “ best fruits,” <sup><0431></sup>Genesis 43:11; ḡn; *nagan*’, to *strike*, i.e. sound a musical chord, <sup><2313></sup>Isaiah 23:13, elsewhere “ play” = ψάλλω, <sup><4151></sup>Ephesians 5:19, elsewhere “ sing”) is strictly a musical science, the pleasing variation between notes of a different pitch in the same part or strain, in distinction from *harmony*, which is the accord of sounds between the different parts; but in general terms ‘it is synonymous with *music* or sweetness of sound. *SEE MUSIC*.

## Melon

(only in the plur. μυγ ~~ἄβια~~) *abattichim*’, from j bF; according to Gesenius by transposition for j bF; to *cook*, but perh. rather a foreign word; Sept. likewise πέπωνες, Vulg. *pepones*) occurs only in <sup>CHIL</sup>Numbers 11:5, where the murmuring Israelites say, “ We remember the fish which we did eat freely in Egypt, the cucumbers and the *melons*,” etc. The correctness of this translation is evident from the kindred word *butikh* used for the melon generically by the Arabs (Abdulp. 52, 54; Rhaz. *De var.* p. 56; Abulf. *Ann.* 2:65), whence the Spanish *budiecas*, and French *pasteques*. The Mishna, however (*Jemmoth*, 8:6; *Maaser*, 1:4), distinguishes this term from watermelons (μυγ [wl d]); but it uses the singular (*Chilaim*, 1:8; *Edujoth*, 3:3) undoubtedly in the sense of muskmelon, a signification which all the versions (Onkelos, Syr., Arab., and Samar.) have affixed to it. A similar distinction prevails among the Arabs, who call the watermelon *butikh-hindi*. or Indian melon. The muskmelon is called in Persian *khurtpuzeh*, and in Hindi *khurbuja*. It is probably a native of the Persian region, whence it has been carried south into India, and north into Europe, the Indian being a slight corruption of the Persian name. As the Arabian authors append *fufash* as the Greek name of *butikh*, it is more than probable that this is intended for πέπων, especially if we compare the description in Avicenna with that in Dioscorides. By Galen it was called *Melopepo*, from *melo* and *pepo*, the former from being roundish in form, like the apple. The melon is supposed to have been the σίκυος of Theophrastus, and the σίκυος πέπων of Hippocrates. It was known to the Romans, and cultivated by Columella, with the assistance of some precaution at cold times of the year. It is said to have been introduced into England about the year 1520, and was called muskmelon to distinguish it from the pumpkin, which was then usually called melon. All travellers in Eastern countries have borne testimony to the refreshment and delight they have experienced from the fruit of the melon (Hasselquist, *Trav.* p. 528; Bellon, *Observ.* 2:75; Joliffe, *Trav.* p. 231; Tournefort, 3:311; Chardin, 3:330; Sonnini, 2:216, 328). Alpinus speaks of their very general use, under the title *Batech*, by the Egyptians (*Rerum Aegypt. Hist.* 1:17). He also describes in the same chapter the kind of melon called *Abdellavi*, which, according to De Sacy, is oblong, tapering at both ends, but thick in the middle (*De Plantis Aegypti*, tab. xli); but Forskal applies this name also to the *Chate* (which is separately described by Alpinus, and a figure given by him at tab. xl), and says it is the

commonest of all fruits in Egypt, and is cultivated in all their fields, and that many prepare from it a very grateful drink (*Flora Egyptiaco-Arabica*, p. 168). The *Chate* is a villous plant with trailing stems, leaves roundish, bluntly angled, and toothed; the fruit pillose, elliptic, and tapering at both ends (Alpin. 50:c. p. 54). Hasselquist calls this the “Egyptian melon” and “queen of cucumbers,” and says that it grows only in the fertile soil round Cairo; that the fruit is a little watery, and the flesh almost of the same substance as that of the melon, sweet and cool. “This the grandees and Europeans in Egypt eat as the most pleasant fruit they find, and that from which they have the least to apprehend. It is the most excellent fruit of this tribe of any yet known” (Hasselquist, *Travels*, p. 258). These plants, though known to the Greeks, are not natives of Europe, but of Eastern countries, whence they must have been introduced into Greece. They probably may be traced to Syria or Egypt, whence other cultivated plants, as well as civilization, have travelled westwards. In Egypt they formed a portion of the food of the people at the very early period when the Israelites were led by Moses from its rich cultivation into the midst of the desert. The melon, the watermelon, and several others of the Cucurbitaceie, are mentioned by Wilkinson (*Thebes*, p. 212; *Ancient Egyptians*, 4:62) as still cultivated there, and are described as being sown in the middle of December, and cut, the melons in ninety and the cucumbers in sixty days.

### Picture for Melon 1

It is not necessary to exclude from the generic term *abattich* in the above passage the watermelon (*Cucurbita citrullus*), which is clearly distinguished by Alpinus as cultivated in Egypt, and called by names similar to the above. Serapion, according to Sprengel (*Comment. in Dioscor.* 2:162) restricts the Arabic *Batikh* to the watermelon. It is mentioned by Forskal, and its properties described by Hasselquist. Though resembling the other kinds very considerably in its properties, it is very different from them in its deeply-cut leaves. The plant is hairy, with trailing cirrhiferous stems. Hasselquist says that it is cultivated on the banks of the Nile, in the rich clayey earth which subsides during the inundation, and serves the “Egyptians for meat, drink, and physic. It is eaten in abundance, during the season, even by the richer sort of the people; but the common people, on whom Providence hath bestowed nothing but poverty and patience, scarcely eat anything but these, and account this the best time of the year,

as they are obliged to put up with worse at other seasons of the year” (*Travels*, p. 256).

## Picture for Melon 2

The common melon (*Cucumis melo*) is cultivated in the same places and ripens at the same time with the watermelon, but the fruit in Egypt is not so delicious (see Sonnini’s *Travels*, 2:328); the poor in Egypt do not eat this melon. “A traveller in the East,” says Kitto (note on <sup>CHIKB</sup>Numbers 11:5), “who recollects the intense gratitude which a gift of a slice of melon inspired while journeying over the hot and dry plains, will readily comprehend the regret with which the Hebrews in the Arabian Desert looked back upon the melons of Egypt.”

For further details, see Ol. Celsius, *De Melonibus Aegyptiis* (Lugd. B. 1726), and *Hierobot.* 1:356 sq.; Salmasii *Homonyles latricce*, c. 35; Rosenmuller, *Morgen.* 2:241 sq.; Thomson, *Land and Book*, 2:261; Tistram, *Nat. Hist. of the Bible*, p. 468

## Melugin, Thomas Maddin

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church., South, was born near Covington, Ky., Sept. 17, 1838; in 1853 he was converted, and joined the above Church; was licensed to preach in August, 1861, and in November following was admitted into the Memphis Conference on trial, and sent to La Grange Circuit; in 1862 to Randolph Circuit; in 1863 to Huntingdon Circuit, where his health failed, and he was compelled to leave the work. In 1864 he received a supernumerary relation, in which he was assigned to Randolph Circuit, and in 1865 to Covington Station, where he remained until his death, April 2, 1866. Mr. Melugin was ever devoted to his work, and in his last illness exemplified the power of the Christian’s faith. See *Minutes of the M. E. Church South*, 1866.

## Melville, Andrew

one of Scotland’s celebrated characters, the most eminent worker in the “Kirk” next to John Knox himself, and denominated by Anglican churchmen “the father of Scottish Presbytery” (Stephen, 1:258; compare, however, Hetherington, p. 78, col 1), was born Aug. 1, 1545. He was the youngest of the nine sons of Richard Melville of Baldovy, a small estate on the banks of the South Esk, near Montrose. He had the misfortune to lose both his parents when only about two years old, his father falling at the

battle of Pinkie in 1547, and his mother dying in the course of the same year; and the education of young Andrew devolved upon his eldest brother, who was minister of the neighboring parish of Maritoun after the establishment of the Reformation in 1560. Even as a child Andrew distinguished himself by the quickness of his capacity, and, though a delicate boy, it was determined that he should have all the advantages the schools of his day could afford him. At the age of fourteen he was removed from the grammar-school of Montrose, where he had been for some time, to St. Mary's College, in the University of St. Andrew's. Here he studied for four years most devotedly, and, upon the completion of the curriculum, bore away the reputation of being "the best philosopher, poet, and Grecian of any young master in the land." We are told that John Douglas, who was at that time rector of St. Andrew's, showed Andrew Melville much marked attention, and that the old rector was so much pleased with his shrewdness and accuracy of observation, that, on parting with him, Douglas exclaimed, "My silly fatherless and motherless boy, it's ill to wit what God may make of thee yet." Anxious to continue his studies under the guidance of master minds, he determined to go abroad, and take his place at the feet of the learned of other lands. 'First among the highschoools of that day figured Paris, and thither he now directed his steps. He was only a boy of nineteen, but he had the purposes of a man, and without the loss of a moment, he made haste to reach Paris, and recommenced his studies at the French capital. After a two-years' stay he proceeded to Poitiers, to devote some time to the study of civil law, not, however, for the purpose of preparing for the legal profession, but only as a source of discipline "connected with a complete course of education."

Melville had gone to Poitiers, as he imagined, a perfect stranger, but his reputation as a scholar had reached the place long before he made his actual debut, and he was greeted with the offer of a professorship at the highschool which he had intended to enter as a student. For three years he labored at the College of St. Marceon with most marked success, at the same time, however, adhering steadfast to the chief intention of his visit thither, viz. the study of civil law. In 1567 the renewed political disturbances obliged him to quit France. He retired to Geneva, and by the exertions of Beza the chair of humanity, which happened to be then vacant, in the academy of that place, was secured for him. Andrew Melville was now more in his element, both politically and religiously, and Geneva was a scene to which his mind often recurred in after-life. It was there he made

that progress in Oriental learning for which he became so distinguished. There also he enjoyed the society of some of the best and most learned men of the age; but above all it was there the hallowed flame of civil and religious liberty began to glow in his breast, with a fervor which continued unabated ever after. In the spring of 1574, at the urgent request of his friends at home, he resigned his position here, and decided to return to his native country, from which he had now been absent altogether about ten years. On this occasion Beza addressed a letter to the General Assembly, in which, among other expressions of a like kind, he declared that Melville was “equally distinguished for his piety and his erudition, and that the Church of Geneva could not give a stronger proof of affection to her sister Church of Scotland than by suffering herself to be bereaved of him that his native country might be enriched with his gifts.”

On Melville’s arrival in Edinburgh, in July, 1574, he was invited by the regent Morton to enter his family as a domestic tutor; but this invitation was declined by Melville, who was averse to a residence at court, and preferred an academic life. He was early gratified in this wish, for, having taught for a short time as private tutor in the house of a near relative, he was urged by archbishop Boyd and other leading men for the principalship of Glasgow College, and was promptly appointed by the General Assembly. In this new position his learning, energy, and talents were eminently serviceable, not only to the university over which he presided, but to the whole kingdom and to literature in general. He introduced improvements of great importance in teaching and discipline, and infused an uncommon ardor into his pupils. It was not, however, as a mere scholar or academician that Melville now distinguished himself. The constitution of his office, as a professor of divinity, entitled him to a seat in the ecclesiastical judicatories, and he took a prominent part in the ecclesiastical disputes of the time, and was active in the Church courts and in the conferences’ held with the Parliament and’ privy council on the then much agitated subject of Church government. During Melville’s absence from Scotland, an incongruous species of Church government—nominally Episcopalian, but which neither satisfied Episcopalians nor Presbyterians—had been introduced. He, however, was not a believer in prelacy. He insisted that prelacy is not founded upon scriptural authority, and that it is foreign to the institutions and practices of apostolical times. His stay in Geneva, moreover, had afforded him a very favorable opportunity to judge of the workings of the Presbyterian parity, and, in consequence, he was

determined to exert himself for the establishment of like institutions in his own country. Hetherington will have it that the Episcopalians are in “the habit of ascribing the decided Presbyterian form of Church government in Scotland to the personal influence of Andrew Melville, who, they say, had brought from Geneva the opinions of Calvin and Beza, and succeeded in infusing them into the Scottish ministers, who had previously been favorable to a modified prelacy.” But no less an authority than Dr. Cook, himself a Presbyterian, holds that until Melville’s arrival from Geneva “a modified and excellent form of episcopacy” was prevailing in the Church of Scotland, and that it was the indifference of the earl of Morton, who was now acting regent that resulted perniciously to the country, and paved the way for the agitation of “new plans of ecclesiastical polity” (i. 237, 238). He certainly was not given the name of Episcopomatrix, or the “scourge of bishops,” by any Episcopalian, and there seems every reason for the opinion that Melville was really the first Scotchman to press the interests of Presbyterianism. There is one thing certain, however, that even though Melville did not come determined to oust prelacy from Scottish churches, he yet steered clear of the regent’s proposals, which, if Melville had acceded to them, “might have enabled that crafty statesman [Morton] to rivet securely the fetters with which he was striving to bind the Church, instead of being mightily instrumental in wrenching them asunder” (Hetherington, p. 78, col. 2). Melville’s intrepidity was often very remarkable. On one occasion, when threatened by Morton in a menacing way, which few who were acquainted with the regent’s temper could bear without apprehension, Melville replied, “Tush, man! threaten your courtiers so. It is the same to me whether I rot in the air or in the ground; and I have lived out of your country as well as in it. Let God be praised; you can neither hang nor exile his truth !”

In March, 1575, Melville had an opportunity to publicly press his reforming schemes. He was at this time a member of the General Assembly, and his name was included in a committee appointed to confer with the government on the subject of the polity of the Church, and to prepare a scheme of ecclesiastical administration to be submitted to a general assembly. In 1578 his labors were finally-crowned with success. He presided this year over the assembly, and had the pleasure to take the vote approving the secondbook of Discipline, from that period the standard of Presbyterian Church government. Another matter to which the attention of the General Assembly was at this time directed was the reformation and

improvement of the universities. Here Melville also took a leading part. The high state of learning and discipline to which the University of Glasgow had been raised by him, and the comparatively low grade of education in the other colleges, had become an object of public notoriety, and it was necessary that measures be taken for reforming and-remodelling them. A new theological school was agreed upon for St. Andrew's, and it was resolved to translate Melville thither. At the end of the year 1580 he was installed principal of St. Mary's College, in the University of St. Andrew's, and in this new position he distinguished himself by his usual zeal and ability. Besides giving lectures on theology, he taught the Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, and rabbinical languages, and his prelections were attended not only by young students in unusual numbers, but also by several masters of the other colleges. But his scholastic labors, however arduous and multifarious, could not prevent him from continuing an active worker for the interests of the Church, even in the pulpit. Immediately after his removal to St. Andrew's, Melville began to perform divine service, and he also took a share of the other ministerial duties of the parish. His gratuitous labors were highly gratifying to the people in general, but the freedom and fidelity with which he reprov'd vice exposed him to the resentment of several leading individuals, and the most atrocious calumnies against Melville were conveyed to the king, whose mind was predisposed to receive any insinuations to his disadvantage. A bad matter was made worse in 1582, when Melville was sent to the General Assembly, and was by that body honored with the office of moderator. In this prominent place he had many-opportunities to advocate the interests of his pet plans on ecclesiastical government. But even here matters did not rest. He was invited to preach before the assembly, and in his sermon he boldly inveighed against the tyrannous measures of the court, and against those who had brought into the country the "bludie gullie" of absolute power. This fearless charge, which the assembly had applauded, and had seconded by a written remonstrance, intrusted to Melville for presentation at court, led to a citation before the privy council for high-treason, and, though the crime was not proved, he was sentenced to imprisonment for contempt of court, as he had refused to appear, maintaining that whatever a preacher might say in the pulpit, even if it should be called treason, he was not bound to answer for it in a civil court until he had been first tried in an ecclesiastical court. Apprehensive that his life was really in danger, he set out for London, and did not return to the North till the faction of Arran was dismissed in the year following. After being reinstated in his office at

St. Andrew's, Melville and his nephew took an active part in the proceedings of the Synod of Fife (q.v.), which terminated in the excommunication of archbishop Adamson, for having dictated and defended the laws subversive of ecclesiastical discipline. When Adamson was relaxed from censure, and restored to his see, Melville was charged to retire to the north of the Tay, and was not permitted to return to his post till the college had reluctantly consented to gratify one of the king's menial servants by renewing a lease, to the great diminution of the rental. Not long afterwards, the king, accompanied by Du Bartas, the poet, on a visit to St. Andrew's, had an opportunity of hearing from Melville a most spirited and learned, though extemporaneous, refutation of an elaborate lecture by Adamson in favor of his views of royal prerogative, and, upon the decease of Adamson in 1592, Melville had the pleasure of seeing the passage of an act of Parliament ratifying the government of the Church by general assemblies, provincial synods, presbyteries, and kirk sessions, and explaining away or rescinding the most offensive of the acts of the year 1584—the *black acts*, as they were usually called. This important action is considered to this day as the legal foundation of the Presbyterian government, and it was regarded by Melville as an ample reward for his laborious efforts. The king, however, was not sincerely in favor of these measures, and secretly displayed a strong desire to make the “Kirk” a mere tool of political power, or to restore episcopacy. Melville strenuously resisted every such attempt, whether made in an open or clandestine form.

In 1596 a very favorable opportunity seemed to present itself for the court to effect its purposes. A tumult had taken place at Edinburgh on December 16, and this opportunity was seized by the court as a handle for the purpose of effecting a change in the constitution of the Church. Melville, and the Synod of Fife, and many leading clergymen, protested. To reach the king's ears, Melville was selected as chairman of a deputation to the king. Upon this occasion Melville displayed the same intrepidity of character that he had exhibited on meeting Morton while in the regency. King James seemed to be displeased with the Protestants, and reminded Melville that he was his vassal. “Sirrah,” retorted Melville, “ye are *God's* silly vassal; there are two kings and two kingdoms in Scotland: there is king James, the head of the commonwealth; and there is Christ Jesus, the king of the Church, whose subject James the Sixth is, and of whose kingdom he is not a king, nor a lord, nor a head, but a member.” It is not to be wondered at that such plain speaking met the displeasure of the man

who had a peculiar liking for stratagems, or who was accustomed to look upon the works of darkness as the essence of "kingcraft." A general assembly was summoned by the king to meet at Perth; and as it was composed chiefly of ministers from the north, who were studiously infected with prejudices against their southern brethren, the adherents of Melville were left in the minority. But the next assembly at Dundee, as we shall see presently, was not quite so tractable. and it became quite clear to king James that in this way he would not succeed in annihilating, nor even lessening, Melville's ascendancy. An opportunity, however, was not long wanting for such a nefarious attempt. A royal visitation of the university was determined upon, and king James went to St. Andrew's in person, where, after searching in vain for matter of accusation against Melville, it was ordained that all professors of theology or philosophy, not being actual pastors, should thenceforth be precluded from sitting in sessions, presbyteries, synods, or assemblies, and from teaching in congregations. When the assembly met at Dundee in 1588, Melville made his appearance, notwithstanding the restrictions under which he had just been placed; but, when his name was called, king James objected, and declared that he would not permit any business to be done until Melville had withdrawn. Melville defended himself, and boldly told the king that the objection was invalid; to prevent difficulty, however, he finally withdrew under protest. Preparation was now made for restoring the order of bishops, and the first approach to this measure was to induce the commissioners of the General Assembly to solicit that the ministers and elders of the Church might be represented in Parliament. A statute was accordingly passed, declaring prelacy to be the third estate, and asserting the right of such ministers as should be advanced to the episcopal dignity to the same legislative privileges which had been enjoyed by the former prelates. The next conference, held at Falkland, Melville attended. and there, in presence of his majesty, maintained his sentiments with his accustomed fearlessness and vehemence, and the king judged it prudent to refer all the matters which were still intended to be adjusted to an assembly which met at Montrose in March, 1600. Melville appeared as a commissioner from his presbytery, and though, by the king's objections, he was not suffered to take his seat, his counsels and his unconquerable zeal served to animate and confirm the resolution of his brethren; and the assembly was with great difficulty prevailed upon to adopt the scheme of the court, under certain modifications. In 1601 Melville, nothing daunted by the fierce opposition of his royal master, attended the assembly at Burnt Island. Melville's conduct was grossly

misrepresented, and James, incensed by the perseverance of his subject, immediately set out for St. Andrew's, and there, without even the sanction of his privy council, issued a *lettre de cachet*, charging Melville to confine himself within the walls of the college; the royal mandamus decreeing, at the same time, "if he fail and do in the contrary, that he shall be incontinent thereafter, denounced rebel, and put to the law, and all his movable goods escheat to his highness's use for his contemption." The king's conduct towards the Church from this time forward we have already treated in detail in the article JAMES *SEE JAMES* I (q.v.).

James's accession to the English throne brought to Melville a permit enlarging his circle of activity to within six miles of the college, and three congratulatory poems, which he had written for the occasion, seemed even to have established peace between the two combatants. In 1606, however, the war broke out anew, and this-time it ended only with the removal of the sturdy reformer. In 1604 and in 1605. Melville had sorely provoked the king by his activity against the royal measures. In 1606 Melville was selected to represent his presbytery at Parliament, and protest against the act of restoring episcopacy and reviving chapters. This action was unfavorably commented upon before the king, and the latter determined to punish Melville. One fine day Melville quite unexpectedly received a letter from his majesty desiring him to repair to London before September 15, that his majesty might consult him and others of his learned brethren on ecclesiastical matters. Melville and others went accordingly, and had various interviews with the king, who at times condescended even to be jocular with them; but they soon learned that they were interdicted from leaving the place without special permission from his majesty, and that James was only waiting for a favorable opportunity to vent his wrath upon Melville. The occasion was not long wanting. Melville having written a short Latin epigram, in which he expressed his feelings of contempt and indignation at some rites of the English Church on the festival of St. Michael, was immediately summoned before the privy council, found guilty of "scandalum magnatum," and, after a confinement of nearly twelve months, first in the house of the dean of St. Paul's, and afterwards in that of the bishop of Winchester, was committed to the Tower, and was there kept a prisoner for more than four years, in violation of every principle of justice. The first year of his imprisonment was particularly severe. He was deprived of all opportunity to give expression to his thoughts either by writing or oral communication. Through the influence of Sir James Sempill,

he was removed, at the end of ten months, to a more healthy and spacious apartment, and was allowed the use of pen, ink, and paper. When the rigor of his confinement was relaxed, he was consulted both by Arminius and his antagonist Lubbertus on their theological disputes. He continued to refresh his mind by occasionally writing a poem, and in two or three letters to his nephew, James Melville, whom he loved as a son, he reviewed Dr. Downham's sermon on Episcopacy. In 1610 he printed a specimen of poetical translations of the Psalms into Latin verse, and he never wrote a letter to his nephew without transmitting copies of some of his verses. In 1611 he was released, on the solicitation of the duke of Bouillon, who wanted his services as a professor in the university at Sedan, in France. Melville, now in his sixty-sixth year, would fain have gone home to Scotland to lay his bones there, but the king would on no account hear of such a thing, and he was forced to spend his old age in exile. Melville died about 1622, but neither the date of his death nor the events of his last years are ascertained.

Melville appears to have been low in stature and slender in his person, but possessed of great physical energy. His voice was strong, his gesture vehement, and he had much force and fluency of language, with great ardor of mind and constancy of purpose. His natural talents were of a superior order, and he was a scholar and divine of no common attainments. "As a preacher of God's word, he was talented in a very high degree-zealous, untiring, instant in season and out of season, and eminently successful-and as a saint of God, he was a living epistle of the power of religion on the heart. Sound in faith, pure in morals, he recommended the Gospel in his life and conversation-he fought the good fight; and, as a shock cometh in at its season, so he bade adieu to this mortal life, ripe for everlasting glory. If John Knox rid Scotland of the errors and superstitions of popery, Andrew Melville contributed materially, by his fortitude, example, and counsel, to resist, even to the death, the propagation of a form of worship uncongenial to the Scottish character" (Howie, p. 278). Dr. McCrie concludes his two interesting volumes of Melville's *Life* (1819) with the declaration, "Next to the Reformer, I know no individual from whom Scotland has received such important services, or to whom she continues to owe so deep a debt of national respect and gratitude, as Andrew Melville." See, besides McCrie's biography, Hetherington, *Hist. of the Church of Scotland* (N. Y. 1856, 8vo), p. 78 sq.; Cook, *Reformation in Scotland*, chap. xxvii; Stephen, *Hist. of the Church of Scotland* (Lond. 1845, 4 vols. 8vo), 1:258 sq.; Russel,

*Hist. of the Church of Scotland* (Lond. 1834, 2 vols. 18mo), i, chap. ix; ii, chap. x sq.; Howie, *Scots Worthies*, p. 239 sq.; Chambers and Thomson, *Biog. Dict. of Eminent Scotsmen* (1855), 4:1 sq.; *Blackwood's Magazine*, Sept. 1824. (J.H.W.)

### Melville, Henry, B.D.

an eminent English divine and pulpit orator, was born at Pendennis Castle, Cornwall, Sept. 14, 1800; was educated at St. Peter's College, Cambridge, graduated B.A. in 1821, and soon after became a fellow and tutor; later he determined to take holy orders, and was appointed minister of Camden Chapel, Camberwell, London; in 1843 he was made principal of East India College, Haileybury; in 1846 he accepted the appointment as chaplain to the Tower of London, and incumbent of the church within its precincts; about 1848 he was elected to the Golden Lectureship of St. Margaret's, Lothbury; in 1853 he became chaplain to the queen, and in 1856 canon of St. Paul's; in 1863 rector of Barnes and rural dean. He died in London Feb. 9, 1871. A 'number of Mr. Melville's *Lectures and Sermons* were published. many of them without his consent (1845, 1846, 1850, 1851, 1853); they have also been several times republished in this country. Also *Voices of the Year: Readings for the Sundays and Holidays through the Year* (1856, 2 vols.) :-*Golden Counsels: Persuasions to a Christian Life* (1857); and other works. "No other clergyman of the English Church during the present century has 'had the reputation for eloquence and rhetorical finish in his discourses which Mr. Melville retained to the last. His sermons were very carefully and elaborately written, and delivered with great earnestness and fervor. If there was fault anywhere, it was in the superabundance of his imagery, and his more than Oriental wealth of style.'" -*New Amer. An. Cyclop.* 1871, p. 495; Allibone's *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, 2:1262; *English Encyclop.* vol. ii, s.v.

### Melville, James

an eminent Scotch scholar and divine, was born in 1556. He was professor of Hebrew and Oriental languages in the University of St. Andrew's in 1580, minister of Anstrutherwerter in 1596, and subsequently of Kilrenny. He died in 1614. Mr. Melville was a zealous advocate of Presbyterian discipline. He was the author of *Ad Jacobum I Ecclesie Scotiance Libellus supplex* (1645), and his *Autobiography and Diary* (1556-1610).

See Dr. M’Crie’s *Life of Andrew Melville ; Blackwood’s Magazine*, 16:256.

## Mel’zar

(Hebrews *meltsar*’, רַחֵל מֶלְזָר, prob. from the Pers. *master of wine*, i.e. chief butler; so Bohlen, *Symbol*. p. 22; others, *treasurer*), the title rather than the name of an officer in the Babylonian court (as in the margin, “steward,” but Sept. Ἀμερσάρ, on account of the Hebrews art., Vulg. *Malasar*), being that of the person who had charge of the diet of the Hebrew youths in training for promotion as magi (<sup><2011></sup>Daniel 1:11, 16; comp. Lengerke, Stuart, *Comment.* ad loc.). “The *melzar* was subordinate to the ‘master of the eunuchs;’ his office was to superintend the nurture and education of the young; he thus combined the duties of the Greek παιδαγωγός and τροφεύς, and more nearly resembles our ‘tutor’ than any other officer. As to the origin of the term, there is some doubt; it is generally regarded as of Persian origin, the words *mal cara* giving the sense of ‘head cup-bearer;’ Furst (*Lex.* s.v.) suggests its connection with the Hebrew *nazar*, ‘to guard.’”

## Member

(in the plur. μῦρα ~~αἰ~~ <sup><1870></sup> *yetsirim*, forms, <sup><1870></sup>Job 17:7; μέλη, parts, i.e. limbs) properly denotes a part of the natural body (<sup><612></sup>1 Corinthians 12:12-25); figuratively, sensual affection, like a body consisting of many members (<sup><612></sup>Romans 7:23); also true believers, members of Christ’s Mystical body, as forming one society or body, of which Christ is the head (<sup><612></sup>Ephesians 4:25).

## Memento Mori

*remember death*. It was God himself who first gave this admonition to fallen Adam (<sup><0039></sup>Genesis 3:19). Such admonitions we find in the Old and New Testament, and that very frequently, no doubt with intent to remind us constantly of the final day, of the end of life. Philip, king of Macedon, it is said, ordered his attendant to remind him of his death every morning by saying, “King, thou art a mortal being; live in the thought of death.” Human beings are but too apt to forget the “Memento mori” when called to high places of honor. An exception, however, was a certain general who, when holding his triumphal processions, had a servant advance to him and cry out -repeatedly, “Do not forget that you are a mortal man.” We

should be mindful that every one of us is but a *mortal* being. Even to this day the sinister thought of this is impressed upon the pope at his coronation, when the master of the ceremony advances toward the holy father with a silver staff, on which is fastened a tuft of oakum; this is lighted by a candle borne by a cleric, who bends his knee, and, holding up the burning oakum, exclaims, "Holy father, be reminded that all earthly existence will be extinguished like this tuft of oakum." Another occasion the Romanists furnish in their liturgy, so especially solemn on Ash Wednesday, where the sentence occurs, "Memento homo, quia pulvis es, et in pulverem reverteris." There are two ecclesiastical orders, the *Carthusians* and *Trappists*, whose members, on meeting a person, utter aloud the words "Memento mori." The Trappists always keep in their gardens an open grave, surely a good warning and constant reminder of the uncertainty of earthly existence. *SEE DEATH.*

### Memling, Hans Or Jan

a celebrated Flemish painter, was born at Constanz in 1439, according to Dr. Boisseree, but other authorities, among whom may be cited Mrs. Heaton, assert positively that his birthplace was Bruges, and that he was born in 1430. There was for a long time a fierce controversy as to this painter's name, some writers insisting that it should be written *Hemling* or *Hemmelinck*, and that he was of German origin; there is, however, very little reason for doubting that Memling was the real name of the painter whose works adorn the Chapel of St. John at Bruges. There is but little known of his life; he appears to have lived some years in Spain, and is supposed to have visited Italy and Germany—certainly Cologne; he is also said to have served Charles the Bold of Burgundy, both as painter and as warrior. He was admitted, wounded and destitute, into the Hospital of St. John at Bruges, a religious institution, in which none but inhabitants of Bruges were entered (which fact is also given to prove that he was born in Bruges), and, upon recovering, painted, from gratitude at his kind treatment, the beautiful picture of *Sibyl Zambeth*. There are a number of works of art in this hospital by Memling, prominent among which is the history, in minute figures, of *St. Ursula*, the virgin saint of Cologne, and her companions, exquisitely painted in oil in many compartments, upon a relic case of Gothic design, known as *La Chasse de Ste. Ursule*. Memling painted also during his stay at this hospital the *Adoration of the Magi*, the large altar-piece of the *Marriage of St. Catharine*, the *Madonna and Child*, and a *Descent from the Cross*. Nine pictures by Memling are in the

Munich Gallery, among which the greatest are, *Israelites collecting Manna*, *St. Christopher carrying the infant Christ*, *Abraham and Melchizedek*, *the Seizure of Christ in the Garden*, *a Saicta Veronica or Face of Christ*, *the Joys and Sorrows of the Virgin*, and *the Journey of the three Kings of the East*. Rathgeber enumerates over one hundred works which are attributed to Memling, but few of them, however, can be authenticated. He also decorated missals and other books of Church service, one of which is in the Library of St. Mark at Venice. Memling probably died in the year 1499, as an authentic document preserved in the records of the town of Bruges, dated in 1499, speaks of him as “the late Meestre Hans.” See Mrs. Heaton, *Masterpieces of Flemish Art* (Lond. 1869, 4to); Kugler’s *Hand-book of Painting*, transl. by Waagen (Lond. 1860, 2 vols. 12mo); Mrs. Jameson, *Legends of the Madonna*, p. 19, 89, 105, 202, 304.

### Memmi, Simon

an eminent Siennese painter, was born in 1285. Vasari says he was a pupil of Giotto; Lanzi, however, claims him as a scholar of the Siennese maestro Mino. He was a close imitator of the style of Giotto, whom he accompanied to Rome. After his master’s death he painted a *Virgin* in the portico of St. Peter, also two figures of *St. Paul* and *St. Peter* upon the wall between the arches of the portico on the outer side. He then returned to Sienna, where he was appointed by the Signoria to paint one of the halls of their palace in fresco, the subject being a *Virgin*, with many figures around her. He painted three other pictures in the same palace, one of which, an *Annunciation*, was afterwards removed to the gallery -of the Uffizi. The other represented the Virgin holding the Child in her arms, and was destroyed by the earthquake of 1798. He was invited to Florence by the general of the Augustines, where he painted a very remarkable *Crucifixion*. Vasari says, “In this painting the thieves on the cross are seen expiring, the soul of the repentant thief being joyfully borne to heaven by angels, while that of the impenitent departs, accompanied by devils; and roughly dragged by these daemons to the torments of hell” (*Lives of the Painters*, 1:184). He also painted three of the walls of the chapter-house of Santa Maria Novella. On the first wall, over the entrance, is the *Life of San Domenico*; on that which is nearest the church he represented the *Brethren of the Dominican Order contending against the Heretics*; on the third, which is where the altar stands, was depicted the *Crucifixion of Christ*. Many other works are attributed to him jointly with his brother Lippo

Memmi, who also practiced the art of painting with great success. About 1342 the two brothers returned to Sienna, where Simon commenced a work of vast extent, being a *Coronation of the Virgin*, with an extraordinary number of figures. He died before its completion at Avignon, in July, 1344. See Vasari, *Lives of the Painters*, transl. by Foster. (Lond. 1850, 5 vols. 8vo), 1:181; Lanzi's *History of Painting*, transl. by Roscoe (Lond. 1847, 3 vols. 8vo), 1:278; Mrs. Jameson, *Legends of the Madonna* (Lond. 1857, 8vo), p. 172, 273.

### Mem'nius, Quintus

(Κόϊντος Μέμμιος), one of the Roman ambassadors sent to the Jews by Lysias (2. Macc. 11:34) about BC. 163-2. *SEE MANLIUS*.

### Memorial

is the name

- (1) of a prayer of oblation; the prayer in the order of the communion beginning "O Lord and heavenly Father," which follows the communion of the faithful.
- (2) The tomb of a martyr, or a church dedicated to his memory.
- (3) The commemoration of a concurrent lesser festival by the use of its collect.
- (4) Exequies, an office for the dead said by the priest in the 14th century in England.

### Memory

that faculty of the mind which enables us to recall past impressions, whether of external facts or internal consciousness. It applies to sensations, perceptions, creations of the fancy, matters acquired by learning, in short, to anything, actual or imaginary, which has previously occupied the mind. It is the great mental storehouse of knowledge. The clearness of the impression so recalled depends, other things being equal, upon the strength and vividness of the original impression, and this largely depends upon the degree of attention given to the object of it at the time. Other conditions are, chiefly, length of interval since the first impression, frequency of its reiteration, variety of intervening and confusing impressions, etc. There are two accessory ideas usually included in the

definition of memory namely, the power of *retaining* as well as recalling previous impressions, and an accompanying consciousness that the impressions recalled relate to the past. But both these are logically involved in the definition above given; for the power of retention is only indicated and measured by the facility or ability of recalling, and the past character of the thing remembered is implied in its being *re*-called rather than conceived, perceived, or originated. Memory is thus a definite act, which serves as the exponent or index of the faculty by virtue of which it is performed; and the power itself is estimated and characterized according to the ease, rapidity and completeness of the function. Memory can hardly be said to be voluntary, yet the will may assist it indirectly. The recurrence of the past impression depends upon what is called the *association of ideas*, i.e. the connection. in which the impression was first made; and this furnishes the link for retrieving it. This association differs greatly in different minds, and, indeed, with almost every occasion. By attentively fixing the mind upon something connected with the matter sought to be recalled, the train of thought may often be recovered; yet, when it does at last recur, it is spontaneous. Hence memory has been distinguished into simple *remembrance*, or passive memory without effort, and *recollection*, or active memory accompanied by a mental endeavor. Memory of a particular point may be clear or faint. Memory in general may be either weak or strong. In some individuals these last characteristics are constitutional. The memory, however, may be greatly improved by habit. Artificial helps are called *mnemonics*. Memory may also be weak in one respect, and strong in another. Hence the distinction of *verbal* memory, etc. Names and numbers are proverbially difficult to remember. Yet some remarkable instances of these species of memory are on record. Singular instances also of disordered memory, either excessively acute or defective in some peculiar respects, have been observed. It is held by many that nothing is absolutely lost by the memory; and some are of the opinion that this faculty will furnish the conscience with the whole catalogue of past sins at the final judgment. *SEE MIND.*

## Mem'phis

### Picture for Memphis

(*Μέμφις*, Herod. 2:99, 114, 136, 154; Polyb. v. 61; Diod. 1:50 sq.), a very ancient city, the capital of Lower Egypt, standing at the apex of the Delta, ruins of which are still found not far from its successor and modern

representative, *Cairo*. In the following account of it, we shall of course mainly have in view the Scripture relations and notices of this important ancient site, but at the same time we shall introduce whatever illustration seems pertinent from profane and monumental sources. *SEE EGYPT*.

**I. The Name.** — Memphis occurs once in the AV., in <sup>2806</sup>Hosea 9:6, where the Hebrew has *Moph* (אֲמוֹ Sept. Μέμφις, Vulg. *Memphis*). Elsewhere the Hebrew name appears as *Noph* (אֲנוֹ) under which form it is mentioned by Isaiah (<sup>2393</sup>Isaiah 19:13), Jeremiah (<sup>2406</sup>Jeremiah 2:16; 46:14, 19), and Ezekiel (<sup>2513</sup>Ezekiel 30:13, 16). These two forms are contractions of the ancient Egyptian MEN-NUFR or MEN-NEFRU, whence the Coptic *Menfi*, *Memfi*, *Membe* (Memphitic forms), and *Memfe* (Sahidic), the Greek name, and the Arabic *Menf*. The Hebrew forms were probably in use among the Shemites in Lower Egypt, and perhaps among the Egyptians, in the vulgar dialect.

The ancient Egyptian *common* name (as above) signifies either “the good abode,” or “the abode of the good one.” Plutarch, whose Egyptian information in the treatise *De Iside de Osiride* is generally valuable, indicates that the latter or a similar explanation was current among the Egyptian priests. He tells us that some interpreted the name the “haven of good ones,” others, “the sepulchre of Osiris” (καὶ τὴν μὲν πόλιν οἱ μὲν ὄρμον ἀγαθῶν ἐρμηνεύουσιν, οἱ δ' [ἰδί] ως τάφον Ὀσίριδης, c. 20). “To come to port” is, in hieroglyphics, MENA or MAN, and in Coptic the long vowel is not only preserved but sometimes repeated. There is, however, no expressed vowel in the name of Memphis, which we take therefore to commence with the word MEN, “abode,” like the name of a town or village MEN-HeBi “the abode, or mansion, of assembly,” cited by Brugsch (*Geographische Inschriften*, 1:191, No. 851, tab. 37). “The good abode” is the more probable rendering, for there is no preposition, which, however, might possibly be omitted in an archaic form. The special determinative of a pyramid follows the name of Memphis, because it was the pyramid-city, pyramids having perhaps been already raised there ‘as early as the reign of Venephes, the fourth king of the first dynasty (Manetho, ap. Cory, *Anc. Frag.* p. 96, 97; comp. Brugsch, *Geogr. Inschr.* 1:240).

The *sacred* name of Memphis was HA-PTAH, PA-PTAH, or HA-PTAH-KA, or HA-KA-PTAH. “the abode of Ptah,” or “of the being of Ptah” (Brugsch, 1:235, 236, Nos. 1102, 1103, 1104, 1105, tab. xlii).

**II. Geographical Position.** — Memphis was well chosen as the capital city of all Egypt. It stood just above the ancient point of the Delta, where the Pelusiac, Sebennytic, and Canopic branches separated. It was within the valley of Upper Egypt, yet it was close to the plain of Lower Egypt. If farther north it could not have been in a position naturally strong; if anywhere but at the division of the two regions of Egypt, it could not have been the seat of a sovereign who wished to unite and command the two. Where the valley of Upper Egypt is about to open into the plain it is about five miles broad. On the east, this valley is bounded almost to the river's brink by the light yellow limestone mountains which slope abruptly to the narrow slip of fertile land. On the west, a broad surface of cultivation extends to the low edge of the Great Desert, upon which rise, like landmarks, the long series of Memphite pyramids. The valley is perfectly flat, except where a village stands on the mound of some ancient town, and unvaried but by the long groves of date-palms which extend along the river, and the smaller groups of the villages. The Nile occupies the midst with its great volume of water, and to the west, not far beneath the Libyan range, is the great canal called the Bahr Yfisuf, or "Sea of Joseph." The scene is beautiful from the contrast of its colors, the delicate tints of the bare desert-mountains or hills bright with the light of an Egyptian sun, and the tender green of the fields, for a great part of the year, except when the Nile spreads its inundating waters from desert to desert, or when the harvest is yellow with such plenteous ears as Pharaoh saw in his dream. The beauty is enhanced by the recollection that here stood that capital of Egypt which was in times very remote a guardian of ancient civilization; that here, as those pyramids-which triflers in all ages have mocked at-were raised to attest, the doctrine of a future state was firmly believed and handed down till revelation gave it its true significance; and that here many of the great events of sacred history may have taken place, certainly many of its chief personages may have wondered at remains which in the days of Abraham were the work of an older and stronger generation.

But for the pyramids it would now be difficult to ascertain the precise site of Memphis, and the pyramids, extending for twenty miles, do not minutely assist us. No lofty mounds, as at Bubastis and Sais, mark the place of the great city; no splendid temples, as at Thebes, enable us to recall its magnificence. The valley between the Libyan Desert and the Nile is flat and unmarked by standing columns, or even, as at neighboring Heliopolis, by a solitary obelisk. Happily a fallen colossal statue and some trifling remains

near by, half buried in the mud, and annually drowned by the inundation, show us where stood the chief temple of Memphis, and doubtless the most ancient part of the city, near the modern village of Mit-Rahinel (fully *Minyet Rahineh*; comp. Robinson, *Researches*, 1:40, 41). This central position is in the valley very near the present west bank of the river, and three miles from the edge of the Great Desert. The distance above Cairo is about nine miles, and that above the ancient head of the Delta about sixteen. The ancient city was -no doubt of great extent, but it is impossible, now that its remains have been destroyed and their traces swallowed up by the alluvial deposit of the Nile, to determine its limits, or to decide whether the different quarters mentioned in the hieroglyphic inscriptions were portions of one connected city; or, again, whether the Memphis known to classical writers was smaller than the old capital, a central part of it, from which the later additions had, ill a time of decay, been gradually separated. In the inscriptions we find three quarters distinguished: The “White Wall,” mentioned by the classical writers (λευκὸν τεῖχος), has the same name in hieroglyphics, SEBT-HET (Brugsch, *ut sup.* 1:120, 234, 235; 1 tab. xv, Nos. 1091-1094; tab. xii). That Memphis is meant in the name of the nome appears not only from the circumstance that Memphis was the capital of the Memphitic Nome, but also from the occurrence of HA-PTAHKA or HA-KA-PTAH, as the equivalent of SEBT-HET in the name of the nome (Brugsch, *ibid.* i, tab. xv; 1:1; 2:1, etc., and *Nomen aus dem neuen Reiche*, p. 1). The White Wall is put in the nome-name for Memphis itself, probably as the oldest part of the city. Herodotus mentions the White Wall as the citadel of Memphis, for he relates that it held a garrison of 120,000 Persians (iii. 91), and he also speaks of it by the name of the Citadel simply (τὸ τεῖχος, p. 13, 14). Thucydides speaks of the White Wall as the third, and, as we may infer, the strongest part of Memphis, but he does not give the names of the other two parts (i. 104). The Scholiast remarks that Memphis had three walls, and that whereas the others were of brick, the third, or White Wall, was of stone (*ad loc.*). No doubt the commentator had in his mind Greek towns surrounded by more than a single wall, and did not know that Egyptian towns were rarely if ever walled. But his idea of the origin of the name white, as applied to the citadel of Memphis, is very probably correct. The Egyptian forts known to us are of crude brick; therefore a stone fort, very possible in a city like Memphis, famous for its great works in masonry, would receive a name denoting its peculiarity. It is noticeable that the monuments mention two other quarters, “The two

regions of life” (Brugsch, *ibid.* 1:236, 237, Nos. 1107 sq., tab. 42, 43), and AHI or PER-AMHI (*ibid.* p. 237, No. 1114 a, tab. 43).

### III. *History.* —

**1.** The foundation of the city is assigned to Menes, the first king of Egypt, head of the first dynasty (Herod. ii, 99). The situation, as already observed, is admirable for a capital of the whole country, and it was probably chosen with that object. It would at once command the Delta and hold the key of Upper Egypt, controlling the commerce of the Nile, defended upon the west by the Libyan mountains and desert, and on the east by the river and its artificial embankments. The climate of Memphis may be inferred from that of the modern Cairo about ten miles to the north -which is the most equable that Egypt affords. The city is said to have had a circumference of about nineteen miles (Diod. Sici. 50), and the houses or inhabited quarters, as was usual in the great cities of antiquity, were interspersed with numerous gardens and public areas.

The building of Memphis is associated by tradition with a stupendous work of art, which has permanently changed the course of the Nile and the face of the Delta. Before the time of Menes the river, emerging from the upper valley into the neck of the Delta, bent its course westward towards the hills of the Libyan Desert, or at least discharged a portion of its waters through an arm in that direction. Here the generous flood, whose yearly inundation gives life and fertility to Egypt, was largely absorbed in the sands of the desert or wasted in stagnant morasses. It is even conjectured that up to the time of Menes the whole Delta was an uninhabitable marsh. The rivers of Damascus, the Barada and ‘Awaj, now lose themselves in the same way in the marshy lakes of the great desert plain south-east of that city. Herodotus informs us, upon the authority of the Egyptian priests of his time, that Menes, “by banking up the river at the bend which it forms about a hundred furlongs south of Memphis, laid the ancient channel dry, while he dug a new course for the stream half-way between the two lines of hills. To this day,” he continues, “the elbow which the Nile forms at the point where it is forced aside into the new channel is guarded with the greatest care by the Persians, and strengthened every year; for if the river were to burst out at this place, and pour over the mound, there would be danger of Memphis being completely overwhelmed by the flood. Men, the first king, having thus, by turning the river, made the tract where it used to run dry land, proceeded in the first place to build the city now called Memphis, which

lies in the narrow part of Egypt; after which he further excavated a lake outside of the town, to the north and west, communicating with the river, which was itself the eastern boundary” (Herod. 2:99). From this description it appears that-like Amsterdam diked in from the Zuyder Zee, or St. Petersburg defended by the mole at Cronstadt from the Gulf of Finland, or more nearly like New Orleans protected by its levee from the freshets of the Mississippi, and drained by Lake Pontchartrain-Memphis was created upon a marsh reclaimed by the dike of Menes and drained by his artificial lake. The dike of Menes began twelve miles south of Memphis, and deflected the main channel of the river about two miles to the eastward. Upon the rise of the Nile, a canal still conducted a portion of its waters westward through the old channel, thus irrigating the plain beyond the city in that direction, while an inundation was guarded against on that side by a large artificial lake or reservoir at Abusir. The skill in engineering which these works required, and which their remains still indicate, argues a high degree of material civilization, at least in the mechanic arts, in the earliest known period of Egyptian history. The manufactures of glass at Memphis were famed for the superior quality of their workmanship, with which Rome continued to be supplied long after Egypt became a province of the empire.

The environs of Memphis presented cultivated groves of the acacia-tree, of whose wood were made the planks and masts of boats, the handles of offensive weapons of war, and various articles of furniture (Wilkinson, 3:92, 168).

Sir Gardner Wilkinson observes, “The dike of Menes was probably near the modern Kafr el-Eiyat, fourteen miles south of Mit-Rahineh, where the Nile takes a considerable bend, and from this point it would (if the previous direction of its course continued) run immediately below the Libyan mountains, and over the site of Memphis. Calculating from the outside of Memphis, this bend agrees exactly with the hundred stadia, or nearly eleven and a half English miles Mt. Rahlneh being about the centre of the old city. No traces of these dikes (*sic*) are now seen” (Rawlinson’s *Herod.* 2:163, note 6). That the dike has been allowed to fall into neglect, and ultimately to disappear, may be accounted for by the gradual obliteration of the old bed, and the cessation of any necessity to keep the inundation from the site of Memphis, which, on the contrary, as the city contracted, became cultivable soil and required to be annually fertilized. But are we to suppose that Menes executed the great engineering works attributed to him? It is

remarkable that the higher we advance towards the beginnings of Egyptian history, the more vast are the works of manual labor. The Lake Mceris, probably excavated under the 6th dynasty, cast into the shade all later works of its or any other kind executed in Egypt. The chief pyramids, which, if reaching down to this time, can scarcely reach later, increase in importance as we go higher, the greatest being those of El-Gizeh, sepulchres of the earlier kings of the 4th dynasty. This state of things implies the existence of a large serf population gradually decreasing towards later times, and shows that Menes might well have diverted the course of the Nile. The digging of a new course seems doubtful, and it may be conjectured that the branch which became the main stream was already existent.

The mythological system of the time of Menes is ascribed by Bunsen to “the amalgamation of the religion of Upper and Lower Egypt;” religion having “already united the two provinces before the power of the race of This in the Thebaid extended itself to Memphis, and before the giant work of Menes converted the Delta from a desert, checkered over with lakes and morasses, into a blooming garden.” The political union of the two divisions of the country was effected by the builder of Memphis. “Menes founded the *Empire of Egypt* by raising the people who inhabited the valley of the Nile from a little provincial station to that of a historical nation” (*Egypt’s Place*, 1:441; 2:409).

**2.** It would appear from the fragments of Manetho’s history that Memphis continued the seat of government of kings of all Egypt as late as the reign of Venephes, the third successor of Menes. Athothis, the son and successor of Menes, built the palace there, and the king first mentioned built the pyramids near Cochoe (Cory’s *Anc. Frag.* 2d ed. p. 94-97); pyramids are scarcely seen but at Memphis, and Cochoe is probably the name of part of the Memphitic necropolis, as will be noticed later. The 3d dynasty was of Memphitic kings, the 2d and part of the 1st having probably lost the undivided rule of Egypt. The 4th dynasty, which succeeded about BC. 2440, was the most powerful Memphitic line, and under its earlier kings the pyramids of El-Ghizeh were built. It is probable that other Egyptian lines were tributary to this, which not only commanded all the resources of Egypt to the quarries of Syene on the southern border, but also worked the copper mines of the Sinaitic Peninsula. The 5th dynasty appears to have been contemporary with the 4th and 6th, the latter being a Memphitic house which continued the succession. At the close of the latter Memphis

fell, according to the opinion of some, into the hands of the Shepherd kings, foreign strangers who, more or less, held Egypt for 500 years. At the beginning of the 18th dynasty we once more find hieroglyphic notices of Memphis after a silence of some centuries. During that dynasty and its two successors, while the Egyptian empire lasted, Memphis was its second city, though, as the sovereigns were Thebans, Thebes was the capital.

**3.** After the decline of the empire, we hear little of Memphis until the Persian period, when the provincial dynasties gave it a preference over Thebes as the chief city of Egypt. Herodotus informs us that Cambyses, enraged at the opposition he encountered at Memphis, committed many outrages upon the city. He killed the sacred Apis, and caused his priests to be scourged. "He opened the ancient sepulchres, and examined the bodies that were buried in them. He likewise went into the temple of Ihephuestus (Ptah), and made great sport of the image.... He went also into the temple of the Cabiri, which it is unlawful for any one to enter except the priests, and, not only made sport of the images, but even burned them" (Herod. 3:37). Memphis never recovered from the blow inflicted by Cambyses. With the Greek rule, indeed, its political importance somewhat rose, and while Thebes had dwindled to a thinly-populated collection of small towns, Memphis became the native capital, where the sovereigns were crowned by the Egyptian priests; but Alexandria gradually destroyed its power, and the policy of the Romans hastened a natural decay.

**4.** At length, after the Arab conquest, the establishment of a succession of rival capitals, on the opposite bank of the Nile—El-Fustat, El-Askar, El-Kata-e, and El-Kahireh, the later Cairo—drew away the remains of its population, and at last left nothing to mark the site of the ancient capital but ruins, which were long the quarries for any who wished for costly marbles, massive columns, or mere blocks of stone for the numerous mosques of the Moslem seats of government. The Arabian physician, Abdel-Latif, who visited Memphis in the 13th century, describes its ruins as then marvellous beyond description (see De Sacy's translation, cited by Brugsch, *Histoire d'Égypte*, p. 18). Abulfeda, in the 14th century, speaks of the remains of Memphis as immense; for the most part in a state of decay, though some sculptures of variegated stone still retained a remarkable freshness of color (*Descriptio Ægypti* ed. Michaelis, 1776). At length, so complete was the ruin of Memphis that for a long time its very site was lost. Pococke could find no trace of it. Recent explorations, especially those of Messrs. Mariette and Linant, have brought to light many

of its antiquities, which have been dispersed in the museums of Europe and America. Some specimens of sculpture from Memphis adorn the Egyptian hall of the British Museum; other monuments of this great city are in the Abbott Museum in New York. The dikes and canals of Menes still form the basis of the system of irrigation for Lower Egypt; the insignificant village of Mit-Rahineh occupies nearly the centre of the ancient capital.

**IV. Edifices, Ruins, and Monuments.**-Of the buildings of Memphis, none remain above ground; the tombs of the neighboring necropolis alone attest its importance, It is, however, necessary to speak of those temples which ancient writers mention, and especially of such of these as are known by remaining fragments.

**1.** Herodotus states, on the authority of the priests, that Menes “built the temple of Hephæstus, which stands within the city, a vast edifice, well worthy of mention” (ii. 99). The divinity whom Herodotus thus identifies with Hephæstus was *Ptah*, “the creative power, the maker of all material things” (Wilkinson, in Rawlinson’s *Herod.* 2:289; Bunsen, *Egypt’s Place*, 1:367, 384). *Ptah* was worshipped in all Egypt, but under different representations in different names; ordinarily “as a god holding before him with both hands the Nilometer, or emblem of stability, combined with the sign of life” (Bunsen, 1:382). But at Memphis his worship was so prominent that the primitive sanctuary of his temple was built by Menes: successive monarchs greatly enlarged and beautified the structure by the addition of courts, porches, and colossal ornaments. Herodotus and Diodorus describe several of these additions and restorations, but nowhere give a complete description of the temple, with measurements of its various dimensions (Herod. 2:99, 101; 108-110, 121, 136, 153, 176; Diod. Sic. 1:45, 51, 62, 67)’- According to these authorities, Mceris built the northern gateway; Sesostris erected in front of the temple colossal statues (varying from thirty to fifty feet in height) of himself, his wife, and his four sons; Rhampsinitus built the western gateway, and erected before it the colossal statues of Summer and Winter; Asychis built the eastern gateway, which” in size and beauty far surpassed the other three;” Psammetichus built the southern gateway; and Amosis presented to this temple “a recumbent colossus seventy-five feet long, and two upright statues, each twenty feet high.” The period between Menes and Amosis, according to Brugsch, was 3731 years; according to Wilkinson only about 2100 years; but upon either calculation the temple, as it appeared to Strabo, was the growth of many centuries. Strabo (xvii. 807) describes this temple as “built

in a very sumptuous manner, both as regards the size of the Naos and in other respects." The Dromos, or grand avenue leading to the temple of Ptah, was used for the celebration of bull-fights, a sport pictured in the tombs. But these fights were probably between animals alone-no captive or gladiator being compelled to enter the arena. The bulls having been trained for the occasion; were brought face to face and goaded on by their masters, the prize being awarded to the owner of the victor. But though the bull was thus used for the sport of the people, he was the sacred animal of Memphis.

This chief temple was near the site of the modern village of Mit-Rahineh. The only important vestige of this great temple, probably second only, if second, to that of Amen-ra at Thebes, now called the temple of El-Karnak, is a broken colossal statue of limestone representing Rameses II, which once stood, probably with a fellow that has been destroyed, before one of the propyla of the temple. (See cut, p. 72.) This statue, complete from the head to below the knees, is the finest Egyptian colossus known. It belongs to the British government, which has never yet spared the necessary funds for transporting it to England.

**2.** Near this temple was one of Apis, or Hapi, the celebrated sacred bull, worshipped with extraordinary honors at Memphis, from which the Israelites possibly took the idea of the golden calf. Apis was believed to be an incarnation of Osiris. The sacred bull was selected by certain outward symbols of the indwelling divinity his color being black, with the exception of white spots of a peculiar shape upon his forehead and right side. The temple of Apis was one of the most noted structures of Memphis. It stood opposite the southern portico of the temple of Ptah; and Psammetichus, who built that gateway, also erected in front of the sanctuary of Apis a magnificent colonnade, supported by colossal statues or Osiride pillars, such as may still be seen at the temple of Medinet Abu at Thebes (Herod. 2:153). Through this colonnade the Apis was led with great pomp upon state occasions. Two stables adjoined the sacred vestibule (Strabo, 17:807).

The Serapeum, or temple of Serapis, or Osirhapi, that is, Osiris-Apis, the ideal correspondent to the animal, lay in the desert to the westward, between the modern villages of Abu-Sir and Sakkarah, though to the west of both. Strabo describes it as very much exposed to sand-drifts, and in his time partly buried by masses of sand heaped up by the wind (xvii. 807).

The sacred cubit and other symbols used in measuring the rise of the Nile, were deposited in the temple of Serapis. Near this temple was the burial-place of the bulls Apis, a vast excavation, in which they were sepulchred in sarcophagi of stone in the most costly manner. Diodorus (i. 85) describes the magnificence with which a deceased Apis was interred and his successor installed at Memphis. The place appropriated to the burial of the sacred bulls was a gallery some 2000 feet in length by twenty in height and width, hewn in the rock without the city. This gallery was divided into numerous recesses upon each side; and the embalmed bodies of the sacred bulls, each in its own sarcophagus of granite. were deposited in these “sepulchral stalls.” A few years since this burial-place of the sacred bulls was discovered by M. Mariette, and a large number of the sarcophagi have already been opened. These catacombs of mummied bulls were approached from Memphis by a paved road, having colossal lions on either side.

**3.** At Memphis was the reputed burial-place of Isis (Diod. Sic. 1:22); it had also a temple to that “myriad named” divinity, which Herodotus (ii. 176) describes as “a vast structure, well worthy of notice,” but inferior to that consecrated to her in Busiris, a chief city of her worship (ii. 59).

Herodotus describes “a beautiful and richly-ornamented enclosure,” situated upon the south side of the temple of Ptah, which was sacred to Proteus, a native Memphitic king. Within this enclosure there was a temple to “the foreign Venus” (Astarte?), concerning which the historian narrates a myth connected with the Grecian Helen. In this enclosure was “the Tvrian camp” (ii. 112). A temple of Ra or Phre, the Sun, and a temple of the Cabiri, complete the enumeration of the sacred buildings of Memphis.

**4.** The necropolis of Memphis has escaped the destruction that has obliterated almost all traces of the city, partly from its being beyond the convenient reach of the inhabitants of the Moslem capitals, partly from the unrivalled massive solidity of its chief edifices. This necropolis, consisting of pyramids, was on a scale of grandeur corresponding with the city itself. The “city of the pyramids” is a title of Memphis in the hieroglyphics upon the monuments. The great field or plain of the pyramids lies wholly upon the western bank of the Nile; and extends from Abu-Roish, a little to the northwest of Cairo, to Meydum, about forty miles to the south, and thence in a south-westerly direction about twenty-five miles farther, to the pyramids of Howara and of Biahmu in the Fayum. Lepsius regards the “pyramid fields of Memphis” as a most important testimony to the

civilization of Egypt (*Letters*, Bohn, p. 25; also *Chronologie der Aegypter*, vol. i). These royal pyramids, with the subterranean halls of Apis, and numerous tombs of public, officers erected on the plain or excavated in the adjacent hills, gave to Memphis the pre-eminence which it enjoyed as “the haven of the blessed.”

The pyramids that belong to Memphis extend along the low edge of the Libyan range, and form four groups -those of El-Ghizeh, Aba-Sir, Sakkarah, and Dahshur -all so named from a neighboring town or village. The principal-pyramids of El-Ghizeh-those called the First or Great; Second, and Third-are respectively the tombs of Khufu or Shufu, the Cheops of Herodotus and Suphis I of Manetho, of the 4th dynasty; of Khafra or Shafra, Cephren (Herod.), of the 5th? and of Menkaura, Mycerinus or Mencheres of the 4th. The Great Pyramid has a base measuring 733 feet square, and a perpendicular height of 456 feet, having lost about twenty-five feet of its original height, which must have been at least 480 feet (Mr. Lane, in Mrs. Poole's *Englishwoman in Egypt*, 2:121, 125). It is of solid stone, except a low core of rock, and a very small space allowed for chambers and passages leading to them. The Second Pyramid is not far inferior to this in size. . Next in order come the two stone pyramids of Dahshfir. The rest are much smaller. In the Dahshur group are two built of crude brick, the only examples in the Memphitic necropolis. The whole number that can now be traced is upwards of thirty, but Lepsius supposes that anciently there were about sixty, including those south of Dahshfir, the last of which are as far as the Faiyum, about sixty miles above the site of Memphis by the course of the river. The principal pyramids in the Memphitic necropolis are twenty in number, the pyramid -of Abu-Roesh, the three chief pyramids of El-Ghizeh, the three of Abui-Sir, the nine of Sakkarah, and the four of Dahshfir. The “pyramids” built by Venephes near Cochoime may have been in the groups of Abdu-Sir, for the part of the necropolis where the Serapeum lay was called in Egyptian KEMKA or KA-KEMI, also KEM or KEMI, as Brugsch has shown, remarking on its probable identity with Cochoime (*ut sap.* 1:240, Nos. 1121, 1122, 1123, tab. xliii).

The pyramids were tombs of kings, and possibly of members of royal families. Around them were the tombs of subjects, of which the oldest were probably in general contemporaneous with the king who raised each pyramid. The private tombs were either built upon the rock or excavated, wherever it presented a suitable face in which a grotto could be cut, and in

either case the mummies were deposited in chambers at the foot of deep pits. Sometimes these pits were not guarded by the upper structure or grotto, though probably they were then originally protected by crude brick walls. A curious inquiry is suggested by the circumstance that the Egyptians localized in the neighborhood of Memphis those terrestrial scenes which they supposed to symbolize the geography of the hidden world, and that in these the Greeks found the first ideas of their own poetical form of the more precise belief of the older race, of the Acherusian Lake, the Ferry, Charon, and the "Meads of Asphodel," but this captivating subject cannot be here pursued (see Brugsch, 1:240, 241, 242). *SEE PYRAMIDS.*

**V.** *Biblical Notices.* — The references to Memphis in the Bible are wholly of the period of the kings. Many have thought that the land of Goshen lay not very far from this city, and that the Pharaohs who protected the Israelites, as well as their oppressors, ruled at Memphis. The indications of Scripture seem, however, to point to the valley through which ran the canal of the Red Sea, the Wadi-t-Tumeylat of the present inhabitants of Egypt, as the old land of Goshen, and to Zoan, or Tanis, as the capital of the oppressors, if not also of the Pharaohs who protected the Israelites. A careful examination of the narrative of the events that preceded the Exodus seems indeed to put any city not in the easternmost portion of the Delta wholly out of the question. *SEE GOSHEN.* ‘

It was in the time of the decline of the Israelitish kingdom, and during the subsequent existence of that of Judah, that Memphis became important to the Hebrews. The Ethiopians of the 25th dynasty, or their Egyptian vassals of the 23d and 24th, probably, and the Saïtes of the 26th, certainly, made Memphis the political capital of Egypt. Hosea mentions Memphis only with Egypt, as the great city, predicting of the Israelitish fugitives, "Mizraim shall gather them up, Noph shall bury them" (~~2006~~ Hosea 9:6). Memphis, the city of the vast necropolis, where Osiris and Anubis, gods of the dead, threatened to overshadow the worship of the local divinity, Ptah, could not be more accurately characterized. No other city but Abydos was so much occupied with burial, and Abydos was far inferior in the extent of its necropolis. With the same force that personifies Memphis as the burier of the unhappy fugitives, the prophet Nahum describes Thebes as walled and fortified by the sea (~~3188~~ Nahum 3:8), as the Nile had been called in ancient and modern times, for Thebes alone of the cities of Egypt lay on both sides of the river. *SEE NO-AMMON.* Isaiah, in the wonderful Burden of Egypt,

which has been more marked and literally fulfilled than perhaps any other like portion of Scripture, couples the princes of Zoan (Tanis) with the princes of Noph as evil advisers of Pharaoh and Egypt (<sup>23913</sup>Isaiah 19:13). Egypt was then weakly governed by the last Tanitic king of the 23d dynasty, as ally or vassal of Tirhakah; and Memphis, as already remarked, was the political capital. In Jeremiah, Noph is spoken of with “Tahapanes,” the frontier stronghold Daphnse, as an enemy of Israel (<sup>3416</sup>Jeremiah 2:16). It is difficult to explain the importance here given to “Tahapanes.” Was it to warn the Israelites that the first city of Egypt which they should afterwards enter in their forbidden flight was a city of enemies? In his prophecy of the overthrow of Pharaoh-Necho’s army, the same prophet warns Migdol, Noph, and “Tahpanhes” of the approach of the invader (xlvi. 14), as if warning the capital and the frontier towns. When Migdol and “Talpanhes” had fallen, or whatever other strongholds guarded the eastern border, the Delta could not be defended. When Memphis was taken, not only the capital was in the hands of the enemy, but the frontier fort commanding the entrance of the valley of Upper Egypt had fallen. Later he says that “Noph shall be waste and desolate, without an inhabitant” (ver. 19). And so it is, while many other cities of that day yet flourish-as Hermopolis Parva and Sebennytus in the Delta, and Lycopolis, Latopolis, and Syene, in Upper Egypt; or still exist as villages, like Chemmis (Panopolis), Tentyra, and Hermonthis, in the latter division-it is doubtful if any village on the site of Memphis, once the most populous city of Egypt, even preserves its name. Latest in time, Ezekiel prophesies the coming distress and final overthrow of Memphis. Egypt is to be filled with slain; the rivers are to be dried and the lands made waste; idols and false gods are to cease out of Noph; there is to be “no more a prince of the land of Egypt.” So much is general, and refers to an invasion by Nebuchadnezzar. Noph, as by Hosea, is coupled with Egypt the capital with the state. Then more particularly Pathros, Zoan, and No are to suffer; Sin and No again; and with more vivid distinctness the distresses of Sin, No, Noph, Aven, Pi-beseth, and “Tehaphnehes” are foretold, as if the prophet witnessed the advance of fire and sword, each city taken, its garrison and fighting citizens,” the young men, slain, and its fair buildings given over to the flames, as the invader marched upon Daphnas, Pelusium, Tanis, Bubastis, and Heliopolis, until Memphis fell before him, and beyond Memphis Thebes alone offered resistance, and met with the like overthrow (30:1-19). Perhaps these vivid images represent, by the force of repetition and their climax-like arrangement, but one series of calamities: perhaps

they represent three invasions — that of Nebuchadnezzar, of which we may expect history one day to tell us; that of Cambyses; and last, and most ruinous of all, that of Ochus. The minuteness with which the first and more particular prediction as to Memphis has been fulfilled is very noticeable. The images and idols of Noph have disappeared; when the site of almost every other ancient town of Egypt is marked by colossi and statues, but one, and that fallen, with some insignificant neighbors, is found where once stood its greatest city.

**VI. Literature.** — The chief authorities on the subject of this article are Lepsius, *Denkmaler aus Aegypten end Aethiopen*; Brugsch, *Geographische Inschrijten*; Colossians Howard Vyse, *Pyramids of Gizeh*, fol. plates, and 8vo text and plates; Sir J. G. Wilkinson, *Modern Egypt and Thebes*, and *Hand-book to Egypt*; and Mrs. Poole, *Englishwoman in Egypt*, where the topography and description of the necropolis and the pyramids are by IMr. Lane. See further, Fourmont, *Descript. des Plaines d'Heliop. et de Memphis* (Par. 1755); Niebuhr, *Trav.* 1:10 ; Du Bois Aymd, in the *Descript. de l'Egypte*, 8:63; Prokesch, *Erinner.* 2:38 sq.; also Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 812; Smith's *Dict. of Class. Geogr.* s.v. **SEE NOPH.**

## Memu'can

(Hebrews *Memukan'*, <sup>^</sup>kWmm] of unknown but prob. Persian origin; Sept. *Μουχαίος*, Vulg. *Mamuchan*), the last named of the seven satraps or royal counsellors at the court of Xerxes, and the one at whose suggestion Vashti was divorced (<sup>^</sup>תוה Esther 1:14,16,21). BC. 483. "They were wise men who knew the times' (skilled in the planets, according to Aben-Ezra), and appear to have formed a council of state; Josephus says that one of their offices was that of interpreting the laws (*Ant.* 11:6,1). This may also be inferred from the manner in which the royal question is put to them when assembled in council; 'According to law what is to be done with the queen Vashti?' Memucan was either the president of the council on this occasion, or gave his opinion first in consequence of his acknowledged wisdom, or from the respect allowed to his advanced age. Whatever may have been the cause of this priority, his sentence for Vashti's disgrace was approved by the king and princes, and at once put into execution. The Targum of Esther identifies him with 'Haman, the grandson of Agag.' 'The reading of the *Kethib*, or written text, in ver. 16, is <sup>^</sup>kmwm."

## Men, The

area class of persons who occupy a somewhat conspicuous place in the religious communities of Northern Scotland, chiefly in those parts of it where the Gaelic language prevails, as in Ross, Sutherland, and the upland districts of Inverness and Argyle. ‘Large and undivided parishes, a scanty supply of the means of grace, patronage, and other causes peculiar to such localities, seem to have developed this abnormal class of self-appointed instructors and spiritual overseers, who sustain in the Church of Scotland a relation very similar to that of our lay-preachers. They are designated “Men” by way of eminence, and as a title of respect, in recognition of their superior natural abilities, and their attainments in religious knowledge and personal piety. There is no formal manner in which they pass into the rank or order of *Men*, further than the general estimation in which they are held by the people among whom they live, on account of their known superior gifts and religious experience. If they are considered to excel their neighbors in the exercises of prayer and exhortation, for which they have abundant opportunities at the *lyke-wakes*, which are still common in the far Highlands, and at the meetings for prayer and Christian fellowship, and if they continue to frequent such meetings, and take part in these religious services, so as to meet with general approbation, they thus gradually gain a repute for godliness, and naturally glide into the order of “The Men.”

There are oftentimes three or four “Men” in a parish; and as, on communion occasions, Friday is specially set apart for prayer and mutual exhortation, these ‘lay-workers have then a public opportunity of exercising their gifts by engaging in prayer, and speaking on “questions bearing on religious experience. This, in many parts of the Highlands, is considered as the great day of the communion season, and is popularly called the “Men’s day;” and, as there may be present twenty or thirty of these “Men” assembled from the surrounding parishes, the whole service of the day is, so to speak, left in their hands—only the minister of the parish usually presides, and sums up the opinions expressed on the subject under consideration. Many of the “Men” assume on these occasions a peculiar garb in the form of a large blue cloak; and in moving about from one community to another, they are treated with great respect, kindness, and hospitality. The influence which was thus acquired by the “Men” over the people was very powerful, and no wonder that some of them grievously abused it. Yet there can be no doubt that, in many parishes in the Highlands, where the ministers have been careless and remiss in the

performance of their duties, these lay-workers have often been useful in keeping spiritual religion alive. It is not to be wondered that the heads of some of them were turned, and that the honor in which they were held begat spiritual pride in them. But these are always said to have been the exception. Since the period of the disruption, when the Highlands have been furnished with a more adequate supply of Gospel ordinances, and spiritual feudalism has been broken, it has been observed that the influence of the "Men," for the most part connected now with the Free Church, has been gradually on the wane. See Auld. *Min. and Men of the Far North* (1868), p. 142-262. (J. HW.)

### Men Of Understanding

a religious sect which seems to have been a branch of the *Brethren and Sisters of the Free Spirit*, has already been considered under the heading *SEE HOMINES INTELLIGENTLE*.

### Menachoth

*SEE TALMUD*.

### Menaea

(or *Μενᾶιον*), apart of the liturgy of the Eastern Church, containing all the changeable parts of the services used for the festival days of the Christian year. It is usually arranged in twelve volumes, one for every month, but the whole is sometimes compressed into three volumes. The Mencea' f the Eastern Church nearly answers to the *Breviary* of the Western Church, omitting, however, some portions of the services which the latter contains, and inserting others which are not in it. See Zacharius, *Bibliotheca Rit.*; Neale, *Eastern Church*, p. 829. *SEE BREVIARY*.

### Menage, Matthieu

a French theologian, was born about 1388, in Maine, near Angers. He studied at the University of Paris, and there received the degree of MA. in 1408, and was called to the chair of philosophy after 1413. The success he obtained caused him to be elected vice-chancellor in 1416, and rector of the university in 1417. He afterwards established himself at Angers, where he taught theology. In the year 1432 he was sent by the Church of Angers, with Guy of Versailles, to the Council of Basle, and'by the council to pope Eugene IV at Florence. He did not return to Basle until 1437. In 1441 he

received the functions of a theologian. He died Nov. 16, 1446. His biography has been written by Gilles Menage. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

## Men'ahem

(Hebrews *Menachem*’, מנחם] *comforting* [comp. *Manaen*, <sup><4431></sup>Acts 13:11; Sept. Μαννάημ, Vulg. *Manahem*; Josephus, Μαννάημος, *Ant.* ix, lj, 1), the seventeenth separate king of Israel, who began to reign BC. 769, and reigned ten years. He was the son of Gadi, and appears to have been one of the generals of king Zachariah. When he heard the news of the murder of that prince, and the usurpation of Shallum, he was at Tirzah, but immediately marched to Samaria, where Shallum had shut himself up, and slew him in that city. He then usurped the throne in his turn, and forthwith reduced Tiphseh, which refused to acknowledge his rule. He adhered to the sin of Jeroboam, like the other kings of Israel. His general character is described by Josephus as rude and exceedingly cruel (*Ant.* 9:11, 1). The contemporary prophets, Hosea and Amos, have left a melancholy picture of the ungodliness, demoralization, and feebleness of Israel; and Ewald adds to their testimony some doubtful references to Isaiah and Zechariah. (For the encounter with the Assyrians, see below.) Menahem died in BC. 759, leaving the throne to his son Pekahiah (<sup><1254></sup>2 Kings 15:14-22). There are some peculiar circumstances in the narrative of his reign, in the discussion of which we follow the most recent elucidations. *SEE ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.*

(1.) Ewald (*Gesch. Isr.* 3:598), following the Sept., would translate the latter part of <sup><1250></sup>2 Kings 15:10, “And Kobolam (or Keblaam) smote him, and slew him, and reigned in his stead.” Ewald considers the fact of such a king’s existence a help to the interpretation of <sup><3108></sup>Zechariah 11:8; and he accounts for the silence of Scripture as to his end by saying that he may have thrown himself across the Jordan, and disappeared among the subjects of king Uzziah. It does not appear, however, how such a translation can be made to agree with the subsequent mention (ver. 13) of Shallum, and with the express ascription of Shallum’s death (ver. 14) to Menahem. Thenius excuses the translation of the Sept. by supposing that their MSS. may have been in a defective state, but ridicules the theory of Ewald. *SEE KINGS.*

(2.) In the brief history of Menahem, his ferocious treatment of Tiphseh occupies a conspicuous place. The time of the occurrence and the site of

the town have been doubted. Keil says that it can be no other place than the remote Thapsacus on the Euphrates, the northeast boundary (<sup><10B></sup>1 Kings 4:24) of Solomon's dominions; and certainly no other place bearing the name is mentioned in the Bible. Others suppose that it may have been some town which Menahem took in his way as he went from Tirzah to win a crown in Samaria (Ewald); or that it is a transcriber's error for Tappuah (<sup><10B></sup>Joshua 17:8), and that Menahem laid it waste when he returned from Samaria to Tirzah (Thenius). No sufficient reason appears for having recourse to such conjectures where the plain text presents no insuperable difficulty. The act, whether perpetrated at the beginning of Menahem's reign or somewhat later, was doubtless intended to strike terror into the hearts of reluctant subjects throughout the whole extent of dominion which he claimed. A precedent for such cruelty might be found in the border wars between Syria and Israel (<sup><10B></sup>2 Kings 8:12). It is a striking sign of the increasing degradation of the land, that a king of Israel practiced upon his subjects a brutality from the mere suggestion of which the unscrupulous Syrian usurper recoiled with indignation. *SEE TIPSAH.*

**(3.)** But the most remarkable event in Menahem's reign is the first appearance of a hostile force of Assyrians on the north-east frontier of Israel. King Pul, however, withdrew, having been converted from an enemy into an ally by a timely gift of 1000 talents of silver, which Menahem exacted by an assessment of fifty shekels a head on 60,000 Israelites. This was probably the only choice left to him, as he had not that resource in the treasures of the Temple of which the kings of Judah availed themselves in similar emergencies. It seems, perhaps, too much to infer from <sup><10B></sup>1 Chronicles 5:26 that Pul also took away Israelitish captives. The name of Pul (Sept. Phaloch or Phalos) appears, according to Rawlinson (*Bampton Lectures* for 1859, Lect. iv, p. 133), in an Assyrian inscription of a Ninevite king, as Phallukha, who took tribute from Beth Kumri (=the house of Omri=Samaria), as well as from Tyre, Sidon, Damascus, Idumaea, and Philistia; the king of Damascus is set down as giving 2300 talents of silver, besides gold and copper, but neither the name of Menahem, nor the amount of his tribute, is stated in the inscription. Rawlinson also says that in another inscription the name of Menahem is given, probably by mistake of the stonecutter, as a tributary of Tiglath-pileser. *SEE NINEVEH.*

## Menahem (Ben-Zerach) Of Estella

a Jewish savant, was born in 1306 at Estella, whither his father had fled after the expulsion of the Jews from France. In 1328, six years after his marriage to the daughter of Benjamin Abiz, the rabbi of Estella, the Navarrese massacre occurred, in which his father, mother, and four younger brothers were murdered, while he himself, severely wounded, was left for dead. A soldier riding by, late in the night, heard him groan, and lifted the unfortunate Jew upon his horse, bound up his wounds, clothed him, and secured a physician's care for him. Thus preserved, Menahem repaired to Toledo, and studied the Talmud for two years. Thence he went to Alcala, where he joined R. Joshua Abalesh in his studies.: Upon the death of the latter in 1350, Menahem succeeded as ruler of the college, and held this place till 1368. Having lost all his property during the civil war, Don Samuel Abarbanel, of Seville, liberally supplied him during the remainder of his life, which he spent at Toledo, where he died in 1374. To this benefactor he dedicated his book on Jewish rites and ceremonies, in 327 chapters, entitled *Provision for the Way*, אדוּזָה לְיְהוּדֵי אֶרֶץ אֵיטָלָה ] (Ferrara, 1554). Comp. Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden* (Leipsic, 1873), 7:312; Jost, *Gesch. d. Judenthums u. s. Sekten.*, 3:86; Zunz, *Zur Gesch. u. Literatur* (Berlin, .1845), p. 415; Dessauer, *Gesch. d. Israeliten* (Breslau, 1870), p. 323 sq.; First, *Bibl. Judaica*, 2:353; Lindo, *History of the Jews of Spain and Portugal* (London, 1848), p. 157 sq.; Finn, *Sephardim, or the History of the Jews in Spain and Portugal* (London, 1841), p. 307; Etheridge, *Introd. to Hebr. Literature*, p. .265; Manasseh ben-Israel, *The Conciliator*, transl. by E. H. Lindo (London, 1842), p. xxx; Zunz, *Literaturgeschichte der synagogalen Poesie* (Berlin, 1865), p. 506. (B. P.)

## Menahem OF Merseburg

a rabbi of great distinction among Jewish scholars of the 14th century, and one of the representatives of truly German synagogal teachers, flourished about 1360. He lived in very troublesome times, and because the literary remains of this period were scanty, it was called the מִטְיָרָד, “the destitute generation.” To the prominent literati of that period, who left some monuments of their learning, belongs Menahem of Merseburg, who wrote *annotations on Rabbinical decisions*, entitled מַשְׁאָל וּתְבִינָה reprinted in Jak. Weit's תְּשׁוּבָה, “questions and answers” (Vened. 1549; Hanau, 1610). Comp. Gratz, *Geschichte der Juden*, 8:149; Jost, *Geschichte des*

*Judenthums u. s. Seten*, 3:116; Zunz, *Zur Geschichte u. Literatur* (Berlin, 1845), p. 193; Fiirst, *Bibl. Judaica*, 2:352.

## Me'nan

or rather MAINAN (Μαῖναν [with much variety of readings], of uncertain signification), a person named as the son of Mattatha and father of Melea, among the private descendants of David and ancestors of Christ (~~408~~ Luke 3:31); but of doubtful authenticity (*Meth. Quart. Revelation* 1852, p. 597). **SEE GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST.**

## Menandrians

one of the most ancient branches of the Gnostics, received their name from their leader, Menander. He was a Samaritan by birth, and is said to have received instruction from Simon Magus. This supposition is not well founded, however, and has arisen, no doubt, from the similarity which existed, to some extent, between his teachings and those of Simon, as well as from the erroneous idea that all the Gnostic sects sprung from the Simonians. Menander aspired to the honor of being a Messiah, and, according to the testimonies of Irenaeus, Justin, and Tertullian, he pretended to be one of the aeons sent from the pleroma, or celestial regions, to succor the souls that lay groaning under bodily oppression' and servitude, and to maintain them against the violence and stratagems of the daemons that hold the reins of empire in this sublunary world. One of the conditions of salvation was baptism in his name, according to a peculiar form instituted by him. He claimed also the power to make his followers immortal. His daring pretensions and fanatical teachings should cause him to be ranked as a lunatic rather than the founder of a heretical sect. The influence of the Menandrians continued through several minor sects until some time in the 6th century. They were often confounded, by those not well informed on the subject, with the orthodox followers of Christ. See Eusebius, *Hist.* ~~2108~~ *Ecclesiastes* 3:26.; 4:22; Irenaeus, *Adv. haeres.* 1:21; Justin M., *Apolog.* 1:26; Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 1:235; Gieseler, *Ecclesiastes Hist.* 1:56; Mosheim, *Commentary on Ecclesiastes Hist.*; Wetzler und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, vol. vi, s.v.; Walch, *Hist. der Ketzereien*, 1:185 sq., 276, 284; Schrockh, *Kirchen-Gesch.* 2:244. **SEE ALSO Gnostics; SEE MAGUS, SIMON.**

## Menard, Claude

a French theologian, was born at Angers in 1580. He began his career as a barrister, and was made a lieutenant-general of the provostship. Becoming depressed in mind by the loss of his wife, he forsook his calling, and intended to retire from the world. His friends prevented his entering a cloister, but he embraced the ecclesiastical profession, and showed his interest in monastic institutions by contributing to the erection of several convents. He applied himself to researches in the antiquities of his province with so much success that his compatriot Menage calls him “Le pere de l’histoire d’Anjou.” He died Jan. 20,1652. He is noted for the following works: *Les deux premiers livres de St. Augustin contre Julien* (Paris, 1617, folio and 8vo) :-*S. Hieronymi endiculus de Hceresibus Judasorum* (ibid. 1617, 4to). Menard published this history from a manuscript which he had found at Lasal. He added different Latin treatises of the same age, and notes, in which he showed much judgment and erudition. Menard’s edition served as a basis for that of Ducange, in which the notes and observations of the former are upheld :-*Itinerarium B. Antonini martyris, cum annotationibus* (Angers, 1640, 4to):-*Recherches et avis sur le corps de St. Jacques le Majeur* (Angers, 1610). In this work he maintains, against general opinion, that the relics of this apostle are kept in StMaurille’s Church at Angers. To Menard is also attributed *L’histoire de l’ordre du Croissant*, a MS. in the library at Paris. See *Biographie Universelle*, s.v.

## Melnard, Francois

a Dutch writer of note, was born at Stellewroof, in Friesland, in 1570. ‘ He established himself at Poitiers, where he was at first professor of humanity, and later professor of jurisprudence. He obtained a pension from Louis XIII. The time of his death is not known. His important works are, *Regidium detestatum, quaesitum, prececutun* (Poitiers, 1610), written on the occasion of the death of Henry IV: *Disputationes de juribus episcoporum* (Poitiers, 1612, 8vo), ‘which displays a deep knowledge of civil and canonical law; and *Des notes sur la vie de Ste. Radegerel et sur la regle de Saint-Cesaire* (edited by Charles Pidoux, Poitiers, 1621).

## Menard, Jean

a French ecclesiastic and writer, was born at Nantes Sept. 23,1650. He studied law at Paris, and met with great success at Nimes as a pleader. But, influenced by conscientious scruples, he entered the Seminary of Saint-

Magloire in 1675 as a student of theology, and, after receiving orders at Paris, returned to his native place to devote himself to the furtherance of true Christianity. Believing that an ascetic life of the very strictest sort is required of all devout Christians, he determined to give himself entirely to works of charity and kindred offices. He refused the canonship to Sainte-Chapelle, and also the bishopric of Saint-Pol de Leon, preferring the humble position of warden of the seminary at Niimes, where he labored with great satisfaction for more than thirty years. He died at Nimes April 15, 1717. Menard is the author of a *Catchisme* (Nimes, 1695, 8vo); which has been approved by many prelates. His memory for some time was the object of a kind of worship, and his tomb, it is said, was a place of miracles and wonderful cures.

### Menard, Leon

a French antiquary, was born Sept. 12, 1706, at Tarasgon. After having studied successfully at the college of the Jesuits at Lyons, he took his degree in law at Toulouse, and succeeded his father in the position of counsellor to the inferior court of Ninmes. After 1744 he resided almost continually at Paris, whither he had been sent in the interest of his clients. Largely devoted to the study of history and antiquity, he made himself known by his *History of the Bishops of Nimes*, the success of which opened to him in 1749 the doors of the Academy of Inscriptions. He also became a member of the academies of Lyons and of Marseilles. In 1762 he went to Avignon, and, at the express invitation of the magistrates, he spent two years in collecting the materials necessary for a history of that city; but, his health failing, he was obliged to desist from this work. He died Oct. 1, 1767, at Paris. Menard wrote, *Histoire des Eviques de Nimes* (La Haye [Lyons], 1737, 2 vols. 12mo); revised in the *Histoire* of that city :- *Histoire civile, ecclesiastique, et litteraire de la Ville de Nimes, avec des Notes et les Preuves* (Paris, 1750-58, 7 vols. 4to). The only fault of this learned work is its excessive prolixity. An abridgment of it has appeared, continuing as far as -1790 (Nimes, 183133, 3 vols. 8vo):-*Refutation du Sentiment de Voltaire qui traite d'Ouvrage suppose le "Testament du Cardinal Richelieu"* (anonymous, 1750, 12mo). Foncemagne joined Menard in sustaining the authenticity of a writing that -Voltaire persisted in declaring apocryphal:-*Pieces fugitives pour servir a l'Histoire de, France avec des Notes historiques et geographiques* (Paris, 1759, 3 vols. 4to). This valued collection, published in cooperation with the marquis D'Aubois, contains a number of researches respecting persons, places,

dates, etc., from 1546 to 1653 :-*Vie de Flechier*, at the head of an edition of the works of that prelate, but of which only the first volume appeared (1760, 4to). Menard is also the author of several dissertations, which have been printed in' the *Memoires de l'Academie des Inscriptions*. See Le. Beau, *Eloge de Menard*, in the *Mem. de l'Acad. des Inscript.* vol. xxxvi; *Necrologe des Hommes illustres de la France* (1770).

### Menard, Nicolas Hugues

a French theologian, was born at Paris in 1585. Having finished his studies at the college of the cardinal Le Moine, Hugues Menard joined the Benedictines in the Monastery of St. Denis, Feb. 3, 1608 . He at first devoted himself to preaching, and was very successful in the principal pulpits of Paris. Finding the discipline not sufficiently severe in the Abbey of St. Denis, he repaired to Verdun, to enter the reformed Monastery of St. Vanne. Later he taught rhetoric at Cluni, and finally went to St. Germain-des-Pres, where he terminated his laborious career, Jan. 20, 1644. He wrote, *Martyrologium SS. ord. S. Benedicti* (Paris, 1629, 8vo), a work that is still read: -*Concordia Regularum, auctore S. Benedicto, Aniance abbate*, with notes and learned observations (Paris, 1628, 4to):-*D. Gregorii papce, cognomento Magni, Liber Sacramentorum* (Par. 1642, 4to) :-*De unico Dyonisio, Areopagitica Athenarum et Parisiorum episcopo* (Paris, 1643, 8vo), against the canon of Launoy — *S. Barnabce, apostoli, Epistola catholica* (Paris, 1645, 4to), an epistle taken by 'H. Menard from a MS. of Corbie; and published after his death by D'Achery. See Niceron, *Memoires*, vol. xxii; Ellies Dupin, *Bibl. des Aut. eccles. du dix-septieme siecle: Hist. litt. de la Cong. de Saint-Maur*, p. 18 sq.

### Menart, Quentin

a French prelate, was born at Flavigny, diocese of Autun, about the beginning of the 15th century. He was successively treasurer to the chapel of Dijon, provost of St. Omer, counsellor to the duke Philippe de Bourgogne, and his ambassador to the kings of France, England, and Germany. The letters of pope Eugenius IV, who afterwards promoted him to the metropolitan see of Besandon, bear the date of Sept. 18, 1439. He made his entrance into that city Aug. 1, 1440. There was at that time no kingdom or republic whose administration was more difficult than that of the Church of Besancon. The archbishop pretended, by virtue of ancient titles, to be temporal lord of the city; but the citizens contested these

assumed rights, and reserved to themselves unqualified freedom, which they did not hesitate to defend at all times even at the point of the sword, so that between the archbishop and his people there was continual war. Quentin Menart had just taken possession of his see as his procurator had arrested a citizen whom he accused of heresy, and caused to be condemned by the ecclesiastical judge. The citizens declared that this crime of heresy was only a pretext, and came to the archbishop's palace bringing a complaint which greatly resembled a menace. The latter was obliged to yield, blamed the conduct of his procurator, and restored liberty to the condemned heretic. Very soon other tumults arose. On the heights of Bregille the archbishop possessed a castle, which overlooked and irritated the city of Besancon. A pretext offering itself, the citizens repaired to Bregille, and entirely demolished not only the castle, but the adjacent houses also. Menart complained in his turn, but they scarcely listened to him. He then retired to his castle of Gy, with all his court, and hurled against the city a sentence of interdiction. The citizens of Besanvon, however, were not superstitious enough to fear this punishment, and submitted without a murmur to the suffering inflicted by the resentment of the archbishop, and refused to yield in order to obtain a repeal of the interdict. Menart proceeded to Rome, and invoked the authority of the pope; the pope delegated the affair to a cardinal, who even aggravated the sentence pronounced upon the rebels. But the people carried the cause before the tribunal of the emperor, and the latter sent many of his counsellors successively to Besanvon-Didier of Montreal, Hartung of Cappel-who in their turn declared Quentin Menart accused and guilty of rebellion. At last, in April, 1450, this great lawsuit was terminated, Menart coming forth victor. The castle of Bregille was reconstructed at the expense of the citizens. Then the archbishop of Besancon returned to his city and to his palace, where he died, Dec. 18, 1462. See Dunod, *Hist. de l'Eglise de Besancon*, vol. i; L'Abbe Richard, *Hist. des Dioc. de Besanfon et de SaintClaude*,.

### Menasseh Ben-Israel

*SEE MANASSEH BENISRAEL.*

### Menasseh Vital

*SEE VITAL.*

## Mencius (Or Meng)

one of the two great Chinese sages (the other being Confucius), is supposed by Legge (whose statements we condense) to have been born about the year BC. 371, one hundred years after the death of Confucius, and to have been contemporary with Plato, Aristotle, Zeno, Epicurus, and Demosthenes. His name, like that of his great exemplar, was Latinized by the Jesuits from *Meng-tse*, as that of the earlier sage was from *Koong-foo-tse*, to conform to which the later worthy should have been called *Mezng-foo-tse*, or *Menfucius*. The Chinese language is monosyllabic, and the original one hundred family names of the empire are all monosyllables. In transferring the names Koong and Meng into Latin or English, foreigners have fallen into the ludicrous mistake of confounding name and title, and making a single polysyllabic surname out of the two as if the Chinese were to make Popjohn out of pope John, or Lordbut out of lord Bute !

Men often owe their greatness to their mothers. The mother of Meng is celebrated throughout China as a model of feminine wisdom in family training. The first home of her widowhood was near a cemetery, and her little boy, with the instinctive imitativeness peculiar to children, began to practice funeral ceremonies, and to perform Liliptian burial-rites. "This will never do," said Madam Meng, "my son will grow up an undertaker," and she promptly removed to a house in the marketplace. Here the boy imitated the cries, disputes, and chafferings of the buyers and sellers. "This will not answer," said the watchful mother, "he will make only a pedler or an auctioneer," and again she removed and took up her abode in the vicinity of a school. The youth forthwith took to chanting lessons in concert with the loud chorus peculiar to the Chinese school-room. "This will do," said the prudent dame, "my son will become a scholar," and she was not disappointed in her forecasting. Nevertheless he was, like all boys, indifferent and careless, and we are told that, to quicken his zeal and give him a striking lesson, his mother one day surprised and alarmed him by suddenly cutting asunder the web she was weaving. Upon his inquiring why she did it, she replied that thus, by' his idleness, he was cutting asunder the web of opportunity, and destroying his prospects for life, just as she had destroyed the product of the loom. The boy was affected, and gave greater diligence to his studies. These are all the glimpses we have of philosopher Meng, until we meet him in public life at forty years of age. He must have spent his early years in diligent study of the classics, but how, or under what masters, we are not informed. In his writings he says,

“Although I could not be a disciple of Confucius myself, I have endeavored to cultivate my character and knowledge by means of others who were.” Like his master Confucius, Mencius doubtless assumed the office of a teacher—not a teacher or professor in our Western sense, but a peripatetic advocate of morals, political philosophy, and good government — one to whom youthful and perplexed inquirers resorted for counsel and encouragement. In the times of Confucius and Mencius, China was not a consolidated empire as at present, but consisted of a number of states or provinces under independent chieftains or kings. To the court of one of these Mencius resorted at about the age of forty years, and at the court of one or another of these petty rulers he lingered for nearly a quarter of a century the period which his published works cover—when he retired to obscurity, and spent the remaining twenty years of his life with his disciples in social converse, or the preparation of the seven books that constitute his writings. It was a long time before his reputation became national; but the time came at last, when a native writer says, “Since the time when Han, duke of Literature, delivered his eulogium Confucius handed the scheme of doctrine to Mencius, on whose death the line of transmission was interrupted all the scholars of the empire have associated Confucius and Mencius together.” Meng lived to an advanced age, dying BC. 288. The influence of his doctrines and opinions in China is second only to that of Confucius. “Confucius,” says a native writer, “spoke only of benevolence; Mencius speaks of benevolence and righteousness.” “Confucius spoke only of the will or mind; Mencius enlarged on the nourishment of the passion-nature.

The pet doctrine of Mencius was the intrinsic goodness of human nature, although he admitted that by far the greater part of mankind had, through unfavorable circumstances or influences, become perverted. He says, “The way in which a man loses his natural goodness is like the way in which trees are deprived by the woodman of their branches and foliage; and, if they still send forth some buds or sprouts, then come the cattle and goats and browse upon them. As in the tree all appearance of life and beauty is destroyed, so in man, after a long exposure to evil influences, all traces of native goodness seem to be obliterated.” But he maintains that “there is an original power of goodness in the race,” and that “all men may, if they will, become like Yao and Shun, two of the early sages and kings, who were pre-eminent for their virtue.” Mencius attributed the decline in morals to the neglect of the precepts of Confucius. He was determined, therefore, to

correct the evils which had sprung up, and, by securing the attention of the people to the study of morals, to restore the virtues of the primitive ages. One well versed in Chinese scholarship says, "The great object of Mencius is to rectify men's hearts. 'If a man once rectify his heart,' says he, 'little else will remain for him to do.' In another place he says, 'The great or superior man is he who does not lose his child's heart,'" an expression which vividly recalls those beautiful lines of the great German poet

***"Wohl dem der frei von Schuld und Fehle  
Bewahrt die kindlich reine Seele" (Schiller).***

It is evident, however, that, owing to his sanguine and ardent nature, or to some other cause, Mencius did not very fully realize the exceeding difficulty of "rectifying one's heart." He did not like disputing, yet, when forced to it, showed himself master of the art. His reasonings are often marked by an enjoyable ingenuity and subtlety. "We have more sympathy with him than with Confucius. He comes closer to us; he is not so awful, but he is more admirable." The people he considered the most important element of a nation, the sovereign of the least consequence. The ground of the relation between sovereign and people is the will of God. He asserts the doctrine, *Vox populi, vox Dei*. "Heaven sees as the people see, Heaven hears as the people hear." The highest compliment to the Chinese sage Meng is paid: him by Dr. Iegge, who finds his views of human nature identical with those of the great author of the "Analogy," bishop Butler, whom Wardlaw, in his Christian Ethics, compares to the Greek Zeno. It would please us to quote largely from the Seven Books. as the best means of showing the real character and teachings of this teaching "celestial." His writings abound in gems of illustration. Opening them at random, we everywhere light upon striking sayings: "To dig a well, and stop without reaching the spring, is to throw away the well." "People cannot live without fire or water, yet, if you knock at a man's door and ask for water or fire, there is no man who will not give them, such is the abundance of these things: a sage king will cause pulse and grain to be as abundant as fire and water." "To the truly great man belong by nature benevolence, righteousness, prosperity, and knowledge." "Good government is feared by the people, good instructions are loved by them: good government gets their wealth, good instructions their hearts." "Honor and virtue delight in righteousness." "Death in the discharge of duty may be ascribed to the will of Heaven." "Life springs from sorrow and calamity, death from ease and pleasure." "The value of benevolence depends on its being brought to

maturity.” “ I like life and I like righteousness: if I cannot keep the two together, I will let the life go and choose righteousness.” “The tendency of man’s nature to good is like the tendency of water to flow downwards.” “As you do violence to wood in order to make it into cups and bowls, so you must do violence to humanity to fashion it to benevolence and righteousness.” “No man can bend himself and at the same time make others straight.”

Legge finds fault with Confucius and Mencius because their views were so human—both said so little of God and heaven. To these influential teachers he attributes the gross materialism of the Chinese literati to-day: We have no apology to offer for their atheism. Mencius is an object of reverence, but he does not indirectly contribute, like Confucius, to idolatry, in the sanctification of tables, altars, sacrifices, and victims to himself. Mencius is only human, Confucius is divine. The distinguished Orientalist Remusat, in drawing a comparison between Confucius and Mencius, says the former “is always grave, and even austere; he exalts men of virtue, of whom he presents an ideal portrait; he speaks of bad men only with a cool indignation. Mencius, with the same love of virtue, seems to feel for vice rather contempt than abhorrence. He assails it with the force of argument; he does not disdain even to employ against it the weapons of ridicule.” Mencius combined a certain modesty with a just and manly appreciation of himself. He seemed greatly surprised when one of his disciples was disposed to rank him as a sage; yet he said on another occasion, “ When sages shall rise up again, they will not change my words.’ He believed that he was appointed by Heaven to uphold or restore the doctrines of the ancient sages, such as Yao, Shun, and Confucius. Han-Yu, a celebrated Chinese critic, says, “If we wish to study the doctrines of the sages, we must begin with Mencius.... It is owing to his words that learners nowadays still know how to revere Confucius, to honor benevolence and righteousness, to esteem the true sovereign, and to despise the mere pretender.” See, besides the notice prefixed to the Chinese-English edition of Legge’s *Chinese Classics* (Hong-Kong, 1861), vol. ii, Panthier’s translation of Mencius’s writings (Paris, 1851), and his *Chine*, p. 187 \*sq.; Loomis, *Confucius and the Chinese Classics* (San Francisco, 1867, 12mo), bk. iv; Rosny, in Hofer’s *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.; and the excellent article in Thomas’s *Dict. of Biog. and Mythol.* s.v. (E. W.)

## Mencke, Johann

son of the following, was born at Leipsic in 1674, and was admitted master of arts in that university in 1694. He spent some time there in the study of divinity, and then travelled in Holland and England. The reputation of his father secured him ready admission to literary circles, but, to the great disappointment of his father, he turned away from theology, and gave himself to the pursuit of studies in history and jurisprudence. He died April 1, 1732.

## Mencke, Otto

a learned German divine, was born at Oldenburg, in Westphalia, in 1644. When a youth of seventeen, he left the parental roof to seek further educational advantages than his native place could afford him at the large harbor of Bremen, and there he pursued the study of philosophy; he next removed to the University of Leipsic, where he was admitted master of arts in 1664. Thereafter he continued his studies at the universities of Jena, Wittenberg, Groningen, Franeker, Utrecht, Leyden, and Kiel. Returning to Leipsic, he applied himself for some time to divinity and civil law. In 1668 he was chosen professor of morality in that university, and in 1671 took the degree of licentiate in divinity. He discharged the duties of his professorship with great reputation till his death, which happened in 1707. He was five times rector of the University of Leipsic, and seven times dean of the faculty of philosophy. He published several works of his own, and edited many valuable productions of others. They are all, however, of a secular character. See *Genesis Biog Dict.* s.v.; *Biographie Universelle*, s.v.

## Mendaeans (Or Mendians)

also known as CHRISTIANS OF ST. JOHN, are an Eastern religious sect of Christians, who appear to retain some New-Testament principles, tainted, however, very much with Jewish doctrines and customs, and even with many heathen practices and phases of religious opinion. *SEE HEMEEROBAPTISTTE*. They style themselves *Mendei Yochanan*, i.e. *Disciples of John*.

*Names.* — The name ⲁϥⲉⲛⲏⲏ, *Mandaye*, derived from *Manda de-Chaye*, ⲁϥⲉⲃⲟⲓ the λόγος τῆς ζωῆς, or *word of life*, is equivalent to οἱ λογικοί, in opposition to those holding different views, who are designated by them as ἄλογοι. But it is only among themselves they use that appellation; in

public they call themselves *Sobba* (from the Arabic *tsabbah*), and allow themselves to be considered by the Mohammedans as the followers of the *Sabceans* mentioned in the Koran. This erroneous opinion, it is said, took its rise from their habit of turning to the polar star when praying. The name of *Christians of St. John* was never assumed by them, and originated with travellers. Their most learned and distinguished men are called by them *Nasoraye*, *ayē/xn*;

*Sacred Books.* — Most of their standard works, which might have given us authentic views of their principles, were destroyed by the Turks, and their religious works now extant are only,

1. the *aBriardʒas* *Sidra Rabba*, “the great book ;” also called *aznʒæ Gensa*, “the treasure.” This is their principal work, and contains their doctrines, only in unconnected fragments, evidently the production of a number of different persons. It is divided into two parts, the first forming about two thirds of the whole, is written for the living, and is called *anymæ* “the right;” the other, smaller, for the dead, is called *al ms]* “the left,” and contains an account of the death of Adam, as also the prayers to be used by the priests on the occasion of deaths and funerals. Norberg has given some information on that work under the title “*Liber Adami*,” which is quite improper, and which he probably took from Abraham Ecchellensis; his version also is full of errors arising from erroneous interpretation of the text, which he gives also incorrectly, so that this work can only be used with great caution.
2. *atmyj, ardʒæ* “the book of souls;” it contains the prayers of the priests, and constitutes the liturgy, which every priest is to know by heart.
3. *aTs]* /q. This contains the marriage ritual.
4. *amēʒd]atwæB*; in which are found the prayers for each day.
5. *avbʒd]dæm]*, prayers to be recited before the cross, both at home and in the church, but exclusively by the priests.
6. *anj yd]avrD]* a history of John the Baptist.
7. *ayvæ jnirPʒaj* a treatise on astrology. Aside from these they have formulas for all kinds of sorcery, and amulets for sickness and other misfortunes which evil spirits may bring; these charms are to born on the

breast. Those used against incurable diseases are called **ayj æqj**; those against curable disorders **ayræPæ**. According to Ignatius a Jesu, they also possess another work, entitled “*Divan*,” of which he gives an account; yet the characteristics he furnishes of it seem to apply equally to the *Sidra Rabba*, and it is thought that the latter may be the work he refers to.

*Belief.* — Their religion, which is a singular mixture of the most opposite systems of antiquity, is very obscure and confused, the more as, in the course of time, it underwent different and often contradictory modifications, which we find in their religious works. Another very perplexing feature of the system for those who study it is that the same deities or angels are sometimes designated by entirely different names, until it becomes almost impossible to establish their identity.

In a single abstract from the *Sidra Rabba* (i. 130236) we find no less than three conflicting accounts of the creation. They agree in placing at the beginning of all things **aBriaryPæ**. *Pira Rabba*, “the great fruit,” the **aBriaryPæxBj**; *Bego Pira Rabba*, “in the great fruit.” This recalls the Orphean myth of a world’s egg, containing the germ of all that exists. Norberg, in his preface, remark 3, not being able to understand **aryp**, transformed it into **aj rþ**, which, in his *Onomasticon*, he explains “volucris, sc. Phoenix,” and translates the preceding words “(fruit) Ferho per Ferho,” which, in the *Onom.*, he explains by “Summum Numen per se exstitit.” At the same time with the great fruit was the **arqj d, aBrianam**; “*Mana* the Lord of Glory,” and the **aBriawyzæya**; “the Ether of great brilliancy,” which latter is the world, in which the *Mana Rabba* reigns, and which contains the **aBriandjy**; “the great Jordan” (they call all rivers Jordans), which proceeds from him. *Mana Rabba* finally called forth “the life,” **ayj** (sc. **ayædþj**; “the first”). This accomplished the act of creation, and the *Mana Rabba* at once went into the most absolute retirement, where he dwells invisible to all but the purest emanations, and the most pious among the Mendaeans, who, after their death, are permitted, but only once, to contemplate the Almighty. As the revealed, active, and governing deity—but not similar to the semigods of the Gnostics—stands the *Chaye Kadnaye*, “the first life,” which is therefore entitled to the first worship and adoration. Hence also it is it, and not the *Mana Rabba*, who is first invoked in all prayers, and with whose name every book begins. It is designated under a variety of names, even sometimes by those applied to the *Mana*

Rabba, with whom it is occasionally confounded. Like him, it dwells in the pure, brilliant ether, which is considered as a world in itself, in which all that exists is pervaded by the waters of the fire of life, and is inhabited by numberless Uthre, **ayrēY[**, “angels,” who dwell there in eternal blessedness. From the Chaye Kadmhye emanated first the *Chayi Thinyane*, **aynēt̄ aYēi**, “the second life,” often called also **ymæly**, and then the **aYēd]aDn̄ni** *Mande de-Chaye*. This is sometimes (ii. 208) called : **aykD̄i**, the “pure,” yet is described as susceptible of impure thoughts: thus it attempted to usurp the place of the first life, and was on that account exiled from the pure ether into the world of light, being separated from it by the **aym; ayqyphē** (the Cabalists call them **ycypa μym**). It is similar to Cain, while its younger brother, Mandi de-Chaye, represents Abel. He is called the father, master, and king of the UthrE, lord of the worlds, the beloved son, the good shepherd, the high-priest, the word of life, the **λόγος**, the teacher and redeemer of mankind, who descended into hell and chained the devil: he is, in short, the Christ of the Mendseans; and as the followers of our Saviour, so are they named after the founder of their faith. He dwells with the father, who is supposed to be sometimes Chaye Kadmaye, sometimes Mana Rabba, and is, like the “first life,” called **μδα; aymd̄qi** (comp. in the Cabala, **ˆ/md̄h̄iμδα**). He revealed himself, however, to humanity in his three sons, who are also called his brothers, **lyb̄h̄æ** **lyt̄yæ** and **v̄l̄na**; (Abel, Seth, and Enoch). In another place it is said that Hebil alone is his son, Shethil his grandson, and Anush his great-grandson. Hebil, the most important among them, is almost equally venerated with the Manda de-Chay, receives the same names, and is often confounded with him. He is generally named **lyb̄h̄æ awyzæ**. Among the Uthre, “angels,” who emanated from Chaye Thinyank, the first and most eminent is. **aYēi ayēyl̄ æ** “the third life;” often also called **rWtba**; Abathur. This is not the “buffalo,” as erroneously asserted by Gesenius (in Ersch und Gruber, *Encyklop.* s.v. Zabier), but only has that name because of his being called **κατ̄ ἐξήν**, “the father of the Uthre,” **aba; ayrēY[ d]** He is also called “the old, the hidden, the watcher.” He sits at the limit of the world of light, where, at the door which leads to the middle and lower regions, and in a scale which he always holds in his hand, he weighs the deeds of the departed as they appear before him to gain admittance. Under him there was in the beginning an immense void, and at the bottom of it the troubled,

black waters, *aywaysæYmi* As he looked down and saw his image reflected in it, arose *I yj ætP]* who is also called Gabriel, and retains in part the nature of the dark waters from which he proceeded. He received from his father the mission to build the earth and to create man. This he is represented sometimes as having performed alone; at others, with the aid of the daemons. When he had created Adam and Eve, he found himself unable to give them an upright posture, or to breathe the spirit into them. Hebil, Shethil, and Anush then interfered, and obtained from Chayv Kadmayd (or took from Pethahil at his instigation) the spirit of Mana, and infused it into man, that he might not worship Pethahil as his creator. The latter was on that account exiled from the world of light by his father, and consigned to a place below, where he is to remain until the day of judgment. He will then be raised up by Hebil-Siva, be baptized, made king of the Uthre, and will be generally worshipped. The nether world consists of four entrances into hell, or limbo, each of which is governed by a king and queen. Then only comes the real kingdom of darkness, divided into three parts, governed by three old, single kings—Shedum, the grandson of darkness; Gio, the great; and Krun, or Karkum, “the great mountain of flesh,” who, as the oldest and greatest among them, the first-born king of darkness, inhabits the lowest region. In the entrances to hell there is yet dirty, slimy water; in the real hell there is none, and Krun’s kingdom consists only of dust and vacancy. In hell and its entrance there is no longer any brilliancy in fire, but only a consuming power. Hebil-Siva (or Manda de-Chayi), sustained by the power of Mana Rabba, descended into it, unravelled the mysteries of the lower regions, took all power from their kings, and closed the door of the different worlds. By subterfuge he brought out *Rucha*, daughter of *Kin*, the queen of darkness, and prevented her return to the nether world. She then bore the worst of all devils, *rWa*, the fire, i.e. the destroyer, whom Hebil-Siva, when in his zeal he sought to storm the worlds of light, threw into the black waters, bound, and surrounded with iron and seven golden walls. While Pethahil was occupied in the creation of the world and of man, *Rucha* bore first seven, then twelve, and again five sons to the fire. These twenty-four sons were by Pethahil transplanted into the heavens; the first seven are the seven planets, one for each of the seven heavens; the sun, as the greatest, stands in the central or fourth heaven; the twelve became the signs of the zodiac; the fate of the remaining five is unknown. They are intended to be serviceable to man, but only seek to injure him, and are the source of all evil and

wrong upon earth. The seven planets have their stations, *atrfmi* where they return always, after accomplishing their course in the heavens. They, like the earth, and another world situated in its neighborhood, to the north, rest on anvils which Hebil-Siva placed on the belly of the “fire.” The Mendaeans consider the heavens as built of the clearest, purest water, but so solid that even diamond will not cut it. On this water the planets and other stars are sailing; they are of themselves dark, being evil daemons, but are illuminated by brilliant lights carried by the angels. The clearness of the sky enables us to see through the seven heavens as far as the polar star, around which, as the central sun, all the other stars are revolving. It stands at the dome of heaven, before the door of the Abathur, and is therefore the place to which the Mendseans direct their prayers. They consider the earth as a circle, inclining somewhat to the south. It is surrounded on three sides by the sea; on the north, on the contrary, is a great mountain of turquoise, whose reflection causes the sky to appear blue. Immediately on the other side of that mountain is another world, in which Pharaoh, a king and high-priest of the Mendaeans, and the Egyptians, who did not perish in the Red Sea, but were saved, lead a happy life. Both worlds are surrounded by the outer sea, *āw[sd]aBriaMyi* (which Norberg erroneously translates “the Red Sea”), and immediately behind this are the stations of the seven planets. Man consists of three parts: the body, *argPi*; the animal soul, *aj Wr*; and the heavenly soul, the spirit, *atm]jae* *σῶμα, ψυχή, νοῦς*. It is *Rucha, ψυχή*, who leads him into evil; one virtue only is assigned to hershe plays the part of Juno Lucina at confinements.

Although the Mendaeans were originally Christians. they have entirely estranged themselves from the true principles of Christianity. When in the Syriac N.T. they found the Holy Spirit called *Rucha de-Kodsha*, as for them *Rucha*, as *ψυχή*, was the mother of the devil, they identified them, considered the Messiah as her son, and therefore looked upon him as a sorcerer, and, as Mercury, placed him among the planets. They consider the earth as altogether 480,000 years old, during which it has been alternately under the influence of the various planets for an equal length of time; the human race has been three times destroyed by the sword, fire, and water, only one couple remaining alive after each time. At the time of Noah the world was 466,000 years old; 6000 years after him, when the sun (whom they call also *l yaæyaæni]da} v]lrq*) came to reign over the world, and Jerusalem (called *μl i]t]la*) was built at its command, her first

prophet, Abraham,  $\mu\upsilon\text{j } \text{æ}\beta\text{ɔ}i$  appeared; her second was. Moses,  $\text{avym}\text{æ}$  after whom came Shlimun bar-Davith, to whom the daemons yielded obedience. As' the third false prophet, they name  $\text{Wvyaaj } \text{yv}\text{æ}$  whom they consider as an impostor, taught by the Rucha de-Kodsha, calling himself God and the son of God, but was unmasked as an impostor by Anush (perhaps so called in view of the  $\text{av}\text{na}, \text{rBi}$  of the Syriac N.T.), and was put to death by the Jews. Anush himself was baptized by John the Baptist, the only true prophet, and he performed the miracles and resurrections attributed by Christians to Christ. The last of the false prophets was Mohammed, whom they call Achmat, and there will be none after him. After 4000 or 5000 years mankind will again be destroyed: this time by a terrific storm. But the world will be again repopled by a man and a woman from the upper world, and their descendants shall dwell on the earth for 50,000 years in piety and innocence. Then will the fire, also called leviathan, destroy the earth and the other medium worlds, as well as the nether worlds; their spirits will be annihilated, and the universe become a realm of light.

*Priesthood.* — There are different degrees in their priesthood. The lower class is called *Sheganda*,  $\text{aDn}\text{j}\text{p}\text{v}$ , and forms a sort of medium between the clergy, properly so called, and the laity. The members of it are actually but assistants,  $\text{δ}\text{ι}\text{ά}\text{κ}\text{ο}\text{ν}\text{ο}\text{ι}$ , of the priests, and can be received into it while yet mere boys. They are consecrated to that office by the imposition of hands, and the recital of a short formula at baptism. Many remain always in this subordinate position; if they desire to go higher, which they are not permitted to do before they are fifteen years of age, they must study diligently the religious books and customs of their people, undergo a strict trial for sixty days, and pass seven days and nights awake and in prayer with a priest; if admitted, they then become *Tarmides*,  $\text{adym}\text{æ}\text{t}\text{i}$  (probably for  $\text{adym}\text{æ}\text{t}\text{i}$  "scholars"), to which office they are consecrated by seven priests. This is the true 'priestly order, which qualifies them for every ecclesiastical office. Those who distinguish themselves by their science and conduct can become  $\text{ar}\text{b}\text{z}\text{n}\text{t}\text{i}$  which probably is equivalent to  $\text{r}\text{b}\text{z}\text{æ}\text{r } \text{Bz}\text{z}\text{æ}$  <sup><5008></sup> Ezra 1:8; 7:21, or "thesaurarius," he who possesses the great treasure in himself. It corresponds to the office of high-priest or bishop, and requires only a short probation and the consecration by another of that rank. His functions are only to consecrate others, and to preside at marriages, which can, however, be legally administered by the tarmides, without his

participation. A priest who officiates at the marriage of a woman not a maiden, a widow, or a woman divorced from her husband loses the right to perform afterwards any religious ceremony except such marriages; he is then called **qsøP**, “one cut off.” Finally, the highest ecclesiastical dignity, similar to that of patriarch or pope, is that of the **am[ivyr]** “chief of the people,” who is also considered as their civil chief. Their princes-when they had princes-were to be at the same time their highpriests, as they assert was the case with Pharaohs At present they have none. Women are also allowed by them to become members of the clergy: they must be virgins to enter into the order of shegandi, but when they enter the order of tarmides they must at once marry a priest of that order or of a higher. They can in this manner arrive to the degree of *Resh Amma*, if their husband is invested with that title, for in no case can the woman have a higher title than her husband. The official dress of the priests is pure white, is very simple, and consists of white linen underclothing, and a shirt of the same material tied with a white belt. From both shoulders hangs a white stole, about the width of the hand, extending down to the feet. They wear a white cloth on their head, twisted like a turban, the end of which, about a yard in length, hangs down on the left side in front. On the right forearm they wear, during divine -worship only, the **agT**; “crown,” which consists of a piece of white linen, two finger-lengths in breadth, sewed on three sides, and which, when not in use, is put under the turban. On the little finger of the right hand the tarmides wear a gilt and the superior priests a golden seal-ring, bearing the inscription **awyæwy; μlv**, “the name of the *JavarSiva*,” and carry an olive-branch in the left hand. They must always be barefooted in exercising their functions.

*Houses of Worship.* — The churches, which are only intended for the use of the priests and their assistants, the laymen remaining in the entry, are so small that only two persons can stand in them at the same time. They are built from west to east, and are distinguished by gable-roofs. They have no altar and no ornaments, only a few boards in the corners to put things on when needed, but they must be provided with flowing water for baptism.

*Religious Worship, Practices, and Observances.*—Their year is the solar year of 365 days, divided into twelve months of thirty days each; the remaining five days do not belong to any month. Their months are generally named after the signs of the zodiac; they have also retained for

them the Jewish appellation, with a few alterations. They observe the Sabbath, and have besides four ecclesiastical festivals:

**1**, on New-year's-day, at the beginning of the "Waterman;"

**2**, on the 18<sup>th</sup> day of "Taurus;"

**3**, between the Virgin and the Balance;

**4**, on the first day of the Capricorn. Their greatest festival is the Pantasha, the five days of baptism: it is the third in the above list. On this occasion all Mendseans are baptized again; the most pious among them are baptized every Sunday. The Lord's Supper is always connected by them with baptism; for it they use paste, prepared in the church by the priest, instead of bread, and water in the place of wine. It is only on the occasion of marriage, which is always preceded by baptism, that the laymen commune with wine, prepared also in the church by the priest. The priests, on the contrary, always commune with wine.

*Number.* — In the 17th century the Mendaeans still counted some 20,000 families; they have since considerably decreased in number. They are located, some on the Euphrates and Tigris, south of Bagdad, or between the two rivers; some in various cities of Kurdistan, where they carry on the trades of jewellers, blacksmiths, shipbuilders, carpenters, or joiners. The statement of Germanus Conti, that there are persons of the same creed in Lebanon, appears to have originated in a mistake between them and the Nosairians. The Mendaeans do not outwardly distinguish themselves from the Mohammedans among whom they reside. They should, however, according to their law, dress entirely in white; but, as the Mohammedans claim the exclusive use of that color, the Mendaeans wear mostly brown, or brown and white garments. They must void dark colors, as belonging to the kingdom of darkness, yet this rule cannot always be observed. Polygamy is not only permitted, but advised, as their "great book" repeatedly recommends them to diligently increase the race. It is a very general practice with them, although, according to the statement of the priests, they do not usually have more than two wives. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 9:318 sq.; also Farrar, *Ecclesiastes Dict.* s.v.; *Deutsche Zeitschrift*; *christl. Wissenschaft u. christl. Leben*, 1854, No. 23; 856, No. 42, 43, 46, 49; Burckhardt, *Les Nazoreses ou Mcandai-Jahja appelés ordinairement Zabiens et Chrétiens de St. Jean Baptiste* (Strasb. 1840) ;

Chwolsohn, *Die Szabier* (Petersb. 1856); Petermann, *Reisen inn Orient*, (1861), vol. ii.

### Mendelssohn, Bartholdy-Felix

the first musical composer of-eminence who, since Bach and Handel bequeathed to the world their sacred harmonies, devoted his best efforts and great talents chiefly to sacred music. Felix was the grandson of Moses Mendelssohn, the philosopher; his father was the eminent Jewish banker, Abraham Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, who embraced the Christian religion and became a member of the Lutheran Church. Felix was born Feb. 3, 1809, at Hamburg. As a boy he displayed a wonderful talent for music, which attracted the attention of the poet Goethe, who warmly interested himself in Felix, and greatly encouraged him to develop that talent with which the Creator had so largely endowed him. Upon the removal of his parents to Berlin in 1812, his instruction in music was intrusted to Zelter and Berger, both masters in the art; the former a profound musical theorist, and the latter a renowned pianist and teacher. It is not to be wondered at that; under the care and guidance of such masters, the progress of Felix in his musical studies more than fulfilled their expectations. At the age of nine we find him giving his first concert in Berlin, delighting the audience by his graceful performance on the piano. He now commenced to write musical compositions of every form. At the early age of sixteen, he composed his first opera, the music of which is not only charming, but full of dramatic element. This composition shows what Mendelssohn might have accomplished in operatic music had he not left this field for a higher and nobler one that of sacred music. Another proof of his dramatic power is in his music to Shakespeare's *Midsummer Night's Dream*, which is regarded as one of his best efforts in dramatic music. In 1821 he composed his second opera, and finished one half of a third one, besides writing six symphonies, one quartette for the piano and stringed instruments, a cantata, six fugues, and a number of etudes, sonatas, and songs. At the age of twenty Mendelssohn visited England for the first time, and was there deeply influenced for the whole course of his afterlife. He arrived in London in 1829, and, being known by reputation to the most eminent musicians, was most cordially received. At the first concert with the Philharmonic Society, his overture to *Midsummer Night's Dream* was most enthusiastically received by those who had not even heard his name. In the same year Mendelssohn visited Scotland, and was warmly welcomed by literary and musical societies fully able to appreciate his genius. He

made an extended tour through the Highlands, being deeply impressed with the wild and romantic beauty of the old Caledonian music, which some years after gave rise to his celebrated Scotch symphony 'in A minor. His music to the Isles of Fingal also owes its origin to the impression made upon his mind by the wild and stormy shores of the Hebrides. In the following year he visited Italy, and two years afterwards Paris. Later he revisited London, and from that time to the end of his life was a frequent sojourner there. He began to be even more appreciated in England than in his native country, and it became to him, as it were, the land of his adoption. Benedict, in his life of Mendelssohn, says: "The mean cabals which were always at work against him in Berlin increased his dislike to that city, so much so as to induce him to leave it, as he then thought, forever." At Leipsic he accepted the conductorship of the celebrated Gewandhaus concerts, and remained there until 1844, when, induced by the invitation of the king of Prussia, he returned to Berlin.

His entrance upon his glorious career as a composer of sacred music may be ascribed to the committee of the Birmingham Festival, which called forth the oratorio of St. Paul for its festival of 1837. The impression which this composition made at Birmingham is described by those present as truly grand. In 1840 Mendelssohn composed his *Hymn of Praise*, written expressly for the Birmingham Festival, and performed under his direction. It is a work called a symphony cantata, of marvellous beauty. His third and last oratorio was also written, for Birmingham, and, although he commenced it in 1837, it was only finished in time for the festival of 1846, and during these nine years he bestowed upon it his greatest care and attention. The first performance of it took place Aug. 26, 1846, he being the conductor. The enthusiasm was unbounded, and it was universally pronounced his masterpiece, and the greatest oratorio since Handel brought out his *Messiah*.

Although king Frederick William IV bestowed the greatest honors upon Mendelssohn, and offered him every inducement to stay in Berlin, yet he preferred Leipsic, and it was mostly there and in England that he devoted his time to further everything noble and true in art. Mendelssohn was also a diligent scholar in philology, history, and other sciences. His *Letters from Italy and Switzerland* (translated from the German by lady Wallace, London, 1862) bear evidence of his superior attainments, and may be regarded as a fine literary production. In the selection of a text for his oratorios he was very exact, and to the careful student of sacred music it

must be apparent that in Mendelssohn's compositions, founded upon a scriptural text, not only love of music as an art, but also a genuine spirit of piety is revealed. No one could give more true and deeply felt expression than he did in his music to such passages as these: "As the hart pants for cooling streams," "I waited for the Lord," "He, watching over Israel," "It is enough," etc. By the student and lover of sacred music Mendelssohn must ever be regarded as a shining light. If not endowed with the genius of a Bach, Handel, Mozart, or Beethoven, the great talent, exquisite taste, and depth of feeling which he displayed in all his compositions will ever secure him a place among the first of masters. Riehl, in his *Musikalische Charakterkopfe* (i. 106), says, "Many thousands have, by the influence of Mendelssohn's music, been led to the study of the works of Bach and Handel, and enabled to form a more correct idea of their true and lasting value." Again, Riehl says (p. 101), "He made the severe forms of sacred music more elegant and more charming by uniting the formal part of it with a subjective wealth of feeling." In his private life he was a man of most charming disposition, making all who came in contact with him his ardent friends and admirers. Towards his fellow-artists he was perfectly free from envy, always encouraging those in whom he discovered talent. Death plucked him when in his best years, at Leipsic, Nov. 4, 1847. It is impossible to speak herein detail of Mendelssohn's works. They are very numerous, and embrace every branch of his art, but it was in sacred music that his highest powers were displayed; and *St. Paul* and *Elijah* will descend to posterity along with the *Messiah* and *Israel in Egypt*. See Benedict, *Leben u. Werke des F. Mendelssohn-Bartholdy* (1850); Lampadius, *Leben d. Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy* (Leips. 1848; in English, N. Y. 186) ; Fetis, *Biographie Universelle des Musicens*; V. Magnien, *Etude biographique sur Mendelssohn-Bartholdy* (1850); Hiller, *Mendelssohn-Bartholdy* (Cologne and Lond. 1874); *Fraser's Magazine*, April, 1848; *British Quarterly Review*, October, 1862.

### Mendelssohn, Moses

(also' called RAMBAN [<sup>^</sup>8mbmr], from the initials of I dnm μj nm <sup>^</sup>b hçm 8r, *R. Moses ben-Menachem Mendel*, and MOSES DESSAU), whom Mirabeau describes as "un homme jete par la nature au sien d'une horde avilie, ne sans espece de fortune, avec un temperament faible et mdme infirme, un caractere timide, une douceur peutetre excessive, enchainee toute sa vie dans une profession presque mdchanique, s'st eleve

rang des plus grands ecrivains que ce sinle a vu naltre en Allemagne” (*Sur Moses Mendelssohn*, London, 1787), was born at Dessau, Germany, Sept. 6, 1729. His father was a copier (r

ws

) of Biblical writings upon parchment. Moses gave early tokens of an intelligent and scrutinizing mind. Fortunately for his nascent talents, the rabbi of the congregation, David Herschel Frankel, perceiving the eagerness of the boy for learning, undertook to instruct him in all those branches which then constituted a Jewish education—the Bible in the original Hebrew, with its chief commentaries, and rabbinical literature. At an early age Mendelssohn also became acquainted with Maimonides’s (q.v.) famous work, the *More Nebuchim*, or “Guide of the Perplexed,” the intense study of which made anew aera in his life, and that in two ways—it laid the foundation of his mental culture, and also of his bodily disease and suffering. (Mendelssohn was hump-backed, and extremely small, and feeble in person.) The German language the rabbins of Mendelssohn’s early days proscribed as Gentile learning, and hence his studies had been entirely confined to the Hebrew; but as he branched out in his studies he also acquired the German tongue. When hardly fourteen years of age he was obliged to relinquish learning for the choice of a profession. He went to Berlin in search of employment, and there gained his scanty subsistence by following the occupation of copyist and corrector for the press, carefully making use of every leisure moment to learn the ancient languages, and to gain instruction in general literature and philosophy. Chance favored him with the acquaintance of a Polish Jew who possessed a profound knowledge of mathematics. The Pole became his instructor in Euclid, which ‘he studied from a copy of the vork in Hebrew, this being the only language understood by his teacher. Besides Locke’s *Essay on the Human Understanding*, he studied the writings of Wolf, Leibnitz, and Spinoza, which exercised the greatest influence upon his mental development. Thus passed seven of the most laborious years of his life; it was the period of apprenticeship served to science. Gradually this most; reserved but most persevering and highly-cultivated. youth became known in wider circles. His fortune now began to turn. A rich co-religionist of Berlin, Isaac Bernhard, a silk manufacturer, engaged him as tutor for his children. Henceforth he was in easy if not affluent circumstances. His connection with the house of Bernhard continued throughout life, first as tutor in the family, afterwards as book-keeper in the manufactory, and eventually as manager if not as partner in the concern. In the intervals of business he published, in’ concert with his friend, Tobias Bock, some essays on natural philosophy in Hebrew, for the

use of young men studying the Talmud. This publication, which appeared in the *rsllm tl hqpi*.e. “The Hebrew Preacher,” gave some offence to the rabbins, and he escaped persecution only by his strict observance of the Oral Law, to which he undeviatingly submitted all the rest of his life, although his internal convictions’ were little in accordance with its practices. About this time (1754) he became acquainted with Lessing (q.v.) and Nicolai (q.v.). With the former he formed an intimate friendship, always regarded by Mendelssohn as among the most fortunate circumstances of his life; for in “Lessing, than whom no man was ever more free from the prejudices of creed and nation, Mendelssohn found a hearty sympathy and an effective fellow-laborer in his projects for bettering the condition of the German Jews, an object which then and at all times lay nearest his heart. Indeed, the known friendship of so eminent a man for one of that tribe, in defiance of all the prejudices of his age, was scarcely less important to the Jews in general than it was to Mendelssohn in particular.” For two hours every day regularly they met and discussed together literary and philosophical subjects, a circumstance which led Mendelssohn to write his *Philosophische Gespräche*, the very first effort by which he became ‘distinguished beyond the pale of Judaism. The MS. of these dialogues Mendelssohn left with Lessing for examination; but how great was the former’s surprise when one day Lessing returned his dialogues in print, published without the author’s knowledge. He next sent forth *Pope; ein Metaphysiker* (together with Lessing [1755]), and several other essays, and finally his *Briefe über die Empfindungen* (1764). In the same year he also wrote *Abhandlungen über die Evidenz der metaphysischen Wissenschaften* as a prize essay for the Berlin Academy, which was crowned by that learned body, who besides unanimously resolved to elect him a member of their number. Frederick the Great, however, generally prejudiced against the Jews, struck the name off the list, and the Jew had to content himself with the consciousness that he enjoyed less than his contemporaries believed him entitled to. Mendelssohn afterwards, at the instigation of Nicolai and Lessing, collected all his philosophical lucubrations, and published them in 1761 under the title of *Philosophische Schriften*, of which in a short time three editions were published (3d ed. 1777, 2 vols. 8vo). At thirty-one Mendelssohn married a lady from Hamburg, by whom he had several children, among them a son. whose birth gave rise to one of his most celebrated works, the *Morgenstunden*, which treats on the existence of God. in refutation of Pantheism and Spinozism—the result of many years’ inquiry on that subject. Mendelssohn had formerly defined the

universe as a creation out of the divine substance, a view involving the main principle of Spinozism, and directly opposed to the notions of deity and creation prevalent in his day. He now attempted, by concessions and modifications, to get rid of the ethical objections usually brought against kindred theories. The work is a fragment; only the first volume appeared (in 1785), the death of the author arresting its progress. The most popular work, however, was his *Phadon, oder iiber die Unsterblichkeit der Seele*, a colloquy on the doctrine of immortality. The characters are taken from Plato's dialogue of the same name, and the descriptive parts are mere translations of the original. The Jewish philosopher, however, has made Socrates produce new arguments in place of those attributed to him by his disciple Plato, thinking these substitutions better adapted to modern readers. The following is his principal, and, indeed, his only peculiar argument, the rest of the dialogue being employed in its defence, and in expressions of reliance on the goodness of the Deity. For every change three things are required: first, a state of the changeable thing prior to its change; secondly, the state that follows the change; and, thirdly, a middle state, as change does not take place at once, but by degrees. Between being and not-being there is no middle state. Now the soul being simple, and not, as a compound body, capable, of resolution into parts, must, if it perish, be absolutely annihilated; and in its change from death to life, it must pass at once from being to not-being, without, of course, going through any middle state—a change which, according to the three requisitions of change, is impossible. Thus by “*reductio ad absurdum*” the immortality of the soul was proved. Kant, in his *Kritik der reinen Vernunft* (2d ed.; it is not in the 1st ed.; see the complete edition of Kant's works by M. Rosenkianz [Leipsic]), has shown the futility of Mendelssohn's argument, while he admits his acuteness in perceiving that mere incapability of resolution into parts was of itself not sufficient to preserve the immortality of the soul, as had been supposed by many philosophers of the time. Mendelssohn, by assuming that change must be gradual and not sudden, thought that he had established his point, as the soul, being simple, could not admit of gradual resolution. Kant, however, shows that we may conceive a gradual annihilation even without resolution into parts—or, to use his own expression, a diminution of the “intensive magnitude.” Thus a deep red color may grow fainter and fainter till at last all the redness is gone, and this without any diminution of the surface colored. Another fallacy in Mendelssohn's argument is that his definition of change applies only to a transition from one state of being to another, and therefore does

not include a transition from being to not-being. For if not-being be considered a state of being, there is no occasion for an argument at all, as the continuance of being is assumed in the definition of change, nor would anything be gained by supposing the soul in such a paradoxical state as nonentity with still a sort of being attached to it. This work not only immortalized its author's name, but conferred upon him for the strength of his reasoning the name of "the Jewish Socrates," and "the Jewish Plato" for the amenity of his diction. In less than two years after its first appearance (1767) it went through three large editions, and was translated into Hebrew, and into almost every modern language; English editions were published in 1789 and 1838. Mendelssohn's fame was at its height both among Christians and Jews, and he was lauded both as a philosopher and literary character. Zealous Christians were wondering that so enlightened and exemplary a man should retain the faith of his fathers, and regarded it as a sacred duty to bring him over to the Church. Foremost among them was John Caspar Lavater (q.v.), who sought to drag him into theological controversy, though with no unkind intentions. In order to bring about this result, he dedicated to Mendelssohn his translation of Bonnet's *Inquiry into the Evidences of Christianity*, with the request that he would refute it in case he should find the argument untenable; and that, if it should seem to him conclusive, he would "do what policy, love of truth, and probity demanded-what Socrates doubtless would have done, had he read the work and found it unanswerable;" thus offering him the alternative either to incur the odium of his own people by formally abjuring the faith of his fathers, or to draw upon himself the wrath of the Christian clergy by a public assault on their religion. 'his was in the year 1769. The position in which Mendelssohn was thus placed was not only most delicate, but also not without peril. He clung to the ancestral religion not only with the tenacity of early habits, but also with the fulness of conviction which profound study of the subject had given him. How was it possible to reply to the arguments brought forward in favor of Christianity without giving offence to the dominant churches, and becoming liable to the severe penalties enacted by the laws against the assailants of the established creeds? Mendelssohn, however, did reply. He wrote a courteous but decided letter to the pastor of Zurich, in which he not only speaks of his "veneration for the moral character of the founder of Christianity," but also defines very fully his position as a liberal-minded and enlightened Jew. This letter not only satisfied all parties, but also drew from Lavater a public apology and retraction of his peremptory challenge. The agitation caused

by this transaction aggravated Mendelssohn's constitutional complaints, threatening his life, and for a long time incapacitating him for intellectual labor. After his recovery he published a Hebrew commentary on Ecclesiastes (Berl. 1769; *ibid.* 1788), translated into German by Rabe (Anspach, 1771), and into English by Preston (Lond. 1845). The author complains that "nearly all the commentators who have preceded me have almost entirely failed in doing justice to their task of interpretation .. I have not found in one of them an interpretation adequate to the correct explanation of the connection of the verses of the book, but, according to their method, nearly every verse is spoken separately and unconnectedly; and this would not be right in a private and insignificant author, much less in a wise king." As to the design of the book, Mendelssohn thinks "that Solomon wrote it to propound the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, and the necessity of leading a cheerful and contented life, and interspersed these cardinal points with lessons of minor importance, such as worship, politics, domestic economy, etc." Soon after this appeared a German translation of the Pentateuch, made by himself, with a grammatical and exegetical commentary in Hebrew, contributed by several Jewish literati, viz. Sal. Dubno (q.v.), Aaron Jaroslaw, N. IL Wessely (q.v.), and H. Homberg. This important work, which is entitled **rpsewVhit/bytæ** i.e. *The Book of the Paths of Peace* (Berlin, 1780-83), is preceded by an elaborate and most valuable introduction, written in Hebrew, called **r/a hbyTæ** *A Light to the Path*, in which Mendelssohn discusses various topics connected with Biblical exegesis and literature. The introduction, which was published separately before the completion of the commentary (Dec. 1782), now accompanies the translation and commentary, and is given in German in his *Collected Works* (Leips. 1845), 7:18 sq.; and in English in the *Hebrew Review*, edited by Breslau (Lond. 1860). The work soon found its way into the principal synagogues and schools in Germany, and, thus encouraged, he produced afterwards a version of the Psalms and the Song of Solomon, which are considered classical. "It was in this especially," says Da Costa, "that the philosopher kept up the striking resemblance to Maimonides, his celebrated predecessor and model. Both, under the outward forms of Rabbinical Judaism, desired to give an entirely new direction to the religion of the Jews-to reform it, to develop it." Nothing, indeed, could have more powerfully affected the Orientalism of his countrymen than these efforts of Mendelssohn for Biblical criticism from a modern Platonic stand-point. The new medium of vision brought

new insight; critical inquiry took the place of fanaticism; the divergences of Shemitic and European thought proved not so irreconcilable after all. Cabalism and other kindred superstitions quietly dropped out of sight; the old dialectical barbarism was extirpated; the Jews who read his Scriptures in the translation attained purity of idiom, and with it the power of appreciating the writings of the great minds of Germany, to whom they had remained strangers. Ere long the best minds of the race became thoroughly associated with the intellectual movement of Germany, content to abandon mystical ambitions and theocratic pretensions; and to find their Canaan in Europe. Mendelssohn's next work declared more clearly (though always with a degree of vagueness) his own ideas on religion than any other work hitherto published. It was written in answer to the treatise of his friend the councillor Dohm (*Ueber die biirgerliche Verbesserung der Juden*). The statesman in his work "had started from the principle that every amendment must proceed from liberty and equality of rights in society bestowed upon the Jew; from an entire reform in the systems of instruction and education; from free admission to the practice of all arts and sciences, and even a participation in some posts and offices of state; the authority of the synagogue over its members to be maintained, in cases of religious difference, by the power of casting them out of its bosom for a time or entirely." On this last point Mendelssohn took exception. He would not allow the synagogue or any other religious society to impose any restriction whatever on the rights of thinking and teaching. In the preface to his German translation of Manasseh ben-Israel's (q.v.) *Salvation of Israel*, he plainly declared his conviction." that every society had certainly the right to exclude its members when they ceased to conform to the principle of the society; but that this rule could not in any way apply to a religious society, whether church or synagogue, because true religion exerts no authority over ideas and opinions, but, being all heart and spirit, only desires to use the power of conviction; and Jews especially should take from Christians, among whom they live, an example of charity, and not of hatred or intolerance, and begin by loving and bearing with each other, that they might themselves be loved and tolerated by others." The influence produced by the writings of Mendelssohn was to destroy all respect. for the Talmud and the rabbinical writers among the Jews, who approved his opinions. This is the more remarkable, inasmuch as Mendelssohn professed all them while to be himself an admirer of those works; and this obvious inconsistency called forth a publication entitled *Ein Brief an Mendelssohn*, in which this contradiction was clearly pointed out,

and the assertion made that he was in reality a Christian, without having the courage to avow his true sentiments. To this attack he replied by his *Jerusalem, oder fiber religioſe Macht und Judenthum* (Berlin, 1783), in which he contended that “the ſtate, which has the right to compel actions, cannot juſtly attempt to conſtrain its citizens to unanimity in thought and ſentiment; it ſhould, however, ſeek by wiſe proviſions to produce thoſe ſentiments from which good actions ſpring. Religious differences ſhould not prejudice civil equality; the true ideal is not unity, but freedom of belief.” He ſays, “All religion is ſolely a matter of the heart, and ſhould not be under any control, either of the State, Church, or Synagogue;” while at the ſame time he inſiſts that “the law of Moſes was not a law of faith, but merely of ſtatutes and prohibitions.” “Whatever may have cauſed the inward ſtruggles of the philoſopher of Berlin,” ſays Da Coſta, “it is certain that, without wiſhing or ſuſpecting it, Mendelsſohn-as, ſix centuries earlier, Maimonides-ſtirred up among his co-religioniſts a feeling of void.” Soon, however, Mendelsſohn was doomed to experience another trial of his ſenſibility in an attack on his deceased friend Leſſing by Jacobi (q.v.), who published *Briefe an Mendelsſohn iiber die Lehre des Spinoza*, in which he charged Leſſing with being an “implicit Spinoziſt” — a charge then much ſeverer than at preſent, when many German philoſophers are avowed admirers of Spinoza. Mendelsſohn endeavored to refute the charge in a work entitled *Moses Mendelsſohn an die Freunde Leſſing’s* (1786), in which he ſtated that “if Leſſing was able abſolutely and without all further limitation to declare for the ſyſtem of any man, he was at that time no more in harmony with himſelf, or he was in a ſtrange humor to make a paradoxical aſſertion which, in a ſerious hour, he himſelf rejected.” The answer was conſidered triumphant, and drew from Kant the remark, “It is Mendelsſohn’s fault that Jacobi thinks himſelf a philoſopher.” In a hurried preparation of this latter work Mendelsſohn overtaſked his physical powers, and the exhaustion thus produced led to his premature death, which took place Jan. 4, 1786. Ramler wrote this epitaph on Menelſſohn : “True to the religion of his forefathers, wiſe as Socrates, teaching immortality, and becoming immortal like Socrates.” Beſides many Hebrew and German eſſays which we have not room to mention, Mendelsſohn contributed freely to the *Bibliothek der ſchonen Wiſſenſchaften*, edited by Leſſing (q.v.). His complete works were collected and edited by his grandſon, G. B. Mendelsſohn (Leips. 1843-5, 7 vols.). The influence which he exerciſed. over the Jewish nation is incalculable. He roused the Jews of Germany, if not of the world, from the mental apathy with which in his day

they regarded all that had not a distinct reference to religion, On the other hand, he acted in the most beneficial manner on his Christian contemporaries by exterminating the brutal prejudices which they entertained against Jews. and through his most distinguished Christian friends brought about the abrogation of the disgraceful laws with respect to them. *SEE JEWS*. He effected a reformation in Judaism, and founded that new school of Hebrew literature and Biblical exegesis which has now produced so many and such distinguished Jewish literati not only in Germany, but throughout Europe. No wonder that the Jews express their gratitude to-him and reverence for him in the saying, “From Moses (the law-giver) to Moses (Maimonides) and Moses (Mendelssohn), no one hath arisen like Moses” (הַצֶּמֶח הַצֶּמֶח מִהַ אֵל הַצֶּמֶח דְּ[ו] הַצֶּמֶל ). See Kayserling, *M. Mendelssohn, seine Leben u. s. Werke* (Leips. 1862); Samuels, *Memoirs of Moses Mendelssohn*, etc. (2d ed. Lond. 1827); Hedge, *Prose Writers of Germany*, ‘p. 99 sq.; Adler, *Versöhnung von Gott, Religion, und Menschenthum durch M. Mendelssohn* (Berlin, 1871); Axenfeld, *Moses Mendelssohn im Verhältniss zum Christenthum* (Erlangen, 1865); Griatz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, xi, I sq.; Ueberweg, *History of Philosophy*, 2:118, 523, 528 (Engl. transl. by Morris, New York, 1874); Milman, *Hist. of the Jews*, 3:408 sq.; McCaul, *Sketches of Judaism and the Jews*, p. 43 sq.; Da Costa, *Israel and the Gentiles*, p. 544 sq.; Schmucker, *Hist. of the Modern Jews* (Philadelphia, 1867), p. 239 sq.; Kalkar, *Israel u. d. Kirche* (Hamburg, 1869), p. 117 sq.; *Jewish Intelligence* (Lond. 1866), p. 31 sq.; Etheridge, *Introduction to Hebrew Literature*, p. 475 sq.; *Miscellany of Hebrew Literature* (Londo 1872), p. 22 sq.; Dessauer, *Gesch. d. Israeliten* (Bres. lau, 1870), p. 497 sq.; Stern, *Gesch. d. Judenthums* (ibia 1870), p. 54 sq.; Cassel, *Zeitfaden für Jüd. Gesch. u. Literatur* (Berlin, 1872), p. 108 sq.; Furst, *Bibl. Jud.* 2:359-367; De Rossi, *Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei* (German transl. by Hamberger), p. 224 sq, id., *Bibliotheca Judaica antichristiana*, p. 69; Jost, *Gesch. d. Israeliten*, 9:66; id., *Gesch. d. Juden. u. s. Sektel*, 3:293 sq.; Zedner, *Auswahl historischer Stücke* (Berl. 1840), p. 204 sq.; Farrar, *Crit. History of Free Thought*; Hurst’s Hagenbach, *Church Hist.* 18th and 19th Century; *Christian Remembrancer*, Oct. 1866, p. 267. (B. P.)

## Mendez, Alphonso

a noted missionary of the Roman Catholic Church, flourished in Abyssinia in the early part of the 17th century. He was a Portuguese by birth, but we

know little of his personal history disconnected from his labors in the East. He belonged to the Society of Jesus, and was created patriarch of the Abyssinians in 1626, by the emperor Suscenius, or Socinius, who, quite contrary to general practices, not only himself paid allegiance to the Roman pontiff, but also obliged his subjects to abandon the religious rites and tenets of their ancestors, and to embrace the doctrine and worship of the Rornish Church. Mendez, as patriarch, by his intemperate zeal, imprudence, and arrogance, ruined the cause in which he had embarked, and occasioned the total subversion of the Roman pontiff's authority and jurisdiction, which seemed to have been established upon solid foundations. "He began his ministry," says Mosheim (*Ecclesiastes Hist.*, Harper's edit., 2:193), "with the most inconsiderate acts of violence and despotism. Following the spirit of the Spanish Inquisition, he employed formidable threatenings and cruel tortures to convert the Abyssinians; the greatest part of whom, together with their priests and ministers, held the religion of their ancestors in the highest veneration, and were willing to part with their lives and fortunes rather than forsake it. He also ordered those to be rebaptized who, in compliance with the orders of the emperor, had embraced the faith of Rome, as if their former religion had been nothing more than a system of paganism. Nor did the insolent patriarch rest satisfied with these arbitrary and despotic proceedings in the Church; he excited tumults and factions in the state, and, with an unparalleled spirit of rebellion and arrogance, encroached upon the prerogatives of the throne, and attempted to give law to the emperor himself. Hence arose civil commotions, conspiracies, and seditions, which excited in a little time the indignation of the emperor, and the hatred of the people against the Jesuits, and produced at length, in 1631, a public declaration from the throne, by which the Abyssinian monarch annulled the orders he had formerly given in favor of popery, and left his subjects at liberty either to persevere in the doctrine of their ancestors or to embrace the faith of Rome. This rational declaration was mild and indulgent toward the Jesuits, considering the treatment which their insolence and presumption had so justly deserved; but in the following reign much severer measures were employed against them. Basilides, or Facilidas, the son of Segued, who succeeded his father in 1632, thought it expedient to free his dominions from these troublesome and despotic guests, and accordingly, in 1634, he banished from his territories the patriarch Mendez, with all the Jesuits and Europeans who belonged to his retinue, and treated the Roman Catholic missionaries with excessive severity. From this period the very name of Rome, its religion, and its

pontiff, were objects of the highest aversion among the Abyssinians.” Le Grand, himself a Roman Catholic, makes the following remark upon the conduct of the patriarch Mendez: “It is to be wished that the patriarch had never intermeddled in such a variety of affairs” (by which mitigated expression the author means his ambitious attempts to govern in the cabinet as well as in the Church), “or carried his authority to such a height as to behave in Ethiopia as if he had been in a country where the Inquisition was established; for by this conduct he set all the people against him, and excited in them such an aversion to the Roman Catholics in general, and to the Jesuits in particular, as nothing has hitherto been able to diminish, and which subsists in full force to this day” (in the fourth dissertation subjoined to vol. ii of Lobo’s *Voyage d’Abyssinie*, which the reader will do well to consult, especially p. 116, 130, 144). See also Ludolfi *Histor. tithiopica*, lib. iii, cap. xii; Geddes, *Ch. Hist. of Ethiopia*, p. 233; La Croze, *Hist. du Christianisme d’Ethiopie*, p. 79; Lockman; *Travels of the Jesuits*, 1:308 sq.- (J. HW.)

### Mendez, Gonzalez Juan

a Roman Catholic prelate of note, flourished in the latter half of the 16th century. He was an Augustinian friar of the province of Castile, when he was chosen by the king of Spain to become ambassador to the emperor of China in 1584. In 1593 he was made bishop of Lipari, in Italy; in 1607, bishop of Chiapi, in New Spain; and in 1608, bishop of Propajan, in the West Indies. He died in 1617. He wrote *A History of China* in Spanish, which has been translated into several languages.

### Mendez, Gonzalez Pedro

a noted Roman Catholic prelate in the Church of Spain, called the “grand cardinal,” was born at Guadalajara in 1428, of an ancient and noble family. He made rapid progress in his studies, especially in the languages, in civil and canon law, and in belles-lettres. His uncle, Gautier Alvarez, archbishop of Toledo, gave him an archdeaconry in his church, and sent him to the court of John II, king of Castile. His merit and quality soon made him friends and he acquired the bishopric of Calahorra. Henry IV who succeeded John, trusted him with the most important affairs of state, and with the bishopric of Sigtenca, and finally procured a cardinal’s hat for him, from Sixtus IV, in 1517. When Henry died, in the year following, he named cardinal Mendez for his executor, and dignified him. at the same time with

the title of the Cardinal of Spain. He did great service afterwards to Ferdinand and Isabella, in the war against the king of Portugal, and in the conquest of the kingdom of Granada from the Moors. He was then made archbishop of Seville and Toledo successively; and, after governing some years in his several provinces with great wisdom and moderation, he died Jan. 11, 1495. He founded the magnificent college of Santa Cruz at Valladolid, and a hospital at Toledo. See Salazar de Mendoza, *Chronica del gran Cardinal de Espana* (1625).

### Mendicants, Order Of

also known as *Begging Friars*, is the name of several religious organizations within the boundaries of the Roman Catholic Church, intended to depend for support on the voluntary contributions of the laity. This sort of society began in the 13th century, and the members of it, by the tenor of their institution, were to remain entirely destitute of all fixed revenues and possessions. Innocent III was the first of the popes who perceived the necessity of instituting such an order; and though his far-seeing eye took in the possible dangers of fierce and ascetic enthusiasm, he nevertheless felt constrained to give those monastic societies making a profession of poverty the most distinguishing marks of his protection and favor. The peculiar state and circumstances of the time seem to have rendered such an establishment very essential for the preservation of the Church. The monastic orders then existing wallowed in opulence, and were by the corrupting influence of their ample possessions lulled into a luxurious indolence. They lost sight of all their religious obligations, trampled upon the authority of their superiors, suffered heresy to triumph unrestrained, and the sectaries to form various assemblies; in short, they were incapable of promoting the true interests of the Church, and abandoned themselves, without either shame or remorse, to all sorts of crimes. On the other hand, the "heretics" of the Church, the sects which had left its communion, followed certain austere rules of life and conduct, which formed a strong contrast between them and the religious orders, and contributed to render the licentiousness of the latter still more offensive and shocking to the people. These sects maintained that voluntary poverty was the leading and essential quality in a servant of Christ; obliged their doctors to imitate the simplicity of the apostles; reproached the Church with its overgrown opulence, and the vices and corruptions of the clergy, that flowed thence as from their natural source; and, by their commendation of poverty and contempt of riches, acquired a high degree

of respect, and gained a prodigious ascendancy over the minds of the 'multitude. In consequence, the great desire of the Church was the formation of a society composed of a set of men who-by the austerity of their manners, their contempt of riches, and the external gravity and sanctity of their conduct and maxims-might resemble those doctors that had gained such reputation for the heretical sects, and who might rise so far above the allurements of worldly profit and pleasure as not to be seduced by the promises or threats of kings and princes from the performance of the duties which they owed to the Church, or from persevering in their subordination to the Roman pontiffs.

The favors which the Mendicants received at the hands of Innocent III were extended to them likewise by his successors in the pontifical chair, as experience had demonstrated their public and extensive usefulness. But when it became generally known that they had such a peculiar place in the esteem and protection of the rulers of the Church, their number grew to such an enormous and unwieldy multitude, and swarmed so prodigiously in all the European provinces, that they became a burden, not only to the people, but to the Church itself. The great inconvenience that arose from the excessive multiplication of the Mendicant orders was first attempted to be remedied by Gregory X in a general council which he assembled at Lyons in 1272; for here all the religious orders that had sprung up after the council held at Rome in 1215, under the pontificate of Innocent III, were suppressed; and the extravagant multitude of Mendicants, as Gregory called them, were reduced to a smaller number, and confined to four societies or denominations, viz. the *Dominicans*, the *Franciscans*, the *Carmelites*. and the *Augustines*, or Hermits of St. Augustine (see each). As the pontiffs allowed these four Mendicant orders the liberty of travelling wherever they thought proper, of conversing with persons of every rank, of instructing the youth and multitude wherever they went, and as these monks exhibited in their outward appearance and manner of life more striking marks of gravity and holiness than were observable in the other monastic societies, they arose all at once to the very summit of fame, and were regarded with the utmost esteem and veneration through all the countries of Europe. The enthusiastic attachment to these sanctimonious beggars went so far that, as we learn from the most authentic records, several cities were divided or cantoned out into four parts, with a view to these four orders: the first part being assigned to the Dominicans, the second to the Franciscans, the third to the Carmelites, and the fourth to the

Augustines. The people were unwilling to receive the sacraments from any other hands than those of the Mendicants, to whose churches they crowded to perform their devotions while living, and were extremely desirous to deposit there their remains after death. Nor did the influence and credit of the Mendicants end here, for we find in the history of this and the succeeding ages that they were employed not only in spiritual matters, but also in temporal and political affairs of the greatest consequence—in composing the differences of princes, concluding treaties of peace, concerting alliances, presiding in cabinet councils, governing courts, levying taxes, and other occupations, not only remote from, but absolutely inconsistent with the monastic character and profession. However, the power of the Dominicans and Franciscans greatly surpassed that of the other two orders, insomuch that these two orders were, before the Reformation, what the Jesuits have been since that period—the very soul of the hierarchy, the engines of the state, the secret spring of all the motions of the one and the other, and the authors and directors of every great and important event, both in the religious and political world.

By very quick progression, the pride and confidence of the Mendicants arrived at such a pitch that they had the presumption to declare themselves publicly possessed of a divine impulse and commission to illustrate and maintain the religion of Jesus. They treated with the utmost insolence and contempt the priesthood; they affirmed without a blush that the true method of salvation was revealed to them alone; proclaimed with ostentation the superior efficacy and virtue of their indulgences; and vaunted beyond measure their interest at the court of heaven, and their familiar connections with the Supreme Being, the Virgin Mary, and the saints in glory. By these impious wiles they so deluded and captivated the ignorant and blinded the multitude that they would not intrust any others but the Mendicants with the care of their souls. They retained their credit and influence to such a degree nearly to the close of the 14th century that great numbers of both sexes—some in health, others in a state of infirmity, others at the point of death—earnestly desired to be admitted into the Mendicant order, which they looked upon as a sure and infallible method of rendering Heaven propitious. Many made it an essential part of their last wills that their bodies, after death, should be wrapped in old, ragged Dominican or Franciscan habits, and interred among the Mendicants; for such was the barbarous superstition and wretched ignorance of this age, that people universally believed they should readily obtain mercy from

Christ at the day of judgment if they appeared before his tribunal associated with the Mendicant friars. About this time, however, the Mendicants fell under a universal odium; but, being resolutely protected against all opposition, whether open or secret, by the popes, who regarded them as their best friends and most effectual supports, they suffered little or nothing from their numerous adversaries.

In the 15th century, besides their arrogance, which was excessive, a quarrelsome and litigious spirit prevailed among the Mendicants, and drew upon them justly the displeasure and indignation of many. By affording refuge at the time to the Beguins (q.v.) in their order, they became offensive to the bishops, and were involved in difficulties and perplexities of various kinds. They lost their credit in the 16th century by their rustic impudence, their ridiculous superstitions, their ignorance, cruelty, and brutish manners. They displayed the most barbarous aversion to the arts and sciences, and expressed a like abhorrence of certain eminent and learned men, who had endeavored to open the paths of science to the pursuits of the studious youth. and had recommended the culture of the mind, and attacked the barbarism of the age in their writings and discourses. The general character of the society, together with other circumstances, concurred to render a reformation desirable, and had the effect of bringing it about. Among the number of Mendicants are also ranked the Capuchins, Recollets. Minims, and others, who are branches or derivations from the former. Buchanan says that the Mendicants of Scotland, under an appearance of beggary, lived a very luxurious life; whence one wittily called them, not *Mendicant*, but *Manducant* friars. See Jean le Rond d'Alembert, *Hist. des Moines mendiants* (Paris, 1768, 12mo; German by J. Scheubner, Nuremb. 1769); J. Gurlitt, *Gesch. d. Bettelmenchsorden im 13 Jahrh.* (*Theol. Studien u. Kritiken*, 1:109 sq.); Gieseler, *Ecclesiastes Hist.* 2:287 sq.; 3:46 et al.; Mosheim, *Ecclesiastes Hist.* vol. ii (see Index); Neander, *Ch. Hist.* vol. v (see Index); Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, 7:321-et al.; Hardwick, *Ch. Hist.* (Middle Ages) p. 252 sq., 320 sq. et al.; Mrs. Jameson, *Legends of the Monastic Orders*, p. 227 sq.; Lea, *Sacerdotal Celibacy*, p. 377; *Chr. Review*, vol. xx, Jan. (J. HW.)

**Mendoza**

*SEE MENDEZ.*

## Mends, Herbert

an English Protestant divine, born at Brinkworth, in Wiltshire, about the middle of the 18th century, was the son of Christopher Mends, also a clergyman. He early decided to devote himself to the ministry, and was accordingly placed at a gram-mar-school at Plymouth, where he obtained the rudiments of a classical education; and was after that instructed by the Revelation Samuel Buncombe, a minister of the Independent Church at Ottery St. Mary, Devon., where he continued three years. In 1777, having completed his academical studies, he removed to Sherborne, in Dorset, and was ordained pastor of the Church. In 1782, his father's infirmities increasing, he was invited to assist him at Plymouth; here he was very successful, his Church augmenting greatly, not only in the number of hearers, but in the membership. He was steadfast and consistent in his attachment to evangelical truth in the midst of various and conflicting errors, which at that period pervaded the West of England, and which led him to express his sentiments with unusual energy in his confession of faith delivered at his ordination. If in his later years he insisted more earnestly on the obligations of true Christians to maintain good works, it did not arise from any diminished sense of the value of other religious duties; but local circumstances induced him to inveigh against certain errors which seemed to him dangerous to practical religion. Another great cause of his success was the animation and warmth of his address, which not only attracted a large congregation, but kept them still united at a period when a minister's waning energies frequently impair his usefulness. -In 1785 Mr. Mends became the first and most active promoter of the Association of Independent Ministers of Churches in the West of England, by which society valuable aid was contributed to the extension and success of the Gospel. He died about the opening of this century. Mends did not write much for publication. In 1785 he published an *Elegy on the Death of William Shephard, Esq.*; in 1789, *A Sermon on the Injustice and Cruelty of the Slave-trade*; in 1790, *A Sermon on the Education of the Children of the Poor*; in 1797, *A Defence of Infant Baptism*; and, in 1801, *A Sermon preached in London before the Missionary Society*.

## Me'ne

a word Anglicized in the Auth. Vers. of the Chaldee sentence MENE, MENE, TEKEL, UPHARSM (*anē]ysæpW | qē]anē]* mene', mene', tekel, upharsin', *numbered, numbered, weighed, and dividing*, as each

term is. immediately interpreted, the last being given in its sing. and pass. form **srḒ]** *peres*, *divided*; Sept. [i.e. Theodotion ] in both passages **μανή, θεκέλ, φάρεις**; Vulg. *mane, thecel, phares*), an inscription supernaturally written “ upon the plaster of the wall” in Belshazzar’s palace at Babylon (Daniel v. 5-25); which “ the astrologers, the Chaldmans, and the soothsayers” could neither read nor interpret, but which Daniel first read and then interpreted. Yet the words, as they are found in Daniel, are pure Chaldee, and, if they appeared in the Chaldee character, could have been read, at least, by any person present on the occasion who understood the alphabet of his own language. To account for their inability to decipher this inscription, it has been supposed that it consisted of those Chaldee words written in another character. Dr. Hales thinks that it may have been written in the primitive Hebrew character, from which the Samaritan was formed, and that, in order to show on this occasion that the writer of the inscription was the offended God of Israel, whose authority was at that moment peculiarly despised (ver. 2, 3,4), he adopted his own sacred character, in which he had originally written the decalogue, in which Moses could transcribe it into the law, and whose autograph copy was found in Josiah’s days, and was most probably brought to Babylon in the care of Daniel, who could therefore understand the character without inspiration, but which would be unknown to “the wise men of Babylon” (*New Analysis of Chronology* [Lond. 1811], 1:505). This theory has the recommendation that it involves as little as possible of miraculous agency. Josephus makes Daniel discourse to Belshazzar as if the inscription had been in Greek. “He (Daniel) explained the writing thus: MANH. ‘This,’ said he, ‘in the Greek language, may mean a number ; thus God hath numbered so long a time for thy life and for thy government, and that there remains a short time for thee. OEKEA. This signifies *weight*; hence he says, ‘God having weighed in a balance the time of thy kingdom, finds it already going down. ΦΑΡΕΣ. This also, according to *the Greek language*, denotes a *fragment*; hence ‘ he will break in pieces thy kingdom, and divide it among the Medes and Persians’” (*Ant.* 10:11, 3). It has been supposed by some that “ the wise men” were not so much at fault to read the inscription as to explain its meaning, which, it is said, they might’ sufficiently understand to see its boding import to the monarch, and be unwilling to consider further-like the disciples in regard to the predictions of our Lord’s death (~~105~~ Luke 9:45), where it is said, “This saying was hid from them, they perceived it not; and they feared to ask him of that saying.” Certainly it is said throughout our narrative that “the wise men could not read the writing, nor make known

the interpretation of it," phrases which would seem to mean one and the same thing; since, if they mean different things, the order of ideas would be that they could not interpret nor even read it, and Wintle accordingly translates, "could not read so as to interpret it" (*Improved Version of Daniel*, Lond. 1/807). At all events, the meaning of the inscription by itself would be extremely enigmatical and obscure. To determine the application, and to give the full sense, of an isolated device which amounted to no more than "he or it is numbered, he or it is numbered, he or it is weighed, they are divided" (and there is even a riddle or paranomasia on the last word **srp**; comp. Susannah, ver. 54, 55, and 58, 59, Greek, and <sup>אחיה</sup>Jeremiah 1:11, 12, Hebrew; which may either mean "they divide," or "the Persians," with little difference of pronunciation in the sing. [**srə**] and **srP**) and none in the plur. [**ysæP**]), must surely have required a supernatural endowment on the part of Daniel—a conclusion which is confirmed by the exact coincidence of the event with the prediction, which he propounded with so much fortitude (ver. 30, 31).

## Menedemus

a Greek philosopher and teacher, flourished in the 3d century BC.

*Life.*—He was born in Eretria of a noble family, the Theopropidae. Being poor, he labored as a tent-maker and builder for a livelihood. According to Diogenes Laertius, he was sent on some military service to Megara, where he profited by the occasion to hear Plato. He then relinquished the army, and devoted himself to philosophy. But it is not probable that he was old enough to have heard Plato before the death of the latter. If the length of his life as Diogenes gives it is correct, it would not have been possible; for at the period of Plato's death he would have been only four years of age. According to the story in Athenseus (iv, p. 168), he and his friend Asclepiades labored for a maintenance as millers, passing the night in toil in order to gain time for philosophy during the day. They subsequently became pupils of Stilpo at Megara, whence they proceeded to Elis, to profit by the instructions of some disciples of Phaedo. Menedemus, on his return to Eretria, established a school of philosophy, which was called the Eretrian. He did not devote himself entirely to philosophy, but was an active-participant in the politics of his native city, becoming the most influential man in the state, although in his earlier days he was regarded with dislike. He was sent on various missions to Ptolemaeus (probably Ptolemaeus Ceraunus), to Lysimachus, and to Demetrius, and obtained for

his native city a repeal of a portion of the tax paid to Demetrius. During some portion of his life he visited Cyprus, and greatly enraged the tyrant Nicocreon by his freely-expressed opinions. The story of his being in Egypt, and sharing in the making of the Septuagint version, which is found in Aristeas, is doubtless unworthy of credence. He enjoyed the favor of Antigonus Gonatus, and persuaded the Eretrians to present to him a public congratulation after his victory over the Gauls. This induced the suspicion of an intention on his part of betraying Eretria into the power of Antigonus. According to one account, these surmises led him to depart secretly from Eretria, and take refuge in the sanctuary of Amphiaraus at Oropus. Some golden vessels, the property of the temple, being lost while he was there, the Boeotians compelled him to leave, when he fled to the court of Antigonus, where he soon died of grief, probably in the year BC. 277, at the age of seventy-four. Another account says that he went to Antigonus to solicit his interference in behalf of the freedom of his native city.

*As a Philosopher and Teacher.*-As a teacher, Menedemus, in his intercourse with his disciples, was characterized by the absence of formality and restraint, although noted for the severity with which he rebuked all dissoluteness and intemperance, so that the fear of his censure seems to have acted as a check. He lived with his friend Asclepiades, between whom and himself there existed a close friendship. In the latter part of his life he seems to have lived in affluence. Of the philosophy of Menedemus little is known, excepting that it closely resembled that of the Megarian school, and that of Phaedo of Elis. Indeed, he may be said to have continued Philo's philosophy. Its leading feature was the dogma of the oneness of the Good, which he carefully distinguished from the Useful. All distinctions between virtues he regarded as merely nominal. The Good and the True he looked upon as identical. In dialectics he rejected all merely negative propositions, maintaining that truth could be predicated only of those which were affirmative, and of these he admitted such alone as were identical propositions. He was a vehement and keen disputant, but none of his philosophical controversies or doctrines were committed to writing. Epicrates, in a passage quoted by Athenseus (ii, p. 59), classes Menedemus with Plato and Speusippus; but it appears from Diogenes Laertius that his opinion of Plato and Xenocrates was not very high. Stilpo he greatly admired. See Diogenes Laertius, 2:125144; Plutarch, *De Adul.*

et Amic. Disc. p. 55; Strabo, ix, p. 393; Ritter, *Geschichte der Philosophie*, bk. vii, c. 5.

## Menela'ius

(*Μενέλαος*, a common Greek name), a usurping high-priest who obtained the office from Antiochus Epiphanes (BC. cir. 172) by a large bribe (2 Macc. 4:23-25), and drove out Jason, who had obtained it not long before by similar means. When he neglected to pay the sum which he had promised, he was summoned to the king's presence, and by plundering the Temple gained the means of silencing the accusations which were brought against him. By a similar sacrilege he secured himself against the consequences of an insurrection which his tyranny had excited, and also procured the death of Onias (ver. 27-34). He was afterwards hard pressed by Jason, who, taking occasion from his unpopularity, attempted unsuccessfully to recover the high-priesthood (2 Macc. v. 5-10). For a time he then disappears from the history (yet comp. ver. 23), but at last he met with a violent death at the hands of Antiochus Eupator (BC. cir. 163), which seemed in a peculiar manner a providential punishment of his sacrilege. (xiii. 3, 4).

According to Josephus (*Ant.* sii. 5,1) he was a younger brother of Jason and Onias, and, like Jason, changed his proper name, *Onias*, for a Greek name. In 2 Macc., on the other hand, he is called a brother of Simon the Benjamite (2 Macc. 4:23), whose treason led to the first attempt to plunder the Temple. If this account be correct, the profanation of the sacred office was the more marked by the fact that it was transferred from the family of Aaron:

## Menes

was the name of the first king of the first Egyptian dynasty. He marks a great chronological epoch, being placed by different chronologers as early as BC. 3643, 3892, or even 5702. Stricter Egyptologists make his accession BC. 2717. This name, which signifies *the conductor*, has been found on inscriptions, but no contemporary monuments of him are known. Menes is the most usual form of his name, but it is also written *Menas*, *Menis*, *Meinis*, *Men*, *Min*, and *Mein*. It is singularly in accordance with the Indian *Menu*, the Greek *Minos*, the Teutonic *Mannus*, and similar appellations of a primeval king; although the oldest Egyptian language seems to have had nothing akin with the Aryan family, to which the others

belong. Herodotus says that he built Memphis on the original bed of the Nile, which he turned from its former course, and erected therein a beautiful temple to Hephaestus or Pthah II (comp. Diod. 1:50, ed Wess. ad loc.). Diodorus informs us that he introduced into Egypt the worship of the gods, the practice of sacrifices, and many luxuries. For this last innovation he was subsequently held in great dishonor, as Plutarch mentions a pillar at Thebes, in Egypt, on which was inscribed an imprecation against Menes as an introducer of luxury. There is a legend preserved by Diodorus which narrates—in defiance of chronology, unless *Mendes* is to be substituted for *Menas* — his being saved from death in Lake Mceris by a crocodile, in gratitude for which he inaugurated the worship of that animal, and built a city in the neighborhood of the lake called the City of Crocodiles, and a pyramid to serve as his own tomb. During his reign there was a revolt of the Libyans. That he made foreign conquests we learn from an extract from Manetho, preserved by Eusebius. By Marsham and others he is considered as identical with the *Mizraim* of Scripture. According to some accounts he was killed by a hippopotamus. See Lepsius, *Konigsbuch*, Quellentaf, p. 5; Bockh, *Manetho*, p. 386; Poole, *Hor. Egypt.* p. 219; ‘Herodotus, 2:4, 99; Diodorus, 1:43, 45, 89 (ed. Wess. ad loc.); Plutarch, *De Isaiiah et Osir.* p. 8; Perizon, *Orig. Egypt.* c. 5; Shuckford’s *Connection*, bk. iv; Bunsen, *Egyptens Stelle in der Weltgeschichte*, 2:38-45. **SEE EGYPT; SEE MEMPHIS.**

### Meneses, Aleixio De

a Portuguese prelate and statesman, was born Jan. 25, 1559. His father had directed the education of king Sebastian. Brought up in the palace, he entered, contrary to his parent’s wishes, the convent of the Augustines at Lisbon, Feb. 24, 1574, and finished his studies at Coimbra. He was appointed archbishop of Goa by Philip II, and took possession of his see in September, 1595. He convened a provincial synod, in which useful reforms were established; he organized many missions, and evangelized, among others, the savage inhabitants of the island of Socotra. He devoted himself also to the Christians of Abyssinia, and, above all, to those schismatic Nestorians known under the name of “Christians of St. Thomas,” who have taken refuge for centuries in the mountains of Malabar. That in which the bishop of Cochin, the Jesuits, the Dominicans, and even the disciples of St. Francis were unsuccessful, he was enabled to accomplish, and after many centuries of division the Roman Church received into its bosom the greater part of this branch of the Christian family. Pope Clement testified to

Meneses his satisfaction by a brief April 1, 1599. Meneses was subsequently appointed to the government of the Indies, and performed the duties of viceroy from May 3, 1606, to May 28, 1609. He showed himself stern and severe towards some of the Mohammedan princes, but tranquillity at least was preserved in the Indies during his administration. He died May 3, 1617. His memorable journey in the mountains is published under this title: *Jornadado Arcebispo de Goa D. Aleixo de Menezes quando foi a serras do Malavar, em que mordo os antigos Christaos de S.-Tome poi Fr. Antonio de Gouvea* (Coimbra, 1606, fol.). There is added generally to this curious narration: *Sinodo diocesano de igreja e bispado de antigos Christaos de S.-Tome das serras de Malavar celebrado por D. Fr. Aleixo de Menezes* (ibid. 1606; translated into Spanish in 1608 by Francis Mufios . He also wrote *Histoire Orientale des grands progres de l'Eglise catholique en la reduction des anciens Chritiens dits de St. Thomas, avec la messe des anciens Chretiens ens l'evche d'Angamae* (Bruxelles, 1609. 8vo; the translator, J. B. de Glen, has unfortunately left many blanks in his version). See Barbosa Machado, *Bibliotheca Lusitana*; Ternaux-Compans, *Biblioth. Asiatique et Africaine*; Veyssiere la Croze, *Hist. du Christianisme des Indes*; Pedro Barreto de Regende, *Tratado dos Vizos-Reis da India*, in MS. in the Biblioth. imp. de Paris.

### Menes'theus

(*Μενεσθεός* v. r. *Μενέσθεσις*, Vulg. *Mnestheus*), the father of Apollonius (q.v.), the ambassador of Antiochus Epiphanes to Ptolemy Philometor (2 Macc. 4:21).

### Meng

*SEE MENCIVS.*

### Mengs, Anton Rafael

a distinguished artist of the 18th century, was born at Aussig, in Bohemia, in 1728. His father, also a painter, adopted a very cruel course of treatment to his son, forcing him, at the age of six years, to draw the entire day without other nourishment than a crust of bread and a bottle of water, and chastising him severely if the task given was unfinished in the allotted time. In 1741, at the age of thirteen, he was taken to Rome, where he was employed in copying the works of Raphael in miniature for Augustus III, elector of Saxony and king of Poland. In 1744 he returned to Dresden, and

was appointed court-painter by Augustus, with permission to return to Rome to continue his studies. He there painted several original pictures, among which was a lovely *Virgin and Child*, in which the Virgin was painted from a beautiful peasant girl, of whom he became so enamoured that he turned Roman Catholic for her sake and married her. Soon after this he again returned to Dresden, where he remained three years, when the tyranny of his father became so oppressive that he received permission from his royal patron to visit Rome again, in order to execute his commission for an altar-piece for the royal chapel. Shortly after his arrival he was deprived of his pension, the king's finances having suffered by the Seven-Years' War; and thus suddenly thrown upon his own resources, Mengs painted at low prices for the support of his family. In 1754 he received an appointment as director of the new academy at Rome, and in 1757 was employed by the Celestines to paint the ceilings of the Church of St. Eusebio. In 1761 the king of Spain invited Mengs to his court at Madrid, and granted him a liberal pension. Here he executed, among other works, a *Descent from the Cross* and the *Council of the Gods*. The air of Spain proved detrimental to his health, and he returned to Rome, and was there engaged, immediately upon his arrival, by Clement XIV, to paint in the Vatican a picture of *Janus dictating to History*, and one of the *Holy Family*. One of his finest productions is the *Nativity*, painted for the royal collection of the king of Spain. He died in 1779. See Giobals, *Eloge historique de Mengs* (1781); Bianconi, *Elogio storico di R. Mengs* (1780); Spooner, *Biographical History of the Fine Arts* (N. Y. 1865, 2 vols. 8vo), vol. ii; Chev. Don Joseph Nicholas d'Azara, *The Works of Anthony Raphael Mengs* (Lond. 1796, 2 vols. 12mo); Kugler's *Hand-book of Painting* (transl. by Waagen, Lond. 1860, 2 vols. 12mo), 2:519, 521.

## Meni

(Hebrews *Meni'*, *ynæ*] from *hnm*; to *distribute*; Sept. *τύχη*, Vulg. i.e. *fortuna*, just mentioned, **SEE GAD**; Auth. Vers. "that number," marg. "Meni"), apparently an idol which the captive Israelites worshipped by libations (lectisternia), after the custom of the Babylonians (<sup>2861</sup>Isaiah 66:11), and probably symbolical of destiny (a sense indicated by the first clause of the next verse), like the Arabic *mananfate* (from the same root), and the Greek *μοῖρα*. Pococke (*Specim. hist. Arab.* p. 92) has pointed out the resemblance to *Manat*, an idol of the ancient Arabs (Koran, Sur. 53:19. 20), "What think ye of Allat, and AI-Uzzah, and *Manah*, that other third

goddess?" Manah was the object of worship of "the tribes of Hudhey and Kuza'ah, who dwelt between Mekkeh and El-Medineh, and, as some say, of the tribes of Ows, El-Khazraj, and Thakik also. This idol was a large stone, demolished by one Saad in the eighth year of the flight, a year so fatal to the idols of Arabia" (Lane's *Sel. from the Kur-an*, pref. p. 30, 31). But Al-Zamakhshari, the commentator on the Koran derives *Manah* from a root signifying "to flow," because of the blood which flowed at the sacrifices to this idol, or, as Mill explains it, because the ancient idea of the moon was that it was a star full of moisture, with which it filled the sublunary regions. "That the word is a proper name, and also the proper name of an object of idolatrous worship cultivated by the Jews in Babylon, is a supposition which there seems no reason to question, as it is in accordance with the context, and has every probability to recommend it. But the identification of Meni with any known heathen god is still uncertain. The versions are at variance. In the Sept. the word is rendered 'fortune' or 'luck.' The old Latin version of the clause is 'impletis dcemoni potionem;' while Symmachus (as quoted by Jerome) must have had a different reading, *γνεσθαι μιν*, 'without me,' which Jerome interprets as signifying that the act of worship implied in the drink-offering was not performed for God, but for the daemon (' ut doceat non sibi fieri sed daemoni). The Targum of Jonathan is very vague- ' and mingle cups for their idols;' and the Syriac translators either omit the word altogether, or had a different reading, perhaps *ܘܠܗܘܢ* ; *lamo*, 'for them.' Some variation of the same kind apparently gave rise to the *super eam* of the Vulgate, referring to the 'table' mentioned in the first clause of the verse. From the old versions we come to the commentators, and their judgments are equally conflicting. Jerome :(Comm. in Es. 65:11) illustrates the passage by reference to an ancient idolatrous custom which prevailed in Egypt, and especially at Alexandria, on the last day of the last month of the year, of placing a table covered with dishes of various kinds, and a cup mixed with mead, in acknowledgment of the fertility of the past year, or as an omen of that which was to come (comp. Virgil, AEn. 2:763). But he gives no clue to the identification of Meni, and his explanation is evidently suggested by the renderings of the Sept. and the old Latin version; the former, as he quotes them, translating *Gad* by 'fortune,' and *Meni* by 'demon,' in which they are followed by the latter. In the later mythology of Egypt, as we learn from Macrobius (*Saturn.* 1:19), *Δαίμων* and *Τύχη* were two of the four deities who presided over birth, and represented respectively the Sun and Moon. A passage quoted by Selden (*De Dis Syris*, i, c. 1) from a MS. of

Vettius Valens of Antioch, an ancient astrologer, goes also to prove that in the astrological language of his day the sun and moon were indicated by **δαίμων** and **τύχη**, as being the arbiters of human destiny. This circumstance, coupled with the similarity between Meni and **Μήν** or **Μήνη**, the ancient name for the moon, has induced the majority of commentators to conclude that Meni is the Moon god or goddess, the *Deus Lunus*, or *Dea Luna* of the Romans; masculine as regards the earth which she illumines (*terre maritus*), feminine with respect to the sun (*solis uxor*), from whom she receives her light. This twofold character of the moon is thought by David Mill to be indicated in the two names Gad and Meni, the former feminine, the latter masculine (*Diss.* v, § 23); but as both are masculine in Hebrew, his speculation falls to the ground. Le Moyne, on the other hand, regarded both words as denoting the sun, and his double worship among the Egyptians: *Gad* is then the goat of Mendes, and *Meni* = Mnevis worshipped at Heliopolis. The opinion of Huetius that the *Meni*-of Isaiah and the **Μήν** of Strabo (xii, c. 31) both denoted the sun, was refuted by Vitringa and others. Among those who have interpreted the word literally ‘number’ may be reckoned Jarchi and Abarbanel, who understand by it the ‘number’ of the priests that formed the company of revellers at the feast, and later Hoheisel (*Obs. ad. diffc. Jes. loca*, p. 349) followed in the same track. Kimchi, in his note on <sup>2351b</sup>Isaiah 65:11, says of Meni, ‘It is a-star, and some interpret it of the stars which are *numbered*, and they are the seven stars of motion,’ i.e. the planets. Buxtorf (*Lex. Hebr.*) applies it to the ‘number’ of the stars which were worshipped as gods; Schindler (*Lex. Pentagl.*) to the ‘number and multitude’ of the idols, while according to others it refers to ‘Mercury, the god of numbers;’ all which are mere conjectures, *quot homines, tot sententice*, and take their origin from the play upon the word Meni, which is found in the verse next following that in which it occurs (‘therefore will I *number* [yt<sup>g</sup>ad<sup>ll</sup>, *um-ninithi*], you to the sword’), and which is supposed to point to its derivation from the verb **hnm**; *manah*, to number. But the origin of the name of Noah, as given in Genesis v. 29, shows that such plays upon words are not to be depended upon as the bases of etymology. On the supposition, however, that in this case the etymology of Meni is really indicated, its meaning is still uncertain. Those who understand by it the moon, derive an argument for their theory from the fact that anciently years were *numbered* by the courses of the moon.”

The fact of Meni being a Babylonian god renders it probable that some planet was worshipped under this name: but there is much diversity of opinion as to the particular planet to which the designation of *destiny* would be most applicable (see Lakemacher, *Observ. philol.* 4:18 sq.; David Mill's diss. on the subject in his *Dissert. selectee*, p. 81-132). Miinter considers it to be *Venus* (see Gesenius, *Comment. ad loc.*), as the lesser star of good fortune (the *Naneea* of the Persians [2 Macc. 1:13] or *Anctis* [Strabo, 15:733] of the Armenians [xi. 532.; 12:559]); Ewald takes it to be *Saturn*, the chief dispenser of evil influences; and Movers (*Phonic.* 1:650) has returned to the old opinion that Meni is the *moon* which was also supposed to be an arbitress of fortune: the best arguments for which last view are collected by Vtringa (ad loc.). It also deserves notice that there are some, among whom is Hitzig, who consider Gad and Meni to be names for one and the same god, and who chiefly differ as to whether the sun or the moon is the god intended. It would seem on the whole that, in the passage under consideration, the prophet reproaches the idolatrous Jews with setting up a table to Fortune, and with making libations to Fate; and Jerome (ad loc.) observes that it was the custom as late as his time, in all cities, especially in Egypt, to set tables before the gods, and furnish them with various luxurious articles of food, and with goblets containing a mixture of new wine, on the last day of the month and of the year, and that the people drew omens from them in respect to the fruitfulness of the year; but in honor of what god these things were done he does not state. Numerous examples of this practice occur on the monuments of Egypt (Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* 1:265). **SEE GAD.**

### Menifee, Quinn M.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, son of Hon. William Menifee, was a native of Texas. He first studied law, and took his place at the bar with a good prospect of success in that profession. At the call of duty, however, he relinquished the practice of jurisprudence, and entered the Methodist itinerancy in 1857. During the war he served, for nearly two years, as a private soldier in the army of Virginia, losing a leg at the battle of Sharpsburg. After the restoration of peace he entered upon ministerial work in Texas, and there labored faithfully till his death in 1867. "Quinn Menifee was a young man of noble and generous impulses, a high-toned gentleman, and a pure-minded Christian... Notwithstanding the loss of one of his limbs, his friends predicted for him a useful and successful career in

the ministry. But his sun of life went down ere it had reached its meridian.” See Thrall, *Hist. of Meth. in Texas*, p. 164.

## Menippus

one of the most noted Cynic philosophers, was born at Gadara, in Coele-Syria, in the first century BC. He was originally a slave, but afterwards became one of the pupils of Diogenes. He satirized the philosophers of his time in such severe terms that the most bitter satires were afterwards denominated Menippean. Lucian pronounces him “the greatest snarler and snapper among the old dogs” (the Cynics), and in his “Dialogues of the Dead” makes Diogenes describe him as an old bald-headed man, in a tattered cloak, incessantly ridiculing the pedantry of his brother philosophers. He was the author of thirteen treatises, which contained, we are told, nothing serious, but were filled with cutting sarcasms. These works are all lost, but we have fragments of Varro’s *Saturce Menippece*, written in imitation of Menippus. According to Diogenes (vi. 101), these works were entitled as follows: *Νεκυία, Διαθήκαι, Ἐπιστολαί*, etc. He amassed great wealth as a usurer, but, having been cheated out of all of it, was so mortified that he strangled himself.

## Menius (Or Menig), Justus

an eminent German theologian of the Reformation period, noted for his part in the spread of the Protestant doctrines, was born at Fulda Dec. 13, 1499. He studied for the Church. and intended to become amonastic in order to serve the cause of Rome the more faithfully, but, while living as deacon at Meilberg, he was made acquainted with the doctrines of Luther, and he became so interested in the reformatory movement that he decided to go to the very stronghold of the heretics and judge for himself. He accordingly set out for Wittenberg to hear Luther preach, and while there was made a convert to the new cause, and at once identified himself with the Protestants. In 1546 he was made ecclesiastical superintendent of Gotha, and afterwards he became pastor of St. Thomas’s Church at Leipsic, which situation he retained until his death, Aug. 11, 1588. Menius was a devoted friend of Luther, whom he accompanied to the Colloquy of Marburg (q.v.) and in 1532 he signed the articles of Smalcald (q.v.). Together with George Spalatin, Cruciger, Myconius, and John Webern, he drew up the first ecclesiastical ritual used in Saxony. Among his works, we notice *Commentaria in lib. Samuelis et Acta Apostolorum* (Wittenb. 1532,

8vo):-*Sepultura Lutheri* (1538, 4to) :- *Vom Geist d. Wiedertauffer* (Wittenb. 1544, 4to) :- *Von d. Nothwehr* (Wittenb. 1547,8vo) :-*Historica Doescriptio de Bello Gothico* (1568, 8vo). See Motschmann, *Efordia Literata*; Albrecht, *Sichsische Kirchengesch.* 1:306; Tenzel, *Suppl. Reliqua Hist.* Gothance, p. 787; Schmidt, *Justus Menius, der Reformator Thiuingens* (1867, 2 vols. 8vo); *Jahrb. deutsch. Theol.* 1870, No. iv; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopidie*, 9:325 sq.

### Menken, Gottfried, DD.

an eminent German Protestant divine, was born at Bremen May 29, 1768. His early education was somewhat imperfect, from want of means, but in 1788 he entered the University of Jena, bringing with him only his Bible, a lexicon, and the works of Jacob Bohme. The rationalistic tendency which prevailed in the German universities at that time was thoroughly repugnant to his nature, and he determined to give himself to a close and quiet study of his Bible, and of those languages which could assist him in that object, leaving entirely aside the divers purely theological systems. He wrote at the time a number of essays and expositions, which, however, not being satisfied with them, he afterwards destroyed at Wetzlar, with the exception of some valuable pieces forming one volume of about 150 pages. In 1790 he went to the University of Duisburg, where he found the same general tendency prevailing as at Jena. He met, however, with some kindred spirits, such as Achelis (a judge at Duisburg in 1857) and Schlechtendal, earnest evangelical men, with whom he formed a friendship which lasted all his life. About 1791 he became an inmate in the family of the rector, Fr. A. Hasenkamp, whose example and precepts appear to have exerted a lasting influence over him. In 1794 he became assistant preacher at Frankfort-on-the-Main; in 1796, pastor of the Protestant Church at Wetzlar; removed in the same capacity to Bremen in 1802, and died there June 1, 1831. He was a great admirer of Bengel, and opposed not only Wolf and Baumgarten's views, but also those of such men as Lavater, Pfenninger, Hafeli, Stolz, Ewald, and Yung Stilling, whom he accused of conceding too much to the philosophical notions of the times. Among his numerous works we notice *Beitrag z. Dimonologie, oder Widerlegung d. exegetischen Aufsdtze d. H. Prof. Grimm* (Frankf. and Leips. 1793) :- *Ueber Glick u. Sieg d. Gottlosen* (Frankf. and Leips. 1795) — both of which were published anonymously:- *Christliche Homilien* (Nurenb. 1798):-*Neue Sammlung* (1802) :-*Homilien u. d. Propheten Elias* (1804):-*Predigten* (1825). After his death there appeared *Letzte Sammlung christlicher Predigten* (Cologne, 1847): —

*Anleitung z. eigenen Unterricht in d. Wahrheiten d. Heiligen Schrift* (Frankf. 1805; 2d edit. 1825):—*Leitfaden z. Unterricht f. Confirmanden* (1817; - d edit. 1826). See Osiander-(J. E.), in the *Tibinger Zeitschrift*, 1832, vol. ii; also, separately, *Menken als Schrift. steller* (Bremen, 1832); Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie*, 9:328 sq. (JN.P.)

### Mennander, Carl Fredrik

a learned Swedish prelate, was born July 19, 1712, at Stockholm. After having been bishop of Abo, in Finland, he was called to teach physics at the University of Upsala. Towards the close of his life he was made archbishop of that city. He was a member of the Academy of Sciences at Upsala, in which city he died, May 22, 1786. He wrote *De Usu Logices in historia* (Abo, 1748):-*De OphiolatRIA Gentilium* (ibid. 1752, 4to):-*De Synodis Aboensibus* (ibid. 1773, 4to); and many papers on archaeology inserted in the collection of the society of Upsala.

### Mennas

a patriarch of the Eastern Church, flourished in the first half of the 6th century. He was for a time superintendent of the great hospital “Holy Samson,” at Constantinople. In 536 he became patriarch of that city by the choice of the emperor Justinian and the clergy, to supersede the Monophysite Antimus I, who had left his episcopal seat at Trapezunt, and had usurped the patriarchal dignity. Mennas was the first among Oriental patriarchs who was consecrated as bishop by a Roman pope (March 13, 563) (see Labbe, *Concil.* col. 47 sq.; also Baronius, *Annal.* ad ann. 536, n. 27; Pagi, *Critica*, ad ann. 536, n. 6). Mennas attended quietly to his duties at the Church of Constantinople till the war of the “Three Chapters” broke out and involved him, **SEE CHAPTERS, THREE**, and finally brought about his deposition from Rome, because of his adhesion to the side of the emperor against the Roman pontiff. In this trying hour Mennas displayed a most amiable disposition, and acted the part of a truly honorable man. He bowed submissively to the severe decision of the pope, and even used his influence to persuade the other bishops of the Eastern Church, who had suffered like him the displeasure of the papal vicegerent, to bear patiently with the holy father and to approve his decisions, and to revoke their previous approval of the imperial decrees (Hardouin, 3:10; Labbe, v. 338). Mennas soon after died, August, 552. He had presided over the Church of Constantinople for sixteen years and six months. He is commemorated in

the Latin *Martyrologium* Aug. 25, and in the Greek *Menologium* Aug. 24. A pretty full account of the life of Mennas is furnished both in the Latin and Greek *Martyrologies* under the dates of commemoration. See also Wetzter und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 7:57.

## Menno, Simon

one of the “shining lights” of the 16th century, a Reformer whose apostolic spirit and labors have thus far failed to receive the recognition they deserve, probably because of the relation he sustained to that peculiar sect of Christians called after him, *Mennonites* (q.v.).

*Life.* — The early history of Menno is somewhat obscured; it has not yet been definitely determined when he was born. The year generally fixed upon is 1498; his friends of the Netherlands believe it to have occurred in 1496, but Gobel, the noted German Church historian, holds that Menno saw the light of day in 1505 (*Gesch. d. christl. Lebens in d. Rhein. Westph. evangel. Kirche*, 1:191). His native place was the little village of Witmarsum, in Friesland. He was reared and educated under the influence of the Church, and finally decided to devote his life to her service. In 1524 he took orders as priest, and was located at the village of Pingium. His religious condition at this time was anything but ‘desirable. “He was,” we are told, “in utter darkness of mind and worldliness of spirit, yet not without some tenderness of conscience and apparent piety.” In 1530 he was induced to examine the New Testament with diligence, in consequence of doubts concerning transubstantiation. He now became through grace gradually enlightened, his preaching changed, and he was called by some an evangelical preacher, though he says of himself, “At that time the world loved me; and I the world.” His preaching found favor among the people, and he gained daily in popularity. In 1531 finally came the turning-point which resulted in his ‘departure from the mother Church. In this year he witnessed the martyrdom of Sieke Snyder, at Leeuwarden, for Anabaptism. This severity towards one who had dared to differ for conscience sake rather enlisted his sympathy, roused him to a similar inquiry concerning the sacrament of *Baptism*, and resulted in his embracing the views of the persecuted Baptists, though he for several years struggled to suppress his secret convictions, on account of the odium and suffering which the avowal must incur. “By the gracious favor of God,” he observes “I have acquired my knowledge, as well of baptism’ as of the Lord’s Supper; through the enlightening of the Holy Spirit, attendant on my much reading

and contemplating the Scriptures, and not through the efforts and means of seducing sects, as I am accused.”

Mosheim has taken advantage of this hesitating course on the part of Menno after his conversion to the cause of the Anabaptists, and has accused our subject of duplicity, as guilty of having held “clandestine intercourse with the Anabaptists” until he found it convenient. “to throw off the mask.” This, however, is unjust and cruel. Menno was never truly an Anabaptist. He never sympathized with the excesses committed at Minster and elsewhere (for he actually published a sever

e censure against the erroneous opinions and vile practices of John of Leyden in 1535), and his views of baptism were so peculiar that to this day the *Mennonites* stand alone in their mode of observing this sacrament. The only thing he held in common with the Anabaptists was opposition to infant baptism. Menno, however, associated quite freely with the Anabaptists, and exerted a most salutary influence over them, making many friends among that sect. In 1537 he was actually invited by a number of Anabaptists of Groningen to assume among them the rank and functions of a public teacher; and as he looked upon the persons who made this proposal as exempt from the fanatical frenzy of their brethren at Miinster, he yielded to their entreaties. His conversion from Romanism he himself alludes to in the following strain: “I besought my God with sighing and tears that to me, a troubled sinner, he would grant the gift of his grace; that he would endue me with wisdom, spirit, frankness, and manly fortitude, so that I might preach his worthy name and holy word unadulterated, and proclaim his truth to his praise. At length the great and gracious Lord, perhaps after the course of nine months, extended to me his fatherly spirit, help, and mighty hand, so that I freely abandoned at once my character, honor, and fame, which I had among men, as also my antichristian abominations, mass, infant baptism, loose and careless life, and all, and put myself willingly in all trouble and poverty under the pressing cross of Christ my Lord. In my weakness I feared God; I sought pious people, and of these I found some, though few, in good zeal and doctrine. I disputed with the perverted, and some I gained through God’s help and power, and led them by his word to the Lord Christ; but the stiff-necked and obdurate I commended to the Lord. . Thus has the gracious Lord drawn me, through the free favor of his great grace. He first stirred in my heart: he has given me a new mind; he has humbled me in his fear; he has led me from the way of death, and, through mere mercy, has called me upon the narrow path of

life into the company of the saints. To him be praise forever. Amen.” According to Van Oosterzee (in Herzog’s *Real-Encyclopadie*, 9:339 sq.), Menno was led to separation from Rome by the cruel treatment of the Anabaptists in 1535. Many of the sufferers at this time had been hearers of the word of God as dispensed by Menno, and had been made disciples of the new sect by his declarations against infant baptism and the opinion of a “real presence” in the Eucharist. Indeed, his own brother had suffered a martyr’s death on this occasion, and this may have contributed in no small measure to the decided step which Menno took shortly after.

With Menno’s appointment to the ministry of a class of “Anabaptists” at Groningen opens the most eventful period of his life’s work. His withdrawal from the Church of Rome relieved him of the vow of celibacy, and he made haste to select a companion for life, by whom he had several children. All these things would make it appear that Menno settled quietly at Groningen, and there enjoyed life’s ease. But this is not the record of Simon Menno. Anxious to spread the Reformed doctrines, and more especially his own peculiar views of the Bible’s teachings, he travelled constantly far and near. He visited not only all Friesland, but traversed Holland and Germany, determined to make new converts, and to organize and unite the scattered members of the Anabaptists into his own fold. Although oftentimes exposed to persecution, he nevertheless continued steadfast in the work. When he found it impossible to remain any longer in Friesland he removed to Wismar; finally he settled at Oldeslohe, in Holstein, where he was granted not only protection, but even encouragement, and was allowed to establish a printing-press for the diffusion of his religious opinions. There he died, January 13, 1561, in the satisfaction of having gathered a large and flourishing sect, which continues to this day. *SEE MENNONITES.*

*Menno as a Protestant.*—Mosheim (*Ecclesiastes Hist.* 16th century) thus speaks of Menno’s labors after his establishment at Groningen as a Protestant minister: “East and West Friesland, with the province of Groningen, were first visited by this zealous apostle of the Anabaptists; whence he directed his course into Holland, Guelderland, Brabant, and Westphalia; continued, it through the German provinces that lie on the coast of the Baltic Sea, and penetrated so far as Livonia. In all these places his ministerial labors were attended with remarkable success, and added to his sect a prodigious number of followers. Hence he is deservedly considered as the common chief of almost all the Anabaptists, and the

parent of the sect that still subsists under that denomination.” As Mosheim persists in mentioning Menno in connection with the Anabaptists, and as the public is prejudiced against all who were known under that name, we think it but just to insert here Menno’s own account of his labors:

“Through our feeble service, teaching, and simple writing, with the careful deportment, labor, and help of our faithful brethren, the great and mighty God has made so known and public, in many cities and lands, the word of true repentance, the word of his grace and power, together with the wholesome use of his holy sacraments, and has given such growth to his churches, and endued them with such invincible strength, that not only many proud, stout hearts have become humble, the impure chaste, the drunken temperate, the covetous liberal, the cruel kind, the godless godly, but also, for the testimony which they bear, they faithfully give up their property to confiscation, and their bodies to” torture and to death; as has occurred again and again to the present hour. These can be no fruits nor marks of false doctrine (with that God does not co-operate); nor under such oppression and misery could anything have stood so long were it not the power and word of the Almighty. See, this is our calling, doctrine, and fruit of our service, for which we are so horribly calumniated, and persecuted with so much enmity. Whether all the prophets, apostles, and true servants of God did not through their service also produce the like fruits, we would gladly let all the pious judge. He who bought me with the blood of his love, and called me to his service, unworthy as I am, searches me, and knows that I seek neither gold and goods, nor luxury, nor ease on earth, but only my Lord’s glory, my salvation, and the souls of many immortals. Wherefore I have had, now the eighteenth year, to endure so excessive anxiety, oppression, trouble, sorrow, and persecution, with my poor, feeble wife and little offspring, that I have stood in jeopardy of my life and in many a fear. Yes, while the priests lie on soft beds and cushions, we must hide ourselves commonly in secret corners. While they at all nuptials and christenings, and other times, make themselves merry in public with fifes, drums, and various kinds of music, we must look out for every dog, lest he be one employed to catch us. Instead of being greeted by all as doctors and masters, we must be called Anabaptists, clandestine holders-forth, deceivers, and heretics. In short, while for their services they are rewarded in princely style, with great emoluments and good days, our reward and portion must be fire, sword, and death. What now I, and my true coadjutors in this very difficult, hazardous service, have sought, or could have sought, all the well-disposed may easily estimate from the work

itself and its fruit. I will then humbly entreat the faithful and candid reader once more, for Jesus's sake, to receive in love this my forced acknowledgment of my enlightening, and make of it a suitable application. I have presented it out of great necessity, that the pious reader may know how it has happened, since I am on all sides calumniated and falsely accused, as if I were ordained and called to this service by a seditious and misleading sect. Let-him that fears God read and judge."

In the article ANABAPTISTS we have already alluded to the general mistake of supposing that all Anabaptists were engaged in the Munster excesses, and that usually persons fail to make a distinction between the sober Christians and the worst fanatics of the party. In our sketch of the life and labors of *David Joris* (qv.), we had occasion to point out the earnestness which characterized his followers of the "Anabaptists;" but it is in this place that we would enlist our reader's attention to the injustice of suffering a whole sect to be despised and forsaken because of the faults of a few who may have secured membership in order to make their religious garb a stepping-stone to abused power. The two large Protestant bodies of Lutheran and Reformed have always been characterized by jealousy towards any new sects, and have quickly charged their weaker rivals with all the infirmities which flesh is heir to, if any one member of the new comers was open to criticism. Even in our very day the Methodists and Baptists suffer more or less persecution from the communicants of the State churches in Germany; how much more likely in those days of the 16th century, when first the iron hold of the papacy, which had cramped the Church for ages, was suddenly relaxing. From all the sources now at our command, we gather the fact that Menno was a gentle, earnest, modest man, of a spiritual nature, with no trace about him of wild fanaticism; ready to encourage all that was noble, pure, and good in his fellow-men, constantly reproofing those of his followers who appeared guilty of misdemeanors of any sort. Flourishing in the Reformation period, he was frequently involved in controversies; thus hi 1543 he was visited by the celebrated John a Lasko, who was determined to draw Menno into the party of the Reformed or Lutherans. For three or four days the two eminent divines held public disputations upon Christ's humanity, infant baptism, etc., etc., but so gentle was Menno in his manner that at the close of the controversy the two combatants parted in peace, promising goodwill towards each other. In 1550 he published a special tract to defend the doctrine of the Trinity against the Unitarians, who were coming to his

country from Italy and Switzerland; in 1552, *A thorough Confession on Disputed Points*, for the use of other religious bodies than his own.

*Result of Menno's Labors.* — The whole system of theology as taught by Simon Menno presents few, if any, new developments. In his controversies with John i Lasko and Micronius, he confessed a peculiar Christology. He did not believe in a Son sundered and divided into two persons (“*zerstückelt oder zertheilt*”) of a human and divine nature. He confessed one and the same Son and Only-begotten, who in his very flesh is the God Logos, who in his flesh came down from heaven, and in very flesh became man. He believed that Christ, in this way, was born *in* Mary, but not *of* Mary; that he became flesh, and was made man, without taking upon him Mary's flesh and blood. Anxious to ascribe to our Lord the highest purity possible, he seems to have indulged in speculations which rendered the reality of Christ's human nature somewhat doubtful. He probably borrowed this vague notion from the Munster Anabaptists. As a writer of systematic theology, Simon Menno was inferior to most of his contemporaries, and his main work, *Das Fundamentbuch* (1539), shows his want of adaptedness to a systematic treatment of religious doctrines. Following the example of the apostles, he taught his followers, as the occasion required, in a simple, childlike way, and never allowed himself to be drawn into abstruse, or even abstract questions, when preaching to them. A complete and systematic statement of his doctrines was never given by Simon Menno, and the great influence which he and his followers exercised on the internal and external history of the Reformation was due to the *principle* they represented.

Like the other Protestant Reformers, Menno accepted the *formal* and *material* principles of the Reformation; but, besides these, he aimed at a *moral, practical* end. It was his earnest desire to restore the kingdom of God, or the Christian Church, to that purity which is taught in the New Testament, and which he believed had existed in the Apostolic Church. To bring back this golden age of Christianity, and to organize a congregation *μὴ ἔχουσαν σπίλον, ἢ ῥυτίδα, ἢ τι τῶν τοιούτων* (Ephesians 5:27), was the constant aim of all his efforts. This accounts for the singular asceticism of the sect, and explains why the Mennonites did not, like other evangelical bodies, concern themselves about abstract religious speculations, but about moral laws and duties. For the same reasons they also separated themselves from the unbelieving world, and tried to purify the Church by administering the ordinance of baptism only to those who

had made a personal profession of faith in Christ. The validity of infant baptism was rejected, while only adults “who do actually profess repentance towards God and obedience to our Lord Jesus Christ” were considered proper subjects of this ordinance. We quote here article seven of a Mennonite Confession of Faith: “We confess of baptism that all repenting believers, who by faith, regeneration, and renewal of heart by the Holy Spirit, have been united with God, and whose names are written down in heaven, are to be baptized in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, to show forth in. a solemn and beautiful emblem their faith in the crucified, buried, and risen Redeemer, with its effect to live up to whatsoever things Christ taught his followers.” The necessity of the power of excommunication in the Church was earnestly asserted by Menno, “for without the right usage of excommunication the spiritual kingdom of God on earth cannot exist intact in purity and piety. A Church without the proper apostolical ban or excommunication is like a city without walls or gates, like a field or garden without a fence, or like a house without walls or doors. For without it the Church would stand open to all seducers and evil-doers, to idolators and wilfully persistent sinners.”. He insisted upon excommunication to such an extent that members of his congregation at Wismar who had listened to the sermons of Lutheran clergymen were excommunicated as if they had committed public crimes, or indulged in gross passions.

The works of Simon Menno, of which-the last were printed in his own printing establishment, were published collectively in 1600, under the title *Sommaria of Byllnvergadering van sommige schriftelyke Bekentenissen des geloofs, mitsgaders eenige waarachtige Verant woordingen, gedaan door Menno Simons*. It was, however, a very imperfect compilation; much better was that of 1646, 4to; but the best appeared in 1681, in sm. fol., at Amsterdam, entitled *Olpea omnia theologica, of al de Godgeleerde weoken van Menno Sinonis*, etc.

Besides the histories on his' followers, quoted in the article MENNONITES, see *Biographie des Protest. celibres* (Paris), 2:59-70; Cramer, *Het leven an de verrigtingen von Menno Simons* (Amst. 1837), perhaps the most important work to be consulted; Harder, *Leben Menno Simons* (Konigsb. 1846); Roosen, *Menno Simons den evan. gelischen Mennonitengenieinden geschildert* (Leipsic, 1848). (J. H. W.)

## Mennonites

is the name of a Christian sect which sprung up in Holland and Germany about the time of the Reformation, though it cannot be said to have actually originated in the great revolution of the 16th century. The Baptists claim the Mennonites as their forerunners, and regard them to be the direct descendants of the Waldenses (q.v.); but this origin of the Mennonites is disputed by most Pusedobaptist writers, who recognise them simply as the followers of one Simon Menno (q.v.), who gathered the more moderate of the *Anabaptists* (q.v.), gave them a new code of discipline, and became to them the interpreter of the law and the Gospel. Because of the excesses committed by the more fanatic and unruly of the German Anabaptists in the reformatory period, the Baptists and Mennonites take exception to this classification. M. Herman Schyn, a Mennonite minister, who has published their history and apology, seeks to maintain that they are not Anabaptists, either by principle or by origin. Besides the necessity of adult baptism, the Mennonites in the 16th century held, in common with the Anabaptists, the belief in Christ's personal reign during the millennium—the unlawfulness of oaths and wars, even in resistance to injury the impropriety of engaging in lawsuits and the exclusion of the civil magistrate from the Church. But with the wild notions, which were indulged in by many, of setting up Christ's kingdom on earth by violence and bloodshed, they had no sympathy. Every immoral practice, also, they as a sect discountenanced; and they deserve to be held up as a Christian body characterized by consistency and moderation. In the days of their founder they were certainly among the most pious Christians the Church ever saw, and the worthiest citizens the State ever had. "It must be at once conceded," says Hardwick (*Church Hist. during the Ref.* p. 280), "that the principles of the sect are free from nearly all the dark fanaticism which stains the records of the older party."

Mennonites, the Anabaptists of the Netherlands first called themselves in 1536, the year in which the hitherto scattered community celebrated its union. Menno, seeing clearly that "in union lies strength," had obtained a regular state of Church order, separate from all Dutch and German Protestants, and thus secured an ecclesiastical establishment. He laid down rules for the guidance of the congregations, and furnished them with a sort of "confession of faith." His doctrines were free from the anti-social and licentious tenets and the pretensions to inspiration which are ascribed to the Anabaptists; but he agreed with them in condemning the baptism of

infants (~~1819~~ Matthew 28:19), in expecting a personal reign of Christ on earth for a thousand years at the millennium, in excluding magistrates from the Christian Church (Schyn, 1:214), and in maintaining that all war was unlawful (~~1812~~ Matthew 26:52), that the taking of oaths was prohibited by Christ (Matthew v. 37), and that human science is useless and pernicious to a Christian. But these tenets were so explained and modified by Menno as to differ very little from the doctrines generally held by the Reformed churches, securing a high degree of credit to the religious system of this famous teacher, and thus contributing to the rapid progress of his followers both in numbers and in influence. He insisted upon the strictest attention to moral duties, and exercised a most severe discipline upon offenders, and in a very short time succeeded in excluding from this fellowship those fanatics that had so dishonored the name of Anabaptists, and gradually built up a large and flourishing sect.

The severe discipline which Menno exercised over his followers had, however, ultimately the effect of producing divisions within his flock. Oftentimes the propriety or impropriety of excommunicating from the fellowship of the Church those who had incurred its censures was questioned. Menno insisted upon the expulsion of all guilty of misdemeanor, even if the erring ones showed signs of repentance. Some in the flock took exception to this severity, and insisted upon it that an excommunicated might at least be readmitted if signs of repentance were clearly manifest. This division of opinion resulted finally in the division of the sect into two parties, named respectively “*die Feinzen*,” the Fine, and “*die Groben*,” the Coarse. They were also called “Flemings” or “Flandrians” and “Waterlanders,” from the districts in which they resided. The former was the more rigid of the two; but ere long it was also divided into Flandrians and Frieslanders. This separation arose out of a question as to what should constitute a sufficient cause for excommunication. One party regarded those only who were open contemners of the divine law to be deserving the highest censure of the Church, while the other party considered offences of the most trivial kind a reason for the instant rejection of the offender. Menno himself officially sided with the Flemings, and he was forced to pronounce the expulsion of the milder party, although his sympathies were supposed to be with them.

Other particular sentiments that divided the Mennonites are the following: The Flemingians maintain, with various degrees of rigor, the opinions of their founder Menno as to the human nature of Christ, alleging that it was

produced in the womb of the Virgin by the creating power of the Holy Ghost, and hence object to the terms *person* and *trinity* as not consistent with the simplicity of the Scriptures; they hold to the obligation that binds us to wash the feet of strangers, in consequence of our Saviour's command; the necessity of excommunicating and avoiding, as one would do the plague, not only avowed sinners, but also all those who depart, even in some slight instances pertaining to dress, etc., from the simplicity of their ancestors; the contempt due to human learning, and to other matters of less moment. Another separation took place at Amsterdam in 1664, and had a much wider influence, extending also to the other Dutch churches; it was between the Mennonites who held to the opinions of the *Remonstrants* (q.v.) and the old orthodox party. The leader of the Remonstrants, or Socinians, was Dr. Galenus Abrahams (see Benthem, *Holland. Kirche- u. Schunstaat*, ij 832; Jehring, p. 30), hence called *Gallenists* (q.v.), and, from the house where they assembled (*bij het Lans*), Lamists; the opponents were called Apostoolians, from their leader, Dr. Samuel Apostool; and Zonists, from their house in *de Zon* (sun). By the *Algemene Doopsgezinde Societeit*, founded in 1811, the two churches came again into closer fellowship (see *Jahrboekje voor de- Doopsgez. Gemeenten*, 1838 and 1839, p. 118; comp. p. 99).

But, though divided, all Mennonites are agreed in regard to the fundamental doctrine of baptism, which is administered by pouring, and only to adults. "The opinions," says Mosheim (*Ecclesiastes Hist.* 4:142 sq.), "that are held in common by the Mennonites, seem to be all derived from this fundamental principle, that the kingdom which Christ established upon earth is a visible Church, or community, into which the holy and just alone are to be admitted, and which is consequently exempt from all those institutions and rules of discipline that have been invented by human wisdom for the correction and reformation of the wicked. This fanatical principle was avowed by the ancient Mennonites, but it is now almost wholly renounced. Yet from this ancient doctrine many of the religious opinions that distinguish the Mennonites from all other Christian communities seem to be derived. In consequence of this doctrine, they admit none to the sacrament of baptism except persons that are come to the full use of their reason; they neither admit civil rulers into their communion, nor allow any of their members to perform the functions of magistracy; they pretend to deny the lawfulness of repelling force by force, and consider war, in all its shapes, as unchristian and unjust; they entertain

the utmost aversion to the execution of justice, and more especially to capital punishments; and they also refuse to confirm their testimony by an oath.”

The first settlement of the Mennonites in- the United Provinces was granted them by William, prince of Orange, towards the close of the 16th century. During the War of Liberation they had played no unimportant part. Although their obligation not to carry arms prevented them from entering the. army, they nevertheless greatly aided the cause by liberal contributions of money, etc. It was not, however, before the 17th century that their liberty and tranquillity were fixed upon solid foundations, when, by a Confession of Faith published in the year 1626, they cleared themselves from the imputations of those pernicious and detestable errors that had been laid to their charge. In order to appease their intestine discords, a considerable part of the Anabaptists of Flanders, Germany, and Friesland concluded their debates in a conference held at Amsterdam in the year 1630, and entered into the bonds of fraternal communion, each reserving to themselves a liberty of retaining certain opinions. This association, simply nominal, however, was renewed and confirmed by new resolutions in the year 1649, in consequence of which the rigorous laws of Menno and his successors were in various respects mitigated and corrected. Their association at that time was very much like that of the Congregationalists in the United States. -Indeed, in cultus they had much in common with this religious body. Each congregation chooses its own pastor, whom they call *exhorter*, and upon him they lean in his strength or weakness. These preachers frequently were not paid by their congregations, but depended upon business or trade enterprises for their daily bread. When no preacher could be secured, the deacon would minister unto the male portion, and the deaconess unto the female portion of the congregation.

In the 17th and 18th centuries the persecution of the Mennonites in Germany and Switzerland drove many to Holland, and the “parent” body was thus largely increased. It was estimated about the middle of the 18th century at some 160,000. Since that time the Dutch Mennonites have again considerably decreased in number. An important event in their history was the provision of the theological training of their ministry by the establishment of a seminary in 1735. There are no buildings connected with this college, but the students receive theological instruction in a room, containing the library, over the Mennonite chapel. The lectures are

delivered in Latin; and each student before his entrance must be acquainted with Latin and Greek. They attend at a literary institution for instruction in Hebrew, ecclesiastical history, physics, natural and moral philosophy, etc. They have private lodgings in different parts of the city. The college was established nearly a century ago, and was at first supported by the Amsterdam Mennonites alone; but lately other churches send in their contributions. Some of the students receive support from the public fund; they are all intended for the Christian ministry. Thus provided with an educated ministry, they were placed on a more equal footing with the other Protestant bodies of the country. The names Oosterbaan, Stinstra, and Hesselink are mentioned with pride as theologians of Holland, and not simply as Mennonite ministers, by every Dutchman. In 1795 they were granted equality with the other Protestants, and soon after they began gradually to drop peculiar characteristics, so as to form substantially only one national body. In 1811 all Mennonites united in the formation of a society for the support and encouragement of theological education. In 1835 the tercentennial date of Menno's withdrawal from the Papal Church was unitedly observed by all his followers. A missionary society, sustaining three laborers in Java, is supported by all Mennonites, and so is the *Teyler Theological Society at Harlem*. According to the Mennonite "Year-Book" of 1850 (the last published by the denomination), they had then in Holland 127 congregations and 140 ministers, not counting the retired preachers and those engaged as professors.

*The Mennonites in Germany, etc.* — In Germany the Mennonites were rather numerous in the 17th century. In Moravia alone they counted some 70,000. They were expelled from that country by Ferdinand II in 1622, and, after a short stay in Hungary and Transylvania, finally found a resting-place in Russian territory (see below). The Mennonites were very largely represented in Eastern Prussia. They were particularly numerous at Dantzic, Marienburg, and Elbing. Their Dutch neatness and Dutch industry soon made these desolate and swampy regions to flourish like a garden. But almost incessant persecution largely reduced their number by emigration. In 1730 and in 1732 they were threatened with expatriation on account of their refusal to serve in the army; but the storm passed by, and king Frederick II gave them additional privileges—not, however, until the order had been weakened by emigration. Gradually they increased again until 1789, when they were forbidden to purchase landed property. But, notwithstanding all difficulties, the Mennonites have remained, in part at

least, on Prussian soil, particularly the valley of the Vistula, called “the Garden Spot of Prussia.” Their number in all Germany is estimated at about 50,000.

*The Mennonites in Russia.* — Russia gladly availed herself of Prussia’s intolerance, and did much to secure these valuable citizens for her own territory. Catharine II in 1786 had invited the Mennonites to Russia, along with other German colonists, and in 1789 228 families arrived in Russia, and between 1793 and 1796 there was an immigration of 118 more families. These all settled on and near the island of Khortitz, on the Lower Dnieper, below Tekaterinoslav. The conditions on which they came to Russia were: Protection from all attacks, freedom of worship, a gift of lands to the amount of 190 acres for each family, exemption from all taxes and imposts for ten years, money for their journey, and money and wood with which to establish themselves, freedom of trade and manufactures, the administration of oaths in their own way, and exemption forever from military service.! These privileges were confirmed by the emperor Paul, and extended to all Mennonites who should come thereafter. In spite, therefore, of the repeal and mitigation of the severe laws against them in Prussia, there was a continued and large immigration of Mennonites into Russia up to the year 1817. These colonists settled near their brethren in the government of Taurid, in the region between the rivers. Molotchna, Dnieper, and Tokmak, not far from the town of Berdiansk; From that time the Mennonites have gone on increasing and prospering, until they now number about 40,000 souls. They have always been protected and favored by the government, so that they have almost entirely governed themselves, and have preserved their German character and institutions intact. This they in great part owe to the character and efforts of Johann Cornies, who, up to his death in 1848, exercised a very powerful influence over them, though he held no office and no rank. Titles and orders were on several occasions offered to him by the imperial government, which highly appreciated his services, but they were always refused. His advice was several times asked by the minister of domains, and the governor-general of New Russia rarely took an important measure without first consulting Cornies. These Mennonites not only had their own schools and churches, and retained in their integrity the language, habits, and usages of their ancestors, but had a sort of self-government, each group of villages being under a governor appointed by themselves from their own ranks, who acted as the organ of communication between them and the general

government. In 1861, the present czar (Alexander II) granted new lands and renewed all the old concessions to a colony of Mennonites who settled on the Volga. These lands, however, as also those ceded by Catharine, were not given in fee simple. The receivers were allowed to leave them to their children and to sell them to each other, but could not dispose of them to any other than a Mennonite without special permission of the government.

In our own day the attitude of the Russian government towards the Mennonites has decidedly changed, and a harsh and unfriendly spirit been manifested in regard to them. The sharp-sighted among them foresaw an invasion of their liberties from the tone of the Russian newspapers and the attitude of Russian officials. On June 4, 1871, the expected blow came. An edict, addressed to all the colonists in the empire—German Lutherans and Roman Catholics, as well as Mennonites, Bulgarians, and others, to all of whom, as to the Mennonites, grants of lands and special privileges had been given—set the limit of ten years as the terminal period of exemption from military service, with the proviso that, as to furnishing recruits, the laws ruling colonists should remain in force only till the publication of a general law on military duty. Such a law might be promulgated at any day, and the Mennonites, with others, be obliged: to furnish recruits, in spite of their religious convictions against bearing arms. By the general law of Russia emigration is not permitted; but, for the benefit of the aggrieved colonists, ten years were given them in which to take themselves out of Russia, if unwilling to come under the full intent of Russian law. After that time no emigration is to be permitted. Meanwhile some of the Mennonites had been busy making inquiries to guide them in the selection of new homes. Cornelius Jonsen, a leading Mennonite, acting as German consul at Berdiansk, had written letters to members of the sect in this country and Canada, asking information as to the advantage of America for settlement by their people. Very full and encouraging replies were received from John Funk, at Elkhart, Indiana, and from others in Canada, Pennsylvania, and the West. Jonsen had these letters printed, and distributed them, together with little pamphlets, telling of the attractions of America. So enthusiastic did the people become over the hope of freer and happier homes in the New World, that in a short time \$20,000 was raised to aid a deputation to America, to visit its finest sections, and to return to Russia with a report of the result of their spying out of the land. The delegates sent were twelve in number, and left Russia for this country at various times from February to

May, 1873, and the result is manifest in the large arrival of this people, who have purchased lands on the Western prairies, and in some of our Southern states. The probability is that all the Mennonites of Russia will settle in the United States.

Those Mennonites who, after their emigration to Russia, settled in the Crimea, and there lived on land bought by themselves, and not included in the grants of either Catharine or Alexander, are likewise emigrating to this country. An advance guard of some thirty families, who were able to sell their estates at once, quitted the Russian territory and arrived here Aug. 15 (1873). They are essentially German, still speaking the language of the land they were obliged to leave nearly a century ago, and are from the villages of Friedenstein ("Stone of Peace") and Bruderfeld ("Brother's Field"), in the Crimea, in the-neighborhood of the Black Sea. They marry only within their own Church. A correspondent of the *New York Tribune* writes-from St. Petersburg, under date of April 19 (1873), concerning this people: "That the Mennonites are thrifty, industrious, and economical, their prosperity is sufficient proof. They are, besides this, very clean, neat, and orderly (a lady could go into every peasant's stable), and quiet, contented, honest, moral, and deeply religious. There is no drunkenness or gambling among them. Crime is exceedingly rare. The latest statistics I can find are dated 1841, and those show that for 37 years there were only 88 crimes in the Mennonite of on Molotchna, including about 12,000 people. Of these crimes, 41 sprang from the sexual relation, and 9 were thefts; all the rest were minor offences, such as disobedience to the authorities. Besides all this, the Mennonites are educated. Every child knows how to read and write; in every village there is a school. The Bible and other religious books are, of course, to be found in every house. The Mennonites were visited by Haxthausen in 1843. and by Petzholdt in 1855, and both travellers bear testimony to the worth and the prosperity of the colonists. Petzholdt says: 'It is my firm conviction that Russia possesses no more useful or more industrious citizens than the Mennonites.' Up to this time the Mennonites have always been loyal subjects to Russia. They have never been remiss in their taxes; and during the Crimean War sent large voluntary gifts of grain and provender to the besieged army. It is only because the privileges granted to them are infringed, and they will be compelled to enter the army against their conscience, that they now wish to emigrate from Russia."

*The Mennonites in the United States.* — These newcomers are not by any means the first Mennonites in the United States. They came as early as

1683. Holding much in common with the Friends, the Mennonites received an invitation from William Penn to settle in the new province of Pennsylvania. Many accepted the kind offer of the Quaker leader, and in little more than half a century the sect had migrated to the number of about 500 families. In 1708 a school and meeting-house were erected by them in Germantown, Pa. In the following year another colony was established in what is now known as Lancaster County, Pa. Other emigrations followed in 1711, 1717, 1727, and 1733 successively. In 1735 there were nearly if not quite 500 families settled in Lancaster County. Afterwards their families settled also in various parts of Maryland, Ohio, Indiana, New York, and Canada; and they are now found in nearly every part of the Union and of Canada, though they are most numerous presented in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Maryland, and Virginia. It is difficult to arrive at their whole number, as they keep no accessible records for that purpose, believing public displays of this nature to be only one of the vanities of denominations, and of no good service, as the Great Head of the Church well sees and knows how many are his. They probably number, however, as nearly as can be ascertained, about 350 ministers and 66,000 members. They have a publishing-house at Elkhart, Indiana. Their bishops, ministers, and deacons meet semi-annually in district conferences for the purpose of learning the state of the Church, and deliberating upon suggested methods for advancing her spiritual prosperity.' Their religious views are similar to those held by their brethren in Europe. They have, however, distinguishing peculiarities. Their office-bearers—bishops, ministers, and deacons are all of them chosen by lot. Their pastors give their services gratuitously. Their views and character as a body meeting with much misrepresentation, and exciting considerable prejudice against them, they translated and published at Philadelphia, in 1727, their Confession of Faith. For details, see *American Christian Record*, p. 145 sq.

Besides the *Old Mennonites*, there are in America:

**1.** *The Reformed or Strict Mennonites*, who in 1811 branched off from the parent American body. They follow strictly the injunctions Of Simon Menno in regard to foot-washing, non-resistance of evil, abstinence from oaths, and separation from all excommunicated persons. This sect numbers not more than 4000, and is confined chiefly to Pennsylvania, where it first originated. Their doctrines are too rigid for general acceptance, and they progress but slowly. They are a worthy, honest, and exemplary people.

2. *The New Mennonites*, numbering about 10,000, organized in 1847 by J. H. Oberholtzer and ten other ministers of the Old Mennonites in Eastern Pennsylvania. They introduced various reforms, and spread rapidly, not only in Pennsylvania, but in other states, and were the first Mennonites to found a theological seminary, located at Wadsworth, Ohio. In 1872 they had three teachers and twenty-two pupils. They also have a publishing-house at Milford Square, Pa.
3. *The Evangelical Mennonites*, organized from the preceding body in 1856, who hold stated meetings for prayer as a Christian necessity. They number only about 300.
4. *The Omish Mennonites*, numbering about 22,500, followers of Jacob Amman, of Alsace, and very much like the Reformed. They discard the use of buttons on their clothes, substituting the hook, and hence are frequently called *Hookers*.

The Mennonites all over the world count probably 300,000. Their oldest authoritative "Confession of Faith" dates from 1580, entitled *De Waterlandsche Belydenis*; in 1591 was published the *Concept von Koln*; in 1617, *De Friesche Belydenis*; and later (1766), the most complete and generally accepted Confession—was prepared by John Ries, preacher of the Waterlanders in Alcmár, and by Lubbert Gerard, in Latin (comp. Schyn, 2:78, 279; 1:172).

For information respecting the Mennonites, see Ottus, *Annales Anabaptistici* (Basle, 1672, 4to); *Grundliche Historie von den Begebenheiten, Streitigkeiten, und Trennungen, so unter den Tvaufgesinnten bis 1615 vorgegangen* (from the Dutch of Van Gent), by Jehring (Jena, 1720); Schyn, [*Hist. Christianorum, qui in Belgio foderato Mennonitice appellantur* (Amstelod. 1725)]; id., *Historice Mennonitarum plenior Deductio* (Amsterd. 1729), which is a defence of the sect, and in which the author protests against their being confounded with the Anabaptists; Van Huyzen, *Epitome doctr. Mennonitarum*; Botsace, *Wiederbelebung der Wiedertufferischen Lehre*; Crichton, *Gesch. der Mennoniten*; Starck, *Gesch. d. Taufe u. Taufgesinnten*; V. Reischwitz u. Wadzeck, *Glaubensbekenntniss der Mennoniten u. Nachricht von ihren Colonieen nebst Lebensbeschreib. Menno Simonis* (Berl. 1824); Reischwitz, *Beitrage zur Kenntniss der Mennoniten* (Breslau, 1829); Blaupot Ten Cate, *Geschiedenis der Doopsgezinden in Friesland, Holland, Zeeland, etc.* (Amsterd. 1837-50); Cornelius, *Gesch. d. Miinstersch.*

*Aufruhrs* (Leips. 1855); Wigandus, *In Dognatibus Anabaptistarum*; Hase, *Neue Propheten*; De Bussiere, *Les Anabaptistes* (Paris, 1853); Rues, *Gegenwdrtiger Zustand der Mennoniten*; Moshelm, *Ecclesiastes Hist.* cent. xvi, § iii, pt. ii, c. 3; and cent. xvii, § ii, pt. ii, c. 5 (it is to be wished that Mosheim had written the history of this sect in a spirit of greater candor); Gieseler, *Ecclesiastes Hist.* 4:371.sq.; Mohler, *Symbolics*, p. 355 sq.; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, vol. ii (see Index); and Van Oosterzee, in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* vol. ix, s.v.

## Menochius, Giovanni Steffano

a learned Italian, the son of Jacques Menochius, a celebrated lawyer, was born at Pavia in 1576. At the age of seventeen he entered the Order of the Jesuits. He taught theology in different colleges of his order, was principal of those of Modena and Rome, then became inspector for the province of Milan, next for that of Venice, and was finally appointed assistant to the superior-general. He died at Rome Feb. 4, 1655. Of his works we mention *Hieropoliticon, sive institutiones politicce e Scripturis de promptce* (Lyons, 1625, 8vo)';-*Institutiones economice e Scripturis depromptce* (Lyons, 1627, 8vo):*Brevis Expositio sensus litteralis totius Scripture* (Cologne, 1630, 2 vols. fol.: this estimable work was reprinted several times; the best edition is that published at Paris [1719, 2 vols fol.], by P. Tournemine reproduced at Avignon [1768, 4 vols. 4to], it contains an appendix to the commentaries on the Bible, and to different Jesutical authors. See Simon, *Histoire critique lTis pinicipux Commentateurs du Nouv. Test.* 1). 651 );-*Stoie tessute di varie eruditione sacrcra, inorule e profina* (Rome, 1646-54, 6 vols. 4to); the first published under the fictitious name of J. Corona: -*De Republica Hebraeorum* (Paris, 1648 and 1652, fol. ): - *De (Econonmi Christiana* (Venice, 1656, 4to): -*Storia Miscellanea Sacra* '(Venice, 1658, 4to). See also Alegambe and Sottwell, *Scriptores Societatis Jesu*; Dupin, *Bibl. des Auteurs Eccls.* vol.

## Menologium

(*μνηνλόγιον*, from *μήνη* and *λόγος*), a name given by the Greek Christians to such of their Church books as contained, besides the *Mencea* (q.v.), or special prayers and hymns for each festival and saint's day, short biographical notices and descriptions of the death of the saints and martyrs. The menologia were generally divided into monthly parts; sometimes into two semi-annual volumes. There are yet a number of them extant in MS.,

and extracts of them for the use of the Greek Church were repeatedly printed in the 17th century. It nearly corresponds to the *Martyrology* of the Roman Church. The Greeks give the names of the saints, together with short biographical notices of them, taken from the *μηναῖα*, and also the Gospel lessons for the day. Allatius, in *‘De libris Graecorum*, p. 83-88, gives an account of their origin and contents. Several of them are very ancient, and known to us by the accounts of Assemani, Genebrardus, and Ant. Contius. The most important are: *Menol. ex versione Cardinalis Sirleti in, Canisii lectt. antiqua-ruan* (tome v):-*Menol. ex Menceis Graccorum eruturn et in linguamn vern. versum a Maximo Margunio ed. Anton. Pinello* (Venet. 1529): *Menol. Graecorum jussu Basilii Imperatoris Greece olim editum — nunc psimum Gr. et Lat. prodit studio et opera Annibalis Tit. ‘S. Clementis* (Urbini. 1727). Still more remarkable than this edition of the so-called Menologium Basilianum is the *Μηνολόγιον τῶν εὐαγγέλων ἑορταστικῶν* sive *‘Calendarium Ecclesice Constantinopolitanae primitus ex Bibliotheca Romuna Albanorum in lucem editum, etc., ‘cursa’ Steph. Anton. Morcelli* (Rome, 1788, 2 vols.). The text in this edition, revised with great care, was, according to the opinion of the author, written during the reign of Constantinus Copronymus. See ‘Augusti, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, 6:208; 12:300; Suicer and Du Fresle, *Lexicon*, s.v.; ‘Siegel, *Christl. Alterthümme* (see Index); Neale, *‘Introd. Hist. East. Church*.

### Menot, Michel

a French preacher, was born about 1440. He belonged to the Order of the Gray Friars, among whom he taught theology for several years; His sermons were of a peculiar make up half in barbarous Latin, half in burlesque French,. and filled with coarse jests and trivialities; he nevertheless gained great reputation, rather for his oddity than any display of ability, and his enthusiastic hearers surnamed him “the golden trigend. Menot died at Paris in 1518. The printer Claude Chevalier collected a certain number of Menot’s sermons, which appeared under the title *Sermones quadragesimales olim Turonis declamati* (Paris, 1519 and 1525, 8vo), very rarely seen at present. See Nicéron, *Memoires*, etc., vol. xxiv; *Dict. Hist.* (ed. of 1822), s.v.; Le Bas, *Dict. Encycl. de la France*, s.v.

## Menoux, Joseph De

a French Jesuit, was born October 14, 1695, at Besancon. He belonged to an ecclesiastical family, and, destined for the Church, he entered the Society of Jesus at an early age, studied the classics at different colleges, and applied himself with success to preaching. He obtained the confidence of king Stanislas, who appointed him preacher and superior of the seminary of missions for Lorraine. He is represented as a man of mind, intriguing and serviceable, a useful friend and a dangerous enemy.' Voltaire says that he persuaded pope Benedict XIV, the author of some large treatises in folio on the canonization of the saints, that he should translate them into French. He sent several pages of it to him, and obtained a good benefice for his 'seminary, of which the Benedictines were robbed. Voltaire, who in his secret correspondence calls Menoux a false brother, was assured of the protection of the learned Jesuit in all circumstances; but the alliance established between them was not sincere on either side. Menoux was one of the first members of the Academy of Nancy, and was associated with those of the Arcades of Rome. He wrote: *Notions Philosophiques des writes fondamentales de la Religion, ouvrage didactique d'un ordre nouveau* (7th edition, revised and corrected; Nancy, 1758, 8vo. This work appeared at first under the title of *Defi geneial a l'incredulite*. "There are few," says Freron, "so methodical, so clear, so precise, so consistent"): *Heures du Chretien, a l'usage des Missions* (Nancy, 1741, 12mo): — *Discours prononce en 1753 a ha seance publique de la Societe Litteraire de Nanci* (ibid. 1753, 4to; translated into Italian by order of pope Benedict XIV) i-*Coup d'eiil sus l'ari'et du'Parlement de Paris concernant l'institut des Jesuites* (Avignon, 1761, in two parts, 8vo). Menoux is regarded as the author of this writing, signed by P. Griffet, and he furnished to Cerutti the materials for *L'Apologie generale de l'institut des Jesuites*. He was a co-laborer in the moral and religious works of Stanislas. See Freron, *Anne litteraire*, 1753, 1758; Durival, *Descript. de la Lorractine*, 1:236; J. J. Rousseau, *Confessions*, bk. viii.

## Mensa, Mensal

(*table*), a name anciently given to a church erected over a martyr's grave. **SEE MARTYR.** Such edifices received this appellation from the distinctive altar or communion table. Thus Augustine speaks of a church called *mensa Cypriani*-Cyprian, as he explains, not having eaten there, but having there been offered up. Prior to the Reformation in Scotland, when the revenue of

a popish bishopric arose from the annexation of parish churches, those allotted to the bishop himself were called *mensal* churches, as furnishing his table; the other churches being called common, as bishop and chapter had an interest in them. *Mensa* is used by some writers in the same sense as *Martyrium* (q.v.). See Eadie, *Ecclesiastes Cyclop.* s.v.; Riddle, *Christian Antiquities* (Index); Walcott, *Sacred Archceol.* s.v.

### Mensa Capitularis And Mensa Episcopalis

are the technical terms severally given to the *table support* of chapter members and the incumbents of the episcopal office. So long as communistic life prevailed in churches endowed by monastic institutions, the expense for the table was provided for by the common property of the chapter. But in the 10th and 11th centuries, when canonical life was done away with, and the canons supported their own *private* establishments, the endowment was reduced by deducting therefrom the amount necessary to defray the expense of the table, and this sum was apportioned, and consequently the term

(1) *mensa capitularis* for that share of the table endowment which was to defray the table expenses of the chapter members, and

(2) *mensa episcopalis* for the episcopal share. The chapter's portion was again subdivided according to the number of members belonging to a chapter, and the proportion of allowance for each particular person was determined by rank. The administration of the capitular property was usually intrusted to the provost, and that of the episcopal table estate to an official appointed by the bishop himself (vice-dominus) (Carol. M., capit I ao. 802, c. 13; Lothar I, capit ao. 824, c. 8). If any of the capitulary estates were to be sold, a permit of the bishop and all capitularies must be secured (c. 1, 2, 3, 8, x, *De his quaefuint a prelat.* 3:10; sext. c. 2, *De reb. eccl. non alien.* 3:9). If any of the episcopal estates were to be sold, a permit of the pope had to be asked for (c. 8, x, *De reb. eccl. non alien.*). In cases where the episcopal chair is endowed with such goods, this regulation remains yet in force. See Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, s.v.

### Mensa Dei

(*the Lord's table*), a term which has immediate reference to the Lord's Supper. The opposition between the expressions, "table of the Lord" and

“table of daemons” (see 1 Corinthians 11), at once marks it out as a table set apart for sacred purposes. *SEE ALTAR; SEE TABLE.*

## Menses Papales

is the technical term for one form of papal investiture claimed by the incumbent of St. Peter’s chair, in case the vacancy occurs within certain stated months. The present rules of the Roman chancel on this point are: “Cupiens Sanctissimus Dominus Noster pauperibus clericis et allis benemeritis personis providere omnia beneficia ecclesiastica cum cura et sine cura, saecularia et quorumvis ordinum regularia qualitercumque qualificata, et ubicumque existentia in singulis Januarii, Februarii, Aprilis, Maii, Julii, Augusti, Octobris, et Novembris mensibus, usque ad sue voluntatis beneplacitum extra Romanam curiam, alias, quam per resignationem quocumque modo vacatura, ad collationem, provisionem, praesentationem, electionem, et quamvis aliam dispositionem quorumcunque collatorum et collatricium saecularium et quorumvis ordinum regularium (non autem S. R. E. cardinalium, aut aliorum sub concordatis inter sedem apostolicam et quoscunque alios initis, et per eos qui illa acceptare et observare debuerant acceptatis, quae laedere non intendit, comprehensorum) quomodolibet pertinentia dispositioni suae generaliter reservavit,” etc. It is to be remarked that the term *alternativa mensium* is sometimes used to designate the papal months, although they do not really have the same meaning. In the case of patriarchs, archbishops, or bishops, residing in their dioceses, the papal months are reduced from eight to six, the pope retaining only the uneven months (January, March, May, July, September, November).

The papal months originated in the 12th century. The reason was a desire of the popes to secure benefices to worthy but destitute members of the clergy. At first this was done by recommendations (preces); when this did not succeed, a real command was issued (*mandatum deprovidendo*). Gratian’s decretal of 1151 contains no such mandate, as they originated shortly afterwards. One example of them, of the times of Innocent II, is given by Peter, abbot of Cluny, in his *Epistol.* lib. ii, ep. 33-35 (quoted in Gonzales Tellez, cap. 37, x, *De rescriptis*, 1:3, No. 4); another from Adrian IV (1154-1159), epist. 13 (Wirdtwein, *Subsidia diplomatica* [Heidelb. 1774], tom. iv, p. ix); Mansi, *Collectio Conciliorum*, 21:805. If these mandates were not obeyed, it was then the practice to issue successively *littere monitorice*, *praeceptorice*. and *executorice*. The

*mandata de providendo* came afterwards to be issued not only for actually vacant benefices, but- also in advance (c. 19, x, *De rescriptis*, 1:3: “Si qua [praebenda] tune in eorum vacaret ecclesia vel proxima vacaturam”). The Council of Lateran of 1179, however, forbade to present to or even to promise benefices before they were vacant (c. 2, x, *De concess. pceeb. non vacatis*, 3:8), and this defence was renewed by Innocent III, Honorius III, and Boniface VIII; the practice was however, justified on the ground that the promise did not specify any particular benefice. The churches often resisted these papal encroachments (see Richter, *Lehrbuch d. Kirchenrechts*, § 148; Thomassin, *Vetus ac nova ecclesiae disciplina*, pt. ii, lib. i, cap. xliii, xlv) but their protestations were disregarded until, in the Council of Costnitz (1418), pope Martin V declared: “Ultra reservationes juris duae partes sint in dispositione Papa?, et tertia pars remaneat in dispositione Ordinariorum; ita, quod duo prima cedant Papae et tertium Ordinario, ita, quod per quamcumque aliam reservationem aut praerogativas non minuatur” (Van der Ilard, *Concilium Constantiense*, 1:1022 sq.). In France this was understood, in 1425, to give the pope eight months, the bishops four. By the Concordat of Vienna, in 1448, the pope was to have the disposal of vacant benefices during the six uneven months, and the bishops during the six others. The text of the concordat further states: “De caeteris dignitatibus et beneficiis quibuscumque, secularibus et regularibus vacaturis, ultra reservationes jam dictas, majoribus dignitatibus post pontificales in cathedralibus et principalibus in collegiatis exceptis, de quibus jure ordinario provideatur per illos inferiores, ad quos alias pertinet; idem. sancti simus dominus.. non impedit, quo minus de illis, cum vacabunt de mensibus Februarii libere disponatur per illos, ad quos collatio, provisio, praesentatio, electio aut alia quaevis dispositio pertinebit..” This seems evidently to signify that the other dignities are excepted from the *alternativa mensium*; but from the first this was understood to take the appointment to such dignities out of the *alternativa* to confer it on the pope. That the first was the true interpretation is apparent from its being the view. taken by Martin V in the Council of Costnitz, whose tenor was more favorable even than that of the Concordat of Vienna to the papal cause. The later interpretation, however, was asserted by Pius II.

Vacancies occurring in consequence of a simple resignation, or of an exchange of benefices, are excepted from the *alternativa mensium* (Schlor, *De reservatione beneficiorum et dignitatum ex qualitate vacationis per resignationem* [Francf. ad M. 1777, 4to]), as also benefices under lay

patronage (Ferraris, *Bibliotheca Canonica*, s.v. Beneficium, art. xi, note 18-20); most curacies, and other subordinate offices, are also excepted (Hedderich, *Dise. de parochiis in Germania*, etc. [Bonn, 1780, 4to], vol. i; Koch, *Sanctio pragmatica Germanorum illustrata* [Argentorati. 1789, 4to], p.228, note 64).

Some dioceses, however, managed to elude the papal months entirely, by means of special papal edicts rendered for the purpose of securing other advantages (see Probst, *Tuirnarii ecclesiarum Germanice*, in Ullheimer, *Ad concordata nationis Germ. integra documentorum*, fasc. iv [Frankf. and Leips. 1777], p. 360,376; Gudenus. *Codex diplomat.* tom. iv, No. cccxxiv, p. 717; Le Bret, *Magazin z. Gebrauche Staaten- u. Kirchengesch.* pt. viii, p. 4, etc.).

This law is still in force, but has in later times undergone various modifications. In Bavaria, the Concordat of 1817, art. x, states:” Regia Majestas ad canonicatus in sex mensibus apostolicis sive papalibus nominabit” For Prussia, the bull *De salute animarum*, of 1821, regulates that “Futuro autem tempore... canonicatus in mensibus Januarii, Martii, Maii, Julii, Semtembris, ac Novembris... vacantes conferentur, quemadmodum hactenus in capitulo Wratislaviensi hactenus factum est” (see Laspeyre, *Gesch. u. heutige Verfassung d. Kath. K. Preussens* [Halle, 1840], 339, 369, 370). In several other countries the law has fallen into disuse. and the appointments are made by the dioceses. See Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 9:359.

## Men-Stealer

(ἀνδραποδιστής), one who kidnaps or decoys a free person into slavery, an act condemned by the apostle among the highest crimes (<sup><5010></sup>1 Timothy 1:10). The seizing or stealing of a free-born Israelite, either to treat him as a slave or sell him as a slave to others, was by the law of Moses punished with death (<sup><0216></sup>Exodus 21:16; <sup><0307></sup>Deuteronomy 24:7), which the Jewish writers inform us was inflicted by strangling (see Wetstein, ad loc.). The practice was likewise forbidden among the Greeks (see Smith’s *Diet. of Class. Ant.* s.v. Andrapodismou Graphe), and was condemned by law among the Romans (see Adams’s *Roman Antiq.* p. 24). **SEE SLAVE.**

## Mensurius

bishop of Carthage, of whose personal history but little is known, figured very prominently during the Diocletian persecutions. He seems to have been identified with the liberal or Arian party, and to have entertained heretical opinions, to which he gave publicity in books published under the title of "Sacred Scriptures." He opposed the enthusiastic veneration of the confessors who were kept in prison. At the synod held at Ceuta, AD. 305, he was arraigned for these acts, but, as most of the African bishops were accused of the same crime, the matter was passed over. Later a new charge was brought against Mensurius, and he had to defend himself at Rome in 311. It seems that he there cleared himself, but on his return home he died. Under his successor in the bishopric the Donatist quarrels opened. *SEE DONATISTS.*

## Mental Reservation

is a term for withholding or failing to disclose something that affects a statement, promise, oath, etc., and which, if disclosed, would materially vary its import. As this is a false and deceitful way of acting, it can not be approved by true morality. The Jesuits, indeed, allowed and taught their pupils to delude people by all kinds of mental reservations and deceitful intentions. With many of them the end sanctified the means, and so they taught that even deceit by false promises and perjuries is allowable, if only good things were attained thereby in the end. They defended this manner of action by the shallow pretext that mentally something very different has been promised or sworn to from what the spoken words declared. *SEE CASUISTRY; SEE MORAL PHILOSOPHY.*

## Mentone, Bernard De.

*SEE BERNARD.*

## Mentzer, Balthasar (1),

a German Lutheran divine, greatly noted for his decided opposition to the Reformed Church theologians, was born in Allendorf Hesse, February 27, 1565. He studied at the University of Marburg, where he excelled by the display of unusual talents and knowledge. After preaching for several years at Kirtorf, he was appointed in 1596 professor of theology at his alma mater. While in this position he was involved in many controversies

because of his prince's tendency towards the doctrines of the Reformed Church. Mentzer was especially radical in his opposition to their views on the doctrine of *Ubiquity*, on *Iconoclasm*, *the Lord's Supper*, and the *Decalogue*, and in 1605 was actually forced to quit Marburg, and, together with his colleagues, Winckelmann and Leuchter, removed to Giessen; to take a position in the new university founded by landgrave Lewis, and there became one of the most renowned teachers. He died Jan. 6, 1627, at Marburg, to which place the university had been removed in the mean time.

Mentzer was a pure Lutheran; his Christian faith was a truly orthodox belief in the Christological dogma as furnished in the idiomatic and ubiquistic doctrine. He published many works, most of which bore a polemic character. His Latin works were afterwards collected and published by his son: *Opera theologica Latina* (Frankf. 1669, 2 vols. 8vo). His apologetic works against Romanism aid the Reformed Church contain the *Exegesis Confessionis Augustance* (Giessen, 1603). Similar to this is his *Repetitio Chemnitiana*. Challenged by the work of the Romanist John Pistorius (*Wegweiser für alle, welche fuhren Christen*), he wrote *Anti-Pistorius sui disputatio de præcipuis quibusdam controversis capitibus* (Marburg, 16 ("Engelischer Wegweiser (Marburg, 1603); and many others. He engaged in a controversy with John Crocius, professor Marburg, against whom he sent forth *Abstersio calumniarum J. Crocii, Apologetica, Anticrocia, Collatio Augustance Confessionis cum doctrina Calvinii, Bezoe et sociorum* (1610). He had also a controversy with John Sadeel, of Paris and Geneva, Matthias Martinius, at Herborn, Paul Stein, at Cassel, Schinfeld, and Pareus: *Elencheus errorum J. Sadeelis in libello de veritate humane nature Christi* (Giessen, 1615): — *Elencheus errorum J. Sadeelis in libello de sacramentali manducatione* (Giessen, 1612): *Anti Martinius sive modesta et solida responsio*, etc. (Giessen, 1612); and many others. These polemics concerning the human nature of Christ, the sacramental use of the Lord's Supper, and the idiomatic use of *impanation*, give an idea of the logic of the Reformed criticism and the tenacity of the Lutheran defence. The humanity of Christ, the "Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us," are the principal points of Mentzer's theological grounds. He condemns his opponent's view as Arianistic: "Non igitur existimo, unquam exstitisse inter Christianos, qui Christo homini vel nature ejus humane minus glorie et auctoritatis et potentale tribuendum censuerint, quam Martinium hunc Freienhagensensem" (*Anti-Martinius*, p. 167). In a communication to Martinius, Mentzer's assertion, "Ipsa divina

pruesentia juxta sacras literas est actio,” provoked another controversy with his colleagues at Giessen, professors Winckelmann and Gisenius. This controversy was settled by the landgrave’s personal interference only, who in 1607 imposed silence and peace on all parties. Mentzer’s principal work is *Necessaria et justa defensio contra injustas criminationes L. Osiandri, M. Nicolai, Th. Tummii, in qua multi de persona et officio Christi erroris deteguntur et refutantur* (1624). This was answered in 1625 in Thummi’s *Acta*. In 1618 Mentzer was called to Wolfenbittel to give his opinion on Calixtus’s *Epitome theologice*. He never went thither, but sent a criticism to his son-in-law, superintendent Wiedeburg, acknowledging the eminent talents of the author, but judging his epitome from his own narrow and exclusive stand-point. See Witten, *Mem. Theol.* 1:223 sq.; Strieder, *Hessische Gelehrten-geschichte*, vol. viii; Walch, *Relig. Streitigkeiten innerhalb der Luth.-Kirche*; also, *Streitigkeiten ausserhall der’ Luther. Kirche*, 3:505; Henke, *Georg. Calixtus*, 1:123, 282, 307, 321; 2:23; *Memor. Theol.* 1:223 sq.; Gasz, *Gesch. der protest. Theol.* 1:277, 278; Walch, *Biblioth. theologica*, 2:654; Dorner, *Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, 2:243 et al. (J. H. W.)

## Mentzer, Balthasar

(2), son of the preceding, was born May 14, 1614, at Giessen, and was educated at the University of Marburg, which he entered in 1628, but completed his education at Strasburg and Jena. In 1640 he became professor at Marburg, in 1648 at Rinteln. He returned four years after and got a position at the University of Giessen, and died July 28, 1679. His most important works are, *Compendium Theol. Christ.* (Rinteln, 1649):- *Quaestt. Theol. ad Aug. Conf.* (Darmst. 1668; often republished; at last at Rinteln, 1753):- *De termino vitce* (1647), and *Abgeniothigte frere Erklarung der Frage vom Ziel des menschlichen Lebens* (Rinteln, 1649):- *Kurzes Bedenken uber Wahrenberg’s Gespräch von der Polygamie* (Darmst. 1671); etc.

## Menu

SEE MANU

## Menluchah

(Hebrews *Menuchah*’, [hj Wnm](#)], *rest*, as often) appears in the marg. of the A. V. at <sup>4718</sup>Judges 20:43 (Sept. [Vat.] [ἀπὸ Νουά](#), Vulg. and A. V. “with

ease,” as if *hj WNmæ* and <sup><2519></sup>Jeremiah 51:59 (Sept. *δῶρον*, Vulg. propheticæ, AV. “quiet”). The Sept. likewise, in the remarkable list of additional towns in Judah (<sup><1159></sup>Joshua 15:59), seems to make mention of it (*Μανοχώ*). Furst (*Hebrews Lex.* s.v.) thinks it the place in Benjamin called *Manochath* (<sup><1386></sup>1 Chronicles 8:6) or *Hatsi-ham-Menuchoth* (<sup><1024></sup>1 Chronicles 2:54). But all this is doubtful, and the word is rather an appellative. *SEE MENUCHITE*.

### Menuchite Or Menuchoth

is given in the margin of the A. V. at <sup><1325></sup>1 Chronicles 2:52, 54, in place of “MaUVthf of the textual rendering, as ai alternative rendering of the Hebrews *Menuchoth*’ (*twḡnaw*] ver. 52) or *Menachti*’ (*yTḡḡim*] ver. 54), which, as far as can be gathered from the obscure and confused passage, seems to be assigned as a general name of certain descendants of Judah, classified according to some locality settled or inhabited by them. Some (as -apparently the A. V.) have referred this presumed place to the Manahath (q.v.) of <sup><1386></sup>1 Chronicles 8:6; but this was either in Benjamin or Moab, certainly not in Judah. Others have found it in the Menuchah (q.v.) supposed to be referred to in <sup><1026></sup>Judges 20:43; but of the existence of this latter there is very great doubt. The ancient versions are able to make nothing intelligible out of the passage. Thus much is clear, that the *Hatsi-ham-Menuchoth* of ver. 52 corresponds as one half either of a lineage or of a district to the other half which appears in ver. 54 as *Hatsiham-Menachti*; but the relation between the noun Monuchoth and the adjective Menachthite we cannot discover. The latter of these two moieties is predicated of the son of Salma, the former of the son of Shobal. As of Shobal, however, *sons* are announced, we must recognise in Haroeh the name of another son; moreover, in chap. 4:2, Reaiah appears as a son of Shobal, and this name so closely resembles Haroeh that we may suppose them identical. Haroeh and Reaiah are thus associated as the two sons of Shobah, and the I connective (“and”) may have originally stood between them in the text. Haroeh, indeed, may be resolved into the article and a participle (*harb*; = *the seer*), and thus be reduced to a mere appellation or attribute, but this would not help the narrative. *Hatsi-ham-Menuchoth*, on the other hand, is a less natural form for a patril name than *Hatsi-ham-Menachti*, and this would seem to designate an original or ancestor by the name of Manachath (*tj nim*), a form which actually occurs elsewhere as the name of a man. *SEE MANAHATH*. Now as Shobal is repeatedly stated

to be the “father” (founder) of Kirjath-jearim, his sons of course, in part at least, settled there. We may therefore clear up ver. 52 by interpreting it as meaning that Shobal had two sons, Reaiah and Manahath, and that part of the descendants of the latter settled at Kirjath-jearim, becoming the heads of the families named in ver. 53. The other portion of the Manahathites appear to have colonized at Zorah, in the adjoining territory of Dan; and are hence, for some reason not clear, classed in ver. 54 with the descendants of Shobal’s brother Salma as “Zorites,” that city being perhaps chiefly occupied by the latter. Yet it is a singular circumstance that in chap. 4:1, 2, :Keaiah’s posterity are said to have peopled this city, if, indeed, that be the just interpretation of “Zorathites.” *SEE ZORAH.*

### Menymeni

(*Μενυμένοι*, *the initiated*) was the name given, especially in the 4th and 5th centuries, to full members of the Church of Christ. It originated in the supposed analogy between baptism and the rites of initiation into the sacred mysteries of the heathen. The phrase *ἴσασιν οἱ μεμνημένοι*, “the initiated know,” occurs about fifty times in the works of Augustine and Chrysostom. In like manner *μώσται*, *μυσταγώγητοι*, *μυσταγωγοί*, and other terms borrowed from the heathen mysteries, are applied to the Christian rites. All these expressions, which came into general use in the 4th century, mark the prevalence of that system of secret instruction or doctrine which we noticed in the article *SEE ARCANI DISCIPLINA*. See Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, p. 195.

### Meon

*SEE BAAL-MEON; SEE BETH-BAAL-MEON; SEE BETH-MEON.*

### Meon’anim

(Hebrews *Meonenim*’) occurs in the Auth. Vers. (<sup>0087</sup>Judges 9:37) in the proper name Elon-Meonenim (*μυνημένη ἄνωρα*), “the plain;” or, as it should be rendered, *the oak of Meonenim* (Sept. *Ἦλων Μαωνενίμ* v. r. *δρύος ἀποβλεπόντων*, marg. “regarders of times”). Meonenim (variously rendered in the Auth. Vers. “sooth-sayers,” “regarders of times,” etc.) means *sorcerers*, and is derived either from *הנחף*, “time” (<sup>0210</sup>Exodus 21:10), from *עַיִן* “the eye,” or else, which is more probable, from *ענן*; “a cloud;” it means, therefore, those dealers in forbidden arts who-observe

times, or practice fascination, or take auguries from the signs of the sky. *SEE DIVINATION*. Whatever was its original meaning, Meonenim was afterwards used in a perfectly general sense (<sup><6180></sup>Deuteronomy 18:10, 14; <sup><1216></sup>2 Kings 21:6; <sup><3152></sup>Micah 5:12) for wizards. In this article, therefore, we are only concerned with “the oak of the sorcerers,” a celebrated tree near Shechem, mentioned in <sup><1057></sup>Judges 9:37, where Gaal, son of Ebed, the Shechemite conspirator, standing “in the entering of the gate,” saw the soldiers of Abimelech first on the hilltops, and then in two companies, of which one approached by the “oak of the sorcerers,” which is evidently pointed out as a conspicuous land-mark. It would be the better suited for this purpose because oaks are rare in Palestine, except in the hills. For other trees used as land-marks, see <sup><1318></sup>Genesis 35:8; <sup><1216></sup>1 Samuel 22:6; x,3; 14:2, etc. Now it happens that in Scripture no less than *four* other celebrated trees in the immediate neighborhood of Shechem are prominently mentioned in connection with important events, and it is interesting to inquire whether all or any of these can be identified with “the sorcerer’s oak.” *SEE OAK*.

**1.** In <sup><1126></sup>Genesis 12:6 we are told that Abraham “.passed through the land unto the place of Sichem, unto the oak of Moreh” (Sept. τὴν δρῦν τὴν ὑψηλήν), where the use of the singular points to *one* tree of note, although at Shechem there was a grove of oaks (<sup><6130></sup>Deuteronomy 11:30). It was, therefore, in all probability conspicuous for size and beauty, and the vision which Abraham there commemorated by building an altar would add to it a sacred and venerable association. *SEE ABRAHAM*.

**2.** In <sup><1134></sup>Genesis 35:4 we read that Jacob, on his way to Bethel, took from his family all the strange gods which were in their hand, and all their earrings which were in their ears, and hid them under the oak which was by Shechem (μικτὰμ[æνα]ἠι αἶθ). The use of the article in this verse is not, indeed, absolutely decisive, but would lead naturally to the supposition that this tree was the one already so famous in the religious history of the Israelitish family. That ἠι αἶθ used (Sept. τερεβινθος) and not ᾠβαἶθ is a consideration of no importance, for it seems certain that the two words are synonymous (see Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 50, 51), or at any rate are used interchangeably. *SEE TEREBNTH*.

**3.** In <sup><1205></sup>Joshua 24:26, Joshua, after addressing the assembled tribes at Shechem. “took a great stone and set it up there under an oak (*the* oak, ἠLah) that was by the sanctuary of the Lord.” The use of the definite

article again renders it probable that this is the same tree as that which had been connected with the memories of Abraham's vision, and Jacob's rejection of idolatrous possessions; and the probability is strengthened into certainty by the fact that Joshua's injunction in ver. 14 ("put away the gods which your fathers served on the other side of the flood") is almost identical with that which Jacob had addressed to his family on that very spot (<sup><018D></sup>Genesis 35:2) some 300 years before. Kalisch, indeed, objects that a "sanctuary of the Lord" would never have been erected at the place of idols (*Genesis*, p. 586); but, to say nothing of the fact that *several* of the Jewish high-places seem to have been also connected with the worship of the Canaanites, a place where idols had been buried, and so rejected, and scorned, would surely be most fitted for the sanctuary', especially if it had been hallowed by a previous protest made by the great forefather of the race against the idolatry which there surrounded him (<sup><0127></sup>Genesis 12:7).

4. In <sup><0106></sup>Judges 9:6, we read that "all the men of Shechem... made Abimelech king, by the oak (AV. plain) of the pillar that was in Shechem" (<sup><0106></sup>ϖβααμ[αρκυβαενα]βχμου. The word βχμου *mutstsab'*, is very obscure. and Jerome's version, "quercus quas stabat in Sichem," seems to show that it may once have followed ρνα. The Sept. renders it πρὸς τῇ βαλάνῳ (τῇ ευρετῇ τῆς στάσεως τῆς ἐν Σικίμοις, where στασις. means "a military station," a rendering approved, by Gesenius (*Thesaur.* p. 904), who compares <sup><0308></sup>Isaiah 29:3. Our AV. refers it to the sacred stone set up by Joshua, and this seems a very probable rendering, from the constant use of the word *matstsebah* for similar erections (<sup><0128></sup>Genesis 28:18; <sup><0244></sup>Exodus 24:4; <sup><0100></sup>2 Kings 3:2; Micah v. 13, etc.). It seems further possible that during the confusions which prevailed in the country after Joshua's death, the stone which he had erected beneath it, and which he invested, even though only in metaphor, with qualities so like those which the Canaanites attributed to the stones they worshipped - during these confused times this famous block may have become sacred among the Canaanites, one of their "matstsebahs" [SEE IDOL], and thus the tree have acquired the name of "the oak of Mutstsab" from the fetish below it. - The argument that this tree cannot be identical with Jacob's, because *that* is spoken of as *near*' (μ[ε] and *this* as in (b) Shechem, is quite unconvincing, both because the use of the prepositions by Hebrew writers is by no means minutely accurate, in this way corresponding to their general ἀγεωγραφία, and because Shechem may mean the *district round the city*, as well as the city itself. -(For a decisive case in point, see Joshua v. 13,

where the Vulgate rightly renders /j yry<sup>ϕ</sup>Ba<sup>y</sup> “*in agris urbis Jericho.*”) We believe, therefore, that all these trees are one and the same, which thus becomes connected with four most memorable events in the lives of Abraham, Jacob, Joshua, and Abimelech.

Was this tree also the “oak of the sorcerers?” There might at first seem to be a positive reason *against* the identification, because (1.) The name “sorcerers,” or “enchanters,” would not be particularly suitable to the tree, which Kalisch also thinks might with more propriety have been called the “oak of idols,” or of “witchcraft,” than the oak of enchanters (*Genesis*, p. 586); and (2.) Because Gaal evidently points to the Elon-Meonenim at a distance from the city, whereas Jacob’s tree was in it. Of this second argument we have already disposed; and-besides, Gaal’s expression may merely mean that one company was on the *road which led by* “the sorcerer’s oak.” As regards the first argument, the Elon Meonenim may have been the same as Jacob’s tree, and yet not have received its name from the idols and amulets which Jacob buried there. The close connection of ear-rings with talismans and magic arts is well known, and in the Chaldee the word used for ear-ring is avyDaj<sup>ϕ</sup> so that it does seem reasonable to suppose that there is a connection between the name and the event. But if not, *may not the name have originated in some use made of the tree by the priests and necromancers of the neighboring shrine of Baal-Berith?* (<sup><0083></sup>Judges 8:33; 9:36). If it be asked how it was that a tree so sacred as this could have received *an opprobrious name*, it must be borne in mind that this name only occurs on the lips of Gaal, who in all probability was an aboriginal Canaanite of the old royal family (ix. 28; comp. <sup><0302></sup>Genesis 34:2, 6), and who would therefore be likely to call the tree by a name derived from its associations with idolatrous rather than with Jewish worship. *SEE GAAL.*

### Meon’othai

(Hebrews *Meonothay’*, yt<sup>n</sup>ϕm] *my habitations*; Sept. Μαναθί v. r. Μωναθει), the father (? founder) of Ophrah, and apparently the brother of Hathath, the son of Othniel (<sup><1344></sup>1 Chronicles 4:14). BC. post 1612.

### Meph’aath

[some *Mepha’ath*] (Hebrews *Meypha’ath*, t [p<sup>j</sup>me] prob. *splendor*; once defectively written t [p<sup>j</sup>me<sup><0638></sup> Joshua 13:18, and once [Kethib] t [p<sup>j</sup>m,

<sup><24821></sup>Jeremiah 48:21; Sept. **Μηφάαθ** in Josh., **Φαάθ** v. r. **Μαεφλά** in Chron. And **Μαφάς** v. r. **Μωφάθ** in Jer.), a Levitical (Merarite) city (<sup><0237></sup>Joshua 21:37; <sup><1159></sup>1 Chronicles 6:79) of the tribe of Reuben (<sup><6138></sup>Joshua 13:18), doubtless originally (like Heshbon, of which it formed a dependency) in the hands of the Amorites (<sup><0226></sup>Numbers 21:26), but afterwards belonging to Moab (<sup><24821></sup>Jeremiah 48:21); probably situated near Kedemoth and Jahazah, in connection with which it is always mentioned. Eusebius (*Onomast.*) calls it *Mephath* (**Μηφάθ**), and states that it was still occupied by a Roman garrison as a defence against the Arabs of the neighboring desert. As the name implies a conspicuous position, the site may possibly correspond with that of the modern village with ruins on an eminence marked as *Umn el- Weled* on Van de Velde's *Map*, east of Medeba. "The extended, and possibly later, form of the name which occurs in Chronicles and Jeremiah, as if *Mey Phaath*, 'waters of Phaath,' may be, as in other cases, an attempt to fix an intelligible meaning on an archaic or foreign word;" although the fuller form appears to be radical (so both Gesenius and Ffirst, from [pj]; to glitter, be eminent).

## Mephib'osheth

(Heb. *Mephioo'sheth*, **tvbypæ**[twice' defectively' **tvbpæ**] 2 Sam, 19:24; 21:8], *exterminator of the shame*, i.e. idols or Baal, see Simonis *Lex. V. T.* p. 160; Ewald, *Isr. Gesch.* 2:383; Sept. **Μεφιβόσεθ** v. . **Μεμφονπσθέ**, Vulg. *Miphiboseth*, Josephus **Μεμφίβοσθος**), the name of two of king- Saul's descendants. "Bosheth appears to have been a favorite appellation in Saul's family, for it forms a part of the names of no fewer than three members of it — Ish-bosheth and the two Mephibosheths. But in the genealogies preserved in 1 Chronicles these names are given in the different forms of Esh-baal and Merib-baal. The variation is identical with that of Jerub-baal and Jerubbesheth, and is in accordance with passages in Jeremiah (<sup><24113></sup>Jeremiah 11:13) and Hosea (<sup><23910></sup>Hosea 9:10), where Baal and Bosheth appear to be convertible or, at least, related terms, the latter being used as a contemptuous or derisive synonyme of the former. One inference from this would be that the persons in question were originally named Baal; that this appears in the two fragments of the family records preserved in Chronicles; but that in Samuel the hateful heathen name has been uniformly erased, and the nickname of Bosheth substituted for it. It is some support to this to find that Saul had an ancestor named Baal, who appears

in the lists of Chronicles only (<sup><1383></sup>1 Chronicles 8:30; 9:36). But such a change in the record supposes an amount of editing and interpolation which would hardly have been accomplished without leaving more obvious traces, in reasons given for the change, etc. How different it is, for example, from the case of Jerub-besheth, where the alteration is mentioned and commented on. Still the facts are as above stated, whatever explanation may be given of them.” *SEE ISHBOSHETH.*

W. Saul’s son by his concubine Rizpah, the daughter of Aiah (<sup><1218></sup>2 Samuel 21:8). He and his brother Armoni were among the seven victims who were surrendered by David to the Gibeonites, and by them crucified in sacrifice to Jehovah, to avert a famine from which the country was suffering. There is no doubt about this being the real meaning of the word [qj; translated here and in <sup><1234></sup>Numbers 25:4 “hanged up” (see Michaelis’s *Supplement*, No. 1046; also Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 620; and Furst, *Handwb.* p. 539 b). Aquila has ἀναπήγνυμι, understanding them to have been not crucified but impaled. The Vulgate reads *crucifixerunt* (ver. 9), and *qui affixifuerant* (ver. 13). The Hebrew term is entirely distinct from חל ת; also rendered “to hang” in the AV., which is its real signification. It is this latter word which is employed in the story of the five kings of Makkedah; in the account of the indignities practiced on Saul’s body, <sup><1212></sup>2 Samuel 21:12; on Baanah and Rechab by David, <sup><1012></sup>2 Samuel 4:12; and elsewhere.

The seven corpses, protected by the tender care of the mother of Mephibosheth from the attacks of bird and beast, were exposed on their crosses to the fierce sun of at least five of the midsummer months, on the sacred eminence of Gibeah. This period results from the statement that they hung from barley harvest (April) till the commencement of the rains (October); but it is also worthy of notice that the Sept. has employed the word ἐξηλιάζειν, “to expose to the sun.” It is also remarkable that on the only other occasion on which this Hebrew term is used—<sup><1234></sup>Numbers 25:4—an express command was given that the victims should be crucified “in front of the sun.” At the end of that time the attention of David was called to the circumstance, and also possibly to the fact that the sacrifice had failed in its purpose. A different method was tried: the bones of Saul and Jonathan were disinterred from their resting-place at the foot of the great tree at Jabesh-Gilead, the blanched and withered remains of Mephibosheth, his brother, and his five relatives, were taken down from the crosses, and father, son, and grandsons found at last a restingplace together in the

ancestral cave of Kish at Zelah. When this had been done, “ God was entreated for the land,” and the famine ceased. BC. 1053 -1019. *SEE RIZPAH.*

**2.** The son of Jonathan and grandson of king Saul (<sup><3004></sup>2 Samuel 4:4; in which sense “ the son of Saul “ is to be taken in <sup><1002></sup>2 Samuel 19:24; see Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 216); called also by the equivalent name of MERIBBAAL (<sup><1390></sup>1 Chronicles 9:40). The following account of his history and character is sufficiently detailed to set forth the important relations which he held to the adventures and reign of his father’s successor.

**1.** His life seems to have been, from beginning to end, one of trial and discomfort. The name of his mother is unknown. There is reason to think that she died shortly after his birth, and that he was an only child. At any rate, we know for certain that when his father and grandfather were slain on Gilboa he was an infant of but five years old. BC. 1053. He was then living under the charge of his nurse, probably at Gibeah, the regular residence of Saul. The tidings that the army was destroyed, the king and his sons slain, and that the Philistines, spreading from hill to hill of the country, were sweeping all before them, reached the royal household. The nurse, perhaps apprehending that the enemy were seeking to exterminate the whole royal family, fled, carrying the child on her shoulder. This is the statement of Josephus (<sup><1000></sup>ἀπὸ τῶν ὄμων, *Ant.* 7:5, 5); but it is hardly necessary, for in the East children are always carried on the shoulder (see Lane’s *Mod. Egyptians*, ch. i, p. 52, and the art. CHILD). But in her panic and hurry she stumbled, and Mephibosheth was precipitated to the ground with such force as to deprive him for life of the use of both feet. (<sup><1004></sup>2 Samuel 4:4). These early misfortunes threw a shade over his whole life, and his personal deformity-as is often the case where it has been the result of accident-seems to have exercised a depressing and depreciatory influence on his character. He can never forget that he. is a poor lame slave (<sup><1005></sup>2 Samuel 19:26), and unable to walk; a dead dog (ix. 8); that all the house of his father were dead (19:28); that the king is an angel of God (ib. 27), and he his abject dependent (9:6, 8). He receives the slanders of Ziba and the harshness of David alike with a submissive equanimity which is quite touching, and which effectually wins our sympathy.

**2.** After the accident which thus embittered his whole existence, Mephibosheth was carried with the rest of his family beyond the Jordan to

the mountains of Gilead, where he found a refuge in the house of Machir ben-Ammiel, a powerful Gadite or Manassite sheik at Lo-debar, not far from Mahanaim, which during the reign of his uncle Ishbosheth was the head-quarters of his family. By Machir he was brought up (Josephus, *Ant.* 7:5, 5); there he married, and there he was living at a later period, when David, having completed the subjugation of the adversaries of Israel on every side, had leisure to turn his attention to claims of other and less pressing descriptions. The solemn oath which he had sworn to the father of Mephibosheth at their critical interview by the stone Ezel, that he “would not cut off his kindness from the house of Jonathan forever: no, not when Jehovah had cut off the enemies of David each one from the face of the earth” (~~1015~~1 Samuel 20:15); and again, that “Jehovah should be between Jonathan’s seed and his seed forever” (ver. 42), was naturally the first thing that occurred to him, and he eagerly inquired who was left of the house of Saul, that he might show kindness to him for Jonathan’s sake (~~1001~~2 Samuel 9:1). So completely had the family of the late king vanished from the western side of Jordan that the only person to be met with in any way related to them was one Ziba, formerly a slave of the royal house, but now a freed man, with a family of fifteen sons, who, by arts which, from the glimpse we subsequently have of his character, are not difficult to understand, must have acquired considerable substance, since he was possessed of an establishment of twenty slaves of his own. From this man David learned of the existence of Mephibosheth. Royal messengers were sent to the house of Machir at Lo-debar, in the mountains of Gilead, and by them the prince and his infant son Michah (comp. ~~1090~~1 Chronicles 9:40) were brought to Jerusalem. The interview with David was marked by extreme kindness on the part of the king, and on that of Mephibosheth by the fear and humility which have been pointed out as characteristic of him. He leaves the royal presence with all the property of his grandfather restored to him, and with the whole family and establishment of Ziba as his slaves, to cultivate the land and harvest the produce. He himself is to be a daily guest at David’s table. From this time forward he resided at Jerusalem (2 Samuel ix). BC. cir. 1037. See Kitto’s *Daily Bible Illust.* ad loc.

**3.** An interval of about fourteen years now passes, and the crisis of David’s life arrives. *SEE DAVID*. Of Mephibosheth’s behavior on this occasion we possess two accounts-his own (~~1002~~2 Samuel 19:24-30), and that of Ziba (16:1-4). They are naturally at variance with each other.

(1.) Ziba meets the king on his flight at the most opportune moment, just as David has undergone the most trying part of that trying day's journey, has taken the last look at the city so peculiarly his own, and completed the hot and toilsome ascent of the Mount of Olives. He is on foot, and is in want of relief and refreshment. The relief and refreshment are there. There stand a couple of strong he-asses ready saddled for the king or his household to make the descent upon; and there are bread, grapes, melons, and a skin of wine; and there—the donor of these welcome gifts—is Ziba, with respect in his look and sympathy on his tongue. Of course the whole, though offered as Ziba's, is the property of Mephibosheth: the asses are his, one of them his own riding animal (r/mj } both in 17:2, and 19:26); the fruits are from his gardens and orchards. But why is not their owner here in person ? Where is the “son of Saul?” He, says Ziba, is in Jerusalem, waiting to receive from the nation the throne of his grandfather, that throne from which he has so long been unjustly excluded. Such an aspiration would be very natural, but it must have been speedily dissipated by the thought that *he* at least would be likely to gain little by Absalom's rebellion. Still it must be confessed that Ziba's tale at first sight is a most plausible one, and that the answer of David is no more than was to be expected. So the presumed ingratitude of Mephibosheth is requited with the ruin he deserves, while the loyalty and thoughtful courtesy of Ziba are rewarded by the possessions of his master, thus reinstating him in the position which he seems to have occupied on Mephibosheth's arrival in Judah.

(2.) Mephibosheth's story which, however, he had not the opportunity of telling until several days later, when he met David returning to his kingdom at the western bank of the Jordan — was very different from Ziba's. He had been desirous to fly with his patron and benefactor, and had ordered Ziba to make ready his ass that he might join the cortege. But Ziba had deceived him, had left him, and not returned with the asses. In his helpless condition he had no alternative, when once the opportunity of accompanying David was lost, but to remain where he was. The swift pursuit which had been made after Ahimaaz and Jonathan (2 Samuel 17) had shown what risks even a strong and able man must run who would try to follow the king. But all that he could do under the circumstances he had done. He had gone into the deepest mourning possible (the same as in 12:20) for his lost friend. From the very day that David left he had allowed his beard to grow ragged, his crippled feet were unwashed (Jerome,

however, *pedibus infectis*-alluding to false wooden feet which he was accustomed to wear, *Quaest. Hebrews* ad loc.) and untended, his linen remained unchanged. That David did not disbelieve this story is shown by his revoking the judgment he had previously given. That he did not entirely reverse his decision, but allowed Ziba to retain possession of half the lands of Mephibosheth, is probably due partly to weariness at the whole transaction. but mainly to the conciliatory frame of mind in which he was at that moment. "Shall, then, any man be put to death this day?" is the key note of the whole proceeding. David could not but have been sensible that he had acted hastily, and was doubtless touched by the devotedness of his friend's son, as well as angry at the imposition of Ziba; but, as he was not wholly convinced of Mephibosheth's innocence, and as there was at the time no opportunity to examine fully into the matter, perhaps also actuated by the pride of an already expressed judgment or by reluctance to offend Ziba, who had adhered to him when so many old friends forsook him, he answered abruptly, "Why speakest thou any more of thy matters? I have said Thou and Ziba divide the land." The answer of Mephibosheth was worthy of the son of the generous Jonathan, and, couched as it is in Oriental phrase, shows that he had met a better reception than he had expected: "Yea, let him take all; forasmuch as my lord the king. is come again in peace unto his own house" (~~1024~~ 2 Samuel 19:24-30). BC. cir. 1023.

**4.** We hear no more of Mephibosheth, except that David was careful that he should not be included in the savage vengeance which the Gibeonites were suffered to execute upon the house of Saul for the great wrong they had sustained during his reign (~~1027~~ 2 Samuel 21:7). BC. cir. 1019. Through his son Micah the family of Saul was continued to a late generation (~~1390~~ 1 Chronicles 9:40 sq.).

On the transaction between David and Mephibosheth, see J. G. Elsner, *Ueb. die gerechte Unschuld u. Redlichkeit Mephiboseths* (Frankf. u. Leipz. 1760); Niemever, *Charakt.* 4:434 sq.; Kitto's *Daily Bible Illust.* ad loc.; Blunt, *Undesigned Coincidences*, ad loc.; Hall, *Contemplations*, ad loc.; H. Lindsay, *Lectures*, 2:102; Doddridge, *Sermons*, 1:177; Ewald, *Hist. of Israel* (Engl. transl. 3:191). **SEE ZIBA.**