

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY  
**REFERENCE**

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL,  
THEOLOGICAL and  
ECCLESIASTICAL  
LITERATURE

**Merab - Metrophanes, Critopulus**

*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**

## Me'rab

(Hebrews *Merlab'*, *brimēincrease*; Sept. **Μερόβ** and **Μερώβ**; Josephus **Μερόβη**, *Ant.* 6:6, 5), the eldest of the two daughters of king Saul (doubtless by his wife Ahinoam), and possibly the eldest child (<sup><0944></sup>1 Samuel 14:49). She first appears (BC. cir. 1062) after the victory over Goliath and the Philistines, when David had become an inmate in Saul's house (<sup><0982></sup>1 Samuel 18:2), and immediately after the commencement of his friendship with Jonathan. In accordance with the promise which he made before the engagement with Goliath (17:25), Saul betrothed Merab to David (18:17), but it is evidently implied that one object of thus rewarding his valor was to incite him to further feats, which might at last lead to his death by the Philistines. David's hesitation looks as if he did not much value the honor, although his language in ver. 18 may be only an Oriental form of self-depreciation (comp. <sup><0982></sup>1 Samuel 18:23; 25:42; <sup><1008></sup>2 Samuel 9:8); at any rate before the marriage Merab's younger sister Michal had displayed her attachment for David, and Merab was then married to Adriel the Meholathite, who seems to have been one of the wealthy sheiks of the eastern part of Palestine, with whom the house of Saul always maintained an alliance. To Adriei she bore five sons, who formed five of the seven members of the house of Saul who were given up to the Gibeonites by David, and by them impaled as a propitiation to Jehovah on the sacred hill of Gibeah (<sup><1018></sup>2 Samuel 21:8). *SEE RIZPAH.*

The Authorized Version of this passage is an accommodation, rendering **hdi y**; "she brought up," although it has "she bare" for the same Hebrew word in the previous part of the verse. The Hebrew text has "the five sons of Michal, daughter of Saul, which she bare to Adriel," and this is followed in the Sept. and Vulgate. The Targum explains the discrepancy thus: "The five sons of Merab (which Michal, Saul's daughter, brought up) which she bare," etc. The Peshito substitutes Merab (in the present state of the text "Nodob") for Michal. J. H. Michaelis, in his Hebrew Bible (<sup><1010></sup>2 Samuel 21:10), suggests that there were two daughters of Saul named Michal, as there were two Elishamas and two Eliphalets among David's sons. Probably the most feasible solution of the difficulty is that "Michal" is the mistake of a transcriber for "Merab;" but, if so, it is manifest from the agreement of the versions and of Josephus (*Ant* vii. 4,30) with the present text, that the error is one of very ancient date. *SEE MICHAL.*

## Merai'ah

(Hebrews *Merayah'*, **מְרַיָּה**] *resistance*; Sept. **Ἀμαρία** v. r. **Μαρέα**; Vulg. *Maraja*), a chief priest, the “son” of Seraiah, contemporary with the high-priest Joiakim (<sup><3621></sup>Nehemiah 12:12). BC. post 536.

## Merai'oth

(Hebrews *Merayoth'*, **מְרַיָּוֹת**] *rebellions*; Sept. **Μεραιώθ**, **Μεραώθ**, and **Μαριώθ** v. r. **Μαριήλ**), the name of one or more leading priests.

**1.** The son of Zerariah and father of Amariah, a high-priest of the line of Eleazar (<sup><1306></sup>1 Chronicles 6:6, 7, 52; <sup><1308></sup>Ezra 7:3). BC. considerably ante 1062. It was thought by Lightfoot that he was the immediate predecessor of Eli in the office of high-priest, and that at his death the high-priesthood changed from the line of Eleazar to the line of Ithamar (*Temple Service*, iv, § 1). In <sup><1301></sup>1 Chronicles 9:11; <sup><6111></sup>Nehemiah 11:11, his name appears to have become transposed between those of Zadok and Ahitub, instead of its proper place after the latter, as may be seen from <sup><1306></sup>1 Chronicles 6:6-12. **SEE HIGH-PRI-EST.**

**2.** A chief priest whose son Helkai was contemporary with the high-priest Joiakim (<sup><3625></sup>Nehemiah 12:15); doubtless identical with the MEREMOTH of ver. 3.

## Me'ran

(**Μεῤῥαν**, Vulg. *Me-rrha*), a place mentioned along with Theman as famous for its merchants and its wise men (Bar. 3:23). The association with the Hagarenes leads us to seek for Meran in Arabia. It may be *Mohrah* in Desert Arabia, or *Marane*, of which Pliny speaks (*N. H.* 6:28,32). Strabo (xvi. 4, p. 776) and Diodor. Sic. (iii. 43) also mention the **Μαρανῖται**. The conjecture of Grotinus that it is the *Mearah* mentioned in <sup><6304></sup>Joshua 13:4, and that of Havernick (*De librno Baruch*, p. 5) that it is the Syrian town *Maarah*, are mere guesses (comp. Fritzsche, Exequet. *Hdb.* z. *Apok.* ad loc.).-Kitto. The suggestion of Hitzig (*Psalmen*, ii 119) that Meran is merely a corruption of “Medan” or “Midian.” owing to the ready mistake: by a translator of **d** for **r**, is more plausible, although there is little evidence of a Hebrew original for this portion of Baruch. Junins and Tremellius give *Medancei*, and their conjecture is supported by the appearance of the Midianites as nomade merchants in Genesis 37, Both

Medan and Midian. are enumerated among the sons of Keturah in <sup><0271></sup>Genesis 25:21 and are closely connected with the Deanim, whose “travelling companies,” or caravans, are frequently alluded to (<sup><2213></sup>Isaiah 21:13; <sup><2715></sup>Ezekiel 27:15).

## Mera’ri

(Hebrews *Merari*, *yræm] sad*; Sept. *Μεραρί*), the youngest son of Levi, probably born in Canaan (<sup><0461></sup>Genesis 46:11; <sup><0166></sup>Exodus 6:16; <sup><0187></sup>Numbers 3:17; <sup><1361></sup>1 Chronicles 6:1). BC. 1874. Of Merari’s personal history, beyond the fact of his birth before the descent of Jacob into Egypt, and of his being one of the seventy who accompanied Jacob thither, we know nothing whatever (<sup><0468></sup>Genesis 46:8, 11). He became the head of the third great division (*hj Pvnæ*) of the Levites, whose designation in Hebrew is the same as that of their progenitor, only with the article prefixed, viz. *yræm]hi* i.e. the Merarites (<sup><0169></sup>Exodus 6:19), who during the march through the desert had charge of the materials of the Tabernacle (<sup><0436></sup>Numbers 3:36; 4:30 sq.), for the transportation of which they were provided with four carts, each drawn by a yoke of oxen (<sup><0308></sup>Numbers 7:8). In Palestine they were assigned twelve trans-Jordanic cities for a residence (<sup><0610></sup>Joshua 21:7, 34 sq.). *SEE MERARITE*.

## Merari

(*Μεραρί* v. r. *Μεραρεί*) was likewise the name of the. father of Judith (Judith 8:1; 16:7).

## Mera’rite

(Hebrews same as *Merari*, Sept. *Μεραρί*, Auth. Vers. “Merarites”), the patronymic title of the descendants of MERARI (<sup><0267></sup>Numbers 26:57). Their prominence among the Levitical families justifies a somewhat copious treatment of the subject.

## Picture for Merarite

At the time of the exodus, and the numbering in the wilderness, the Merarites consisted of two families, the Mahlites and the Mushites, Mahli and Mushi being either the two sons or the son and grandson of Merari (<sup><1369></sup>1 Chronicles 6:19,47). Their chief at that time was Zuriel, and the whole number of the family, from a month old and upwards, was 6200;

those from thirty years old to fifty were 3200. Their charge was the boards, bars, pillars, cockets, pins, and cords of the Tabernacle and the court, and all the tools connected with setting them up. In the encampment their place was to the north of the Tabernacle, and both they and the Gershonites were “under the hand” of Ithamar, the son of Aaron. Owing to the heavy nature of the materials which they had to carry, four wagons and eight oxen were assigned to them; and in the march both they and the Gershonites followed immediately after the standard of Judah, and before that of Reuben, that they might set up the Tabernacle against the arrival of the Kohathites (<sup><4133></sup>Numbers 3:20,33-37; 4:29-33, 42-45; 7:8; 10:17, 21). In the division of the land by Joshua, the Merarites had twelve cities assigned to them, out of Reuben, Gad, and Zebulun, of which one was Ramoth-Gilead, a city of refuge, and in later times a frequent subject of war between Israel and Syria (<sup><4207></sup>Joshua 21:7, 34-40; <sup><4365></sup>1 Chronicles 6:63, 79-81). In the time of David Asaiah was their chief, and assisted with 220 of his family in bringing up the ark (<sup><4316></sup>1 Chronicles 15:6). Afterwards we find the Merarites still sharing with the two other Levitical families the various functions of their caste (<sup><4326></sup>1 Chronicles 23:6, 21-23). Thus a third part of the singers and musicians were Merarites, and Ethan or Jeduthun was their chief in the time of David. *SEE JEDUTHUN*. A third part of the door-keepers were Merarites (<sup><4326></sup>1 Chronicles 23:5, 6; 26:10,19), unless, indeed, we are to understand from ver. 19 that the door-keepers were all either Kohathites or Merarites, to the exclusion of the Gershonites, which does not seem probable. In the days of Hezekiah the Merarites were still flourishing, and Kish, the son of Abdi, and Azariah, the son of Jehalelel, took their part with their brethren of the two other Levitical families in promoting the reformation, and purifying the house of the Lord (<sup><4292></sup>2 Chronicles 29:12,15). After the return from captivity Shemaiah represents the sons of Merari, in <sup><4394></sup>1 Chronicles 9:14; <sup><4615></sup>Nehemiah 11:15, and is said, with other chiefs of the Levites, to have “had the oversight of the outward business of the house of God.” - There were also at that time sons of Jeduthun under Obadiah or Abda, the son of Shemaiah (<sup><4396></sup>1 Chronicles 9:16; <sup><4617></sup>Nehemiah 11:17). A little later again, in the time of Ezra, when he was in great want of Levites to accompany him on his journey from Babylon to Jerusalem, “a man of good understanding of the sons of Mahli” was found, whose name, if the text here and at ver. 24 is correct, is not given. “Jeshaiah, also, of the sons of Merari,” with twenty of his sons and brethren, came with him at the same time (<sup><4388></sup>Ezra 8:18, 19). But it seems pretty certain that Shirebiah, in ver. 18, is the name of the Mahlite, and that

both he and Hashabiah, as well as Jeshaiiah, in ver. 19, were Levites of the family of Merari, and not, as the actual text of ver. 24 indicates, priests. The copulative *w* has probably fallen out before their, names in ver. 24, as appears from ver. 30 (see also ~~1394~~1 Chronicles 9:14; ~~624~~Nehemiah 12:24). *SEE LEVITE.*

The above table gives the principal descents, as far as it is possible to ascertain them. But the true position of Jaaziah, Mahli, and Jeduthun is doubtful. Here too, as elsewhere, it is difficult to decide when a given name indicates an individual, and when the family called after him, or the head of that family. It is sometimes no less difficult to decide whether any name which occurs repeatedly designates the same person, or others of the family who bore the same name, as e.g. in the case of Mahli, Hilkiah, Shimri, Kishi or Kish, and others. As regards the confusion between Ethan and Jeduthun, it may perhaps be that Jeduthun was the patronymic title of the house of which Ethan was the head in the time of David. Jeduthun might have been the brother of one of Ethan's direct ancestors before Hashabiah, in which case Hashabiah, in ~~1328~~1 Chronicles 25:3, 19, might be the same as Hashabiah in 6:45. Hosah and Obedom seem to have been other descendants or clansmen of Jeduthun, who lived in the time of David; and, if we may argue from the name of Hosah's sons, Simri and Hilkiah, that they were descendants of Shamer and Hilkiah, in the line of Ethan, the inference would be that Jeduthun was a son either of Hilkiah or Amaziah, since he lived after Hilkiah, but before Hashabiah. The great advantage of this' supposition is, that while it leaves to Ethan the patronymic designation Jeduthun, it draws a wide distinction between the term "sons of Jeduthun" and " sons of Ethan," and explains how in David's time there could be sons of those who are called sons of Jeduthun above thirty years of age (since they filled offices, ~~1350~~1 Chronicles 26:10), at the same time that Jeduthun was said to be the chief of the singers. In like manner it is possible that Jaaziah may have been a brother of Malluch or of Abdi, and that if Abdi or Ibri had other descendants besides the lines of Kish and Eleazar, they may have been reckoned under the headship of Jaaziah, The families of Merari which were so reckoned were, according to ~~1327~~1 Chronicles 24:27, Shoham, Zaccir (apparently the same as Zechariah in ~~1358~~1 Chronicles 15:18, where we probably ought to read " Zaccur, son of Jaaziah," and 26:11), and Ibri, where the Sept. has Ὠβδῖ, Ἀβὰι, and Ἀβδῖ. See each name in its place.

## Meratha'im

(Hebrews *Meratha'yim*, מֵרַתַּיִם] *double rebellion*; Sept. πικρῶς, Vulg. *dominantes*), a name given to Babylon (מֵרַתַּיִם Jeremiah 50:21), symbolical of its intensely perverse character (see Henderson, *Comment. ad loc.*). The expression "the land of two dominations" seems especially to allude "to the double captivity which Chaldaea had inflicted on the nation of Israel (מֵרַתַּיִם Jeremiah 50:21). This is the opinion of Gesenius, Furst, Michaelis (*Bibel fui Ungelehrten*), etc., and in this sense the word is taken by the versions generally, excepting that of Junius and Tremellius, which the A.V. — as in other instances — has followed here."

## Merati, Gaetano Maria

an Italian theologian, was born at Venice Dec. 23, 1668. He was educated in the regular order of the Theatians, afterwards taught philosophy and theology in the college belonging to his order, and in 1705 accompanied the Venetian ambassador to London. He went to Rome in 1716 as procurator general of his order. Pope Benedict XIV honored him with his friendship. He died at Rome. Sept. 8, 1744. Some of Merati's works are, *La vita soavemente regolata delle-donne* (Venice, 1708,. 12mo) :-*La Verita della Religione. Cristiana e Cattolica dimostrata ae' suoi fondamenti* (1721, 2 vols. 4to) :-*Novce Observationes et Additiones ad Gavanti. Commentaria in rubricas Misalis et Breviarii Romani* (Augsburg, 1740, 2 vols. 4to):-*six Lettres dans les Epistole claraor. Venetorum* (1746, 2 vols.), addressed to Mogliobecchi. He was also the editor of *Thesaurus sacrorum Rituum de Gavanti* (Rome, 1736-38, 4 vols. 4to), a work to which he made valuable contributions.

## Merault, Athanase Renee

a noted French educator, was born at Paris in 1744, and was educated at the College of Jeully. Although possessing a very large fortune, he entered the Oratory in order to devote himself to the instruction of the young. After his twenty-fifth year he was director of the house of education. Compelled to leave Paris by the Revolution, he retired to Orleans, where his parents resided. Imprisoned in 1793, and set free again after the 9th of Thermidor, he remained in the city, and became in 1805 grand vicar of the bishopric of Bernier, which placed him at the head of the great, seminary. The Church of Orleans is indebted to the abbot Merault for several

religious and charitable institutions, to the foundation of which he devoted a large portion of his money. He died at Orleans June 13, 1835. His works are, *Les Apologistes Involontaires ou la Religion eternelleprouvee et defenduepar les objections memes des incredules* (Paris, 1806, anonymous, and 1820, 12mo);-*Les Apologistes, ou la Religion Chretienne prouvee par ses ennemis comme par ses amis* (Orleans, 1821, 8vo and 12mo); a continuation of the preceding work: - *Conspiration de l'impiete contre l'humanite* (Paris, 1822, 8vo): -*Rapport sur Phistoire des Hebreux rapprochee des temps contemporains* (Orleans, 1825, 12mo):*Enseginements de la Religion* (Orleans, 1827, 5 vols. 12mo) : - *Recueil des Mandements sur l'instructipn des peiiles* (Paris, 1830, 12mo).

### Merbes, Bon De

a French theologian, was born in 1616-at Montdidier. He entered the congregation of the Oratory, and rose to much distinction. The doctorate of theology was conferred upon him. He died Aug. 2, 1684. His Latin works are excellent. Especial notice is due to his *Summa Christiana seu Orthodoxa morum disciplina ex Sacris Litteris, sanctorum patrum monumentis, conciliorun oraculis, summorum denique pontificum' decretis fideliter excenpta*, etc. See Du Pin, *Bibliotheque du dix-septieme siicle*, 4:271.

### Mercati, Giovanni Baptista

a painter of the 17th century, was a native of S. Sepolcro, Tuscany. He achieved a high reputation at home, and his fame extended as far as Rome. Two of his historical frescos, representing *Our Lady*, are in S. Chiara; and at S. Lorenzo there is a picture of the titular, with other saints. In the Guides to Venice and Rome several of his works are mentioned; and in that of Leghorn, the only picture in the cathedral esteemed worthy of notice is that of the *Five Saints*, painted by Mercati with great care. See Lanzi's *History of Painting*, transl. by Roscoe (London, 1847, 3 vols. 8vo), 1:255.

### Mercator, Marius

SEE MARIUS.

### Mercein, T. F. Randolph

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in New York City Nov. 27, 1825. He was converted in early youth, and joined the



Presbyterian Church, to which his parents belonged. His educational advantages were very superior, as he was intended for the ministry. In his second year at college his health failed, and he was obliged to desist from all study. While at home he fell in with books that gave him a distaste for Calvinistic theology. He promptly joined the Methodists, was licensed to preach, and exercised his power as a Christian pastor for eleven years. He died at Sheffield, Mass., Sept. 15, 1856. "Of a high order of intellect, carefully educated, deeply serious and thoughtful, with a profound sense of ministerial responsibility, bold and faithful in the discharge of duty, gentle, amiable, and genial, he was eminently fitted to adorn both public and private life. His deep, ardent piety pervaded and beautified his whole being. He was emphatically a pure, humble, heavenly minded man. His rare gifts made him an attractive speaker, a fine writer, a successful author, an accomplished debater, a choice friend. He was loved even more than he was admired" (Smith, *Sacred Memories of the N. Y. and N. Y. East Conf.*: p. 75 sq.). His published works are, *Natural Goodness:-The Wise Master Builder:- Childhood and the Church*; and numerous essays, etc., in the periodicals of the Church. All these evince great genius and earnest study, deeply imbued with the spirit of Christian love.-*Minutes of Conferences*, 6:321; Dr. Dewey's *Lecture* (p. 298). of the "Pitt's Street Chapel Lectures" (Boston, Jewett & Co., 1858).

### Mercer, Jesse, DD.

a Baptist minister, was born in Halifax County, N. C., Dec. 16, 1769. His early education was limited, yet he began to preach when only eighteen years of age; was ordained Nov. 7, 1789, and soon became pastor of a Church at Hutton's Fork (now Sardis), in Wilkes County. In 1793 he accepted a call to Indian Creek (or Bethany), in Oglethorpe County, whence he removed in 1796 to Salem, where he became preceptor in the academy, and also succeeded his father in the charge of the Phillips Mill, Powelton, and Bethesda churches for some time, and finally removed to the fork of the Little River, in Green County. In 1826 he attended the General Convention in Philadelphia, and at the end of the next year accepted a call from the Church at Washington, Wilkes County, where he continued until 1833, when he became editor of the *Christian Index*, a religious periodical. He was made DD. by Brown University in 1835. He was for many years identified with the Georgia Association, acting as clerk of that body from 1795 till 1816, and afterwards as moderator till 1839; he was also connected with the Baptist Convention of the State of

Georgia from its beginning in 1822, being its moderator until 1841, when his impaired health obliged him, to resign. He became also one of the trustees of the college at Washington, and president of the mission board of the Georgia Association from 1830 to 1841. He died Sept. 6, 1841. Dr. Mercer published a large number of *Addresses, Circular Letters, Essays*, etc. See Mallory, *Memoir of the Revelation Jesse Mercer, DD.*; Sprague, *Annals*, 6:283.

## Merchant

### Picture for Merchant

this and kindred terms, as *merchandise*, etc., are properly expressed by some form of the Hebrews **רַךְ**; *sachar'*, to *travel* about, *Gr.* **ἔμπορος**, a *passenger* to and fro; sometimes also by **ל** **כַּרְ**; *rakal'*, to *go* about; and occasionally by the title CANAANITE). Trade is of very great antiquity in the East (Niebuhr, *Trav.* 3:4 sq.), and was sometimes carried on by sea (<sup><1814></sup>Proverbs 31:14; <sup><1973></sup>Psalms 107:23), but more commonly on land by means of a company associated for a mercantile journey (<sup><1375></sup>Genesis 37:25; <sup><1618></sup>Job 6:18). **SEE CARAVAN**. The itinerant character and temporary location which appear in all the ancient notices of Oriental merchants, whether individuals or an association of several persons, is still a marked trait of the same class in the East (Hackett's *Illustrat. of Script.* p. 63). In the patriarchal times such parties of Ishmaelites passed through Canaan on their way to Egypt (<sup><1375></sup>Genesis 37:25, 28), and bartered with the nomades for various products of their herds in exchange for implements, apparel, and similar articles, and sometimes purchased slaves (<sup><1378></sup>Genesis 37:28; 39:1). After the Hebrews became settled in Palestine, they were drawn into those forms of commercial relations that early existed, but rather passively than actively, since the Mosaic law little favored this profession (Michaelis, *Mos. Recht*, 1:238 sq.; Josephus's denial of all mercantile pursuits by his nation, *Apion*, 1:12, is probably too strong an expression), although the geographical position of their country would seem to be in general advantageous for it; but the circumscribed extent of their territory, the prevailing direction of the population to agriculture, which left few poor, their almost total want of those natural and artificial products most in demand for general traffic, and the preoccupation of the trade between Asia and Africa by two mercantile nations (the Phoenicians and Arabians), mostly precluded them from an independent commerce, for which, indeed, they were further incapacitated

by the continuance of their sea-coast for the most part in the hands of the Canaanites and Philistines, who had, more over, secured to themselves the great commercial route to Damascus, through the prominence of several cities in the northern part of Palestine (Bertheau, *Isr. Gesch.* p. 287). Yet the north-western Israelites appear quite early to have occupied a post in the Phoenician marts (<sup><1093></sup>Genesis 49:13; <sup><1638></sup>Deuteronomy 33:18; <sup><1057></sup>Judges 5:17). Solomon not only (as a royal monopoly) imported horses from Egypt, and traded them away in Syria by governmental salesmen (<sup><1105></sup>1 Kings 10:26; <sup><1016></sup>2 Chronicles 1:16,17), but formed a commercial treaty with the king of Tyre for maritime enterprise (<sup><1025></sup>1 Kings 9:26), and launched from the Edomitish ports of Ezion-geber and Elath, which David had acquired on the Red Sea, a fleet that sailed under the pilotage of Tyrian seamen into the Indian Ocean, and, after a three years' voyage, brought back gold, silver, ivory, sandal-wood, ebony, apes, peacocks, and other products of Chin-India (<sup><1101></sup>1 Kings 10:11; 22:22, 50; <sup><1090></sup>2 Chronicles 9:10, 21). *SEE OPHIR*. After the death of Solomon this marine commerce shared the neglect of all the royal affairs, and the trade never revived,-with the 'single exception of Jehoshaphat's undertaking (<sup><1229></sup>1 Kings 22:49), until these harbors passed entirely out of the control of the Israelites. *SEE EDOMITE*. What position the Jews held in the Phoenician traffic, or what profit the transit of Phoenician merchandise brought them, is only to be gleaned indirectly from the historical records- (Bertheau, *Isr. Gesch.* p. 354); but that both these were not inconsiderable is clear from <sup><3312></sup>Ezekiel 26:2; 27:17. The kingdom of Israel was probably more favored in this latter particular than that of Judah, as the principal thoroughfares of trade passed through its bounds. Commercial relations subsisted between Tyre and Judaea after the exile (<sup><1636></sup>Nehemiah 13:16), and even in New-Testament times (<sup><4121></sup>Acts 12:20). From the Phoenicians the Hebrews imported, besides timber for edifices (1 Kings 5; <sup><1341></sup>1 Chronicles 14:1), and sea-fish (<sup><1636></sup>Nehemiah 13:16), a great many foreign necessaries, and even luxuries (such as variegated stuffs, unguents, and peltries, purple garments, etc.), which for the most part came from Arabia, Babylonia, and India (comp. Ezekiel 27), and sold in exchange wheat (comp. <sup><4121></sup>Acts 12:20), oil (<sup><1051></sup>1 Kings 5:11), honey, dates, balsam (<sup><3312></sup>Hosea 12:2; see <sup><3277></sup>Ezekiel 27:17), and also a fine species of fancy fabric, which the diligent hands of the women had prepared (<sup><1824></sup>Proverbs 31:24)., Respecting the balance of trade we have no certain means of judging, and it is the more difficult to ascertain how this was adjusted, inasmuch as Palestine must have derived its supply of the metals likewise from foreigners. Yet we

nowhere find any indication that the national wealth had sensibly diminished; on the contrary, the Israelites were able to endure an almost unbroken series of hostile attacks, often resulting in pillage, and always very exhaustive of money (<sup><1146></sup>1 Kings 14:26; 15:18; <sup><1228></sup>2 Kings 12:18; 14:14; 16:18, etc.), while certain periods (<sup><2317></sup>Isaiah 2:7),-and even individual tribes (<sup><3111></sup>Hosea 12:9), were distinguished for opulence and luxury; perhaps the revenue was derived through the surrounding districts of Edom, Moab, and Phoenicia (see T. C. Tychsen, *De commerciis et naigationibus Hebsrceor. ante exil Bab.*, in the *Comment. Gott.* vol. xvi; *Class. Hist.* p. 150 sq.; Hartmann, *Ueb. Pentat.* p. 751 sq.)' After the exile the Hebrew commerce had a wider range, especially as many Jews had become scattered in foreign countries where they experienced many favors, so that the nation took a greater relish in this avocation and in its safe emoluments. Prince Simon invited commercial intercourse by the improvement of the harbor of Joppa; the Palestinian Jews, however, being still restrained by the discouragement of their law and their early mercantile prejudices, appear not to have risen to any great degree of activity in trade; and Herod's improved port at Caesarea (Josephus, *Ant.* 15:9, 6) was mostly occupied by foreigners, while under the Roman dominion traffic was encumbered by tolls and imposts, many commodities being even included in the list of government monopolies. Still Jewish love of gain prevailed wherever a favorable opportunity offered (Josephus, *Life*, p. 13), and laid claim to trading privileges (Josephus, *War*, 2:21, 2). Internal, especially retail trade (enactments relative to which are contained in <sup><8196></sup>Leviticus 19:36; <sup><6513></sup>Deuteronomy 25:13 sq.; comp. <sup><3128></sup>Hosea 12:8), was particularly promoted by the high festivals, to which every adult Israelite resorted in pursuance of the national religion. In the cities open spaces at the gates were designated for the exposure of wares, and even Tyrian merchants frequented the market at Jerusalem (<sup><6136></sup>Nehemiah 13:16; see Hartman, ad loc.; comp. Zephaniah i., 10; <sup><3842></sup>Zechariah 14:2; and see Movers, *Phonic.* 1:50); a mart for sacrificial victims and sacred shekels being established in the outer court of the Temple itself (<sup><8124></sup>John 2:14 sq.; <sup><1212></sup>Matthew 21:12). The Mishna contains notices of the early practice of beating down in price (*Nedar.* 3:1), and of shop-keepers (*Maaseroth.* 2:3). For the commerce of the Phoenicians, Egyptians (<sup><2354></sup>Isaiah 45:14), Babylonians (Nah. 3:16), and Arabians, see those articles respectively. **SEE COMMERCE.** In modern Oriental cities the retail trade is chiefly carried on in small shops, usually gathered -together in a particular quarter or street, like the stalls in an Occidental market. **SEE BAZAAR.**

## Merchants' Lecture

a lecture originally set up at Pinner's Hall in 1672 by the Presbyterians and Independents to defend the doctrines of the Reformation against popery and Socinianism. Some misunderstanding occurring, the Presbyterians removed to Salter's Hall. *SEE LECTURE.*

## Mercier, Barthelemi

a learned French ecclesiastic and bibliographer, was born at Lyons April 4, 1734. At the age of fifteen he became a novice among the regular prebendaries of the collegiate church of Saint-Genevieve, in Paris, and after one year of probation he was allowed to take the vow. Immediately thereafter he was sent to the Abbey of Chatrices, in Champagne, and there studied rhetoric and philosophy. In 1754 he was made assistant to the learned Perigre, librarian of Saint-Genevieve, and in 1760 was appointed his successor. Four years later Mercier was invested with the abbotship of Saint-Leger, which was then vacant, at Soissons. In 1772, in consequence of some trouble which he had with his associates, he resigned his functions as an abbot. Being thus liberated from official duties, he travelled through Holland and the Netherlands, where he was in hopes of collecting the materials necessary for the compilation of certain works on which he was engaged. Although he had yet published only the *Supplement* to the history of printing by Marchand he was warmly greeted wherever he went. In 1792 he was appointed a member of the so-called Monument Commission. In this capacity he exerted himself to rescue from destruction all private and public collections of art and literature. He also drew up for the use of librarians minute instructions touching the books intrusted to their custody, and a method for classifying them. Towards the latter part of his life Francois de Neufchateau, a clergyman and a fosterer of letters, granted him a pension of 2400 francs, the first annual installment of which was paid to him in 1798. - This assistance enabled Mercier to decline the generous offer of La Serna Santander, who had proposed to relinquish in favor of Mercier his own office of librarian at Brussels. He died in 1799. His writings are characterized by an evidence of profound erudition, together with system and perspicuity in all his researches. He published a large number of works, among which we may cite, *Lettres sur la Bibliographie instructive de M. Debure* (Paris, 1763, 8vo); *Lettre sur le veritable auteur du Testament politique du Cardinal de Richelieu* (Paris, 1765, 8vo; all of which were extracted from the *memoires de Treveux*); - *Consultation sur la*

*question de savoir si les religieux de Saint-Genevieve sont ou ne sont pas Chanoines Reguliars* (new ed. Paris, 1772, 4to).:-*Opinion sur de pretendues propheties qu'on applique aux evenements presents* (Paris, 1791):-*Dissertations sur l'auteur de l'Imitation de Jesus-Christ, par l'abbe Ghesquiere* (1775, 12mo). See *Notice sur la vie et les ecrits de Mercier de Saint-Leger*, by Chardon de la Rochette.

### Mercier, Christopher,

a French ascetic author, was born at Dole near the opening of the 17th century. He entered the Order of the Carmelites, and changed his worldly name to *Albert de Saint-Jacques*. He died in 1680. His most celebrated works are, *Vie de la Miere Therese de Jeus, fondatrice des Carmelites de la Franche Course* (Lyons, 1673, 4to); and *La Lumiere aux vivants par l'expeaiences des morts* (Lyons, 1675, 8vo).

### Mercier (Or Le Mercier), Jean

in Latin *Mercurus*, a distinguished Huguenot, was born in Uzes, France, near the beginning of the 16th century. Destined for the bar, he studied law in Avignon, and also in Toulouse. -But the dead languages having' a powerful attraction for him, he devoted much of his time to the study of Greek, and ere long confined himself entirely to the pursuit of Hebrew and' other Shemitic tongues. After having been the most noted pupil of Vatable, he became his successor, in 1546; to the chair of professor of Hebrew in the Royal College of France. Casaubon believed that Mercier was the most learned Hebraist of his day. When the second religious war broke out, Mercier was constrained to quit Paris. After the treaty of peace at Saint-Germain, he returned to France, but while passing through his native city he was carried away by the pestilence. He died a Protestant in 1562.

Mercier-published almost the whole of Jonathan's *Targum* on the Prophecies. He also wrote in Latin valuable commentaries on all the books of the Old Testament, and on the Gospel according to Matthew. His commentaries furnished matter to the *Synopsis Criticorum* of Utrecht (1634). He is also the author of *Tractatulus de accentibus Jobi, Proverbiorum, et Psalmorum, auctore R. Juda, jilio Betham Hispano*, a translation from Hebrew (Paris, 1556, 4to):-*Liber de accentibus Scripturce, auctore R. Juda, filio Balaam* (Paris, 1565, 4to):-*In Decalogum commentarius Rabbini A braham, cognomento JBen-Ezra, interpr. J. Mercero* (-Lyons, 1568, 4r,) , - *Notae in Thesaurum Linguce*

*Sanctce Pagnizi* (Lyons, 1575-95, fol.) -*Observationes ad Horcepollinis hieroglyphica* (Strasburg, 1595, 4to). He also published a *Commentary on the Canticles* and *Lectures on Genesis*. See Haag, *La France Protestante*.

## Mercurianus, Father

a noted Romanist of the Order of the Jesuits, was a Belgian by birth. We know but little of his personal history, except that he stood very high in the estimation of pope Gregory XIII, who caused his advancement to the generalship of the order. He died Aug. 1, 1580. Nicolini, *Hist. of the Jesuits* (p. 150), tells us that "he was a simple and weak old man. Mercurianus," he continues, exercised very little influence on the destinies of the order, and was the first general whose authority was held in little account."

## Mercur'rius

### Picture for Mercurius

(the Roman name of the god *Mercury*, the *Hermes* of the Greeks, Ἑρμῆς, ~~Acts~~ Acts 14:12; comp. ~~Romans~~ Romans 16:14; the name is of uncertain etymology), properly, a Greek deity, whom the Romans identified with their god of commerce and bargains. In the Greek mythology Hermes was the son of Zeus and Maia, the daughter of Atlas, and is constantly represented as the companion of his father in his wanderings upon earth. On one of these occasions they were travelling in Phrygia, and were refused hospitality by all save Baucis and Philemon, the two aged peasants of whom Ovid tells the charming episode in his *Metam.* 8:620-724, which appears to have formed part of the folk-lore of Asia Minor. **SEE LYCAONIA.** Mercury was the herald of the gods (Homer, *Od.* v. 28; *Hym. in Herm.* 3), and of Zeus (*Od.* 1:38, 84; *Il.* 24:333; 461), the eloquent orator (*Od.* 1:86; Horace, *Od.* 1:10, 1), inventor of letters, music, and the arts. He was equally characterized by-adroitness of action -and readiness of speech, being the representative of intelligence and craft among men (see Pauly's *Real-Encyklop.* 4:1842). He was usually-represented as a slender, beardless youth ,but in an older Pelasgic figure he was bearded. The fact that he was the customary attendant of Jupiter when he appeared on earth (Ovid, *Fast.* v. 495; comp. *Metam.* 2:731 sq.), explains why the inhabitants of Lystra (~~Acts~~ Acts 14:12), as soon as they were disposed to believe that the gods had visited them in the likeness of men, discovered Hermes in Paul, as the chief speaker, and as the attendant of Jupiter (see Kuinol,

*Comment. ad loc.*). It seems unnecessary to be curious whether the representations of Mercury in ancient statues accord with the supposed personal appearance of Paul (see Walch, *Diss. ad Acta Ap.* 3:183 sq.), and especially in the matter of the *beard* of the latter, for all known representations of the god differ in much more important particulars from the probable costume of Paul (e.g. in the absence of any garment at all, or in the use of the short chlamys merely; in the caduceus, the petasus, etc. (see Muller, *Ancient Art*, § 379381). It is more reasonable to suppose that those who expected to see the gods mixing in the affairs of this lower world, in human form, would not look for much more than the outward semblance of ordinary men.

## Mercurius.

*SEE HERMES TRISMEGISTUS.*

## Mercy

(properly *dsj* , *che'sed*, *kindness*; ἔλεος, *pity*), a virtue which inspires us with compassion for others, and inclines us to assist them in their necessities. That works of mercy may be acceptable to God, as Christ has promised (<sup><4187></sup>Matthew 5:7), it is not enough that they proceed from a natural sentiment of humanity, but they must be performed for the sake of God, and from truly pious motives. In Scripture mercy and truth are commonly joined together, to show the goodness that precedes and the faithfulness that accompanies the promises; or, a goodness, a clemency, a mercy that is constant and faithful, and that does not deceive. Mercy is also taken for favors and benefits received from God or man; for probity, justice, goodness. Merciful men in Hebrew, *chasdim* are men of piety and goodness. Mercy is often taken for giving of alms, <sup><2184></sup>Proverbs 14:34; 16:6; <sup><3109></sup>Zechariah 7:9. *SEE CHARITY.*

*Mercy*, as derived from *miser cordia*, may import that sympathetic sense of the suffering of another by which the heart is affected. It is one of the noblest traits of character. The object “of mercy is misery: so God pities human misery, and forbears to chastise severely; so man pities the misery of a fellow-man, and assists to diminish it; so public officers occasionally moderate the strictness of national laws from pity to the culprit. But only those can hope for mercy who express penitence and solicit mercy; the impenitent, the stubborn, the obdurate, rather brave the avenging hand of justice than beseech the relieving hand of mercy. *SEE PARDON.*



Mercy is an essential attribute of Jehovah, for the knowledge of which we are indebted wholly to revelation. By the propitiatory sacrifice of our Divine Redeemer a way is opened for the exercise of mercy and grace towards the human family perfectly honorable to the attributes and government of God. He appears a just God and a Saviour: "He is just, and yet he justifieth him that believeth in Jesus." Thus the plan of salvation by Jesus Christ provides for the exercise of infinite mercy, consistently with the most rigid demands of truth and righteousness; so that, under this gracious dispensation, "mercy and truth" are said to "have met together," and "righteousness and peace have kissed each other" (<sup><0199></sup>Genesis 19:19; <sup><0216></sup>Exodus 20:6; :34:6, 7; <sup><0850></sup>Psalms 85:10; 86:15, 16.; 103:17; <sup><0183></sup>Luke 18:13; <sup><0915></sup>Romans 9:15-18; <sup><0846></sup>Hebrews 4:16; 8:12). The expression "I will have mercy, and not sacrifice" (<sup><0306></sup>Hosea 6:6; <sup><0093></sup>Matthew 9:13), signifies, as the connection indicates, that God is pleased with the-exercise of mercy rather than with the offering of sacrifices, though sin has made the latter necessary (<sup><0952></sup>1 Samuel 15:22; <sup><0306></sup>Micah 6:6-8). *SEE ATONEMENT.*

Mercy is also a Christian grace, and no duty is more strongly urged by the Scriptures than the exercise of it towards all men, and especially towards such as have trespassed against us (<sup><0087></sup>Matthew 5:7; 18:33-35).

## Mercy, Sisters Of

*SEE SISTERS OF MERCY.*

## Mercy, Wilhelm

a German Roman Catholic theologian, was born Feb. 9, 1753, at Ueberlingen, near the Bodensee, and was educated at Oberschwangar. In 1787 he was called to the court of duke Charles of Wuirtemberg, and in 1798 became minister at Gruol, principality of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen. His advanced age obliged him to resign his position in 1819, and he died July 1, 1825. Mercy was an extremely well-educated man. He published in 1801 an essay on the necessity of reform within the Roman Catholic Church, which caused considerable sensation. He aimed at an entire reform of the Church constitution and the clergy. Besides several articles in the *Jahresschriftenuiir Theologie und Kirchenrecht der Katholiken* (Ulm, 180610), he published several other valuable but minor productions in theological literature. See Doring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, s.v.

## Mercy-Seat

(**trPKi** *kappo' reth*, a *covering*, i.e. lid of a vessel, spoken only of the top of the sacred ark; 'Sept. and, New Test. **ἱλαστήριον**, Vulg. *propitiatorium*), the cover of the box or ark containing the tables of the Sinaitic law, and overspread by the cherubim, between which appeared the shekinah, or visible radiant symbol of the divine presence; it is properly represented as a plank of acacia overlaid with gold, for it was not probably a solid plate or sheet of the purest gold (<sup><0257></sup>Exodus 25:17 sq.; 30:6; 31:7, etc.). Hence the holy of holies is sometimes called the "house of the mercy-seat" (<sup><0381></sup>1 Chronicles 28:11, Heb.). Josephus simply calls it a lid (**ἐπίθεμα**, *Ant.* 3:6, 5); but the versions have all regarded the term as indicative of *propitiation* (as if from the Piel of **rpK**; and the same view appears to be taken by the New-Testament writers, who compare it with the throne of grace in heaven, access to which has been opened by the blood of Christ (<sup><0305></sup>Hebrews 9:5; <sup><0194></sup>Romans 3:24). **SEE ARK**. Comp. <sup><0381></sup>1 Chronicles 28:11, where the holy of holies is called the **tyBet rPKi**; "house of the mercy-seat." "It was that whereon the blood of the yearly atonement was sprinkled by the high-priest; and in this relation it is doubtful whether the sense of the word in the Hebrews is based on the material fact of its 'covering' the ark, or from this notion of its reference to the 'covering' (i.e. atonement of sin. **SEE ATONEMENT**. But in any case the notion of a 'seat,' as conveyed by the name in English, seems superfluous and likely to mislead. Jehovah is indeed spoken of as 'dwelling' and even as 'sitting' (<sup><0901></sup>Psalms 80:1; 99:1) between the cherubim, but undoubtedly his seat in this conception would not be on the same level as that on which they stood (<sup><0258></sup>Exodus 25:18), and an enthronement in the glory above it must be supposed. The idea with which it is connected is not merely that of 'mercy,' but of formal atonement made for the breach of the covenant (<sup><0164></sup>Leviticus 16:14), which the ark contained in its material vehicle—the two tables of stone. The communications made to Moses are represented as made 'from the mercy-seat that was upon the ark of the testimony' (<sup><0189></sup>Numbers 7:89; comp. <sup><0252></sup>Exodus 25:22; 30:6); a sublime illustration of the moral relation and responsibility into which the people were by covenant regarded as brought before God" (Smith). It is not without significance that the mercy-seat was *above* the ark and below the symbols of the divine presence and attributes, as if to foreshadow the superseding of the law of ordinances contained in the ark by the free grace of the Gospel. See Pratenius, *De Judaea arca*

(Upsal. -1727); Werner, *De Propitiatoria* (Giessen, 1695). *SEE SHEKINAH.*

## Me'red

(Hebrews *id.*, **dr̄m**, *rebellion*, as in <sup><1622></sup>Joshua 22:22; Sept. **Μωράδ** and **Μωρήδ**, Vulg. *Mered*), a person named as the second son of Ezra (or Ezer), of the tribe of Judah (<sup><13047></sup>1 Chronicles 4:17). *SEE EZRAH.* Great confusion prevails in the account of his lineage and family. and indeed in the whole chapter in question. Ver. 17, after mentioning the four sons of Ezra, immediately adds, “and she bore Miriam,” etc.; where the Sept., by an evident gloss, attributes these children to Jethro, the first named of Ezra’s sons; the Vulg. has *genuit*, referring them to Ezra as additional sons, in defiance of the text **rhīlīwī** which is undoubtedly feminine; while Luther renders this word as a proper name, *Thahar*, equally at variance with the text, which joins the following word by the accus. Particle **taēa** construction that does not here allow the resolution by the rendering *with*. In ver. 18 we find several sons attributed to “his wife Jehudijah,” and the statement added, “And these are the sons of Bithiah, the daughter of Pharaoh, which Mered took:” the Sept., Vulg., and Luth. follow the Heb., which yields no intelligible connection. Ver. 19: “And the sons of hiswife Hodiah, the sister of Naham, the father of Keilah the Garmite, and Eshtemoa the Maachathite ;” where, however, the Hebrews text would be more naturally rendered “the, sons of the wife of Hodijah,” **hYdāa tvae ynB]** the form **tvae** being rarely absolute (see Nordheimer’s *Hebrews Gamm.* § 604); the Sept. renders: “And the sons of the wife of his Jewish sister [**υἱοὶ γυναικὸς τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἀδελφῆς**] were Nachem, and Danra the father of Keeila, and Someion the father of Joriam. And the sons of Naem, the father of Keeila, were Garmi and Jesthemoe, Machatha” [various readings, “of the Idumaeen sister” (or “of Odia the sister”) of Nachain, the father of Keeila, were Garmi (others “Hotarmi” or “Hogarmi”) and Eshthaimon, Nochathi]; the Vulg. and Luther are like the Heb., except the ambiguous renderings, “Et filii uxoris Odajae,” “Die Kinder des Weibes Hodija.” The Syr. and Arab. omit ver. 17 and 18 (Davidson’s *Revis. of the Hebrews Text*, ad loc.). The corruption of the text is evident. We suggest a conjectural restoration by transposing the latter part of ver. 18 to the middle of ver. 17, and the whole of ver. 19 to the end of ver. 17; these simple changes will supply the manifest incongruities as follows: “And the sons of Ezra [or Ezer] were Jether, and

Mered, and Epher, and Jalon. And these are the sons of Bithiah (the daughter of Pharaoh), whom Mered [first] married; she bore Miriam, and Shammai, and Ishbah (founder of Eshtemoa): and the sons of his [second] wife Hodijah (the sister of Naham, father [founder] of Keilah the Garinite [? strong city] and of Eshtemoa the Maachathite)-this Jewish wife bore Jered (founder of Gedor), and Heber (founder of Socho), and Jekuthiel (founder of Zanoah).” This essentially agrees with Bertheau’s rectification of the passage (*Erklldr. ad loc.*), adopted by Keil (*Comment. ad loc.*).

“It has been supposed that Pharaoh is here the name of an Israelite, but there are strong reasons for the common and contrary opinion. The name Bithiah, ‘daughter,’ that is, ‘servant of the Lord,’ is appropriate to a convert. It may be observed that the Moslems of the present day very frequently give the name Abdallah, ‘servant of God,’ to these who adopt their religion. That another wife was called the Jewess, is in favor of Bithiah’s Egyptian origin. The name Miriam, if, as we believe, Egyptian, is especially suitable to the child of an Egyptian.” *SEE BITHIAH*. Pharaoh, whose daughter Mered espoused, was therefore undoubtedly some one of the Egyptian kings, and hence Mered himself would appear to have been a person of note among the Israelites. As his children by his other wife (who was also highly related), were recognised as chief men or rebuilders of Canaanitish cities, and hence must have lived soon after the conquest and settlement of Palestine by the Hebrews, Mered himself will be placed in the period of the exode, and he may be supposed to have married the daughter of the predecessor of that Pharaoh by whom the Israelites were detained in so cruel bondage; perhaps his Egyptian wife refused to accompany him to the promised land, and the later children may have been the fruit of a subsequent marriage during the wanderings in the desert with a Hebrewess Hodijah. BC. cir. 1658.

Mered’s wife Bithiah “is enumerated by the rabbins among the nine who entered Paradise (Hottinger, *Smegma Orientale*, p. 515), and in the Targum of R. Joseph on Chronicles she is said to have been a proselyte. In the same Targum we find it stated that Caleb, the son of Jephunneh, was called Mered because he withstood or rebelled against (**drim**) the counsel of the spies, a tradition also recorded by Jarchi. But another and very curious tradition is preserved in the *Quaestiones in libr. Paral.*, attributed to Jerome. According to this Ezra was Amram; his sons Jether and Mered were Aaron and Mos’es; Epher was Eldad, and Jalon Medad. The tradition goes on to say that Moses, after receiving the law in the desert, enjoined

his father to put away his mother because she was his aunt, being the daughter of Levi: that Amram did so, married again, and begat Eldad and Medad. Bithiah, the daughter of Pharaoh, is said, on the same authority, to have been ‘taken’ by Moses, because she forsook idols, and was converted to the worship of the true God. The origin of all this seems to have been the occurrence of the name ‘Miriam’ in <sup><13047></sup>1 Chronicles 4:17, which was referred to Miriam the sister of Moses. Rabbi D. Kimchi would put the first clause of ver. 18 in a parenthesis. He makes Bithiah the daughter of Pharaoh the first wife of Mered, and mother of Miriam, Shammai, and Ishbah; Jehudijah, or ‘the Jewess,’ being his second wife.”

### Meredith, C. G.

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Baltimore County, Md., May 5, 1820; was converted at eleven, joined the Ohio Conference in 1846, travelled with usefulness eight years, and died at Lebanon Station, Ohio, July 16, 1854. Mr. Meredith was amiable and serious from childhood, was full of good works; and by his own efforts acquired not only a fine general English education, but read Greek and Latin fluently. He was a sound theologian, and a dignified, instructive, and useful minister of the Gospel. See ‘*Minutes of Conferences*, v. 467’,

### Meredith, Thomas

a Baptist minister, was born at Warwick, Bucks County, Pa. After graduating (Jan. 4, 1816) in the University of Philadelphia, he began the study of theology, as licensed Dec. 10, 1816, and two years after he was ordained at Edenton. In 1819 he was settled as pastor of the Baptist Church at Newbern. In 1822 he accepted a call of the Baptist Church of Savannah, and finally settled in 1825 as pastor of the Church at Edenton, N. C., where he remained for nine years. He commenced the publication of the *Baptist Interpreter*, the first Baptist paper printed in North Carolina. In 1835 he returned to the Church of Newbern, where he published the *Biblical Recorder*. In 1840 he removed to Raleigh, where he continued to issue the paper, though his health was too feeble to allow him to take a pastoral charge. He died Nov. 13, 1850. He published a pamphlet entitled *Christianity and Slavery* in 1847, which had previously appeared in the *Biblical Recorder*.

## Mer'emoth

(Heb. *Meremoth'*, t/mrᵉ] *exaltations*), the name of two men at the close of the captivity.

1. (Sept. Μεραμόθ, Μαρεμόθ, Μαρμόθ, ἀπὸ ῚΡαμόθ v. r. Μαριμώθ, etc.; Vulg. *Merimuth*). A priest, son of Urijah, and grandson (descendant) of Koz; who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (<461B> Nehemiah 12:3), BC. 536, and to whom were afterwards consigned the bullion and sacred-vessels forwarded by Ezra (<48B3> Ezra 8:33). BC. 459. "After the statement in <48B2> Ezra 2:62, respecting the exclusion of the family of Koz from the priesthood, it is puzzling to find one of this family recognised as a priest; but probably the exclusion did not extend to the whole family, some being able to establish their pedigree" (Kitto). He repaired two sections of the walls of Jerusalem (<461B> Nehemiah 3:4,21), BC. 446, and lived to join in the sacred covenant of fidelity to Jehovah (<461B> Nehemiah 10:5). BC. cir. 410. In <46215> Nehemiah 12:15 he is mentioned by the name of MERAIOTH, as the father of Helkai.

2. (Sept. Μαριμώθ, Vulg. *Marimuth*.) An Israelite of the "sons" (? inhabitants) of Bani, who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (<450B6> Ezra 10:36). BC. 459.

## Mererius

a French prelate, flourished in the latter half of the 6th century as bishop of Angouleme. He was originally count of Angouleme. At that period of history the civil government differed so little from the ecclesiastical that, without any change of habits or alteration of moral life, the appellation of count was not unfrequently exchanged for that of bishop, in order to transmit to a son, or perhaps a nephew, the title thus relinquished. In this way the prerogatives of both titles were retained in the same family. But it was considered an abuse of authority to have any one person invested with the combined privileges and distinctions of a count and of a bishop. The count Mererius was canonically settled in the see of Angouleme by St. Germain, bishop of Paris, and St. Euphrone, archbishop of Tours, with the consent of king Charibert. Nantin, the nephew of Mererius, inherited the immunities and possessions attached to the title of count. This occurred about 570. After seven years of episcopacy Mererius was poisoned by Frontonius, who seized the bishop's mitre, and was apparently recognised without opposition as the bishop of Angouleme. It is worthy of notice that

in those troublesome times it was not uncommon through such crimes to reach the highest offices. The authors of *L'Histoire Litteraire* and the *Gallia Christiana* have fancied the identity of Mererius, bishop of Angoulême, with one Maracharius, who, according to Fortunatus, attended the dedication of the church at Nantes in 568 but father Lecoite would rather believe that this Maracharius Romacharius was the bishop of Coutances, Yet neither the bishop of Coutances nor the bishop of Angoulême was a fellow provincial of the bishop of Nantes. It is much more likely that the Maracharius mentioned by Fortunatus is the same with Maclianus, bishop of Vannes, who died probably in 577. It is said that some writings by Mererius were deposited in the library of Cluni, but they seem to have been lost.

### Me' res

(Hebrews *id.*, *sr̄m*, from the Sanscrit *meresh*, *worthy*, according to Beinfey, p. 200; Sept. *Μέρεϛ*, but most copies omit; Vulg. *Mares*), one of the seven satraps or viziers of Xerxes (<sup><1704></sup>Esther 1:14). BC. 483.

### Meri, Francois

a French Benedictine monk, was born at Vierzon in 1675. He died Oct. 18, 1721 in the Abbey of Saint-Martin de Magai, province of Berry. Merin published a work entitled *Discussion critique et theologique des Remarques de M. sur le dictionnaire de Moreri*, under the nom de plume *M.' Thomas*-(1720). He has sometimes been mistaken for Dom Philippe Billouet, his contemporary, who never published any work.

### Meriadec, St.

a French prelate, whose name in Latin is *Mereadocus*, was born in Vannes about AD. 605. He was a lineal descendant of the ancient kings of Armorica, and was brought up at the court of Joel III, king of Brittany. He was ordained a priest by Hingueten, the bishop: of Vannes. and afterwards retired into the waste and sterile country of Stival, near Pontivy. At the death of Hingueten, the clergy and the laity alike with one acclaim appointed Meriadec his legitimate successor. St. Meriadec is mentioned in the *Vita Sanctorum* by Bollandus (ii. 36). It is not known when he was canonized, but his name is still much venerated in Brittany, where many churches and chapels have been consecrated under the inspiration of his memory. He died in Vannes in the year 666.

## Merian, Hans Bernhard

a noted philosopher, was born in 1723 at Lichstall, in the canton of Basle, where his father was a minister. After finishing an academical course of philosophical and philological studies, he became private tutor of a young Dutch nobleman. At the recommendation of M. de Maupertuis, Frederick the Great called him to Berlin. Here he became a member of the Academy of Sciences, and soon distinguished himself so much that in 1771 he was nominated director of the philosophical department, and in 1797 (after Formey's death) secretary of the academy. Of his numerous philosophical works, some of which show superior merits, we mention the following: *Diss. de autochiria* (Basle, 1740); *-Discours sur la metaphysique* (Basle, 1766) :- *Systeme du monde* (Bouillon, 1770); *Examenn de l'histoire naturelle de la religion par Mr. Hume, ou on refute les erreurs*, etc. (Amsterdam, 1779). Numerous philosophical essays of his are printed in the "Mem. de l'Acad. des Sciences a Berlin," e.g. *Mem. sur l'apperception de sa propre existence*; *Menm. sur apperception consideree relativement aux idees, ou sur lexistence des idees dans l'ame* (vol. v); *Reflexions philos. sur la resemblance* (vol. xii); *Examen d'une question concernant a liberte* (vol. ix); *Parallble de deux principes de psychologie* (vol. xiii); *Sur le sens moral* (vol. xiv) ; *Sur le desir* (vol. xvi); *Sur la crainte de la mort*; *Sur le mepris de la mort*; *Sur le suicide* (vol. xix); *Sur le duree et sur l'intensite du plaisir et de la peine* (vol. xii). For further details, see Fred. Ancillon, *Eloge historique de J. B. Merian*, etc. (Berlin, 1810).

## Mer'ibah

### Picture for Meribah

(Hebrews *Meribah'*, **hbyrꝰꝰ** *quarrel*, or "strife," as in <sup><0138></sup>Genesis 13:8; <sup><0274></sup>Numbers 27:14), the designation of two places, each marked by a spring.

**1.** (Sept. **λοιδόρησις**; Vulg. joins with the preceding name in one, *tentatio*, <sup><0270></sup>Exodus 17:7; but in <sup><0808></sup>Psalms 81:8, **λοιδορία**, *contradictio*.) The latter of the two names given by Moses to the fountain in the desert of Sin, on the western gulf of the Red Sea, which issued from the rock which he smote by the divine command, the other equivalent name being MASSAH; and the reason is assigned, "because of the *chiding* of the children of Israel, and because they did there *tempt* the Lord" (<sup><0270></sup>Exodus



17:1-7). This spot is only named once again by this title (<sup><0908></sup>Psalm 82:8). The general locality is designated by the name REPHIDIM (ver. 1, 8). *SEE EXODE*. The monks of Sinai still pretend to show the identical rock from which Moses brought forth the water (Olin's *Tavel's*, i., 416). Stephens describes it as an isolated stone, about twelve feet high, with several artificial gashes from which water trickles (*Trav.* 1:285). Burckhardt, also, who was one of the first travellers that critically examined the locality, thinks it bears indubitable marks of art, yet one of the later travellers, D. Roberts, holds that the orifice has been naturally formed by the oozing of water for a long period (*Holy Land, Egypt, etc.*, vol. iii, pl. iii). The rock rests isolated where it has fallen from the face of the mountain. It is of red granite, fifteen feet long, and ten feet wide. Down the front of the block, in an oblique direction, runs a seam, twelve or fourteen inches wide, of apparently a softer material; the rock also has ten or twelve deep horizontal crevices, at nearly equal distances from each other. There are also other apertures upon its surface from which the water is said to have issued—in all about twenty in number, and lying nearly in a straight line around the three sides of the stone, and for the most part ten or twelve inches long, two or three inches broad, and from one to two inches deep; but a few are as deep as four inches. The rock is highly revered both by the Christians and Bedouins. It lies in the valley called Wady el-Lejah, in the very highest region of the Sinai group, running up narrow and choked with fallen rocks between the two peaks that claim to be the Mount of Moses, and contains the deserted convent of El-Abein (Kitto, *Pict. Bible*, ad loc.).

2. (Sept. ἀντιλογία, in <sup><0903></sup>Numbers 20:13; 27:14; <sup><0925></sup>Deuteronomy 32:51; λειδορία in <sup><0904></sup>Numbers 20:24; Vulg. *contradictio*; but in <sup><0908></sup>Psalm 95:8, πειρασμός, *tentatio*, AuthVers. “provocation;” and in <sup><0970></sup>Ezekiel 47:19, Μαριμώθ; 48:28, Βαριμώθ—in which last two passages, as well as in <sup><0962></sup>Psalm 106:32, the AuthVers. has “strife.”) Another fountain produced in the same manner, and under similar circumstances, in the desert of Zin (Wady Arabah), near Kadash; to which the name was given with a similar reference to the previous misconduct of the Israelites (<sup><0903></sup>Numbers 20:13, 24; <sup><0903></sup>Deuteronomy 33:8). In the last text, which is the only one where the two places are mentioned together, the former is called Massah only, to prevent the confusion of the two Meribahs, “Whom thou didst prove at Massah, and with whom thou didst strive at the waters of Meribah.” Indeed, this latter Meribah is almost always indicated by the addition of “waters,” as if further to distinguish it from the other

(<sup><0213></sup>Numbers 20:13, 24; <sup><0513></sup>Deuteronomy 33:8; <sup><0813></sup>Psalms 81:8; 106:32; <sup><3479></sup>Ezekiel 47:19; 48:28), a title that is but once applied to the other Meribah (<sup><0813></sup>Psalms 81:8); and the locality we are now considering is still more distinctly called “waters of Meribah in Kadesh” (<sup><0274></sup>Numbers 27:14), and even Meribah of Kadesh (AV. “Meribah-Kadesh,” <sup><0525></sup>Deuteronomy 32:51). Only once is this place called simply Meribah (<sup><0913></sup>Psalms 95:8). It is strange that, with all this carefulness of distinction in Scripture, the two places should rarely have been properly discriminated. Indeed many commentators have regarded the one as a mere duplicate of the other, owing to a mixture of earlier and later legend. The above monkish tradition has contributed to confound the two localities. But, besides the differences already noted, there was this very important one, that in smiting the rock at the second place Moses himself exhibited impatience with the multitude (<sup><0210></sup>Numbers 20:10-12); whereas he showed no signs of passion on the former occasion. *SEE MOSES*. The distance of place from the former Meribah, the distance of time, and the difference of the people in a new generation, are circumstances which, when the positive conditions of the two wells were so equal, explain why Moses might give the same name to two places. *SEE KADESH*.

### Merib'-Baal

(Hebrews *Merib'-Ba'al*, I [*Bibyræ*] contender with *Baal*, <sup><1383></sup>1 Chronicles 8:34; Sept. *Μεριβαάλ* v.r. *Μεφριβαάλ*, Vulg. *Meribaal*; also in the contracted form *Meri'-Ba'al* I [*biyræ*] <sup><1394></sup>1 Chronicles 9:40; Sept. *Μεριβαάλ* v.r. *Μεχριβαάλ*, Vulg. *Meribaal*, the son of Jonathan, elsewhere called *MEPHIBOSHETH* (<sup><1094></sup>2 Samuel 4:4, etc.), apparently from an unwillingness to pronounce the idolatrous name of *Baal*. *SEE ISHBOSHETH*.

### Merici, Angela

foundress of the Order of Ursulines, was born at Desenzano, on the lake of Garda, in 1511. Her family name was *De Brescia*. She was brought up by her uncle, and at an early age entered the Order of St. Francis. She made a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, and after her return established at Brescia, in 1537, a new order of nuns, of which she was appointed superior. Angela Merici died March 21, 1540. Her order was so successful that at the end of a century after its organization it counted in France alone over three hundred and fifty convents. See Helyot, *Hist. des ordres monastiques*,

4:150; D'Emillianne, *Hist. des ordres monustiques*, p. 247-249; Moreri, *Dict. hist. s.v.*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Bioy. Generale*, 2:638. *SEE URSULINES.*

## Meridian

is the technical term for the siesta or noon-day sleep in a convent, allowed to be taken during one hour after hall-time.

## Merino, John Anton Diaz,

a Roman Catholic prelate, was born in 1771. In his twelfth year he had made such extraordinary progress in his studies that he was ready to enter the University of Alcala. Later he lectured as professor of theology at several universities in Spain and Cuba, then joined the Dominicans, and was shortly after promoted general of this order. On account of his great wisdom and sagacity, he was often consulted by the bishops in cases of an intricate character. In 1832 he was ordained, and in his position led a most exemplary and simple life, and greatly devoted himself to the sufferings of the poor. His firm and vivid faith was a bulwark against the evils of his time, and, for refusing to support irreligious edicts of his government, he was finally expelled from his see and had to leave Spain. He spent his last years in France in exile, and died at Marseilles in 1844. He published *Coleccion Ecclesiastica* and *Biblioteca de la Religion*, the first work containing all the acts of the Spanish bishops in defence of the system of the Church pursued during the constitutional epoch, and the latter comprising the translation of the works of Lamennais, Maistre, etc.

## Merit

signifies *desert*, or that which is earned.; originally the word was applied to soldiers and other military persons, who, by their labors in the field, and by the various hardships they underwent during the course of a campaign, as also by other services they might occasionally render to the commonwealth, were said, *mserere stipendio*, to merit, or earn their pay; which they might properly be said to do, because they yielded in real service an equivalent to the state for the stipend they received, which was therefore due to them in justice. Here, then. we come at the true meaning of the word *merit*; from which it is very clearly to be seen that, in a theological sense, there can be no such thing as merit in our best obedience. One man may merit of another, but all mankind together cannot merit from the hand of God. This evidently appears, if we consider the

imperfections of all our services, and-the express declaration of the divine Word (<sup><488></sup>Ephesians 2:8, 9; <sup><511></sup>Romans 11:5, 6; <sup><508></sup>Titus 3:5; <sup><510></sup>Romans 10:1, 4). The scholastic distinction between *merit of congruity* and *merit of condignity* is thus stated by Hobbes (*Of Man*, pt. i, ch. iv): “ God Almighty having promised Paradise to those that can walk through this world according to the limits and precepts prescribed by him, they say he that shall so walk shall *merit* Paradise *ex congruo*. -But because no man can demand a right to it by his own righteousness, or any other power in himself, but by the free grace of God only, they say no man can *merit* Paradise *ex condigno*.” **SEE MERITUM**. See South’s *Sermons, The Doctrine of Merit stated*, vol. iii, ser. 1; Toplady’s *Works*, 3:471; Hervey’s *Eleven Letters. to Wesley*; Robinson’s *Claude*, 2:218. **SEE ALSO WORKS**.

### Merits Of Christ,

a term used to denote the influence or moral consideration resulting from the obedience of Christ-all that he wrought and all that he suffered for the salvation of mankind. **SEE ATONEMENT**; **SEE IMPUTATION**; **SEE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF CHRIST**.

### Merits Of Saints

**SEE SUPEREROGATION**.

### Meritum De Condigno, Or De Congruo

(*desert of worth or fitness*). This distinction in the idea of the merit of good works, as it was first interpreted by Thomas Aquinas, may be looked upon as a compromise between the strict Augustinian doctrine to which he himself was attached, and the Pelagian tendencies of the Church in general, particularly on the subject of good works. He therefore considers meritorious works under two aspects:

1. According to the substance of the work itself, in so far as proceeding from beings endowed with free will, it is an effect of their free volition.
2. As proceeding in a measure from the grace of the Holy Spirit. Under the last aspect, being, in fact, an effect of the divine grace in man, it is *meritorium vitae aeternae ex condigno*. While considered as a result of free will, the immense disproportion between the creature and the supernatural communicated grace prevents there being any *condignitas*, any absolute desert, bhut only a *congruitas*, propter quamdam sequalitatem proportionis.

For it appears suitable that “ut homini operanti secundum *suam* virtutem Deus recompenset secundum excellentiam suce virtutis.” From this Thomas Aquinas concludes:

1. That no one but Christ can gain by *meritum condigni* any *primam gratiam* for another.
2. That, on the contrary, it is possible to all as regards *meritum congrui*, since “secundum amicitime proportionem Deus implet hominis voluntatem in salvatione alterius.” The conclusion, which opens wide the door to the practice of supererogatory works, is consequently this, that “fides aliorum valet alii ad salutem merito congrui, non condigni.” Duns Scotus goes even further in this Pelagian direction, and asserts that man can, de congruo, prepare (*disponere*) himself for the reception of the grace offered him. By Protestants this distinction is of course rejected, as well as the whole doctrine of good works. “The *Apol. Conf.* (ii. 63) declares that this scholastic distinction is but a screen for Pelagianism: “Nam si Deus necessario dat gratiam pro merito congrui, jam non est meritum congrui, sed condigni;” elsewhere (iii. 127) it opposes to it the following arguments:

1. That this doctrine tends to diminish the mediatorial character of Christ; quiperpetuo est mediator, non tantum in principio justificationis.
2. That it continually awakens doubts in the conscience, for hypocrites could always rely on their good works to merit justification, while conscientious believers would be in doubt as to all their works, and always seeking for more. “Hoc est enim de congruo mereri, dubitare et sine fide operari, donec desperatio incidit.” See Muinscher. *Lehrbuch d. Dogenges.* . 2:1, 145, 146,176; Neander, *Gesch. d. chrisft. Religion u. Kirche*, 2:294, 610; :Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 9:365.

### Merlat, Elie

a French theologian, was born at Saintes in March, 1634, and was educated at Saumur and Mont-auban; he afterwards visited Switzerland, Holland. and England, and in 1658 secured a position as minister at the church of All Saints. In 1678 he presided over the provincial synod at Jonzac. His reply to *Reversement de la Morale d’Arnauld* brought upon him the displeasure of the government in 1679; he was sent to prison, and in 1680 the Parliament of Guienne banished him from the country. Merlat escaped to Lausanne, where he was appointed professor of theology. He

died there Nov. 18, 1705. His most celebrated works are, *Response generale au livre de M. Arnauld: Le Reversement de la Morale de Jesus Christ* (Saumur, 1672, 12mo): *Le noyen de discerner les esprits*; this sermon was directed towards the visionaries, -and created great disturbance: *Le vai et le faux Pielisme* (Lausanne, 1700, 12mo).

### Merle D'aubigne, Jean Henri, D.D.,

one of the illustrious characters of the Church of the 19th century, the popular historian of the most prominent event of modern times the great Reformation of the 16th century -was born at the village of Eaux Vives, on Lake Lemman, in the canton of Geneva, Switzerland, Aug. 16, 1794. He was the descendant of celebrated French Protestants. His first French ancestor to leave the native-soil was his great-grandfather, John Lewis Merle, who quitted his home at Nismes after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes (1685), and found a refuge in the home of Switzerland's greatest character- John Calvin. In 1743 Francis, son of John Lewis, married Elizabeth D'Aubigne, daughter of the celebrated French Protestant nobleman, and direct descendant of the noted chevalier Theodore Agrippa d'Aubigne, the grandfather of Madame de MAINTENON *SEE MAINTENON* (q.v.). According to French usage, the family name of Elizabeth's illustrious ancestry was appended to the family name of her own offspring. One of these was her son, And Robert (born in 1755, murdered in 1799), the father of this subject, and of two other sons who now figure in American mercantile life one of them has been for many years a resident of Brooklyn, L. I.; the other a resident of New Orleans.

Jean Henri was educated in the Academy, or, as it is more commonly called, the University of Geneva. Determined to enter the ministry, he inaugurated his theological course at his alma mater. While engaged in his studies, under the leadership of a faculty decidedly rationalistic in tendency, he fell in with the Haldanes, and was led to dedicate himself to Christ as a faithful and devoted servant. In his' own account of his conversion, Dr. d'Aubigne states that his professor of divinity disbelieved the doctrine of the Trinity, and that, instead of the Bible, "St. Seneca and St. Plato were the two saints whose writings he held up for admiration." The pupil followed the master throughout. He was chairman of a meeting of students who protested most vehemently, in a public document, against "the odious aggression" of a pamphlet entitled "Considerations upon the Divinity of Jesus Christ," by Henri Empeytaz, which was addressed to them, and had

produced a great excitement. “But Soon,” he continues, “I met Robert Haldane, and heard him read from an English Bible a chapter from Romans about the natural corruption of many doctrine of which I had never before heard. In fact, I was quite astonished to hear of man being corrupt by nature. I remember saying to Mr. Haldane, ‘Now I see that doctrine in the Bible.’ ‘Yes,’ he replied; ‘but do you see it in your heart?’ That was but a simple question, yet-it came home to my conscience. It was the Sword of the Spirit; and from that time I saw that my heart was corrupted, and knew from the Word of God that I can be saved by grace alone. So that, if Geneva gave something to Scotland at the time of the Reformation-if she communicated light to John Knox Geneva has received something from Scotland in return in the blessed exertions of Robert Haldane.” *SEE HALDANE; SEE MALAN.*

Upon the completion of his theological course at Geneva, Merle d’Aubigné went abroad and studied at the universities of Leipsic and Berlin. In the last-named place he attended the lectures of the “father of modern Church history,” Neander. On his way to Berlin he had passed through Eisenach, and visited the castle of Wartburg, made famous by Luther’s sojourn. It was in this spot that he first conceived the purpose of writing the “History of the Reformation.” His stay at Berlin and association with the immortal Neander, only confirmed the purpose, and he rested not until the work was in the possession of the world. In 1817 he was ordained to preach, and became the pastor of an interesting French Protestant Church at Hamburg., There he labored diligently for his people and his God for some five years, when he was invited to Brussels, by the late king himself, as pastor of a newly-formed French congregation. He rapidly rose in favor and distinction, and enjoyed the position of president of the Consistory of the French and German Protestant churches of the Belgian capital. In 1830, the revolution delivering the country from Protestant rule and Dutch authority, all persons friendly to the king of Holland were regarded as enemies of the Belgians, and Merle d’Aubigne, fearing for his life, determined to return to his native country. The pious “Switzers” were actively canvassing at this time for the establishment of an independent theological school a training place for the ministry of the orthodox churches. His arrival gave a new impetus to the project, and resulted in the formation of the “Evangelical Society” in 1831, and the founding of the long-desired seminary. Merle was appointed professor of Church history, and intrusted with the management of the school, a position which he

continued to hold for the remainder of his life, adorning it by his piety, learning, and eloquence, and sanctified by the divine blessing upon his ever-memorable labors. His associates in the school were Gausson, celebrated as the author of a work on "Inspiration," Pilet, and La Harpe. Though possessed of an ample fortune, Dr. Merle d'Aubigne lived a life of laborious activity. At seventy-eight he was still vigorous, and went to bed on Sunday night, October 20, after partaking of the sacrament, and subsequent devotions, with no sense of pain or illness. Like Dr. Chalmers, whom in some points he may be said to have resembled, he was found to have died quietly in his room at night, and to have been some hours dead before his family knew their loss. His death occurred on Oct. 21, 1872, at Geneva. Upon his country's loss, the *Christian Intelligencer* (Oct. 24, 1872) thus comments in a beautifully-written obituary of our subject: "Not since the impressive death-scene of John Calvin, which took place 308 years ago, has Geneva been called to mourn over the loss of a more illustrious citizen and minister of the Lord Jesus Christ. The Free Church, of which he was founder, pastor, professor which differs from the Established Church in having no connection with the State government partakes largely of the nature of Calvinistic Methodism. But the man himself was broader and greater than any sect. His beautiful tribute to the memory of Calvin is his own most appropriate epitaph: 'He was not a Genevan; he was not a Swiss; he was of the City of God.'" Henry Baylies, in a short report of "An Evening with D'Aubigne" (*Zion's Herald*, Nov. 14, 1872), has furnished a description of Merle's appearance of late years: "D'Aubigne stood, I should say, full six feet, rather more than less; was large, but not corpulent. His face was long, not full, and smooth, I think. His iron-gray locks were combed back, exposing a high forehead; his eyebrows were heavy and black. His features and expression were somewhat severe, and marked, as if he had inherited the spirit and fought the battles of the old Scotch Covenanters. He conversed in English with tolerable readiness. His health was then feeble, but he was hopeful of improvement."

*Merle d'Aubigne as an Author.* — The duties incumbent upon a professor of theology are so varied, especially at Geneva, where the influences, as in most large European cities, are decidedly rationalistic, that the manner in which D'Aubigne discharged his duty towards his pupils was of itself sufficient to entitle him to the very highest regards on the part of all followers of Jesus the Christ. The task, however, which D'Aubigne had set



for himself at Eisenach, the writing of *a history of the great Reformation*, was the one that mainly occupied him; and while a most devoted pastor and a truly laborious professor, he yet found time for the completion of a work that has immortalized the name of its author. His *Histoire de la Reformation au Seizieme Siecle* (Paris, 1835-53, 5 vols. 8vo) 'gained for him literally a world-wide reputation. His warm, devotional manner made him singularly popular as a preacher and speaker, and threw a charm over his hearers; His vigorous Protestantism, and his belief in the special providential mission of the evangelical forms of Protestant Christianity, made his history almost a manifesto of Protestantism. His style is brilliant, and generally clear, and, as was said of him by one of the most eminent of the English reviewers, "He wrote for time, and his writings will endure for eternity." The sale of this work was immense. More than 200,000 copies were sold in France alone; while the English translation has circulated in more than 300,000 copies in Great Britain and the United States. In Germany also the work proved an immense success. But while the fascinations of its style, as well as the transcendent interest and importance of its matter, captivated the people, there are many scholars who 'have taken exception to his "one-sidedness," and have declared it uncritical and unscholarly. One of the latest writers on the subject, Prof. Fisher, of Yale, 'actually ignores D'Aubigne as an authority, and refuses to place him by the side of such men as Gieseler and Ranke. This we think a great injustice to D'Aubigne. We do not ourselves believe that he has done anything more than *popularize* the great Protestant story; but to ignore him who may be said to have been virtually the first to write the history of the Reformation is a shortcoming to be regretted. See Preface to Fisher, *The Reformation* (N. Y. 1873, 8vo); and compare Baird, *D'Aubigne and his Writings, with a Sketch of the Life of the Author* (NY. 1846, 12mo), p. 20. Says the writer in the *Christian Intelligencer*, whom we have already had occasion to quote: "It is impossible to estimate the far-reaching influence of this work in reproducing the characters, scenes, and struggles of the Reformation times, and in its strong hold upon the popular mind. We are well aware of the critical ordeal which it has passed through among the scholars of Europe, and that its scientific value is not rated so high as that of histories written for learned men. But as a book for the people it has no rival, either in its immense circulation, or in its acknowledged power in behalf of the great principles of the Protestant Reformation. The work is, moreover, the bright and best reflection of its gifted author's genius, learning, and grace. Brilliant in style, picturesque in description,

sententious, full of striking thoughts and powerful word-painting, it also glows with his profound love for the dear old faith, and with burning zeal against the corruptions and iniquities of the great apostasy of Rome. In no other book in our language do Luther and Erasmus, Melancthon, Farel, Calvin, Tetzels, and Dr. Eck, the great emperor and the greater elector, Leo X, and other characters, so live and move, and act in all their personal traits and historical deeds." In 1862 he supplemented his great work by the publication of *The History of the Reformation in Europe in the Time of Calvin*, the fourth volume of which was published in 1868. The other works of M. d'Aubigne, although less widely celebrated, are in their way scarcely inferior to his greatly-renowned production. They are: *Le Lutheranisme et la Reforme* (Paris, 1844):-*Le Protecteur, ou -la Republique d'Angleterre aux Jours de Cromwell* (ibid. 1848, 8vo): rendered into English, and largely circulated under the title, "The Protector, or the English Republic in the Days of Cromwell," a thoughtful and admirably written review of the rule of the Puritan dictator. It is based upon Carlyle's famous monogram on the Protector, and was expressly designed as an exhibit of that "Protestantism which in Cromwell's mind was far above his own person" *Germany, England, and Scotland, or Recollections of a Swiss Minister* (London, 1848, 8vo), a work that showed great powers of observation and clearness of expression:-*Three Centuries of Struggling in Scotland, or Two Kings and Two Kingdoms* (Paris, 1850, 18mo): a brief if we may so style it in which are presented the main features of the Scottish Reformation: *L'Ancien. et le Ministre* (1856):-and *Character of the Reformer and the Reformation of Geneva* (1862, 8vo). M. Merle d'Aubigne has also contributed largely to periodical publications, the most noted of his papers being a series on the *Archives of Christianity*. See, besides the writers already quoted, *La France Protestante, ou vies des Protestants Francais* (1853); Charles de Remusat, *Melanges de Litterature et Philosophie*; Vapereau, *Dict. des Contemporains*, sv.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Genrale*, s.v.; *Brit. and For. Evang. Revelation* 1843, 101 sq.; *New-Englander*, 4:344; *Harper's Magazine*, 1872, Nov. (J. H. W.)

### Merle, Matthieu

a noted Huguenot soldier, was born at Uzis, Languedoc, in 1548. He was not, as De Thou represents, the son of a wool-carder, nor did he follow in his youth the trade of wool-carding. He belonged to a noble but poor family of Lower Languedoc, did not receive any school education,, and

never learned either to read or to write. Having a decided liking for war and the profession of arms, Merle, at the age of twenty; enlisted in a guard commanded by D'Acier, who subsequently became the duke of Uzes. As a member of that guard, Merle went through the campaign of 1569 in Poitou. After the pacification in 1570. he entered the service of Francois de Pevre, a gentleman of the horse, who intrusted him with the supervision" of his castle in Gdnaudau. Shortly after the massacre of St. Bartholomew, hostilities having been kindled afresh, Merle inflicted the bloodiest retaliation upon the Romanists, and by his deeds of valor and prowess became so redoubtable that the mere mention of his name was sufficient to cause far and near the direst consternation among his enemies. He died about 1590. Goudin, in his *Memoires*, published a brief sketch of Merle, and his career as a soldier. See De Thou, *Historia sui temporis*; M. Imberais, *Hist. des guerres religieuses en Auvergne*; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Geneale*, s.v.

### Merlin, Charles

a French critic, was born at Amiens in 1678. He joined the Society of Jesus; at first was a teacher of belles-lettres, and subsequently instructed-in theology with much success. He was also one of the editors of the *Memoires de Trevoux*. Merlin died in Paris about 1747. He is the author of *Refautation des critiques de M. Bayle sur St. Augustin* (Paris, 1732, 4to). He had also undertaken to examine or refute Bayle's criticisms on religious matters, but this work was never given to the public. Nearly all the articles which Merlin contributed to the '*Memoires de Trevoux* were intended to controvert Bayle's religious opinions. Other works of his are, *Veritable clef des ouvrages de St. Augustin* (Paris, 1732, 4to):-*Examen exact et detaille defaeit d'Honorius* (1738,12mo):-*Traite historique et dogstnatique sur les paroles ou lesformes des Sacrenments del lEglise* (Paris, 1745, 12mo; reprinted in 1840 by Migne).

### Merlin, Jacques (1),

a French theologian, was born n Saint-Victurin, Limousin, about the latter part of the 15th century. After having received his diploma as a doctor of theology at Navarre (1499), he became lecturer on divinity to the chapter of Saint-Etienne de Limoges. Subsequently he was ordained curate of Montmartre, near Paris. In 1525 he was appointed chief penitentiary of the cathedral of Notre-Dame, of which he had previously been resident canon.

In 1527, king Francis I caused his arrest and incarceration for preaching against certain courtiers who were suspected of sympathy with the reform movement. He was cast into the dungeon of the Louvre. At the entreaties of the prebendaries of Paris he was liberated, after having suffered incarceration 'for two years, but even then was confined in his residence at Nantes. He was allowed, however, to return to Paris in 1530, when he was installed grand-vicar' to the bishop of Paris, and also curate and archpriest of La Madeleine. In the introduction to the edition of Origen's works, which he published in 1511, he wrote an *Apologie d'Origene*. This apology, wherein, for the first time, the errors imputed to Origen are justified, caused Merlin's condemnation by the Paris Faculty of Theology, and by the impetuous syndic Noel Beda. He likewise published a *Collection de tous les Coriciles*, the first ever issued from the press (Paris, 1524, fol.; Cologne, 1530, 8vo; and Paris, 1535, 8vo). He also edited the works of *Richard de Saint-Victor*. (Paris, 1518):-Pierre de Blois (Paris, 1519): — *Durand de Saint-Poursain* (1515); and six *Homelies en Français, surces paroles de l'Evangile: Missus est angelus Gabrniel* (Paris, 1538, 8vo). Merlin died in Paris Sept. 26, 1541, and was buried in the crypt of Notre-Dame. See Dupin, *Aut. eccl. du seizime siecle*, 4:545; Salmon, *Trait de l'Etude des Conciles*, p. 197, 474.

### Merlin, Jacques (2),

a Protestant clergyman, the son of Pierre Merlin, was born at Alençon Feb. 5, 1566. He studied at Geneva, and at Oxford, England. In 1589 he was appointed incumbent of La Rochelle, where he continued to labor until the end of his life. In 1601 he was a delegate from his province to the political assembly at Sainte-Foi. He was chosen vice-president of the national synod held at La Rochelle in 1607, and president of the synod convened two years later in Saint-Maxent. He wrote *Diaire ou Journal du ministre Merlin* (Geneva, 1855, 8vo, 65 pp.), published by M. Crottet from a MS. deposited in the library at La Rochelle. In this same library there, is another MS. by Jacques Merlin, which contains a chronological record of the events noted by him in La Rochelle. He died about 1620. See Haag, *La France Protest.*; Arcere, *Hist. de La Rochelle*.

### Merlin, Jean-Raymond

(surnamed *Monroy*), a Protestant theologian, was,; born at Romans, France, about 1510. He was a professor of Hebrew at Lausanne, probably

from 1537 to 1558, when he resigned his position in order the better to protest against the removal from office of two of his colleagues, Pierre Viret and Jacob Valier, by act of the Bernese government. He afterwards retired to Geneva, where he was pastor for three years. Called to Paris in 1561, at the instance of Coligny, he was intrusted with a mission to La Rochelle, and attended the Conference at Poissy, where he took, however, only a secondary part. Jeanne d'Albret then invited him to visit the Bearn, and engaged him to propagate the doctrines of the Reformation. He returned to Geneva about the middle of 1564. Shortly thereafter he came in conflict with the civil authorities, and, because of his decided opposition to civil interference in ecclesiastical affairs, was removed. Merlin then went into the Dauphine, from which the massacre of St. Bartholomew drove him away. He sought refuge in Geneva. He died about 1578. Merlin wrote a French translation entitled *Commentaires d'OEcolampade sur Job. et Daniel* (Geneva, 1561, 8vo). He also published *Catechisme extiait decelui de Geneve, pour examiner. ceux qu'on veut recevoir . ' la C ane, avec la translation en langue Bearnoise* (Limoges, s. d. 8vo): *Les dix Commandements de la loi de Dieu, translates d'Hebreu en Franfais, et exposes avec six autres translations* (Geneva, 1561, 8vo). See Marchand, *Dict. Historique.*; Haag, *La France Protestante*.

### Merlin, Pierre

a French Protestant theologian, the son of Jean-Raymond, was born about 1535.' After having been a disciple of Theodore de Beza, according to De Thou, he became religious adviser to the prince de Conde. D'Aubigne, however, maintains that he was a minister of the Gospel under admiral de'Chatillon. The latter version is the likelier of the two. Certain it is that he was with admiral de Chatillon during the St. Bartholomew massacre. Through a fortunate circumstance he escaped the slaughter and fled to Geneva, where he formed the acquaintance of J. J. Scaliger. In process of time, however, he returned to France, and then became the pastor in ordinary of a nobleman named Laval, residing at Vitre. He was highly esteemed by his co-religionists, and presided at the general synods held respectively at Sainte-Foi, in 1578, and at Vitre, in 1583. As a delegate from the churches in Brittany, he also attended the Synod of Saumur in 1596. Pierre de L'Estoile relates that the impetuous Covenanter, Jean Boucher, in a sermon preached in July, 1591, represented that Merlin was really the father of Henry of Navarre (Henry IV). From this singular fabrication likewise sprang the other story that he had clandestinely married

Jeanne d'Albret, the queen of Navarre, and that the celebrated D'Aubigne was the issue from that union. Prosper Marchand, in his *Dictionnaire*, took great pains to refute all these allegations made by the Covenanters,' or opposers of Henry IV. Merlin died about 1603. He wrote: *Vingt Sermons sur le livre d'Esther* (La Rochelle, 1591, 8vo; Geneva, 1594, 8vo):-*Job Commentariis illustratus* (Geneva, 1599, 18mo): *Sainctes Prikre s recueillies de plusieurs passages de. 'Ancien et. du Nouveau Testament* (Geneva, 1609, 8vo):-*Discours theologiques de la tranquillite et vrai repos de l'ame* (Geneva, 8vo). See Haag, *La France Protestante.*-Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale.*, S. V.

## Mero

SEE MEROTH

## Mer'odach

(Hebrews *Merodak'*, **Ἐδῖρω]** apparently a syncopated form of **Ἐδδᾶσμ]** Sept. **Μαιρωδάχ** v. r. **Μεωδάχ** and **Μαιωδάχ**; Vulg. *Merodach*) occurs in <sup><3810></sup>Jeremiah 50:2, in such connection with idols as to leave no doubt that it is the name of a Babylonian god. In conformity with the general character of Babylonian idolatry, Merodach is supposed to be the name of a planet; and, as one of the Tsbian and Arabic names for Mars is *Mirrich*, "arrow" (the latter of which Gesenius thinks may be for *Mirdich*, which is very nearly the same as Merodach), there is some presumption that it may be Mars, but in other respects he more closely resembles Jupiter. As for etymologies of the word, Hitzig has suggested (*Comment. on* <sup><3301></sup>Isaiah 39:1) that it is the Persian *mardak*, the diminutive of *mard*, "man," used as a term of endearment; but more probably it is from the Persian and Indo-Germanic *mord*, or *mort* (which' means death, and is so far in harmony with the conception of Mars, as the lesser star of evil omen), and the affix *och*, which is found in many Assyrian names, as Nisroch, etc. (Gesenius, *Thes. Hebrews* p. 818). The bloody rites with which Mars was worshipped by the ancient Arabs are described in Norberg's *Onomast. Codicis Nasar.* p. 107. Of the worship of this idol by, the Assyrians and Babylonians, besides the passages in <sup><3301></sup>Isaiah 39:1; Jeremiah 1, 2, we have testimony in the proper names of the kings of Assyria and Babylonia, which are often compounded with this name, as Evil-Merodach, and Merodach-Baladan, who is also called BerodachBaladan (see Gesenius, *Comment. zu Jesa.* 1:281). In the above passage of Jeremiah, "Bel and Merodach are coupled

together, and threatened with destruction in the fall of Babylon. It has commonly been concluded from this passage that Bel and Merodach were separate gods; but from the Assyrian and Babylonian inscriptions it appears that this was not exactly the case. Merodach was really identical with the famous Babylonian Bel or Belus, the word being probably at first a mere epithet of the god, which by degrees superseded 'his proper appellation. Still a certain distinction appears to have been maintained between the names. The golden image in the great temple at Babylon seems to have been worshipped distinctly as Bel rather than Merodach, while other idols of the god may have represented him as Merodach rather than Bel. It is not known what the word Merodach means, or what the special aspect of the god was, when worshipped under that title. In a general way Bel-Merodach may be said to correspond to the Greek Jupiter. He is the old man of the gods; 'the judge,' and as the gates of heaven under his especial charge. Nebuchadnezzar calls him 'the great lord, the senior of the gods, the most ancient, and Neriglissar 'the first-born of the gods, the 'layer-up of treasures.' In the earlier period of Babylonian history 'he seems to share with several other deities (as Nebo, Nergal, Bel-Nimrod, Anu, etc.) the worship of the people, but in the later times he is regarded as the source of all power and blessings, and thus concentrates in his own person the greater part of that homage and respect which had previously been divided among the various gods of the Pantheon." See Rawlinson, *Herodotus*, 1:267 sq.; *Ancient Monarchies*, 1:169.

### Mer'odach-Bal'adan

(Hebrews *Merodak'-Baladan'*,  $\hat{d}a\} \beta i \acute{E} d a o m$ ] *Mars* [or *Jupiter*] is his lord, **SEE MERODACH**; Bohlen less well compares the Persian *mardak balaudaun*, *honored man*; Sept. **Μαρωδάχ Βαλαδάν** v. r. **Μαιωδάχ Ἀλαδάν**, Vulg. *Merodach Baladan*), a king of Babylonia, the son of Baladan, and contemporary of Hezekiah (BC. 711), with whom he cherished friendly relations (<sup><2301></sup>Isaiah 39:1; <sup><1202></sup>2 Kings 20:12; <sup><443></sup>2 Chronicles 32:31; in two of which passages the name is written BERODACH-BALADAN, by an interchange of letters). He is unquestionably the *Mardokempad* (**Μαδοκέμπαδος**) of Ptolemy's *Canon* (comp. Ewald, *Isr. Gesch.* 3:344), who reigned at Babylon for twelve years, BC. 721-709. Josephus (*Ant.* 10:2, 2) calls him simply *Baladas* (**Βαλάδας**), apparently identifying his name with that of his father. He is usually identified (Gesenius, *Comment.* on Isaiah ad loc.) with the

Merodach-Baladan mentioned by Berosus (in Eusebius, *Chron. Armen.* 1:42, ed. Aucher) as a viceroy of the king of Assyria, who rebelled and seized the kingdom of Babylon for himself (see Knobel, *Comment.* on Isaiah p. 282); but this person is probably one who fell in a part of the two years' interregnum some years later (BC. 702-699), since he is said to have been slain by Elibus (the Belibus of Ptolemy's *Canon*) after a reign of only six months (see Hitzig, *Comment.* on Isaiah p. 450). Merodach Baladan is mentioned in the Assyrian inscriptions at Khorsabad, deciphered by Dr. Hincks and Colossians Rawlinson, according to which he was conquered by Sennacherib in the first year of the latter's reign. Merodach Baladan is there called king of Kar-Duniyas, a city and country frequently mentioned in the Assyrian inscriptions, and comprising the southernmost part of Mesopotamia, near the confluence of the Tigris and Euphrates, together with the districts watered by these two rivers, to the borders of Susiana., This king, with the help of his Susianian allies, had recently recovered Babylon, from which Sargon, Sennacherib's father, had expelled him in the twelfth year of his reign. The battle seems to have been fought considerably to the north of that city. The result was that Sennacherib totally defeated Merodach-Baladan, who fled to save his life, leaving behind him all his military equipments. In the cuneiform annals of the fourth year of Sennacherib's reign, Merodach-Baladan is further mentioned as having escaped to an island, where himself and all his family were finally captured by Sennacherib (Layard's *Nineveh and Babylon*, p. 140, 145). The dates of these notices would seem to identify the Merodach-Baladan of the monuments with the temporary usurper of the same name alluded to by Berosus, rather than with the one of Scripture; possibly future investigations may show that they were all three identical, as also the Mardokempadus of the *Canon*, since the records of the inscriptions appear to speak of an occupancy of Babylon by him at two distinct periods, the first during the reign of Sargon (being probably that referred to in the Scriptures and the *Canon*), and the second for a shorter space and after a considerable interval, in the first of Sennacherib (being that alluded to by Berosus). A different but analogous solution of the above difficulty is to suppose two kings of the same name at the two periods in question. **SEE HEZEKIAH**

“Putting all our notices together, it becomes apparent that Merodach-Baladan was the head of the popular party, which resisted the Assyrian monarchs, and strove to maintain the independence of the country. It is



uncertain whether he was self-raised or was the son of a former king. In the second book of Kings he is styled 'the son of Baladan;' but the inscriptions call him 'the son of *Yagin*;' whence it is to be presumed that Baladan was a more remote ancestor. *Yagin*, the real father of Merodach-Baladan, is possibly represented in Ptolemy's Canon by the name *Jugeuss*-which in some copies replaces the name *Elulæus*, as the appellation of the immediate predecessor of Merodach-Baladan. At any rate, from the time of Sargon, Merodach Baladan and his family were the champions of Babylonian independence, and fought with spirit the losing battle of their country. The king of whom we are here treating sustained two contests with the power of Assyria, was twice defeated, and twice compelled to fly his country. His sons, supported by the king of Elam, or Susiana, continued the struggle, and are found among the adversaries of Esar Haddon, Sennacherib's son and successor. His grandsons contended against Asshur-bani-pal, the son of EsarHaddon. It is not till the fourth generation that the family seems to become extinct, and the Babylonians, having no champion to maintain their cause, contentedly acquiesce in the yoke of the stranger. The increasing power of Assyria was at this period causing alarm to her neighbors, and the circumstances of the time were such as would tend to draw Judæa and Babylonia together, and to give rise to negotiation's between them. The astronomical marvel, whatever it was, which accompanied the recovery of Hezekiah, would doubtless have attracted the attention of the Babylonians; but it was probably rather the pretext than the motive for the formal embassy which the Chaldaean king despatched to Jerusalem on the occasion. The real object of the mission was most likely to effect a league between Babylon, Judæa, and *Egypt* (<sup>2316</sup>Isaiah 20:5, 6), in order to check the growing power of the Assyrians. Hezekiah's exhibition of 'all his precious things' (<sup>2313</sup>2 Kings 20:13) would thus have been, not a mere display, but a mode of satisfying the Babylonian ambassadors of his ability to support the expenses of a war. The league, however, though designed, does not seem to have taken effect. Sargon, acquainted probably with the intentions of his adversaries, anticipated them. He sent expeditions both into Syria and Babylonia-seized the stronghold of Ashdod in the one, and completely defeated Merodach-Baladan in the other. That monarch sought safety in flight, and lived for eight years in exile. At last he found an opportunity to return. In BC. 703 or 7.02 Babylonia was plunged in anarchy-the Assyrian yoke was thrown off, and various native leaders struggled for the mastery. Under these circumstances the exiled monarch seems to have returned, and recovered

his throne. His adversary, Sargon, was dead or dying, and a new and untried prince was about to rule over the Assyrians. He might hope that the reins of government would be held by a weaker hand, and that he might stand his ground against the son, though he had been forced to yield to the father. In this hope, however, he was disappointed. Sennacherib had scarcely established himself on the throne when he proceeded to engage his people in wars, and it seems that his very first step was to invade the kingdom of Babylon. Merodach-Baladan had obtained a body of troops from his ally, the king of Susiana; but Sennacherib defeated the combined army in a pitched battle; after which he ravaged the entire country, destroying 79 walled cities and 820 towns and villages, and carrying vast numbers of the people into captivity. Merodach-Baladan fled to ‘the islands at the mouth of the Euphrates’ (Fox Talbot’s *Assyrian Texts*, p. 1)-tracts probably now joined to the continent-and succeeded in eluding the search which the Assyrians made for him. If we may believe Polyhistor, however, this escape availed him little. That writer relates (*ap. Euseb. Chron. Can.* 1:5) that he was soon after put to death by Elibus, or Belibus, the viceroy whom Sennacherib appointed to represent him at Babylon. At any rate, he lost his recovered crown after wearing it for about six months, and spent the remainder of his days in exile and obscurity.” *SEE BABYLONIA.*

## Meroe

*SEE SEBA.*

## Me’rom

(Hebrews *Merom*, *מֵרוֹם* *height*; Sept. *Μερόμ*), a lake (*μῦραι* “waters”) among the hills (hence the name, Burckhardt, *Trav.* 2:553) of northern Palestine, whose shores were the scene of the great victory of the Hebrews over the northern Canaanites (<sup>6105</sup>Joshua 11:5-7); doubtless the same with that through which the Jordan flows three miles from its source, called by Josephus *Samechonitis* (*Σαμοχωνίτις* or *Σεμεχωνίτις*, *Ant.* v. 5, 1; *War.* 3:10, 7; 4:1, 1). In his account of the battle (*Ant.* v. 1. 18), the confederate kings encamp “near Beroth, a city of upper Galilee, not far from Kedes;” nor is there any mention of water. In the *Onomasticon* of Eusebius the name is given as “Merran” (*Μεπράν*), and it is stated to be “a village twelve miles distant from Sebaste’ (Samaria), and near Dothaim.” Abulfeda (*Tab. Syr.* p. 155) calls it the *Sea of Banias*, but its usual modern name is *Bakrat el-Hlekh* (Burckhardt, *Trav.* 1:87). It was visited by Lieut. Lynch

(*Expedition*, p. 471), and is most fully described by Thomson (in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1846, p. 185; see also 1843, p. 12, and map; 1854, p. 56; Robinson's *Res. new ed.* p. 395; comp. Reland, *Palaest.* p. 261 sq.; Hamelsveld, 1:482 sq. Schwarz, *Palaest.* p. 47). As regards the modern name of Huleh, by which the native inhabitants of the district commonly designate the lake, there are some grounds for tracing it also to a very ancient source. Josephus (*Ant.* 15:10, 3) speaks of Herod as having obtained from Caesar the territory of a troublesome prince named Zenodorus—a territory that lay between Trachon and Galilee, and which “contained Ulatha (Οὐλάθαν) and Paneas.” The country so described is the very region in which Lake Meromis situated; and Οὐλάθα has every appearance of being the Greek form of Huleh. It is also conjectured that this *Ulatha* of Josephus and *Huleh* of modern times may derive their common origin from a period so remote as that of *Hul*, the son of Aram, mentioned in the book of Genesis (Genesis 10:23), a personage whom Josephus calls Ὀυλος (*Ant.* 1:6, 4). Hence, not improbably, the name (see Ritter, *Palest. und Syr.* 2:234; Stanley, *Sin. and Pal.* p. 283). The word, both in Hebrew and Arabic, seems to have the force of *depression*—the low land (see Michaelis, *Suppl.* Nos. 687,720); and Michaelis most ingeniously suggests that it is the root of the name Κοιλησυρία, although in its present form it may have been sufficiently modified to transform it into an intelligible Greek word (*Spicilegium*, 2:137,138). The name *Samechonitis* may perhaps be derived from the Arabic root *samak*, “to be high,” and would thus be identical in meaning with the Hebrew Merom (Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 1276; Reland, *Palaest.* p. 262). Perhaps the phrase מַרְוֵם יַם might be rendered “the upper waters;” that is, the upper lake or collection of waters formed by the river Jordan (see Reland, p. 262). Several other explanations of the Greek name as found in Josephus have been given:

1. It is derived from the Chaldee qms, “red,” because of the ruddy color of its water.
2. From bs, “a thorn,” because its shores abound with thorn-bushes (Lightfoot, *Opp*, 2:172).
3. From the Arabic *samk*, “a fish” (Reland, p. 262). These explanations appear to be all too fanciful (Stanley, *Sin. and Pal.* p. 383, note). Josephus mentions a city called *Meroth* (Μηρώθ or Μηρώ, *Life*, p. 37; *War*, 2:20, 6), which Ritter connects with the Hebrews name of the lake (*Pal. und Syr.* 2:235).

This interesting lake-Merom, Samechonitis, or Hileh lies embedded in the midst of one of the finest scenes in Palestine. The Ard el-Huleh, the centre of which the lake occupies, is a nearly level plain of sixteen miles in length, from north-to south; and its breadth, from east to west, is from seven to eight miles. On the west it is walled in by the steep and lofty range of the hills of Kedesh-Naphtali; on the east it is bounded by the lower and more gradually ascending slopes of Bashan; on the north it is shut in by a line of hills hummocky and irregular in shape, and of no great height, and stretching across from the mountains of Naphtali to the roots of Mount Hermon, which towers up, at the north-eastern angle of the plain, to a height' of 10,000 feet. At its southern extremity the plain is similarly traversed by elevated and broken ground, through which, by deep and narrow clefts, the Jordan, after passing through Lake Huleh, makes its rapid descent to the Sea of Galilee, the level of which is from 600 to 700 feet lower than that of the waters of Merom (Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 181). This noble landscape, when seen, for the first time and suddenly, from the lofty brow of the mountains of Naphtali, can never fail to excite the liveliest admiration: the intense greenness, so unusual in Palestine, of the abundantly-watered plain — the bright blue lake reflecting from its bosom the yet brighter and bluer sky—the singularly-picturesque ranges-of the surrounding hills; and, rising far above them all, the Jebel esh-Sheikb, the monarch of the mountains, the mighty Hermon, dark and shaggy to its shoulders with the forests that clothe its sides, and with its double summit covered with perpetual snow. The lake itself in form is not far from a triangle, the base being at the north and the apex at the south; and, though no exact measurement of it seems ever to have been made, it is about four and a half miles in length by about three miles in breadth. According to Josephus (*War*, 4:1, 1) it is sixty stadia long and thirty wide, and full of fish (Burckhardt, *Trav.* 2:554). Robinson states (*Researches*, 3:339 sq.) that its size varies somewhat according to the season, being when he saw it (in summer) about two miles long, but in the northern part bounded by an extensive marsh, which explains the length sometimes assigned of eight or ten miles (Seetzen, in *Zach's Monatl. Corresp.* 18:344). It is surrounded on all sides, and especially on the south, west, and north, by broad morasses, and by such impervious brakes of tall sedges, reeds, and canes, as to be all but unapproachable. It is the receptacle for the drainage of the highlands on each side, but more especially for the waters of the Merj Ayftn, an elevated plateau which lies above it among the roots of the great northern mountains of Palestine. On the north-western side of the lake the

morasses extend almost to the very base of the Kedesh-Naphtali hills. The Hasbany river, which falls almost due south from its source in the great Wady et-Teim, is joined at the north-east corner of the Ard el-Hfileh by the streams from Banias and Tell el-Kady, and the united stream then flows on through the morass, rather nearer its eastern than its western side,-until it enters the lake close to the eastern end of its upper side. From the apex of the triangle at the lower end the Jordan. flows out. In addition to the Hasbany, and the innumerable smaller watercourses which filter into it the waters of the swamp above, the lake is fed by independent springs on the slope of its enclosing mountains. Of these the most considerable is the Ain el-Mellahah, near the upper end of its western side, which sends down a stream of forty or fifty feet in width. Though this name signifies "the fountain of salt," neither is the water brackish, nor is there any saline incrustation in its neighborhood, to account for such a designation. This spring gives to the lake one of its names. William of Tyre calls it *Lacus Meleha* (*Hist.* 18:13); and the name now frequently given to it by the neighboring Arabs is *Bahret el-Melalhad*. The water of the lake is clear and sweet; it is covered in parts by a broad-leaved plant, and abounds in water-fowl. The only inhabitants of the plain are a few tribes of Arabs who dwell in tents. There is -not a single village or house in any part of it. Its soil is singularly fertile, and where cultivated, as it is partially to the south and east of the lake, yields luxuriant crops. Its rich, swampy pastures: are covered with large herds of buffaloes. This cultivated district is called the Ard el-Khait, perhaps "the undulating land" (otherwise "the land of wheat," from its fertility), el-Khait being also the name which the Arabs sometimes call the lake (Thomson, in the *Bibl. Sacra*, 3:199; Robinson, *Bib. Res.* iii, App. p. 135,136). In fact the name Huleh appears to belong rather to the district, and only to the lake as occupying a portion of it. It is not restricted to this spot, but is applied to another very fertile district in northern Syria lying below Hamah. A town of the same name is also found south of and close to the Kasimiyeh river, a few miles from the castle of Hunin. *SEE PALESTINE.*

## Merom

*SEE SHIMRON-MERON.*

## Merón, PHILIPPE VAN

a Dutch visionary and doctor of theology, was born at Goude in 1435. He was a member of the Brethren of the Conference, and distinguished himself by his eloquence. He was sent as a missionary to Sweden, and died in 1506.' His works are of a mystical character. The most important of them is *Historie van den Heiligen Patriach Joseph, bruydegom der Mcegh Maria, ende opvoeder Ons Heeren Jesu Christi* (Goude, 1496, 8vo). In this work Meron narrates a revelation which he claims to have had in Sweden when he ascertained by divine intuition that Joseph "became the foster-father of Jesus Christ on the 19th of January." In consequence of this revelation he exhorted all good Christians to fast on that day, and to keep the festival of St. Joseph. But this alleged revelation did not in any way alter the custom of the Church to honor the memory of Joseph on the 19th of March. See Walvis, *Beschr. v. Goude*, 2:144; Prosper Marchand. *Dictionnaire*, p. 106.

### Meronoth

SEE MERONOTHITE.

### Merón'othite

(Hebrews *Meronthi'*, ϣⲓⲁⲟⲟⲉgentile from ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲉ*Meronoth'*, signif. uncertain, a place elsewhere unknown; Sept. ἐκ Μερᾶθών or Μαρθῶν, Μηρωνωθύτης, Vulg. *Meronothites*), an epithet applied to Jehdeiah, the herdsman of the royal asses in the time of David and Solomon (<sup><1373></sup>1 Chronicles 27:30), and also to Jadon, one of those who repaired the walls of Jerusalem (<sup><1487></sup>Nehemiah 3:7); apparently as being natives of some town called MERONOTH, of the position or existence of which no other notice is extant, but from the latter passage it may be conjectured to have lain not far from Gibeon and Mizpah, and appears to have been inhabited after the captivity.

### Merorim

SEE BITTER (HERBS).

### Meroth

(Μηρώθ) or Mero (Μηρώ), a fortified town of Galilee (Josephus, *War*, 2:20, 6; *Life*, p. 37), probably the *Meiron* (ⲙⲣⲓⲙ) of the Talmud (Reland,

*Palaest.* p. 817); now the village of *Meiron*, about 13 hours west-north-west of Safed; famous for Jewish pilgrimages to the tombs of their ancient rabbis (Wilsoi, *Lands of the Bible*, 2:311; Carmoly, *Itin.* p. 133, 260; Robinson, *Researches*, 3:334; *Later Res.* p. 73, 74; Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 70 note, 186; Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 334). **SEE AERYTHA; SEE MEROM; SEE MEROZ.**

## Me'roz

(Hebrews *Meroz'*, *z/rmē*perh., as suggested by Gesenius, for *z/rēm*, from the Arabic, *refuge*; but Furst disapproves of this etymology; Sept. **Μηρόζ**, V ulg. *terra Meroz*), a place in the northern part of Palestine, the inhabitants of which were severely reprehended (<sup><0723></sup>Judges 5:23) for not having taken the field with Barak against Sisera (comp. <sup><0218></sup>Judges 21:8-10; <sup><0107></sup>1 Samuel 11:7). It would seem as if they had had an opportunity of rendering some particular and important service to the public cause which they neglected (see Dr. Robinson's note in the *Bib. Repos.* 1831, p. 606). The tradition of its site was lost as early as the time of Procopius of Gaza, who had attempted in vain to recover it (Reland, *Palaest.* p. 896). Possibly the city was utterly destroyed in consequence of the curse. In the Jewish traditions preserved in the Commentary on the Song of Deborah attributed to Jerome, Meroz, which may be interpreted as *secret.*, is made to signify the evil angels who led on the Canaanites, and are cursed by Michael, the angel of Jehovah, the leader of the Israelites. Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s.v. Merrus) fix it twelve Roman miles from Sebaste, on the road to Dothaim; but this position would place it south of the field of battle, and therefore scarcely agrees with the history. Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 36) says it is mentioned in the Talmud under the name of *Marchesheth* or *Maresheth*, and locates it (*ib.* p. 168) at the village, of *Murussus*, two or three miles north or north-west of Bethshan, on the line of hills separating the basin of Tayibeh from the valley of Jezreel (Robinson's *Researches*, new ed. 3:339). The town must have commanded the Pass, and if any of Sisera's people attempted, as the Midianites did when routed by Gideon, to escape in that direction, its inhabitants might no doubt have prevented their doing so, and have slaughtered them. Furst (*Lex.* s.v.) suggests that it was a locality in a district of Galilee partly inhabited-by Gentiles (<sup><1091></sup>1 Kings 9:11), not far from Kedesh-Naphtali, and consequently in the neighborhood of the Lake Merom, perhaps the locality (reading *μ/rmē*high place) which gave name to the lake itself. Wilson (*Lands of the Bible*, 2:89) identifies it

with the *Kefr-Mesr*, on the southern slope of Mount Tabor, and this Van de Velde approves (*Memoir*, p. 334). Thomson thinks it may be the present Meiron, a famous Jewish cemetery six miles west of Safed; this would be between Barak's residence and Tabor (<sup>(17042)</sup>Judges 4:12), and therefore render the inhabitants liable to a summons to arms by the Hebrew general (*Land and Book*, 1:424). This last place is possibly the *Meroth*, strongly fortified by Josephus (*Life*, p. 37; *War*, 2:20, 6; 3:3, 1).

### Merriam, Edwin Elisha

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Mason, Hillsborough County, N. H., in 1837. He graduated with honor at Amherst College, Mass., in 1858, and at Union Theological Seminary, N. Y., in 1863; was ordained and installed pastor of the Church in Salem, Wayne County, Pa., in 1864, where he died Feb. 17, 1865. Mr. Merriam possessed superior qualifications for usefulness as a minister, and was much beloved as a pastor. See *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1866, p. 218.

### Merriam, W. W.

an American missionary to Turkey, of whose personal history we know but little, deserves a place here for his activity and zeal in behalf of the cause of missions, a devotion which cost him his life in June, 1862, when he was assassinated near Philippopolis, Turkey, on his return from a missionary meeting at Constantinople. Merriam was appointed by the American Board.

### Merrick, James

an English divine, noted for his theological and, especially, for his poetical productions, called by Lowth "one of the best of men and most eminent of scholars," was born Jan. 8, 1720, and was educated at Trinity College, Oxford. He became a "probation fellow" at his alma mater in 1744, took holy orders shortly after, and became noted for his philanthropic labors. Owing to infirm health he never undertook the task of supplying the pulpit. He died Jan. 5, 1769. When yet a mere boy at school at Reading, Merrick published a poetical production that deserves to be placed among the classical writings of the English. His chief works are, *A Dissertation on Proverbs*, ch. ix (Lond. 1744, 8vo): *Prayers for a Time of Earthquakes and Violent Floods*, written in 1756, soon after the earthquake at Lisbon:- *Annotations, Critical and Grammatical, on the Gospel of St. John*



(Reading, 1764, 8vo; 2d pt. 1767, 8vo) :-*Annotations on the Psalms* (ibid. 1767, 8vo; 1768 4to), of which only part were his own; archbishop Seeker, bishop Lowth, and Kennicott were contributors: -*An Encouragement to a Good Life*, particularly addressed to soldiers quartered at Reading, among whom he labored much for the good of the Christian cause. Indeed, he appears to have paid great attention to this class of men, who at that time especially required it. He also wrote *Poems on Sacred Subjects*, and made an excellent *Translation of the Psalms into English Verse*. This, beyond all doubt the best poetical translation in English, was unfortunately not adapted for parochial choirs, inasmuch as it was divided into stanzas for music. This work is not perhaps as generally known as its merits-would justify. He published several other minor religious treatises. See Orme, *Bibliotheca Biblica*, p. 313; Allibone,- *Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; *English Cyclop.* s.v.; Holland, *Psalms of Great Britain*, 2:210 sq.

### Merrick, James Lyman

a Presbyterian minister, was born at Monson, Mass., Dec. 11, 1813. He graduated at Amherst College in 1830, and in 1833 at the theological seminary at Columbia, S. C.; was ordained as a missionary to the Persians in 1834; in August of the same year he sailed for Constantinople, and in October, 1835, arrived at Tabriz, Persia. He labored, travelled, and explored among the Mohammedans about two years, then joined the Nestorian Mission at Oroomiah, and in 1845 returned to America, and in 1849 was installed pastor of the Congregational Church at Amherst, Mass. He died June 18, 1866. Mr. Merrick had a strong mind, and was a good scholar, a faithful pastor, and an earnest missionary. He was thoroughly acquainted with the Persian, and well read in the Arabic, Hebrew, Turkish, Greek, Latin, and French tongues. He was altogether absorbed in the interests of the Persian language and literature, and bequeathed his property to the literary institutions which had afforded him his early advantages, for the founding of four Persian scholarships. He was the author of *The Pilgrim's Harp*, a volume of poems (1847) : — *The Life and Religion of Mohammed*, translated from the Persian (1850) :-*Keith's Evidences of Prophecy*, translated into Persian (1846). He also left in MS., *A Full Work on Astronomy*, selected, compiled, and translated into Persian, *A Friendly Treatise on the Christian Religion*, and *A Treatise on the Orthography and Grammar of the English Language*. See *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1867, p. 181, 182; *N. Amer. Revelation* lxxi. 273; *Brownson's Quar. Revelation* 2d ser., 4:408. (J. L. S.).

## Merriken, Joseph

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Annapolis, Md., Nov. 25, 1811; entered the Baltimore Conference in 1831; in 1835-8 was stationed in Baltimore; in 1838-9, in Lewiston, Pa.; in 1840-1, in Hagerstown, Md.; in 1842-3, in Annapolis; in 1844-5, in Baltimore; and in 1847 in Alexandria; where he died, in February (?), 1848. He was a man of great energy and labor, and one of the best preachers of his time, not in great talents, but in sound judgment, clear and earnest study, and great faith. He was especially noted for excellence and faithfulness as a pastor. See *Minutes of Conferences*, 4:197.

## Merrill, Daniel

an American Baptist minister, noted for his opposition to open communion and Paedobaptists, flourished as pastor at Sedgwick, Me., where he died in 1833, about sixty-five years of age. His works are, *Seven Sermons on Baptism* (10th ed. 1812): *Eight Letters on Open Communion* (1805):— *Letters occasioned by Worcester's Discourses: Balaam Disappointed*; and several sermons preached on important public occasions.

## Merrill, David

a Presbyterian minister, was born at Peacham, Vt., in 1798, and was educated at Dartmouth College (class of 1821). He was called to preach at Urbana, Ohio, in 1827; thence to the Church at Peacham in 1841, where he died in 1850. Mr. Merrill published *Three Occasional Sermons*, and contributed to several periodicals. A volume of his sermons, with a sketch of his life, was published by Thomas Scott Pearson (Windsor, Vt., 1855, 8vo). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

## Merrill, Franklin

a Presbyterian minister, was born in 1819. He was educated at Princeton College, studied divinity at the Princeton Theological Seminary, and was ordained pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Hempstead, Long Island, N. Y., in 1848. In 1853 he accepted a call to the Presbyterian Church of Stillwater, NY., and in 1858 to the Reformed Dutch Church of Schuylerville, NY., where he died, March 31, 1861. Mr. Merrill was an earnest and instructive preacher, and possessed the high art of impressing

the message of God with peculiar directness and pungency. See *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1862, p. 206.

### Merrill, Joseph A.

a noted Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Newbury, Mass.; Nov. 22, 1785; was converted in 1804; entered the New England Conference in 1807; was stationed in Boston in 1813-14; in 1815-18 was presiding elder on Vermont District; in 1819 was agent of the Wesleyan Academy at New Market, and the first missionary of the first missionary society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, which was formed by the Lynn Common Church, and his field was New Hampshire. In 1826-27 he was stationed in Boston; 1830-33 was presiding elder on Providence District; 1834-38 was on Springfield District; 1843-47, in Salem, Boston, and Cambridge; and died at Wilbraham, Mass., July 22, 1849. "Mr. Merrill was an able and useful minister, and greatly devoted to the interests of the Church. He was one of the original trustees of the Wesleyan University, and remarkably successful as an agent for the academy, of which he secured the removal to Wilbraham. He was one of the earliest and most devoted friends of the anti-slavery cause, and his name is honorably identified with the rise and progress of that important movement." His administrative and practical talents were of the highest order, and his firm integrity made him trusted and respected by all. See *Minutes of Conferences*, 4:536; *Steven's Memorials of Methodism*, ii, ch. 32:(G. L. T.)

### Merrill, Thomas Abbott, D.D.,

a Congregational minister, was born January 18, 1780, in Andover, Mass.; graduated at Dartmouth College in 1801; was chosen tutor in 1803; and in 1804 tutor in Middlebury College, which office he held a year, and was then ordained pastor in Middlebury, Dec. 19, 1805. He labored on this charge until Oct. 19, 1842. He died April 25, 1855. He was one of the formers of the Vermont Domestic Missionary Society in 1818, and secretary of the same until 1821; and he was president of the Peace Convention in 1853. In 1842 he was chosen treasurer of Middlebury College. He published two of his sermons (1806; 1833). See *Sprague, Annals*, 2:481.

## Merritt, Timothy

an early and eminent Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Barkhamstead, Conn., October, 1775. He was converted about 1792, and entered the New England Conference in 1796. From 1803 to 1817 he located ; was stationed in Boston in 1817-18; in 1822 was at Providence;- in 1825-26 preached at Boston; in 1831 at Malden, and also “devoted much time to the editorship of *Zion’s Herald*;” from 1832 to 1836 was assistant editor of the *Christian Advocate and Journal*, New York. He died at Lynn, Mass., 1845. Mr. Merritt was an able and powerful writer, an eloquent preacher, an accomplished debater, and in all respects one of the foremost ministers of his time. He was a well-read man, and worthy of a place among the scholars of his Church. His ministry was made especially useful by the enjoyment and earnest preaching of the doctrine of Christian perfection., His influence was wide and blessed, and his memory is precious. Mr. Merritt published *Convert’s Guide and Preacher’s Assistant:-Christian Manual:-Discussion against Universal Salvation:-On the Validity and Sufficiency of Infant Baptism:* and (together with Dr. Wilbur Fisk) *Lectures and Discussions on Universal Salvation*. See *Minutes of Conferences*, 2:616; *Steven’s Memorials of Methodism*, i, ch. 23; ii, ch. 27; *Sherman’s New Engl. Divines*, p.312. (G. L. T.)

## Merriwether, John T.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South; joined the Memphis’ (Tenn.) Conference in: 1854, and was appointed to Dyersburg Circuit; in 1855 to Dresden Station; ;in 1856 to Trenton Station; , in. 1857 to Holly Springs Station; in 1858 to Asbury Chapel, Memphis; in 1859 and 1860 to Aberdeen Station; in 1861 was made presiding elder of Aberdeen District; in 1865 was appointed to Denmark Circuit; and in 1866 took a supernumerary relation. He died in Denmark, Tenn., April 10, 1867. “He possessed a. strong and highly-cultured mind, a soul imbued with the spirit of Christ, and an intelligent yet burning zeal in his high calling.” - See *Minutes of the M. E. Church South*, 1867.

## Mersennus (Fr., Mersenne), Marin

a. very learned French ecclesiastic and philosopher, was born in 1588 at Oyse, in the present department of Maine. He received his education at the College of La Fleche, where he was a fellow-student of Des Cartes, and with him he formed an intimacy, which a similarity of pursuits ripened into

a friendship dissolved only by death. He also studied at the University of Paris, and subsequently at the Sorbonne. In 1612 he took the vows at the Minimes, in the neighborhood of Paris. In the year following entering the priesthood, he deemed it incumbent on him to study the Hebrew language, and addressed himself to the accomplishment of this task. In 1615 he filled the chair of philosophy at Nevers, and there taught till the year 1619, when he was chosen superior of the convent, and, on completing the term of his office, he travelled in Germany, Italy, and the Netherlands. He finally settled in Paris, where his gentle temper and polite and engaging manners procured him a number of distinguished friends. Of these the chief was the founder of the Cartesian philosophy, who entertained the highest opinion of his abilities, and consulted him upon all occasions. It has been stated - though the story seems highly improbable that Des Cartes, by the advice of Mersenne, at once changed his intention of founding his system on the principle of a vacuum, and adopted that of a plenum. The discovery of the cycloid has been ascribed to him and also to Des Cartes, but it now seems pretty clear that to neither are we indebted for the first notice of this curve. Mersenne died at Paris in 1648. Pere Mersenne was undoubtedly a man of great learning and unwearied research, and deserved the esteem in which he was held by the philosophers and literati of his age; but, except his *Harmonie Universelle*, his works are now unread and almost unknown. If by some he was overrated, by others he has been undervalued; and when Voltaire mentioned him as "Le minime et tres minime Pere Mersenne," he indulged his wit at the expense of one with whose writings, it is to be suspected, he was very little acquainted. His eulogist, however, in the *Dictionnaire Historique*, admits that Mersennus very ingeniously converted the thoughts of others to his own use; and the abbe Le Vayer calls him "Le bon Larron" a skilful pilferer. Nevertheless, the work above named, *L'Harmonie Universelle, contenant la Theorie et la Pratique de la Musique* (1637, 2 vols. fol.), has proved of the utmost value to all later writers on the subject. The work was, in 1648, translated into Latin and enlarged by the author; but both the original and translation have now become as rare as they are curious. Another, but earlier production of his, *La Verite des Sciences contre les Sceptiques* (Paris, 1625), discusses at considerable length the nature of mathematical evidence, and concludes by maintaining that mental philosophy, jurisprudence, and all the arts and sciences, should be taught and illustrated through the aid of mathematics (liv. i, ch. 8, 10, 13, 14). "The mind itself," he held, "is the real and effective source of all its powers and perceptions of abstract truth" (p.

193). See Hilarion de Coste, *Vie du R. P. Marin de Mersenne*; Nicéron, *Hommes illustres*, vol. 32; Blakey, *Hist. of the Philosophy of Mind*, 2:423 sq. (J. H W.)

### Merton, Walter

an English prelate noted for his philanthropy, flourished in the 13th century. He was surnamed from the place of his birth, a village in Surrey. His education he received at a neighboring convent, and was there influenced to enter the ecclesiastic life. After filling various important offices in the Church, he was in 1258 advanced to the post of chancellor of England; but he held this position only a very short time. In 1264 he founded a college at Oxford, which still bears his name. In 1274 he was advanced to the see of Rochester. He died before the expiration of 1277.

### Meru Or Merus

(*Gr.* Μηρός), a word of doubtful etymology, is in Hindu mythology the name of a mythical mountain. It is said to be situated in the centre of the seven continents, and its height is supposed to be 84,000 yojanas. of which 16,000 are below the surface of the earth. (A yojana is usually reckoned at 16,000 yards, or about nine of our miles; but, according to some authorities, it is only five miles.) The sacred river Ganges, (Ganga), we are told, falls from heaven on its summit, and flows to the surrounding worlds in four streams, of which the southernmost is the Ganges of India. Brahma, attended by *rishis* (sages) and celestial minstrels is supposed to visit them, and also Siva and his consort Parvati. Sq. Wilson, *Sanscrit Dictionary*, s.v.; Moor, *Hindu Pantheon*, s.v.; Coleman, *Hindu Mythology*, p. 253. ,

### Me'ruth

(Ἐμμερούθ, vulg. *Emerus*), put (1 Esdr. v. 24) for IMMER (<sup>15237</sup>Ezra 2:37).

### Merwin, Samuel

an early and eminent Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Durham, Conn., Sept. 13, 1777; was converted while young; entered the New York Conference in 1800; in 1803 was stationed at Montreal, Canada; in 1804 at New York; in 1806 at Boston; in 1807-8. at Newport, R. I.; in 1812-13 at Albany; in 1814 at Brooklyn; from 1815 to 1818 was presiding elder on New York District; in 1819 preached in New York; in 1820 in Albany;

from 1821 to 1823 was on the New Haven District; in 1824-5 at Baltimore; in 1826-7 at Philadelphia; in 1828-9 at Troy; in 1830-31 at New York; from 1832 to 1835 on the New York District; in 1836 at New York; in 1837-8 at Rhinebeck, NY., where he died, Jan. 13, 1839. Mr. Merwin was a man of great influence and usefulness in his whole public career. His ministerial and administrative talents were of the highest order. He possessed a mind of great richness and power, a vivid imagination, a commanding voice and person, and fervent piety; these, combined with the gift of utterance, made him one of the most eloquent men of his time; and the important stations which he filled in the New England, New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore Conferences, testify to the opinion of his brethren respecting his abilities.' In the presiding eldership his masterly judgment and influence over men made him conspicuous as a peace-maker and an organizer. Many souls were converted through his labors, and his memory in the church is blessed. See *Minutes of Conferences* 2:669; Sprague, *Annals of American Pulpit*, vol. 7:(GL.T.)

### Merz, Philipp Paul

a German theologian, as born at Augsburg near the close of the seventeenth century. After having been received as a candidate for orders in the evangelical ministry in 1724, he suddenly turned to Romanism; was subsequently ordained a priest, and became the curate of Schwabsoyen, and sometime afterwards retired into his native city. He died in 1754. He wrote *Thesaurus Biblicus* (Augsburg, 1733-38, 1751, 1791, 2 vols. 4to; Venice, 1758, 4to). This work is very useful to preachers. At the end of each important word it contains a reference to such passages of Scripture as bear upon it. Merz also published *Quotlibet Catecheticum* (Augsburg, 1752, 5 vols. 4to), which is a complete and methodical abstract of the best catechisms then extant. See Zapf, *Augsburgische Bibliothek*, p. 11; Veith, *Bibliotheca Augustana*; Meusel, *Gelehrten-Lexikon*, s.v.

### Mesa, Christobal De

a Spanish poet, was born at Zafra (Estramadura) in 1550. The little that is known of him is gathered from his own poetical compositions, and particularly his two epistles to the count de Lemos, together with that addressed to the count de Castro. From these productions it appears that in his youth Mesa was the pupil of Sanchez, the most eminent of Spanish philologists, and that he had also deeply studied both Fernand de Herrera

and Louis de Soto. In afterlife he spent some years in Italy, where he became intimately acquainted with the poet Tasso. He died, poor and obscure, about 1620. One of his poems is founded upon the tradition that the corpse of St. James, after his martyrdom in Jerusalem, was miraculously translated to Spain and deposited at Compostella, where from that day to this James has been honored as the patron saint of the realm. *SEE JAMES*. Another of his poems treats of Pelagius and the struggles of the Christians against the Moors up to the battle of Covadonga.; His third poetical work relates the battle of Tolosa, which destroyed the power of the Mohammedans, and secured the emancipation of the Peninsula. He also wrote *El Patron de España* (Madrid, 1611, 12mo). See Ticknor, *History of Spanish Literature*, 2:462; Hoefler, *Nouv; Biog. Generale*, s.v.

## Me'sech

(~~19015~~Psalm 120:5). *SEE MESHECH*.

## Mesengui, Francois Phillippe

a French ecclesiastic, celebrated for his connection with Jansenism, was born at Beauvais, in August, 1677. His parents being poor, friends defrayed the expenses of his education in the College of Beauvais and at the Seminary of Trente-Trois in Paris. After having been invested with the first minor orders, he became a professor of humanities in his native city. On his return to Paris in 1707, through the influence of his friends he was appointed superintendent of the department of rhetoric in the college at Beauvais. Coffin, who succeeded Rollin as the director of that institution, selected the abbe Mesengui for his coadjutor, and upon him devolved the duty of teaching the catechism to the students. The opposition, however, which he manifested to the papal bull known as *Unigenitus* constrained him in 1728 to resign his official functions. He subsequently became a member of the clergy at Saint-Etienne-du-Mont. Suspected of harboring the doctrines of Jansenism, he was in consequence prohibited from all ecclesiastical avocations, and confined to privacy and obscurity. He took up his residence in Paris, and devoted himself to the composition of various works designed for the propagation of the Jansenistic doctrines, which he finally adopted. He died in February, 1763, at Saint-Germain-enLaye. Mesengui published: *Idee de la vie et de lesprit de N. Choart de Buzauval, eveque de Beauvais, avec un abrege de la vie de AM. Hermant* (Paris, 1717, 12mo):*Abrege de l'histoire et de la morale de l'Ancien Testament*



(Paris, 1728, 12mo) :-*Le Nouveau Testament, trad. en Francais, avec des notes litterales* (Paris, 1729, 12mo; 1752, 3 vols. 12mo):-*Vie des Saints pour tons les jours de l'annee* (Paris, 1730, 6 vols. 12mo).-: *Abrege de l'histoire de l'Ancien Testament, avec des eclaircissements et des reflexions* (Paris, 1735-53, 10 vols. 12mo): -*Abrige de l'histoire de 'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament* (Paris. 1737-38, 3 vols. 12mo): — *Epitres et Evangiles, avec des reflexions* (Paris, 1737; Lyons, 1810,12mo): -*Exposition de la doctrine Chretienne, ou instructions sur les principales verites de la religion* (Utrecht [Paris], 1744, 6 vols. 12mo; new edition, revised and enlarged, Paris, 1754-58, 4 vols. 12mo). Some writers state that the duke of Orleans endeavored to prevail upon Mesengui to expunge from his works such passages as reflected upon the religious controversies of his day; but Mesengui evidently turned a deaf ear to the duke's entreaties. A new edition of the last work, issued in Italy, was placed in the *Index Expurgatorius* by an apostolic brief from pope Clement XIII in 1761. In a posthumous *Memoire*, addressed to the cardinal Passionei, Mesengui attempted to justify his religious views. Among his other works may be mentioned, *La Constitution Unigenitus, avec des Remarques* (Paris, 1746, 12mo): *Entretien de Theophile et d'Eugene sur la religion* (ibid. 1760, 12mo). Mesengui took. part with Vigier and Coffin in the liturgical writings which' M. de Vintimille, archbishop of Paris, disseminated in his diocese. See Legneux, *Memoire abrege sut la aie et les ouvrages de l'abb ie Mesengui* (Paris, 1763, 8vo). .

## Me'sha

### Picture for Mesha

the name of a place and of three men, differently written in the Heb.

**1.** (Hebrews *Mesha'*, *avme* probably of Arabic origin; Sept. *Μασση*, Vulg. *Messq.*) A place mentioned in describing the boundaries of that part of Arabia inhabited by the descendants of Joktan (<sup>(CHRB)</sup>Genesis 10:30), where it is stated that “their dwelling was from Mesha even unto Sephar, (and beyond even unto) a mount of the east.” In this passage it has been assumed by. many that “the mountain of the east” (*μδQhirhi*) is not put by apposition in conjunction with Sephar, but is some third locality to which the boundary extends, as Saadias interprets; and, if so, it is doubtless none other than the chain running across the middle of Arabia from the region of Mecca and Medina as far as the Persian Gulf, now called Nesjd,

the highlands (see Jomard, *Notice sur le pays de l'Arabie centale*, Paris, 1823). Sephar would then be the modern Sephr, the chief city of the district Shehr in the province of Hadramant. **SEE SEP HAR**. Bochart (*Phaleg*, 2:20) thinks that Mesha, from which the boundary extends, is the *Musa* or *Muza* (Μοῦσα, Ptol. 6:8; Μοῦζα, Arrian, *Peripl.*; *Muza*, Pliny, 6:23) spoken of as a maritime city on the western coast of Arabia, not far from Mocha, where *Muzaa* (Niebuhr, *Arabien*, p. 223; Janaen, *Hist. Jemance*, p. 286), or rather *Mausi* (Niebuhr, p. 224, 225; Mannert, *Geogr.* 6:1, p. 63), now stands. It was a town of note in classical times, but has since fallen into decay, if the modern *Musa* be the same place. The latter is situated in about 130 40' N. lat., 43° 20' E. long., and is near a mountain called the *Three Sisters*, or *Jebel Musa*, in the Admiralty Chart of the Red Sea, drawn from the surveys of captain Pullen, RN. But as neither of these Arabic names can well be compared with that of Mesha, it may be better (with J. D. Michaelis, *Spicileg.* ii, p. 214; *Suppl.* No. 1561) to understand *Mesene* or *Meisan*, situated among the mouths of the Tigris (in the Shat el-Arab) on the Persian Gulf— a place described by Philostogius (iii. 7; comp. Dion Cass. 68. 28.; Asseman. *Bibl. Orient.* 3:2, p. 430, 603; Abulfeda in *Tab. Iracce* ap. Michael. in *Spicil.* 1. c.; D'Anville, *l'Euphrate et le Tigre*, p. 135), the name perhaps signifying the river island, from its being enclosed by the branches of the Tigris, as often alluded to by the Greek geographers (see Steph. Byz. s.v. Orathra and Messene; Pliny, v. 27,31; Cellar. *Notit.* ii, p. 749; D'Anville, p. 130, 131). The sacred writer would thus in his description begin with the eastern limits of the Joktanidse, and end with the western and northern, Sephar being sought between them. "But it is very doubtful whether the island, which has been formed by the deposits of the river, was in existence in the days of Moses; and it is still more doubtful whether such a spot could at that early period have attained to any political or geographical notoriety. Besides, it is not likely that an accurate writer would describe a purely Arabian territory as commencing on the east side of the Tigris. The theory of Mr. Forster is much more probable than either of the preceding. He identifies Mesha with a mountain-range called *Zames* by Ptolemy (vi. 7), which commences near the Persian Gulf, and runs in a south-western direction nearly across the peninsula. It is an undoubted fact that the various Joktanitic tribes, or Beni-Kahtan, as they are called by Arab writers, are still found, and have been from the earliest period, in the wide region extending from Mount Zames to the Indian Ocean and Red Sea; and that this range separates them from the Ishmaelitish Arabs (Forster, *Geography of Arabia*, 1:95 sq.). Forster

further conjectures that the name Zames is radically identical with Mesha, the syllables being inverted, as is very common in Arabic words -thus Mesza= Mesha. The Zames range is now called by the general name of the 'Nejd Mountains,' and the country extending thence to the Indian Ocean on the east, and the Red Sea in the south, embraces the most fertile part of Arabia the classic Arabia Felix, now called Yemen (Ritter, *Erdkunde*, 12:708 sq.). The mountains of Nejd are famous for their pastures and for their horses, which are considered the best in — Arabia (Ritter, p. 918-1035; Fresnel, *Lettres sur la Geog. de l'Arabie*, in *Journ. Asiat.* vol. "The position of the early Joktanitic colonists is clearly made out from the traces they have left in the ethnology, language, and monuments of Southeri Arabia; and, without putting too precise a limitation upon the possible situation of Mesba and Sephar, we may suppose that these places must have fallen within the south-western quarter of the peninsula; including the modern Yemen on the west, and the districts of Oman, Mahreh, Shihr, etc., as far as Hadramaut, on the east. These general boundaries are strengthened by the identification of Sephar with the port of Zafari, or Dhafari; though the site of Sephar may possibly be hereafter connected with the old Himyeritic metropolis in the Yemen, but this would not materially alter the question. In Sephar we believe we have the eastern limit of the early settlers, whether its site be the sea-port or the inland city; and the correctness of this supposition appears from the Biblical record, in which the migration is apparently from west to east, from the probable course taken by the immigrants, and from the greater importance of the known western settlements of the Joktanites, or those of Yemen."

**2.** (Hebrews *Meysha'*, [vymēdeliverance; Sept. **Μαρισάς** v. r. **Μαρισά**, Vulg. *Mesa*.) The eldest son of Caleb or Chelubai (brother of Jerahmeel and son of Hezron), and the father (founder) of Ziph, of the tribe of Judah (<sup><1180></sup>1 Chronicles 2:42). BC. cir. 1618.

**3.** (Hebrews *Meysha'*, avymēretreat; Sept. **Μωσά** v. r. **Μισά**, Vulg. *Mosa*.) One of the sons of Shaharaim of the tribe of Benjamin, by the latter of his two wives, Baara or Hodesh (<sup><1180></sup>1 Chronicles 8:9). BC. cir. 1612.  
*SEE SHAHARAIM.*

**4.** (Hebrews *Meysha'*, [vymēdeliverance; Sept. **Μεσά** v. r. **Μωσά**, Vulg. *Mesa*.) A king of Moab, who possessed an immense number of flocks and herds (<sup><1180></sup>2 Kings 3:4). Probably the allegiance of Moab, with that of the tribes east of the Jordan, was transferred to the northern kingdom of Israel

upon the division of the monarchy, for there is no account of any subjugation of the country subsequent to the war of extermination with which it was visited by David, when Benaiah displayed his prowess (<sup><1023></sup>2 Samuel 23:20), and “the Moabites became David’s servants, bearers of gifts” (<sup><1082></sup>2 Samuel 8:2). When Ahab had fallen in battle at Ramoth Gilead, Mesha seized the opportunity afforded by the confusion consequent upon this disaster, and the feeble reign of Ahaziah, to shake off the yoke of Israel, and free himself from the burdensome tribute of a “hundred thousand lambs and a hundred thousand rams with their wool.” These numbers may seem exaggerated if understood as the amount of yearly tribute. It is therefore more probable that the greedy and implacable Ahab had at some one time levied this enormous impost upon the Moabites; and it is likely that it was the apprehension of a recurrence of such ruinous exactions which incited the revolt (<sup><1200></sup>2 Kings 1:1; 3:5). The country east of the Jordan was rich in pasture for cattle (<sup><0221></sup>Numbers 22:1), the chief wealth of the Moabites consisted in their large flocks of sheep, and the king of this pastoral ‘people is described as *noked* (<sup><0400></sup>דקנ), “a sheepmaster,” or owner of herds. About the signification of this word *noked* there is not much doubt, but its origin is obscure. It occurs but once besides in <sup><1001></sup>Amos 1:1, where the prophet Amos is described as “among the herdmens (<sup><0400></sup>קדני, *nokedim*) of Tekoah.” On this Kim-chi remarks that a herdsman was called *noked*, because most cattle have black or white spots (comp. <sup><0400></sup>דקנ; *nakod*, <sup><0182></sup>Genesis 30:32, AV. “speckled”), or, as Buxtorf explains it, because sheep are generally marked with certain signs so as to be known. But it is highly improbable that any such etymology should be correct, and Furst’s conjecture that it is derived from an obsolete root, signifying to keep or feed cattle, is more likely to be true (*Concord.* s.v.).  
**SEE HERD.**

When, upon the death of Ahaziah, his brother Jehoram succeeded to the throne of Israel, one of his first acts was to secure the assistance of Jehoshaphat, his father’s ally, in reducing the Moabites to their former condition of tributaries, The united armies of the two kings marched by a circuitous route round the Dead’ Sea, and were joined by the forces of the king of Edom. **SEE JEHORAM.** The disordered soldier of Moab, eager only for spoil, were surprised by the warriors of Israel and their allies, and became an easy prey. In the panic which ensued they were slaughtered without mercy, their country was made a desert, and the king took refuge in his last stronghold and defended himself with the energy of despair. With

700 fighting men he made a vigorous attempt to cut his way through the beleaguering army, and, when beaten back, he withdrew to the wall of his city, and there, in sight of the allied host, offered his first-born son, his successor in the kingdom, as a burnt-offering to Chemosh, the ruthless fire-god of Moab. There appears to be no reason for supposing that the son of the king of Edom was the victim on this occasion, whether, as R. Joseph Kimchi supposed, he was already in the power of the king of Moab, and was the cause of the Edomites joining the armies of Israel and Judah; or whether, as R. Moses Kimchi suggested, he was taken prisoner in the sally of the Moabites, and sacrificed out of revenge for its failure. These conjectures appear to have arisen from an attempt to find in this incident the event to which allusion is made. in <sup><III></sup>Amos 2:1, where, the Moabite is charged with burning the bones of the king of Edom into lime. It is more natural, and renders the narrative more vivid and consistent, to suppose that the king of Moab, finding his last resource fail him, endeavored to avert the wrath and obtain the aid of his god by the most costly sacrifice in his power. On beholding this fearful sight, the besiegers withdrew in horror, lest some portion of the monstrous crime might attach to their own souls (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 9:3, 2; Ewald, *Isr. Gesch.* iii., 226 sq.). By this withdrawal they, however, afforded the king the relief he desired, and this was, no doubt, attributed by him to the efficacy' of his offering, anti to the satisfaction of his god therewith. The invaders, however, ravaged the country as they withdrew. and returned with much spoil to their own land (<sup><III></sup>2 Kings 3:25-27). BC. cir. 891. **SEE MOABITE.**

The exploits of "Mesha, son [i.e. votary] of Chemosh, king of Moab," are recorded in the Phoenician inscription lately discovered by M. Ganneau on a block of black basalt at Dibon in Moab (see *Quarterly Statement*, No. 5, of "The Palestine Exploration Fund," Lond. 1870); which, according to the decipherment given by him in the *Revue Archeologique* (Jan. and June, 1870), is as below (see the *Wesleyan Magazine*, April, 1870). Prof. Neubauer has published the text in modern Hebrew characters in Gratz's *Monatschrift*, and Prof. J. Derenbourg a translation in the *Revue Israelite* (April 8, 1870), substantially as below. See also the *Church Gazette*, N. Y. 1871, No. 6. Several other commentaries have been published upon it, especially by Dr. Deutsch of the British Museum. See also Noldeke, *Inschrift des Mesa* (Kiel, 1870); Schlottman, *Siegessaule Mesa's* (Halle, 1870); De Costa, *The Moabite Stone* (NY. 1871). The fullest exhibit,

together with the literature of the subject, is that of Dr. Ginsburg (2d ed. Lond. 1871).

1. I, Mesha, son of Chemosh,. King of Moab, [son]
2. of Yabni My father reigned over Moab (thirty years), and I reigned
3. after him; I made this altar for Chemosh at Karhah on account
4. of the assistance he gave me in all battles, and because he made me successful against my enemies the men
5. of the King of Israel, who oppressed Moab a long time, for Chemosh was angry against
6. his land. His son succeeded him, and he also said, I will oppress Moab. In my days he (Chemosh) said, [I will go]
7. and appear (be favorable) to Moab and his temple; then Israel wasted continually. Omri took [the plain of]
8. Mahdeba and dwelt in it built forty [and dwelt].
9. Chemosh. there in my days. I built Baal-Meon and made (sacrifices) there and I [built]
10. Kiryathan. The men of Gad [dwelt] in [this] land from early times, and there built the King
11. of Israel [Yazer]; I besieged the city, took it, and killed all [who dwelt]
12. in the city, to the gratification of Chemosh and Moab; I made captive there...
13. [and brought] it to Chemosh at Keriyoth. I remained here with the chiefs and [the soldiers until]
14. the next day. Then Chemosh bade me go and take Nebo from Israel. I arose and]
15. went in the night and fought against it from the break of day till noon: I
16. took it, killed all, seven thousand.. [to please Astor].

17. for Chemosh devoted to Astor:.. I took from there all
18. the vessels of Jehovah, and Cofferred] them to Chemosh. And the King of Israel built
19. Yahaz, and dwelt there, when I made war upon him. Chemosh drove him out from thence; I ..
20. took from Moab two hundred men, all chiefs, transferred them to Yahaz, and began
21. to make war against Dibon. I built Kirhah, Hamath-ha-Yearim, and Hamath.
22. I constructed their gates and their towers I
23. built the palace, and I made aqueducts' (?) in the interior
24. of the town. There were no cisterns in the interior of the town of Kirhah, and I said to all the people, Make,
25. every one a cistern in his house. And I made a ditch round Kirhah with [the men]
26. of Israel. I built (Aro)ir, and I made the passage over the Arnon.
27. I built Beth-Bamoth, which had been overthrown, and Bezer, which had been destroyed.
28. I fortified Dibon to hold it in subjection, and I constructed
29. fortresses in the towns which I added to [my] land. I built
30. Beth-Diblathan, Beth-Ball-Meon, and transported thither [Moabites]
31. [in order to take possession of] the land. AtHoronan dwelt [the children of Reuben] ..
32. Chernosh told me, Go, fight against Horonan [I fought against it and took it],
33. [and there dwelt] Chemosh in my days.
- 34.

## Me'shach

(Hebrews or Chald. *Meyshak'*, *Ἐβμϛ* of foreign etymology; Sept. *Μισάκ* v. r. *Μισάχ*, Vulg. *Misach*), the title given by the Babylonian court to MICHAEL *SEE MICHAEL* (q.v.), one of the Hebrew youths in training for the rank of magi (<sup><2007></sup>Daniel 1:7; 2:49; 3:12-30). “Gesenius resolves the name into the Persic *miz-shah*, ‘the guest of the shah’ (*Thesaur. sav.*); Hitzig (*Exeget. Hdb. ad loc.*) and Fiirst (*Heb.-Lex. s.v.*) refer it to the Sanscrit *Meshah*. ‘a ram,’ and regard it as a name of the sun-god. The changing of the names of persons taken into a family as servants or slaves was common in ancient times among both the Orientals and the Greeks (Jahn, *Archaol. pt. i, vol. ii, p. 280*: Theodoret on <sup><2007></sup>Daniel 1:7: Chrysostom, *Opp. v. 286*; Haivernick, *Comm. ib. Daniel p. 30*)” (Kitto). “That Meshach was the name of some god of the Chaldaeans is extremely probable. from the fact that Daniel, who had the name of Belteshazzar, was so called after the god of Nebuchadnezzar (<sup><2048></sup>Daniel 4:8), and that Abednego was named after Nego, or Nebo, the Chaldeean name for the planet Mercury.’ *SEE DANIEL*.

## Me'shech

(Hebrews *Me'shek*, *Ἐβμ*, a *drawing out*, as in <sup><8016></sup>Psalms 136:6; or *possession*, as in <sup><8388></sup>Job 28:18; Sept. *Μοσόχ*, Vulg. *Mosoch*; a pronunciation which the Samaritan codex also exhibits, *Ἐ/ν/μ*; but in <sup><2682></sup>Ezekiel 38:2, 3; 39:1, Sept. v. r. *Μοσόκ* and *Μεσόχ*; in <sup><2701></sup>Ezekiel 27:1, *τὰ παρατείνοντα*; in <sup><8016></sup>Psalms 120:5, Sept. *ἔμακρύνθη*, Vulg. *polongatus est*, AuthVers. “Mesech”), the sixth son of Japheth, BC. cir. 2500 (<sup><0102></sup>Genesis 10:2), and founder of a tribe mentioned among his descendants (<sup><1306></sup>1 Chronicles 1:5), and later (<sup><2713></sup>Ezekiel 27:13) as engaged in traffic with Tyre, in connection with Gog (<sup><2682></sup>Ezekiel 38:2,3; 39:1). In nearly every instance they are coupled with Tubal or the Tibareni as neighbors (<sup><0102></sup>Genesis 10:2; <sup><2713></sup>Ezekiel 27:13; 32:26; 38:2,3; 39:1: so also Herodotus, 3:94; 7:78; comp. Hengstenberg, *Moses*, p. 206; Wilkinson, i., 378 sq.); and from one passage at least (<sup><2726></sup>Ezekiel 32:26) they appear to have lived near Assyria and Elymais. They are without doubt the same with the *Moschi* (Bochart, *Phaleg*, 3:12), a barbarous people of Asia, inhabiting what were known as the Moschian Mountains (Ptol. v. 6,1; 13, 5), between the Black and Caspian seas (Strabo, 11:344, 378, 498 sq. i Pliny, 6:11), in the later Iberia (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 1:6,1), who are named by



ancient authors as forming a single department of the Persian empire under a separate jurisdiction with the Tibarenians (Herod. 3:94; 7:78). In confirmation of the trade alluded to in <sup><2713></sup>Ezekiel 27:13, Reineggs remarks (*Beschreib. des Caucas.* 1:6; 2:61) that the Moschian Mountains contain rich copper-mines, and this region has always been noted for the export of slaves, especially females, whose beauty usually commands a ready market for the Turkish harems (see Rosenmiller, *Alterth.* I, 1:248 sq.). In <sup><3015></sup>Psalm 120:5, the name occurs in connection with Kedar as a synonyme for foreigners or barbarians (Michaelis, *Suppl.* p. 1569), like the modern phrase “Turks and Hottentots.” — Winer, 2:86. The same name. but in a plural form, appears. according to some, in <sup><2769></sup>Isaiah 66:19 (<sup><2769></sup>tvq,ykēh, Sept. <sup><2769></sup>Μοσόχ, Vulg. *tendentes sagittam*, Auth. Vers. “that draw the bow”), but it there is rather an appellation of the archers (comp. <sup><2440></sup>Jeremiah 46:9); also, but with still less probability, in Jeremiah v. 8 (<sup><2440></sup>μyKαēh, Sept. <sup><2440></sup>θηλυμανίς, Vulg. *emissarii*, Auth. Vers. “fed”). “The Colchian tribes, the Chalybes more especially, were skilled in working metals, and hence arose the trade in the ‘vessels of brass’ with Tyre; nor is it at all improbable that slaves were largely exported thence as now from the neighboring district of Georgia. Although the Moschi were a comparatively unimportant race in classical times, they had previously been one of the most powerful nations of Western Asia. The Assyrian monarchs were engaged in frequent wars with them, and it is not improbable that they had occupied the whole of the district afterwards named Cappadocia. In the Assyrian inscriptions the name ‘appears under the form of *Muskai*: a somewhat similar name, *Mashoash*, appears in an Egyptian inscription which commemorates the achievements of the third Rameses (Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* 1:398, Abridg.). The subsequent history of Meshech is unknown; Knobel’s attempt to connect them with the Ligurians (*Volkertaf.* p. 119, etc.) is devoid of all solid ground.” “The names of the Moschians and Tybarenians are also joined frequently on the Assyrian inscriptions (Rawlinson’s *Herodotus*, 1:651; comp. Pliny, 6:4). The primitive seat of the Moschi appears to have been among the Caucasus Mountains, on the south-eastern shores of the Black Sea, immediately north of Armenia (Strabo, xi, p. 498 sq.); and, according to Strabo, a part of the great chain or group of mountains took their name (xi, p. 521). The Moschi were, however, a wild and warlike race, and extended their depredations and conquests far beyond the confines of their native hills. Cappadocia appears to have been, at least in part, occupied by them (Josephus, *Ant.* 1:6, 1), and probably from them its capital city took its name *Mazaka* (Strabo, xii, p. 538; Rawlinson’s

*Herodotus*, 4:222). In the time of the Hebrew prophets their power was felt even in Syria and Egypt in conjunction with their Scythic allies, Gog and Magog, under whose command they had, apparently placed themselves. It is interesting to observe how Ezekiel's description of their equipments bucklers, small shields (<sup>ⲁⲓⲙ</sup>), and swords' (<sup>ⲁⲓⲟⲩ</sup> Ezekiel 38:1-5)- corresponds with that of Herodotus (vii. 78). During the ascendancy of the Babylonians and Persians in Western Asia the Moschi were subdued; but it seems probable that a large number of them crossed the Caucasus range and spread over the northern steppes, mingling with the Scythians. There they became known as *Muskovs*, and gave that name to the Russian nation, and its ancient capital, by which they are still universally known throughout the East (Rawlinson's *Herod.* 4:222).” **SEE ETHNOLOGY.** :

### Meshed-Ali And- Meshed-Hossein

is the name of a Mohammedan cemetery situated near the ruins of Babylon, which is one of the most celebrated places of pilgrimage of the Shiites. Many thousands of corpses are brought thither during the year for interment from all parts of the East.

### Meshelemi'ah

(He>. *Meshelemyah'*, <sup>ⲏⲙⲓ</sup> <sup>ⲛⲙⲓ</sup> friendship of Jehovah, <sup>ⲁⲓⲟⲩ</sup> 1 Chronicles 9:21; Sept. **Μοσολλάμι** v. r. **Μοσολλάμί**, Vulg. *Mosollamia*.; also, in the prolonged form, *Meshelemya'hu*, <sup>ⲏⲙⲓ</sup> <sup>ⲛⲙⲓ</sup> <sup>ⲁⲓⲟⲩ</sup> 1 Chronicles 26:1; **Μοσολλάμι** v. r. **Μοσελλεμία**; ver. 2, **Μασελλαμία** v. r. **Μοσελλαμία**.; ver. 9, **Μεσολλεμία** v. r. **Μοσελλεμία** ; Vulg. *Mesellemia*), a Levite of the Korhite branch, who, with his seven sons and ten other relatives, was appointed by David warden of the east gate of the Temple; called SHELEMIAH in <sup>ⲁⲓⲟⲩ</sup> 1 Chronicles 26:14; and apparently also SHALLUM in <sup>ⲁⲓⲟⲩ</sup> 1 Chronicles 9:19. BC. 1014. “As we learn from ver. 9 that he had eighteen strong men of his' sons and brethren under him, we may conclude that all his-sons except Zechariah the first-born (ver. 14) served with him, and therefore Elioenai likewise. There were six-Levites daily on guard at the east gate, whose turn would therefore come every third day.”

### Meshez'abeel

(Hebrews *Mesheyzabel'*, <sup>ⲓ</sup> <sup>ⲁⲃⲏⲛⲁⲓ</sup> whose deliverer is God; Sept. **Μαζαβήλ**, **Μεσωζεβήλ**, and **Βασηζά** v.r. **Μασεζειήλ**; Vulg. *Mesezebel*

and *Mesizebel*), one of the chief Israelites that subscribed the sacred covenant after the captivity, BC. cir. 410 (<sup><4612></sup>Nehemiah 10:21); apparently the same with the father of Pethahiah the Zerahite of Judah, which latter had previously (BC. cir. 440) assisted in the administration of civil affairs (<sup><4612></sup>Nehemiah 11:24); and perhaps the same with the father of Berechiah and grandfather of Meshullam, which last had (BC. 446) assisted in repairing the walls of Jerusalem (<sup><4610></sup>Nehemiah 3:4).

## Meshi

*SEE SILK.*

## Meshi'lemith

(<sup><1392></sup>1 Chronicles 9:12). *SEE MESHILLEMOTH.*

## Meshil'lemoth

(Hebrews *Meshillemoth'*, **twm/Lwæ]** *requitals*; Vulg. *Mosollamoth*), the name of two men.

**1.** (Sept. **Μοσολλαμώθ** v. r. **Μοσολαμώθ**.) The father of the chief Ephraimite Berechiah, which latter was one of those who opposed the reduction of their captive brethren of Judah to slavery (<sup><4612></sup>2 Chronicles 28:12). BC. ante 738.

**2.** (Sept. **Μεσαριμίθ**.) A priest, son of Immer and father of. Ahasai (<sup><4613></sup>Nehemiah 11:13); doubtless the same with the priest MESHILLEMITH '(Hebrews *Meshillenith'*, **tymæswæ]** *retribution*; Sept. **Μοσολλαμώθ** v. r. **Μασελμώθ**, Vulg. *Mosollamith*), the son of Immer and father of Meshullam'(<sup><1392></sup>1 Chronicles 9:12). BC. long ante 440.

## Mesho'bab

(Hebrews *Meshobab'*, **bb/vm]** *returned*; Sept. **Μεσωβάβ**), one of the chief Simeonites, whose enlarged family induced him to migrate to Gedor in the time of Hezekiah (<sup><1393></sup>1 Chronicles 4:34). BC. cir. 711.

## Meshul'lam

(Hebrews *Meshullam'*, **μLvw]** *befriended*; Sept. usually **Μοσολλάμ**), the name of several persons in the later periods of Jewish history.

- 1.** One of the chief Gadites resident in Bashan in the time of Jotham's viceroyship (<sup><1351></sup>1 Chronicles 5:13). B. C. 781.
- 2.** The father of Azaliah and grandfather of Shaphan, which last was the scribe sent by Josiah to direct the contributions for repairing the Temple (<sup><1223></sup>2 Kings 22:3). BC. considerably ante 623.
- 3.** A priest, son of Zadok and father of Hilkiah (<sup><1391></sup>1 Chronicles 9:11; <sup><1611></sup>Nehemiah 11:11). Probably the same as SHALLUM (q.v.), the high-priest (<sup><1363></sup>1 Chronicles 6:13; <sup><1501></sup>Ezra 7:1).
- 4.** A Levite of the family of Kohath, one of the overseers of the Temple repairs undertaken by Josiah (<sup><1442></sup>2 Chronicles 34:12). BC. 623.
- 5.** One of the chief Benjamites of the family of Elpaal resident at Jerusalem (<sup><1387></sup>1 Chronicles 8:17). BC. ante 589. He is perhaps the-Benjamite (son of Hodaviah, and grandson of Hasenuah) whose son (or descendant) Sallu resided at Jerusalem after the captivity (<sup><1397></sup>1 Chronicles 9:7); but this person seems elsewhere to be called the son of Joed (<sup><1610></sup>Nehemiah 11:7).
- 6.** The eldest of the children of Zerubbabel (<sup><1389></sup>1 Chronicles 3:19). BC. cir. 536.
- 7.** A chief priest, son of Ezra, contemporary with Joiakim (<sup><1623></sup>Nehemiah 12:13). BC. post 536.
- 8.** A chief priest, son of Ginnethon, contemporary with Joiakim (<sup><1626></sup>Nehemiah 12:16). BC. post 536.
- 9.** One of the leading Israelites sent for by Ezra to accompany his party to Jerusalem (<sup><1386></sup>Ezra 8:16). BC. 459. He appears to be the same with one of those who assisted in the investigation concerning the foreign marriages of those who had returned (<sup><1505></sup>Ezra 10:15). He was perhaps the same with one of the Temple wardens, as afterwards arranged (<sup><1625></sup>Nehemiah 12:25). BC. cir. 440. This last is also called MESHELEMIAM (<sup><1391></sup>1 Chronicles 26:1), SHELEMIAM (<sup><1334></sup>1 Chronicles 26:14), and SHALLUM (<sup><1625></sup>Nehemiah 7:45). -; ;'
- 10.** An Israelite, of the "sons" "(or residents) of Bani, who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (<sup><1509></sup>Ezra 10:29). BC. 459.
- 11.** A priest, son of Meshillemith and father of Jahzerah (<sup><1392></sup>1 Chronicles 9:12; comp. <sup><1613></sup>Nehemiah 11:13). BC. long ante 440.

- 12.** The son of Berechiah and grandson of Meshezabeel; he repaired two portions of the walls of Jerusalem after the captivity (<sup><4684></sup>Nehemiah 3:4, 30). BC. 446. It was his daughter that Tobiah's son Johanan married (<sup><4668></sup>Nehemiah 6:18).
- 13.** The son of Besodeiah, who, in connection with Jehoiada, repaired the "old gate" of Jerusalem after the exile (<sup><4686></sup>Nehemiah 3:6). BC. 446.
- 14.** One of the Jewish leaders who made the tour of the walls of Jerusalem on their completion after the captivity (<sup><4623></sup>Nehemiah 12:33). BC. 446.
- 15.** A chief Benjamite (son of Shephathiah), who dwelt at Jerusalem after the captivity (<sup><1308></sup>1 Chronicles 9:8). BC. cir. 440.
- 16.** One of the principal Israelites who supported Ezra on the left while expounding the law to the people (<sup><4684></sup>Nehemiah 8:4). BC. cir. 410. He may have been identical with No. 9, 12, 13, 14, or 15. He is probably the same with one of those who subscribed the sacred covenant on the same occasion (<sup><4600></sup>Nehemiah 10:20).
- 17.** One of the priests who joined in Nehemiah's solemn bond of allegiance to Jehovah (<sup><4607></sup>Nehemiah 10:7). BC. cir. 410. He is perhaps the same with either. No. 6 or No.7.

## Meshul'lemeth

(Hebrews *Meshulle'meth*, מֶשׁוּלֶמֶת] *friend*; Sept. Μεσολλάμ, Vulg. *Messalemeth* the daughter of Haruz of Jotbah; she was the mother of king Amon, and consequently the wife of Manasseh, whom she appears to have survived (<sup><2219></sup>2 Kings 21:19). Her character may be inferred from the idolatry of her son as well as of her husband. BC. 664-642.

## Mesitys

(μεσίτης, i.e. *mediator*) was the name given to a presbyter while engaged in discharging the functions of the Eucharist. This was considered by the ancient Church as the highest point of a presbyter's dignity and office. The appellation was very properly censured by Augustine as derogating from the dignity and office of the true and only Mediator of the Christian covenant (*Contr. Parmen.* lib. ii, c. 8; comp. *De Civ. Dei*, lib. ix, c. 15). This word also denoted the middle rank occupied by the presbyter

between the bishop and deacon. See Riddle, *Christian Antiquities* (see Index).

## Mesmer, Franz

(according to others, FRIEDRICH ANTON), the founder of the doctrine of animal magnetism, or, as it is more generally' termed, mesmerism, was born at a village near the Bodensee May 23, 1733. He studied mathematics and natural science at the Jesuit school in Dillingen, and, later, medicine at the University of Vienna, and there took the degree of doctor of medicine in 1766. About 1772 he commenced, assisted by father Hell, to investigate the curative powers of the magnet, and was led to adopt the opinion that there exists a power similar to magnetism, which exercises an extraordinary influence. on the human body. This he called *animal magnetism*, and published an account of his discovery, and of its medicinal value, in 1775: *Precis historique et faits relatifs au magnetisme animal*; and in 1776, in his thesis, *On the Influence of the Planets on the Human Body*. Honors were conferred upon him in Germany. In 1778 he went to Paris, where he attracted much attention. His system obtained the support of members of the medical profession, as well as of others; but he refused two offers, one of 30,000 livres, and the other of 340,000 livres, to reveal his secret; and this, combined with other circumstances, gave rise to suspicion, and induced the French government to appoint a commission, composed of physicians and naturalists, among them Bailly, our own Franklin, and Lavoisier, whose report was unfavorable to him. He now fell into disrepute, and after a visit to England, retired- to Meersburg, near his native place, where he spent the rest of his life in complete obscurity. He died March 5, 1815. *SEE MESMERISM.*

## Mesmerism

Under this heading we propose to consider the various phenomena which have at different times been presented for public consideration under the names of *Mesmerism*, *Animal Magnetism*, *Magnetic Somnambulism*, *Clairvoyance*, etc., etc. The nature of this *Cyclopaedia* of course limits us in the consideration of this subject from a theological stand-point.

Animal magnetism is a supposed influence or emanation by means of which one person can act upon another, producing wonderful effects upon his body, and controlling his actions and thoughts. It was fancied to have some analogy to the magnetism of the loadstone, and hence its name. The term

has been used to group together a multitude of manifestations deemed to be of a wonderful kind, which have given rise to an amount of delusion and credulity hardly exemplified on any other subject. Electro-biology, odyism, table-turning, spirit-rapping, table-talking, spiritism, have been classed as only modifications of the same phenomena. For the sake of securing a thorough review of the various phenomena: which mesmerism, so called, or better, animal magnetism, has been conceived to produce in those who were brought under its influence, we divide the subject into two classes: cases which are effected while the person operated upon remains awake, and those which take place while the patient is in a state of sleep, or in a state resembling it. These two classes of phenomena, moreover, belong to different periods of the history of mesmerism. To those of the first class chiefly the early practitioners of this mysterious art confined their pretensions, and it was only at a later period that the magnetizers laid claim to the power of producing those wonderful manifestations included under the second class.

*Mesmerism Proper.*-Anthony Mesmer, whose personal history we have detailed above, is supposed to be the first in modern times who claimed to have discovered the process of healing physical derangements by the application of animal magnetism, as already defined. Many were the cures pretended to be wrought by Mesmer and his disciples, until he was suddenly checked in his auspicious career by the unfavorable report of the committee which the French government appointed in 1785. "This pretended agent," said they, "is not magnetism; 'for on examining the grand reservoir of the fluid by a needle and electrometer, neither magnetism nor electricity could be detected. We tried it upon ourselves and others without effect. On blindfolding those who professed great susceptibility of its influence, all its ordinary effects were produced when nothing was done, but they imagined they were magnetized; while none of its effects were produced when they were really magnetized, but imagined nothing was done. So also when brought under a magnetized tree; nothing happened if they thought they were at a distance from it, while they immediately went into violent convulsions when they thought they were near the tree, though really not so. The effects, therefore," say the commissioners, "are purely imaginary; and although they have wrought some cures, they are not without evil results, for the convulsions sometimes spread among the feeble of mind and body, and especially among women. And, finally, there-are parts of the operations which may

readily be turned to vicious purposes, and in fact immoral: practices have already actually grown out of them.”

*Mesmerism Modified.* — But even long before the supposed discovery of Mesmer had been subjected to the test of scientific investigation, mesmerism had entered on a new phase, and assumed a form differing widely in many respects from that which it obtained from the hands of its author. We allude to what is scientifically termed *Magnetic Somnambulism*, and which was first brought before the public for consideration by one of Mesmer’s pupils, the marquis de Puysegur. In the hands of Mesmer animal magnetism was simply a curative agent; in the hands of Puysegur, however, we find it not only to be a curative means, but to confer the power of detecting the morbid condition of parts, both in the person operated on and in others, and the instinctive knowledge of the remedies required to effect a cure. With this important advance, the mesmeric system was after this time advocated by Mesmer himself, and hence the mistake on the part of some that Mesmer was acquainted with the phenomena of somnambulism and had discoursed upon them from the very first during his stay in Paris. But whether De Puysegur. or Mesmer be the discoverer of magnetic somnambulism, certain it is that if this discovery had not been made, animal magnetism would have found its resting-place in the grave of Mesmer. Remodelled by this valuable addition, new life was infused into the expiring system; “a life so vigorous, indeed, that it has been sufficient to keep it alive till the present time.”

The art of inducing the magnetic state, as practiced by its discoverer, Mesmer, involved the use of apparatus the *baquet*, or magnetic tub, iron rods, etc.; but the means which De Puysegur first used, and which became the more common, are *passes* made by the hands of the magnetizer from the head of the “subject” or patient downward, or simply making him fix his eyes on the operator. “Ordinarily,” we are told, “the magnetizer and the patient are seated opposite to each other; the former, with each hand, lays hold of the opposite hand of the latter, with the balls of the thumbs resting against each other. Thus they sit for five or ten minutes, or until the influence begins to be felt. The magnetizer then withdraws his hands, and makes slow passes with open hands and outspread fingers over the patient from the head to the foot, turning the hands away while moving them upward, and while making the downward passes keeping the points of the fingers within an inch or two of the patient’s clothing. After making a dozen or two of such passes, the magnetizer resumes his former position.



During the whole of this process he keeps his attention on the patient, and exercises his will in silent commands that he shall become somnambolic. The patient should be still, quiet, and resigned. Some persons can be mesmerized within a few minutes; others can not be affected by trials of an hour daily for weeks; but after the experiment has once succeeded, it can be more easily repeated. The patient becomes more susceptible, and the magnetizer more powerful, by every successful trial. The patient who could not, at first, be thrown into the mesmeric sleep in less than an hour of constant contact with the operator, may at last be magnetized in a few minutes or seconds, without contact, by the mere outstretched hand, glance, or even will of the mesmerist." According to the mesmeric theory, the nervous energy of the operator has overpowered that of the subject, as a powerful magnet does a weak one, and the two are in *rapport*, as it is termed. In some cases the mesmeric trance assumes the form of *clairvoyance*.

The various stages of the magnetic influence mesmerizers distinguish as six different classes. "The first stage is that of waking magnetization. The patient feels a singular influence pervading his body, frequently a pricking, somewhat like that felt in a limb asleep. Sometimes there is an increase of temperature and sweat. The second stage is that of drowsiness. The pulse becomes fuller, the breathing slower; there is a feeling as though warmth were radiating from the stomach; there is a heavy pressure on the eyelids, which close against the will of the patient, and he is unable to open them; but still he retains his normal consciousness and sensation. The third stage is that of coma, or senseless sleep, wherein he is insensible to the loudest noises, and all the nerves of sensation are as if benumbed. The fourth stage is that of magnetic somnambulism. The patient awakes from the third stage into a new sphere of existence, and as another person. He has consciousness and sensation, but they differ greatly from those of his normal condition. He hears only the voice of his magnetizer, or of some person in contact with him. The magnetizer can make his muscles rigid in almost any position, and has the power of governing his physical motions. His own senses of touch, taste, and smell appear to be dormant, but he perceives all the impressions produced on those senses in the magnetizer's frame. The fifth stage is that of clairvoyance. This is a heightened condition of the fourth stage. The patient has means of perception unknown to man in his normal state, and so singular that the assertion of their possession, measured by the general experience of the race, appears to be an impudent

falsehood or imposture. The somnambulist can see with his eyes closed and bandaged; he can then even see what waking men in his place can not see with their eyes open. He can read the contents of letters unopened; he can see through clothing, wood and metal boxes, and walls of brick or stone; he can tell what is going on in the room above him or in the room below. Sometimes the sense of sight, or a faculty capable of perceiving things which the normal man perceives only by means of the organ of vision, seems to reside in the forehead, in the back-head, in the fingers, or in the knuckles of the hand. Thus the clairvoyant will sometimes move about holding his fist in front of him for the purpose of seeing where he is going. How this means of perception can exist apart from the organs of vision, why it exists in one part of the body more than another, and why one should have it in the hand, another in the forehead, and a third in the back-head, are questions very proper to be asked, but to which there is no satisfactory answer.. The clairvoyant not only sees things outside of his body, but even in it. His whole physical frame is transparent to him; he looks through and sees all the functions of life as though they were going on in a glass case. He can see through the bodies of others placed in magnetic connection with him in the same way. Frequently he will describe, with the accuracy of high anatomical, physiological, and pathological knowledge, the operations of healthy and diseased organs; and will even prescribe remedies for disease.” While in this state the functions of the body are liable to be much affected the pulsations of the heart and the respirations are quickened or retarded, and the secretions altered, and that chiefly at the will of the operator. At his direction the limbs are made rigid, or become endowed with unnatural strength; one liquid tastes as any other, and is hot or cold, sweet or bitter, as the subject is told; in short, *every thought, sensation, and movement of the subject obeys the behest of the mesmerizer*, if we may take the word of mesmerists for the subject’s experience. The sixth and last stage finally, the mesmerists claim to be that of “perfect clairvoyance,” and a far more exalted position than the fifth. “The perfect clairvoyant,” we are told, “sees what is going on at a distance of hundreds of miles. reads the thoughts of all persons about him, reads the past, and can truly foretell the future. His soul dwells in light and delight; he often regrets that he cannot continue in that state forever; he shudders at the necessity of being brought down into the dull, tiresome, base world of normal life.” Between these different stages of the mesmeric condition, as here described, no precise line can be drawn. The transition from one stage to the other is gradual, and generally imperceptible at the time. Thus

many of the characteristics of the clairvoyant stage belong also to the somnambulant stage, in which they are, indeed, most frequently observed.

These are the phenomena alleged by mesmerists. To say that they are not true statements, or to decide which only are true, if any there be that are false, does not lie within our domain as encyclopedists, but it may be well enough to state here that physiologists, physicians, and savans are pretty well agreed that the notion of a force of any kind whatever proceeding in such cases from a person, or from a magnetizing apparatus, is a *delusion*. The effects, whatever they are, must have their cause somewhere else. Where it is to be looked for—was already indicated in the earliest days of mesmerism by the committee appointed by the French government, who closed their report by saying, “*the effects actually produced were produced purely by the imagination.*” This part of the science of human nature the reflex action of the mental upon the physical—had not then, however, been sufficiently studied, and is not now widely enough known to render the conclusion of the reporters a satisfactory explanation of the phenomena; and the fallacies of mesmerism, though subjected to many similar exposures (Dr. Falkoner, of Bath, e.g., annihilated the patent metallic tractors of Perkin by making wooden ones exactly like them, which produced exactly the same effects), have constantly revived in some shape or other. One chief cause of the inveteracy of the delusion is that the opponents of mesmerism do not distinguish between denying the theory of the mesmerists and the facts which that theory pretends to explain, and have been too ready to ascribe the whole to delusion and fraud. It thus happens that the most sceptical often become all of a sudden the most credulous. Finding that things do actually happen which they cannot explain, and had been accustomed to denounce as impostures, they rush to the other extreme, and embrace not only the facts but the theory, and call this, too, believing the evidence of their senses. Now the reality of the greater part of the manifestations appealed to by the mesmerist must be admitted, though we deny his explanation of them; and even where their reality must be denied, it does not follow that the mesmerist is not sincere in believing them; there is only greater room than in any other case for suspecting that he has deceived himself.

The first to give a really scientific direction to the investigation of appearances of this class was Mr. Braid, a surgeon in Manchester, who detaches them altogether from the semblance of power exerted by one individual over another, or by metallic disks or magnets, and traces the

whole to the brain of the subject, acted on by *suggestion*, a principle long known to psychologists, though never yet made so prominent as it ought to be. The subject has been ably handled in a paper in the *Quarterly Review* for September, 1853 (said to be by Dr. Carpenter). The reviewer traces the operation of this principle through the most ordinary actions, which no one thinks wonderful, up to the most miraculous of the so-called “spiritual” manifestations. Ideas become associated in our minds by habit or otherwise, and one being awakened brings on another, thus forming a train of thought; this is *internal* suggestion. But impressions from without originate and modify those trains, constituting *external* suggestion. While awake and in a normal condition, the *will* interferes with and directs these trains of thought, selecting some ideas to be dwelt upon, and comparing them with others and with present impressions. A comparative inactivity of this selecting and comparing faculty, leaving the flow of ideas to its spontaneous activity, produces the state of mind called *reverie* or *abstraction*. In dreaming and somnambulism, the will and judgment seem completely suspended; and under internal suggestions the mind becomes a mere automaton, while external suggestions, if they act at all, act as upon a machine. These are well-known facts of the human constitution, and independent of mesmerism, though their bearing upon it is obvious. Another fact of like bearing is the effect of concentrated attention on any object of thought in intensifying the impression received. This may proceed so far, in morbid states of the nervous system, that an idea or revived sensation assumes the vividness of a present impression, and overpowers the evidence of the senses. Ideas thus become dominant, overriding the impressions of the outer world, and carrying themselves out into action independently of the will, and even *without the consciousness* of the individual. These dominant-ideas play a greater part in human actions and beliefs than most are aware of. “Expectant attention” acts powerfully on the bodily organs, and often makes the individual see and hear what he expects to see and hear, and, without his consciousness, moves his muscles to bring it about. These, too, are recognised facts in the sciences of physiology and psychology. See Carpenter’s *Human Physiology* and Dr. Holland’s *Chapters on Mental Physiology*.

In the *Illustrations of Modern Mesmerism, from Personal Observation*, published by Dr. (the late Sir John) Forbes in 1845, we have, in small compass a complete exposure of- the pretended clairvoyant powers of some of the most notorious persons of this class. In the preface he states

that he only professes, by a simple narrative of facts, to illustrate the actual pretensions and performances of the mesmerists of the present day, and to show on what sandy foundations the popular belief in their marvels rests. He expresses the modest hope that what is contained in this little book may teach a useful lesson to those numerous unscientific persons who are accustomed to attend mesmeric exhibitions. public or private, from motives of rational curiosity, or with the commendable object of investigating what seem to be important truths. He believes that such persons must now feel convinced that no reliance whatever is to be placed on the results presented at such exhibitions as evincing the truth and powers of mesmerism. He found that it was impossible for the ordinary visitor at these exhibitions to discriminate the true from the false, and that the coarsest juggling might pass with the trusting spectator, seated at a distance from the scene of action, for mysterious and awful truths. Mesmerism or clairvoyance may be true or false, and he professes to be ready to believe them on obtaining sufficient proof of their reality. If, however, we find the most eminent, and apparently the most trustworthy of the clairvoyants, not only uniformly unsuccessful when the necessary precautions are taken to test their powers, but actually detected, and confessing with shame that they have been guilty of the grossest imposture and deceit where are we to look for the means of establishing the truths of this mysterious science? If we were to believe a fiftieth part of the pretensions put forth in the works and lectures of professional mesmerists, it would be the easiest matter in the world to carry off the prizes offered to any one who could read writing contained in an envelope so secured that it could not be read in the ordinary way. If it is an easy matter to see what is going on in the arctic regions, it cannot surely be difficult to see what is contained in a deal-box. In July, 1839, M. Bourdin, a member of the French academy of science and medicine, as one of a commission of that celebrated body, appointed to inquire into the merits of clairvoyance, made the following offer to the mesmerists: "Bring us a person magnetized or not magnetized, asleep or awake; let that person read with the eyes open, through an opaque substance, such as tissue of cotton, linen, or silk, placed at six inches from the face, or read even through a simple sheet of paper, and that person shall have 3000 francs." *No candidate appeared.* (*Bull. de 'Acad.* 3:1123.) If such a power as seeing in any other way than by the organ of vision really existed, as was vaunted to be possessed by so many persons both before the prize was offered and since, surely some one of the clairvoyants would have come forward and established a just claim to the prize, but, as none appeared, we

may conclude with safety that both then and now no such marvellous power exists or is developed in the human constitution.

So signal and repeated were the failures of the magnetists to establish the truth of their doctrines in France, that the whole subject seems to have fallen into merited contempt and oblivion. In more-recent times the exciting phenomena of spirit-rapping have superseded those of somnambulism, and spiritual media have of late too much occupied the public attention to leave any room for those who can boast no higher powers than those of which magnetic clairvoyants claim the possession.

Our limits do not permit us to pursue the subject at greater length. *SEE SPIRITISM*. We must content ourselves with stating briefly the following general conclusions advanced by the *Encyclopædia Britannica*:

1. That it has not been proved that there is any magnetic influence, or nervous fluid, which passes from the operator to the person operated on, and produces in him the various phenomena of magnetic somnambulism.
2. That it has been proved that all the phenomena recorded, which have received sufficient scientific scrutiny to convince men of their truth and reality, can be accounted for on ordinary principles, without the aid of mesmerism.
3. That the lower phenomena-such as sleep, diminished or exalted sensibility, loss of voluntary motion, muscular rigidity, and the like, can be produced by persons acting on themselves by means of fixed staring at objects; which are incapable of giving out- any nervous or magnetic influence.
4. That the evidence which can be obtained of the reality of the existence of magnetic somnambulism, in any case, is inconclusive; that it is possible that the person supposed to be in such a state may really be awake, and simply feigning sleep; and that in many cases there is the most conclusive evidence that the persons pretending to be so affected are impostors, while in other cases, in which no intention to deceive may have existed, the patients have acted under a peculiar state of mind, to which only the weak and nervous are liable.
5. That though numerous cases of surgical operations are recorded in which the patients are reported not to have felt pain, it is probable that some at least may have really experienced painful sensations without giving

any outward expression of their sensations; that we have no evidence or means of knowing, except from their own testimony, that they did not really feel pain; but that it is very probable that in some cases, from a peculiar state of the mind acting upon the nervous system, the patients were really rendered unconscious of pain.

6. That it does not appear from experiment that immunity from pain in operations can be induced, in any but exceptional cases, in Europeans; though it appears, from the experience of Dr. Esdaile, that it can be produced with comparative facility in the natives of India.
7. That the higher phenomena of clairvoyance, pre-vision, intro-vision, and retro-vision, do not rest on adequate and satisfactory evidence. That it has never been proved in a single instance, when the necessary precautions have been taken, that a person could read or see objects through opaque substances; and that the alleged instances of the possession of such a power, when put to the test, have proved uniformly unsuccessful, and have amounted to nothing more than attempts at vague guessing. That it has been proved in some cases that the persons pretending to know events which happened at a distance were fully acquainted with the events through ordinary channels of information. That the description of events pretended to have been discovered by means of clairvoyance has not been in accordance with the truth, unless it has been possible for the patient to employ the usual means of discovering them; and that in most instances there are observed the most manifest attempts, on the part of their friends, to assist clairvoyants by suggestions and leading questions. That the attempts to describe what is going on in the interior of their own bodies, to diagnose diseases in themselves or others, and to prescribe remedies for the cure of the diseases which they pretend to discover, have been complete failures, and mere repetitions of such notions of anatomy, of disease, and of treatment, as they may have acquired by casual reading, conversation, or more careful study.
8. That there is. no recorded instance, worthy of credit, of transference of the senses-that is, of persons being able to read, taste, smell, or hear, by the fingers, stomach, or any other part of the body, other than the organs by which these functions are naturally performed-and that pretended instances of the possession of such powers have been proved to be cases of fraud and wilful imposition.

**9.** That phreno-mesmerism does not prove the truth of phrenology, or throw any light upon the doctrine that the faculties of the mind have a local seat in 'special parts of the brain, which can be tied up and let loose-mesmerized or de-mesmerized-at pleasure; and that the experiments designed to prove the excitement of the so-called phrenological organs by magnetic operations have all resulted in manifest failures or impositions when properly tested.

**10.** That the phenomena described by different authors, under the various designations of animal magnetism, magnetic somnambulism, hypnotism, odyle, and electro-biology, are identical in their nature, and can be explained, in so far as they possess any truth or scientific value, upon recognised physiological principles. That the whole subject has been systematically obscured by its cultivators with a cloud of mystery, which has given rise to difficulties, and placed impediments in the way of rational and scientific investigation. That the real phenomena which not unfrequently occur in the weak and nervous subjects of magnetic operations are in themselves very remarkable, but that they are not different from phenomena which occur spontaneously; and that they are to be explained by the reciprocal influence exerted by the mind and the nervous system upon each other, and by the unnatural influence thus induced of the nervous upon the muscular systems. See Thouret, *Recherches et Doutes sur le Magnetisme animal* (1784); Eschmayer, *Versuch fiber die scheinbare Magik des Magnetismus* (Stuttg. and Tub. 1816, 8vo); *Thiorie du Mesmerisme* (Paris, 1818, 8vo); Jozwik, *Sur le Magnetisme animal* (1832); Townshend, *Facts in Mesmerism* (Lond. 1853); id. *Mesmerism Proved True* (Lond. 1857); Sandys, *Mesmerism and its Opponents*; *Amer. Bib. Repository*, 2d Ser. 1:362; *Brit. Qu.* ~~Ⓜ~~ *Revelation* 2:402; *Christ. Examiner*, 1:496; 51:395; *For. Qi. Revelation* v. 96; 12:413; *North Brit.* ~~Ⓜ~~ *Revelation* 13:1; 15:69; *Lond. Qu. Revelation* 61:151; 1871, Oct. art. i; *Blackw. Mag.* 57:219; lxx. 70 sq.; *New-Engl.* 4:443; *Bib. Sacra.* 1:333.

## Mesobaiah

SEE MESOBAITE.

## Meso'baite

(Hebrews *Metsobayah*', [hybxa\]](#) garrison of Jehovah, being apparently the name of the place itself, used for a gentile, the preceding noun being regarded as in the construct; Sept. [Μεσωβία](#) v. r. [Μειναβεία](#), Vulg.



*Masobia*), a designation of Jasiel, the last named of David's body-guard (<sup><3147></sup>1 Chronicles 11:47), probably meaning of *Mesobaiah*, as being his place of residence; but, no other clue being given to its locality there is no room even to conjecture its position. Possibly it is rather the name of a person from whom he was descended; but the form and construction are equally difficult as a patronymic. Perhaps we should point **hybXMBi** and thus refer to ZOBAAH as the place of his nationality. Kennicott's conclusion (*Dissertation*, p. 233, 234) is that originally the word was "the Metsobaites" (**μyεxMh**), and applied to the three names preceding it.

## Mesopota'mia

### Picture for Mesopotamia

(**Μεσοποταμία**, <sup><411></sup>Acts 2:9; 7:2; so called as lying *between the rivers*; see Tzchucke, *Mela*, 3:335 sq.; the ARAM, **μρά**) of the Hebrews, usually rendered "Aram," or "Syria," in the Auth. Vers.), the Greek and Roman name for the entire region lying between the rivers Euphrates and Tigris, and bounded on the north by Matthew Taurus, and by Matthew Masius on the north-east (Ptol. v. 18; Pliny, v. 13; 6:9; Philostr. Apol. 1:20). It never formed a distinct state, and the Greek name, which does not appear to extend back beyond the time of Alexander (comp. Arrian, *Alex.* 7:7; Tacit. *Annal.* 6:37), applies rather to its natural than political geography, but was generally employed by the Romans, who (under the emperors) joined it with Syria (Mela, 1:11, 1; Pliny, 6:13); and hence it appears in <sup><411></sup>Acts 2:9. In the Old-Test. geography it is designated as a part of Aramaea, under the names PADANARAM (**μρά**) **DPi**, *the plain of Aram*, <sup><01231></sup>Genesis 25:20; 21:18; 33:18; comp. *the field of Aram*, **μρά**) **hDe**], <sup><3122></sup>Z Hosea 12:12; and so *campi Mesopotamice*, Curt. 3:2, 3; 4:9, 6) and ARAM-NAHARAIM (**μyεhjiμρά**) *Aram of the two rivers*, <sup><01240></sup>Genesis 24:10; <sup><01215></sup>Deuteronomy 23:5), for which the Sept. has *Mesopotamia*, or *Mesopotamia of Syria*; the Syriac renders *house of the rivers* (Peshito at <sup><411></sup>Acts 2:9; 7:2; see Assemani, *Biblioth. Orient.* 1:462), and the Arabs call it *the island* (i.e. peninsula; see Abulfedas *Tab. Mesopot.* ed. Paulus; and Tuch, *Abulfed. descriptionis Mesopot. spec.* [Hal. 1830]). In this early-inhabited land, the northern portion of which was an uncommonly fertile plateau, rich in fat cattle (Strabo, 16:747), and not destitute of forests (Dio Cass. lxxviii. 26; lxxv. 9), dwelt the nomade ancestors of the Hebrews (Genesis 11; comp. <sup><411></sup>Acts 7:2). From hence Isaac obtained his wife Rebecca (<sup><01240></sup>Genesis

24:10,19; 25:20); here Jacob served as a herdsman for Rachel (Genesis 28 sq.), and here most of his sons were born (<sup>-01335</sup>Genesis 35:26; 46:15). The principal cities, situated not only on the two main rivers, but also along their tributaries, the Chaboras (Habor) and Mygdonius, were Nisibis, Edessa, Canse (Haran), and Circesium (Carchemesh); in the interior were only villages (Philostr. Apoll. 1:20). The inhabitants were of Syrian origin (Strabo, xvi. 737), and spoke a dialect of the Arammean (Strabo, 2:84; comp. <sup>-01347</sup>Genesis 31:47). Southern Mesopotamia, on the contrary, is a flat, uncultivated, and poorly-irrigated steppe, a resort of lions (Ammin. Marc. 18:7), ostriches, and (formerly) wild asses, and roamed over by predatory hordes of Arabs (see Strabo, 16:747, 748; comp. Xenoph. *Anab.* 1:5, 1). Only on the banks of the two principal rivers is it susceptible of much tillage. Yet through this barren tract from the earliest ages passed the great caravan route for commerce from the shore of the Euphrates to Seleucia and Babylon (Strabo,xvi. 748), as it still does to Bagdad. See generally Cellar. *Notit.* 2:602 sq.; Olivier, *Voyage*, iv, ch. xiv, p. 372 sq.; Ainsworth, *Researches*; Heeren, *Ideen*, I, 1:183 sq.; Ritter, *Erdk.* xi, pl. 36 [1844] ; Forbiger, *Handb.* 2:625 sq.; Southgate's *Tour*; Buckingham's *Travels*; Layard's *Nineveh and Bab.* ch. xi-xv.

Of the history of this whole country we have but little information till the time of the Persian rule. "According to the Assyrian inscriptions, Mesopotamia was inhabited in the early times of the empire (BC. 1200-1100) by a vast number of petty tribes, each under its own prince, and all quite independent of one another. The Assyrian monarchs contended with these chiefs at great advantage. and by the time of Jehu (BC. 880) had fully established their dominion over them. The tribes were all called 'tribes of the Nai'ri, a term which some compare with the *Naharaim* of the Jews, and translate 'tribes of the *stream lands*.' 'But this identification is very uncertain. It appears, however, in close accordance with Scripture, first, that Mesopotamia was independent of Assyria till after the time of David; secondly, that the Mesopotamians were warlike, and used chariots in battle; and; thirdly, that not long after the time of David they lost their independence, their country being absorbed by Assyria, of which it was thenceforth commonly reckoned a part." The Mesopotamian king Chushan Rishathaim, who for eight years (BC. 1575-1567) held the (trans-Jordanic) tribes of Israel in subjection (<sup>-01008</sup>Judges 3:8,10), was probably only the petty chieftain of one of the principalities nearest the Euphrates. In the time of David (BC. 1040) the kings of Syria-Zoba appear to have had dominion

over the Mesopotamian clans (~~1006~~ 2 Samuel 10:16). *SEE ZOBABH*. In the beginning of the 8th century BC., Shalmaneser of Assyria had brought the different states of Mesopotamia under his sway (~~1293~~ 2 Kings 19:13); and in after-times the Mesopotamians shared the conquest of the other Asiatic nations under the successive empires of the Babylonians, Persians, and Macedonians. After Alexander's death, this country fell under the Syrian rule of the Seleucidm (comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 12:3, 4); and after the fall of this dynasty it became the arena for the Parthian, Armenian, and finally the Roman arms. In New-Test. times many Jews had settled in Mesopotamia (Josephus, *Ant.* 12:3, 4; comp. ~~411B~~ Acts 2:9). The Romans under Lucullus and Pompey began to disturb Mesopotamia; and, somewhat later, Crassus was there defeated and slain. Trajan wrested the whole province, with several adjacent territories, from the Parthians; and although Hadrian had to relinquish these con. quests, Lucius Verus and Severus again subdued Mesopotamia, and it remained a Roman province until the end of the 4th century. On the death of Julian, Jovian found himself obliged to abandon the greater part of the country to the Persians, the Romans only retaining so much of Western Mesopotamia as was enclosed by the Chaboras and Euphrates, and on the north by the Mons Masius (see Smith's *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s.v.). When the Sassanian dynasty in Persia was overthrown by the Arabs, towards the middle of the 7th century, Mesopotamia came under the dominion of the caliphs. Since the year 1516 it has formed an integral part of the Ottoman empire. *SEE SYRIA*.

## Mesorion

(*μεσώριον*) is the technical term for an intermediate office in the Greek Church after *Proton*, *Triton*, *Ekton*, *Ennaton*; but omitted after *Luchnikon* and *Hesperinon*, *Apodeipnon*, *Mesonuktion* (matins), and *Orthron* (lauds). *SEE CANONICAL HOURS*.

## Mespelbrunn, Johann Ech-Ter Von

an eminent German theologian, of princely birth, was born at Mespelbrunn, near Mayence, March 18, 1545. In 1555, when but ten years old, he obtained a canonicate in Witzsburg, and in 1559 one in Mayence. He studied at Mayence, Cologne, Louvain, Douay, Paris, and Pavia; became prebendary of Wirzburg in 1569, and soon after dean of the cathedral, and finally prince bishop of Witzsburg, Dec. 1, 1573. He was ambitious of honors and consideration, but aimed at the same time at the moral and

religious improvement of his diocese. The emperor Rudolph II often employed him, particularly in 1578-79, to quell the disturbances in the Spanish Netherlands, and as envoy on affairs of state; in this capacity Echter was one of the prime motors of the Ligue. Yet in a difficulty he had with the abbot of Fulda concerning that abbey, both the pope and, in 1602, the emperor decided against him. In order to check the progress of the evangelical doctrines of the Reformation in Wirzburg, he occupied himself zealously with the interior affairs of his diocese, and endeavored to reform its Church. In 1576 he took part in the Diet of Regensburg, and in 1582 in that of Augsburg. He improved the system of education, organized several public schools, and in 1582 founded the University of Wirzburg. The chairs of philosophy and theology he filled with Jesuits, and founded three colleges, which were afterwards united into one under the name of Seminary of St. Kilian. On the other hand he deposed and exiled all the evangelical ministers and preachers, and even the civil officers of his diocese who favored the principles of the Reformation, whenever an occasion presented. He sought to retain the people in their allegiance to the Roman Catholic Church by means of preaching and visiting tours, while he tried to reform the immorality of the clergy, and to restore them to a better standing. With this view he wrote his *Constitutiones pro cultu divino, statuta ruralia pro Clero* (1584; in German, 1589); several *Antiphonien u. Psalterien* (1602), and a *Missal*. He also founded the Julius Hospital at Wuirzburg. He died Sept. 13, 1617. See J.N. Buchinger, *J. Echter v. Mespelbrunn* (Wurzb. 1843). (J. HW.)

### Mesplede, Louis

a French canonist, was born at Cahors about 1601. He became a Dominican monk, was made a prior, and then a provincial of Languedoc; but in the latter capacity he had to contend with many difficulties, and failed in his efforts to bring about a general reform of the order to which he belonged. He died at Cahors in 1663. The following works of his, written in tolerably good Latin, deserve our notice: *Quaerela apologetica provincie Occitanice Ordinis Prædicatorum* (Cahors, 1624, 4to) :- *Catalaunia Gallice vindicata, adversus Hispaniarum scriptorum imposturas* (Paris, 1643, 8vo): — *Notitia antiqui status Ordinis Prædicatorum* (Paris, 1643, 8vo; reprinted in Cahors, 1644, with appendices, under the title *Commonitorium de Ordinis Prædicatorum Renovatione*). See Echard et Quetif, *Script. Ord. Prædicat*; Bayle, *Diet. Crit.* s.v.; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

## Mesrop

also called *Mashtoz*, the noted translator of the Armenian version of the Bible, was born in the latter half of the 4th century in a small village of the province Taron. He was at first secretary of the Armenian patriarch Nerses the Great, and afterwards became his minister of ecclesiastical affairs. After filling this position seven years, he went into a convent, but, failing to find any satisfaction there, he went into a desert, where he gathered about him a number of young men as scholars. Under the government of the patriarch Isaak (Sa'ak) the Great (AD. 390-440) Mesrop was commissioned to preach as missionary, for which position he was especially fitted by his thorough knowledge of foreign languages. He now found need of an Armenian version of the Scriptures, the version of the clergy being in the Syriac, a language but little understood by the populace. After having spent several years in the arduous task, and that with but little show of success, he resolved to throw himself upon the mercy of his Lord and God, and seek at his hands the wisdom and knowledge required for the successful accomplishment of his undertaking. Nor did he wait long for answer to his prayer. While sojourning at Samosata, we are told, he was led to see the different types engraved in a rock, and that he could remember every single letter so plainly that he was able to describe them to the distinguished calligrapher Rufanus, who finally composed the desired alphabet. He immediately commenced the gigantic work of translating the Bible from the Greek into the Armenian, a version which was introduced afterwards into that part of Armenia governed by his king Vramshapuh. By request of other sovereigns, he made also translations for the Georgian and Albanian countries. A change in the government obliged him to quit Persian territory, and he sought a new home in Grecian Armenia, where he continued his activity under the special protection of the emperor Theodosius of Constantinople and the patriarch Atticus. In spite of the severe crusades against the members of the new religion, he continued to inspire his scholars and friends with confidence in their final success, and defeated several times the various attempts to introduce idolatry in the practices of a pure Catholic religion. One of his later great works was the translation of the liturgical books of the Greeks into the modern Armenian language. After the death of his old companion Isaak I, Mesrop was elected patriarch of Armenia, but he died the next year, February 19, 441. A critical edition of Mesrop's translation of the Bible appeared in Venice in 1805, in four volumes. As an energetic and scientific man, Mesrop ranks

among the most important combatants of the Christian religion in the early centuries, when the communication of the new religion met especially with great obstacles in the East for want of written languages. Mesrop furthered literature among his countrymen not only by his own literary productions, but by founding “a whole school of remarkable thinkers and writers, that created what is called ‘the golden period’ for the enlightenment of ancient Armenia” (Malan). See Naumann, *Versuch einer Gesch. d. Armenischen Lit.* (Leips. 1836, 8vo); *Quadro della storia letteraria di Armenia estesa da Mons Placido Tukias Somal.* etc. (Yen. 1829), p. 14.sq.; *Quadro delle opere di vari autori anticamente tradotte in Armeno* (Ven. 1825), p. 7-9; Goriund, *Life of St. Mesrop*; Malan, *Life and Times of Gregory the Illuminator*, etc. (Lond. 1868, 8vo), p. 28 sq. **SEE ARMENIAN VERSION.** (J. H.W.)

## Mess

(**tæh̄ni** *maseth'*, a *lifting up*, as of the hands, <sup><410></sup>Psalm 141:2; or of *flame*, <sup><0718></sup>Judges 20:38,40; so of a *sign*, <sup><2401></sup>Jeremiah 6:1; hence an *oracle* or “burden,” <sup><2014></sup>Lamentations 2:14), properly a *gift* (“oblation,” “reward,” etc., <sup><0718></sup>Esther 2:18; <sup><2415></sup>Jeremiah 40:5; Amos v. 11); also *tribute* (“oblation,” “collection,” <sup><4016></sup>2 Chronicles 24:6, 9; <sup><5010></sup>Ezekiel 20:40); specially a portion of food to a guest (<sup><0434></sup>Genesis 43:34; <sup><0118></sup>2 Samuel 11:8). **SEE EATING.**

## Mess Johns

in the Church of England, is, according to Broughton (*Bibliotheca Hist. Sac.* s.v.), a name given last century to a certain class of chaplains kept by the nobility and families of higher rank, who were generally expected to rise from table after the second course, and were in little better esteem than menials. In Scotland, Eadie (*Ecclesiastes Cyclop.* s.v.) informs us, the name of *Mass* or *Mess John* was given to Presbyterian ministers, not from any connection with the mass, or because they succeeded mass-priests, but probably because they were called *Mr.* or *Messrs.*, the title “*reverend*” not being applied to them.

## Message

(prop. for **tWka| mi** Hag. 1:13; **ἀγγελία**, <sup><6111></sup>1 John 3:11; elsewhere **r̄bD**; a word; **ἐπαγγελία**, a *promise*; **πρεσβεία**, an *embassy*). **SEE MESSENGER.**

## Messalians

(from Chald.  $\text{ܝܠ ܟܢܝܢ}$ ), or EUCHITES (from  $\text{εὐχομαι}$ , to *pray*) is the name borne by two heretical sects of Christian mendicants.

(1.) An ancient sect, composed of roaming mendicant monks, flourished in Mesopotamia and Syria towards the end of the 4th century (dating from 360) as a distinct body, although their doctrine and discipline subsisted in Syria, Egypt, and other countries before the birth of Christ. They were a sort of mystics, who believed that two souls exist in man, the one good, the other evil. They were anxious to expel the evil soul, and hasten the return of the good Spirit of God, by contemplation and prayer, believing that only prayer could save them, and therefore taught the duty of every Christian to make life a period of unintermitted prayer. They despised all physical labor, moral law, and the sacraments, and embraced many opinions nearly resembling the Manichæan doctrine, derived from Oriental philosophy. When their heretic principles became fully known towards the end of the 4th century, the persecution of both the ecclesiastical and civil authority fell upon them; yet they perpetuated themselves to the 7th century, and reappeared in the Bogomiles and Messalians (2) of the Middle Ages.

(2.) Another sect of this name arose in the 12th century, in which there appears a revival or extension of the opinions held by those of the same name in the 4th century. They are charged with holding heterodox views respecting the Trinity. They rejected marriage, abstained from animal food, treated with contempt the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper, and the various ordinances of external worship, placing the essence of religion in prayer, and maintaining the efficacy of perpetual supplications to the Supreme Being for expelling the evil genius which dwells in the breast of every mortal. The term *Euchite*, or *Messalian*, became an invidious appellation for persons of piety in the Eastern churches, just as the terms Albigenses, Waldenses, and Bogomiles were used subsequently to designate all enemies of the Roman pontiff. See Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 3:589; Hæweis, *Ch. Hist.* 2:222; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* bk. iii, ch. xii; pt. ii, ch. v; Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 2:199 sq. (J. H. W.)

## Messemakers, Engelbert

(Latin, *Cultrificus*), a Belgian theologian, was born at Nimegue about the opening of the 15th century. He joined the Dominican friars, became a doctor of theology, probably at Cologne, and in 1465 undertook to

establish a convent in Zwolle, of which he was appointed the first friar. He died about 1492. Among other works, he wrote *Epistola declaratoria privilegiorum F. F. Mendicantium contra curawos parochiales et Epistola de simonia vitanda in receptione noviciorum* (Nimegue, 1479, 4to; Cologne, 1497, 8vo; Paris, 1507, 8vo; Delft, 1508, 16mo) :-*Carmen de Pane*: - *Manuale Confessorum metricum* (Cologne, 1497, 4to). See De Jonghe, *Desolata Batavia Dominicana*, p. 186-87; Hartzheim, *Prodromus Hist. univers. Colouiensis*, vol. ii.

## Messenger

(properly **Ēal** **ἄγγελος**, *malak*, **SEE MALACHI**, **ἄγγελος**, both words often rendered *angel* [q.v.]; in a more general sense **γυχαε****ἀπόστολος**, **Proverbs** 25:13; **Isaiah** 57:9, **SEE APOSTLE**; in a special sense for forms of **rvB**; *to convey good news*, **SEE GOSPEL**, also vaguely for **dnh**; *to tell*; **hwxat** *command*). It is a practice in the East to employ messengers who run on foot to convey despatches (**Job** 1:14), and these men sometimes go a hundred and fifty miles in less than twenty-four hours. **SEE FOOTMAN**. Such messengers were sent by Joab to acquaint David with the fate of his son Absalom. Ahimaaz went with such speed that he outran Cushai, and was the first to appear before the king, who sat at the gate of Mahanaim, anxiously awaiting tidings from the battle (**2 Kings** 9:18). The common pace of travelling in the East is very slow. Camels go little more than two miles an hour; but dromedaries are often used for the purpose of conveying messages in haste, especially to a distance, as they are said to outrun the swiftest horses. To this practice Job alludes when he says, "My days are swifter than a post" (**Job** 9:25). Instead of passing away with a slowness of motion like that of a caravan, my days of prosperity have disappeared with a swiftness like that of a messenger carrying despatches.

## Messer, Asa, Dd., LLd.

a noted American educator and Baptist minister, was born in Methuen, Mass., in 1769. He studied at Brown University, where he graduated in 1790. The next year he became a tutor in that institution; a professor of languages in 1796. of mathematics and natural philosophy in 1799, and president in 1802, which latter position he held until 1826. Having been licensed in 1792, and ordained in 1801, he preached occasionally, both while professor and president, for congregations of different



denominations. After retiring from the presidency, he was elected to several civil offices of trust by the citizens of Providence. He died Oct. II. 1836. Dr. Messer published a number of discourses and orations. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 6:326.

## Messer, Leon

also called MESTRE LEON, LEONE HEBREO, was the oldest son of the famous statesman, philosopher, theologian, and commentator. Don Isaac b.-Jehudah Abrabanel (q.v.), whose full name was *Don Jehuda Leon b.-Isaak Abravanel*. He is better known as *Leo Hebraeus*. Leon Messer was born at Lisbon near the close of the 15th century. When the Jews were expelled from Spain in 1492, he accompanied his father in all his peregrinations, and finally settled at Genoa, where he practiced medicine with great repute, for which cause he was also called "Medico Hebreo." He was a profound philosopher, and an excellent poet. His *Philography*, 'or *Dialoghi di Amore* (Rome, 1535; Venice, 1607). contains disquisitions on the doctrines of Neo-Platonism, the symbols of mythology, the Hebrew Kabala, and the Arabian philosophy. It exists in French, Spanish, and Latin translations, all made in the 16th century. He also wrote some poems in honor of his father, an elegy on his death, and a poem of 130 stanzas descriptive of the vicissitudes of his life, and containing exhortations to his son. He was also a good mathematician, and an amateur in music. The date of his death is not known. Comp. First, *Biblioth. Jud.* 2:230 sq.; Lindo, *History of the Jews of Spain and Portugal*, p. 268 sq.; Finn, *Sephardim*, p. 418; Etheridge, *Introd. to Hebr. Lit.* p. 449 sq.; Da Costa, *Israel and the Gentiles*, p. 377; Ueberweg, *History of Philosophy* (transl. by C. Morris, NY. 1872), p. 428; Munk, *Esquisse historique de la philosophie chez les Juifs* (Germ. transl. by B. Beer, Leipsic, 1852), p. 37,84 sq.; Zunz, *Literaturgesch. d. Synagog. Poesie*, p. 524; *Geschichte und literatur*, p. 250, 316; Ticknor, *Hist. of Spanish Literature* (Am. ed.), 3:189,190, note; Jost, *Geschichte d. Jud. us. Sekten*, 3:117; Gritz, *Gesch. d. Jud.* vol. viii; but especially Delitzsch's lucid treatise in the *L. B. d. Orients*, 1840, c. 81 sq., *Leo der Hebrder: Charakteristik seines Zeitalters, seiner Ric. tung und seiner Werke.* (B. P.)

## Messi'ah

the special title of the Saviour promised to the world through the Jewish race. We have space for the discussion of a few points only of this extensive

theme, and we here treat especially those points not particularly discussed under other heads. *SEE REDEEMER.*

**I. Official Import of the Name.** — The Hebrew word **j jvæ**, *Mashi'ach*, is in every instance of its use (thirty-nine times) rendered in the Sept. by the suitable term **Χριστός**, which becomes so illustrious in the N.T. as the official designation of the Holy Saviour. It is a verbal noun (see *Simonis Arcanum Form. Hebr. Ling.* p. 92 sq.), derived from **j vīm**; and has much the same meaning as the participle **j Wvm**; (<sup><1039></sup>2 Samuel 3:39, and occasionally in the Pentateuch), i.e. *Anointed*. The prevalent and all but universal (<sup><2206></sup>Isaiah 21:5 and <sup><2214></sup>Jeremiah 22:14 being perhaps the sole exceptions) sense of the root **j vīm**; points to the consecration of objects to sacred purposes by means of anointing-oil. Inanimate objects (such as the tabernacle, altar, laver, etc.) are included under the use of the verb; but the noun **j jvæ** is applied only to animate objects. There is, however, some doubt as to <sup><1021></sup>2 Samuel 1:21, — **^mVBij jvæyl B̄l Wav; ^gæ**; -wb ere, according to some (Maurer, Gesenius, Furst; see also Corn. h Lapidè, ad loc.), the phrase, “not anointed with oil,” is applied to *the shield* (comp. <sup><2206></sup>Isaiah 21:5). The majority of commentators refer it to *Saul*, “as if he had not been anointed with oil.” So the A. V., which seems to follow the Vulgate. This version, however (*quasi non esset unctus oleo*), is really as inexplicit as the original, admitting the application of “*anointed*” to either the king or his shield. This double sense is avoided by *the Septuagint* (**θυρεὸς Σαοῦλ οὐχ ἐχρίσθη ἐν ἐλαίῳ**), which assigns the anointing, as an epithet, to the shield. The Targum of Jonathan refers the **j jvæ** to *Saul*, but drops the negative. To us the unvarying use of the word, as a *human* epithet, in all the other (thirty-eight) passages, two of them occurring in the very context of the disputed place (<sup><1014></sup>2 Samuel 1:14, 16), settles the point in favor of our A. V., as if the king had fallen on the fatal field of Gilboa like one of the common soldiers, “not as one who had been anointed with oil.” *SEE ANOINTING.*

The official persons (“the Christs of the O.T. Perowle, *Coherence of O.T. and N. T.*) who were consecrated with oil were *priests* (<sup><1281></sup>Exodus 28:41; <sup><1018></sup>Leviticus 4:3, 5, 16; <sup><1038></sup>Numbers 35:35), *kings* (<sup><1006></sup>1 Samuel 9:16; 16:3; <sup><1017></sup>2 Samuel 12:7; <sup><1033></sup>1 Kings 1:34), and *prophets* (<sup><1196></sup>1 Kings 19:16). The great Antitype, the Christ of the N.T., embraced and exhausted in himself these several offices, which, in fact, were shadows of

his threefold functions as the Prophet, Priest, and King of his people. It is the preeminence which this combination of anointed offices gave him that seems to be pointed at in <sup><4918></sup>Psalm 45:8, where the great Messiah is anointed “*above ‘his fellows;*” above the Christs of old, whether of only one function, as the priest Aaron, or the prophet Elisha, or the king Saul; or of two functions, as Melchizedek the priest and king, or Moses the priest and prophet, or David the king and prophet. In our Saviour Christ is uniquely found the triple comprehension, the recapitulation in himself of the three offices (see Eusebius, *Hist.* <sup><2100></sup>*Ecclesiastes* 1:3, vol. i, p. 24, by Burton [Oxon. 1848]). But not only were the ancient offices typical, the material of consecration had also its antitype in the Holy Ghost (Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catech. Ilium.* 10:99; *Catech., Neoo.* p. 202, 203; Basil, *contra Eunom.* v; Chrysostom on Psalm 45; Theodoret, *Epit. divin. Decret.* xi, p. 279; Theophylact on Matthew 1; (Ecumenius on Romans i, etc.). The prophecy of <sup><2310></sup>Isaiah 11:1 (“The Spirit of the Lord Jehovah is upon me, because Jehovah hath anointed me”) was expressly claimed by Jesus for fulfilment in the synagogue at Nazareth (<sup><4046></sup>Luke 4:16-21) on his return to Galilee “*in the power of the Spirit*” (ver. 14), which he had plenary received at his recent baptism (ver. 1), and by which he was subsequently led into the wilderness (ver. 1). This anointing of our Lord to his Messianic functions is referred to in a general sense in such passages as <sup><2310></sup>Isaiah 11:2 and <sup><4418></sup>Acts 10:38. But from the more specific statement of Peter (<sup><4426></sup>Acts 2:36), it would appear that it was not before his resurrection and consequent ascension that Christ was fully inducted into his Messianic dignities. “He was anointed to his prophetic office at his baptism; but thereby rather initiated to be, than actually made Christ and Lord. Unto these two offices of everlasting Priest and everlasting King he was not actually anointed, or fully consecrated, until his resurrection from the dead” (dean Jackson, *Works*, 7:368). As often as the evangelists style him *Christ* before his resurrection from the dead, it is by way of *anticipation* (*ibid.* p. 296). On this point, indeed, the grammatical note of Gersdorf (*Sprachchar.* 1:39, 272), as quoted by Winer (*Gramm. des N.T. sprachid.* 3:18, p. 107; Clark, p. 130), is interesting: “The four evangelists almost always write ὁ Χριστός [the expected Messiah, like ὁ ἐρχόμενος], while Paul and Peter employ Χριστός, as the appellation had become more of a proper name. In the epistles of Paul and Peter, however, the word has the article when a governing noun precedes” (for extremely elaborate tables, containing every combination of the sacred names of Christ in the N.T., the reader is referred to the last edition of bishop Middleton’s *Doctrine of the*

*Greek Article*, by H. J. Rose, BD., App. ii, p. 486-496). Twice only in the N.T. does the Hebrew form of it (Messias) occur, in <sup><404></sup>John 1:41 and 4:25; and twice only in the O.T. have our translators retained the same form (Messiah), in <sup><202></sup>Daniel 9:25 and 26. In these passages, both in the Greek of the evangelist [*Μεσσίας*, or (as Griesbach preferred to read) *Μεσίας*, more closely like the original] and in the Hebrew of the prophet [*יְהוֹשֻׁעַ*], there is an absence of the article—the word having, in fact, grown out of its appellative state, which so often occurs in the earlier books, into a proper name; thus resembling the course of the *Χριστός* of the Christian Scriptures. *SEE CHRIST*.

## II. *The gradual Growth of the Messianic Revelation.*

### 1. *First or Patriarchal Period.*

(1.) In the primeval promise (<sup><0615></sup>Genesis 3:15) lies the germ of a universal blessing. The tempter came to the woman in the guise of a serpent, and the curse thus pronounced has a reference both to the serpent which was the instrument, and to the tempter that employed it; to the natural terror and enmity of man against the serpent, and to the conflict between mankind redeemed by Christ its Head, and Satan ‘that deceived mankind. Many interpreters would understand by the seed of the woman the Messiah only; but it is easier to think with Calvin that mankind after they are gathered into one army by Jesus the Christ, the Head of the Church, are to achieve a victory over evil. The Messianic character of this prophecy has been much questioned by those who see, in the history of the fall nothing but a fable: to those who accept it as true, this passage is the primitive germ of the Gospel. “The seed of the woman,” the vagueness and obscurity of which phrase was so suited to the period of the protevangelium, is cleared in the light of the NT. (see <sup><404></sup>Galatians 4:4, where the *γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός* explains the original *H[r]*). The deliverance intimated was no doubt understood by our first parents to be universal, like the injury sustained, and it is no absurdity to suppose that the promise was cherished afterwards by thoughtful Gentiles as well as believing Jews; but to the latter it was subsequently shaped into increasing precision by supplementary revelation’s, while to the former it never lost its formal vagueness and obscurity. The O.T. gives us occasional gleams of the glorious primeval light as it struggled with the gross traditions of the heathen. The nearer to Israel the clearer the light; as in the cases of the Abimelechs (<sup><0216></sup>Genesis 20:6; 26:28), and Melchizedek (<sup><0148></sup>Genesis 14:18), and Job (<sup><3825></sup>Job

19:25), and Balaam (<sup><0247></sup>Numbers 24:17), and the magi (Matthew 2), and the Samaritan woman (<sup><0125></sup>John 4:25; and see, on the Christology of the Samaritans, Westcott's *Introduction*, p. 148, 149). But even at a distance from Israel the light still flickered to the last, as "the unconscious prophecies of heathendom" show, as archbishop Trench happily designates-though in a somewhat different sense-the yearnings of the Gentiles after a deliverer (*Hulsean Lectures* for 1846; see also bishop Horsley's *Dissert. on the Messianic Prophecies dispersed among the Heathen, in Sermons*, ed. 1829, 2:263-318; and comp. Virgil's well-known eclogue Pollio, and the expectations mentioned by Suetonius, Vit. *Vespasian*. 4:8,- and Tacitus, *Hist.* v. 9, 13, and the Sibylline oracles, discussed by Horsley [*ut sup.*], with a strong leaning to their authenticity). See below, § 4:1 (3). But although the promise was absolutely indefinite to the first father of man (on which see bishop Horsley, *Sermon* xvi, p. 234, 235, comp. with Faber's *Prophetical Dissert.* 7:4 and 5), additional light was given, after the deluge, to the second father of the human race.

(2.) To Noah was vouchsafed a special reservation of blessing for one of his sons in preference to the other two, and-as if words failed him-he exclaimed, "Blessed be Jehovah, the God of Shem!" (<sup><0026></sup>Genesis 9:26). Not that at any time God meant to *confine* a monopoly of blessing to the individual selected as the special depositary thereof. In the present instance Japheth, in the next verse, is associated with his brother for at least some secondary advantage: "God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem." Instead of blessing Shem, as he had cursed Canaan, he carries up the blessing to the great fountain of the blessings that were to follow Shem.

(3.) The principle of limitation goes on. One of Shem's descendants has three sons. Only one of these is selected as the peculiar treasurer of the divine favor. But not for himself alone was Abraham chosen. As in Shem's instance, so here again Abraham was to be the centre of blessing to even a larger scope. More than once was he assured of this: "In thy seed ["in thee," 12:3] shall all the nations of the earth be blessed" (<sup><0228></sup>Genesis 22:18). The Messianic purport of this repeated promise cannot be doubted after Christ's own statement (<sup><0186></sup>John 8:56) and Paul's comment (<sup><0116></sup>Galatians 3:16). The promise is still indefinite, but it tends to the undoing of the curse of Adam by a blessing to 'all the earth through the seed of Abraham, as death had come on the whole earth through Adam. When our Lord says "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he

saw it and was glad” (<sup><4086></sup>John 8:56), we are to understand that this promise of a real blessing and restoration to come hereafter was understood in a spiritual sense, as a leading back to God, as a coming nearer to him, from whom the promise came; and he desired with hope and rejoicing (“gestivit cum desiderio,” Bengel) to behold the day of it.

(4.) In Abraham’s son-the father of twin sons we meet with another limitation; Jacob not only secures the traditional blessing to himself, but is inspired to concentrate it at his death on Judah, to the exclusion of the eleven other members of his family. “Judah, thou art he whom thy brothers praise... The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until *Shiloh* come” (<sup><4408></sup>Genesis 49:8, 10; see Perowne’s *Essay*, p. 26,188; Delitzsch, *ad loc.*; bishop Pearson, *Creed*, art. ii; Hengstenberg, *Christol.* 1:59, 60; Davison, *On Prophecy*, p. 106; Dollinger, *Gentile and Jew in the Courts of the Temple of Christ*, translated by Darnell, 2:392. Onkelos and Raschi, it may be worth while to add, make *Shiloh* here to refer to the Messiah, as do D. Kimchi and Abendana). To us the Messianic interpretation of the passage seems to be called for by the principle of periodical limitation, which amounts to a law in the Christological Scriptures. We accept the conclusion, therefore, that the **hl v;waf** of this verse is the : **μ/I v;Arci**; “Prince of Peace,” of <sup><2305></sup>Isaiah 9:5 [6]; and the **μ/I v;hz**, “This man is peace,” of <sup><3104></sup>Micah 5:4; and the **μ/I v;rBdæ** “the peace-speaker,” of <sup><3910></sup>Zechariah 9:10.; and the **Εἰρήνη ἡμῶν**, “our peace,” of Paul, <sup><4024></sup>Ephesians 2:14 in a word, our Messiah, Jesus Christ. This, then, is the first case in which the promises distinctly centre in one person; and he is to be the man of peace; he is to wield and retain the government, and the nations shall look up to him and obey him. **SEE SHILOH.**

## 2. Mosaic Period.

(1.) The next passage usually quoted is the prophecy of Balaam (<sup><0247></sup>Numbers 24:17-19). The *star* points indeed to the glory, as the sceptre denotes the power, of a king. Onkelos and Jonathan (pseudo) see here the Messiah. But it is doubtful whether the prophecy is not fulfilled in David (<sup><1082></sup>2 Samuel 8:2, 14); and though David is himself a type of Christ, the direct Messianic application of this place is by no means certain.

(2.) The prophecy of Moses (<sup><0518></sup>Deuteronomy 18:18),” I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my

words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him,” claims attention. Does this refer to the Messiah? The reference to Moses in <sup><4055></sup>John 5:45-47 He wrote of me seems to point to this passage; for it is a cold and forced interpretation to refer it to the whole types and symbols of the Mosaic law. On the other hand, many critics would fain find here the divine institution of the whole prophetic order, which, if not here, does not occur at all. Hengstenberg thinks that it does promise that an order of prophets should be sent, but that the singular is used with direct reference to the greatest of the prophets, Christ himself, without whom the words would not have been fulfilled. “The spirit of Christ spoke in the prophets, and Christ is in a sense the only prophet” (<sup><4011></sup>1 Peter 1:11). Jews in earlier times might have been excused for referring the words to this or that present prophet; but the Jews whom the Lord rebukes (John 5) were inexcusable; for, having the words before them, and the works of Christ as well, they should have known that no prophet had so fulfilled the words as he had.

**(3.)** The passages in the Pentateuch which relate to “the Angel of the Lord” have been thought by many to bear reference to the Messiah.

**3. Period of David.**-Here another advance is found in prophetic limitation. Jacob had only specified *the tribe*, now the particular *family* is indicated from which Messiah was to spring. From the great promise made to David (<sup><4071></sup>2 Samuel 7:11-16), and so frequently referred to afterwards (<sup><4113></sup>1 Kings 11:34, 38; <sup><4388></sup>Psalms 89:30-37; <sup><2553></sup>Isaiah 55:3; <sup><4133></sup>Acts 13:34), and described by *the sweet psalmist of Israel* himself as “an everlasting covenant ordered in all things, and sure” (<sup><4035></sup>2 Samuel 23:5), arose that concentrated expectation of the Messiah expressed by the popular phrase *Son of David*, of which we hear so much in the N.T. (comp. <sup><4127></sup>Matthew 9:27; 12:23; 21:9; 22:42; <sup><4107></sup>Mark 10:47, 48; 11:10; <sup><4132></sup>Luke 1:32; 18:38, 39; <sup><4172></sup>John 7:42; <sup><4003></sup>Romans 1:3; <sup><4226></sup>Revelation 22:16; with <sup><4235></sup>Jeremiah 23:5).

In the promises of a kingdom to David and his house “forever” (<sup><4073></sup>2 Samuel 7:13), there is more than could be fulfilled save by the eternal kingdom in which that of David merged; and David’s last words dwell on this promise of an everlasting throne (2 Samuel 23). Passages in the Psalms are numerous which are applied to the Messiah in the N.T. such are Psalm 2, 16, 22, 40, 110. Other psalms quoted in the N.T. appear to refer to the actual history of another king; but only those who deny the existence of

types and prophecy will consider this as an evidence against an ulterior allusion to Messiah; such psalms are 45, 68, 69, 72. The advance in clearness in this period is great. The name of Anointed, i.e. King, comes in, and the Messiah is to come of the lineage of David. He is described in his exaltation, with his great kingdom that shall be spiritual rather than temporal (Psalm 2, 21, 40, 110). In other places he is seen in suffering and humiliation (Psalm 22, 16, 40).

Having now confined the Messiah's descent to the family of the illustrious king who was "the man after God's own heart," prophecy will await God's own express identification of the *individual* (see it given in <sup><4017></sup>Matthew 3:17; 17:5; <sup><4011></sup>Mark 1:11; 9:7; <sup><4192></sup>Luke 3:22; 9:35; and referred to in <sup><6017></sup>2 Peter 1:17). But it will not idly wait. It has other particulars to announce, to give point and precision to a nation's hopes.

**4. Period of Prophetism.** — After the time of David the predictions of the Messiah ceased for a time, until those prophets arose whose works we possess in the canon of Scripture. They nowhere give us an exact and complete account of the nature of the Messiah; but different aspects of the truth are produced by the various needs of the people, and so they are led to speak of him now as a Conqueror, or a Judge, or a Redeemer from sin; it is from the study of the whole of them that we gain a clear and complete image of his person and kingdom. This third period lasts from the reign of Uzziah to the Babylonian captivity. The Messiah is a King and Ruler of David's home, who shall come to reform and restore the Jewish nation and purify the Church, as in Isaiah 11, 40-66. The blessings of the restoration, however, will not be confined to Jews; the heathen are made to share them fully (Isaiah 2, 66). Whatever theories have been attempted about Isaiah 53, there can be no doubt that the most natural is the received interpretation that it refers to the suffering Redeemer; and so in the N.T. it is always considered to do. The passage of <sup><3392></sup>Micah 5:2 (comp. <sup><4016></sup>Matthew 2:6) left no doubt in the mind of the Sanhedrim as to the birthplace of the Messiah. The lineage of David is again alluded to in <sup><3820></sup>Zechariah 12:10-14. The time of the second Temple is fixed by <sup><3709></sup>Haggai 2:9 for Messiah's coming; and the coming of the Forerunner and of the Anointed is clearly revealed in <sup><3911></sup>Malachi 3:1; 4:5, 6.

All the more important events of the coming Redeemer's life and death, and subsequent kingdom and exaltation, were foretold. Bethlehem was to be his birthplace (<sup><3392></sup>Micah 5:2; comp. with <sup><4011></sup>Matthew 2:1-6); Galilee his



country (<sup><2900></sup>Isaiah 9:1, 2; comp. with <sup><4044></sup>Matthew 4:14-16); a virgin his mother (<sup><2974></sup>Isaiah 7:14; comp. with <sup><4023></sup>Matthew 1:23); he was to preach glad tidings to the meek and to bind up the broken-hearted (<sup><2900></sup>Isaiah 61:1; comp. with <sup><4047></sup>Luke 4:17-21); though her king, he was to come to the daughter of Zion, just and having salvation, lowly and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt, the foal of an ass (<sup><3009></sup>Zechariah 9:9; comp. with <sup><4214></sup>John 12:14, 15); he was to be despised and rejected of men; was to be led like a lamb to the slaughter (<sup><2938></sup>Isaiah 53:3, 7; comp. with <sup><4226></sup>Psalms 22:6; <sup><3011></sup>John 1:11; 18:40; <sup><4143></sup>Mark 14:61 and 15:5); his garments were to be parted, and lots cast upon his vesture (<sup><4228></sup>Psalms 22:18; comp. with <sup><4223></sup>John 19:23, 24); his hands and feet were to be pierced (<sup><4226></sup>Psalms 22:16; comp. with <sup><4233></sup>Luke 23:33, and <sup><4225></sup>John 20:25); he was to have vinegar give in to him to drink (<sup><4921></sup>Psalms 69:21; comp. with <sup><4234></sup>Matthew 27:34, 38); he was to pour out his soul unto death; was to be numbered with the transgressors; and his grave, though intended to be with wicked men (see this translation in Mason and Bernard's *Hebr. Gram.* 2:305), was in reality destined to be with a rich man (<sup><2939></sup>Isaiah 53:9; comp. with <sup><4257></sup>Matthew 27:57, 58); his soul was not to be left in hell, nor his flesh to see corruption (<sup><4960></sup>Psalms 16:10; comp. with <sup><4023></sup>Acts 2:31, and 13:34-36); he was to sit on the right hand of Jehovah till his foes were made his footstool (<sup><3801></sup>Psalms 110:1; comp. with <sup><4022></sup>1 Peter 3:22; <sup><3003></sup>Hebrews 1:3; <sup><4169></sup>Mark 16:19, and <sup><4655></sup>1 Corinthians 15:25) his kingdom was to spread until ultimately "the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, should be given to the saints of the Most High" (<sup><2027></sup>Daniel 7:27; see Perowne, *Coherence*, p. 29, 30). Slight as is this sketch of the prophetic announcements with which God was pleased to sustain human hope amid human misery, "as a light that shineth in a dark place" (<sup><4019></sup>2 Peter 1:19), "shining more and more unto the perfect day" (<sup><2048></sup>Proverbs 4:18), it is yet enough to suggest to us how great must have been the longing for their Deliverer which such persistent and progressive promises were likely to excite in the hearts of faithful men and women.

The expectation of a golden age that should return upon the earth was, as we have seen, common in heathen nations (Hesiod, *Works and Days*, p. 109; Ovid, *Met.* 1:89; Virgil, *Ecl.* iv; and passages in Eusebius, *Præp. Ev.* 1:7; 12:13). It was doubtless inspired by some light that had reached them from the Jewish revelation. This hope the Jews also shared, but with them it was associated with the coming of a particular person, the Messiah. It has been asserted that in him the Jews looked for an earthly king, and that

the existence of the hope of a Messiah may thus be accounted for on natural grounds and without a divine revelation. But the prophecies refute this: they hold out not a King only, but a Prophet and a Priest, whose business it should be to set the people free from sin, and to teach them the ways of God, as in Psalm 22, 40, 110; Isaiah 2, 11, 53, In these and other places, too, the power of the coming One reaches beyond the Jews and embraces all the Gentiles, which is contrary to the exclusive notions of Judaism. A fair consideration of all the passages will convince us that the growth of the Messianic idea in the prophecies is owing to revelation from God. The witness of the N.T. to the O.T. prophecies can bear no other meaning; it is summed up in the above-cited words of Peter (<sup>6019</sup>2 Peter 1:19-21; comp. the elaborate essay on this text in Knapp's *Opuscula*, vol. i). Our Lord affirms that there are prophecies of the Messiah in the O.T., and that they are fulfilled in him (<sup>4054</sup>Matthew 26:54; <sup>4002</sup>Mark 9:12; <sup>2081</sup>Luke 18:31-33; 22:37; 24:27; <sup>4059</sup>John 5:39, 46). The apostles preach the same truth in <sup>4406</sup>Acts 2:16, '25; 8:28-35; 10:43; 13:23, 32; 26:22, 23; <sup>4011</sup>1 Peter 1:11, and in many passages of Paul. Even if internal evidence did not prove that the prophecies were much more than vague longings after better times, the N.T. proclaims everywhere that although the Gospel was the sun, and O.-T. prophecy the dim light of a candle, yet both were light, and both assisted those who heeded them to see aright; and that the prophets interpreted, not the private longings of their own hearts, but the will of God, in speaking as they did (see Knapp's Essay for this explanation) of the coming kingdom.

**5.** The period after the close of the canon of the O.T. is known to us in a great measure from allusions in the N.T. to the expectation of the Jews. From such passages as <sup>4900</sup>Psalm 2:2, 6, '8; <sup>2235</sup>Jeremiah 23:5, 6; <sup>3080</sup>Zechariah 9:9, the Pharisees, and those of the Jews who expected the Messiah at all, looked for a temporal prince only. The apostles themselves were infected with this opinion till after the resurrection (<sup>4000</sup>Matthew 20:20, 21; <sup>4201</sup>Luke 24:21; <sup>4406</sup>Acts 1:6). Gleams of a purer faith appear (<sup>4010</sup>Luke 2:30; 23:42; <sup>4025</sup>John 4:25). On the other hand, there was a sceptical school which had discarded the expectation altogether. No mention of the Messiah appears in the Book of Wisdom, nor in the writings of Philo; and Josephus avoids the doctrine. Intercourse with heathens had made some Jews ashamed of their fathers' faith.

It is quite consistent with the prospects which, as we have seen, the prophecies were calculated to raise, that we are informed by Luke of the

existence of what seems to have been a considerable number of persons “that looked for redemption in Israel” (<sup><4128></sup>Luke 2:38). The demeanor of these believers was exhibited in a close and conscientious adherence to the law of Moses, which was, in its statutes and ordinances, at once the rule of pious life and the schoolmaster to guide men to their Messiah (<sup><4124></sup>Galatians 3:24). As examples of these “just and devout” persons, the evangelist presents us with a few short but beautiful sketches in his first and second chapters. Besides the blessed Mary and faithful Joseph, there are Zacharias and Elisabeth, Simeon and Anna—pictures of holiness to be met with among men and women, married and unmarried, whose piety was strongly toned with this eminent feature, which is expressly attributed to one of them, “waiting for the consolation of Israel” (comp. <sup><4106></sup>Luke 1:6 with 2:25, and 37, 38). Such hopes, stimulated by a profound and far-sighted faith, were exhibited at the birth and infancy of the Messiah Jesus by these expectant *Jews*; and they were not alone. *Gentiles* displayed a not less marvellous faith, when “the wise men from the East” did homage to the babe of Bethlehem, undeterred by the disguise of humiliation with which the Messiah’s glory was to the human eye obscured (<sup><4102></sup>Matthew 2:2, 11). But at his death, no less than at his birth, under a still darker veil of ignominy, similar acknowledgments of faith in his Messiahship were exhibited. Mark mentions it as one of the points in the character of Joseph of Arimathaea that he “waited for the kingdom of God;” and it would seem that this faith urged him to that holy “boldness” of using his influence with Pilate to rescue the body of Jesus, and commit it to an honorable tomb, as if he realized the truth of Isaiah’s great prophecy, and saw in the Crucified no less than the Messiah himself (<sup><4153></sup>Mark 15:43). To a like faith must be imputed the remarkable confession of the repentant thief upon the cross (<sup><4232></sup>Luke 23:42) a faith which brought even the Gentile centurion who superintended the execution of Jesus to the conviction that the expiring sufferer was not only innocent (<sup><4237></sup>Luke 23:47), but even “the Son of God” (<sup><4174></sup>Matthew 27:54, and <sup><4153></sup>Mark 15:39). This conjunction of Gentile faith with that of Hebrews is most interesting, and, indeed, consistent with the progress of the promise. We have seen above how, in the earliest stages of the revelation Gentile interests were not overlooked. Abraham, who saw the Messiah’s day (<sup><4186></sup>John 8:56), was repeatedly assured of the share which all nations were destined to have in the blessings of his death (<sup><4112></sup>Genesis 12:3; 22:18; <sup><4125></sup>Acts 3:25). Nor was the breadth of the promise afterwards narrowed. Moses called “the nations” to rejoice with the chosen people (<sup><4123></sup>Deuteronomy 32:43). Isaiah proclaimed the

Messiah expressly as “the light of the Gentiles” (<sup><2306></sup>Isaiah 42:6; 49:6); Haggai foretold his coming as “the desire of all nations” (<sup><3007></sup>Haggai 2:7); and when he came at last, holy Simeon inaugurated his life on earth under the title of “a light-to lighten the Gentiles” (<sup><4023></sup>Luke 2:32). When his Gospel was beginning to run its free course, the two missionaries for the heathen quoted this great prophetic note as the warrant of their ministry: “I have set thee to be a light of the Gentiles, that thou shouldst be for salvation unto the ends of the earth” (<sup><4437></sup>Acts 13:47). Plain, however, as was the general scope of the Messianic prophecies, there were features in it which the Jewish nation failed to perceive. Framing their ideal not so much from their Scriptures as from their desires, and impatient of a hated heathen yoke, they longed for an avenging Messiah who should inflict upon their oppressors retaliation for many wrongs. ‘his wish colored all their national hopes; and it should be borne in mind by the student of the Gospels, on which it throws much light. Not only was the more religious class, such as Christ’s own apostles and pupils, affected by this thought of an external kingdom, even so late as his last journey to Jerusalem (<sup><4137></sup>Mark 10:37); but the indiscriminating crowds, who would have forcibly made him king (<sup><4165></sup>John 6:15) so strongly did his miracles attest his Messianic mission even in their view (ver. 14) and who afterwards followed him to the capital and shouted hosannas to his praise, most abruptly withdrew their popular favor from him and joined in his destruction, because he gave them no signs of an earthly empire or of political emancipation. Christ’s kingdom was “not of this world” — a proposition which, although containing the very essence of Christianity, offended the Jewish people when Jesus presented himself as their veritable Messiah, and led to their rejection of him. Moreover, his lowly condition, sufferings, and death, have been a stumbling-block in the way of their recognition of him ever since. *SEE SAVIOUR.*

**III. Jewish Views respecting the Messiah.** — “Even in the first prediction of the woman’s seed bruising the serpent’s head, there is the idea of a painful struggle and of a victory, which leaves the mark of suffering upon the Conqueror” (Smith’s Messianic Prophecies of Isaiah [1862], p. 164). This thought has tinged the sentiments of all orthodox believers since, although it has often been obscured by the brilliant fancy of ambition. *SEE SON OF MAN.*

**1. Early Jewish Opinions.**—The portrait of an afflicted and suffering Messiah is too minutely sketched by the Psalmist (Psalm 22, 42, 43, 69), by

Isaiah (ch. 53), by Zechariah (ch. 11-13), and Daniel (~~7:24-27~~ Daniel 9:24-27), to be ignored even by reluctant Jews; and strange is the embarrassment observable in Talmudic Judaism to obviate the advantage which accrues to Christianity from its tenure of this unpalatable doctrine. Long ago did Trypho, Justin Martyr's Jew, own the force of the prophetic Scriptures, which delineated Messiah as "a man of sorrows" (Justin. *Dial.* 89). In later times, after the Talmud of Babylon (7th century) became influential, the doctrine of two Messiahs was held among the Jews. For several centuries it was their current belief that Messiah *Ben-David* was referred to in all the prophecies which spoke of glory and triumph, while on Messiah *Ben-Joseph* of Ephraim fell all the predicted woes and sufferings. By this expedient they both glorified their traditional idea which exonerated their chief Messiah, of David's illustrious race, from all humiliation, and likewise saved their nominal deference to the inspired prophets who had written of the sorrows of Messiah. (For a popular sketch of this opinion of two Messiahs, the reader is referred to Smith's sermons *On the Messianic Prophecies of Isaiah*, p. 177-181; see also Buxtorf's *Lexicon Talmud.* s.v. *y çm*, p. 1126, 1127, and s.v. *swl ymæþi*; Eisenmenger's *nedecktes Judenthum*, 2:720-750; Otho's *Lexicon Rabbin.* Schittgen, *Horæ Hebrews et Rabbin.* 2:1-778.) All the references to a *suffering* Messiah made by great writers, such as Rashi, Ibn-Esra, and D. Kimchi, are to "Messiah *Ben-Joseph*;" while of the more than seventy quotations cited by Buxtorf from the Targums, including Onkelos, not one refers to the Messiah *as suffering*. This early Targumistic literature (as distinguished from the latter Rabbinical) dwells on the glories, triumphs, and power of a conquering Messiah. However absurd this distortion was, it was yet felt to be too great a homage to the plain interpretation of the prophetic Scriptures as given by Christian writers, who showed to the votaries of the Talmud that their earlier authors had applied to the Son of David the very passages which they were for referring to the Son of Joseph. From the tenth and eleventh centuries, therefore, other interpretations have been sought for. Maimonides omits the whole story of Messiah *Ben-Joseph* in his account of the Messiah; see Pococke, *Append. on Malachi. The Messiah has been withdrawal together from the reach of all predicted sufferings*. Such passages as Isaiah 53, have been and still are applied to some persecuted servant of God, Jeremiah especially, or to the aggregate Jewish nation. This anti-Messianic exegesis is prevalent among the Neologians of Germany and France, and their "free-handling" disciples of the English school (see Dr. Rowland Williams, *Essays and Reviews*, p. 71-75 [edit. 2]).

Thus Jewish sentiment has either reverted to that low standard of mere worldly expectation which recognises no humiliation in Messiah, but only a career of unmixed triumph and glory, or else has collapsed in a disappointment and despair which forbid all speculation of a Messiah whatever (Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judezth.* i., 677). Jewish despair does not often resolve itself into Christian hope. Here and there affecting instances of the genuine change occur, such as the two mentioned by bishop Thirlwall (*Reply to Dr. W.'s earnestly respectful letter*, p. 78); in the second of which—that of Isaac da Costa—conversion arose from his thoughtful reflections on the present dispersion of the Jewish race for its sins. His acceptance of Jesus as the Messiah solved all enigmas to him, and enabled him to estimate the importance of such prophetic promises as are yet unfulfilled to Israel. But the normal state of Jewish Messianic opinion is that sickness of heart which comes from deferred hopes. This despair produces an abasement of faith and a lowering of religious tone, or else finds occasional relief in looking out after pretended Messiahs. Upwards of thirty cases of these have deluded the nation in its scattered state since the destruction of Jerusalem. **SEE MESSIAHS, FALSE.** The havoc of life and reputation caused by these attempts has tended more than any thing else to the discouragement of Messianic hopes among the modern Jews. Foremost in the unhappy catalogue of these fanatics stands the formidable rebellion under Bar-Cocheba, in the 2d century. Rabbi Akiba, “the second Moses,” the great light of the day in Jewry, declared before the Sanhedrim that Bar-Cocheba was the Messiah. Rabbi Jochanan alone made opposition, and said, “Grass, O Akiba, will grow out of thy jaws, and yet the Son of David not have come.” We know not what was the fate of Bar-Cocheba (or Bar-Coseba, “the son of lying,” as his disappointed dupes at length called him), but the gray-headed Akiba was taken by the Romans and executed. More are said to have perished in this attempt than in the previous war of Titus. Embarrassing as all these failures are to the Jews, they only add one more to the many proofs of the Messiahship of Jesus of Nazareth, who expressly foretold these delusions of “false Christs” (<sup>Ⓜ</sup>Matthew 24:24; <sup>Ⓜ</sup>Mark 13:22), as one class of retributions which should avenge on Israel the guilt of his own rejection. Not only, however, from the lowliness and suffering of the Christian Messiah, but in a still greater degree from his exalted character, there arises a difficulty of faith to the Jewish objection. The divinity of nature which Jesus claimed is perhaps the greatest doctrinal obstacle to his reception among the Jews. See Gfrorer, *Gesch. d.*

*Urchristenthums* (Stuttg. 1838); Solani, *Croyances Messianiques* (Strasb. 1864). *SEE SON OF GOD.*

**2. Modern Jewish Views.** — The hope of a Messiah the bounteous benefactor and inaugurator of a glorious reign on earth, firmly establishing forever and ever the greatness of Abraham's descendants-had prevailed even among the children of Israel, but it required the days of trial and tribulation, such as came in the days of the exile, to create a yearning for the appearance of the King, the Conqueror, the God of Israel. Within the Romans of a foreign ruler, and subject to his rule, the Messiah became an ever-present being to the thoughts and to the visions of the Jews; and yet when at last the Son of man came to his own, his own knew him not. But though they rejected him of whom Moses and the prophets wrote, the faith in a Restorer of Israel for many centuries continued to knit together the nation in their dispersed condition. Of late only a change has come over them, and the Jewish camp may be truly said to have divided into three distinct branches: (1) the extreme right, (2) the extreme left, and (3) the centre.

**(1)** The Jews belonging to the first class are those. who remain either (*a*) orthodox in their adherence to the liberal interpretation of the Bible and tradition, or (*b*) who, though accepting both Bible and tradition, favor. a liberal construction of the traditional usages. This class of Jews continue to look for a personal reign of Messiah, and their restoration to the land of their forefathers. Their number is daily decreasing, however, and the time promises to be soon when they shall be counted among the things that were.

**(2)** To the second class belong those Jews generally denominated *Reformed*. "They would sweep away Talmudism and the ceremonial law, claiming a complete emancipation from religious thralldom as their indefeasible right. They question the propriety of interpreting the prophets as predicting a personal Messiah, and deny the possibility of a restoration of Israel as a nation of political entity. In 1840 they for the first time gave public expression to their belief in a meeting at Fraakfort, when they declared that "a Messiah who is to lead back to Palestine is neither expected nor desired by the associated, and they acknowledge that alone to be their country to which they belong by birth or civil relation.' In 1869 a meeting of the educated Jews of Germany was held in the city of Leipsic, at which eighty-four different Jewish congregations were represented.

Twenty-four of the attendants were rabbis of high repute; the lay members men who had secured the highest places in the gift of the nation, among them the late Dr. First, then professor at the University of Leipsic, the learned Lazarus, of the University of Berlin, etc In 1840 the gathering had been composed of a handful of rationalistic Jews; in 1869 the meeting at Leipsic was attended by Israel's ablest and most devoted adherents, Yet these men *rejected* the belief in Israel's restoration, and passed the following resolution: "Those portions of our prayers which refer to the re-establishment of the annual sacrifices at the Messianic period, or to the return of the Jews to Jerusalem, must be modified." Now widespread the opinion represented at this time owing may be best judged if such a conservative journal as the *London Jewish Chronicle* is led to comment that "Although every Jew is bound to believe in a Messiah, the question whether that expression indicates a person or a time, and whether he or it has arrived or not, is, according to the Talmud, an open question."

(3) The main portion of modern Judaism consists of the moderate party, embracing those Jews who seek to develop a higher spirituality from the old form of Judaism. With them the ceremonial law is valuable only as a hedge to keep the people apart from other forms of religion till the times are fulfilled. Like Kimchi, Abrabanel, and other Jewish commentators, they apply the oracle in ~~2310E~~ Isaiah 11:1-10 to the age of the Messiah, whose advent they place at the very time when the final gathering of the Jewish people is to be accomplished. "The one," says the Revelation Prof. Marks (*Jewish Messenger*, January, 1872), His to be immediately consequent upon the other; or, rather, they are prophesied as synchronous events." Denying the accuracy of Christian interpretation, which refers the 11th chapter to the first, and the 12th chapter to the coming of Christ in the final day, they insist that the Hebrew Scriptures teach only one Messianic appearance, and that chapter 11 warrants no distinction in point of time between "the clearly-defined occurrences which are to mark Messiah's advent;" "and," continues Prof. Marks, "so far from representing the complete regeneration of the moral world as the result of many centuries after the promised Messiah shall have appeared, the prophet of the text mentions the *universal peace and harmony that shall prevail, as well as the ingathering of the dispersed of Judah and of Israel*, as the especial events which are to characterize the inauguration of the Messianic age. *The promised regenerator of mankind is to be known by the accomplishment of these his appointed tasks*; and no one, according to the Jewish view of



prophetic Scripture, is entitled to the name of ‘the Messiah’ who does. not vindicate his claim to that high office by means of the fulfilment of the conditions which the word of inspiration has assigned to his coming.”

As is well known, the Jews looked for a Messiah in the days of our Saviour. For centuries after the whole nation was incessantly on the watch: their prosperity seemed the harbinger of his coming; their darkest calamities, they believed, gathered them only to display, with the force of stronger contrast, the mercy of their God and the glory of their Redeemer. Calculation upon calculation failed, until at last, their courage threatening desertion, the rabbinical interdict was sent forth to repress the dangerous curiosity which, often baffled, would still penetrate the secrets of futurity. “Cursed is he who calculates the time of the Messiah’s coming” was the daily message to the faithful of the synagogue; and at last it was declared that “No indication is given with regard to the particular epoch at which the prophecy of the 11th chapter (of Isaiah) is to be accomplished,” but that the inspired messenger of God has furnished means of determining by the evidence of our senses the *distinctive signs* by which the advent of the Messiah is to be marked, viz.

- (1) the arrival of the *golden age* (ver. 7, 8, 9);
- (2) the rallying of the nations, unsought and uninvited, around the Messianic banner (ver. 10); and
- (3) the second ingathering of the whole of the Jewish people, including the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, as well as those which composed the kingdom of Samaria, and are popularly spoken of as “the lost tribes” (ver. 11 and 12. Compare on this. point Lindo, *The Conciliator of R. Manasseh ben-Israel* [Lond. 1842, 2 vols. 8vo], 2:143). “As Jews, we,” they say, “maintain that the promised Messiah has not yet appeared, and that the world has never witnessed such a moral picture as the prophets predict of the Messianic age.” And yet they are obliged themselves to confess that “*Various opinions prevail* [among them] *with respect to what is to be precisely understood by the coming of the Messiah.* Some hold that it implies the birth of a particular personage; others, that it describes the conjunction of certain events which are to act with extraordinary moral power on the world at large. But what it does especially behoove us to bear in mind is, first, that the prophets identify the Messianic advent with an *age* when brute force shall have come to an end, when warfare and strife shall have disappeared from the earth, and when love shall have

become the sole governing principle of humanity; and, secondly, that this important work of the regeneration of mankind is to be brought about by the instrumentality of the Jewish people, *if not by some remarkable individual born of that race.*”

Jesus the Christ they refuse to recognise as that “remarkable individual,” “because,” as one of their number has declared, “we do not find *in the present comparatively imperfect stage of human progress the realization of that blessed condition of mankind which the prophet Isaiah associates with the era when Messiah is to appear. And as our Hebrew Scriptures speak of one Messianic advent only, and not of two advents* (even those in the synagogue who speak of a Messiah from the house of Joseph concurrently with one from the house of David make their advent synchronous); *and as the inspired Book does not preach Messiah’s kingdom as a matter of faith, but distinctly identifies it with matters of fact which are to be made evident to the senses, we cling to the plain inference to be drawn from the text of the Bible, and we deny that Messiah has yet appeared, and upon the following grounds:* First. Because of the three distinctive facts which the inspired seer of Judah inseparably connects with the advent of the Messiah, viz. the cessation of war and the uninterrupted reign of peace, the prevalence of a perfect concord of opinion on all matters bearing upon the worship of the one and only God, and the ingathering of the remnant of Judah and of the dispersed ten tribes of Israel-not one has, up to the present time, been accomplished. ‘Second. We dissent from the proposition that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah announced by the prophets, because the Church which he founded, and which his successors developed, has offered, during a succession of centuries, a most singular contrast to what is described by the Hebrew Scriptures as the immediate consequence of Messiah’s advent, and of his glorious kingdom. The prophet Isaiah declares that when the Messiah appears, peace, love, and union will be permanently established; and every candid man must admit that the world has not yet realized the accomplishment of this prophecy. Again, in the days of Messiah, all men, as Scripture saith, ‘are to serve God with one accord;’ and yet it is very certain that since the appearance of him whom our Christian brethren believe to be Messiah, mankind has been split into more hostile divisions on the grounds of religious belief, and more antagonistic sects have sprung up, than in any historic age before Christianity was preached.” For the articles of confession, see the article. *SEE JUDAISM*, 4:1057, col. 1 (9 and 12),

1058, and especially those portions in *Conservative and Reformed JUDAISM*; also *SEE RESTORATION OF THE JEWS*.

**IV.** *Proof of the Messiahship of Jesus.* — This discussion resolves itself into two questions. *SEE JESUS CHRIST*.

**1.** The promised Messiah *has already come*. To prove this assertion, we shall confine our remarks to *three* prophecies.

(1.) The first is the passage above commented on, occurring in <sup>408</sup>Genesis 49:8, 10, where Jacob is giving his sons his parting benediction, etc. When he comes to Judah, he says: “The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the obedience of the people be.” It is evident that by Judah is here meant, not the *person*, but the *tribe*; for Judah died in Egypt, without any pre-eminence. By *sceptre* and *lawgiver* are obviously intended the legislative and ruling power, which did, in the course of time, commence in David, and which for centuries afterwards was continued in his descendants. Whatever variety the form of government—whether monarchical or aristocratical might have assumed, the *law* and *polity were still the same*. This prediction all the ancient Jews referred to the Messiah. Ben-Uzziel renders it, “Until the time when the king Messiah shall come.” The Targum of Onkelos speaks to the same effect, and that of Jerusalem paraphrases it thus: “Kings shall not cease from the house of Judah, nor doctors that teach the law from his children, until that the king Messiah do come, whose the kingdom is; and all nations of the earth shall be subject unto him.” Now that the sceptre has ‘departed from Judah, and, consequently, that the Messiah has come, we argue from the acknowledgments of some most learned Jews themselves. Kimchi thus comments on Hosea: “These are the days of our captivity, wherein we have neither king nor prince in Israel; but we are in the power of the Gentiles, and under their kings and princes.” Again, Abarbanel, commenting on Isaiah 53, says that it is a great part of their misery in their captivity that they have neither kingdom nor rule, nor a sceptre of judgment! The *precise* time when all authority departed from Judah is disputed. Some date its departure from the time when Herod, an Idumnean, set aside the Maccabees and Sanhedrim. Thereupon the Jews are said to have shaved their heads, put on sackcloth, and cried, “Woe to us, because the sceptre is departed from Judah, and a lawgiver from beneath his feet !” Others think that it was when Vespasian and Titus destroyed Jerusalem and the Temple that the Jews lost the last vestige of

authority. If, therefore, the sceptre *has* departed from Judah-and who can question it who looks at the broken-up, scattered, and lost state of that tribe for ages? the conclusion is clearly irresistible that the Messiah *must have long since come!* To avoid the force of this conclusion the Jews now say that the **fbvϷshe'bet**, which we render *sceptre*, may be translated *rod*, and metaphorically signifies, in the above passage, *affliction*. That the word cannot bear this meaning *here* is evident, because, for a long while after the prophecy was uttered, especially in the reigns of David and Solomon, the tribe of Judah was in a most prosperous state. **SEE SCEPTRE.**

(2.) The next proof that the Messiah has long since come we adduce from <sup>(2025)</sup>Daniel 9:25, 26, 27. It is evident that the true Messiah is here spoken of. He is twice designated by the very name. If we consider what the work is which he is here said to accomplish, we shall have a full confirmation of this. Who but he could finish and take away transgression, make reconciliation for iniquity, bring in everlasting righteousness, seal up the vision and prophecy, confirm the covenants with many, and cause to cease the sacrifice and oblation? Indeed, there is a saying extant in the Talmud, as the tradition of former times, "In Daniel is delivered to us the end of the Messiah," i.e. the term wherein he ought to come, as it is explained by Jarchi. Grotius (*De Veritat.* v) speaks of a Jew, R. Berachia, who lived fifty years before our Lord, and who declared that the time fixed by Daniel could not go beyond fifty years! If then it be the true Messiah who is described in the above prophecy, it remains for us to see how the time predicted for his coming has long since transpired. This is expressly said to be seventy weeks from the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem. That by seventy weeks are to be understood seventy sevens of years, a day being put for a year, and a week for seven years, making up 490 years, is allowed by Kimchi, Jarchi, rabbi Saadias, and other learned Jews, as well as by many Christian commentators. It is clear that these seventy weeks cannot consist of weeks of days, for all put together make but one year, four months, and odd days-a space of time too short to crowd so many various events into as are here specified; nor can any such time be assigned between the two captivities, wherein like events did happen (see Prideaux, *Connect.* lib. v, pt. -1). This period of time then *must have long since* elapsed, whether we date its commencement from the first decree of Cyrus (<sup>(4500)</sup>Ezra 1:1, 2), the second of Darius Hystaspes (vi.

15), or that of Artaxerxes (viii. 1). See Grotius, *De Veritat.* v; Josephus, *War*, 7:12, 13. *SEE SEVENTY WEEKS.*

(3.) We can only barely allude to one remarkable prediction more, which fixes the time of the Messiah's advent, viz. <sup><300></sup>Haggai 2:7-9: I will shake all nations, and the desire of all nations shall come: and I will fill this house with glory, saith the Lord of Hosts. The silver is mine, and the gold is mine, saith the Lord of Hosts. The glory of this latter house shall be greater than of the former, saith the Lord of Hosts." The glory here spoken of *must* be in reference to the Messiah, or on some other account. It could not have been said that the second Temple exceeded in glory the former one; for in many particulars, according to the acknowledgment of the Jews themselves, it was far inferior, both as a building (<sup><458B></sup>Ezra 3:3, 12) and in respect of the symbols and tokens of God's special favor being wanting (see Kimchi and R. Salomon on <sup><300B></sup>Haggai 1:8). The promised glory, therefore, must refer to the coming and presence of him who was promised to the world before there was any nation of the Jews and who is aptly called the "*Desire of all nations.*" This view is amply confirmed by the prophet Malachi (<sup><300B></sup>Malachi 3:1). Since, then, the very Temple into which the Saviour was to 'enter has for ages been destroyed, *He must*, if the integrity of this prophecy be preserved, *have come*. Nor is the force of this passage for our present purpose greatly diminished if we take the interpretation of many, that hDmj , "desire," here, being fem., cannot directly refer to the Messiah personally; for in any case the prophecy refers to some glorification, at the time future, of the then existing Temple; and as that Temple has now utterly passed away, its fulfilment cannot be looked for under any Messiah yet to come. *SEE DESIRE.*

That there was, at the time of our Lord's birth, a great expectation of the Messiah, both among Jews and Gentiles, may be seen from three celebrated historians, as well as from the sacred Scriptures. Tacitus (*Hist.* c. 13) says: "Pluribus persuasio inerat, antiquis sacerdotum literaris contineri, eo ipso tempore fore ut valesceret *Oriens*, profectique Judaea rerum potirentur." Again, Suetonius (in *Vespas.* 4) says: "Percrebruerat Oriente toto vetus et constans opinio, esse in fatis ut eo tempore Judsei profecti rerum potirentur." Josephus, not being able to find any calculation by which to protract the general expectation of the Messiah, applies it in the following words to Vespasian (*War*, 7:31): "That which chiefly excited the Jews to war was an ambiguous prophecy, which was also found in the sacred books, that at that time some one within their country should arise who

would obtain the empire of the whole world.” We are, moreover, informed again by Suetonius (*Octav.* 94), that, upon the conception of Augustus, it was generally thought that *Nature* was then in labor to bring forth a king who would rule the Romans. Some suppose that the words of Virgil (*Eclog.* iv) point at our Saviour, but they were intended by him to apply to the son of Pollio. We may just add that as there was a general expectation of the Messiah at this time, so there were many impostors who drew after them many followers (Josephus, *Ant.* 20:2, 6; *War.* 57:31). See also a full account of the false Christs who appeared by John h Lent, *Schediasnz.* c. 2; Maimonides, *Ep. ad Judceos Marsilienses*, Christ prophesies of such persons (<sup><4024></sup>Matthew 24:24, 29).

**2.** The limits of this article will admit of our only touching upon the proofs that Jesus of Nazareth, and none other, is the very Messiah that was to come.

**(1.)** What was predicted of the Messiah was fulfilled in Jesus. Was the Messiah to be of the seed of the woman (<sup><0085></sup>Genesis 3:15), and this woman a virgin? (<sup><3074></sup>Isaiah 7:14). So we are told (<sup><4044></sup>Galatians 4:4; <sup><4018></sup>Matthew 1:18, and 22, 23) that Jesus was made of a woman, and born of a virgin. Was it predicted that he (Messiah) should be of the tribe of Judah, of the family of Jesse, and of the house of David? (<sup><3082></sup>Micah 5:2; <sup><0490></sup>Genesis 49:10; <sup><3110></sup>Isaiah 11:10; <sup><2325></sup>Jeremiah 23:5). This was fulfilled in Jesus (<sup><4012></sup>Luke 1:27, 69; <sup><4008></sup>Matthew 1:1). **SEE GENEALOGY OF CHRIST.**

**(2.)** If the Messiah was to be a prophet like unto Moses, so was Jesus also (Isaiah 18; <sup><4064></sup>John 6:14). If the Messiah was to appear in the second Temple, so did Jesus (<sup><3017></sup>Haggai 2:7, 9; <sup><4080></sup>John 18:20).

**(3.)** The Messiah was to work miracles (<sup><2355></sup>Isaiah 35:5, 6; comp. <sup><4004></sup>Matthew 11:4, 5). **SEE MIRACLE.**

**(4.)** If the Messiah was to suffer and die (Isaiah 53), we find that Jesus died in the same manner, at the very time, and under the identical circumstances, which were predicted of him. The very man who betrayed him, the price for which he was sold, the indignities he was to receive in his last moments, the parting of his garments, and his last words, etc., were all foretold of the Messiah, and accomplished in Jesus!

**(5.)** Was the Messiah to rise from the dead? So did Jesus. How stupendous and adorable is the providence of God, who, through so many

apparent contingencies, brought such things to pass! See Kidder, *Demonstration of the Messiah* (Lond. 1726, fol.); Olearius, *Jesus d. wahre Messias* (Leips. 1714, 1737); M'Cauley, *Messiahship of Jesus* (Warburton Lect. 1852); Black, *Messiahs and anti-Messiahs* (Lond. 1853); Browne, *Messiah as foretold and expected* (Lond. 1862); Higginson, *Hebrew Messianic Hope and Christian Reality* (Lond. 1871). Comp. also Malcolm's *Theological Index*, s.v.; Volbeding's *Index Progranammatum*, p. 38 sq.; Hase's *Leben Jesu*, p. 86; and Danz, *Worterbuch*, p. 855 sq. **SEE CHRISTOLOGY.**

### Messiahs, False

Jesus warned his disciples that false Christs should arise (~~400~~ Matthew 24:24), and the event has verified the prediction. No less than twenty-four such impostors have been enumerated as having appeared in different places and at different times; and even this does not exhaust the list. One by the name of *Simeon* was the first of any note who made a noise in the world. Being dissatisfied with the state of things under Hadrian, he set himself up as the head of the Jewish nation, and proclaimed himself their long-expected Messiah. He was one of those banditti that infested Judaea, and committed all kinds of violence against the Romans; and had become so powerful that he was chosen king of the Jews, and by them acknowledged their Messiah. However, to facilitate the success of this bold enterprise, he assumed the name of Bar-Cocheba (q.v.), alluding to the star foretold by Balaam; for he pretended to be the star sent by heaven to restore his nation to its ancient liberty and glory. This epithet was changed by his enemies into that of Bar-Cozeba, i.e. *son of a lie*. He chose a forerunner, raised an army, was anointed king, coined money inscribed with his own name, and proclaimed himself Messiah and prince of the Jewish nation. Hadrian raised an army, and sent it against him: he retired into a town called Bither, where he was besieged. Bar-Cocheba seems to have been killed in the siege, the city was taken, and a dreadful havoc succeeded. The Jews themselves allow that during this short war against the Romans in defence of this false Messiah they lost five or six hundred thousand souls. This was in the first half of the 2d century. In the reign of Theodosius the Younger, AD. 434. another impostor arose, called *Moses Cretensis*. He pretended to be a second Moses, sent to deliver the Jews who dwelt in Crete, and promised to divide the sea and give them a safe passage through it. Their delusion proved so strong and universal that they neglected their lands, houses, and other concerns, and took only so much

with them as they could conveniently carry. On the day appointed, this false Moses, having led them to the top of a rock, men, women, and children threw themselves headlong down into the sea, without the least hesitation or reluctance, till so great a number of them were drowned. as to open the eyes of the rest, and make them sensible of the cheat. They then began to look for their pretended leader, but he had disappeared, and escaped out of their hands.

In the reign of Justin, about AD. 520, another impostor appeared, who called himself the son of Moses. His name was *Dunaan*. He entered into a city of Arabia Felix, and there he greatly oppressed the Christians; but he was taken prisoner and put to death by Elesban, an Ethiopian general. The Jews and Samaritans rebelled against the emperor Justinian, AD. 529, and set up one *Julian* for their king, and accounted him the Messiah. The emperor sent an army against them, killed great numbers of them, took their pretended Messiah prisoner, and immediately put him to death. In the time of Leo the Isaurian, about AD. 721, arose another false Messiah in Spain: his name was *Sercnus*. He drew great numbers after him, to their no small loss and disappointment; but all his pretensions came to nothing.

The 12th century was particularly fruitful in producing Messiahs. About 1137 there appeared one in France, who was put to death, and numbers of those who followed him. In AD. 1138 the Persians were disturbed with a Jew who called himself the Messiah. He collected a vast army; but he, too, was put to death, and his followers were treated with great inhumanity. A false Messiah stirred up the Jews at Cordova, in Spain, AD. 1157. The wiser and better part looked upon him as a madman, but the great body of the Jewish nation believed in him. On this occasion nearly all the Jews in Spain were destroyed. Another false Messiah who arose in the kingdom of Fez, AD. 1167, under the name of *David Alroi* (Alroy), brought great troubles and persecutions upon the Jews that were scattered throughout that country. Disraeli has taken this historical event as the plot of his *Alroy*. In the same year an Arabian professed to be the Messiah, and pretended to work miracles. When search was made for him, his followers fled, and he was brought before the Arabian king. Being questioned by him, he replied that he was a prophet sent from God. The king then asked him what sign he could show to confirm his mission. "Cut off my head," said he, "and I will return to life again." The king took him at his word, promising to believe him if his prediction was accomplished. The poor wretch, however, never came to life again, and the cheat was sufficiently discovered. Those



who had been deluded by him were grievously punished, and the nation was condemned to a very heavy fine. Not long after this, a Jew who dwelt beyond the Euphrates called himself the Messiah, and drew vast multitudes of people about him. He gave this for a sign of it, that he had been leprous, and had been cured in the course of one night. He, like the rest, perished, and brought great persecution on his countrymen. A magician and false Christ arose in Persia, AD. 1174, who seduced many of the common people, and brought the Jews into great tribulation (see Maimonides, *Epistol. ad Judceos in Massilia agentes*). Another of these impostors, a great cabalist, arose, AD. 1176, in Moravia, who was called *David Almasser*. He pretended he could make himself invisible; but he was soon taken and put to death, and a heavy fine laid upon the Jews. A famous cheat and rebel exerted himself in Persia, AD. 1199, called *David el-David*. He was a man of learning, a great magician, and pretended to be the Messiah. He raised an army against the king, but was 'taken' and imprisoned; and, having made his escape, was afterwards retaken and beheaded. Vast numbers of the Jews were butchered for taking part with this impostor.

In the 13th and 14th centuries the Messiah imposition had come to a comparative stand-still. It is true the most learned of the rabbis, the celebrated Saadia. Abraham Ibn-Chija, Nachman, and Gersoni, had taken upon themselves to calculate the time of the actual coming of the veritable deliverer, and had fixed upon 1358 as the Messiah year; but no one came forward and sought to impose himself upon the waiting multitude. Towards the close of the 15th- century, however. the opportunity was renewed by the terrible fate of the Jews, especially in the Iberian peninsula, where for so many years they had enjoyed a haven of rest. On the Continent the Jews had suffered from the very start of the Crusading movement, but in the Iberian peninsula they had found a pleasant home and a quiet retreat, frequently even positions of power and of honor. Gradually, however, their position was undermined. First the Church of Rome trained men as polemic against the Jews. Later it was determined to make converts of them at any price, and if they could not be secured peacefully, to subject them to bloody persecution. This policy was inaugurated at Seville in 1391-92, and soon spread over the peninsula. Escape was difficult, and, if made, hardly augured a brighter future in other lands; and thus reasoning, they remained, and some 200,000 Jews were made to accept baptism at the point of the sword. This event forms the saddest

turning-point in Jewish history. Persecution upon persecution followed. The Jew, finding no alternative, was forced to play the part of the hypocrite, and, while pressing the cross to his lips, vowed in his heart more faithful devotion to the cause of Israel. The gloomiest day came with the date of America's discovery. The year that shed new light upon Europe shrouded the Jew in darkness, and forms at the same time the grandest and the most melancholy hour of modern history. But though at first many had been made converts in the hours of oppression, they gradually came to believe in the vital truths of Christianity; and though the examples before them were no, promotive of a true Christian life, the fact that no deliverer had come to Israel in the most trying hour made them not only faint but wavering, and there seemed danger that, if not soon inspired with new hope, the last day had come for the Jewish race. There remained, it is true, a small remnant that had continued thus far in open defiance to all demands of the government, and valiantly contended for liberty of conscience. But even these successive trials had broken their courage, and had robbed them of the prospect of a more auspicious future. Not only the uneducated, but even the learned and the devoted, were yielding up the long cherished Messianic hope, as a sweet dream, an idle fancy, which lacked all chance of reality. The Jewish race, they declared, was born to suffer forever, and the day would never come for deliverance from oppression; never should they see a day of freedom and independence. This hopeless and hapless condition of his countrymen determined the learned Jewish rabbi Abrabanel (q.v.) to employ his pen in defence of the O.-T. Scriptures, and of Jewish interpretation. Aware that if this spirit of discontent and unbelief were suffered to grow it would result in the ultimate defunction of the Jewish ranks, he essayed to combat it by inspiring them anew with the prospects of an early delivery from oppression, and the dawn of a happy change. Though hoary with age, he wrote with trembling hands book after book to explain the principal Messianic passages of the O. T., especially those of Daniel, and argued that Israel could safely depend upon a glorious future, and that the day of the Messiah was near at hand. He even went so far as to determine the date, and fixed upon 1503 as the year of their delivery. As a leader in Israel, Abrabanel's word commanded attention, and the wretched people were encouraged to take new hope.

At such a moment there was room for imposition, and it came immediately with the very opening of the 16th century. Enthusiasts declared that the time had arrived for removal to the Holy Land, to anticipate the change so

near at hand. One German rabbi, Ascher Lammlein (or Limmlin), a resident within the Austrian dominions, actually gave himself out as the forerunner of the approaching Messiah, and, as pseudo-John, about AD. 1502, called the people to repentance, and urged an immediate removal to the East. He pulled down his own house, presaging that by another year he and his brethren who would follow him should live in peace under the reign of the "King of the Jews." Lammlein lived near Venice, but his admonitions travelled all through Germany, Italy, Spain, and France. Everywhere his cause made converts; even Christians are said to have believed in his mission (see Gratz, *Gesch. d. Juden*, 9:243). But the prophet died suddenly, and all hopes lay prostrate in the dust. The agony of the people, so basely deceived, lacks description. A few flocked to the cross of Christ, and in this their most trying hour declared that Jesus was the Christ; but the greater number, with that stubbornness characteristic of the Shemitic race, yet refused to look for help from the *great* Physician.

The Messiah-hope still lingered, however faintly, in the heart of the Jew, particularly in the Iberian peninsula, where he now suffered most; and it was not long before a new impostor arose to abuse the confidence of his much dejected brethren. This time the pretender played his part more acutely, and it was some time before his deception was discovered. During the eventful reign of Charles V a person suddenly turned up at the court of the king of Portugal, who, calling himself *David Reubeni*, declared that he had come from India as ambassador of his brother, the king of the Jews, to propose an alliance for the recovery of the Holy Land from the Mussulman. He had so carefully prepared himself for his role that he appeared natural, and his story apparently bore truth upon its face. He readily found friends both among Jews and Gentiles, and he was favorably received wherever he went. To persuade the Iberian government of the verity of his mission, he had brought papers confirming his claims; and he kept at such a respectful distance from the Jews that they became doubly anxious to approach him. Those who had been forcibly converted to Christianity fairly worshipped the ground he had stood upon; and great was the joy among the Jews of Italy when David found favor in the eyes of Clement VII (1523-34), and gained distinctions at the papal-court. In the midst of his successes he was joined by one *Solomon Alolcho* (q.v.), a Portuguese New-Christian, who openly apostatized to Judaism, and set up as the prophet of the movement. He submitted to circumcision, and in many other ways sought to prove his sincerity. At first he travelled with

David but, anxious to visit the Holy Land, he parted with the prince and set out for the East. On his return he visited Clement VII, and found even greater favor with the pope than David. Indeed, Molcho enjoyed Clement's protection thereafter, and, though an apostate, he was suffered to pour out his apocalyptic rhapsodies without restraint. But he finally came to a woful end. He had met David again, and together they had gone to Ratisbon, the seat of Charles V, to convert the emperor. Charles was hardhearted, and both David and Solomon were thrown into prison; the former escaping, we hardly know how, the latter expiating his daring at the stake. This put an end to the Messiah promises of the 16th century.

In the 17th century the first false Christ arose in the East Indies, AD. 1615, and was largely followed by the Portuguese Jews who are scattered over that country. Another in the Low Countries declared himself to be the Messiah of the family of David, and of the line of Nathan, AD. 1624. He promised to destroy Rome, and to overthrow the kingdom of Antichrist and the Turkish empire.

The year 1666 was a year of great expectation, and some wonderful thing was looked for by many. This was a fit time for an impostor to set up, and accordingly lying reports were carried about. It was said that great multitudes marched from unknown parts to the remote deserts of Arabia, and they were supposed to be the ten tribes of Israel, who had been dispersed for many ages; that a ship had arrived in the north part of Scotland with sails and' cordage of silk; that the mariners spoke nothing but Hebrew; that on the sails was this motto, "The Twelve Tribes of Israel." The auspicious moment. was embraced to advantage by one *Sabbathai Zebi* (q.v.), the greatest of all Jewish pretenders, who made a great noise, and gained a great number of proselytes. He was born at Aleppo, and imposed on the Jews for a considerable time with great success as "King of the kings of the earth i" but when the Turkish government, under whose protection he lived, questioned his wholesome influence on the people, he forsook the Jews and turned Mohammedan for the sake of saving his life, which he believed in danger-a presentiment that proved but too true, for he was finally beheaded. Sabbathai Zebi's influence is still incalculable; he demands so much notice at our hands that we refer our readers to the special article under his name. Suffice it to say here that this man formed a considerable sect, which notwithstanding that the conduct of its founder might, one would suppose, have disabused the most blind and fanatic enthusiasm-long existed, and still continues to exist.

Another false Christ that made any considerable number of converts was one rabbi *Mordecai*, a Jew of Germany: he appeared AD. 1682. It was not long before he was found out to be an impostor, and was obliged to flee from Italy to Poland to save his life: what became of him afterwards does not seem to be recorded. About the middle of the 18th century an extraordinary adventurer, named Frank, by birth a Polish Jew, and by profession, in his younger days, a distiller of brandy, suddenly came to the front, and revived the expiring Sabbathaic party by the propagation of a new creed, which leaned towards Christianity, while it was really neither that nor Judaism. This lofty eclectic rejected the Talmud, but insisted on a hidden sense in the Scriptures. He admitted the trinity and the incarnation of, the Deity, but preserved an artful ambiguity as to the person in whom the Deity was incarnate. He was himself a believer in Sabbathai Zebi, and yet he dared not to speak out against Christ; consequently he preferred to leave the question unsettled, until his connection with the Christian world seemed to demand a more decided confession, when he openly embraced Christianity as a member of the Roman Catholic Church. In his last years he flourished as “baron” Frank, and his followers dared even to presume that he was of royal lineage, and closely related to the reigning house of Russia. The extent of his influence may be fairly estimated by our readers when we tell them that 800 persons attended his funeral. A cross was set up over his tomb. For some time a daughter whom he had left guided his followers; but these gradually dispersed, and, deprived of pecuniary aid, the family of Frank gave to the world a work written by him many years before his decease, counselling the Jews to embrace the Christian religion. *SEE FRANK, JACOB.* Frank evidently preferred to continue the work of Sabbathai Zebi rather than declare himself a Messiah. He frequently declared that his mission was to unite together all religions, sects, and confessions. Among the paradoxical opinions he is said to have advanced was the idea that the Lord Jesus Christ is still upon earth, and that he would soon again send forth twelve apostles to publish the Gospel. All that now remains of the Frankists is contained within the Roman Catholic Church of Poland; they are therefore virtually Christians, though distinguishing themselves by marked remains of Judaism. Some consider that they still retain in secret a belief in the religion of the synagogue. They are found in Poland, especially at Warsaw, dispersed among all, even the highest, classes of society, chiefly in the profession of law and medicine. They are said to have taken a considerable share in the war of insurrection against Russia in the year 1830; it has even been said that the chief of the

Frankists was a member of the Diet of Poland, and afterwards obliged to take refuge as an exile in France. But little is known of them at present, as they mix so largely With the Christians as such.

In our own day the Messiah question is again enlivened by the appearance of new claimants. One of these lately made his debut in the far East, at Sana, in the kingdom of Yemen, and created much excitement, which has scarcely subsided yet. The well-known Eastern traveller, baron De Maltzahn, furnishes the following account of this modern Messiah of the Orient: The pretender, of a fascinating exterior, remarkably brilliant eyes, and a melodious voice, after studying the mysteries of the great cabalistical work, the Zohar. withdrew from intercourse with his fellow-men, and eventually retired into a desert, where he submitted to bodily mortifications and self-denial. He soon became distinguished as a worker of miracles, and as such attracted the attention of the superstitious Bedouins. These, seeking to obtain his good graces, brought various descriptions of food, and were pleased that he condescended to accept their offerings. The increase of their flocks and of their household, and even their success in the attack upon hostile troops, were attributed to the power peculiar to this worker of marvels. His reputation spread far and wide among the Arabian population, and many incredible stories were circulated about this "wise man." It was said of him that his face had the splendor of the sun; that the name, "Son of David," was engraved upon his hand; that he possessed the valuable power of discovering treasures; that he was invulnerable, etc. His Jewish compatriots, not pleased with the connection between their favorite scholar and the members of a strange religion, were about to bring him back to his own people, when a sudden calamity gave the position of this man a new turn. An epidemic broke out among the flocks of the Bedouins, who in consequence' of this calamity were in a short time reduced to extreme want. These changes in the fortune of the Arabs were assigned to the secret influence of the mysterious man. It was then remembered that he was a Jew, and he all at once became the object of bitter hatred. The recluse had meanwhile quitted his solitude and returned to his native place. Here he was declared, chiefly by the Arabs, to be a Messiah, and he became a dreaded and unapproachable power even in the eyes of his fiercest enemies. His Jewish countrymen were in expectation that he would crush the Arabs and lead his own brethren to the Holy Land. His heated imagination accepted the messianic part which the delusion of the people had conferred upon him; and he beheld in the opinion of the multitude an

evidence of his high mission. He received everywhere munificent presents, lived in a princely style, was revered by his own people, and dreaded by the Moslems, until some daring Arabs finally waylaid and killed him, and thus proved that he was vulnerable. But superstition is more invulnerable than false Messiahs. *Ari Shocher* (such was his name) is not considered as dead by his followers. He appeared after the murder, they say, under another form, in the neighborhood of Sana, and proclaimed that, at a later time, he would assume again his former shape. The government has taken steps to seize him, but he has since disappeared, and his present whereabouts are unknown.

Very recently “a new Messiah,” writes the *Fremdenblatt* (August, 1872), “has made his appearance, and he has been graciously pleased to address his first official communication to the Jewish congregation of Berlin. The royal ‘whom it may concern’ bore a seal which had on it the crown of Israel, the shield of David, and the following words as motto: ‘*Lo bechail velo bekoach ki im beruchi, amar Adonai Zebaoth*—not with power, nor with force, but with my Spirit, says the Lord Zebaoth.’ The congregation is commanded to cause to be proclaimed in the synagogue the commemoration day of the destruction of Jerusalem, that thenceforth that day shall be celebrated no longer as a day of mourning, but as a day of joy and jubilation, because he, ‘*Jekuthiel*, king of Israel,’ has come, and is about to assume the throne of his empire as the veritable Messiah. Should they refuse to carry out his behest, he will-pour out the vial of his anger on the unbelievers, and the infidels will fall under the ban of excommunication, on his entering Berlin. The communication is accompanied by a memorial containing the rules of government which ‘*Jekuthiel*, the king of Israel,’ prescribes for the government of his people, and a copy of the diplomatic notes which his royal majesty has caused to be transmitted to the Porte and the other great powers for a peaceable cession of Palestine and Syria.” Although a year has passed since he issued his *address*, nothing has been heard of his entry into the new capital of the German empire.

See Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald. Talm. et Rabbin.* (Basle, 1640, fol.), coll. 1267 sq.; id. *Synagoga Judaica*, ch. i; Hulsius, *Theol. Jud.* (Bredse, 1653, 4to); Pocock, *Theol. Works*, 1:159 sq.; Johannes a Lent, *Hist. of Fkalse Messiahs* (in Ugolini’s *Thesaurus*, entitled *De Pseudo-Messiis*); Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judenthum* (Konigsb. 1711, 2 vols. 4to), 2:647 sq., a book to be read very guardedly; Jortin, *Remarks on Eccl. Hist.* 3:330; Birch, *De Messia* (Havn. 1789); Harris, *Sermons on the Messiah*;

Simpson, *Key to the Prophecies*, sec. 9; Maclaurin, *On the Prophecies relating to the Messiah*; Fuller, *Jesus the true Messiah*; Stehelin, *Traditions of the Jews* (Lond. 1751-52, fol.); De Rossi, *Della vana aspettazione degli Ebrei del loro Re Messia* (Parma, 1773, 4to); Bertholdt, *Christologia Jud. Jesu apostolorumque AEtate* (Erlangen, 1811) - convenient but superficial; Lange, *Life of Christ* (see Index); Liddon, *Divinity of Christ*, p. 69, 77, 91; *Alger, Hist. Fut. Life*, p. 169, 219, 353; Sadler, *Emanuel*, p. 97 sq.; Milman, *Hist. of the Jews*, 2:432 sq.; 3:366; Allen, *Mod. Judaism*, p. 253 sq.; Young, *Christology of the Targums* (Edinb. 1853); Jost, *Gesch. der Israeliten*, vol. viii; Gratz, *Gesch. der Juden* (see Index in vol. vi, vii, viii, and x); Michel Nicolas, *Des doctrines rel. des Juifs pendant les deux siecles anterieurs a l'ere Chretienne* (Paris, 1860, 8vo), p. 266 sq.; Langen, *Judenth. zur Zeit Christi* (Freib. 1866), p. 391 sq.; Grau, *Semiten und Indogermanen* (2d ed. Stuttg. 1867, sm. 8vo), Introd. and chap. v; Rule, *Karaites* (Lond. 1870, 12mo), p. 132 sq.; *Journ. Sac. Lit.* 1873, Jan. art. viii; *Jahrb. deutsch. Theol.* 1867, 2:340 sq.; *Christian Examiner*, 1869. p. 96; *Engl. ~~Revelation~~ Revelation 8:182*; *Christian Monthly*, 1844, Nov. p. 581; *National Revelation* April, 1863, p. 46'6 sq.; 1864, p. 554 sq.; *Old and New*, 1870, April, p. 545; *New-Englander*, v. 360 sq.; 10:102 sq.; *Biblioth. Sac.* 11:609 sq.; *Hamburger, Real Encyklop. Bibel u. Talmud*, art. Messias. (J. HW.)

## Messi'as

(*Μεσσίας*), the Grecized form (~~Revelation~~ John 1:41; 4:25) of the Hebrews title MESSIAH *SEE MESSIAH* (q.v.), translated *Christ*.

## Messina, Antonella Da

an Italian painter, was born at Messina some time between 1414 and 1426: studied in the Netherlands in the school of Johann van Eyck, where he learned the secret of the preparation and use of oil-colors, and spread the knowledge of it afterwards among the Venetians. Authors differ widely as to this artist, and very little is known of his life. His principal works are the head of *St. Sebastian* and a *Madonna and Child*, in the Berlin Museum. A *Christ bound to a Pillar* is in the Manfrini Gallery at Venice, and a *Dead Christ*, with three weeping angels, in the Imperial Gallery of Vienna. A *Crucifixion*, with the Virgin and St. John, is in the Antwerp Museum; and in the Academy of Venice is a *Weeping Nun*. Two altarpieces by him are recorded, which were painted for the two churches of the Dominante,



besides several Madonnas and sacred subjects for individuals. He died about 1490. See Vasari, *Lives of the Painters*, transl. by Foster (London, 1850, 5 vols. 8vo), 2:55; Spooner, *Biographical History of the Fine Arts* (N. Y. 1865, 2 vols. 8vo), vol. ii, s.v.

### Mestrezat, Jean

a distinguished French Protestant theologian, was born at Geneva in 1592. He studied theology at Saumur, and was in 1615 appointed pastor at Charenton, near Paris, which position he held until his death, May 2, 1657. He took part in the national synod held at Charenton in 1623, and presided over that of 1631. Among the important events of his life, we must mention three public conferences he held, the first with P. Veron, a Jesuit, the great polemic of his order; the second with P. Regourd, in the presence of Anne of Austria; and the third with abbot De Retz (afterwards cardinal), who relates the most striking features of it in his *Memoires*. Mestrezat was distinguished for his inflexible firmness of purpose. It is said that he once defended the cause of Protestantism in the presence of the cardinal De Richelieu with so much vivacity that that prelate could not help remarking, "Here is the most daring minister in France." Like his colleague Daille (q.v.), he inclined towards the views of the theologians of Saumur concerning hypothetical universalism. His most important works are: *De la Communion de Jesus Christ au sacrement de l'Eucharistie, contre les Cardinaux Bellarnin et Du Perron* (Sedan, 1624, 8vo):-*Traite de l'Ecriture Sainte, contre le Jesuite Regourd et le Cardinal Du Perron* (Genesis 1642, 8vo):-*Traite de 'Eglise* (Genesis 1649, 4to):-*Sermons sur la venue et la naissance de Jesus Christ au monde* (Genesis 1649, 8vo):-*Sermons sur les chapitres XII et XIII de 'Eptre aux Hebreux* (Genesis 1655, 8vo):-*Vingt sermons sur divers textes* (Sedan, 1625, 12mo; Genesis 1658, 8vo). See *Memoires du Cardinal de Retz* (Petitot's collection), 44:130; Bayle, *Dict. Hist.*; Senebier, *Hist. Litt. de Geneve*; Haag, *La France Protest.* 7:400; Andre, *Essai. sur les ceuvres de. J. Mestrezat* (Strasb. 1847); Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 35:184; Herzog, *Real-Encyk.* 9:443; AVinet, *Hist. de la Predication*, p. 143. (J. N. P.)

### Mestrezat, Philippe

a Reformed theologian, son of Jean, was born at Geneva. In 1641 he was a professor of philosophy in his native city; in 1644 the pastor of a church; and in 1649 a professor of theology. He acquired the reputation of being an

original thinker and a good preacher. He died at Geneva in 1690. He published many dissertations, among which may be mentioned: *De Unione Personarum in Christo* (Genesis 1682, 4to) :-*De Communicatione idiomatum toti Christo facta* (ibid. 1675, 4to):-*De Tolerantia fratrum dissidentium in praeter-fundamentalibus* (1663, 4to) :-*Quaestionum philosophico-theologicarum de libero aritrio Decas* (1655, 4to). See Senebier, *Hist. Litter. de Geneve*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

## Metabolism

(from **μεταβάλλω**, to *change*) is a term coined by the German theologian Ruckert to describe the doctrinal views of the Christian fathers Ignatius, Justin, and Irenaeus on the Lord's Supper. They stand midway between strict transubstantiation and the merely symbolical view, and hold fast to an objective union of the sensible with the supersensible. **SEE LORDS SUPPER; SEE ZWINGLE.**

## Metagnostics

is a synonyme of *metaphysics* (qv.) (from **μετά**, *beyond*, and **γνώσις**, knowledge), because it transcends common knowledge. This name, of course might be given to the whole system of philosophy.

## Metal

a term that nowhere occurs in the AuthVer, although the various metals and operations with them are frequently referred to. The allusions indeed are of such a character as to show that the art of metallurgy was well advanced in those ancient times. The mountains of Palestine contained metals, noi were the Hebrews ignorant of the fact (<sup><4700></sup>Deuteronomy 8:9) but they do not appear to have understood the art of mining, unless indeed the numerous allusions apparently to mining operations in Job 28 are an evidence that these were carried on in the period of the monarchy. **SEE MINE.** They therefore obtained from others the superior as well as the inferior metals, and worked them up. They received also metal utensils ready made, or metal in plates (<sup><2400></sup>Jeremiah 10:9), from neighboring and distant countries of Asia and Europe. The Hebrews, in common with other ancient nations, were acquainted with nearly all the metals known to modern metallurgy, whether as the products of their own soil or the results of intercourse with foreigners. The trade in these metals was chiefly in the hands of the Phoenicians (<sup><2700></sup>Ezekiel 27:7), who obtained them from their

colonies, principally those in Spain (<sup><2409></sup>Jeremiah 10:9; <sup><3712></sup>Ezekiel 27:12). Some also came from Arabia (<sup><3719></sup>Ezekiel 27:19), and some apparently from the country of the Caucasus (<sup><3713></sup>Ezekiel 27:13).

**I.** One of the earliest geographical definitions is the one describing the country of Havilah as the land which abounded in *gold*, and the gold of which was good (<sup><0021></sup>Genesis 2:11, 12). The first artist in metals was a Cainite, Tubal-cain, the son of Lamech, the forger or sharpener of every instrument of *copper* (A. V. “brass”) and *iron* (<sup><0022></sup>Genesis 4:22). “Abraham was very rich in cattle, in *silver*, and in *gold*” (<sup><0132></sup>Genesis 13:2); silver, as will be shown hereafter, being the medium of commerce, while gold existed in the shape of ornaments during the patriarchal ages. The vast quantity of silver and gold used in the Temple in the time of Solomon, and otherwise possessed by the Jews during the flourishing time of the nation, is very remarkable, under whatever interpretation we regard such texts as <sup><3224></sup>1 Chronicles 22:14; 29:4, etc. In like manner, we find among other ancient Asiatic nations, and also among the Romans, extraordinary wealth in gold and silver vessels and ornaments of jewelry. As all the accounts, received from sources so various, cannot be founded on exaggeration, we may rest assured that the precious metals were in those ancient times obtained abundantly from mines—gold from Africa, India, and perhaps even then from Northern Asia; and silver principally from Spain.

*Tin* is first mentioned among the spoils of the Midianites which were taken when Balaam was slain (<sup><0422></sup>Numbers 31:22), and *lead* is used to heighten the imagery of Moses’s triumphal song (<sup><0250></sup>Exodus 15:10).

Whether the ancient Hebrews were acquainted with *steel*, properly so called, is uncertain; the words so rendered in the A. V. (<sup><1025></sup>2 Samuel 22:35; <sup><3804></sup>Job 20:24; <sup><0984></sup>Psalms 18:34; <sup><2452></sup>Jeremiah 15:12) are in all other passages translated *brass*, and would be more correctly *copper*. The “northern iron” of <sup><2452></sup>Jeremiah 15:12 is believed by commentators to be iron hardened and tempered by some peculiar process, so as more nearly to correspond to what we call steel (q.v.); and the “flaming torches” of Nah. 2:3 are probably the flashing steel scythes of the warchariots which should come against Nineveh.

Besides the simple metals, it is supposed that the Hebrews used the mixture of copper and tin known as *bronze*, and probably in all cases in which copper is mentioned as in any way manufactured, bronze is to be understood as the metal indicated. But with regard to the *chashmal* (A. V.

“amber”) of <sup>(2001)</sup>Ezekiel 1:4, 27; 8:2, rendered by the Sept. ἤλεκτρον, and the Vulg. *electrum*, by which our translators were misled, there is considerable difficulty. Whatever be the meaning of *chashmal*, for which no satisfactory etymology has been proposed, there can be but little doubt that by ἤλεκτρον the Sept. translators intended, not the fossil resin known by that name to the Greeks and to us as “amber,” but the metal so called, which consisted of a mixture of four parts of gold with one of silver, described by Pliny (32. 23) as more brilliant than silver by lamp-light. There is the same difficulty attending the χαλκολίβανον (<sup>(6015)</sup>Revelation 1:15; 2:18; A. V. “fine brass”), which has hitherto successfully resisted all the efforts of commentators, but which is explained by Suidas as a kind of *electron* more precious than gold. That it was a mixed metal of great brilliancy is extremely probable, but it has hitherto been impossible to identify it. Whether it was the same as that precious compound known among the ancients as *Corinthian brass* is uncertain, but it is likely that in later times the Jews possessed splendid vessels of the costly compound known by that name. Indeed, this is distinctly affirmed by Josephus (*Life*, p. 13). **SEE BRASS.**

In addition to the metals actually mentioned in the Bible, it has been supposed that *mercury* is alluded to in <sup>(06123)</sup>Numbers 31:23 as “the water of separation,” being “looked upon as the mother by which all the metals’ were fructified, purified, and brought forth,” and on this account kept secret, and only mysteriously hinted at (Napier, *Metal. of the Bible*, Introd. p. 6). Mr. Napier adds, “There is not the slightest foundation for this supposition.”

With the exception of iron, gold is the most widely diffused of all metals. Almost every country in the world has in its turn yielded a certain supply; and as it is found most frequently in alluvial soil, among the debris of rocks washed down by the torrents, it was known at a very early period, and was procured with little difficulty. The existence of gold and the prevalence of gold ornaments in early times are no proof of a high state of civilization, but rather the reverse. Gold was undoubtedly used before the art of working iron or copper was discovered. We have no indications of gold streams or mines in Palestine. The Hebrews obtained their principal supply from the south of Arabia, and the commerce of the Persian Gulf. The ships of Hiram, king of Tyre, brought it for Solomon (<sup>(1001)</sup>1 Kings 9:11; 10:11), and at a later period, when the Hebrew monarch had equipped a fleet and manned it with Tyrian sailors, the chief of their freight was the gold of

Ophir (<sup><1102></sup>1 Kings 9:21, 28). It was brought thence in the ships of Tarshish: (<sup><1228></sup>1 Kings 22:48), the Indiamen of the ancient world; and Parvaim (<sup><1485></sup>2 Chronicles 3:6), Raamah (<sup><3312></sup>Ezekiel 26:22), Sheba (<sup><1102></sup>1 Kings 10:2,10; <sup><3725></sup>Psalms 72:15; <sup><2316></sup>Isaiah 60:6; <sup><3722></sup>Ezekiel 27:22), and Uphaz (<sup><2410></sup>Jeremiah 10:9), were other sources of gold for the markets of Palestine and Tyre. It was probably brought in the form of ingots (<sup><1072></sup>Joshua 7:21; **A. V.** “wedge,” lit. “tongue”), and was rapidly converted into articles of ornament and use. Ear-rings, or: rather nose-rings, were made of it—those given to Rebecca were half a shekel (1 oz.) in weight (<sup><1022></sup>Genesis 24:22) — bracelets (<sup><1022></sup>Genesis 24:22), chains (<sup><1414></sup>Genesis 41:42), signets (<sup><1252></sup>Exodus 35:22), *bullae*, or spherical ornaments suspended from the neck (<sup><1252></sup>Exodus 35:22), and chains for the legs (<sup><1615></sup>Numbers 31:50; comp. <sup><2318></sup>Isaiah 3:18; Pliny, 33:12). It was used in embroidery (<sup><1234></sup>Exodus 39:3; <sup><1012></sup>2 Samuel 1:24; Pliny, 8:74); the decorations and furniture of the Tabernacle were enriched with the gold of the ornaments which the Hebrews willingly offered (Exodus 35-40); the same precious metal was lavished upon the Temple (1 Kings 6, 7); Solomon’s throne was overlaid with gold (<sup><1108></sup>1 Kings 10:18), his drinking-cups and the vessels of the house of the forest of Lebanon were of pure gold (<sup><1102></sup>1 Kings 10:21), and the neighboring princes brought him as presents vessels of gold and silver (<sup><1105></sup>1 Kings 10:25). So plentiful indeed was the supply of the precious metals (during his reign that silver was esteemed of little worth (<sup><1102></sup>1 Kings 10:21, 27). Gold and silver were devoted to the fashioning of idolatrous images (<sup><1023></sup>Exodus 20:23; 32:4; <sup><1297></sup>Deuteronomy 29:17; <sup><1128></sup>1 Kings 12:28). The crown on the head of Malcham (A.V. “their king”), the idol of the Ammonites at Rabbah, weighed a talent of gold, that is, 125 lbs. troy, a weight so great that it could not have been worn by David among the ordinary insignia of royalty (<sup><1023></sup>2 Samuel 12:30). The great abundance of gold in early times is indicated by its entering into the composition of every article of ornament and almost all of domestic use. ‘Among the spoils of the Midianites taken by the Israelites, in their bloodless victory when Balaam was slain, were ear-rings and jewels to the amount of 16,750 shekels in gold (<sup><1014></sup>Numbers 21:48-54), equal in value to more than \$150,000. 1700 shekels of gold (worth more than \$15,000) in nose jewels (A.V. “ear-rings”) alone were taken by Gideon’s army from the slaughtered Midianites (<sup><1035></sup>Judges 8:26). These numbers, though large, are not incredibly great, when we consider that the country of the Midianites was at that time rich in gold streams, which have since been exhausted, and that, like the Malays of the present day and the Peruvians of the time of

Pizarro, they carried most of their wealth about them. But the amount of treasure accumulated by David from spoils taken in war is so enormous that we are tempted to conclude the numbers exaggerated. From the gold shields of Hadadezer's army of Syrians and other sources he had collected, according to the chronicler (I Chron. 22:14), 100,000 talents of gold, and 1,000,000 talents of silver; to these must be added his own contribution of 3000 talents of gold and 7000 of silver (<sup><1300></sup>1 Chronicles 29:2-4), and the additional offerings of the people, the total value of which, estimating the weight of a talent to be 125 lbs. troy, gold at 73s. per oz., and silver at 4s. 4 1/2d. per oz., is reckoned by Mr. Napier to be £939,929,687. Some idea of the largeness of this sum may be formed by considering that in 1855 the total amount of gold in use in the world was calculated to be about \$4,100,000,000. Undoubtedly the quantity of the precious metals possessed by the Israelites might be greater in consequence of their commercial intercourse with the Phoenicians, who were masters of the sea; but in the time of David they were a nation struggling for political existence, surrounded by powerful enemies, and without the leisure necessary for developing their commercial capabilities. The numbers given by Josephus (*Ant.* 7:14, 2) are only one tenth of those in the text, but the sum, even when thus reduced, is still enormous. But though gold was thus common, silver appears to have been the ordinary medium of commerce. The first commercial transaction of which we possess the details was the purchase of Ephron's field by Abraham for 400 shekels of silver (<sup><0236></sup>Genesis 23:16); slaves were bought with silver (<sup><0172></sup>Genesis 17:12); silver was the money paid by Abimelech as a compensation to Abraham (<sup><0206></sup>Genesis 20:16); Joseph was sold to the Ishmaelite merchants for twenty pieces of silver (<sup><0378></sup>Genesis 37:28); and generally in the Old Testament, "money" in the A. V. is literally silver. The first payment in gold is mentioned in <sup><1325></sup>1 Chronicles 21:25, where David buys the threshing-floor of Oman, or Araunah, the Jebusite, for "six hundred shekels of gold by weight." But in the parallel narrative of the transaction in <sup><0224></sup>2 Samuel 24:24, the price paid for the threshing floor and the oxen is fifty shekels of silver. An attempt has been made by Keil to reconcile these two passages, by supposing that in the former the purchase referred to was that of the entire hill on which the threshing-floor stood, and in the latter that of the threshing-floor itself. But the close resemblance between the two narratives renders it difficult to accept this explanation, and to imagine that two different circumstances are described. That there is a discrepancy between the numbers in <sup><0249></sup>2 Samuel 24:9 and <sup><1305></sup>1 Chronicles

21:5 is admitted, and it seems impossible to avoid the conclusion that the present case is but another instance of the same kind. With this one exception there is no case in the O.T. in which gold is alluded to as a medium of commerce; the Hebrew coinage may have been partly gold, but we have no proof of it. *SEE GOLD.*

Silver was brought into Palestine in the form of plates from Tarshish, with gold and ivory (<sup><1102></sup>1 Kings 10:22; <sup><492></sup>2 Chronicles 9:21; <sup><310></sup>Jeremiah 10:9). The accumulation of wealth in the reign of Solomon was so great that silver was but little esteemed: the king made silver to be in Jerusalem as stones" (<sup><1102></sup>1 Kings 10:21, 27). With the treasures which were brought out of Egypt, not only the ornaments, but the ordinary metal-work of the Tabernacle was made. Silver was employed for the sockets of the boards (<sup><239></sup>Exodus 26:19), and for the hooks of the pillars and their fillets (<sup><230></sup>Exodus 38:10). The capitals of the pillars were overlaid with it (<sup><237></sup>Exodus 38:17); the chargers and bowls offered by the princes at the dedication of the Tabernacle (<sup><473></sup>Numbers 7:13, etc.), the trumpets for marshalling the host (<sup><412></sup>Numbers 10:2), and some of the candlesticks and tables for the Temple, were of silver (<sup><385></sup>1 Chronicles 28:15, 16). It was used for the setting of gold ornaments (<sup><151></sup>Proverbs 25:11) and other decorations (<sup><211></sup>Song of Solomon 1:11), and for the pillars of Solomon's gorgeous chariot or palanquin (<sup><210></sup>Song of Solomon 3:10). *SEE SILVER.*

From a comparison of the different amounts of gold and silver collected by David, it appears that the proportion of the former to the latter was 1 to 9 nearly. Three hundred talents of silver and thirty talents of gold were demanded of Hezekiah by Sennacherib (<sup><184></sup>2 Kings 18:14); but later, when Pharaoh-nechoh took Jehoahaz prisoner, he imposed upon the land a tribute of 100 talents of silver, and only one talent of gold (<sup><233></sup>2 Kings 23:33). The difference in the proportion of gold to silver in these two cases is very remarkable, and does not appear to have been explained. *SEE MONEY.*

Brass, or more properly copper, was a native product of Palestine, "a land whose stones are iron, and out of whose hills thou mayest dig *copper*" (<sup><88></sup>Deuteronomy 8:9; <sup><882></sup>Job 28:2). It was so plentiful in the days of Solomon that the quantity employed in the Temple could not be estimated, it was so great (<sup><1047></sup>1 Kings 7:47). Much of the copper which David had prepared for this work was taken from the Syrians after the defeat of Hadadezer (<sup><1088></sup>2 Samuel 8:8), and more was presented by Toi, king of

Hamath. The market of Tyre was supplied with vessels of the same metal by the merchants of Javan, Tubal, and Meshech (<sup><3273></sup>Ezekiel 27:13). There is strong reason to believe that brass, a mixture of copper and zinc, was unknown to the ancients. To the latter metal no allusion is found. But tin was well known, and from the difficulty which attends the toughening of pure copper so as to render it fit for hammering, it is probable that the mode of deoxidizing copper by the admixture of small quantities of tin had been early discovered. "We are inclined to think," says Mr. Napier, "that Moses used no copper vessels for domestic purposes, but bronze, the use of which is less objectionable. Bronze, not being so subject to tarnish, takes on a finer polish, and being much more easily melted and cast, it probably was more extensively used than copper alone. These practical considerations, and the fact that almost all the antique castings and other articles in metal which are preserved from these, ancient times are composed of bronze, prove in our opinion that where the word 'brass' occurs in Scripture, except where it refers to an ore, such as <sup><1332></sup>Job 28:2 and <sup><1333></sup>Deuteronomy 8:9, it should be translated bronze" (*Metals of the Bible*, p. 66). Arms (<sup><1006></sup>2 Samuel 21:6; <sup><1374></sup>Job 20:24; <sup><1334></sup>Psalm 18:34) and armor (<sup><1976></sup>1 Samuel 17:6, 38) were made of this metal, which was capable of being so wrought as to admit of a keen and hard edge. The Egyptians employed it in cutting the hardest granite. The Mexicans, before the discovery of iron, "found a substitute in an alloy of tin and copper; and with tools made of this bronze they could cut not only metals, but, with the aid of silicious dust, the hardest substances, as basalt, porphyry, amethysts, and emeralds" (Prescott, *Conq. of Mexico*, ch. 5). The great skill attained by the Egyptians in working metals at a very early period throws light upon the remarkable facility with which the Israelites, during their wanderings in the desert, elaborated the works of art connected with the structure of the Tabernacle, for which great acquaintance with metals was requisite. In the troublous times which followed their entrance into Palestine this knowledge seems to have been lost, for when the Temple was built the metal-workers employed were Phoenicians. *SEE COPPER.*

Iron, like copper, was found in the hills of Palestine. The "iron mountain" in the trans-Jordanic region is described by Josephus (*War*, 4:8, 2), and was remarkable for producing a particular kind of palm (Mishna, *Succa*, ed. Dachs. p. 182). Iron mines are still worked by the inhabitants of Kefr Huneh in the S. of the valley Zaharani; smelting-works are found at Shemuster, three hours W. of Baalbek, and others in the oak-woods at



Masbek (Ritter, *Erdkunde*, 17:73,201); but the method employed is the simplest possible, like that of the old Samothracians, and the iron so obtained is chiefly used for horse-shoes. *SEE IRON.*

Tin and lead were both known at a very early period, though- there is no distinct trace of them in Palestine. The former was among the spoils of the Midianites (<sup><0612></sup>Numbers 31:22), who might have obtained it in their intercourse with the Phoenician merchants (comp. <sup><0375></sup>Genesis 37:25, 36), who themselves procured it from Tarshish (<sup><3572></sup>Ezekiel 27:12) and the tin countries of the West. The allusions to it in the Old Testament principally point to its admixture with the ores of the precious metals (Isaiah 25; <sup><3218></sup>Ezekiel 22:18, 20). It must have occurred in the composition of bronze: the Assyrian bowls and dishes in the British Museum are found to contain one part of tin to ten of copper. "The tin was probably obtained from Phoenicia, and consequently that used in the bronzes in the British Museum may actually have been exported, nearly three thousand years ago, from the British Isles" (Layard, *Nin. and Bab.* p. 191). *SEE LEAD*;. *SEE TIN.*

Antimony (<sup><1333></sup>2 Kings 9:30; <sup><2063></sup>Jeremiah 4:30; A. V. "painting"), in the form of powder, was used by the Hebrew women, like the *kohl* of the Arabs, for coloring their eyelids and eyebrows. *SEE PAINT.*

**III.** As above stated, the invention of the metallurgic arts is in Scripture ascribed to Tubal-cain (<sup><0022></sup>Genesis 4:22). In later times the manufacture of useful utensils and implements in metals seems to have been carried on to a considerable extent among the Israelites, if we may judge from the frequent allusions to them by the poets and prophets. But it does not appear that, in the finer and more elaborate branches of this great art, they made much, if any, progress during the flourishing times of their commonwealth; and it will be remembered that Solomon was obliged to obtain assistance from the Phoenicians in executing the metal work of the Temple (<sup><1073></sup>1 Kings 7:13). Among the ancient Egyptians the operations of metallurgy were carried to great perfection, as the delineations extant upon the monuments still testify (see Wilkinson, 2:133 sq.). The Assyrians likewise had made great proficiency in the same art (see Layard's *Nineveh*, 2:315 sq.; *Nin. and Bab.* p. 191 sq.).

The Hebrew workers in iron, and especially such as made arms, were frequently carried away by the different conquerors of the Israelites (<sup><0339></sup>1 Samuel 13:19; <sup><1244></sup>2 Kings 24:14, 15; <sup><2041></sup>Jeremiah 24:1; 29:2); which is one

circumstance among others to show the high estimation in which this branch of handicraft was anciently held.

The following are the metallic -manufactures named in the Old Testament: Of *iron*, axes (<sup><1595></sup>Deuteronomy 19:5-2; <sup><1285></sup>2 Kings 6:5); saws (<sup><1023></sup>2 Samuel 12:31); stone-cutters' tools (<sup><1575></sup>Deuteronomy 27:5); sauce-pans (<sup><3043></sup>Ezekiel 4:3); bolts, chains, knives, etc., but especially weapons of war (<sup><1970></sup>1 Samuel 17:7; 1 Macc. 6:33). Bedsteads even were sometimes made of iron (<sup><1511></sup>Deuteronomy 3:11); "chariots of iron," i.e. war-chariots, are noticed frequently. Of *copper* we find vessels of all kinds (<sup><1063></sup>Leviticus 6:28; <sup><1469></sup>Numbers 16:39; <sup><1416></sup>2 Chronicles 4:16; <sup><3612></sup>Ezekiel 8:27); and also weapons of war, principally helmets, cuirasses, shields, spears (<sup><1975></sup>1 Samuel 17:5; 6:38; <sup><1216></sup>2 Samuel 21:16); also chains (<sup><1762></sup>Judges 16:21); and even mirrors (<sup><1238></sup>Exodus 38:8). *Gold* and silver furnished articles of ornament, also vessels, such as cups, goblets, etc. The holy vessels of the Temple were mostly of gold (<sup><1514></sup>Ezra 5:14). Idolaters had idols and other sacred objects of silver (<sup><1210></sup>Exodus 20:20; <sup><2321></sup>Isaiah 2:20; <sup><4172></sup>Acts 17:29; 19:24). *Lead* is mentioned as being used for weights, and for plumb-lines in measuring (<sup><3107></sup>Amos 7:7; <sup><3188></sup>Zechariah 5:8). Some of the tools of workers in metal are also mentioned: **μ [Pi] pa'am**, the *anvil* (<sup><2340></sup>Isaiah 41:7); **hbQmi makkabah'**, the *hammer* for carpenters (<sup><2342></sup>Isaiah 44:12); **vyFæi pattish'**, the *stone-hammer* (<sup><2340></sup>Isaiah 41:7); **μyj æl mi mal kachim'**, the *pincers*; **j Pwi ma alappu'ach**, the *bellows* (<sup><2469></sup>Jeremiah 6:29); **ãræñi matzreph'**, the *crucible* (<sup><1713></sup>Proverbs 17:3); **rWK, kur**, the *melting-furnace* (<sup><3228></sup>Ezekiel 22:18). See each of these articles in alphabetical order.

There are also allusions to various operations connected with the preparation of metals.

(1.) The smelting of metal was not only for the purpose of rendering it fluid, but in order to separate and purify the richer metal when mixed with baser minerals, as silver from lead, etc. (<sup><2125></sup>Isaiah 1:25; comp. Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 37:47; <sup><3228></sup>Ezekiel 22:18-20). The dross separated by this process is called **μygsas sigim'**, although this word also applies to metal not yet purified from its dross. For the actual or chemical separation other materials were mixed in the smelting, such as alkaline salts, **r/B, bor** (<sup><2125></sup>Isaiah 1:25), and lead (<sup><2469></sup>Jeremiah 6:29; comp. Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 33:31).

- (2.) The casting of images (<sup><025D></sup>Exodus 25:12; 26:37; <sup><30D></sup>Isaiah 40:19), which are always of gold, silver, or copper. The casting of iron is not mentioned, and was perhaps unknown to the ancients (Hausmann, *in Commentatt. Soc. Gott.* 4:53 sq.; Miiller, *Archdol.* p. 371).
- (3.) The hammering of metal, and making it into broad sheets (<sup><046B></sup>Numbers 16:38; <sup><34D></sup>Isaiah 44:12; Jeremiah 10).
- (4.) Soldering and welding parts of metal together (<sup><340D></sup>Isaiah 41:7)
- (5.) Smoothing and polishing metals (<sup><1075></sup>1 Kings 7:45).
- (6.) Overlaying with plates of gold, and silver, and copper (<sup><025D></sup>Exodus 25:11-24; <sup><106D></sup>1 Kings 6:20; <sup><405></sup>2 Chronicles 3:5; comp. <sup><30D></sup>Isaiah 40:19). The execution of these different metallurgic operations appears to have formed three distinct branches of handicraft before the exile; for we read of the blacksmith, by the name of the “worker in iron” (**Ι ζρβιυρρο** <sup><34D></sup>Isaiah 44:12); the brass-founder (<sup><1074></sup>1 Kings 7:14); and the gold and silver smith (<sup><0770></sup>Judges 17:4; <sup><30D></sup>Malachi 3:2). *SEE MECHANIC.*

See generally, Bellermann, *Handb.* 1:221 sq.; De Wette, *Archaol.* p. 130 sq.; Faber, *Archaol.* 1:394 sq.; Link, *Urwelt*, 1:435 sq.; Winer, *Realw.* s.v. Metalle. *SEE FURTHER UNDER MINE.*

## Metallurgy

*SEE METAL; SEE MINE.*

## Metamorphoses

(Gr. **μεταμόρφωσις**, *change of form*) denoted, in the mythology of the ancients, those transformations of human beings into beasts, stones, trees, and even into fire, water, etc., in fables of which that mythology abounded. The origin and significance of such fables it is often impossible to determine. Some of them probably originated in observation of the wonderful transformations of nature; some in a misapprehension of the metaphors employed by the older poets; and some perhaps in mere superstition and love of the marvellous. The wild imagination of the Orientals filled their mythologies with metamorphoses in the greatest number; and the classic mythology approaches to them in this respect. The mediaeval days of Europe, especially of Germany, gave forth the fairy tales

and other forms of folk-lore, wonderfully rich in metamorphoses. *SEE MYTHOLOGY.*

## Metaphor

(Gr. *μεταφορά*, a *transference*), a figure of speech by means of which one thing is put for another which it only resembles. It differs from other comparisons, e.g. *simile*, etc., in consisting of a *single word*. Thus the Psalmist speaks of God's law as being "a light to his feet and a lamp to his path." The metaphor is therefore a kind of comparison, in which the speaker' or writer, casting aside the circumlocution of the ordinary similitude, seeks to attain his end at once by boldly identifying his illustration with the thing illustrated. It is thus of necessity, when well conceived and expressed, graphic and striking in the highest degree, and has been a favorite figure with poets and orators, and the makers of proverbs, in all ages. Even in ordinary language the meanings of words are in great part metaphors; as when we speak of an *acute* intellect or a *bold* promontory.

## Metaphrastes, Simeon

a Byzantine writer of the Middle Ages, acquired great reputation by his compilation of the lives of many saints and martyrs. Very little is known of his individual history. It appears, however, to be proved that he lived at Constantinople, and there filled an official position. The name Metaphrastes was given him on account of the manner in which he commented and *paraphrased* (*ἔμετέφρασε*) the materials for his biographical work. The greatest variety of opinion prevails as to the time when he lived: Blondell, Vossius, Ceillier, Baronius, Simler, Volaterra, Allatins, Cave, Oudin, Fabricius, all give different dates, varying from the 9th to the 14th century. It even appears uncertain whether there may not have existed two men of that name at different times. The more ancient date is that of Leo Allatius, who in his work *De Simeonum Scriptis* (Par. 1664, p. 49 sq.) enters into deep researches concerning Metaphrastes, the result of which is adopted by Cave (*Histor. Litter.* [Lond. 1688], p. 573) and Fabricius (*Bibl. Gr.* 6:509; in ed. Harl. 10:180 sq.). His conclusions were opposed by Oudin in his *Dissertatio de cetate et scriptis Sim. Met.* (*Comment.* 2:1300 sq.). From various passages in works undoubtedly written by Metaphrastes, it appears to be pretty well established that he lived during the reign of the emperor Leo VI (Philosophus), and was sent

as ambassador to the Arabs of Crete in 902, and in 904 to those who had conquered Thessalonica, whom he persuaded not to destroy that city, as they originally intended. It seems also well established that he was still alive in the time of the emperor Constantine VII (Porphyrogenitus). His principal works are: *Vitae Sanctorum*, undertaken, it is said, at the suggestion of the emperor Constantine. This assertion, however, has often been contradicted. The work is not original; Metaphrastes only arranged and paraphrased, in very good style for the times, various biographies which existed previously in the libraries of churches and convents. He omitted many details which he considered useless or unproved, and substituted others which he looked upon as more important or authentic. He has been accused of having by these modifications destroyed the simplicity of the ancient biographies. His own work has undergone many alterations and additions, as well as curtailment, so that, according to Fabricius, out of 539 biographies generally ascribed to him, only 122 are undoubtedly genuine. Cave, on the other hand, maintains that the greater part of the 417 manuscript biographies extant in the various libraries of Europe are the work of Metaphrastes. Agapius, a monk, gave an extract of them under the title *Liber dictus Paraclitus, seu illustrium sanctorum vitæ desumptæ ex Simeone Metaphraste* (Venice, 1541, 4to). The most important among these biographies were published, in Greek and Latin, in the Bollandists' *Acta Sanctorum: Annales*, commencing with the emperor Leo the Armenian (813-820), and ending with Romanus, the son of Constantine Porphyrogenitus (959-963). It is evident that Metaphrastes, who was already an ambassador in 902, could not have been the historian of events which occurred sixty years later. Some critics consequently consider the later part of the *Annales* to have been written by another Metaphrastes, while Baronius thinks that the whole work was composed by a writer living in the 12th century. These *Annales*, which are of great historical value, were published with a Latin translation by Combofis in his *Hist. Byzantine Scriptores. post Theophanem.* of which the edition by Immanuel Bekker (Bonn, 1838, 8vo) is a carefully-revised reprint:— Epistolæ IX, published in Greek and Latin by Leo Allatius, *Diatriba de Simeonibus; Carmina pia duo politica*, ii Allatius; and in Lectius, *Potæta Græci veteres* (Geneva, 1614, fol.):—*Sermo in Diem Sabbati sancti, in Latin only, by Combefis, Biblioth. Concionator.* vol. iii :- **Εἰς τὸν θρῆνον τῆς ὑπεραγίας θεοτόκου**, etc., in Greek and Latin by Allatius; several hymns, or *canons*, still in use in the Greek Church : — **Ἡθικὸὶ λόγοι**, an extract from the works of St. Basil, and published in Greek and Latin by

Morel (Paris, 1556, 8vo). See Fabricius, *Biblioth. Graeca*, vii. 683; 10:180; Cave, *Histoire Litt.*; Hankius, *Scriptores Byzant.* ch. 24; Oudin, *Dissert. de Aetate et Scriptis Simeonis Metaphrastis*, in his *Comment. de script. eccles.*; Baronius, *Annales ad ann.* 859. Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* 9:446; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog.* <sup><1858></sup>Genesis 35:188; Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Romans Biog. and Mythol.* 2:1055. (J. N. P.)

## Metaphysics

in its strictest sense, is applied, as a term. to that department of *philosophy* which has for its object the investigation of existences out of ourselves “that knowledge of causes and principles which we should carry with us into every department of inquiry.” Inasmuch as mind cannot properly know what is not in contact with itself, the question, “What is the nature of our knowledge of the external world?” has been asked by philosophers, and answered in various ways; and this is the great question of metaphysics, if the term is applied in a strictly historical sense. Among modern writers of note in the field of philosophy, Prof. Ferrier, in his *Institutes of Metaphysics* (Edinb. and Lond. 1854, 12mo), accordingly occupies himself solely with the questions connected with knowledge, or the nature of our perception of an external world; his explanatory title is, *The Theory of Knowing and Being*. On the other hand, the lately-deceased Scotch philosopher Mansel, in his article *Metaphysics* (*Cyclopaedia Britannica*, 8th ed. vol. 14, s.v.), divided the subject into two parts—“*Psychology*, or the science of the facts of consciousness [which expresses the science of mind generally] as such; and *Ontology*, or the science of the same facts considered in their relation to realities existing without the mind”—that is, the problem of perception or metaphysics in the narrower sense. “Metaphysics,” says the writer of the article on that subject in the *Edinburgh Cyclopaedia*, “have been called the *First philosophy*, or the Science of Sciences, as their object is to explain the principles and causes of all things existing, and to supply the defects of inferior sciences, which do not demonstrate, or sufficiently explain, their principles.” Here we have a still further departure from our first and somewhat circumscribed sphere to the vast expanse of the department itself known as *philosophy*. Of the above two branches of philosophy or metaphysics, *psychology* (q.v.) investigates the faculties and operations of the human mind, while *ontology* (q.v.) seeks to develop the nature and laws of real existence. The former deals with the phenomena of consciousness, the constitution of the mind, the laws of thought; the latter with the essential characteristics of being *per*

se, the constitution of the universe, the laws of things. The former is descriptive, and the latter scientific metaphysics. "Metaphysics," says Sir William Hamilton (*Lect.* vii, p. 85), "in whatever latitude the term be taken, is a science, or complement of sciences, exclusively occupied with mind. Now the philosophy of mind-psychology or metaphysics, in the widest signification of the terms-is threefold, for the object it immediately proposes for consideration may be either, 1, *Phenomena* in general; or, 2, *Laws*; or, 3, *Inferences* and *Results*.... The whole of philosophy is the answer to these three questions:

1. What are the facts or phenomena to be observed?
2. What are the laws which regulate these facts, or under which these phenomena appear?
3. What are the real results, not immediately manifested, which these facts or phenomena warrant us in drawing?"

The great authority which Aristotle enjoyed in the Middle Ages, and the little actual knowledge respecting the laws of existence, induced his followers to form from his philosophical fragments a system, which served as a canon for the philosophy of the time. The oldest commentators of Aristotle had directed their endeavors to this point; but metaphysics, as an independent science, was developed by the schoolmen of the Middle Ages (Thomas Aquinas, Duns Scotus, William Occam, and others). In the 17th century, however, the metaphysics of the schoolmen was undermined, by the introduction of a critical spirit of investigation. Lord Bacon, More, Hobbes, appeared in England; Th. Campanella, in Italy; Des Cartes, in France, as adversaries of the Aristotelian school-philosophy. For details, *SEE PHILOSOPHY*.

As regards the origin of the name, the most recent discussions appear, on the whole, to confirm the commonly-received opinion, according to which the term *Metaphysics*, though originally employed to designate a treatise of Aristotle, was probably unknown to that philosopher himself. It is true that the oldest and best of the extant commentators on Aristotle refers the inscription of the treatise to the Stagyrite (Alexander, in *Arist. Meth.* p. 127, ed. Bonitz); but in the extant writings of Aristotle himself, though the work and its subject are frequently referred to under the titles of the *First Philosophy*, or *Theology*, or *Wisdom* (Asclepius, apud Brandis *Schol.* p. 519, b. 19; Bonitz, in *Arist. Metaph.* p. 5), no authority is found for the

latter and more popular appellation. On the whole, the weight of evidence appears to be in favor of the supposition which attributes the inscription *τὰ μετὰ τὰ φυσικά* to Andronicus Rhodius, the first editor of Aristotle's collected works. The title, as given to the writings on the first philosophy, probably indicates only their place in the collection, as coming *after the physical treatises* of the author (comp. Bonitz *ad Arist. Metaph.* p. 3, 5). In this respect the term *Metaphysics* has been aptly compared to that of *Postils*; both names signifying nothing more than the fact of something else having preceded. Shakespeare used *metaphysical* as synonymous with *supernatural*.

***“Fate and metaphysical aid doth seem To have thee crowned.”-  
acbeth, Act i, Scene 3.***

Clemens Alexandrinus (*Strom.* i) considered *metaphysical* as equivalent to *supernatural*; and is supported by the Greek commentator Philoponus. But if *μετά* be interpreted, as it may, to mean *along with*, then *metaphysics*, or metaphysical philosophy, will be that philosophy which we should take *along with* us into physics. and into every other philosophy-that knowledge of causes and principles which we should carry with us into every department of inquiry. Aristotle called it the governing philosophy, which gives laws to all, but receives laws from none (*Metaphys.* lib. i, cap. 2). Lord Bacon (*Advancement of Learning*, bk. ii) has limited its sphere, when he says, “The’ one part (of philosophy), which is *physics*, inquireth and handleth the *material* and *efficient* causes; and the other, which is *metaphysics*, handleth the *formal* and *final* cause.” But all causes are considered by Aristotle in his writings which have been entitled *Metaphysics*. “Aristotle,” says Schwegler (*Hist. of Philos.* p. 112), “held that every science must have for investigation a determined province and separate form of being, but that none of these sciences reaches the conception of being itself. Hence there is needed a science which should investigate that which the other sciences take up hypothetically, or through experience. This is done by the first philosophy, which has to do with being as such, while the other sciences relate only to determined and concrete being. The *metaphysics*, which is this science of being and its primitive grounds, is the *first philosophy*, since it is presupposed by every other discipline. Thus, says Aristotle, if there were only a physical substance, then would physics be the first and the only philosophy; but if there be an immaterial and unmoved essence which is the ground of all being, then must there be also an antecedent, and, because it is antecedent, a universal



philosophy. The first ground of all being is God, whence Aristotle occasionally gives to the first philosophy the name of theology." "The aim of metaphysics," says D'Alembert (*Melanges*, 4:143), "is to examine the generation of our ideas, and to show that they come from *sensations*." This is the ideology of Condillac and De Trace. "Metaphysics," says Stewart (*Dissert.* pt. ii, p. 475), "was a word formerly appropriated to the ontology and pneumatology of the schools, but now understood as equally applicable to all those inquiries which have for their object to trace the various branches of human knowledge to their first principles in the constitution of the human mind;" and in the Preface to the same *Dissertation* he says that by metaphysics he understands the "inductive philosophy of the human mind." For literature, **SEE PHILOSOPHY**. (J. H. W.)

### Metastasio, Pietro Bonaventura

an eminent Italian poet, deserves our notice as the author of several sacred dramas, oratorios, etc. He was born at Rome in 1698, and was originally named TRAPASSI. He manifested at an early age extraordinary talents for improvisation on any subject. Having attracted the notice of the celebrated jurist Gravina, he was adopted by him, and his name was changed to Metastasio (a "changing"), in allusion to his adoption. His benefactor died in 1718, leaving his property to Metastasio, who now devoted himself principally to literary pursuits and the publication of his different poetical productions. In 1729 he was invited to Vienna to become poet laureate, and flourished at the Austrian capital until his death in 1782. The genius of Metastasio is eulogized by Voltaire and La Harpe, the former of whom compares some of his scenes to the most sublime of the Greek poets. Rousseau, in his *Nouvelle Heloise*, pronounces him "the only poet of the heart, the only genius who can move by the charm of poetic and musical harmony;" and Schlegel observes that his purity of diction, grace, and delicacy have rendered him, in the eyes of his countrymen, a classic author—the Racine of Italy. Of Metastasio's seven sacred dramas, or oratorios, *La Passione*, *La Morte d'Abel*, and *Isacco*, are best known; but all of them, Calsabigi justly observes, are as perfect as this kind of composition will allow. See Burney, *Memoirs of Metastasio* (1796, 3 vols.); Torcia, *Elogio del Abbate P. Metastasio* (1782); Hiller, *Ueber P. Metastasio und seine Werke* (1786); Altanesi, *Vita di P. Metastasio* (1787); *Lives of the Italian Poets*, by the Revelation Henry Stebbing (London, 1831). (J. HW.)

## Metcalfe, William, M.D.

a prominent minister of the Bible-Christian Church, was born in the parish of Orton, Westmoreland, England, March 11, 1788. He became a disciple of the Revelation Dr. Cowherd, a noted minister of the Swedenborgian Church, who in 1809 organized the Bible-Christian Church. Metcalfe in 1811 was ordained as a minister of this Church by Dr. Cowherd, and in 1817, with a small company of his fellow-believers, immigrated to Philadelphia, where he continued his ministerial labors till the day of his death in 1862. According to his biographer, the specific work of Mr. Metcalfe's life was "that of sowing the seeds and cultivating the principles of temperance and vegetarianism, and permanently establishing the Bible-Christian Church in this country." The Bible-Christian Church in England founded its doctrinal basis mainly upon the writings of Swedenborg. It propounded views upon two subjects, however, which have never been generally received in the *New Jerusalem Church*, as the Swedenborgians prefer to call themselves. It inculcated the duty of total abstinence from all intoxicating drinks as a beverage, and from the use of animal food. These two requirements were made conditions of Church membership, more particularly by Mr. Metcalfe. He was one of the original members of the American "Vegetarian Society," and was one of his most earnest supporters. On the death of Dr. William A. Alcott, the first president of the society, in 1859, Dr. Metcalfe was elected his successor. He rendered efficient service also in the cause of temperance, and may be termed one of the pioneers of the movement in this country. "As a preacher," we are told by his biographer, "he was not what is called an orator, but his delivery was easy, plain, distinct, and impressive. His action was moderate and graceful. He was never boisterous, never sensational, and seldom allowed his imagination to display its powers in the pulpit. His sermons were suggestive and instructive, always including some teaching on practical, every-day duties. He sought all fields for the illustration of Bible truths, especially availing himself of the lights of modern science and of ancient history in the elucidation of his subject." Seventeen of his *Discourses* were lately published by his son Joseph, under the title *Out of the Clouds into the Light* (Phila. 1872, 12mo). See *New Jerusalem Messenger*, Oct. 23, 1872; *Memoir of the Revelation William Metcalfe, MD.*, by his son Joseph (Phila. 1866, 12mo).

## Metel (Lat. Metellus), Hugues

a French canon, was born at Toul, in Lorraine, about 1080. He was the offspring of wealthy parents. While yet a child he lost his father, and was indebted to the solicitude of his mother for a liberal education. He studied theology at Laon under the celebrated teacher Anselm, and embraced Christianity at Toul about 1118, when he was entered a member of the regular canons in the abbey of Saint Laon. He remained in that institution until his death, which occurred near 1157. Fifty-five noted epistles bear his authorship. The first of them is addressed to St. Bernard, whom Hugues Metel calls a “*clarissima lampas*,” while to himself he attributes the humbler qualifications of *quondam nugigerulus, nunc crucis Christi bajulus*. See Calmet, *Histoire de la Lorraine*, i, cxxi; Fortin d’Urban, *Histoire et (Euvrages de Hugues Metel* (Paris, 1839, 8vo).

## Metempsychosis

SEE TRANSMIGRATION.

## Mete’rus

(Μετήρουσ v. r. Βαιτηρούς, Vulg. omits), given (1 Esdr. 5:17) among those whose “sons” returned from the captivity with Zerubbabel; but the Hebrews lists (Ezra 2; Nehemiah 7) have no corresponding name.

## Mete-Yard

(*hRma<sup>h</sup>middah*’, <sup>LEBES</sup> Leviticus 19:35; *measure* simply, as elsewhere rendered).

## Meth, Ezeghiel

a noted leader of a mystic sect who at the beginning of the 17th century created great excitement in Thuringia. Meth was practicing medicine in the city of Langensalza, Thuringia, when his uncle, a merchant in the same town, who had become an enthusiastic mystic, presented him with his peculiar conceptions of Christian fellowship and responsibility. Meth was readily won in favor of the heretical doctrines, and became one of the leaders of a sect which soon became numerous. He afterwards moved to Leipsic, where he died in 1640. Stiefel and Meth found their first followers among their own relatives and friends at Langensalza and Erfurt. They also gained access to the house of count Hans Ludwig de Gleichen, whose wife,

the countess Juliana, became so ensnared in their mystic doctrines that she was finally excluded from the Lord's table. But matters did not rest here. She imagined she was a second Virgin Mary, and was to give birth to the new Messiah. She therefore separated herself from the count, and to the day of her death (July 28, 1633) remained steadfast in her hopes that she would bring forth the Messiah. The authorities tried in various ways to bring these enthusiasts to their senses, but kindness as well as punishment proved in vain, until at last Stiefel died—Stiefel who had been considered immortal by Meth and all his followers. A change took place in Stiefel's mind, and he is said to have died a truly converted Christian.

The doctrines of Stiefel and Meth were for the most part identical with the mysticism of the Anabaptists and of Schwenkfeld, as specified and condemned in the Formula of Concord. Only Christ, the living Word, is recognised, while the revealed Word, i.e. the Bible, is despised, the ministry, with all its officers, rejected, and the sacraments—baptism and communion—are declared works of witchcraft. They further taught that as the law of God has been fulfilled by Christ, the true Church can neither sin nor err; that no resurrection can take place, nor eternal life be hoped for, as all true Christians are already dead to the world, and feel the promised joys of eternity in their lives, to the fullest extent possible. See Arnold, *Kirchen u. Ketzler Historie* (see Index). *SEE STIEFEL.*

## Metheg

*SEE METHEG-AMMAH.*

## Me'theg-Am'mah

(Heb *me'theg ha-anmmah'*, *gtm, hMah*; *bridle* [as in <sup><198></sup>2 Kings 19:28, etc.] *of the mother* [i.e. mother-city = *μαῖν* <sup><109></sup>2 Samuel 20:19]; Sept. ἡ ἄρωρισμένη, Vulg. *frenum tributi*), a figurative term for a chief city, occurring in the statement (<sup><101></sup>2 Samuel 8:1), "David took the bit of the metropolis (Auth. Vers. 'Metheg-Ammah') out of the hand of the Philistines," i.e. he subdued their capital or strongest town, meaning GATH, as is expressly affirmed in the parallel passage (<sup><180></sup>1 Chronicles 18:1). Other interpretations may be seen in Glassii *Philol. Sacr.* ed. Dathe, p. 783. Gesenius (*Thes. Hebrews* p. 113) compares the Arabic proverb, "I give thee not my bridle," i.e. I do not submit to thee (see Schultens *ad Job*, 20:11; and Hariri *Cons.* iv; *Hist. Tamerl.* p. 243; *Vit. Tim.* 1:50). On the

other hand, Ewald (*Gesch.* 3:190) less naturally takes Ammah as meaning the “forearm,” and treats the words as a metaphor to express the perfect manner in which David had smitten and humbled his foes, had torn the bridle from their arm, and thus broken forever the dominion with which they curbed Israel, as a rider manages his horse by the rein held fast on his arm. He objects to the other interpretation that Gath had its own king still in the days of Solomon; but it may be replied that the king in Solomon’s time. may have been, and probably was, tributary to Israel, as the kings ‘on this side the Euphrates’ (~~102~~ 1 Kings 4:24) were. It is an obvious objection to Ewald’s interpretation, that to control his horse a rider must hold the bridle, not on his arm, but fast in his hand.

## Methen

SEE MITHNITE.

## Methoar

SEE REMMON-METHOAR.

## Methodism

as a distinctive form of Church life and polity, dates from the revival of religion in England under the labors of the brothers Wesley and of Whitefield. See’ these names respectively.

**I. Origin.** — In November, 1729, the Wesleys, Whitefield, and their associates—about a dozen young men, students at Oxford University—formed themselves into a society for purposes of mutual moral improvement. They had a sincere desire to please God; and, by diligence, self-denial, and active benevolence, they sought to know and do his will. By instructing the children of the neglected poor, by visiting the sick and the inmates of prisons and almshouses, by a strict observance of the fasts ordained by the Church, and by scrupulous exactness in their attendance upon public worship,’ they became objects of general notice. Many grave men thought them righteous overmuch, and attempted to dissuade them from an excess of piety; while profane wits treated them with sarcasm and contempt. Nothing could save from ridicule men who in that age and in such a place professed to make religion the great business of life. Hence by their fellow-students they were called in turn, *Sacramentarians*, *Bible-bigots*, *Bible-moths*, *The Godly Club*. One, a student of Christ-Church

College, with greater reverence than his fellows, and more learning, observed, in reference to their *methodical* manner of life, that a new sect of METHODISTS had sprung up, alluding to the ancient school of physicians known by that name. The appellation obtained currency, and, although the word is still sometimes used reproachfully as expressive of enthusiasm, or undue religious strictness, it has become the acknowledged name of one of the largest and most rapidly increasing evangelical Christian denominations (comp. Tyerman, *The Oxford Methodists*, N. Y., Harpers, 1873, 8vo).

From this time Methodism may be said to have started. In 1739 the first Methodist “meeting-house” in England was built at Kingswood. “Wesley’s idea at this time, and for many years afterwards,” says Skeats (*Hist. of the Free Churches of England*, p. 363), “was merely to revive the state of religion in the Church; but he knew enough of the condition of society in England, and of human nature, to be aware that unless those who had been brought under the awakening influence of the Gospel met together, and assisted each other in keeping alive the fire which had been lit in their hearts, it must, in many instances, seriously diminish, if not altogether die out.” Originally, therefore, it was no part of the design of Wesley and’ his associates to found a new religious sect. *He* considered them all me-ni’bers of the Church of England-zealous for her welfare, and loyal to her legitimate authorities. For a full discussion of this point, see the article WESLEY. They were all tenacious of her order, and great sticklers for what they deemed decency and decorum. One of them tells us, “I should have thought the saving of souls almost a sin if it had not been done in a church;” and such was the sentiment of John Wesley, when, to his horror he first heard that his bosom friend, Whitefield, had attempted to preach the Gospel in the open air. This was in the year 1739, on Saturday, the 17th of February. The discourse was addressed to the colliers at Kingswood, near the city of Bristol. “I thought,” said Whitefield, “that it might be doing the service of my Creator, who had a mountain for his pulpit, and the heavens for a sounding-board; and who, when his Gospel was rejected by the Jews, sent his servants into the highways and hedges.” In a little while John Wesley was induced to follow his example. Being providentially at Bristol, and a great assembly (estimated at 3000) having come together at a place called Race Green, “I submitted,” he says, “to be more vile, and proclaimed in the highways the glad tidings of salvation This was Wesley’s first attempt in England. He had previously preached in the open air while in this country as a missionary to the Indians in Georgia, but

he had no intention of resuming the practice in England, till he was stimulated by the example and urgent advice of his friend. His brother Charles was even more opposed to this departure from Church usages, and this apparent breach of ecclesiastical order. He had ‘confined himself to the usual labors of the ministry in such pulpits as were opened to him, preaching the Gospel with earnestness and simplicity, more especially in London, where he also devoted much of his time to the felons in Newgate, not a few of whom were brought through his instrumentality to repentance and faith in Christ. Being strenuously urged by-Whitefield, he-at length consented to make one effort. “I prayed,” he says, “and went forth in the name of Jesus Christ. I found near a thousand helpless sinners waiting for the Word in Moorfields. I invited them in my Master’s words, as well as name, ‘Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.’ The Lord was with me, even me, the meanest of his messengers, according to his promise.. My load was gone, and all my doubts and scruples. God shone on my path, and I knew this was his will concerning me.” Thenceforth, in various parts of the kingdom, they continued to preach the Gospel in the open air as opportunity was afforded. Immense crowds thronged everywhere to hear the Word, and multitudes were converted from the error of their way. As a consequence of this violation of ecclesiastical order, and more especially because of the earnest and energetic style of the preachers, most of the pulpits of the Established Church were soon closed against them. Many dignitaries of the Church were above measure enraged at this *new way*, and zealous in opposing it. “Some clergymen,” says Wesley, “objected to this ‘new doctrine;’ salvation by faith; and, because of my unfashionable doctrine, I was excluded from one and another church, and at length shut out of all.” In many places, too, Wesley and his associates were treated as disturbers of the peace, and subjected to annoyance and persecution. They were reviled, mobbed, imprisoned. They bore everything with patience. “Not daring to be silent,” says Wesley, “it remained only to preach in the open air; which I did at first not out of choice, but necessity. I have since seen abundant reason to adore the wise providence of God herein, making a way for myriads of people who never troubled any church, nor were likely so to do, to hear that Word which they soon found to be the power of God unto salvation.”

The result of these labors was not only the conversion of manly souls, but the formation of religious societies. The young converts, neglected, and in

many instances treated contemptuously by the established clergy, were as sheep having no shepherd. They naturally longed for the fellowship of kindred spirits. At their own request, they were united together for mutual comfort and edification. Wesley gives the following account of the origin of what was then called simply “the United Society.” The rules which were drawn up for them are to the present day recognised, with two or three very slight alterations, as the *General Rules* of all branches of the great Methodist family in England, in the United States, and elsewhere:

“**1.** In the latter end of the year 1739 eight or ten persons came to me in London, who appeared to be deeply convinced of sin, and earnestly groaning for redemption. They desired (as did two or three more the next day) that I would spend some time with them in prayer, and advise them how to flee from the wrath to come, which they saw continually hanging over their heads. That we might have more time for this great work, I appointed a day when they might all come together; which, from thenceforward, they did every week, viz. on Thursday in the evening. To these, and as many more as desired to join with them (for their number increased daily), I gave those advices from time to time which I judged most needful for them; and we always concluded our meetings with prayer suitable to their several necessities.

“**2.** This was the rise of the United Society, first in London, and then in other places. Such a society is no other than ‘a company of men having the form and seeking the power of godliness; united in order to pray together, to receive the word of exhortation, and to watch over one another in love, that they may help each other to work out their salvation.’

“**3.** That it may the more easily be discerned whether they are indeed working out their own salvation, each society is divided into smaller companies, called classes according to their respective places of abode. There are about twelve persons in every class; one of whom is styled the Leader. It is his business,

“(1.) To see each person in his class once a week, at least, in order

“To inquire how their souls prosper; “To advise, reprove, comfort, or exhort, as occasion may require;

“To receive what they are willing to give towards the support of the Gospel;



“(2.) To meet the ministers and the stewards of the society once a week, in order

“To inform the minister of any that are sick, or of any that walk disorderly, and will not be reprov'd;

“To pay to the stewards what they have received of their several classes in the week preceding; and

“To show their account of what each person has contributed.

“4. There is one only condition previously required of those who desire admission into these societies; viz. ‘a desire to flee from the wrath to come, and be saved from their sins.’ But wherever this is really fixed in the soul, it will be shown by its fruits. It is therefore expected of all who continue therein that they should continue to evidence their desire of salvation,

“First, by doing no harm, by avoiding evil in every kind; especially that which is most generally practiced. Such as

“The taking the name of God in vain; “The profaning the day of the Lord, either by doing ordinary work thereon, or by buying or selling;

“Drunkenness; buying or selling spirituous liquors; or drinking them, unless in cases of extreme necessity;

“Fighting, quarrelling, brawling; brother going to law with brother; returning evil for evil, or railing for railing; the using many words in buying or selling;

“The buying or selling uncustomed goods; “The giving or taking things on usury, viz. unlawful interest;

“Uncharitable or unprofitable conversation ; particularly speaking evil of magistrates or of ministers;

“Doing to others as we would not they should do unto us;

“Doing what we know is not for the glory of God: as, “The putting on of gold and costly apparel; “The taking such diversions as cannot be used in the name of the Lord Jesus;

“The singing those songs or reading those books which do not tend to the knowledge or love of God;

“Softness, and needless self-indulgence; “Laying up treasure upon earth; “Borrowing without a probability of paying; or taking up goods without a probability of paying for them.

**5.** It is expected of all who continue in these societies, that they should continue to evidence their desire of salvation,

“Secondly, by doing good, by being in every kind merciful after their power, as they have opportunity; doing good of every possible sort, and as far as is possible to all men:

“To their bodies, of the ability that God giveth, by giving food to the hungry, by clothing the naked, by helping or visiting them that are sick or in prison ;

“To their souls, by instructing, reproving, or exhorting all we have any intercourse with; trampling under foot that enthusiastic doctrine of devils, that ‘we are not to do good, unless our hearts be free to it.’

“By doing good, especially to them that are of the household of faith, or groaning so to be; employing them preferably to others, buying one of another, helping each other in business; and so much the more, because the world will love its own, and them only.

“By all possible diligence and frugality, that the Gospel be not blamed.

“By running with patience the race that is set before them, denying themselves, and taking up their cross daily; submitting to bear the reproach of Christ; to be as the filth and offscouring of the world; and looking that men should say all manner of evil of them falsely, for the Lord’s sake.

**6.** It is expected of all who desire to continue in these societies that they should continue to evidence their desire of salvation,

“Thirdly, by attending upon all the ordinances of God: such are

“The public worship of God; “The ministry of the word, either read or expounded;’ “The supper of the Lord: “Family and private prayer; “Searching the Scriptures; and “Fasting or abstinence.

“7. These are the general rules of our societies: all which we are taught of God to observe, even in his written Word the only rule, and the sufficient rule, both of our faith and practice. And all these we know his Spirit writes. on every truly awakened heart. If there be any among us who observe them not, who habitually break any of them, let it be made known unto them who watch over that soul, as they that must give an account. We will admonish him of the error of his ways: we will bear with him for a season. But then, if he repent not, he hath no more place among us. We have delivered our own souls.”

The “societies” thus formed increased so rapidly that very soon there arose a necessity for additional ministerial service. As the leaders in this wonderful revival of religion had been led providentially into the practice of field-preaching, and into the formation of religious societies, so they were induced in the same manner to accept the assistance of preachers who had not been educated for the ministry, nor ordained to that service; This was at that time regarded by many as the most heinous of their offences. The Wesleys themselves at first hesitated at what seemed so monstrous an innovation; and the elder brother, when he first heard that a layman had taken a text and preached a sermon, hastened to London to put a stop to the irregularity. The man, Thomas Maxfield by name, had been left in charge of the little flock during the absence of the ordained ministers, had prayed with them, read to them passages of Scripture, attempted an exposition of a verse or two, and found himself preaching almost before he was aware of it. Happily for the interests of the new sect, and happily, too, for the cause of Christ, Wesley was met by his mother before he had time to censure the young preacher, or publicly to denounce this innovation. Mrs Wesley; the widow of a stanch minister of the Established Church, had been educated in its doctrines, and she revered its prelatical assumptions. But she had heard the young man preach several times. On the arrival of her son, seeing that his countenance was expressive of dissatisfaction, she inquired the cause. “Thomas Maxfield,” said he, abruptly, “has turned preacher, I find.” She looked attentively at him, and replied “John, you know what my sentiments have been. You cannot suspect me of readily favoring anything of this kind; but take care what you do with respect to that young man, for he is as surely called of God to preach as you are.” Her advice was followed, and the result justified her opinion. Wesley recognised the validity of the young man’s call; and thereafter it became a settled conviction with him, as it is with his followers to this day, that a

warrant to preach the Gospel does not of necessity come only through one channel. In process of time, as instances of this kind increased, it became necessary to devise some criterion by which to test those who professed to believe themselves called of God to preach. This was a subject to which John Wesley early turned his attention; and the question, with his answer, continues to the present day to be incorporated among the rules recognised by all Wesleyan Methodists. We say *Wesleyan* Methodists because, previous to the preaching of Maxfield, Whitefield had separated himself from his associates, and thenceforward became known as the leader of the Calvinistic division of Methodism. The question and answer were in the following words:

**“Quest.** How shall we try those who profess to be moved by the Holy Ghost to preach ?

**“Ans. 1.** Let the following questions be asked, namely: Do they know God as a pardoning God? Have they the love of God abiding in them ? Do they desire nothing but God ? And are they holy in all manner of conversation?

**“2.** Have they the gifts (as well as the grace) for the work? Have they (in some tolerable degree) a clear, sound understanding, a right judgment in the things of God, a just conception of salvation by faith? And has God given them any degree of utterance ? Do they speak justly, readily, clearly?

**“3.** Have they fruit? Are any truly convinced of sin and converted to God by their preaching ?

“As long as these three marks concur in any one, we believe he is called of God to preach. These we receive as sufficient proof that he is moved by the Holy Ghost.”

From the time of Maxfield’s admission as a preacher, many others of similar piety and gifts offered their services and were accepted. As the work went on, and additions were made to the “societies” in all parts of the kingdom, the demand for preachers increased. Wesley had always thought that preachers would be supplied from the pulpits of the Established Church, but, disappointed in this, he came to favor the admission of those who, although not episcopally ordained, were wholly devoted to the work of preaching the Gospel, and gladly recognised them as ministers of Christ. The employment of this class of auxiliaries constantly increasing, finally led

to a meeting, held annually thereafter, and known as “the Conference” (q.v.). The first of these assemblies was held in 1744, and from this year Methodism began to assume the appearance of an organized system. It was in 1744 that the brothers John and Charles Wesley, with two or three other regularly-ordained clergymen, met with such of the “preachers” as could conveniently attend, to clothe Methodism with the conventional forms of established ecclesiastical government. Of course neither John nor Charles could brook the idea of becoming Dissenters, and Methodism was organized as an independent Church body only after the death of John Wesley. *SEE WESLEYANS*. To all intents and purposes the Church was organized at this first Conference in 1744, and yet by this very body one of the questions asked was, “Are we Dissenters?” and its answer an emphatic “No.” “Although we call sinners to repentance in all places of God’s dominion, and although we frequently use extemporaneous prayer, and unite together in a religious society, yet we are not Dissenters in the only sense which our law acknowledges, viz. those who renounce the service of the Church. We do not, we dare not, separate from it. We are not seceders, nor do we bear any resemblance to them. We set out upon quite opposite principles. The seceders laid the very foundation of their work in judging and condemning others. We laid the foundation of our work in judging and condemning ourselves. They begin everywhere with showing their hearers how fallen the Church and its ministers are; we begin everywhere with showing our hearers how fallen they are themselves” (Coke, *Life of Wesley*, p. 287). “Monday, June 25, and the five following days,” says the leader of this little band, “we spent in conference with our preachers, seriously considering by what means we might the most effectually save our own souls and them that heard us, and the result of our consultations we set down to be the rule of our future practice.” Already had the larger portion of England been divided into “circuits.” to each of which several preachers, were sent for one or two years. A part of the work of each annual assembly was to arrange these appointments and changes. At the early Conferences various theological questions were discussed with reference to the agreement of all the parties in a common standard; and when this was settled, and the doctrinal discussions were discontinued, new regulations of another kind were from year to year adopted, as the state of the societies, and the enlarging opportunities of doing good, seemed to require. The first indication of a desire to see a separate establishment was given by John Wesley in 1784, when he ordained Coke (q.v.) bishop of the Methodist Church in this country. *SEE METHODIST*

**EPISCOPAL CHURCH.** On neither side of the ocean had adherents of Wesley hitherto organized as a Church. They were simply up to this time non-ecclesiastical religious societies, entirely voluntary on the part of the members, and all governed by a common discipline, of which their founder was the sole dictator and the chief executor. Yet even this step to provide for the Methodists in America a separate ecclesiastical organization does not clearly reveal whether Wesley changed his mind as to his former relation and that of his adherents within the Anglican rule to the Church of England. Says Dr. Curry, of the *Christian Advocate* (N. Y., May 25, 1871), "No fact respecting the history of John Wesley is more clearly manifest than that he was always a strenuous supporter of the authority of the Established Church of England. He jealously regarded the exclusive ecclesiastical authority of that Church in all that he did as an evangelist, and seemed always determined that while he lived and ruled—and it was always understood that he would rule as long as he lived—nothing should be tolerated in his societies at all repugnant to the sole and exclusive ecclesiastical authority of the Established Church. This rule was applied to his societies in America before the Revolution just as strictly as to those in England. But the political separation of America from Great Britain, as it also ended the authority of the English Church in this country, made it lawful, according to his theory of the case, for the Methodist societies in America to become regularly organized churches."

**II.** The *theological doctrines* of Wesleyan Methodism are, with perhaps two or three modifications, the same as those which, by common consent, are at present deemed evangelical. The articles of religion drawn up by Wesley for his immediate followers, and substantially adopted by all Methodist bodies since, are but slightly modified from those of the Established Church of England. They were originally prepared for the churches in the States. **SEE ARTICLES, TWENTY-FIVE.** The sermons of John Wesley, and his notes on the New Testament, are recognised by his followers in Great Britain and America as the standard of Methodism, and as the basis of their theological creed. The unity of the Godhead, and the coequal divinity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; the death, resurrection, ascension, and intercession of Jesus Christ; salvation by faith; the sufficiency and divine inspiration of the Holy Scriptures; a final day of judgment, and the eternity of future rewards and punishments, are doctrines held in common with other evangelical branches of the Church of Christ. Maintaining man's total depravity through the fall of Adam, and his

utter inability, unless aided by divine grace, to take one step towards his recovery, Methodists hold that this grace is free, extending itself equally, by virtue of the atonement, to all the children of men. Hence they deny the doctrine of special election, with its counterpart, reprobation, as taught in Calvinistic formularies, and maintain, in opposition to those who hold to a limited atonement, that Jesus Christ, “by his oblation of himself once offered, made a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world.” They recognise two sacraments as ordained by Christ Baptism and the Lord’s Supper. Infant children and believing adults have a right to the former; and penitent, seekers of salvation, as well as professing Christians, are invited to partake of the latter, both being regarded not only as “badges or tokens of Christian men’s profession, but as certain signs of grace and God’s good will towards us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in him.” As to the *mode* of baptism, so that the ceremony be performed by an authorized minister in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, it is optional whether the water be applied by sprinkling or pouring, or by the immersion of the candidate; and although kneeling is the usual mode of receiving the elements at the Lord’s table, those who prefer may partake of them in a standing or sitting posture. They deny the doctrine usually styled the “perseverance of the saints,” believing that a true child of God may fall from grace and finally perish; but they hold the doctrine of assurance, in the sense that it is the privilege of the justified sinner now to know his sins forgiven. The Holy Spirit, they teach, bears witness of the fact of present pardon and acceptance; but this is deemed to be the privilege of believers, not the indispensable evidence of regeneration. “It does not follow,” says Wesley, “that all who do not *know* their sins forgiven are children of the devil.” Methodism teaches also that it is the privilege of believers in this life to reach that maturity of grace, and that conformity to the divine nature, which cleanses the heart from sin. and fills it with love to God and man—the being filled as Paul phrases it, with all the fulness of God. This they call Christian perfection, a state which they declare to be attainable through faith in Christ. Wesley says on this subject, and none of his authorized followers have gone beyond him, “Christian perfection implies the being so crucified with Christ as to be able to testify, ‘I live not, but Christ liveth in me.’ It does not imply an exemption from ignorance or mistake, infirmities or temptations. I believe,” he adds, “there is no such perfection in this life as excludes these involuntary transgressions, which I apprehend to be

naturally consequent on the ignorance and mistakes inseparable from mortality. Therefore ‘sinless perfection’ is’ a phrase I never use, lest I should seem to contradict myself. I believe a person filled with the love of God is still liable to these involuntary transgressions. Such transgressions you may call sins, if you please: I do not, for the reasons above mentioned.” This doctrine Wesley calls “the grand depositum which God has given to the people called Methodists;” and he gives it as his opinion that God raised them up chiefly to preach, and exemplify, and propagate it. *SEE WESLEYANISM.*

**II.** As to *the government and usages of ‘Methodism* they are similar, but not entirely uniform, in all its branches and divisions. In the parent body, the Wesleyan Methodists of England, the ecclesiastical government is entirely in the hands of the ministry. “The Conference,” originally instituted, as we have seen, by Wesley, has the power of making rules and regulations for the government of the body. This power is, how, ever, restricted within certain limits prescribed in what is known as “the deed of declaration,” executed by John Wesley a little while before his death, and enrolled in the archives of the high court of chancery in 1794. By the provisions of this deed, the Conference consists of one hundred ministers, who were originally named therein, and to whom and to their successors was committed the duty of filling vacancies as they occur. The Conference, by the deed of declaration, is to meet annually, and to continue in session not less than five days nor more than three weeks. Other ministers attend and take part in the discussions, but the legal body consists of the “hundred” only. Their first business, after filling vacancies, is the election from their own number of a president, who holds his office for one year, but is eligible to a reelection after an interval of eight years. Any member of the “legal hundred” absenting himself without leave from two successive Conferences, and not appearing on the first day of the third, forfeits his seat. The Conference admits preachers on trial; receives them into full membership by ordination; examines and scrutinizes the character of every minister in the connection, and has power ‘to try those against whom any charge is brought, and to censure, suspend, or excommunicate, if necessary. By the Conference the proceedings of subordinate bodies are finally reviewed, and the state and prospects of the Church at large are considered, and regulations enacted for its increasing efficiency. The most important of these subordinate judicatories is “the district meeting,” which is composed of ministers and laymen “residing within a district of country



embracing from ten to twenty or more circuits” a circuit being the prescribed field of labor for two, three, or, in some cases, four ministers. The district meeting has authority:

1. To examine candidates for the ministry; and without their recommendation no candidate can come before the Annual Conference.
2. To try and suspend ministers who are found immoral, erroneous in doctrine, unfaithful to their ordination vows, or deficient in ability for the work they have undertaken.
3. To decide preliminary questions concerning the building of chapels.
4. To review the demands from the less wealthy churches, which draw upon the public funds of the connection for aid in supporting their ministers.
5. To elect a representative, who is thus made a member of a committee appointed to sit previously to the meeting of “the Conference,” in order to prepare a draft of the stations of all the ministers for the ensuing year; regard being had to the wishes of the people in the allocation of individual pastors. The judgment of this “stationing committee” is conclusive until Conference, to which an appeal is allowed in all cases, either from ministers or people. But the appointments are made for one year only, and no preacher can be appointed to the same charge more than three years successive. In the District Conference laymen take part, equally with ministers, in all that affects the general welfare of the body; and the lay influence predominates still more in “the quarterly meeting,” which is held, as its name indicates, every three months on every circuit. All *local preachers*, a numerous and influential body of men, who preach on Sundays, and follow some secular employments for a livelihood; *stewards*, whose duty it is to attend more especially to the temporalities of the society; *class-leaders*, of whom mention is made above in the general rules, are members of the quarterly meeting, at which candidates for the sacred office are first proposed, and, if rejected by their fellow-members, they have no appeal to- another tribunal. A similar balance of power is maintained in the “leaders-meeting,” which is held monthly, in regard to various affairs of the particular society to which it belongs. Many of these meetings are attended by one minister only, or, at the most, by two or three, while the lay members are very numerous. No leader, or other society officer, is appointed but with the concurrence of a leaders’ meeting;

no steward without that of the quarterly meeting. Among the usages peculiar to Methodism we have already noticed “the class-meeting,” at which, although chiefly designed for spiritual instruction and improvement, it is expected that weekly contributions shall be made for the support of the ministry; and in which it is necessary for all who desire to become Methodists to undergo a period of probation of three among the Methodists of England, and of six months among those of the Methodist Episcopal Church (in the Church South there is no probationship), and attendance upon which thereafter is a term of membership. There is also in England what is known as the band-meeting, which differs from the class-meeting in that it is a voluntary association, and does not allow males and females to meet together, nor the married to belong to the same “band” with the single. The love-feast is a meeting held at the discretion of the preacher, quarterly or oftener; and the watchnight is a meeting for prayer, preaching, and mutual exhortation, held at first frequently, but now only on the last night of the year, and continuing until after midnight. John Wesley is claimed to have been the originator of religious tracts for gratuitous distribution, and of cheap volumes for the dissemination of the principles of Christianity. His followers have continued the system of publishing, and from “the Book-room” in London still emanate religious publications, tracts, and periodicals, the profits arising from the sale of which are applied to connectional purposes. For further details, *SEE WESLEYANS*.

The duties of a Methodist minister were thus defined by Mr. Wesley, and they have since remained substantially in all branches of the denomination (*see Discipline, etc.*, § 138 sq.):

“**Q.** What is the office of a Christian minister ?

**A.** To watch over souls, as he that must give an account. To feed and guide the flock.

**Q.** How shall he be fully qualified for his great work?

**A.** By walking closely with God, and having his work greatly at heart; by understanding and loving every branch of our discipline, and by carefully and constantly observing the twelve rules of a helper, viz.:

**1.** Be diligent; never be unemployed; never be triflingly employed; never WHILE away time, nor spend more time at any place than is strictly necessary.

- 2.** Be serious; let your motto be, *Holiness to the Lord*; avoid all lightness, jesting, and foolish talking.
- 3.** Converse sparingly and cautiously with women, particularly with young women.
- 4.** Take no step towards marriage without solemn prayer to God, and consulting with your brethren.
- 5.** Believe evil of no one; unless fully proved, take heed how you credit it: put the best construction you can on everything-you know the judge is always supposed to be on the prisoner's side.
- 6.** Speak evil of no one. else *your* word especially would eat as doth a canker; keep your thoughts within your own breast till you come to the person concerned.
- 7.** Tell every one what you think wrong in him, lovingly and plainly, and as soon as may be, else it will fester in your own heart; make all haste to cast the fire out of your bosom.
- 8.** Do not affect the gentleman; a preacher of the Gospel is the servant of all.
- 9.** Be ashamed of nothing but sin; no, not of cleaning your own shoes when necessary.
- 10.** Be punctual; do everything exactly at the time; and do not mend our rules, but keep them, and that for conscience' sake.
- 11.** You have nothing to do but to save souls, and therefore spend and be spent in this work; and go always, not only to those who want you, but to those who want you most.
- 12.** Act in all things, not according to your own will, but as a son in the Gospel, and in union with your brethren. As such, it is your part to employ your time as our rules direct; partly in preaching and visiting from house to house; partly in reading, meditation, and prayer. Above all, if you labor with us in our Lord's vineyard, it is needful that you should do that part of the work which the Conference shall advise, at those times and places which they shall judge most for his glory. Observe: It is not your business to preach so many times, and to take care merely of this and that society, but to save as many souls as you can; to bring as many sinners as you

possibly can to repentance; and with all your power to build them up in that holiness without which they cannot see the Lord; and, remember, *a Methodist preacher is to, mind every point, great and small, in the Methodist discipline*; therefore you will need all the grace and all the sense you have, and to have all your wits about you.” *SEE ITINERANCY.*

The latest writer on Methodism (the Revelation L. Tyerman, *Life and Times of John Wesley*) who dares to hold that it is “the greatest fact in the history of the Church of Christ,” thus comments upon the present condition of the parent body of Methodism, the *Wesleyan Methodist Church* (q.v.): “The ‘Methodist,’ or *parent* ‘Conference,’ employs in Great Britain and Ireland 1782 regular ministers. Besides these, there were, in 1864, in England only, 11,804 lay preachers, preaching 8754 sermons every Sabbath-day. In the same year, the number of preaching-places in England only was 6718, and the number of sermons preached weekly, by ministers and lay preachers combined, was 13,852. To these must be added the lay preachers, preaching-places, etc., in Wales, Scotland, Ireland, Shetland, and the Channel Islands. The number of Church members in Great Britain and Ireland is 365,285, with 21,223 on trial; and, calculating that the hearers are three times as numerous as the Church members, there are considerably more than a million persons in the United Kingdom who are attendants upon the religious services of the parent Conference of ‘the people called Methodists.’ Some idea of their chapel and school property may be formed from the fact that, during the last seven years, there has been expended, in Great Britain only, in new erections and in reducing debts on existing buildings, £1,672,541; and towards that amount of expenditure there has been actually raised and paid (exclusive of all connectional collections, loans, and drafts) the sum of £1,284,498. During the ten years from 1859 to 1868, inclusive, there was raised for the support of the foreign missions of the connection £1,408,235; and if to this there be added the amount of the Jubilee Fund, we find more than a million and a half-sterling contributed during the decade for the sustenance and extension of the Methodist work in foreign lands. The missions now referred to are carried on in Ireland, France, Switzerland, Germany, Italy, Gibraltar, India, Ceylon, China, South and West Africa, the West Indies, Canada, Eastern British America, Australia, and Polynesia. In these distant places the committee having the management of the missions employ 3798 paid agents, including 994 who are regularly ordained, and are wholly engaged in the work of the Christian ministry. Besides these, there are

about 20,000 agents of the society (as lay preachers; etc.) who are rendering important service gratuitously, while the number of Church members is 154,187, and the number of attendants upon the religious services more than half a million. Space prevents a reference to the other institutions and funds of British Methodism, except to add that, besides 174,721 children in the mission schools, the parent connection has in Great Britain 698 day-schools, efficiently conducted by 1532 certificated, assistant, and pupil teachers, and containing 119,070 scholars; also 5328 Sunday schools, containing 601,801 scholars, taught by 103,441 persons who render their services gratuitously; and that the total number of publications printed and issued by the English Book Committee only, during the year ending June, 1866, was four millions one hundred and twenty-two thousand eight hundred, of which nearly two millions were periodicals, and more than a quarter of a million were hymn-books.”

**IV. Subdivisions.**-The different branches of the great Methodistic body are as follows:

- 1.** The WESLEYAN METHODISTS, or main and original body of the Methodists in Great Britain, often spoken of above. *SEE WESLEYANS.*
- 2.** The CALVINISTIC METHODISTS date from a dispute between Whitefield and the Wesleys on doctrinal points. The former, with his associates, under the special patronage of the countess of Huntingdon, and greatly aided by her liberal contributions, organized societies and built chapels in various parts of England, Scotland, and Wales. For their particular doctrinal tenets, *SEE CALVINISM.* After the death of Whitefield they were divided into three separate sects.

**(1.)** The first was known as *Lady Huntingdon's Connection*, which observed strictly the liturgical forms of the English Established Church, with a settled pastorate instead of an itinerant ministry. They have not increased with much rapidity since her death, having at the present time less than a hundred ministers, and between sixty and seventy chapels. They have maintained from the beginning a theological school for the education of ministers, now known as Cheshunt College, in Hertfordshire, England. *SEE HUNTINGDON.* Although the name “connection” continues to be used, the Congregational polity is practically adopted; and, of late years, several of the congregations have become, in name as well as virtually, Congregational Churches. The number of chapels, mentioned in the census

of 1851, as belonging to this connection, was 109, containing accommodations for 38,727 persons, and the attendance on the census Saturday was 19,151.

(2.) The second of these divisions was called the *Tabernacle Connection*, or *Whitefield Methodists*. They had no connectional bond after the death of their founder, and each separate society regarding itself as independent, they are now lost as a distinctive sect, and found only among the churches known as Congregationalist or Independent.

(3.) The *Welsh Calvinistic Methodists*, the third of these branches, was organized in 1743. They have continued to increase and prosper until the present day, being confined, however, mostly to the principality of Wales, where they at present number about 60,000 communicants. In the United States there are about 4000 members of this denomination, with four annual Conferences, one in each of the states of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Wisconsin. The members are mostly Welsh, or of Welsh descent, and their religious services are generally celebrated in the Welsh language.

3. The WESLEYAN METHODIST NEW CONNECTION was the result of the first secession from the parent body after the death of Wesley. It originated in 1797, under the leadership of Alexander Kilham, after whom they are sometimes called *Kilhamites* (q.v.). He had been a preacher among the Wesleyans, and was expelled from the Conference in 1796. His offence was a publication in which he criticised severely the then present order of things, and submitted proposals for what he deemed reform. In accordance with his sentiments a secession Church was organized, and the New Connection sprang into existence with about 5000 members. Their Conference is constituted upon the representative system, laymen having an equal voice with the clergy in the government of the Church, while in doctrine and general usage they differ not at all from the old connection. Their history has not been marked by any great success. They have a few chapels in Ireland, and in Canada there are from 8000 to 10,000 members. Of late years they have decreased in the number of membership. In 1890 the body contained about 35,000 members.

4. THE BAND-ROOM METHODISTS originated in Manchester in 1806. The name is derived from the *Band Room* in North Street, Manchester, where a class of overzealous revivalists used to gather, and, contrary to the rules of the *Connection*, admitted parties not members. They were also guilty of acting independently of leaders' meetings, and when remonstrated

with, withdrew and formed an independent body. The Band-Room Methodists still exist; but are now called *The United Free Gospel Churches*. They differ from the “parent” body in having no paid ministers. They have, however, annual conferences.

**5.** The PRIMITIVE METHODISTS are, next to the Wesleyans, the largest Methodist body in England. They date from the year 1810. A few regular Wesleyan preachers introduced, on their circuits, the American practice of holding camp-meetings. These were disapproved by the Conference, and denounced as “highly improper.” Other questions entered into the controversy, and the result was the formation of the new sect. Their discipline and theology are strictly Wesleyan, but they go beyond any other denomination in committing the duty of Church government to the laity. Their Conference is composed of one third preachers and two thirds laymen. From the stir they make in their religious services, they have been called *Ranters*. They allow women to preach. They have several missions in foreign lands, and in England and Wales, according to the last official report of 1890, the connection had 193,658 members. In the United States, also, they have secured a footing; they here count a membership of 5639. *SEE PRIMITIVE METHODISTS.*

**6.** The BRYANITES, or BIBLE CHRISTIANS, are a sect of Methodists very similar to the preceding. They date from 1815. Their leader was a Wesleyan local preacher of considerable talent, by the name of O’ Bryan (q.v.). Among them, as among the Primitive Methodists, females are regularly licensed to preach in public. They principally exist in Cornwall and the West of England, but also have mission stations in the Channel Islands, the United States, Canada, Prince Edward’s Island, and Australia. They had, according to their report of 1873, 26,427 full and accredited Church members.

**7.** The PRIMITIVE METHODISTS OF IRELAND. This body of Primitive Methodists is of later origin than that of England, and is entirely independent of the other organization of like name, *The Primitive Methodists of Ireland* date from 1816. The English Conference in 1795 granted to the members the privilege of receiving from their own ministers, under certain guards and restrictions, the sacraments. The Irish Conference thereupon, in the following year; came to the conclusion that among them “it was not expedient;” but in 1816, after the subject had been freely discussed by the people, and numerous petitions asking that it might be

administered were brought before the Conference, the request was granted by a majority of sixty-two against twenty-six. The minority, with the Revelation Adam Averell, one of their most influential ministers, at their head, separated, and took with them about ten thousand members, full one third of the whole. (It is worthy of remark that the secession in 1797 [see 3] was the result of the non-compliance of the English Conference with the wishes of the people to have the sacrament from their own ministers.) The only difference between the Irish Primitive Methodists and the Wesleyans remains to this day the liberty of members in the former body to partake of the sacraments in the *churches*. The preachers are regarded simply as laymen, because of the failure of this secession among them.- The *real* lay members, however, have also a voice in the government of the societies. In 1861 the Irish Primitive Methodists numbered 14,247 members. *SEE PRIMITIVE METHODISTS.*

**8.** The UNITED METHODIST FREE CHURCH is a union, recently formed, of three different divisions of seceders from Wesleyan Methodism.

**(a)** The PROTESTANT METHODISTS, who organized into a distinct body in 1828, then counting 28 local preachers, 56 leaders, and upwards of 1000 members, seceders from the Leeds societies, because of the opposition to the introduction of an organ.

**(b)** The WESLEYAN METHODIST ASSOCIATION, which was organized in 1835, under the leadership of Samuel Warren, one of the opponents (in 1834) to the proposed establishment of a theological institution, to be presided over by Dr. Jabez Bunting. The Leeds seceders joined the Associationists in 1828; both amalgamated with the *Free Methodists* in 1857. *SEE UNITED METHODIST FREE CHURCH.*

**(c)** The REFORMERS, who were organized into a body in 1849. At the Manchester Conference held in that year, six members, suspected of private intrigue with members of the Wesleyan Methodist Association (see *b*), were placed at the bar, without having received any regular notice of the charges to be preferred against them, as required by the standing laws and usages of the connection, and without a trial, without any evidence that they had violated any law, human or divine, three of them were reprimanded and three were expelled. The act excited the astonishment of the nation, convulsed the connection, and led to the loss of one hundred thousand members. Many of them, after a while, for want of ministers and suitable places of worship, returned to the old body, but others formed



themselves into a distinctive body styled the *Reformed Methodists*. These amalgamated bodies differ from the “parent” body only in Church government and usages. One of their professed objects is the reformation of the body from which they are separated. Their annual assembly admits lay representatives, circuits with less than 500 members sending one; less than 1000, two; and more than 1000, three delegates. Each circuit governs itself by its local courts, without any interference as to the management of its internal affairs. At their Annual Assembly, held at Bristol, England, in August, 1890, they reported 85,461 members.

**9.** The WESLEYAN REFORM UNION is a body composed of those of the seceders of 1849 (see 7 [c]) who refused to amalgamate with the *United Methodist Free Church*. In 1868 it numbered nearly a thousand Church members.

The above comprise all the Methodist branches now existing in Great Britain and Ireland. Some others have occasionally sprung up, such as the *Tent Methodists*, the *Independent Methodists*, etc., but they are now either extinct or incorporated with other churches.

**10.** In the United States, the main body of Wesley’s followers are incorporated in the METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, which was formally organized in 1784. Previous to that time local preachers from England, prominent among whom were Philip Embury and an officer in the British army by the name of Webb, had preached in New York and other places, and organized societies on the English model. In 1769 the first regular itinerant Methodist preachers, Boardman and Pilmoor, were sent over by Mr. Wesley. The former took his station in New York, the latter in Philadelphia—occasionally changing with each other, and often making short excursions into the country. They were very successful in their labors; and, by their instrumentality, not only were multitudes converted, but quite a number of lay preachers were received and employed. At the English Wesleyan Conference of 1771, Francis Asbury and Richard Wright volunteered to come to America as missionaries. They landed in Philadelphia in the month of October of that year, and were received by the societies with great cordiality. In the year 1773 two additional missionaries, Rankin and Shadford, were sent over, and the first American “Conference” was held at Philadelphia in July of that year. The number of members in the society was stated to be 1160; and resolutions were adopted recommending continued conformity to the discipline and

doctrines of the English Methodists. From that time, all through the stormy season of the Revolutionary War, success seems to have attended their efforts, so that, at the Conference of 1784, there were reported to be about 15,000 members in the connection. In this year Wesley, for the first time, performed the solemn rite of ordination by setting apart two men as elders for the flock in America, and by consecrating to the episcopal office Dr. Thomas Coke, at that time a presbyter in the Church of England. The doctor and his two associates immediately thereafter sailed for America, and were present at the Conference in Baltimore, at which the Methodist Episcopal Church was organized. The first act of that Conference was the ratification with entire unanimity of Coke's ordination, and the election of one of their own number, Francis Asbury, to the same office. The Conference also received Wesley's abridgment of the Articles of the Church of England, which continue to be their standard of doctrine to the present day, and also an abridgment of the Book of Common Prayer, prepared by the same hand, and sent over with the recommendation that it should be used in the Methodist chapels. This was done in some of the large cities for a season, but soon fell into disuse, with the exception of the sacramental services and the forms of ordinations, which are still retained and used. The bishops are elected by a General Conference, which meets every four years, and is composed of delegates from the several Annual Conferences in the ratio of one delegate for a certain number of members, which has been changed from time to time according to the increase of the general body. The ratio fixed by the General Conference of 1872 as a basis of future representation is one delegate for every forty-five members of an Annual Conference. At the same Conference lay members, in the ratio of two for every Annual Conference, were also admitted. The bishops, like the preachers, are itinerant; and it is specially enacted that if one of them ceases from travelling without the consent of the General Conference, he shall not thereafter exercise the episcopal office. His powers are similar to those of the president of the English Conference, with the additional duty of fixing the appointments of the preachers, deciding all questions of law in an Annual Conference, and ordaining bishops, elders, and deacons. The limit of *three* years, beyond which the preachers of the British Wesleyan Connection may not continue in the same place, is now also the rule of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States; and to this is added the regulation that they may not be returned to the same place more than three years in six. Presiding elders in this branch of the Church occupy a position very similar to that of the chairmen of districts in England, except that they

have no separate pastoral charge. They are appointed by the bishops, and may remain four years on the same district. They form a kind of advisory committee in assisting the bishops to fix the appointments-of the preachers. The "Book Concern," situated in New York, with a branch at Cincinnati, and depositories in various other cities, has a capital of more than a million of dollars, and is one of the largest publishing houses in the world. Under the patronage and control of the Church are weekly papers published in New York, Syracuse (N. Y.), Pittsburgh (Pa.), Cincinnati (O.), Chicago (Ill.), St. Louis (Mo.), San Francisco (Cal.), Portland (Oregon), and Atlanta (Ga.). They publish also several illustrated papers for Sunday-schools, one of a similar kind for the Tract Society, a monthly Sunday-school journal, a monthly magazine in English, another in German, and a quarterly review. *SEE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.*

**11.** The METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH, projected at Louisville, Ky., in 1845, was formally organized by delegates from Conferences within the slaveholding states in May, 1846. In doctrine, discipline, and general usages, it is the same as the preceding. The same is true of its forms of worship and usages. But while the Church North made open declaration against the institution of slavery, the Church South ignored the subject. Now that the institution is abolished in the United States, the two bodies can hardly be said to differ. The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, has a flourishing publishing house (at Nashville, Tenn.), and issues several periodicals. *SEE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH.*

**12.** The METHODIST PROTESTANT CHURCH was organized in the city of Baltimore, Md., in the year 1830, by a convention composed of an equal number of clerical and lay delegates from various states of the Union. The convention continued in session three weeks, and adopted a "Constitution" for the new association. Its fundamental doctrines, and most of its usages, are the same as those of the Episcopal Methodists, the body from which it seceded. Following the example of the British Wesleyans, the episcopal office is denied, and a president called to rule over each Annual Conference, elected by the ballot of that body. The laity is admitted to an equal participation with the clergy in all Church legislation and government. The General Conference, which meets every four years, consists of an equal number of ministers and laymen, who are elected by the Annual Conferences. The slavery question divided the Methodist Protestant Church into two bodies the *Methodist Protestant Church of the*

*North-western States* and the *Methodist Protestants of the Southern States*. The head-quarters of the former were established at Springfield, Ohio; those of the latter at Baltimore, Md. Their members were found only in certain parts of the United States. Their greatest strength is in Virginia, Maryland, and in some portions of Ohio and Pennsylvania. Of late years, a union of all nonepiscopal Methodists having been proposed, the Protestant Methodists North changed their official name to *The Methodist Church*. The Wesleyan Methodist Church was one of the churches expected to be merged into this newly-constituted body, but hitherto all efforts at union have failed, and there seems to be no immediate prospect of their amalgamation. *The Methodist Church* numbers about 75,000 members; altogether the Methodist Protestants count about 148,000. The head-quarters of the Church South remain at Baltimore, Md.; those of *The Methodist Church* have been removed from Springfield, Ohio, to Pittsburgh, Pa. **SEE METHODIST PROTESTANT CHURCH; SEE METHODISTS. THE.**

**13.** The WESLEYAN METHODIST CHURCH was formed by a convention of clerical and lay delegates which met in the city of Utica, NY., in 1843. The principal part of the delegates in attendance were ministers or members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and the main' reason for the establishment of the new body was their hostility to slavery. At their organization as a Church they adopted a Discipline and plan of Church government, and divided the connection into six Annual Conferences, having about 600 ministers and preachers(mostly local), and a reported membership of about 20.000. Their Articles of Faith are the same as those of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and their General Rules are similar, with the exception that they are more stringent on the subject of slavery. They discard episcopacy and presiding elders, but, like the English Wesleyans, they have chairmen of districts, and elect the presidents of their Annual Conferences at each successive session. Ministers are appointed to their respective fields of labor by a stationing committee, the decisions of said committee being subject to approval by the Conference. Societies and churches are permitted to negotiate beforehand with any minister for his services; but such engagements, if made, must receive the sanction of the Conference. Both General and Annual Conferences are composed of ministers and lay delegates, the local preachers also having a representation.,

**14.** The AFRICAN METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH was formed by a party of colored members, under the leadership of Richard Allen, hence sometimes called *Allenites*, who seceded from their white brethren at Philadelphia in 1816. They adopted, in the main, the doctrines and usages of the body from which they seceded. Mr. Allen was elected to the office of bishop, and ordained by four elders of their Church, assisted by a colored presbyter of the Protestant Episcopal denomination. They are found in various parts of the states of Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland. There are also some in the Western States, and a few in Upper Canada, their congregations being largest and most influential in the city of Philadelphia. The *Methodist Almanac* of 1189 assigns them 7 bishops, 3000 preachers, and( 400,000 members.

**15.** The AFRICAN METHODIST EPISCOPAL (Zion) CHURCH was formed by another secession of colored members in the city of New York in 1819. They elect annually one of their elders as general superintendent but do not ordain or set him apart to that office by the imposition of hands. The *Methodist Almanac* of 1891 credits them with 7 bishops, 3000 preachers, and 412,513 members.

**16.** The UNITED BRETHREN IN CHRIST is the designation of a body of Christians, sometimes called *German Methodists*. They must not be confounded with the Moravians, or Unitas Fratrum, who are sometimes called the United Brethren. “ The United Brethren in Christ,” although mostly consisting of Germans and their immediate descendants, are of American origin, and date as a distinct sect from the year 1800, when their first Annual Conference was held. From that time they have continued to increase in Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, Ohio, Indiana, and other portions of the United States. They have four bishops, nine Annual Conferences, and a General Conference, which meets every fourth year. In doctrines and ‘Church government they are, with few unimportant variations, the same as the Methodist Episcopalians.

**17.** The. EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION are in doctrine and Church government nearly allied to the Episcopal Methodists. They date from the year 1800, and are sometimes called *Albrights*, after one of the founders of the sect. They elect bishops from the body of the elders, and have several Annual Conferences, and a General Conference, the supreme law-making authority, which meets quadrennially. The members are mostly Germans or of German descent, and are numerous only in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and

Illinois. The *Methodist Almanac* of 1891 reports 1 bishop, 1187 preachers, 428 local preachers, and 145,903 members.

**18.** The FREE METHODIST CHURCH was organized by former members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Aug. 23, 1860. The main occasion for the establishment of this body was the expulsion of two ministers from the Genesee Conference. The Free Methodists rigidly enforce the rule for *simplicity of dress*; the privilege of free seats in all houses of worship; congregational singing, without the aid of choir or musical instrument: extemporaneous preaching. In doctrine they are one with other Methodist bodies; but adhere strictly to Wesley's views on *sanctification*, and, teach *everlasting torment*. They have abandoned the episcopacy, but have one *superintendent*, who is elected every four years at the meeting of their General Conference. They report, in 1890, 513 preachers and 19,998 members. *SEE METHODISTS, FREE.*

**19.** The COLORED METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN AMERICA was organized by order of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, December 16, 1870. The new Church consists of the colored preachers and members heretofore belonging to the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. Two bishops were elected—Revelation William H. Miles, of Kentucky, and Revelation R. H. Vanderhorst, of Georgia. The *Christian Index*, edited by Revelation Samuel Watson, at Memphis, Tenn., was adopted as the organ of the new Church, and Revelation L. J. Scurlock was elected assistant editor and book agent. The structure of the new Church, counting about 17,000 members, conforms in all essential particulars to that of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, viz. in doctrine, discipline, and economy, but is entirely independent of that organization, though in sympathy with and fostered by it. White people are not admitted to membership.

There are a few other minor subdivisions of the Methodist family, e.g. the Independent (or Congregational) Methodist Church, the names and statistics of which are given in the tabular summary below. In connection with one or other of the larger bodies; Methodists are found not only in England and North America, but they have "Conferences" in France, Germany, Africa, and Australia. They have missionary stations (for more particulars concerning which. see section VI)

**20.** *Defunct Methodist Bodies.* -Of these, the most important are:

**(a)** The REFORMED METHODIST CHURCH. This body, which is now merged into the *Wesleyan Methodist Church* (see 13), originated in a secession from the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1814. The seceders considered themselves restricted under the episcopal form of government, and, with a view to obtain redress of their grievances, petitioned the General Conference. Their representations met with no favorable reception, and in consequence they withdrew from the membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Their formal separation from that body took place Jan. 16, 1814. In the leading doctrines of Christianity they agreed with the Church which they left; but as to the government of the Church, they conducted their affairs on the Congregational principle. They held peculiar views regarding the efficacy of faith. They believed that all blessings given in answer to prayer are in consequence of faith; and in cases of sickness and distress, faith exercised is the restoring principle. They also taught moral perfection in the present state. They admitted to membership all who simply exhibited clear evidence that their sins were forgiven, and that their hearts were renewed. They held that subscription to any record of Christian principles is altogether unnecessary. In 1818 they spread in Upper Canada, and there made great progress. For some time after the organization of the Wesleyan Methodist Church they united with that body in publishing a magazine—a circumstance which ultimately led to a union between the two bodies.

**(b)** The METHODIST SOCIETY, a body which originated in a secession from the Methodist Episcopal Church in New York in 1820, in consequence of what was deemed an undue interference on the part of the ruling preacher with the temporalities of the Church. In Church doctrine the new body adhered to the rules of the “parent” society, but in the government of the Church there was a considerable difference. 1. No bishop was allowed, but a president of each Annual Conference was chosen yearly by ballot from the members thereof. 2. All ordained ministers, whether travelling or not, were allowed a seat in the Annual Conference. “The property of the societies to be vested in trustees of their own choice, and the minister to have no oversight of the temporal affairs of the Church.” After the organization of the *Methodist Protestant Church* (see 12), the Methodist Society was merged in the former.

**21.** *Methodists in Canada and other British Dominions in America.*—A little more than sixty years ago Methodism was for the first time represented in those parts by William Losee, whom the sainted Asbury had

appointed as a worker of the Gospel, “to range at large.” The work has prospered there as elsewhere, and there are now five large bodies, presided over by no less’ than 900 itinerant ministers. Four of these large bodies, viz. the *Wesleyans*, *Primitives*, *New Connectionists*, and *Bible Christians*, are either an offspring of like associations in the United Kingdom, or in intimate relations at present. But the fifth of them is an independent organization, like the great Methodist body of the United States, from which it sprang, and after which it is named the *Methodist Episcopal Church of Canada*, dating its origin as a separate body in 1828. The Canada Wesleyans, though adhering to the polity of the English Wesleyans, are now agitating the adoption of lay-representation, in order to effect a union of all the Methodist bodies in Canada; their aggregate membership amounts at present to a little over 100,000, their preachers to over 600 in all the different bodies. *SEE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN CANADA; SEE WESLEYAN METHODISTS; SEE PRIMITIVE METHODISTS; SEE NEW-CONNECTION METHODISTS;* etc.

**V. Aggregate.**—Not reckoning the Band-Room Methodists, nor the countless of Huntingdon’s Connection, and making a moderate *estimate* of the Sunday-school scholars belonging to the Welsh Calvinistic Methodists and to the Primitive Methodists in Ireland, we arrive at the results given in the table below. Reckoning two additional hearers for each Church member and Sunday-school scholar, we make a total of more than twelve millions of persons receiving Methodist instruction, and from week to week meeting together in Methodist buildings for the purpose of worshipping Almighty God. The statement is startling, but the statistics given entitle it to the fullest consideration.

But rightly to estimate the results of Methodism during the last hundred and thirty years, there are other facts to be remembered.

“Who will deny, for instance, that Methodism has exercised a potent and beneficial influence upon other churches: Episcopal, Presbyterian, Independent, and Baptist churches have all been largely indebted to Methodism, either directly or indirectly, for many of the best ministers and agents they have ever had. It is a remarkable fact that, during Wesley’s lifetime, of the 690 men who acted under him as itinerant preachers, 249 relinquished the-itinerant ministry. These 249 retirers included not a few of the most intelligent, energetic, pious, and useful preachers that Wesley had. Some left him on the ground of health; others began business, because as



itinerant preachers they were unable to support their wives and families; but a large proportion became ordained ministers in other churches. In some instances, the labors of these men, and their brother Methodists, led to marvellous results. To give but one example: David Taylor, originally a servant of lady Huntingdon, was one of Wesley's first preachers, but afterwards left the work. Taylor, however, was the means of converting Samuel Deacon, an agricultural laborer; and the two combined were the instruments, in the hands of God, in raising up a number of churches in Yorkshire and the midland counties, which, in 1770, were organized into the New Connection of General Baptists; and that connection seventy years afterwards, in 1840, comprised 113 churches, having 11,358 members, a foreign missionary society, and two theological academies" (*Methodist Magazine* [1856], p. 335).

Sunday-schools are now an important appendage of every church, and have been a benefit to millions of immortal souls; but it deserves to be mentioned that Hannah Ball, a young Methodist lady, had a Methodist Sunday-school at High Wycombe fourteen years before Robert Raikes began his at Gloucester; and that Sophia Cooke, another Methodist, who afterwards became the wife of Samuel Bradburn, was the first who suggested to Raikes the Sunday-school idea, and actually marched with him, at the head of his troop of ragged urchins, the first Sunday they were taken to the parish church.

The first British Bible Society that existed, "The Naval and Military," was projected by George Cussons, and organized by a small number of his Methodist companions. The London Missionary Society originated in an appeal from Melville Hornme, who for some years was one of Wesley's itinerant preachers, and then became the successor of Fletcher as vicar of Madeley. The Church Missionary Society was started by John Venn, the son of Henry Venn, the Methodist clergyman. The first Tract Society was formed by John Wesley and Thomas Coke in 1782, seventeen years before the organization of the present great Religious Tract Society in Paternoster Row—a society, by the way, which was instituted chiefly by Rowland Hill, and two or three other Calvinistic Methodists. It is believed that the first Dispensary that the world ever had was founded by Wesley himself in connection with the old Foundry, in Moorfields. The Strangers' Friend Society, paying every year from forty to fifty thousand visits to the sick poor of London, and relieving them as far as possible, is an institution to which Methodism gave birth in 1785.

Building churches is one of the great features of the age. Unfortunately, England has had no religious worship census since 1851; but even then, according to the tables of Horace Mann, Methodism had, in England and Wales only, 11,835 places of worship, with 2,231,017 sittings. In America, according to the census of 1860, Methodism nine years ago provided church accommodation for 6,259,799, which was two and a quarter millions more than was provided by any other Church whatever.

The public press is one of the most powerful institutions of the day. England has four Methodist newspapers; Ireland, one; France, one; Germany, one; India, one; China, one; Australia, two; Canada and British America, five; and the United States about fifty.

## Picture for Methodism 1

### VI. *Outgrowth in Missionary Labors.*

**1.** *In English. or chiefly so.* — Methodism was from its very inception a missionary movement, domestic and foreign. It initiated, so to speak, both the spirit and plan of modern English mission work. Protestant England had manifested but a faint interest in this species of Christian labor until the birth of Methodism, and the spirit of life may be said to have been breathed into English missionary societies by Methodism. Nor need this astonish us. The Church of England recognised as its field the territory held by the Anglican throne; cold and almost lifeless at home, the residents in the colonies and other dependencies received but little religious care. Methodism, the outgrowth of a reawakened zeal for holy living, sought its fields not only in England and Ireland, but manifested early a strong desire for the spread of the Gospel into all parts. To this end Dr. Thomas Coke, in 1786, issued “An Address to the Pious and Benevolent, proposing an Annual Subscription for the Support of Missionaries in the Highlands and adjacent Islands of Scotland, the Isles of Jersey, Guernsey, and Newfoundland, the West Indies, and the Provinces of Nova Scotia and Quebec;” and in the year following the Wesleyan missions bore the distinctive title of “Missions established by the Methodist Society.” Even before this organization had been effected, missionary labors were put forth in behalf of the residents of the West Indies. In 1791 Methodism reached out its hand after France, and its great schemes to Christianize Africa were brought to trial as early as 1811. In Asia labor was commenced in 1814; in Australia in 1815; in Polynesia in 1822; until, from the first call of Wesley

for American evangelists, in the Conference of 1769, down to our day, we see the grand enterprise reaching to the shores of Sweden, to Germany, France, and the Upper Alps; to Gibraltar and Malta; to the banks of the Gambia, to Sierra Leone, and to the Gold Coast; to the Cape of Good Hope; to Ceylon, to India, and to China; to the colonists and aboriginal tribes of Australia; to New Zealand, and the Friendly and Fiji Islands; to the islands of the western as well as of the southern hemisphere; and from the Gulf of St. Lawrence to Puget's Sound (comp. Alder, *Wesleyan Missions* [Lond. 1842], p. 4). From 1803 to the present time Wesleyan Methodism has contributed more than twenty millions of dollars for foreign evangelization. In England the Wesleyan Society to-day enrolls more communicants in its mission churches than all other British missionary societies combined. The historian of religion during the last and present centuries would find it difficult to point to a more magnificent monument of Christianity.

Methodist missions may, however, be said to have had their origin long before the founding of a society for the specific purpose of spreading its doctrines in foreign parts. "From its very beginning," says Stevens (*Hist. of Methodism* iii, 312), Methodism was characterized by a zealous spirit of propagandism. It was essentially missionary. Its introduction into the West Indies by Gilbert in 1760, and into Nova Scotia by Colughlan in 1765; the appointment of Pilmoor and Boardman to America in 1769, and its commencement at New York at least three years before this date; the formation successively of its Irish, Welsh, and English domestic missions, and the organization of a missionary 'institution' at least two years before the first of what are called modern missionary societies, attest its character as an energetic system of evangelization." But these wide developments of missionary energy, grand as some of them are in their historical importance, were but initiatory to that denominational missionary system which arose from Coke's project of an Asiatic mission (in 1786), to be headed by himself in person, requiring his life as a sacrifice, and thus constituting him, above the mere fact of being first bishop of American Methodism, and the first Protestant bishop of the New World, as the representative character of Methodist missions.

American Methodism has been aptly termed by Dr. Abel Stevens (*Centenary of Amer. Meth.* p. 187) "a missionary scheme," for it was clearly "the great home mission enterprise of the North American continent." The independent establishment of the colonies as a republic in

1776 largely altered the relation to England, and the -missionary body gradually ripened into a Church organization, from which, in turn, went out enterprises. The year 1819 is memorable in the history of American Methodism as the epoch of the formal organization of its missionary work. But these early labors were confined to the "home" fields, and aimed mainly at the conversion of the aborigines and slaves. It was some thirteen years later, during the session of the General Conference of 1832, that foreign missions were decided upon, and American Methodism commissioned its Gospel harbingers to carry the truth as it is in Jesus to the dark nations of South Africa, the Romish adherents of Mexico, and of South America. We give below some of the details of this-great work in particular fields. Besides its very extensive domestic work, the Methodist Episcopal Church has now missions in China, Corea, India, Africa, Bulgaria Germany, Switzerland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and South America. Its missions, foreign and domestic, in the year 1889 numbered 1239 circuits and stations, 3325 paid laborers (preachers and assistants), and 261,987 communicants. 'The funds contributed to its treasury, from the beginning down to 1865, amounted to about \$6,000,000. About 350 of the missionaries were in 1866 reported to preach in the German and Scandinavian languages, and more than 30,000 of the communicants of German and Scandinavian origin.

"American, like British Methodism," says Stevens (*Centenary of Amer. Meth.* p. 199), "has become thoroughly imbued with the apostolic idea of foreign and universal evangelization. With both bodies it is no longer an incidental or secondary attribute, but is inwrought into their organic ecclesiastical systems. It has deepened and widened till it has become the great characteristic of modern Methodism, raising it from a revival of vital Protestantism, chiefly among the AngloSaxon race, to a world-wide system of Christianization, which has reacted on all the great interests of its AngloSaxon field, has energized and ennobled most of its other characteristics, and would seem to pledge to it a universal and perpetual sway in the earth. Taken in connection with the London and Church Missionary societies the British and Foreign Bible Society, the London Tract Society, to all of which Methodism gave the originating impulse, and the Sunday-school institution, which it was the first to adopt as an agency of the Church, it is not too much to say that it has been transforming the character of English-Protestantism and the moral prospects of the world. Its missionary development has preserved its primitive energy. According

to the usual history of religious bodies, if not indeed by a law of the human mind, its early heroic character would have passed away by its domestic success and the cessation of the novelty and trials of its early circumstances; but by throwing itself out upon all the world, and especially upon the worst citadels of paganism, it has perpetuated its original militant spirit, and opened for itself a heroic career, which need end only with the universal triumph of Christianity. English Methodism was considered, at the death of its founder, a marvellous fact in British history; but to-day (1866) the Wesleyan missions alone comprise more than twice the number of the regular preachers enrolled in the English Minutes in the year of Wesley's death, and nearly twice as many communicants as the Minutes then reported from all parts of the world which had been reached by Methodism. The latest (1865) reported number of missionary communicants in the Methodist Episcopal Church equals nearly one half the whole membership of the Church in 1819, the year in which the Missionary Society was founded, and is nearly double the membership with which the denomination closed the last century, after more than thirty years of labors and struggles."

**2. *Methodism among the French.*** — In the year 1790 Methodism was introduced among the French by English Wesleyan preachers, and in 1791 Dr. Coke ordained in a small village of Normandy the first French Methodist preacher. The work was successful, and a society of 100 members had been gathered when the storm of the Revolution prevented further progress, and in 1817 the work had to be begun anew. In 1819 Methodism was introduced into the south of France by Charles Cook, whose labors were eminently successful among the Protestants, who were then in such a state of ignorance and religious indifference that, out of some 400 ministers, not ten could be found who knew and preached the Gospel. Revivals ensued, classes were formed, societies were organized, preachers were raised, and in 1844 there was in France a Church of nearly 1500 members, with 24 travelling preachers. During the progress of the work the other churches had profited, however, by the reviving influence, and Methodism being regarded as a "foreign importation," began gradually to lose in membership, so that by 1852 there were only 900 actual adherents to the Methodist Church, notwithstanding that the work of evangelization had progressed as usual. These circumstances prompted the Wesleyans to counsel the independent establishment of French Methodism in a distinct French Church, dependent upon the "parent body"

for an annual stipend only. The first French Conference was held at Nismes in 1852. From that moment the tide turned again in favor of Methodism; and, notwithstanding the organization of other churches, some of which, it must be owned, have grown more rapidly, the Conference of 1890 reported 1518 members, 184 chapels and preaching-rooms, 53 Sunday-schools, 2539 Sunday-scholars, 101 local preachers, and 36 ministers, and some 9000 regular hearers at the public services. The official title of the Methodist body in France is *The Evangelical Methodist Church of France and Switzerland*. The French Methodists sustain a publishing-house at Paris, and issue a weekly paper, entitled *L'Evaangelist*. The "Methodist Episcopal Church" sustains one missionary in the suburbs of Paris, but he is a member of the Swiss Mission Conference, and his labors are intended to benefit only the German residents of the French metropolis.

**3. Methodism among the Germans.** — The Germans were first brought into direct contact with the Methodists in the United States of America. The United Brethren, who have always been in close communion with the Methodists, may really be said to have paved the way for the success of the work among the Germans. The labors of the Revelation William Otterbein, the founder of the United Brethren Church, and a warm personal friend of bishop Asbury, were thoroughly Methodistic, and the United Brethren Church was for many years considered by the Methodists a co-ordinate branch -of their own Church, having a special mission to labor and spread the doctrines of Methodism among the Germans. Turning their attention to the young generation and its wants, the United Brethren came to drop the tongue of the Fatherland, and thus alienated themselves from the field which Methodism anxiously sought to supply. A helper offered in the hour of need in the person of Jacob Albright, who, having been converted, and feeling himself called of God to preach the Gospel among the Germans of Pennsylvania, prayed for the sympathies of the Methodist Episcopal Church-for his project. Failing to secure the aid asked for, he finally struck out for himself, organized the converts God had given him into a Church, which he called the Evangelical Association, a work that has since been owned of God to the salvation of thousands upon thousands of Germans throughout the land. The Evangelical brethren have always claimed to be Methodists, are known as such among the Germans, and were in former years very much in the habit of styling themselves "The Evangelical Association, commonly called Albrights, or Albright Methodists." With blut slight modification, they have adopted the Methodist Discipline and

Methodist usages. In the matter of doctrine they are Methodistic throughout, laying peculiar emphasis upon those experimental doctrines of Christianity—repentance, faith, regeneration and adoption, growth in grace,, and the duty and privilege of entire sanctification. Wesley, Watson, and Clarke are their standard authorities. They lay claim to the fathers of Methodism, thus priding themselves in a common origin with Methodists. At a very early date of their history when they numbered but a few hundred members, they proposed organic union with the Methodist Episcopal Church upon the sole condition of being permitted to use the German language in the public worship of their congregations, and of laboring exclusively among the Germans. Strange as it may now seem, the offer was rejected, under the erroneous impression which then prevailed that the German language would necessarily die out in a generation or so. Of course emigration had not then attained its present gigantic dimensions, nor were there any indications of results in this direction such as we witness in our day. Efforts looking to organic union between the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Evangelical Association have since been renewed.

In 1836 the conversion and call to the ministry of William Nast, a highly-educated German, a graduate of Tübingen University, moved the leading men in the Methodist Church to establish a domestic mission among the Germans, and it was intrusted to the newly-made convert. He travelled extensively through Ohio and Pennsylvania, and was eminently successful in impressing his countrymen with the need of a “higher” life. The progress of forming a congregation, however, was very slow. Thus after a whole year’s labor at Cincinnati, among its thousands of Germans, subjected to the grossest insults, and in constant danger of bodily harm, preaching in the streets and market-places, distributing tracts and talking about Jesus and his salvation in the beer saloons and the tenement houses, he went up to Conference and reported the reception of *three* members, all told. But the final result was, after all, great and glorious. The influence of Nast’s example gradually spread among the Germans, and converts came in numbers. From the little congregation, in the old Burke chapel on Vine Street, in Cincinnati, Methodism has made its inroads among the Germans of the United States with such a force that this branch of the Church now presents the results given in the tables below.

The German Methodists now possess two colleges one in Berea, Ohio, and one in Warrenton, Mo.; one Normal School in Galena, Ill.; and a “Mission

House” at New York. They have also two orphan asylums one in Berea, Ohio, with sixty-five orphans, and one in Warrenton, Mo., with thirty-five orphans; the running expenses of these orphan asylums amount to nearly \$14,000 per year, which sum is contributed by German Methodists. The value of the property of these institutions is over \$250,000, besides an endowment fund of \$57,000 of the German Wallace College at Berea, Ohio. The circulation of their official organ, the *Christliche Apologete*, is 1915, and of the *Sonntag- und SchulGlocke* (their Sunday-school paper) 26,000. Very recently a religious German monthly family magazine has been started, and it promises to be a success. The Germans of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, issue an official organ weekly, and a Sunday-school paper.

German Methodists returning to their native country impressed the German mind with the value of experimental religion, and in 1849 a mission was established in Germany by the Methodist Episcopal Church. Its first superintendent and most efficient worker was the Revelation L. S. Jacoby, DD., himself a German. But long before any effort had been made to establish missions in that country Methodism was already known there. Wesley had spent in 1738 nearly three months in Germany and Holland, and again in 1783 and 1786 shorter periods in the latter country, where he became acquainted with some of the most godly and learned men in those two centres of Protestant Christianity and enlightenment. The friendship of the Moravians contributed to make his name and doings still more widely known there. Nor was the German press silent while such a revival was going on in England. Dr. Burckhardt, a godly minister, of the Savoy Chapel, in the Strand, and an admirer of the Wesleys, published in Nuremberg a *Complete History of the Methodists in England*, which reached a second edition in 1795. Wesley’s sermons were translated into German by Lutheran ministers, several of whom visited England and became greatly interested in Methodism. Since then Methodist literature has multiplied in Germany, until it would make up quite a formidable list both for and against the Methodists,

The first Methodists who established themselves on German soil were the converts of a German named Albrecht, or Albright, who having embraced the Methodist doctrines in America, was pressed in spirit to engage actively in caring for the religious wants of his fellow countrymen in the United States. The work which he first organized, about the beginning of the century, has grown into vast proportions, under the name of the



“Evangelical Association,” noticed above. After having extended to thousands of the Germans of America, the Albrecht Methodists, as they are called abroad, began to extend their efforts towards the Germans in Europe. They held their sixtieth Conference in 1872 at Strasburg, where they commenced a work several years since. They have in all Germany 10,231 Church members, 286 Sunday-schools with 11,322 scholars, and 64 itinerant preachers. They have two periodicals, and have lately extended their field to Switzerland.

This work was strengthened by the establishment of a mission from the Wesleyans of England. A German layman of the name of Muller had been converted in London, and had become an exhorter and class-leader. Upon his return to Wurtemberg, his native place, after an absence of fourteen years, he could not conceal from his family the change which had been wrought in his heart, and he soon began to hold meetings from village to village. A revival took place, and the persons converted organized themselves in classes. Muller, finding himself in a work that demanded all his ability, gave up his secular business and devoted himself to the evangelization of his fellow-countrymen. This work, begun in 1831, has resulted in the founding of a number of small churches, which comprise (in 1873) a membership of 7026, and 6778 Sunday-school scholars, with 101 travelling and local ministers; and has extended from Wurtemberg into the duchy of Baden and to the borders of Austria.

But the grandest and most enterprising of the branches of German Methodism is unquestionably that of the American Methodist Episcopal Church, which, as we have seen above, took its rise from the work among the German emigrants in the United States. In 1852 this missionary field was constituted into an Annual Conference, and it now covers all the German-speaking people in Germany, Switzerland, and France, divided into seven districts: Bremen, Berlin, Frankfort, Ludwigshaven, Carlsruhe, Zurich, and Basle, which comprise more than sixty circuits or stations, with (in 1872) 73 travelling ministers, 386 places of worship, 229 Sunday-schools with 10,071 scholars, 6230 Church members, and 1369 probationers. This mission is thoroughly organized. It has a book publishing-house, which issues, besides a variety of treatises ‘or books, every fortnight the *Evangelist* and *Kinder-Freund*; every month the *Missionar-Sammler* and *Monatlicher Bote*; and every quarter the *Wachter Stimmen*. It has also a theological college, which has had as its professors Dr. Warren, of Boston University, and Dr. Hurst, of Drew Theological

Seminary. Its present instructors are Dr. Sulzberger and Nippert. It had had an existence of fourteen years, when, by the timely and princely gift of John T. Martin, of Brooklyn, N. Y., the present commodious and substantial building, four stories high, standing on a lot one hundred by five hundred feet, was erected, free of debt, at Frankfort-on-the-Main. The property is estimated at about \$30,000. The following branches are taught: Greek, Latin, English, German, Hebrew, geography, arithmetic, music, homiletics, dogmatics, discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, history of Methodism, Church history, profane history, literature, archaeology, exegesis. There are at present twenty-seven young men in this school preparing for the ministry. Sixty or seventy ministers have already gone forth in the course of twelve years. About fifty-four labor in Germany, and others have come to America and are laboring here.

## Picture for Methodism 2

**4. *Methodism among the Scandinavians.***- The Methodist Episcopal Church has also done immense service to the cause of personal religion by its missionary efforts among the Scandinavians, with whom the Church was brought face to face in this country. As early as 1845 these labors were commenced, under the auspices of the Home Missionary Society. The work has grown until it presents this imposing array:

For the last three years a monthly, called *Missionaren*, devoted to religion, has been published. A hymn-book has also been prepared for the members of this branch of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

The success of this work at home gave rise to the 'establishment of a mission to the Scandinavians in 1854. It now extends over Denmark, Sweden, and Norway. Its importance may be judged by the last annual report. In Denmark there are now 301 members, 6 classleaders, 3 exhorters, 2' local preachers, 20 regular appointments, and 4 missionaries, under the superintendence of the Revelation Karl Schon, at Copenhagen, where the mission possesses a very elegant church. In the other two countries the reports are as given in the two preceding tables.

**5. *Methodism in Australia.***-Methodism at the beginning of this century found its adherents in Australia. The first class was organized March 6, 1812. The first missionary to this colony was Samuel Leigh, who landed in 1815. At first the labors of the preacher were confined to the whites, particularly the convicts who had been transported hither from the mother

country. Gradually the work was extended to the natives also. In-1853 Methodism had progressed so well that the formation of an independent Conference was counselled by the home Church, and in January, 1855, the first session of the Wesleyan Conference was held at Melbourne, and was presided over by the Revelation W. B. Boyce, at that time general superintendent of Methodist missions in Australia, now secretary of the Wesleyan Missionary Society, London. At that time there were some 60 preachers and 11,000 members. Now this bough of the vigorous tree planted by John Wesley divides itself into three branches. The first extends over Australia Proper and Van Diemen's Land, the Methodist districts in which adapt themselves to the colonial divisions of New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, Western Australia, and Tasmania. These are the home districts of Methodism in that region, the work in them being missionary only as regards a few surviving relics of the feeble aborigines, or the swarms of immigrant Chinese. The second branch of Australian Methodism divides itself over New Zealand into the two districts of Auckland and Wellington, and the work is of a mixed character, embracing the British settlers and the Maori. The third branch is purely missionary, and extends over the Friendly and the Fiji Islands. "These," said the Revelation G. T. Perks, at the anniversary of the Wesleyan Missionary Society, May 5, 1873, "have been among the most successful of modern missions." *SEE FIJI ISLANDS*. The statistics of these. missions speak for themselves: 23 European missionaries labor in connection with 63 native missionaries, and 906 native catechists, and 1796 local preachers; the number of Church members is 33,149. There are above 133,000 attendants at public worship in 802 chapels and in 357 other preaching-places. The work of education has not been neglected; 1568 day-schools, taught by 148 head teachers, and by 2469 subordinate masters, return 53,804 day-scholars, and about the same number attend the Sunday-schools, in which there are 3551 teachers." At the fifteenth session of the Conference in 1868, held at Sydney, the reports from all parts of the work were very encouraging. There were then 241 preachers and 57 native helpers. The collective totals of the Australian connection were, in 1868, 30,590 members, with 8953 persons "on trial." Australian Methodism has three flourishing high-schools-Newington College, at New South Wales; Wesley College, at Victoria; and Horton College, in Tasmania. Of late a theological school has been projected.

### Picture for Methodism 3

**6. Methodism in the West Indies.** -In no other missionary field has Methodism met with greater success than among this portion of the globe's inhabitants. The West Indies was, moreover, the first foreign field sought by the Wesleyans, and its history is closely linked to that of the founder, John Wesley, and his own associates. One of the natives, Nathaniel Gilbert, from Antigua, came under the influence of the Methodists while on a visit to England, and in 1760 returned to his native land to preach their doctrines to his countrymen. As they were bound by the heavy chains of slavery, he determined to bestow upon them the liberty of the Gospel. When he died two hundred had embraced the cause of Methodism. Their next leader was John Baxter, an Englishman, who had been licensed as "local preacher," and who had gone to the West Indies as a ship-carpenter. He preached for eight years, and did much good among the blacks. When the missionaries finally arrived, he was able to turn over two thousand adherents as the result of *preparatory* labors. In 1786 the home society set aside one man for the spread of missions in the West Indies. He was to accompany Dr. Coke to America, and then be transferred to his new field. On the way the company suffered shipwreck, and by mere accident all landed at Antigua, and, when Coke witnessed the glorious work begun, he left the three missionaries by his side-Warrener, Clarke, and Hammetin the country, and sailed alone to the United States. In 1792, when Coke visited the West Indies, and held a Conference at Antigua, the missionaries reported 20 stations, with 12 preachers and 6500 members. In 1873 the progress of Methodism in these parts was thus commented upon by the Revelation G. T. Perks, at the annual meeting of the Wesleyan Missionary Society (May 5): "The West Indian missions occupy a peculiar position in relation to other missions. The colonies of Jamaica, the Windward and Leeward Islands, the Bahamas, British Guiana, Honduras, and Hayti are mainly inhabited by the descendants of the Africans emancipated in 1834. The European population is comparatively small. No missions have had greater difficulties to contend against. Earthquakes, hurricanes, the pestilence, and occasional fires have from time to time destroyed life and property; the changes in the commercial policy of the British government operated for a while most injuriously in reducing the value of the staples of these colonies, and in some localities fearful droughts reduced the population to poverty and starvation. Our Maya mission to Honduras has been disturbed by Indian raids on the colony; and our societies in Ruatan,

an island belonging to the republic of Honduras, have suffered from a political revolution, which is no strange event in the Spanish republics of America. Yet, in spite of these untoward circumstances, the West Indian colonies are gradually improving-agriculturally, commercially, and socially. The great want is an educated native ministry. The time since the emancipation has been but a short period in the history of a nation, and our moral and educational agencies have not been equal to the task of thoroughly changing the character and habits of the people within the lifetime of a generation. Yet over many of our churches we have great reason to rejoice; and, from what has been effected in their case, to look hopefully in reference to the future. In these missions we have 97 missionaries, 44,728 members, and 28,038 scholars.”

**7. Methodism in India.** — Next in importance is the missionary work in India. The Wesleyans have labored there for years, but their expenditure on the field, both in men and money, is far inferior to that of the Methodist Episcopal Church, which has, especially within a very recent period, met with unprecedented success. But all Methodists have an equal interest in the success of this missionary field, to which the sainted Coke gave his life. **SEE COKE.** Work was commenced in 1813 at Ceylon. By 1819 the impression made warranted the establishing of schools in the principal cities along the western coast. In the mean time missionary labors had been commenced (1817) on the continent itself, with head-quarters at Bombay. At the time of the centennial of Methodism (1839) the mission in India counted 21 stations, 43 missionaries and helpers, and 1200 members. At present (1873) the field covering the Tamil and Singhalese districts, Calcutta, Mysore, and Madras. contains 2976 members, with 13,987 children in the schools, guided by 75 missionaries. These statistics do not give, however, an adequate impression of the nature and character of the work itself. In India and Ceylon the missionaries preach in the streets and bazars, as well as in the chapels; they make frequent missionary tours in their respective districts, to preach and converse, and circulate books in the villages. Much time is necessarily occupied in the training of native agents, and in the charge of the higher classes in the schools, as well as in the general superintendence of the educational department of this work.

The Methodist Episcopal Church sent its missionaries to these parts in 1856. The pioneer operations were confined to efforts for the education of the natives. By 1864 the work had progressed sufficiently to warrant the organization of an Annual Conference, divided into three districts. That

field has since been covered by three distinct conferences and the mission of Malaysia. "Four male and five female missionaries left for India in October last; these are included in the above totals here are 541 members, 526 probationers, 735 non-communicant adherents (regular attendants on worship), with 1178 Sabbath-scholars, and the 86 native helpers, making a Christian community of 3066 souls under the charge of the India Conference in Oulde and Rohilcund, all won for Christ since the Great Rebellion closed. In the 34 Sunday-schools there are 107 officers and teachers, 1177 scholars, and 1088 volumes in the libraries; conversions during last year, 56. In the 45 vernacular day-schools for boys there are 1437 pupils; in the 25 Anglo vernacular boys' schools, 1968 scholars; in the 46 vernacular day-schools for girls, 915 pupils; in the Anglo-vernacular schools, 142 girls: being a total of 116 ;schools, 234 teachers, and 4462 scholars, including 138 orphan boys and 142 orphan girls-the entire expense of which, including the two orphanages, was \$29,423 for the' past year, the whole of which was contributed by friends in India and the Ladies' Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, with the American patrons of the orphan children."

Medical instruction is afforded by some of the missionaries, and the natives have by this means been largely interested in Christian work and life. A Biblical institute for the training of native helpers is supported under the name of the "India Conference Theological Seminary." The school was commenced April 15, 1872. The number of young men in attendance has been sixteen, of whom thirteen have received-scholarships. The local preachers attended during the " hot season term." The following is the course of study pursued this first year, viz.: Old-Testament Exegesis; Church Catechism, Nos. 1, 2, and 3; Sacred Geography; Ecclesiastical History; Compend of Theology (Ilenilahi ka usul); Hand-book of the Bible (Miftah ul-Kitab); Homiletics; the Persian and Arabic languages. The Revelation D. W. Thomas, one of the missionaries in India, has given to this institution \$20,000, and is now in the United States to increase the endowment, in order to make the school self-supporting.

Very recently the successful labors of the Revelation William Taylor, at Bombay, have added Western India to the missionary field of the Methodist Episcopal Church. No statistics have been published authoritatively, but accounts have appeared in the newspapers of the remarkable revival at Bombay, Poonab, and vicinity. Six itinerants are describing the Bombay circuit, and they do not consider their work as

designed for the English and Eurasian populations alone, but for people in IndiaEuropean, Eurasian, Mahratta, Hindu, nominally Christian, Pagan, or Mohammedan.

#### **Picture for Methodism 4**

**8. *Methodism among the Chinese and Japanese.*** — In 1847 the Methodist Episcopal Church opened operations in China, and the field has returned more than it at first promised. The gradual success of the work of this body has been given in the article on *China* (q.v.). The “parent” body—the Wesleyans were introduced into this field by the voluntary labors of George Piercy, a preacher, in 1851. Two years later the Missionary Society of his Church came to his aid by sending two assistants. The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, has also an interest in this field. The Wesleyans support at present in the Canton and Wuchang districts 11 missionaries, with 178 members, and 386 children in the schools. Work has recently been commenced by them at Kwang-chi, with prospects of success. They also support medical institutions. The great coolie traffic moved the establishment of a Chinese mission in Australia, and it is prospering. The mission of the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1890 reported its condition in China to be as follows: Missionaries in the field, 40; assistant missionaries, 29; missionaries of the Women’s Foreign Missionary Society (a body lately formed as auxiliary to the regular Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church), 6; native preachers ordained, 79; adults baptized the past year, 558; children baptized the past year, 663; total baptisms during the year, 1221; members in full connection, 3987; probationers, 2385; baptized children, 6379; total members, probationers, and baptized children, 4387; increase, 78; Sunday- school scholars, 4387. A Biblical institute for the training of native helpers is supported. A Christian native teacher is employed, and each American missionary devotes part of one day every week to giving instruction in some special part in the course of study. There is a press connected with the mission, and last year one million and a half of pages of tracts were printed and distributed. The property of the mission is valued at \$252,620. The mission has also two boarding-schools, one for boys and another for girls; a day-school, with 75 scholars; and a foundling asylum, with 30 inmates. The Woman’s Foreign Missionary Society has greatly aided the work in these parts within the past two years by the employment of deaconesses.

The influx of Chinese on our Pacific coast aroused the interest of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and in 1867 a home mission was inaugurated for their conversion. The present status of this field of labor is as follows: Missionaries, 2; members, 115; 1 church, value \$20,000; 1 parsonage, value \$1000; missionary collections, \$40; missions, 1; money, \$3500. The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, has also very recently commenced operations there,

Near the close of last year a Methodist mission was established at *Japan* under the auspices of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Dr. Maclay, formerly superintendent of the mission in China, has supervision, and he hopes to make this new effort a glorious success. Already a native of influence and rank in the empire has espoused this cause, and is now preaching.

**9. Methodism in Africa.**-Dr. Coke was early drawn towards this field of missionary labor. But all efforts proved unsuccessful until 1811, when a Methodist mission was established at Sierra Leone, commencing its labor with a membership of 110, and three local preachers, who had fostered the work for some time. Gradually the mission extended to the Gambia districts. In these parts of Western Africa the natives are in process of training, under the Christianizing influences of the Wesleyans, to benefit them by the civilization which too often has been made a means of degradation to their race. The majority of the ministers in Africa are natives, educated and trained for their work. Twenty-one missionaries labor in this field, which has 8974 Church members. "In the 'Cape Colony, the Orange Free State, Trans-Vaal Republic, and Natal, the native and European populations are so mingled that it is impossible to separate the returns of the colonial work from those of the missions in Kaffirland and in the Bechuana country. The early history of the mission is identified with the names of Barnabas and William Shaw, the latter, the honored father of the Kaffir mission, is no longer among us, but his work survives. These missions have been since their beginning, tried by native wars, and by the unsettlement of the population occasioned by emigration, and by the discovery of the diamond fields; but the work is rapidly advancing. A large number of the Kaffir population have been brought under Christian influence; thousands of scholars have been trained to read the Word of God in their own tongue, and many able native ministers have been raised up. The difficulty now is to meet the enlarged educational wants and requirements of the native people. In these missions 85 ministers labor; the



number of Church members is 13,748, and the scholars reported are 13,821” (Perks, in his address already quoted).

The Methodist Episcopal Church established a mission in Liberia in 1832. By 1836 the formation of an Annual Conference became necessary, and at present a bishop presides over this field. We have the following summary of statistics for 1890: Members, 2954; deaths, 67; probationers, 224; local preachers, 58; baptismsadults, 121; children, 85; churches, 16. of the probable value of \$31,430; parsonages, 1, of the probable value of \$150; Sabbath - schools, 41; officers and teachers, 405; scholars, 2614; day-schools. 15; scholars in dayschools, 450; volumes in libraries, 1127; collections for the support of the Gospel, \$1282. *SEE LIBERIA.*

The Conference, at its last session, expressed its deep sense of the need of a more thorough training of men for the holy ministry, and took incipient steps towards the establishment of a Biblical institute. Measures have also been taken for the establishment of a mission in the Kong mountains, north and east of Liberia and Sierra Leone, where dwell the Mandingoes, perhaps the most cultivated tribe on the western coast of Africa. *SEE MANDINGO.* Ten thousand dollars have been appropriated for this work.

**10.** *Methodism in Italy, Spain, and Portugal.* -For some time the Wesleyans have supported missionaries in each of these countries. Late events have given a new impetus to the work, and it promises to yield fruit in abundance. Besides two English ministers, seventeen Italians are preaching Methodist doctrines. At Rome the Wesleyans are now in possession of suitable buildings for preaching and educational purposes, and at Naples the new chapel and schools are advancing towards completion, while their educational establishment at Padua is in efficient operation.

The Methodist Episcopal Church in 1871 decided to establish a mission in that country, and placed the Reverend Dr. Vernon in charge. Bologna has been selected as head-quarters.

In Spain, Methodism supported for years a mission at Gibraltar, the only spot available until the new order of things developed. At present there are stations at Barcelona and Port Mahon (in the island of Minorca), and in Portugal at Oporto.

**11.** *Methodism in South America and Mexico.* — In 1836 missionary work was commenced in South America, but the success of the mission has not

yet been fairly established. There are connected with this work 1;8 ordained preachers and 6 assistants, with 985 members. The Sunday-schools number 21.13 teachers and scholars, and the day-school 1379 scholars. About half of these are charity scholars.

In November, 1872, the Methodist Episcopal Church organized a mission for Mexico, under the superintendence of the Rev, William Butler, DD., formerly superintendent of her work in India. The enterprise is too recent to enable us to say much about it.

**12.** *In Bulgaria* the Methodist Episcopal Church established a mission in 1857. Connected with it are two ordained preachers, one at Constantinople and the other at Tultcha. These missionaries are engaged in preaching the Gospel, scattering religious reading, and translating the New Testament into the Bulgarian tongue. The appropriation is \$19,320.

**13.** *Recapitulation.*- The number of Methodists outside of England and America, according to the best information we can obtain, was in 1866 as follows:

Australia	42,194
West Indies	41,592
Ireland	29,060
Africa	19,403
British Provinces	1,297
Germany and Switzerland	7620
France	1,884
Ceylon	1,661
Norway	1,200
India	1,000
China	336
South America	193
Turkey	75
Total	161,515

The whole number of Methodists in the world would therefore figure at the present time about as follows:

United States and Canada	2,591,875
Great Britain and Ireland	931,450
All others	276,675

Total

4,000,000

**VII. Literature.**-The sources for the history and doctrine of the Methodists are as follows: *Works of John Wesley* (first complete edition, Bristol, 1771-74, 32 small volumes, full of typographical errors; 2d ed. 1809-13, 16 vols. 8vo, with a register, also containing errors; a critical edition was prepared by Thomas Jackson and published, London, 1831, 14 vols. 8vo; NY. 1831, 7 vols. 8vo); *Memoirs of the late John Wesley, with a Review of his Life and Writings, and a History of Methodism from its Commencement in 1729 to the present Time*, by John Hampson, AB. (Sunderland, 1791, 3 vols. 12mo; translated into German, with remarks and additions by Niemeyer, Halle. 1793, 2 vols.); Burkhardt, *Complete History of the Methodists in England* (Nurnb. 1795, 2 vols.); *Life of the Revelation John Wesley, A.M., including an Account of the great Revival of Religion in Europe and America, of which he was the first and chief Instrument*, by Dr. Coke and Mr. Moore (Lond. 1792, 8vo); *Life of John Wesley, collected from his private Papers and printed Works, and written at the Request of his Executors; to which is prefixed some Account of his Ancestors and Relations; with the Life of Charles Wesley, collected from his private Journal, and never before published-the whole forming a History of Methodism, in which the Principles and Economy of Methodism are unfolded* (chiefly from a London edition published by John Whitehead, MD., Dublin, 1805, 2 vols. 8vo). For the sources of these biographies, see Curry, *Remarks*, in the addition to his revision of Southey's edition, 1:405, 406; *Sermons by Charles Wesley, with a Memoir of the Author* (Lond. 1816); *Journals, of Charles Wesley, to which are appended Selections from his Correspondence and Poetry, with an Introduction and Notes* by the Rev. T. Jackson (Lond. 2 vols. 8vo); Thomas Jackson, *Memoirs of Charles Wesley, comprising Notices of his Poetry, of the Rise and Progress of Methodism, and of contemporary Events and Characters* (Lond. 8vo); William Myles, *Chronological History of the People called Methodists, of the Connection of the late Rev. John Wesley, from their Rise in the Year 1729 to their last Conference in the Year 1802* (Lond. 1803, 12mo); *Life of Wesley, and Rise and Progress of Methodism*, by Robert Southey, Esq., LL.D., with Notes by the late Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Esq.; and *Remarks on the Life and Character of John Wesley*, by the late Alexander Knox, Esq., edited by the Revelation Charles C. Southey, MA. (2d American edition, with Notes, etc., by the

Revelation Daniel Curry, DD. 2 vols. 12m, N. Y. 1847); Richard Watson, *Observations on Southey's Life of Wesley* (Lond. 1820); R. Watson, *Life of the Rev. John Wesley* (Lond. 1831); A. Clarke, *Memoirs of the Wesley Family* (Lond. and N. Y.); Wm. C. Larrabee, *Wesley and his Coadjutors* (N. Y. 2 vols. 16mo); E. Janes, *Wesley his own Historian* (NY. 1872, 12mo); the Revelation L. Tyerman, *Life and Times of John Wesley, Founder of the Methodists* (Lond. and NY. 1872, 3 vols. 8vo); and by the same author, *The Oxford Methodists* (Lond. and NY. 1873, 8vo); *Complete Works of John Fletcher* (Lond. 1815, 10 vols. 8vo; N. Y. 1831, 4 vols. 8vo); Joseph Benson, *Life of the Revelation John Willian de la Flechere* (Fletcher), compiled from the Narrative of the Revelation Mr. Wesley, the biographical Notes of the Revelation Mr. Gilpin, from his own Letters, and other authentic Documents (Lond. 1817, 8vo;. in German, with a Preface by A. Tholuck, Berlin, 1833); Samuel Drew, *Life of-the Revelation Thomas Coke, LLD., including in Detail his various Travels and extraordinary Missionary Exertions in England, Ireland, America, and the West Indies, with an Account of his Death* (Lond. 1817, 8vo; N. Y. 1847, 12mo); *Extracts of the Journals of the Revelation Dr. Coke's Five Visits to America* (Lond. 1793, 12mo); Stevenson, *City Road Chapel, London* (Lond. 1863, 12mo); *Annual Minutes of the Methodist Conference, from the First held in London by the late Revelation John Wesley, in the Year 1744* (several vols.); *Arminian Magazine*, from 1778, now styled *Wesleyan Methodist Magazine* (Lond.); *London (Quarterly Review*, since 1853; the great ecclesiastical weeklies *Watchman*, *Wesleyan Times*, etc. See also Gillie, *Life of the Revelation George Whitefield* (Lond. 1813); Philip, *Life of Whitefield; Life and Times of the Countess of Huntingdon* (Lond. 2 vols.); Mudge, *Lady Huntingdon Portrayed* (N. Y. 1857); *Lives of Early Methodist Preachers*, edited by -the Revelation Thomas Jackson (Lond. 1839, 2 vols. 12mo); and numerous biographies from the time of the origin of Methodism.

Sources for the history of the Methodist Episcopal Church especially: *Journals of the Revelation Francis Asbury, Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church* (new ed., N. Y. 1854. 3 vols. 12mo); *Minutes -of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church* (N. Y. 29 vols. 8vo); *Journals of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church* (N. Y. 12 vols. 8vo); *Methodist Quarterly Review* (NY. 54 vols.); A. Stevens, *Memorials of the Introduction of Methodism into the Eastern States* (N. Y. 2 vols.); J. B. Finley, *Sketches of Western Methodism* (N. Y.

12mo); and similar researches by Peck, Raybold, and others; Wakely, *Lost Chapters recovered from the Early History of American Methodism* ; id. *Heroes of Methodism* (N. Y. 12mo); Coles, *Heroines of Methodism* (N. Y. 12mo); Stevens, *Women of Methodism* (N. Y. 12mo); Revelation W. Reddy, *Inside Views of Methodism* (N. Y. 18mo); W. P. Strickland, *History of Missions of the Methodist Episcopal Church* (N. Y. 12mo) ; Bishop Thomson, *Our Oriental Missions* (N. Y. 2 vols. 16mo); W. C. Smith, *Pillars in the Temple, or Lives of Deceased Laymen of the Methodist Episcopal Church* (N. Y. 16mo); Deems, *Annals of Southern Methodism*; Miller, *Experience of German Meth. Preachers* (Cincinnati. 1859); Strickland, *Life of Bishop Asbury*; id. *Pioneers of the West* (NY. 12mo); Stevens, *Life and Times of Nathan Bangs* (N. Y. 1863); id. *Sketches and Incidents* (N. Y. 18mo); Larrabee, *Asbury and his Coadjutors; Life and Letters of Bishop Hamline* (NY. 12mo); Sandford, *Wesley's Missionaries to America*; G. Peck, *Episcopacy and Slavery*.

Collective histories of Methodism: the best universal history of Methodism which the Methodist Episcopal Church has ever produced is Dr. Abel Stevens's *History of the Religious Movement of the Eighteenth Century called Methodism, considered in its different denominational Forms, and in its Relation to British and American Protestantism* (NY. and Lond. 1858-61, 3 vols. 8vo and 12mo). The best history which was ever written in England is by Dr. George Smith: *History of Methodism*-vol. i, *Wesley and his Times*; vol. ii, *The Middle Age of Methodism*; vol. iii, *Modern Methodism* (Lond. 1857-62, 3 vols. 8vo). Earlier works: Jackson, *Centenary of Wesleyan Methodism* (Lond. 1839); Jonathan Crowther, *Portraiture of Methodism, or the History of the Wesleyan Methodists, showing their Rise, Progress, and present State; Biographical Sketches of some of their most eminent Ministers; the Doctrines the Methodists believe and teach fully and explicitly stated; with the whole Plan of their Discipline, including their original Rules and subsequent Regulations. Also a Defence of Methodism* (Lond. 1815, 8vo). Concerning the history of the Methodist Episcopal Church especially: Nathan Bangs, *Hist. of the Meth. Episc. Church from the Year 1766 to 1840* (N. Y. 1839-41, 4 vols. 12mo); A. Stevens, *Hist. of the Meth. Episc. Church* (N. Y. 1865-67, 4 vols. 8vo and 12mo); Lee, *Hist. of the Methodists*; Strickland, *Hist. of the Missions of the M. E. Church* (1st ed. Cincinnati. 1849); Goss, *Statistical Hist. of Methodism* (N. Y. 1866,. 18mo); R. Emory, *Hist. of the Discipline of the M. E. Church*, revised and brought down to 1856 by W. P.

Strickland (1st ed. NY. 1843); Charles Elliott, *Hist. of the great Secession from the M. E. Church in the Year 1845, eventuating in the Organization of the new Church, entitled the M. E. Church South* (Cincinnati. 1855, 8vo);. *Hist. of the M. E. Church in the South-west from 1844 to 1864*, by the Revelation Charles Elliott, DD., LLD., edited and revised by the Revelation Leroy Vernon, DD. (St. Louis,; Mo., 1872, 12mo). On Canada: G. F. Playter, *Hist. of Methodism in Canada* (Toronto, 1862, 12mo); Gorrie,;: *Lives of Eminent Methodist Ministers*; etc.

Books on Methodism. (a.) Polemical books. Innumerable anti-Methodistic works have been published since the days of Wesley. A list of 277 such books,. which, however, are now almost forgotten, is given in alphabetic order by H. D. Decanver: *Catalogue of Works in Refutation of Methodism, from its Origin in 1729 to the present Time* (Phila. 1846). (b.) Philosophical (pragmatical) studies: Isaac Taylor, *Wesley and Methodism* (Lond. 1851)-Introduction; 1, *Founders of Methodism*; 2, *Substance of Methodism*; 3, *Form of Methodism*; 4, *Methodism of the Future*. Mir. Taylor, a copious Calvinistic writer of the Anglican Church, was once a Dissenter; BF. Tefft, *Methodism Successful, and the Internal Causes of its Success* (N. Y. 1859). (c.) More or less apologetic are, James Porter, *Compendium of Methodism, embracing the History and present Condition of its various Branches in all Countries, with a Defence of its Doctrinal, Governmental, and Prudential Peculiarities* (N. Y. 1851; 16th ed. 1860, 12mo); George Smith, *The Polity of Wesleyan Methodism exhibited and defended* (Lond. 1852, 12mo); P. D. Gorrie, *Episcopal Methodism as it was and is* (Auburn, N. Y. 1852, 12mo); Bishop Emory, *Defence of our Fathers* (NY. 8vo); T. E. Bond. *Economy of Methodism* (NY. 8vo); J. Dixon, *Methodism in its Economy* (Lond. and NY. 18mo)'; N. Bangs, *Responsibilities of the M. E. Church* (NY. 18mo); A. Stevens, *Church Polity* (NY. 12mo); Morris, *Church Polity* (NY. 12mo); L. S. Jacoby, *Handbuch des Methodismus, embracing its history, doctrine, government, and peculiar ceremonies* (Bremen, 1853, 12mo); Thomas Jackson, *Wesleyan Methodism ai Revival of Apostolical Christianity, a centenary sermon* (Lond. and N. Y. 1839); Dixon, *Methodism in its Origin, Economy, and present Position* (Lond. and N. Y. 1843, 18mo); Wise, *Popular Objections to Methodism Considered and Answered* (Boston, 1856, 12mo); Rigg, *Essay on the Principles of Methodism* (Lond.); Shrewsbury, *Methodism Scriptural* (Lond.); Thomas Bond, *The Economy of Methodism Illustrated and Defended* (N. Y. 8vo); Jackson, *Letter to Dr.*

*Pusey, being a Vindication of the Tenets and Character of the Wesleyan Methodists against his Misrepresentations and Censures* (Lond. and N. Y.); F. Hodgson, *Ecclesiastical Polity of Methodism Defended* (Lond. and N.Y.); Henkle, *Primary Platform of Methodism* (Louisville, Ky., 1851); F. J. Jobson, *America and American Methodism* (NY. 1857, 12mo); Strickland, *Genius and Mission of Methodism* (NY. 1851); Turner, *Constitution of Methodism* (Lond. 12mo); W. J. Sassnett, *Progress, considered with particular Reference to the M. E. Church, South* (Nashville, 1855, 12mo); N. Bangs, *Present State, Prospects, and Responsibilities of the M. E. Church* (N. Y. 1850); John Bakewell, *Admonitory Counsels to a Methodist*, etc. (N. Y. 18mo); Bishop Baker, *Guide in the Administration of the Discipline of the 3. E. Church* (N. Y. 16mo); Hawley, *Manual of Methodism* (N. Y. 12mo).

Among the earlier apologetical works of Methodism, Fletcher's *Checks to Antinomianism*, covering the first two volumes of his whole works (see below), ranks deservedly as the ablest and most learned defence of Arminianism; and, indeed, it proved quite a polemic against Calvinism. The same writer furnished one of the best polemics against Socinianism, provoked by Priestley. The ablest treatise on systematic theology, from a Methodistic stand-point, was furnished by Dr. Richard Watson in his *Theological Institutes*, a work which to this day remains the text-book of Methodist students in divinity. An elaborate *Analysis* was prepared for it by the late senior editor of this Cyclopaedia, the Rev. Dr. John M'Clintock. Editions innumerable have been published of the *Institutes*, with the *Analysis*, both in this country and in England (1st edition Lond. 1822-1828, in 6 parts; N. Y. 2 vols. 8vo; Nashville, Tenn., 1 vol. 8vo). There is also a compilation of Methodist doctrines, entitled *Wesleyana: a System of Wesleyan Theology* (NY. 12mo). See also *Meth. Qu. Revelation* 1853, Jan. p. 136 sq.; *North. Amer. Revelation* 1865, April, p. 593 sq.; *Wesleyan Meth. Magazine*, 1866, Feb.; *Good Words*, 1866, Jan.; *Lond. Qu. Revelation* Oct. 1872; D. D. Whedon, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, April, 1862; J. T. Peck, in the *Meth. Qu. Revelation* April, 1870; J. Porter, in the *Meth. Qu. Revelation* April, 1871; D. A. Whedon, in the *Meth. Qu. Rev.* Jan. 1868, and April, 1870; D. D. Whedon, in the *Meth. Qu. Rev.* 1866, p. 124, 276, 312, 443; 1872, April and Oct. art. iii; 1873, Jan. p. 138 sq.; *Lond. Rev.* Oct. 1854, art. v; *North Brit. Rev.* 1852, Feb.; *Ch. Examiner*, vol. iv; *North Brit. Rev.* 32:269; Newell Culver, *Methodism' Forty Years Ago and Now* (NY. 1873, 18mo); Malcom, *Theological Index*, s.v.; and

the excellent *Catalogue of the Boston Library* (2d or consolidated edition, July, 1873). Dr. Abel Stevens, in his *Hist. of Methodism*, reckons that at least 1500 titles would be required to make up a fair bibliography of Methodism. The Revelation William F. Warren, D.D., in his *Systematische Theologie einheitlich behandelt* (Bremen, 1865, 8vo), besides giving the position of Methodism in systematic theology somewhat in detail, has furnished a very elaborate compilation of Methodist literature, which is quite complete up to the time of the publication of his book; it covers p. 168-186. In England, Dr. Osborn prepared a treatise on the literature of the Wesleyans (Lond. 1868, 8vo). Very recently a work was commenced by the Revelation Dr. Sulzberger, of Frankfort-on-the-Main, which is intended to be a full treatment of Methodist doctrinal theology for the use, especially, of German students. Vol. i appeared in 1873.

### Methodist Episcopal Church, The

is the official title of the largest body of Methodists in the United States, with branches in different parts of the world.

**I. Organization.**-This title was assumed by the American Methodists as a distinct body at what is historically known as the "Christmas Conference," which commenced its session on Friday, Dec. 24, 1784, and was continued through Christmas week, and until the second day of the new year. Previous to this period the American Methodists had constituted *societies*, like those in Great Britain, in connection with and under the jurisdiction of the Revelation John Wesley, whom they all alike revered and obeyed as their spiritual father and head. The first Methodist service in America is believed to have been held in the year 1766, in the city of New York, by Philip Embury, an Irish immigrant and local preacher, a carpenter by trade, who was moved thereto by the stirring appeals of Barbara Heck, an Irishwoman, whose name is illustrious in the annals of the denomination. Thomas Webb, a captain in the British army, who was then staying in America, Robert Strawbridge, and Robert Williams, all local preachers, were, with Embury, the prosecutors of the work thus begun, until, in the autumn of 1769, Richard Boardman and Joseph Pilmoor arrived at Philadelphia as missionaries sent out by Mr. Wesley. Seven others afterwards came; but the entire service of all Wesley's missionaries in the colonies was less than twenty-eight years, leaving out of the account Francis Asbury, who alone of them remained in the country during the Revolutionary War, and who became the apostle and bishop of the Church.



Though several of them were not fortunate in their associations with their American brethren, two soon becoming Presbyterians, a third, by his active Toryism, causing grave scandal and even persecution, and none, except Asbury, staying long, they, as a whole, by their labors, zeal, and adherence to the well-proved Wesleyan discipline, were instrumental in settling the cause upon a firm basis, and raising up scores of native preachers to carry on the work.

The first Conference, held in 1773, presided over by Rankin as superintendent, consisted of ten members, all Europeans, with an aggregate in the societies of 1160. In May, 1784, eleven years later, notwithstanding all the adverse influences of the war, they numbered 14,988 members, several hundred local preachers and exhorters, 84 itinerant preachers, with more than sixty chapels, and probably not less than 200,000 attendants upon their worship. By the system of itinerancy, which had been rigidly enforced during this period, Methodism had been prevented from localizing itself, and had established organized societies in every state of the Union outside of New England, become the dominant, popular, religious power in Maryland and Delaware, and at several points planted its standard beyond the Alleghanies. Though thus widely spread, nearly nine tenths of its membership were south of Mason and Dixon's line, and of these a large proportion were in the Middle States, where the Anglican, or the English Established Church, once so flourishing, had become nearly extinct.

Most of the Methodists of 1784 were without the sacraments; for the English clergy upon whom they had generally depended had, with few exceptions, either left the country or forsaken their parishes. Thousands had been received into the societies without baptism; their children were growing up without that sacred rite; and preachers were ministering in their pulpits who had never even partaken of the Lord's Supper. The growing necessity for some provision for the administration of the sacraments had led to so serious thought and discussion in successive Conferences that the regular session of 1779, deeming the exigency sufficient to warrant a departure from ecclesiastical usage, constituted four of their number a presbyter, who with solemn forms proceeded to ordain one another, and afterwards others of their brethren. At the end of a year the sacramental party yielded to the minority for peace' sake; the administration of the sacraments was suspended; and it was agreed to seek the counsel of Wesley, and abide by his judgment. He advised them to "continue on the old plan until further direction." Wesley found for his American societies

no way of relief until subsequent to the conclusion of the war. Then, after long and mature thought, and consultation with his friends, among whom was Fletcher, the saintly vicar of Madeley, he resolved to use the power which he believed himself as a presbyter to possess, and ordain a ministry that should meet the demands of the thousands who sought aid from him as their spiritual founder. He proposed to the Rev. Thomas Coke, LL.D., to receive ordination at his hands as their superintendent, to which Coke, whose sympathies were profoundly stirred in their behalf, consented, when study and reflection had convinced him of Wesley's power to ordain to the Episcopal office. It was also arranged that two of the English preachers should be ordained to accompany him as elders. Accordingly, on the first day of September, 1784, at Bristol, using the convenient and solemn forms of the Church of England, and, assisted by Dr. Coke and the Revelation Thomas Creighton, a presbyter of the English Church, Wesley ordained Richard Whatcoat and Thomas Vasey to the office of deacon. On the next day he ordained them elders, and, assisted by Creighton and Whatcoat, he also ordained Coke superintendent, or bishop, as this officer was afterwards called. He then sent them upon their mission, with instructions to organize the societies into a distinct Church, and to ordain Asbury joint superintendent with Coke. To facilitate their work, he furnished them with a "Sunday Service," or liturgy, a collection of psalms and hymns, and also "The Articles of Religion." Upon their arrival in America, a special conference or convention of the itinerant preachers was summoned, and on the 24th of December sixty of them assembled in the Lovely Lane Chapel, in the city of Baltimore. Dr. Coke took the chair, and presented the following letter from Wesley, written eight days after the ordinations, and tersely stating the grounds of what he had done and advised:

*"To Dr. Coke, Mr. Asbury, and our Brethren in North America:*

"By a very uncommon train of providences, many of the provinces of North America are totally disjoined from their mother country, and elected into independent states. The English government has no authority over them, either civil or ecclesiastical, any more than over the states of Holland. A civil authority is exercised over them, partly by the Congress and partly by the provincial assemblies; but no one either exercises or claims any ecclesiastical authority- at all. In this peculiar situation, some thousands of the inhabitants of these states desire my advice: and, in compliance with their desire, I have drawn up a little sketch.

“Lord King’s Account of the Primitive Church convinced me, many years ago, that bishops and presbyters are the same order, and consequently have the same right to ordain. For many years I have been importuned, from time to time, to exercise this right, by ordaining part of our travelling preachers. But I have still refused, not only for peace’ -sake, but because I was determined as little as possible to violate the established order of the National Church, to which I belonged.

“But the case is widely different between England and North America. Here there are bishops who have a legal jurisdiction. In America there are none, neither any parish ministers; so that for some hundred miles together there is none either to baptize or to administer the Lord’s Supper. Here, therefore, my scruples are at an end, and I conceive myself at full liberty, as I violate no order and invade no man’s right, by appointing and sending laborers into the harvest.

“I have accordingly appointed Dr. Coke and Mr. Francis Asbury to be joint superintendents over our brethren in North America, as also Richard Whatcoat and Thomas Vasey to act as elders among them, by baptizing and ministering the Lord’s Supper. And I have prepared a liturgy, little differing from that of the Church of England (I think, the best constituted national Church in the world), which I advise all the travelling preachers to use on the Lord’s day in all the congregations, reading the litany only on Wednesdays and Fridays, and praying extempore on all other days. I also advise the elders to administer the Supper of the Lord on every Lord’s day.

“If any one will point out a more rational and scriptural way of feeding and guiding those poor sheep in the wilderness, I will gladly embrace it. At present I cannot see any better method than that I have taken.

“It has indeed been proposed to desire the English bishops to ordain part of our preachers for America; but to this I object: (1.) I desired the bishop of London to ordain only one; but could not prevail. (2.) If they consented, we know the slowness of their proceedings; but the matter admits of no delay. (3.) If they would ordain them now, they would likewise expect to govern them and how grievously would this entangle us ! (4.) As our American

brethren are now totally disentangled both from the state and from the English hierarchy, we dare not entangle them again, either with the one or the other. They are now at full liberty simply to follow the Scriptures and the Primitive Church. And we judge it best that they should stand fast in that liberty wherewith God has so strangely made them free.”

After the reading and consideration of this document, it was, without a single dissenting voice, regularly and formally “agreed to form a Methodist Episcopal Church, in which the liturgy (as presented by the Revelation John Wesley) should be read, and the sacraments be administered by a superintendent, elders, and deacons, who shall be ordained by a presbytery, using the Episcopal form, as prescribed in the Revelation Mr. Wesley’s Prayer-book;” or, in the language of the Minutes of the Conference, “following the counsel of Mr. John Wesley, who recommended the Episcopal mode of government, we thought it best to become an Episcopal Church, making the Episcopal office elective, and the elected superintendent, or bishop, amenable to the body of ministers and preachers.” Asbury refused the high office to which Wesley had appointed him unless it were ratified by the Conference, and, in accordance with the act of organization, both he and Coke were formally and unanimously elected superintendents. On the second day of the session, Asbury was ordained deacon, elder on the third, and superintendent on the fourth, Coke being assisted by Whatcoat and Vasey in the services, and also in the last by Otterbein, a personal friend of Asbury, and a minister in the German Reformed Church. The ““Sunday Service” and “ Articles” prepared by Wesley were adopted; the Rules and Discipline were revised and adapted to the new order of things; the establishment of a college was resolved upon; twelve preachers were ordained elders, and one deacon, and the work of the Conference was done.

Different views have been taken of these transactions, though not among Methodists. On the one hand it is held that Wesley did not ordain Coke as bishop, but to an undefined superintendency; that he found fault with Asbury for assuming to be a bishop; that he did not intend the separation of his societies from the Church of England, or an authority by his ordinations to administer the sacraments. The view taken by Methodist writers may be stated as follows:

**1.** Wesley's letter, above quoted, shows his understanding of the condition of those in whose behalf he acted. Their one great demand was some provision for the sacraments, and this he proposed to answer, not only for the time being, but in perpetuity forever. The Church of England had ceased to exist in the United States, so that he violated no law or regulation of that Church in what he might do for America. He provided for no separation, for there was nothing left to separate from. By the terms of the letter, Whatcoat and Vasey, whom he ordained, were to administer the sacraments, as they proceeded to do immediately after their arrival. He intended the step taken to obviate forever all necessity for any connection of American Methodism with the English hierarchy. The liturgy which he prepared, with the forms used in the English Church for ordinations to the three distinct offices of the ministry, indicates his intent that the three offices should be perpetuated in the Methodist Episcopal Church. To him the name was not important, but the function was. He therefore said "superintendent" and "elder," instead of bishop and presbyter—more modest titles, perhaps, but the same in import; and any newly elected superintendent was to be presented to the superintendent "to be ordained."

**2.** For forty years Mr. Wesley had believed that bishops and presbyters constituted but one order, with the same right to ordain. He knew that for two centuries the succession of bishops in the Church of Alexandria was preserved through ordination by presbyters alone. "I firmly believe," he said, "I am a scriptural ἐπίσκοπος, as much as any man in England or in Europe; for the uninterrupted succession I know to be a fable which no man ever did or can prove;" but he also held that "neither Christ nor his apostles prescribe any particular form of Church government." He was a true bishop of the flock which God had given to his care. He had hitherto refused "to exercise this right" of ordaining, because he would not come into needless conflict with the order of the English Church to which he belonged. But after the Revolution, his ordaining for America would violate no law of the Church; and when the necessity was clearly apparent, his hesitation ceased. "There does not appear," he said; "'any other way of supplying them with ministers.'" Having formed his purpose, in February, 1784, he invited Dr. Coke to his study in City Road, laid the case before him, and proposed to ordain and send him to America. Coke was startled at first, doubting Wesley's right to ordain him, though why, if the ordination were not to the office of bishop, the next higher to that which he already held, is inexplicable. He finally assented, and wrote, "The power of

ordaining others should be received by me from you, by the imposition of your hands.”

**3.** History records no other plan as proposed than that of an Episcopal organization. This is what was laid before the few preachers called for counsel immediately after Coke’s arrival in- America. The title assumed by the Church is “ Episcopal.” The Minutes of the organization say that this was done, following the counsels of Mr. John Wesley, who recommended the Episcopal mode of Church government, making the Episcopal office elective, and the elected superintendent, or bishop, amenable to the body of ministers and preachers;” and he had no reproof for the statement or the title, though the document was printed under his eye. The Minutes of 1789 say of him: “Preferring the Episcopal mode of Church government, he set apart Thomas Coke for the Episcopal office, and having delivered to him letters of Episcopal orders, directed him to set apart Francis Asbury for the same Episcopal office, in consequence of which the said Francis Asbury was solemnly set apart for the said Episcopal office,” which statements Wesley never disputed, and none of these things did he condemn. If Coke and the Methodists of that day misunderstood or exceeded his intentions and acts, that he took no pains to correct their error is the strangest and most unaccountable thing of all.

**4.** The language of Charles Wesley is to the point. He certainly knew what was done, and the intention in doing it. He says that his brother “assumed the Episcopal character, ordained elders, consecrated a bishop, and sent him to ordain our lay preachers in America.” He wrote bitterly to his brother John of Coke’s “Methodist Episcopal Church in Baltimore,” of the readiness of the London preachers to receive orders from him, of Coke’s ambition and rashness. Coke distinctly said, after his return to England, that “he had done nothing but under the direction of Mr. Wesley;” and Wesley replied to Charles that Coke “has done nothing rashly.” Silence in such circumstances becomes assent.

**5.** Wesley, then, intended an Episcopal Church. But an Episcopal Church must have an Episcopacy, and therefore an **ἐπίσκοπος**, bishop, or superintendent, names alike in signification. He preferred the latter, as did Coke, who spoke in his sermon at Asbury’s ordination of “ our bishops, or superintendents, as we rather call them.” When it began to be applied as a personal title to the incumbents of ,the office, Wesley wrote, “ How can you, how dare you, suffer yourself to be called bishop ?” though he well

knew that an Episcopal Church must have its bishop. To the title, not to the thing, he did object, and most strongly, for as it met him in England, its pomp and pretentiousness were far removed from that character of simplicity which he had so laboriously stamped upon Methodism. "I study to be little," he truly said in the same letter; but when he added, "You study to be great," he took counsel of his fears, and showed how little he knew the real character of Asbury, to whom he was writing. The truth is, he made a bishop, and *called* him superintendent. American Methodists early saw fit to sometimes use the other word.

6. "The eldership is by scriptural precedent, and by the natural course of things, as embodying the mass of the mature ministry, the main body and trunk of the ministerial strength and power. As such it is naturally and crudely the undeveloped *one order*. Just as, naturally, and by sacred precedent and expediency, it reserves the diaconate order as its preparatory pupilage, so it flowers up into the Episcopacy as its concentrated representative order. Fundamentally, there may thus be one order; subsidiarily, a second order; and derivatively, yet superior in function, a third order. The ordership and organic permanence is constituted in all three cases, according to sacred precedent, by ordination. The highest of the three orders is especially, as it happens, perpetuated by a series of ordaining hands, passing from predecessor to successor, bishop authenticating bishop, as elder does not authenticate elder, or deacon, deacon. Hence, though, as derivative, it is in origin less an order, and an inferior order, yet, as constituted, it becomes more distinctively an order than either of the other two. The New Testament furnishes, indeed, no decisive precedent of an ordained and permanently fixed superpresbyterial order; but it does furnish classes and instances of men exercising superpresbyterial authority, so that pure and perfect parity of office is not divinely enjoined. Such classes and cases are the apostles, perhaps the evangelists, St. James of Jerusalem, and Timothy and Titus. .. Wesley held that the episcopate and eldership were so one order that the *power* constituting an Episcopal order inhered in the eldership; but he did not believe that there lay in the eldership a *right* to exercise that power without a true providential and divine call. Hence, in his Episcopal diploma given to Coke, he announces, 'I, John Wesley, *think myself providentially CALLED* at this time to set apart,' etc.'" (D. Whedon, *Meth. Quar. Revelation* Oct. 1871, p. 676.)

## II. Doctrines.

**1.** The “*Articles of Religion*” prepared by Wesley for the new Church, twenty-four in number, are an abridgment of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England. Fifteen of the latter are entirely omitted, and several others considerably amended. While all traces of Calvinism, as well as of Romish leanings, are carefully eliminated, there is no insertion of Wesley’s Arminianism, or of his doctrines of the “Witness of the Spirit” and “Christian Perfection.” Several important protests against Pelagian, Romish, and other errors, are retained, as are also, in substance, those articles which are in accordance with the sentiments of the universal Church. On the Trinity, the person and work of Christ, the Holy Spirit, the Scripture canon, original sin, free will, justification by faith, vicarious atonement, and good works, they speak clearly and in the most orthodox language. The design was to provide a broad and liberal platform upon which the great body of Christians who hold the essentials of Christianity might stand together in love and charity. With a few verbal changes, and the insertion of one new article (the twenty-third), they stand as they were adopted in 1784; and from the year 1832 it has been placed beyond the power of the Church to “revoke, alter, or change” them. *SEE ARTICLES, TWENTY-FIVE, of the Methodist episcopal Church.*

**2.** The *theology* of the Church is thoroughly Arminian, as it has been from the beginning. In this it agrees with universal Wesleyan Methodism. It has been stoutly and bitterly accused of Pelagianism by those who formed their estimate of Arminianism from the writings of men who received a part only of that system, and incorporated with it other and objectionable principles, rather than from a familiarity with the views of Arminius himself. The articles on “Original Sin” and “Free Will” should forever have saved it from that reproach. Wesley’s doctrinal sermons, Notes on the New Testament, and other writings, have been its standards of Arminian orthodoxy, while the rigid examination to which all candidates for the ministry are subjected is its chief security that only what is deemed correct and sound in doctrine shall be preached ill its pulpits.

**3.** Wesley’s doctrine of the “Witness of the Spirit,” known to many by the term “Assurance,” holds an important place in the system of the Church. He defines it as “an inward impression on the soul, whereby the Spirit of God immediately and directly witnesses to my spirit that I am a child of God; that Jesus Christ hath loved me, and given himself for me; that all my sins are blotted out, and I, even I, am reconciled to God;” and to effect this persuasion, he supposes that the Holy Spirit “works upon the soul by his



immediate influence, and by a strong though inexplicable operation.” The possession of this assurance is taught to be the privilege of all believers, and penitents are diligently instructed not to rest until it is received; while it is a constant theme in the pulpit and the social meeting. Such is the emphasis practically placed upon it.

**4.** Sanctification, or “Christian Perfection,” as Wesley preferred to style it, is a doctrine of all Methodism, and is firmly held by the Church. It teaches no state attainable in this life like that of the angels, or of Adam in Paradise, or in which there is an exemption from mistakes, ignorance, infirmities, or temptations; and, positively, that all saints may by faith be so filled with the love of God that all the powers of the soul shall be recovered from the abnormal, perverted, sinful condition, and, together with the outward conduct, be controlled in entire harmony with love. *SEE METHODISM.*

### **III.** *Government.*

**1.** The *General Conference*, the highest of the five judicatories of the Church, assembles on the first day of May in every fourth year, and is the only legislative body of the denomination. As in the Christmas Conference, it was for many years, constructively at least, an assembly of the whole ministry; but their increasing number, the impossibility of a general attendance from the constantly-extending field, and the felt necessity of settling the doctrinal and ecclesiastical systems upon a basis less easily changed, led to the arrangement, in 1808, that thenceforth it should be composed of ministerial delegates from the several Annual Conferences, acting under certain clearly-defined restrictions. These restrictive rules, or articles, as they are termed, have been modified from time to time, though the most important change was effected in 1872, providing for the introduction of laymen into the body, with equal powers with the clergy. The General Conference now (1873) consists of one minister for every forty-five members of each Annual Conference, chosen by the clergy, and two laymen, chosen by lay electors from the several Quarterly Conferences within the same territory. The regulations defining its functions are as follows: “The General Conference shall have full powers to make rules and regulations for our Church, under the following limitations and restrictions, namely:

“**I.** The General Conference shall not alter, revoke, or change our Articles of Religion, nor establish any new standards or rules of doctrine contrary to our present existing and established standards of doctrine.

“**II.** They shall not allow of more than one ministerial representative for every fourteen members of the Annual Conference, nor allow of a less number than one for every forty-five, nor more than two lay delegates for any Annual Conference; provided, nevertheless, that when there shall be in any Annual Conference a fraction of two thirds the number which shall be fixed for the ratio of representation, such Annual Conference shall be entitled to an additional delegate for such fraction; and *provided*, also that no Conference shall be denied the privilege of one delegate.

“**III.** They shall not change or alter any part or rule of our government, so as to do away Episcopacy, or destroy the plan of our itinerant general superintendency; but may appoint a missionary bishop or superintendent for any of our foreign missions, limiting his jurisdiction to the same respectively.

“**IV.** They shall not revoke or change the General Rules of the united societies.

“**V.** They shall not do away the privileges of our ministers or preachers of trial by a committee, and of an appeal; neither shall they do away the privileges of our members of trial before the society, or by a committee, and of an appeal.

“**VI.** They shall not appropriate the produce of the Book Concern, nor of the Charter Fund, to any purpose other than for the benefit of the travelling, supernumerary, superannuated, and worn-out preachers, their wives, widows, and children.

*Provided*, nevertheless, that upon the concurrent recommendation of three fourths of all the members of the several Annual Conferences who shall be present and vote on such recommendation, then a majority of two thirds of the General Conference succeeding shall suffice to alter any of the above restrictions excepting the first article; and also, whenever such alteration or alterations shall have been first recommended by two thirds of the General Conference, so soon as three fourths of the members of all the Annual

Conferences shall have concurred as aforesaid, such alteration or alterations shall take effect.”

These *Restrictive Rules*, together with the *Articles of Religion and the General Rules*, **SEE METHODISM**, are commonly held to be the Constitution of the Church. They make the General Conference supreme in authority, with entire supervision over all the interests and work of the denomination, and the bond of the whole connectional system. It elects the bishops and other general officers; the bishops, who are its presiding officers, but not members of the body, are subject to its direction, and answerable to it for their moral as well as official conduct.

**2.** The *Judicial Conference* is instituted for the trial of bishops who may be accused of wrong-doing, and of appeals of convicted members of an Annual Conference. The Annual Conferences severally elect annually seven “Triers of Appeals.” In case of an appeal, the triers from three Conferences contiguous to that whose decision is appealed from, constitute the Judicial Conference, whose action is final, except that all decisions of questions of law are reviewed by the General Conference. For the trial of an accused bishop, the triers from five neighboring Conferences are necessary.

**3.** The *Annual Conference* is composed wholly of travelling preachers. It selects the place of its sessions, the bishops appointing the time, and presiding. It possesses no legislative power: its functions are purely administrative. It holds the power of discipline over its own members, inquiring annually into the Christian character and ministerial efficiency of each by name. It gathers the ecclesiastical statistics of its several societies, though its jurisdiction is over the ministers, rather than over the churches. The proceedings and action of this body, as recorded in its journal, are reviewed by the General Conference, to which it is subject.

**4.** The *District Conference* embraces the churches of a presiding elder’s district, and is composed of the pastors, local preachers, exhorters, and one steward and Sunday-school superintendent from each pastoral charge. It licenses local preachers, recommends them to the Annual Conference for orders or for admission on trial, and holds jurisdiction over them; it is also charged with a general supervision of the temporal and spiritual affairs of the district. Specifically, it inquires into the work of Sunday-schools, forms plans for the occupation of new fields within its territory, and promotes attention to the charities of the Church.

**5.** The *Quarterly Conference* is limited to a single pastoral charge, over which it exercises entire supervision, subject to the provisions of the Discipline. Its members are the pastor, local preachers, exhorters, stewards, and class-leaders, together with the trustees and Sunday-school superintendent, if members of the Church. Besides the functions of the District Conference, which devolve upon it where no District Conference is held, it inquires carefully into the condition and work of every department of the local society.

**6.** *The Leaders' and Stewards' Meeting*, presided over by the pastor, and consisting of all the class-leaders and stewards of his charge, is usually held monthly, for the purpose of inquiring after the sick, needy, and any that, by neglect of the means of grace or by incorrect life, may need the admonitions of good discipline. The meeting recommends probationers for reception into the Church, as also candidates for license to exhort or preach. *SEE LEADERS MEETINGS.*

**7.** The legislation of 1784 gave new force to the essential features which Rankin and Asbury, who had been trained in the school and under the eye of Wesley, had stamped upon the American societies. Evangelization and supervision, the former to extend the work, the latter to secure and build up what had been won, were fundamental in the methods then adopted, as they were in the measures of Wesley. The bishops were chief evangelists, almost plenary in power, yet sharing with the humblest in fare and labor, inspecting the local societies and classes, meeting leaders and trustees, and holding themselves responsible for even the details of the work throughout the denomination. The preacher in charge of a circuit was the bishop's "assistant," and the other preachers of the circuit were the assistant's "helpers," and under his direction. In still closer contact with the membership was the class-leader, appointed by the assistant, and in his subordinate sphere of pastorship aiding him by watching over the little band while he might be in other parts of the circuit. This "military regimen," as the historian of the Church has styled it, very remote from a democracy, which, indeed, it never pretended to be, gave surprising vigor to all the movements of the system. In all the modifications which have been from time to time effected, and the numerous limitations of power which the ministry have imposed upon themselves, these features of evangelization and supervision have been steadily maintained. The bishop presides in the Conferences; forms the districts according to his judgment; appoints the preachers to their fields, allowing none to remain more than

three years in succession in the same charge, except the presiding elders, who may remain four years, and a few others specially designated; ordains; travels through the connection at large, and oversees, in accordance with the prescribed regulations of the General Conference, to which he is subject, the spiritual and temporal business of the Church. The bishops are not diocesan, but have a joint jurisdiction over the whole Church, constituting and “itinerant general superintendency.” The arrangement and division of their work is annually made by themselves, giving to each his portion (though their respective residences are assigned by the General Conference), and for its faithful and orderly performance they are responsible to the General Conference. *SEE EPISCOPACY; SEE ITINERANCY.*

**8.** Ordinations of preachers were at first designed simply to supply the sacraments to the societies, and soon an elder came for this purpose to be placed in charge of a district containing several circuits. Thus originated the office of presiding elder, a sub-episcopate, with duties of oversight and administration indispensable in the system of the Church. Their constant travel through their districts, their presidency in the Quarterly Conferences, and familiarity with both churches and pastors, enabled the presiding elders to give the bishop the information and counsel necessary for the best adjustment of the appointments. In this work usage has made them his advisers, or, in more popular phrase, his “cabinet,” though without authority of law. The wisdom of the Church has judged it best that the sole responsibility of the appointments shall be with the Episcopacy.

**9.** Admission into an Annual Conference is preceded by a two years’ probation in the itinerant work, and a rigid examination in a prescribed course of study; and all preachers thus admitted as members are ordained deacons, and in two years more, on the completion of the required studies, they are ordained elders. It devolves upon the former to “administer baptism, solemnize matrimony, assist the elder in administering the Lord’s Supper, and to do all the duties of a travelling preacher;” and upon the latter, in addition to these, to “administer the Lord’s Supper” and to “conduct divine worship.” But an elder, deacon, or preacher may be in charge of a circuit or station, with no difference in function except in the matter of the sacraments. He is the chief executive officer of the local society, charged to “take care” of its interests in accordance with the provisions of the Discipline, and- is responsible to the Annual Conference both for the proper discharge of his duties and for his moral conduct. While

he is the pastor of the flock, sub-pastors, denominated class-leaders, are charged with the oversight of small bodies of the membership, whom they are to meet weekly “for social and religious worship, for instruction, encouragement, and admonition.” The local preachers, without a share in the government of the Church, except in the District and Quarterly Conferences, constitute a lay ministry, a corps of self-supporting evangelists, numerically larger than the travelling preachers, which has been of great efficiency. *SEE LAY MINISTRY*. All churches and parsonages are the property of the local society, held by trustees chosen in accordance with the law of the state or territory wherever a specific mode is required, and otherwise by the Quarterly Conference.

**10.** Admission to membership in the Church is preceded by a probation of at least six months, during which period the candidate has opportunity for acquiring that familiarity with the Church, its doctrines, rules, and usages, which enables him to intelligently assume the obligations of a member therein. The one preliminary condition for reception on trial is “a desire to flee from the wrath to come, and to be saved from their sins,” which is expected to show itself by such fruits as are specified in the General Rules. Genuine spiritual life is more carefully sought than rigid dogmatic orthodoxy, the only test of the latter sort being “the doctrines of holy Scripture, as set forth in the Articles of Religion,” which, as shown above, embrace little more than the fundamentals of Christian doctrine as accepted by evangelical churches. The probationer, having been previously baptized, and also recommended by the Leaders’ and Stewards’ Meeting, or by his leader if there is no such meeting, may be received into the Church upon giving assurance in presence of the Church of his doctrinal belief as just expressed, his purpose to observe and keep the rules of the Church, and to contribute of his worldly goods, according to his ability for the support of its institutions. Nevertheless, persons coming from other orthodox churches are received at once into full fellowship without the usual probation.

**IV.** *History and Progress.* — Under this head we propose to give a rapid sketch of the work performed by the Methodist Episcopal Church and its gradual growths noting, as we pass, its relations to public questions, its changes of internal economy, and the principal controversies that have grown up from time to time, with their effects.

**1. Pioneer Work.** — “Methodism presented itself to the new nation,” says Stevens, “an Episcopal Church, with all the necessary functions and functionaries of such a body; the only one, of Protestant denomination, now in the nation, for the colonial fragments of the English Establishment had not yet been reorganized.” Led by Coke and Asbury, the little band of itinerants went ‘forth to their self-sacrificing toils with a new sense of consolidation and certainty, and feeling in their souls, as they said, that they were “raised up to reform the continent, and to spread scriptural holiness over these lands.”’. Under the new system, the eucharist was immediately administered to thousands of disciples who had never partaken of it, and large numbers of both adults and children were baptized, scores of the latter receiving the rite at a single meeting. The work extended in every direction. The post of hardship and severity was the post of honor. Going in the true spirit of evangelists, with the conviction that they had “nothing to do but to save souls,” they not only held and strengthened the fields already won, but pressed on to the regions beyond, continually forming new circuits, and proclaiming their message wherever men would hear—in churches, in barns and log-cabins, in the forest and highway. They crossed the mountains, and kept pace with the constantly-advancing frontier; they penetrated Canada, and established themselves in New England and Nova Scotia. Gown, and band, and prayerbook were too cumbersome for their use, and were soon laid aside. The system was providentially adapted to self-propagation. “ Its class and prayer meetings trained most, if not all, the laity to practical missionary labor, and three or four of them, meeting in any distant part of the earth by the emigrations of these times, were prepared immediately to become the nucleus of a Church. {The lay or local ministry, borne on by the tide of population, were almost everywhere found, prior to the arrival of regular preachers, ready to sustain religious services—the pioneers of the Church in every new field.” Such was their success that in sixteen years, at the end of the century, their 15,000 members had become 64,894, and the 84 itinerants had increased to 287, not counting :the scores who had fallen out of their ranks from pure physical inability to endure the terrible severity of the system, but were still working nobly in their local sphere. Bishop Coke’s stay in the country at his first visit was but five months, a fair type of his subsequent visits. After 1787 his Episcopal work was limited to ordinations, presiding in Conference when present, itinerating through the country, and preaching, the stationing of the preachers being left with bishop Asbury.

Coke threw himself with zeal into the work of raising funds for the college at Abingdon, Md., whose cornerstone Asbury laid -three days after his first departure for Europe. In 1789 he stood with Asbury in the presence of Washington, presenting to him, in behalf of the Church, a congratulatory address upon his inauguration as president, approving the recently-adopted Federal Constitution. and professing allegiance to the government. The Methodist Episcopal Church was the first ecclesiastical body to recognise the Constitution of the United States, and, in its article afterwards adopted, it declared its faith that they are a “sovereign and independent nation,” rather than a confederacy of sovereign states. Coke’s indefatigable labors in travelling and preaching in behalf of the cause of education, and for the emancipation of slaves, show him worthy of his high position. Yet Asbury was the chief apostle of the Church, giving it his entire energies, becoming an example to his brethren in labors and sacrifices, and carefully attending to even the most minute and local details. meeting classes, trustees, and often visiting pastorally from house to house. He instituted in 1786, in Virginia, the first Sunday-school in America, and four years later the Conference ordered Sunday-schools to be established for the instruction of poor children, white and black, in “learning and piety,” being the first American Church to recognise this institution. Official attention was given as early as 1788 to the publication of books, a “book steward” being appointed; and a borrowed capital of six hundred dollars became the foundation of the future “Book Concern.” Additional legislation from time to time, as necessity demanded, gave greater efficiency and solidity to the body, but innovations upon well-tried methods found no favor.

**2. *Early Secessions.***-As early as 1792, James O’Kelly introduced into the Conference a resolution permitting a preacher who might feel aggrieved by the appointment assigned him, to “appeal to the Conference and state his objections,” and requiring the bishop, if his objections were found valid, to appoint him to another circuit. The proposition was lost by a large majority; but the defeat cost the Church the secession of the mover with a few other preachers and a large number of members, who ultimately styled themselves “the Christian Church.”

Attempts were made in 1800 to make the presiding eldership elective in the Annual Conferences, to introduce the English method of making the appointments by requiring them to be reading open session, “to hear what the Conference may have to say on each station,” and to aid the bishop in making the appointments by a committee of preachers chosen by the



Conference for the purpose; but they signally failed, though some of them were revived in subsequent years.

**3. *Early Emancipation Movements.*** — The most vexing question of those early, as well as of later times, was that of *slavery*. The Methodist preachers of those days were thoroughly hostile to the institution. At the organization of the Church they pronounced it “contrary to the golden law of God and the unalienable rights of mankind, as well as every principle of the Revolution;” and their enactments required all members holding slaves to set them free, wherever it could be legally done, and forbade all future admission of slaveholders into the Church or to the Lord’s Supper, while all who might buy or sell slaves were “immediately to be expelled, unless they buy them on purpose to free them.” Could they have looked forward a century, and seen that either the Gospel or the sword must solve the problem of slavery, these men who believed themselves divinely sent to “reform the continent,” would surely, with their clear convictions on the subject, not have failed to discern that it was a part of their mission to destroy the great crime of the nation, and they would doubtless have maintained the high ground they had so firmly taken. But they compromised with the evil because of the great embarrassments attending the execution of their rules, which in six months were suspended never again to be enforced. Yet the Church was always anti-slavery. Its preachers, holding “the power of the keys,” effected the liberation of thousands of slaves kept by those who sought admission into its fold. The Discipline never ceased to pronounce a condemnation upon the system; and, from 1804, it perpetually asked, “What shall be done for the extirpation of the evil of slavery ?” while successive General Conferences sought by legislation, addresses to the Church, and measures for memorials to the state Legislatures, to remove and abolish it.

**4. *Completed Organization.***—The absence of Dr. Coke in Europe rendering an additional bishop necessary, Richard Whatcoat was elected to that office in 1800, as was William M’Kendree in 1808, the first native American elevated to the episcopate.

The latter year is the epoch of the plan of a *delegated General Conference*, adopted to “preserve, strengthen, and perpetuate the union of the connection,” and to render “the doctrine, form of government, and General Rules, sacred and inviolable.” - The “Council” devised by the bishops, composed of themselves and the presiding elders, had proved

abortive after two trials, and the General Conference, as then constituted, practically placed the doctrinal and administrative systems of the denomination in the power of the more centrally located ministers. The new plan was conservative of every fundamental principle of the Church, and at the same time gave to the remotest Conference equal power with the most central, in proportion to its number of ministers. The first session, held in 1812, was composed of 90 members, representing 688 preachers, and a membership of 195,357; the sixteenth, held in 1872, was composed of 421 members, 292 clerical and 129 lay, representing, according to the Minutes of 1871, 9699 travelling preachers, 11,382 local preachers, and 1,421,323 members and probationers. Taking a fresh departure with the adoption of this measure, the "Church pressed forwards in its practical work with added zeal.

**5. Denominational Institutions.** — The Book Concern, already (in 1804) removed from Philadelphia to New York, multiplied its publications, and scattered a vigorous Methodist literature through the circuits by the agency of the preachers. They were too busy to make books, but they could sell them, and thus educate a people trained in the truth as they received it. In 1818 the *Methodist Magazine* was started—the beginning of the periodical literature of the denomination. It is now known as the *Methodist Quarterly Review*, one of the ablest of the quarterlies, with the largest circulation of all. The first weekly, *The Christian Advocate*, was issued in 1826, though *Zion's Herald*, under the auspices of New England Methodists, preceded it nearly four years, and in its second half-century it is full of beauty and power. A second publishing-house was established in 1820 in Cincinnati; and depositories are located in several of the principal cities of the country. The increase of the business led in 1833 to a removal from Crosby Street, in New York, where it had been carried on for nine years, to Mulberry Street. The whole establishment was swept away by fire early in 1836, at a loss of at least a quarter of a million. New and better buildings soon rose on the same spot, which, with their subsequent additions, have been used as a manufactory of the house since the date of the removal of the principal office to its present location (805 Broadway), procured for it and the Missionary Society at the cost of about a million dollars. Its entire capital in 1873 was \$1,052,448. There is also a "Western Methodist Book Concern," with a capital of \$467,419.

To the relief of worn-out and needy preachers, and the widows and orphans of preachers, the denomination has always been attentive. At first,

in 1784, the preachers themselves instituted a "Preachers' Fund," each paying out of his poverty a specified sum annually into its treasury. It was afterwards merged in the "Chartered Fund," instituted in 1796 for the same purposes. This fund has never been a favorite charity; it amounts to only about \$40,000, and its dividends to the Conferences have, of course, always been small. Many of the Annual Conferences hold trust funds, whose proceeds are devoted to the same end. Surplus profits of the Book Concern were for many years employed for their relief, but the chief reliance is on the annual contributions of the congregations, amounting, now yearly to \$150,000.

The missionary work of the Church took an organized form in 1819, when its Missionary Society was instituted. Methodism was itself a missionary system, "the great home-mission enterprise of the North American continent, and its domestic work, demanded all its resources of men and money." The Conference of 1784 ordered an annual collection in every principal congregation to provide a fund for "carrying on the whole work of God," chiefly for the expenses of preachers sent to new or feeble fields. Missionaries were early sent among the slaves and Indians, and the constant extension of the Church, whether in the older states or on the ever-advancing frontier, has been a missionary movement. The society, organized primarily to aid the home-mission work, grouped with it the foreign field; and now, besides more than 2000 missionaries in the English-speaking Conferences, 161 in the German Conferences, and 90 among the Indians and other peoples of foreign birth in the United States, supported in whole or in part by the society, its foreign missionaries, including native preachers and teachers, number 679, and are scattered in Africa, South America, China, India, Japan, Germany, Switzerland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Bulgaria, Italy, and Mexico. Its receipts in 1872 amounted to \$661,056 60. It is supplemented by the Woman's Foreign Missionary Society, and by other organizations of a *quasi* missionary character, equally with, it under the control of the General Conference, its Sunday-school Union, its Tract, Freedman's Aid, and Church Extension societies.

The educational movements of the Church began with the Church itself. John Dickens, afterwards the first book agent, suggested to Asbury the plan of an academic institution as early as 1780. and at their first meeting the latter submitted it to Coke, who heartily approved it. It was laid before the Christmas Conference, which agreed upon measures to establish a college. Five thousand dollars—a large sum for those days—were raised for it

before the building was begun; its foundations were laid at Abingdon, Md., in the following June, and in the last month of 1787 it was solemnly dedicated under the name of Cokesbury College. The curriculum embraced "English, Latin, Greek, logic, rhetoric, history, geography, natural philosophy, and astronomy, and, when the finances will admit of it, Hebrew, French, and German." More than seventy students were at one time within its halls. Unfortunately it was burned down in 1795: "a sacrifice of £10,000 in about ten years," says Asbury. A new edifice was soon provided in Baltimore, and the college reopened with fair prospects, but in a year it also was lost by fire. Another college was projected in Georgia in 1789, and several academies were opened before the close of the century. The disastrous fate of Cokesbury led Asbury to think the Lord had "not called Methodists to build colleges," a saying of his that has been most sadly perverted. He would have had the same thing, but would have called it a "school," and not a "college," and he would place one in every Conference. He actually framed a scheme to bring "two thousand children under the best plan of education ever known in this country." In 1818 a second attempt was made to establish a college in Baltimore, but without success. The educational plans of the early Methodists were simply broader than their financial ability. At no time has the slander been just that they were enemies to education. In 1817 an academy was opened in Newmarket, N. H., since removed to Wilbraham, Mass.; and in 1819 another in New York City. In 1820 the General Conference took up the subject, and recommended that each Annual Conference establish as soon as practicable a literary institution under its own control. This action was followed by new efforts. Several Conference seminaries were soon opened, and, to meet the increasing demand for higher education, within twelve years no less than five colleges were put in successful operation. Theological schools are of a later date, and assumed at first the modest title of "Biblical Institute." The first, projected in 1839, after various fortunes, was located at Concord, N. H., in 1847; in 1867 it removed to Boston, and in 1871 became the school of theology in the Boston University. The Garrett Biblical Institute, at Evanston, Ill., founded in 1855, received an endowment of \$300,000 and its name from a liberal Methodist lady of Chicago. The Drew Theological Seminary was originated in the Centenary movement at Madison, N. J., through the munificence of the gentleman whose name it bears. There is also a mission institute at Frankforton-the-Main, in Germany, named *Martin Institute*, after the gentleman whose munificence mainly endowed the school; and there are similar schools in

India, and at two or three points in the Southern States.’ By the close of the centennial year of American Methodism, “the Methodist Episcopal Church alone reported no less than 25 colleges (including theological schools), having 158 instructors, 5345 students, about \$4,000,000 in endowments and other property, and 105,531 volumes in their libraries. It reports also 77 academies, with 556 instructors, and 17,761 students, 10,462 of whom are females, making an aggregate of 102 institutions, with 714 instructors, and 23,106 students. The Southern division of the denomination [the Methodist Episcopal Church, South] reported before the Rebellion 12 colleges and 77 academies, with 8000 students, making an aggregate for the two bodies of 191 institutions and 31,106 students” (Stevens’s *Hist. of Am. Meth.* p. 540). In the thank-offerings of the Centenary, education was made a prominent object of the contributions of the people.

**6. Later Divisions.**—Various causes have operated to prevent the continued unity of the denomination whose origin and progress are here traced, but it should be noted that no division has ever occurred on doctrinal grounds. ‘The separation of O’Kelly and his friends, as already stated, took place in 1792, because the Conference refused to restrict the power of the bishops in the appointments of ministers to their fields of labor. In 1816 the colored members of Philadelphia and its vicinity withdrew and organized the “African Methodist Episcopal Church;” and in 1820 a secession in New York City originated the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church. They are large and useful bodies.

Embarrassments arose in Canada after the War of 1812, through jealousies of the Conference, because of its connection with a foreign ecclesiastical body, which finally became so severe that in 1828 the General Conference was formally requested to set off the Canada Conference as a distinct Church. The General Conference, after full deliberation, held that it had no power to divide the Church, as it was constituted to preserve, not to destroy, its unity. Deeming the case to be one of necessity, it consented to the voluntary withdrawal of the Canada brethren; allowed the bishops, if requested, to ordain the bishop whom the separating Conference might elect; and proposed to the Annual Conferences such a change in the Restrictive Rules as would permit a *pro raeto* division with them of the common property in the Book Concern. The requisite vote not being obtained, the property was not divided; but a satisfactory arrangement was effected through heavy discounts in sales of books, giving what was on all

hands considered a full equivalent. The Canada Conference separated itself from the Church; but between the two sections the most friendly relations have ever subsisted.

The circumstances which led in 1830 to another secession, and the formation of the "Methodist Protestant Church," were of a more serious sort. The subject of lay representation in the General Conference, though from an early day deemed by a few to be important, began about 1820 to agitate the Church. The measures of the "Reformers," as the friends of the movement styled themselves, were unfortunate, leading not only to a most acrimonious controversy, but to such disorders as rendered necessary ecclesiastical trials and expulsions. Out of the controversy arose Emory's masterly production, "The Defence of Our Fathers." The subject came before the General Conference by petitions and memorials, and received the fullest attention. The report refusing the radical change asked for, written by Dr. Thomas E. Bond, a local preacher, and not a member of the body, and presented by Dr. Emory, was unanimously adopted. "The great body of our ministers, both travelling and local, as well as of our members perhaps not much, if any, short of one hundred to one oppose their wishes," says the report; and Bangs thought that "nine tenths of our people were decidedly opposed to the innovation." The result was a new denomination, starting with 83 preachers and 5000 members, and a long and bitter controversy that finally died of exhaustion.

The subject of slavery, which for many years agitated the whole country, and finally plunged it into a civil war, could not fail, in the progress of events, to involve in its complications a Church which constantly put slavery under its ban, but did not make absolute non-slaveholding a test of membership. Two important secessions resulted—one in the North, the other in the South. One of the General Rules—the moral code of the Church from the beginning—forbade "the buying or selling of men, women, or children, with an intention to enslave them." The legislation of the Church was steadily adverse to the institution, "though always embarrassed by the obstacles which the civil laws placed in the way of a legal emancipation. The prohibition, however, of buying or selling slaves with any other intent than their freedom, remained unchanged. Moreover, from the year 1800, the Discipline provided that "when any travelling preacher becomes an owner of a slave or slaves by any means, he shall forfeit his ministerial character in the Methodist Episcopal Church unless he execute, if it be practicable, a legal emancipation of such slaves, conformably to the laws of

the state in which he lives;" from 1816, that "no slaveholder shall be eligible to any official station in our Church hereafter, where the laws of the state in which he lives will admit of emancipation, and permit the liberated slave to enjoy freedom;" and from 1824 it contained provisions for the religious instruction of slaves, and concerning colored local preachers. These regulations were in force at the commencement of the "abolition movement," and continued unchanged until 1860, when the formula in the Discipline declares that "the buying, selling, or holding of human beings, to be used as chattels, is contrary to the laws of God and nature, and inconsistent with the golden rule;" and both preachers and people are admonished to "keep themselves pure from this great evil, and to seek its extirpation by all lawful and Christian means." The discussions in Great Britain from the year 1823, that resulted in emancipation in all the British colonies in 1834, drew attention to the system of slavery as it existed in the United States, which was not greatly unlike that of the West Indies. Philanthropic men became aroused by numerous well authenticated facts of the wicked and inhuman treatment of slaves. They were led to examine the system of chattel slavery and its practical workings, and found them so adverse to the right to himself of every person of full age and sane mind, except for the commission of crime, that they pronounced slaveholding to be a crime in God's sight, and immediate, unconditional emancipation a duty. Leading ministers, chiefly in New England at first, espoused these views, and advocated them in the pulpit, at camp-meetings, in conventions, through the press, and by all those means that could act upon the public mind. In the controversies that followed, in which some of the most able pens of the denomination were engaged, the question was examined in all its aspects. 'The subject was introduced into Quarterly and Annual Conferences, and ultimately became involved with questions of Conference rights, Episcopal prerogatives, and the rights of the laity. The General Conference of 1836 passed a vote of censure upon two of its members who had attended and spoken at an anti-slavery meeting in Cincinnati, where the session was held, (a resolution which in 1868, so greatly had opinion. changed with events, it rescinded and pronounced void), and exhorted the "members and friends" of the Church "to abstain from all abolition movements and associations, and to refrain from patronizing any of their publications." But Methodism had not overlooked the welfare of the slave. At the culmination of these troubles, a hundred thousand colored persons, mostly slaves, were enrolled as members of the Church, amounting to one tenth of the whole. But many apologies for

quietness and tolerance of the legal relation of master were nullified by a resolution of the Georgia Conference, "that slavery, as it exists in the United States, is not a moral evil." At length, the General Conference of 1840 having found it "inexpedient to express any opinion, or to adopt any measures additional to those already in the Discipline," many began to abandon all hope of seeing the Church purged of slavery, and to regard withdrawal as necessary to free themselves from the guilt of connection with it. Others, who had been prominent in the anti-slavery ranks, and had advocated such modifications in the law of the Church as would prevent the holding of slaves as chattels, maintained that the Discipline was against slavery, and that secession was not an anti-slavery measure. They preferred to fight the battle within the Church. But Orange Scott, Jotham Horton, Luther Lee, and others, felt impelled by their consciences to withdraw. At a convention held at Utica N. Y., in 1843, they organized the "Wesleyan Methodist Connection." This was but the beginning of a struggle in which churches were rent in twain through most of the Northern States. The organization thus formed numbered at one period a considerable number of preachers and members; but time and events have produced such changes that many of its first leaders and warmest friends have returned to the old Church in the belief that the denomination has accomplished its mission.

But a severer convulsion was preparing in the South. The discriminations of the Discipline against slaveholding had come to be distasteful to a generation that held views on slavery widely different from those of the fathers, though six Conferences, lying wholly or partly in slave states, the Baltimore being one, rigidly enforced the old rule requiring ministers to emancipate the slaves of whom they might become owners by inheritance, marriage, or any other means, wherever the civil law allowed it, and never permitted slaveholders in their ranks. It was also the ancient and settled policy and constant usage to place no slaveholder in the Episcopacy; and in 1832 James O. Andrew was put in nomination for that high office by Southern delegates, because, though of the South, he was free from all personal connection with slavery, and was elected. This was upon the principle that a bishop, in a system of general superintendency which gave him equal jurisdiction in Massachusetts and South Carolina, must be free from whatever would prevent the exercise of his functions with acceptance in any part of the Church. A slaveholding bishop could never have presided in the Northern Conferences, and the election of one would be an infraction of the law forbidding the General Conference to "destroy the



plan of our itinerant general superintendency.” The increasing restiveness under this exclusion from the highest office of the Church led to an attempt by Southern delegates, in 1836, to elect to it a slaveholder, and, upon its failure, to great agitation and threats of secession, if what was termed “this proscriptive system” should not be abandoned. The renewal of the effort in 1844 was fully determined upon, and the purpose of resistance on the part of the Northern Conferences was equally firm, when the marriage of bishop Andrew, in January of that year, with a lady who was the owner of slaves, suddenly gave the friends of the movement precisely what they wanted, but could not have obtained by the suffrages of the General Conference—a slaveholding bishop. That trouble was ahead was evident, and the Southern ministry became at once a unit in sustaining him. It could not be expected that the Church would quietly submit to the revolutionizing of its ancient policy by a marriage; and nothing could have more astounded the Northern delegates to the General Conference of 1844 than the intelligence, which met them upon their arrival in New York, the place of the session, that slaveholding was already entrenched in the Episcopacy. Early in the session an appeal of the Revelation Francis A. Harding from the action of the Baltimore’ Conference was presented. That gentleman having become by marriage the owner of five slaves, the Conference, in pursuance of its old purpose to “not tolerate slavery in any of its members,” required him to legally emancipate them within the year, and, upon his refusal, suspended him from the ministry. The General Conference, after a full hearing of the case, it being clear that emancipation could be legally effected in Maryland, affirmed the decision of the Baltimore Conference by a vote of 117 to 56. That body, though few were “abolitionists,” certainly was in no mood to yield further to the encroachments of slavery; and it was equally evident that should bishop Andrew be touched, secession would ensue. His voluntary resignation could have saved both the South and the Church; and this step he promptly resolved to take, but he was overruled by the Southern delegates. They preferred disruption to a non-slaveholding Episcopacy. The committee on the Episcopacy was instructed to ascertain and report the facts in relation to the bishop’s alleged connection with slavery, when it was found that, besides the legal ownership of several others, he had married a lady owning slaves, and had secured them to her by a deed of trust, thus putting their freedom out of his power. A resolution, with a preamble reciting the facts, was promptly offered by Mr. Griffith, a delegate from Baltimore, affectionately requesting him to resign

his office; but the final action, after ten days' debate, was the adoption of the following substitute by a vote of 111 yeas and 69 nays:

*“Whereas, The Discipline of our Church forbids the doing anything calculated to destroy our itinerant general superintendency; and whereas bishop Andrew has become connected with slavery by marriage and otherwise, and this act having drawn after it circumstances which, in the estimation of the General Conference, will greatly embarrass the exercise of his office as an itinerant general superintendent, if not in some places entirely prevent it; therefore,*

*“Resolved, That it is the sense of this General Conference that he desist from the exercise of his office so long as this impediment remains.”*

Evidently this was the mildest action possible without the abandonment of the established principles and usage of the Church. It left him still a bishop, free to choose his own course, and with unquestioned right to the full exercise of his powers the hour the “impediment” should be removed; and private individuals vainly opened the way for his relief by offering to bind themselves to purchase all his slaves and their connections, and set them free. The Southern delegates took no steps from first to last towards an amicable settlement of the difficulty ; and acquiescence in the doctrine of a non-slaveholding bishop or separation from the Church were the only alternatives left. All their measures were in the latter direction. First, Dr. Capers proposed a plan of two independent General Conferences, with a joint interest in the Book Concern and the Missionary Society. This, being in reality a division of the Church, was held impossible. Then, as a second step, the following declaration was presented, signed by fifty-one delegates from the thirteen slaveholding Conferences, and one from Illinois:

*“The delegates of the Conferences in the slaveholding states take leave to declare to the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, that the continued agitation on the subject of slavery and abolition in a portion of the Church; the frequent action on that subject in the General Conference; and especially the extra-judicial proceedings against bishop Andrew, which resulted, on Saturday last, in the virtual suspension of him from his office as superintendent, must produce a state of things in the South which renders a continuance of the jurisdiction of this General Conference*

over these Conferences inconsistent with the success of the ministry in the slaveholding states.”

This paper was at once referred to a committee of nine, who were afterwards instructed (according to the Journal), in case they could not frame an “amicable adjustment of the difficulties now existing in the Church on the subject of slavery, to devise, if possible, a constitutional plan for a mutual and friendly division of the Church.” But Mr. Hamline (afterwards bishop), one of the committee, refused to go out with such instructions. “ Being urged to go, he said, ‘ I will not go out with instructions to devise a plan to divide the Church.’ ‘Then will brother Hamline go if the instructions be so changed as simply to read, if the South should separate, to make provision in such a contingency to meet the emergency with Christian kindness and the strictest equity?’ Mr. Hamline said, ‘I will go out with such instructions’” (Hamline’s *Life and Letters*, p. 165). The instructions were modified accordingly. On the next day a protest against the action of the majority was read, affirming in stronger terms the position of the Declaration, which was followed some days later by a Reply. Whether, after this formal notice of the coming separation, it would not have been the wiser to allow events to take their course, is an open question. The protesting delegates, about to renounce the jurisdiction of the General Conference, could claim nothing, as of right, at its hands; and it was certainly an act of the highest magnanimity on the part of the two-thirds’ majority to prescribe for itself beforehand a law of most liberal treatment of the withdrawing Conferences, and to provide for the conditional division with them of the property of the Church. Yet this was done in the report of the committee on the Declaration. (See the paper quoted in full under *SEE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH*.) This document was adopted with great unanimity. An analysis of it shows that

- (1) it is based upon one fundamental condition, namely, a necessity to be found by the slaveholding Conferences for a distinct ecclesiastical connection, produced by the action of the General Conference.
- (2) It assumes that such distinct organization, if formed at all, will come into being by the action of those Conferences, and upon their own responsibility.
- (3) It does not arrange a division of the Church. For this the General Conference had no power, as was agreed in the Committee; and that it did

not and could not divide the Church was as freely asserted by Southern as by Northern delegates, both during and after the debate. The term “division” does occur, but solely with reference to property.

**(4)** It is not a “plan of separation,” as it afterwards came to be styled, for it does not authorize, direct, or sanction any step of the withdrawing party; but is purely an enactment of the rules to be observed by the Methodist Episcopal Church in case a “not improbable contingency” becomes, by the sole action of the South, an accomplished fact.

**(5)** To avoid the strife and bitterness that so generally attend a disruption, it enacts that, in case a new Church is formed, the Methodist Episcopal Church shall exercise no jurisdiction beyond certain limits, if the Church South shall act upon the same friendly principle. The Church simply lays down for itself the rule of non-interference.

**(6)** Nine of the twelve resolutions relate entirely to property, which, even if a Southern Church should be formed, can have no force whatever without the three-fourths concurrent votes of the Annual Conferences for the proposed change of the Restrictive Rule. All this was well understood at the time.

By this eminently Christian enactment the General Conference made provision for peace and quiet in view of the threatened withdrawal of a large and powerful portion of the Church. History must, however, record that the Southern delegates, at a meeting held on the day following ‘the adjournment, and without waiting for the “necessity” to develop itself, and to be found by the Conferences, called a convention of delegates from the slaveholding Conferences, with a defined ratio of representation, to assemble at Louisville, Ky., on May 1, 1845, invited bishop Andrew to attend and preside in their Conferences, and also issued an address to the ministers and members in the South, stating what they term “the facts and reasons connected with the proposed separation of the Southern Conferences into a distinct organization.” This precipitated and virtually decided the question of separation. In the controversies that followed this summary proceeding, the whole Church was stirred. The various questions involved were discussed in public meetings, in Quarterly and Annual Conferences, in Church periodicals and pamphlets. Bishop Soule, the senior bishop of the Church, in September called bishop Andrew into the field, to attend with himself the Conferences, in contravention of the expressed judgment of the General Conference. The slaveholding

Conferences appointed delegates to the proposed convention, although several of them had not found the ‘necessity’ for a separate organization. The recommendation to change the sixth Restrictive Rule failed by 269 votes to receive the concurrence of the Annual Conferences. The Louisville Convention met May 1, 1845; bishops Soule and Andrew were in attendance, and upon invitation presided over its deliberations. On May 17 the new Church was organized by the adoption of the following resolution, whose language may seem singular to the curious reader who remembers that what is styled the “provisional plan of separation” gave no direction, authority, or consent for the assembling or action of the convention, and that the provisions referred to relate solely to the action of the Church separated from, and not at all to the action of the parties separating:

“Be it resolved, by the delegates of the several Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the slaveholding states, in general convention assembled, That it is right, expedient, and necessary to erect the Annual Conferences represented in this convention into a distinct ecclesiastical connection, separate from the jurisdiction of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, as at present constituted; and accordingly we, the delegates of said Annual Conferences, acting under the provisional plan of separation adopted by the General Conference of 1844, do solemnly *declare* the jurisdiction hitherto exercised over said Annual Conferences by the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church *entirely dissolved*; and that said Annual Conferences shall be, and they hereby are, *constituted* a separate ecclesiastical connection, under the provisional plan of separation aforesaid, and based upon the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, comprehending the doctrines and entire moral, ecclesiastical, and canonical rules and regulations of said Discipline, except only in so far as verbal alterations may be necessary to a distinct organization, and to be known by the style and title of THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH”

By this secession the Methodist Episcopal Church lost 1345 travelling and 3166 local preachers, and 495,288 members. Bishop Andrew at once gave in his adhesion to the new Church, and bishop Soule followed him at its first General Conference in May, 1846.

Troubles soon occurred upon the border line of the two churches. The Southern General Conference took summary possession of the newspapers within its territory, and of the Charleston Book Depository, with their books, notes, presses, etc., all of which belonged to the Book Concern. The understanding in relation to boundaries was not kept. Though the rule had not been changed, a *pro rata* division of the Book Concern was demanded on pain of a suit at law. In this state of affairs, the General Conference of 1848 was met by the Rev. Dr. Lovick Pierce, as delegate from the Church South, bearing the "Christian salutations" of that body, and proposing fraternal relations between the two churches; but the existing difficulties were so evidently incompatible with the proposed fraternity, that it could not "at present" be entered into, though all personal courtesies, with an invitation to a seat within the bar, were tendered to Dr. Pierce. As the report on the Declaration was an enactment of the General Conference, it was, like any other enactment, repealable at its pleasure; and in the exercise of its wisdom it said, "Having found, upon clear and incontestable evidence, that the three fundamental conditions of said proposed plan have severally failed, and the failure of either of them separately being sufficient to render it null and void, and having found the practical working of said plan incompatible with certain great constitutional principles elsewhere asserted, we have found and declared the whole and every part of said provisional plan to be null and void." But in its desire to amicably adjust the claims made by the Church South upon the funds of the Book Concern, it authorized the book agents to offer to submit them to disinterested arbiters, provided eminent counsel learned in the law should advise them that it could be legally done: otherwise, and in case a suit at law should be commenced, to propose an arbitration under authority of the court; and in case they could not offer arbitration, and no suit should be commenced, it was recommended to the Annual Conferences to "so far suspend the sixth Restrictive Article of the Discipline as to authorize the book agents at New York and Cincinnati to submit said claim to arbitration." This was going to the utmost limit of its power. The question of the suspension of the sixth article was midway in its progress through the Annual Conferences when it was arrested by the commencement of suits in the civil courts. The case in New York came to a hearing before judge Nelson, but before the issuing of the final decree the matter was amicably adjusted through the friendly offices of judge M'Lean. The Cincinnati case resulted in favor of the defendants in the Circuit Court; but on a hearing of the appeal by the Supreme Court, to which it was carried

by the Southern commissioners, the decision of the court below was reversed, on the alleged ground that the General Conference had full power to divide the Church, and that that body did, in the adoption of the report on the Declaration, actually divide the Church, when the division of the property follows, as a matter of course. The Church at once obeyed the decision; but no intelligent minister or member of the denomination has ever accepted the exposition given by the Supreme Court, through the lips of judge Nelson, of the law of the Church, the facts of its history, or the action of the General Conference of 1844. The relations between the two churches have not as yet become cordial. The bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1869 made some advances towards a reunion, which were ungraciously received; but the General Conference of 1872 ordered the appointment of a delegation of two ministers and one layman to convey its greetings to the General Conference of the Church South at its next ensuing session.

Aside from these troubles, and others growing out of the increasing intensity of the conflict between freedom and slavery, the work of the Church was vigorously and successfully pressed. It stood arrayed with its full moral power on the side of the Union in the war provoked by slavery, and more than a hundred thousand of its members gave themselves to the armies of their country. Before the close of the war it entered upon preparations for the celebration of the centenary of Methodism in America, by all the churches and people, “with devout thanksgiving, by special religious services and liberal thank-offerings;” setting apart the month of October; 1866, for that purpose. The Church had attained by the end of the century, notwithstanding its losses by the several secessions, more than a million of members, and it was hoped that “not less than two millions of dollars” would be contributed to render its agencies more efficient in the future. Appropriate services were held throughout the Church, and at the close of the joyful month the aggregate contributions amounted to \$8,709,498 .39.

**7.** An important organic change in the economy of the Church was effected in 1872 by the introduction of laymen into the General Conference. In 1860 that body expressed its approval of the measure “when it shall be ascertained that the Church desires it,” and also provided for the submission of the question to the votes of both the ministry and members. The result showed a large majority against the proposed change. Nevertheless, while the General Conference felt precluded by this

expression of the popular will from adopting it, it reaffirmed in 1864 its approval of it upon the same condition as before. At its next session it took up the subject anew, recommending a definite plan to the consideration of the Church, ordering the submission afresh of the question of lay delegation to the vote of the laity, and proposing to the Annual Conferences the requisite alterations in the second Restrictive Rule. A large majority of the former, and more than the necessary three fourths vote in the latter, having been obtained in favor of the change, the General Conference, with the assent of 283 out of its 292 members, concurred in the same. The lay delegates, who had been provisionally elected in anticipation of this action, were at once admitted to their seats. It is provided that “ the ministerial and lay delegates shall sit and deliberate together as one body, but they shall vote separately whenever such separate vote shall be demanded by one third of either order; and in such cases the concurrent vote of both orders shall be necessary to complete an action.”

**8. The Bishops:** are assignee to certain residences, and some of them are limited to particular foreign fields. The following are their names, with the year of their ordination, and other facts:

- Thomas Coke.....1784 — Died at sea, May 3, 1814, aged 66.  
 Francis Asbury .....1784.-Died in Virginia, March 31,1816, aged 70.  
 Richard Whatcoat .... 1800 — Died in Delaware, July 5, 1806, aged 71.  
 William M’Kendree .... 1808.-Died in Tennessee, March 5, 1835, aged 77.  
 Enoch George .....1816.-Died in Virginia, August 23, 1828, age 60.  
 Robert R. Roberts .....1816. — Died in Indiana, March 28, 1843, aged 64.  
 Joshua Soule E.....184. -Ent. M. E. Church, South, 1845; died March 6,1867, aged 85.  
 Elijah Hedding . ....1824.-Died in Poughkeepsie, April 9, 1852, aged 72.  
 James O. Andrew .....1832.-Bishop M. E. Church, South, 1845 ; died March 2,1871, aged 77.  
 Then Emory .....1832.-Died in Maryland, Dec. 16, 1835, aged 46.  
 Beverly Waugh.....1836.-Died in Maryland, Feb. 9, 1858, aged 69.  
 Thomas A. Morris ..... 1836.-Died in Ohio, Sept. 2,1874, aged 80.  
 Leonidas L. Hamline ...1844.-Resigned, 1852; died in Iowa, March 22, 1865, aged 67.  
 Edmund S. Janes .....1844.-Died in N. Y. City, Sept. 18, 1816, aged 69.  
 Levi Scott ..... 1852. Died in Odessa, Del., July 13, 188n , aged 80.



- Matthew Simpson .... 1852.-Died in Philadelphia, June 18, 1884, aged 73.  
 Osmon C. Baker .....1852.-Died in Concord, N. H., Dec. 20, 1871, aged 58.  
 Edward R. Ames.... 1852.-Died in Baltimore, April 25, 1879, aged 73.  
 Francis Burns .....1858.-Miss. Bp. to Liberia; died in Baltimore, April 18, 1863.  
 Davis W. Clark -.....1864.-Died in Cincinnati, May 23, 1871, aged 59.  
 Edward Thomson 1864. Died in Wheeling, W. Va., March 22, 1870, aged 59.  
 Calvin Kingsley .... 1864.-Died in Beirut, Syria, April 6, 1870, aged 57.  
 John W. Roberts ..... 1866.-Died in Liberia, Jan. 30, 1876, aged 54.  
 Thomas Bowman ....1872.-Residence, St. Louis.  
 William L. Harris .... 1872.-Died in N. Y. City, Sept. 2, 1887, aged 69.  
 Randolph S. Foster .... 1812.-Residence, Roxbury, Mass.  
 Isaac W. Wiley ... 1872.-Died in Foochow, China, Nov. 22, 1884, aged 59.  
 Stephen M. Merrill ....871.-Residence, Chicago Ill.  
 Edward G. Andrews ... 1872.-Residence, New York City.  
 Gilbert Haven ..... 1872.-Died in Malden, Mass., Jan. 3, 1880, aged 59.  
 Jesse T. Peck .....1872.-Died in Syracuse, N. Y., May 15, 1883, aged 72.  
 Henry W. Warren ....1880.-Residence, Denver, Col.  
 Cyrus D. Foss.;..... 1880.-Residence, Philadelphia, Pa.  
 John F. Hurst .....1880.-Residence, Washington, D. C.  
 Erastus O. Haven....1880. Died in Salem, Ore., Aug. 2, 1881, aged 61.  
 William X. Ninde ....1884.-Residence, Topeka, Kan.  
 John M. Walden .....1884.-Residence, Cincinnati, O.  
 Willard F. Mallalieu... 1884.-Residence, New Orleans, La.  
 Charles H. Fowler ....1884.-Residence, San Francisco, Cal.  
 William Taylor .....1884.-Miss. Bishop to Africa.  
 John H. Vincent..... 1888.-Residence, Buffalo, N. Y.  
 James N. Fitzgerald.... 1888.-Residence, Minneapolis, Minn.  
 Isaac W. Joyce..... 1888.-Residence, Chattanooga, Tenn.  
 John P. Newman.....1888.-Residence, Omaha, Neb.  
 Daniel A. Goodsell.... 1888. — Residence, Fort Worth, Tex.  
 James M. Thoburn... 1888.-Miss. Bp. to India and Malaysia.

**V. Statistics.** — There are in the denomination 76 Annual Conferences, whose statistics show in 1872 10,242 travelling preachers, 11,964 local preachers, 1,458,441 members and probationers. 17,471 Sunday-schools, with 1,278,559 scholars and 193,691 officers and teachers, and 14,008 churches and 4484 parsonages, valued together at \$8,575,877. The baptisms for the year were 53,459 children and 61,311 adults. The benevolent contributions for the year were, for the Missionary Society,

\$671,000 21; Woman's Foreign Missionary Society, \$18,755 34; Church Extension Society, \$94,572 63.; Tract Society, \$21,585 67; Sunday-school Union, \$22,674 15; American Bible Society, \$42,528 35; Freedman's Aid Society, \$12,048 97; Education, \$6,660 42; and for necessitous ministers, \$150,140 62-making an aggregate of \$1,039,966 36. *SEE METHODISM.* (D.A.W.)

## Methodist Episcopal Church In Canada

The first Canadian Methodist Society, as nearly as can be ascertained, was formed in the township of Augusta, in Upper Canada (now Ontario), in 1778. Its first members were some of the parties who had constituted the first Methodist Society in New York. *SEE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.* Prominent names were those of Paul and Barbara Heck; their three sons, John, Jacob, and Samuel; John and Catharine Lawrence-Mrs. Lawrence had been the widow of Philip Embury; and Samuel Embury, a son of Philip Embury. Besides these, it was joined by such others of the scattered settlers of Augusta as wished to. unite with them in Christian fellowship. Samuel Embury was the classleader. About two years after the organization of this society, viz. in 1780, Mr. Tuffey, a Methodist local preacher from England, then connected with a regiment stationed at Quebec, preached to his comrades and to the towns-people; but it does not appear that he attempted to form any regular class.

Methodism was introduced into the country about Niagara and westward by the Revelation George Neal, who was born in Pennsylvania Feb. 28, 1751. He was converted under the ministry of the Revelation Hope Hull. Mr. Neal became a local-preacher, and went into Canada in 1786. He settled in the Niagara District, taught school during the week, and preached to the people on the Sabbath, and frequently on week-day evenings. Following the illustrious examples of Nelson, in England, Williams, in Ireland, and Embury, in New York, Neal collected together those who had been converted through his instrumentality, and formed a society in the township of Stamford- in 1790, appointing Christian Warner the class-leader, an office which he continued to fill until his death, March 21, 1833. This class, collected without the intervention of any travelling preacher, as was also the above class in Augusta, embraced among its members a number who afterwards distinguished themselves as pillars in the Church of God (*Hist. of the M. E. Church in Canada*, p. 34). The ministrations of Mr. Neal were approved by his brethren in the United

States and Canada, and he was therefore ordained deacon by bishop Asbury July 23, 1810, at the Annual Conference held that year at Lyons, in the State of New York.

The Rev. William Losee was the first itinerant Methodist preacher on Canadian soil. In 1789: or the beginning of 1790 he was visiting some of his friends and relatives near Kingston, Upper Canada. Being zealous in the Master's work, he improved his visit by preaching whenever opportunity offered. The people heard him gladly, and, having been, edified by his labors, they sent a petition to the New York Conference, of which he was a member, requesting that body to send Losee among them, and he was appointed. The first class was organized Feb. 20, 1791; the second March 2 of the same year-the very day on which John Wesley died. From' this year the Methodist societies and congregations were regularly supplied with missionaries from the Church in the United States. The ministers in what was then a wilderness endured great privations, and encountered formidable dangers; but they were indefatigable in their labors, through zeal for God and for the salvation of the people.

Early Methodism in Canada, as well as in Europe and the United States, had to contend with great opposition. Its most formidable foes were those who were determined upon the aggrandizement and dominancy of what they called the Established Church, although no such thing as a Church establishment had been constituted in those provinces by legal enactment. These would-be adherents of the Church of England were violent in their hostility to Methodism, as were also the members of some other Protestant churches, to say nothing about the Roman Catholics. An instance of the intolerant spirit manifested towards the early Methodist preachers is presented by the following facts. In 1788 Mr. James M'Carty, an adherent of Mr Whitefield, went from the United States and settled in Earnestown, near the shore of the Bay of Quinte. Feeling it to be his duty to preach the Gospel to his neighbors, he collected them together in their little log-cabins, and dispensed to them the Word of Life. He was interfered with by parties from Kingston, who, clothed with a little brief authority, caused him to be dragged from the place of worship, from his peaceful and happy home, and from the bosom of his family. They cast him into prison, and, after giving him some sort of a trial, sentenced him to banishment from the country. He was taken away from Kingston by his persecutors, and his family saw his face no more. -He is supposed to have been murdered. Mr. Neal was likewise ordered to leave the country; but the hand of God

interposed, and finally he was allowed to remain, and to continue his Christian labors. The spirit of intolerance continued for many years, though, as time advanced, it manifested itself in some what less violent forms. Lawsuits were entered against some of the early preachers for celebrating marriage between the members of their own congregations, and they were ordered into exile on this account. But none of these things moved the devoted men who were sent by bishop Asbury and the New York and Genesee conferences. Steady to their purpose, namely, the advancement of the cause of Christ, their watchword was "Onward!" At the commencement of this century, about ten years after Mr. Losee first entered Canada, the work stood as follows: 1 district, 4 circuits, 7 preachers, and 936 members.

During the next decade the increase in Church membership was still more encouraging. The privations of the preachers were nearly the same, and their labors, if possible, still more arduous, because they had to extend their work yet further into the forest. They had to ford dangerous streams, plod through deep swamps, and often camp out during the night in the dreary woods, with their saddle-bags for a pillow, the canopy of heaven and the foliage of the trees for covering; the faithful horse standing sentinel near his master, suffering with him from cold and hunger. Many a long and dismal night was thus spent by these self-sacrificing men, sometimes aroused from their brief repose by the screeching of owls, the howling of wolves, or the war-whoop of the savage. But the great desire of their hearts was realized - the success of the Gospel cause. In 1810 there were 2 districts, 5 circuits, 19 preachers, and 2795 members. The Upper Canada district was placed under the direction of the Genesee Annual Conference in 1810, and the Lower Canada district in 1811.

Great success attended the preaching of the Word; and the connection continued to prosper until the occurrence of the unhappy War of 1812. Several of the preachers appointed to Canadian circuits were prevented from entering upon their charges because the Canadian government had issued a proclamation ordering all Americans to leave the country before the 3d of July. A few of the preachers already resident determined to risk the danger of remaining; others were British-born subjects, and these, with the assistance of local preachers, supplied the work. During the unhappy conflict, the societies sustained great loss, as will appear from the statistics of the Church at the Genesee Conference of 1815, which was held shortly after peace was declared. The Canada work was reported at that

Conference as follows: 2 districts, 9 circuits, 14 preachers, and 1765 members- a decrease since 1810 of 1.030 members. The war-cloud having passed over, and the sunshine of peace once more shedding its benign rays upon both countries, the Genesee Conference resumed its care of the Canadian Church. But, though the two nations continued at peace, the Methodist societies were doomed to be agitated and divided by men sent out by the English Methodists as missionaries. The bitterness and heartburnings which were produced by the rivalry that ensued retarded to some extent the advancement of the cause in certain localities; but in the greater part of their field the American Methodists steadily increased in numbers, influence, and spirituality.

The year 1817 was distinguished for the most remarkable revival influence that had yet been witnessed in Canada. The Genesee Annual Conference that year was held in Elizabethtown, Upper Canada, commencing June 21, bishop George presiding. An Annual Conference was a new thing in Canada, and therefore great crowds of people attended the ministry of the Word, especially on the Sabbath. The number of preachers present was large, and all were anxious to build up the walls of Zion. Religious services commenced at eight o'clock on Sabbath morning, and the Lord manifested himself with power. Many were seeking redemption before the hour had arrived at which the bishop was to preach, so that when he entered the house the congregation was aglow with the fire of divine love. Hundreds were present. The bishop preached one of his most able and impressive sermons, and the discourse had a powerful effect upon his hearers. The services continued all day with but little intermission, and it was not until late in the evening that the people dispersed. It is believed that more than one hundred souls were brought to Christ at this Conference. But the work of reformation did not end there. The preachers went from the Conference refreshed and strengthened, preaching with great effect Christ, the power of God, and the wisdom of God. On all the circuits the Word prevailed mightily, sinners were converted, and believers quickened. 'For more than three years there were constant additions to the Church throughout the Canadian work; and in some instances the revival influence extended to the border circuits in the United States. In 1820 the Genesee Conference was again held in Canada. The church in which it assembled was at the west end of "Lundy's Lane," near the spot where six years previously the British and American soldiers had met in deadly conflict. How great the change now. Americans and Canadians, actuated by the love of Christ,

united harmoniously in council and effort to build up the walls of Zion, and rejoiced together in the triumphs of the Gospel of peace. There were about one hundred preachers present at the Conference. Bishop George presided, still exerting the same holy influence upon preachers and people as in 1817. Thirty preachers were ordained at this Conference. Some of this number were local preachers residing in Canada. The 'state of the work in' 1820 was 2 districts, 17 circuits, 28 preachers, 47 local preachers, 65 exhorters, and 5557 members.

In the same year a settlement was effected between the General Conference and the English Conference, by which it was agreed that the Methodist Episcopal Church should withdraw its ministers from Lower Canada, and give up that province, with all its Church property therein, to the management of the English Conference; and that the English Conference should in like manner withdraw its missionaries from Upper Canada, and give up that province, with all its Church property therein, to the Methodist Episcopal Church (comp. *History of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada*, p.127-154). The rival interest having been withdrawn from Upper Canada-with the exception of Kingston, where the English Conference continued to keep one of its missionaries-the societies of the Methodist Episcopal Church, once more in the enjoyment of peace, soon recovered from the effects of the recent agitations, and were greatly prospered in spiritual things. - So rapidly had the work extended, that in 1824 the General Conference held in Baltimore consented to the establishment of an Annual Conference for Canada.

The Canada Conference was organized at Hallowell, Upper Canada, August 25, 1824. Bishops George and Hading were present, and presided in turn. The preacher-, numbered, including the two bishops- and those on trial, thirty-three persons. This was a small number compared with the numbers who met at Elizabethtown in 1817, or at Lundy's Lane in 1820. For four years longer the bishops event into Canada and presided at the sessions of the Canada Conference, appointing the preachers to the several charges, both preachers and societies cheerfully accepting such appointments. The work continued to extend and prosper, and Methodism was fast becoming a power in the land. But the good it was accomplishing among the people, instead of removing the prejudices of its opponents, only tended to infuse fear of its great and growing influence among the advocates of a State Church. Among the Methodists, also, there were some who advocated the independent establishment of the Canadian

Methodist Episcopal Church, on the ground that it would secure to the Canadian Methodists greater civil and religious liberty. Prominent among these was the Revelation H. Ryan, who had been agitating for a separation of the societies in Canada from the parent Church in the United States since 1820. The scheme was presented to the people on national and patriotic grounds, and the General Conference was memorialized on the subject, and at its session held at Pittsburgh, May, 1828, the request was granted. Accordingly, the Canadian Methodists were on October 2, 1828, organized into the Methodist Episcopal Church of Canada. In 1828 there were 3 districts, 48 travelling preachers, 7 superannuated preachers, and 32 circuits, with a membership of 9678. The increase for the year was 1033.

From 1828 until 1832 the infant Church in Canada had unprecedented success, considering the opposition it met with from the Rev. H. Ryan and his followers, who separated themselves from the connection in 1829, and organized another body. The provisional government was quite as hostile to the Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada after 1828 as it had been before its separation from the parent body. Parliament vindicated the rights of the preachers and Church, but the executive was not only confederated with the Church and State party in the country to cripple the energies of the original Methodists of the province, but was intriguing with the English Wesleyan Missionary Committee to induce that body-in violation of the settlement of 1820-to send their agents again into the country to form rival societies, large sums of money from the, public revenue being promised if these missionaries would come. The scheme of the executive was successful, and Dr. Alder was sent out by the Missionary- Committee to commence operations in Upper Canada in 1832. It was to avoid a collision with these agents of the English Conference, and also in evident anticipation of large financial supplies, that the great majority of the preachers consented to revolutionize the newly-organized Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada, and to become a mere dependency of the English Conference.

This unconstitutional movement was resisted by some of the preachers, and by hundreds of the members. Despite remonstrance, however, the Canada Conference consummated its union with the English body, taking with it most of the Church property, nearly all the preachers, and the principal part of the membership. Some of the former, and hundreds of the latter, disapproving of the proceedings of the Conference, yet submitted from hopelessness of successful resistance. A respectable minority protested

against the action of the Conference, maintaining that the discipline of the Church did not vest in the Conference the powers assumed by it in that action, and that therefore the action was null and void. They also maintained that if the General Conference had possessed the powers it claimed, its action was nevertheless null and void, because persons were allowed to take part in its proceedings who, according to the discipline of the Church, were not 'members of the General Conference. The protestants further claimed that, having joined an Episcopal Church, they could not without their own consent be made members of a non-Episcopal Church; neither could they, without fault of their own, be deprived of their membership in the Church they had joined; that they therefore were still members of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada, and that said Church remained in its constitution and government intact-the action of the Conference amounting to nothing more than the withdrawal of the Conference and those who followed it from the Church.

Those preachers, travelling and local, who continued to adhere to the Methodist Episcopal Church, therefore exerted themselves to collect together the scattered remnants remaining faithful to the old Church. The win of 1833-34 was spent in this particular work no easy task, because of the extent of country which had to be traversed; but the few preachers who adhered to the original Church organization were indefatigable in their efforts to rebuild the broken-down walls of their beloved Zion. The Conference assembled at Yonge Street in June, 1834, when it was ascertained that only fourteen preachers could be calculated upon who were prepared to take work the ensuing year; with a membership of 1100-a decrease during eight months of 13,899. These statistics, however, did not represent the true status of the Church, for many more of the people returned to the old fold as soon as they found that there was sufficient vitality left in it to reconstruct and carry on the work of God in the land. Ten years after the disruption of 1833, viz. in 1843, there were seventy effective ministers and preachers supplying circuits and stations in Upper Canada, besides superannuated and supernumerary preachers, and a goodly staff of local preachers, who were doing efficient service in the Master's vineyard. The membership had increased to 8880, and there had been a corresponding increase of Church property. It will be remembered that at the union in 1833 the Church had lost almost all its connectional property, and this made the subsequent increase the more marked.



In January, 1845, the *Canada Christian Advocate*, a weekly paper, was established to supply the place in Church literature formerly occupied by the *Christian Guardian*. This medium of communication drew the societies and preachers more closely together, and enabled all better to understand the true position of the Church, and the work accomplished through its agency. It is still the weekly official paper.

‘The connection has now a book-room and publishinghouse, located in the thriving and beautiful city of Hamilton, at the head of Lake Ontario. The class of publications and papers sent out from it very greatly benefits the Church, and assists in advancing the cause of Christ through the country generally.

There are two colleges under the direction and control of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada, viz. Albert College, vested with university powers, and Alexandra College, for the education of young ladies. These educational establishments are located in Belleville, in a healthy situation, surrounded by pleasing scenery, and in full view of the pure and placid waters of the Bay of Quinte, about fifty miles west from Kingston. Under the able management of the president, Revelation A. Carman, MA., these institutions are prospering and are exerting an influence for good in the country.

The Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada is composed of three Annual Conferences, with a delegated General Conference which meets every fourth year, and has the same legislative powers as the parent body in the United States. The present position of the Church, therefore, is: One General Conference, three Annual Conferences-Niagara, Ontario, and Bay of Quinte ten extensive districts, 145 circuits and stations, 228 travelling preachers, 225 local preachers, 21,818 members, with Church property amounting to \$2,149,776. Great attention is given to the Sabbath-school work. As nearly as can be estimated, from reports at hand, there are not far from 30,000 children in the Sunday-schools.

The polity of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada is like that of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States: the bishop taking the general oversight of the connection, presiding at the Conferences, and proceeding in almost every respect in a similar manner to that of the bishops of the parent body. The late incumbent of the bishopric, the Revelation J. Richardson, D.D., Yorkville, Ontario, died in 1874. See

Webster, *Hist. M. Epis. Ch., Canada; Meth. Qu. Revelation* 1863, Jan. p. 169 sq.; 1863, Apr. p. 204; 1868, Apr. p. 264; 1871, Jan. p. 173. (T. W.)

## Methodist Episcopal Church, South

**I. Early History.** — In the year 1766 Philip Embury and Captain Thomas Webb, Methodist local preachers, began to preach in New York, and in the same year Robert Strawbridge, also a local preacher, in Maryland. In 1769 Richard Boardman and Joseph Pilmoor were sent over to America as missionaries by the Rev. John Wesley; and they were followed in 1771 by Francis Asbury and Richard Wright. In 1772 Asbury was made general assistant, that is, superintendent, under Wesley, of the Methodist societies in America. They were all connected with the Colonial Church of England, until that Church was disbanded after the Revolution. As they had no ordained ministers, and the English bishops would not ordain any for them, though importuned to do so by Wesley, he undertook to ordain some for them himself, and to organize his societies into a regular Episcopal Church, to take the place, so far as the Methodists were concerned, of the old Colonial Church. The Methodist Episcopal Church in America, as it was styled, was organized in 1784. The Rev. John Wesley, MA, consecrated the Rev. Thomas Coke, LLD., who was, like himself, a presbyter of the Church of England, to the office of superintendent, or bishop, of the new organization—other clergymen of the Church of England assisting in the consecration. Richard Whatcoat and Thomas Vasey were at the same time ordained elders, or presbyters, for the American Church. Conferences of the preachers had been held annually from the year 1773; but now a special Conference was convened in Baltimore, and bishop Coke consecrated Francis Asbury as bishop, and several elders and deacons were ordained at the same time. The Conference gave its suffrage to all these appointments. Wesley and his associates proceeded upon the true principle that the Episcopacy is derived from the Plesbytery of the Church, so far as it differs from the latter in this respect reverting to the ancient regimen which recognised the bishop as *primus inter pares*. Certain functions of government are ordinarily restricted to the Episcopacy to prevent schism and confusion, but with no idea of a *jus divinum*—as if bishops were, by God's ordinance, a third order in the ministry, and that there can be no Church without one of them. Thus the American Methodists became truly Episcopal, without any tincture of either Romish, Oriental, or Anglican prelacy—that, indeed, being precluded by the repudiation of the dogma of

uninterrupted apostolical succession. The Church being thus organized with a Liturgy and Confession of Faith, judiciously abridged by Mr. Wesley from the Prayer-book and Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, and a Discipline essentially the same as that of the parent Wesleyan body in England, went forward with astonishing success, extending all over the territory of the United States and Canada. As the exigencies required, new bishops were consecrated, and various modifications took place in the discipline of the Church. In 1792 it was ordered that all the travelling preachers in full connection should attend the General Conference; in 1800 this was restricted to all who had travelled four years; in 1804 this was explained to mean “from the time they were received on trial by an Annual Conference.” But as their number multiplied, a delegated General Conference was organized to meet quadrennially the first meeting being in 1812. The ratio of representation was one delegate to every five travelling preachers in full connection. This ratio has been repeatedly altered, in view of the constant increase of the Annual Conferences. The General Conference was bound by the following restrictive rules: “The General Conference shall have full powers to make rules and regulations for our Church, under the following limitations and restrictions, namely:

- 1.** The General Conference shall not revoke, alter, or change our articles of religion, nor establish any new standards or rules of doctrine contrary to our present existing and established standards of doctrine.
- 2.** They shall not allow of more than one representative for every five members of the Annual Conference, nor allow of a less number than one for every seven.
- 3.** They shall not change or alter any part or rule of our government, so as to do away Episcopacy, or destroy the plan of :our general superintendency.
- 4.** They shall not revoke or change the General Rules of the United Societies.
- 5.** They shall not do away the privileges of our ministers or preachers of trial by a committee, and of an appeal; neither shall they do away the privileges of our members of trial before the society, or by a committee, and of an appeal.

**6.** They shall not appropriate the produce of the Book Concern, nor of the Chartered Fund, to any purpose other than for the benefit of the travelling, supernumerary, superannuated, and worn-out preachers, their wives, widows, and children. Provided, nevertheless, that upon the joint recommendation of all the Annual Conferences, then a majority of two thirds of the General Conference succeeding shall suffice to alter any of the above restrictions." In 1832 the proviso was changed thus: "Provided, nevertheless, that upon the concurrent recommendation of three fourths of all the members of the several Annual Conferences who shall be present and vote on such recommendation, then a majority of two thirds of the General Conference succeeding shall suffice to. alter any of the above restrictions excepting the first article; and also, whenever such alteration or alterations shall have been first recommended by two thirds of the General Conference, so soon as three fourths of the members of all the Annual Conferences shall have concurred as aforesaid, such alteration or alterations shall take effect."

**II.** *The Slavery Question.* — From the beginning the American, Methodists legislated on the subject of negro slavery—at first (1780) advising the members holding slaves to emancipate them; then (1783) warning local preachers that it may be necessary to suspend them if they did not in one year emancipate their slaves, if they held them ‘contrary to the laws which authorize their freedom in any of the United States;’ then (1784) ordering that those who bought negroes to hold them as slaves, being previously warned, should be expelled; and forbidding them to sell them on any consideration; and suspending the local preachers in Maryland, Delaware, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey who refused to emancipate them, but “trying those in Virginia another year.” All this was before the Church was organized. At the time of the organization of the Church, the following rules were adopted:

“**Quest. 41.** Are there any directions to be given concerning the negroes?”

**Ans.** Let every preacher, as often as possible, meet them in class; and let the assistant always appoint a proper white person as their leader. Let the assistants also make a regular return to the Conference of the number of negroes in society in their respective circuits.

“**Quest. 42.** What methods can we take to extirpate slavery?”

**Ans.** We are deeply conscious of the impropriety of making new terms of communion for a religious society already established, excepting on the most pressing occasion ; and such we esteem the practice of holding our fellow-creatures in slavery. We view it as contrary to the golden law of God, on which hang all the law and the prophets, and the inalienable rights of mankind, as well as every principle of the Revolution, to hold in the deepest debasement, in a more abject slavery than is perhaps to be found in any part of the world except America, so many souls that are all capable of the image of God. We therefore think it our most bounden duty to take immediately some effectual method to extirpate this abomination from among us; and for that purpose we add the following to the rules of our society, viz.:

- 1.** Every member of our society who has slaves in his possession shall, within twelve months after notice given to him by the assistant (which notice the assistants are required immediately, and without any delay, to give in their respective circuits), legally execute and record an instrument - whereby he emancipates and send free every slave in his possession who is between the ages of forty and forty-five immediately, or at furthest when they arrive at the age of forty-five; and every slave who is between the ages of twenty-five and forty immediately, or at furthest at the expiration of five years from the date of the said instrument; and every slave who is between the ages of twenty and twenty-five immediately, or at furthest when they arrive at the age of thirty; and every slave under the age of twenty, as soon as they arrive at the age of twenty-five, at furthest; and every infant born in slavery after the above-mentioned rules are complied with immediately on its birth.
- 2.** Every assistant shall keep a journal, in which he shall regularly minute down the names and ages of all the slaves belonging to all the masters in his respective circuit, and also the date of every instrument executed and recorded for the manumission of the slaves, with the name of the court, book, and folio in which the said instruments respectively shall have been recorded; which journal shall be handed down in each circuit to the succeeding assistants.
- 3.** In consideration that these rules form a new term of communion, every person concerned, who will not comply with them, shall have liberty quietly to withdraw himself from our society within the twelve months

succeeding the notice given as aforesaid: otherwise the assistant shall exclude him in the society.

**4.** No person so voluntarily withdrawn, or so excluded, shall ever partake of the Supper of the Lord with the Methodists till he complies with the above requisitions.

**5.** No person holding slaves shall, in future, be admitted into society or to the Lord's Supper till he previously complies with these rules concerning slavery. NB.-These rules are to affect the members of our society no further than as they are consistent with the laws of the states in which they reside. And respecting our brethren in Virginia that are concerned, and after due consideration of their peculiar circumstances, we allow them two years from the notice given to consider the expedience of compliance or non-compliance with these rules.

**“Quest. 43.** What shall be done with those who buy or sell slaves, or give them away?

**Ans.** They are immediately to be expelled, unless they buy them on purpose to free them.”

In 1785 these rules were suspended, as it was thought they “ would do harm,” though still the destruction of slavery was to be sought “by all wise and prudent means.” In 1796 the following section was inserted in the Discipline:

**“Quest.** What regulations shall be made for the extirpation of the crying evil of African slavery?

**Ans. 1.** We declare that we are more than ever convinced of the great evil of the African slavery which still exists in these United States, and do most earnestly recommend to the Yearly Conferences, quarterly meetings, and to those who have the oversight of districts and circuits, to be exceedingly cautious what persons they admit to official stations in our Church; and in the case of future admission to official stations, to require such security of those who hold slaves for the emancipation of them, immediately or gradually, as the laws of the states respectively, and the circumstances of the case will admit; and we do fully authorize all the Yearly Conferences to make whatever regulations they judge proper, in the present case, respecting the admission of persons to official stations in our Church.

- 2.** No slaveholder shall be received into society till the preacher who has the oversight of the circuit has spoken to him freely and faithfully on the subject of slavery.
- 3.** Every member of the society who sells a slave shall immediately, after full proof, be excluded the society. And if any member of our society purchase a slave, the ensuing quarterly meeting shall determine on the number of years in which the slave so purchased would work out the price of, his purchase. And the person so purchasing shall, immediately after such determination, execute a legal instrument for the manumission of such slave at the expiration of the term determined by the quarterly meeting. And in default of his executing such instrument of manumission, or on his refusal to submit his case to the judgment of the quarterly meeting, such member shall be excluded the society. *Provided. also*, that in the case of a female slave it shall be inserted in the aforesaid instrument of manumission that all her children who shall be born during the years of her servitude shall be free at the following times, namely: every female child at the age of twenty-one, and every male child at the age of twenty-five. *Nevertheless*, if the member of our society executing the said instrument of manumission judge it proper, he may fix the times of manumission of the children of the female slaves before mentioned at an earlier age than that which is prescribed above.
- 4.** The preachers and other members of our society are requested to consider the subject of negro slavery with deep attention till the ensuing General Conference; and that they impart to the General Conference, through the medium of the Yearly Conferences, or otherwise, any important thoughts upon the subject, that the Conference may have full light, in order to take further steps towards the eradicating this enormous evil from that part of the Church of God to which we are united.”

In 1800 the following new paragraphs were inserted:

“**5.** When any travelling preacher becomes an owner of a slave or slaves by any means, he shall forfeit his ministerial character in our Church, unless he execute, if it be practicable, a legal emancipation of such slaves, conformably to the laws of the state in which he lives.

**6.** The Annual Conferences are directed to draw up addresses for the gradual emancipation of the slaves to the legislatures of those states in which no general laws have been passed for that purpose. These

addresses shall urge, in the most respectful but pointed manner, the necessity of a law for the gradual emancipation of the slaves; proper committees shall be appointed by the Annual Conferences, out of the most respectable of our friends, for the conducting of the business; and the presiding elders, elders, deacons, and travelling preachers, shall secure as many proper signatures as possible to the addresses, and give all the assistance in their power in every respect to aid the committees, and to further this blessed undertaking. Let this be continued from year to year till the desired end be accomplished.”

In 1804 the following alterations were made: the question reads, “What shall be done for the extirpation of the evil of slavery?” In paragraph 1 (1796), instead of “more than ever convinced,” it reads, “as much as ever convinced;” and instead of “the African slavery which still exists in these United States;,” it reads simply “slavery.” In paragraph 4 (3 of 1796), respecting the selling of a slave, before the words “shall immediately,” the following clause is inserted: “Except at the request of the slave, in cases of mercy and humanity, agreeably to the judgment of a committee of the male members of the society, appointed by the preacher who has the charge of the circuit.” This new proviso was inserted: “Provided also, that if a member of our society shall buy a slave with a certificate of future emancipation, the terms of emancipation shall, notwithstanding, be subject to the decision of the Quarterly-meeting Conference.” All after “nevertheless” was stricken out, and the following substituted: “The members of our societies in the states of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Tennessee shall be exempted from the operation of the above rules.” The paragraphs about considering the subject of slavery and petitioning legislatures were cancelled, and this was added:

“**6.** Let the preachers, from time to time, as occasion serves, admonish and exhort all slaves to render due respect and obedience to the commands and interests of their respective masters.”

In 1808 it was ordered that “no slaveholder shall be eligible to the office of an elder, where the laws will admit of emancipation, and permit the liberated slave to enjoy freedom;” but all that related to slaveholding among private members, and paragraph 5 of 1804, were cancelled, and the following substituted:

“**3.** The General Conference authorizes each Annual Conference to form their own regulations relative to buying and selling slaves.”



In 1812 this was altered thus:

**“3.** Whereas the laws of some of the states do not admit of emancipating of slaves without a special act of the legislature, the General Conference authorizes each Annual Conference to form their own regulations relative to buying and selling slaves.”

In 1816 paragraph 1 of 1796 was altered thus:

**“1.** We declare that we are as much as ever convinced of the great evil of slavery; therefore no slaveholder shall be eligible to any official station in our Church hereafter, where the laws of the state in which he lives will admit of emancipation, and permit the liberated slave to enjoy freedom.”

In 1820 the paragraph leaving it to the Annual Conferences “to form their own regulations about buying and selling slaves” was cancelled. In 1824 the following paragraphs were added:

**“4.** All our preachers shall prudently enforce, upon our members the necessity of teaching their slaves to read the Word of God; and to allow them time to attend upon the public worship of God on our regular days of divine service.

**5.** Our colored preachers and official members shall have all the privileges which are usual to others in the District and Quarterly Conferences, where the usages of the country do not forbid it. And the presiding elder may hold for them a separate District Conference, where the number of colored local preachers will justify it.

**6.** The Annual Conferences may employ colored preachers to travel and preach where their services are judged necessary; provided that no one shall be so employed without having been recommended according to the Form of Discipline.”

The General Rules drawn up by Mr. Wesley for the Methodist societies in England were not placed in the Discipline at the time of the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church in America in 1784. They were inserted, with some alterations, by bishops Coke and Asbury in 1789. The bishops took the liberty of interpolating the rule forbidding “the buying or selling the bodies and souls of men with an intention to enslave them.” In 1792 it was altered thus: “The buying or selling of men, women, or children, with

an intention to enslave them.” In 1808 thus: “The buying and selling of men, women, and children, with an intention to enslave them.” In view of the time and manner of its introduction, and its peculiar phraseology, this rule was considered to refer to the African slave-trade, and not to the transfer of those already in slavery from one person to another; hence it met with but little opposition in the South, which denounced that odious traffic. The later General Conferences, down to that of 1840, were conservative on this subject, and this latter affirmed the right of local preachers in Maryland and Virginia who held slaves to ordination, from which they had been debarred by the Baltimore Conference. As the Southern States did not allow the emancipation of slaves without expatriation, both ministers and members held them without violation of the Discipline. As slavery was a civil and social institution, it was impossible for the Church to exist in the South without this permission. In this respect the Methodist Episcopal Church only imitated the Apostolic and Primitive Church, which allowed of slavery among both the membership and ministry, and made laws for the regulation of the same. Mr. Wesley pursued the same course in the West Indies, licensing Mr. Gilbert, a slaveholder, to preach, and baptizing his slaves. The British Conference did so too, charging its ministers in the West Indies to have nothing to do with the institution of slavery, as that was a matter belonging to the legislature, but to preach the Gospel alike to master and slave. Thus, after a tortuous legislation on the vexed question, which scarcely knows a parallel in Church history, the Methodist Episcopal Church in America appears to have been settling down upon a satisfactory and permanent basis.

**III. *The Separation.*** — But when the General Conference met in 1844, in New York, the Revelation Francis A. Harding, of the Baltimore Conference, appealed to it from the decision of that Conference, which had suspended him from the ministry for hot manumitting slaves belonging to his wife. The General Conference confirmed the decision of the Baltimore Conference, despite the laws of Maryland and of the Discipline. It was ascertained, too, that one of the bishops, James Osgood Andrew, residing in Georgia, had become connected with slavery. Neither he nor Mr. Harding had either bought or sold a slave. Bishop Andrew was *legally* in possession of a slave, bequeathed him by a lady, and whom he would liberate at any time, but she would not receive her freedom; also a boy, left by his former wife to his daughter without will; him, too, he would

willingly manumit if he could do so by the laws of Georgia; also slaves legally his by his second marriage, whom he could not own, but secured them by deed to his wife, to whom they belonged-the law not allowing their emancipation. But after a lengthened, excited, and very able discussion of the question on both sides, the General Conference adopted the following preamble and resolution: "Whereas, the Discipline of the Church forbids the doing anything calculated to destroy our itinerant and general superintendency; and whereas, bishop Andrew has become connected with slavery, by marriage and otherwise, and this act having drawn after it circumstances which, in the estimation of the General Conference, will greatly embarrass the exercise of his office as an itinerant general superintendent, if not, in some places, entirely prevent it; therefore, Resolved, That it is the sense of this General Conference that he desist from the exercise of this office so long as this impediment remains." The vote stood 111 for and 69 against all in the affirmative, except one (and he a Northerner), being from Northern Conferences, the Baltimore Conference being equally divided: several from the Northern Conferences, however, voted in the negative. The bishops had requested the General Conference to suspend action in the premises, suggesting that arrangements might be made to retain bishop Andrew in office, as his services would be "welcome and cordial" in the South. Resolutions declaring the action in the case of bishop Andrew, to be advisory only, and not to be considered in the light of a judicial mandate, and postponing its final disposition, according to the suggestion of the bishops, were laid on the table by a vote of 75 to 68 the South, of course, voting in the negative. Resolutions proposing two General Conferences were referred to a committee, which could not agree on a report. The Southern delegates then presented the following "Declaration:" "The delegates of the Conferences in the slaveholding states take leave to *declare* to the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church that the continued agitation on the subject of slavery and abolition in a portion of the Church, the frequent action on that subject in the General Conference, and especially the extra-judicial proceedings against bishop Andrew, which resulted on Saturday last in the virtual suspension of him from his office as superintendent, must produce a state of things in the South which renders a continuance of the jurisdiction of the General Conference over these Conferences inconsistent with the success of the ministry in the slaveholding states." This declaration was referred to a committee of nine, composed of Northern and Southern delegates, with instructions to devise

a constitutional plan for a mutual and friendly division of the Church, provided the difficulties could not be otherwise adjusted. The minority, through Dr. Bascom, presented an elaborate protest against the action of the majority in the case of bishop Andrew, characterizing it as extra-judicial and unconstitutional-the Episcopacy being a co-ordinate branch of the government of the Church, a bishop cannot be subjected by a delegated Conference to any official disability without formal presentation of a charge of the violation of law, and conviction on trial, and no law concerning slavery had been violated by bishop Andrew; the action therefore in his case Was unconstitutional, and would establish a dangerous precedent, subversive of the union and stability of the Methodist Episcopal Church. This protest was allowed to go on the Journal, and a reply was made to it on the part of the majority. Resolutions were adopted allowing bishop Andrew's name to remain in the Minutes, Hymn-book, and Discipline as formerly; allowing him and his family a support; and leaving to him to decide what work he would do, if any, in view of the action of the Conference-the third resolution being adopted by a vote of 103 to 67. The committee of nine made their report on a plan of separation, which, after discussion and amendment, and earnest advocacy by Drs. Olin, Hamline, Bangs, Elliott, and other Northern delegates, was adopted by a nearly unanimous vote. The leaders of the North considered that the Conference was shut up to this course, as they affirmed that, under the circumstances, bishop Andrew could not preside in some of the Northern Conferences, and they believed that if he were suspended, and the Southern Church submitted to it, Methodism could not prosper in the South. Hundreds of thousands of negroes were supplied with the Gospel by the Southern Church, and access to them, especially on the plantations, would be debarred if the measure in question were submitted to by the South. Division, therefore, was inevitable. It was accomplished in the spirit of candor and charity and the rather as the Connection was getting too large, as Dr. Elliott said, for one General-Conference jurisdiction. The following is the *Plan of Separation*:

“The select committee of nine to consider and report on the declaration of the delegates from the Conferences of the slaveholding states, beg leave to submit the following report:

“*Whereas*, a declaration has been presented to this General Conference with the signatures of *fifty-one* delegates of the body, from thirteen Annual Conferences in the slaveholding states,

representing that, for various reasons enumerated, the objects and purposes of the Christian ministry and Church organization cannot be successfully accomplished by them under the jurisdiction of this General Conference as now constituted; and whereas, in the event of a separation, a contingency to which the declaration asks attention as not improbable, we esteem it the duty of this General Conference to meet the emergency with Christian kindness and the strictest equity, therefore, *Resolved*, by the delegates of the several Annual Conferences in General Conference assembled,

“**1.** That should the Annual Conferences in the slaveholding states find it necessary to unite in a distinct ecclesiastical connection, the following rule shall be observed with regard to the northern boundary of such connection: All the societies, stations, and Conferences adhering to the Church in the South, by a vote of a majority of the members of said societies, stations, and Conferences, shall remain under the unmolested pastoral care of the Southern Church; and the ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church shall in no wise attempt to organize churches or societies within the limits of the Church South, nor shall they attempt to exercise any pastoral oversight therein; it being understood that the ministry of the youth reciprocally observe the same rule in relation to stations, societies, and Conferences adhering by a vote of a majority to the Methodist Episcopal Church; provided, also, that this rule shall apply only to societies, stations, and Conferences bordering on the line of division, and not to interior charges, which shall in all cases be left to the care of that Church within whose territory they are situated.

“**2.** That ministers, local and travelling, of every grade and office in the Methodist Episcopal Church, may, as they prefer, remain in that Church, or, without blame, attach themselves to the Church South.

“**3.** *Resolved*, by the delegates of all the Annual Conferences in General Conference assembled, That we recommend to all the Annual Conferences at their first approaching sessions to authorize a change of the sixth Restrictive Article, so that the first clause shall read thus: ‘ They shall not appropriate the produce of the Book Concern, nor of the Chartered Fund, to any other purpose other than for the benefit of the travelling, supernumerary, superannuated, and worn-out preachers, their wives, widows, and children, and to such other purposes as may

be determined upon by the votes of two thirds of the members of the General Conference.’

“4. That whenever the Annual Conferences, by a vote of three fourths of all their members voting on the third resolution, shall have concurred in the recommendation to alter the sixth Restrictive Article, the agents at New York and Cincinnati shall, and they are hereby authorized and directed to deliver over to any authorized agent or appointee of the Church South,- (should one be organized), all notes and book accounts against the ministers, Church members, or citizens within its boundaries, with authority to collect the same for the sole use of the Southern Church; and that said agents also convey to the aforesaid agent or appointee of the South all the real estate, and assign to him all the property, including presses, stock, and all right and interest connected with the printing establishments at Charleston, Richmond, and Nashville, which now belong to the Methodist Episcopal Church.

“5. That when the Annual Conferences shall have approved the aforesaid change in the sixth Restrictive Article, there shall be transferred to the above agents of the Southern Church so much of the capital and produce of the Methodist Book Concern as will, with the notes, book accounts, presses, etc., mentioned in the last resolution, bear the same proportion to the whole property of said Concern that the travelling preachers in the Southern Church shall bear to all the travelling ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the division to be made on the basis of the number of travelling preachers in the forthcoming Minutes.

“6. That the above transfer shall be in ‘the form of annual payments of \$25,000 per annum, and specifically in stock of the Book Concern, and in Southern notes and accounts due the establishment; and accruing after the first transfer mentioned above; and until the payments are made the Southern Church shall share in all the net profits of the Book Concern in the proportion that the amount due them, or in arrears, bears to all the property of the Concern.

“7. That Nathan Bangs, George Peck, and James B. Finley be, and they are hereby appointed commissioners to act in concert with the same number of commissioners appointed by the Southern organization (should one be formed), to estimate the amount which will fall due to the South by the preceding rule, and to have full powers to carry into

effect the whole arrangements proposed with regard to the division of property, should the separation take place. And if by any means a vacancy occur in this, A Board of Commissioners, the Book Committee at New York shall fill said vacancy.

**“8.** That whenever ally agents of the Southern Church are clothed with legal authority or corporate power to act in the premises, the agents at New York are hereby authorized and directed to act in concert with said Southern agents, so as to give the provisions of these resolutions a legally binding force.

**“9.** That all the property of the Methodist Episcopal Church in meeting-houses, parsonages, colleges, schools, Conference funds, cemeteries, and of every kind within the limits of the Southern organization, shall be forever free from any claim set up on the part of the Methodist Episcopal Church, so far as this resolution can be of force in the premises.

**“10.** That the Church so formed in the South shall have a common right to use all the copyrights in possession of the Book Concerns at New York and Cincinnati at the time of the settlement by the commissioners.

**“11.** That the book agents at New York be directed to make such compensation to the Conferences South for their dividend from the Chartered Fund as the commissioners above provided for shall agree upon.

**“12.** That the bishops be respectfully requested to lay that part of this report requiring the action of the Annual Conferences before them as soon as possible, beginning with the New York Conference.”

The Southern delegates sent out an address to their constituents, showing what they had done, and counselling moderation and forbearance. They called for a convention of the Annual Conferences-in the ratio of one to eleven of their members-to meet in Louisville, Ky., May 1, 1845.

Meanwhile the Church in the South, in Quarterly and Annual Conferences, took action in the premises, and declared in favor of the plan of separation with a very near approach to unanimity. The convention met in Louisville at the appointed time, bishops Sould, Andrew, and Morris being present. The bishops were invited to preside, and the two former did so. The convention, acting under the plan of separation, declared the Southern

Conferences there represented a distinct connection, under the style of "*The Methodist Episcopal Church, South*," and made provision for the holding of its first General Conference in Petersburg, Va., May, 1846. Bishops Soule and Andrew were requested to become regular and constitutional bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South; the latter complied with the request, but the former, in view of outstanding engagements, postponed doing so till the session of the General Conference. The action of the convention was nearly unanimous, and it gave great satisfaction throughout the South. Bishop Soule gave in his formal adherence at the General Conference in Petersburg; two other bishops were consecrated, viz.' William Capers, DD., and Robert Paine, DD.; the Discipline was revised; missions, etc., were projected; Henry B. Bascom, Alexander L. P. Green, and Charles B. Parsons were appointed commissioners, and John Early agent and appointee, according to the provisions of the plan of separation; editors, etc., were chosen, and all the operations of the Church went on as though no separation had taken place. Lovick Pierce, DD., was commissioned to attend the session of the Northern General Conference in 1848, to tender to that body the Christian regards and fraternal salutations of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South; but he was not received in his official capacity. A change had come over the Northern Church, and the General Conference repudiated the plan of separation. The Church-property question had to be settled by the Supreme Court of the United States, which decided in favor of the South. The property was divided according to the provisions of the plan. A publishing-house was established in Nashville; a quarterly review, weekly papers, Sunday-school papers, books, tracts, etc., were published; and all things progressed prosperously till the war interfered with the operations of the Church, and sadly crippled its institutions. Much of its property was appropriated by others during the military occupancy of the South; but most of it has been restored, and it is hoped all the rest will soon be. Tentative movements have been made by some in the Northern Church for reunion; but as-that is deemed inexpedient and impracticable, the Northern General Conference of 1872 empowered the bishops to send a deputation to the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in 1874, to see if fraternal intercourse cannot be established between the two connections. It is hoped that this will take place on a basis honorable to both parties. The fraternal messenger sent to the Northern Conference in 1848, assured that body that



the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was always ready for fraternization on the basis of the plan of separation.

**III. Present Condition.** — The Church has been rapidly recovering from the sad effects of the war. At the time of the separation, in 1844, there were about 450,000 communicants in the Southern Church. In 1860 there were 757,205, of whom 207,766 were colored members. These figures were greatly reduced during the war. In 1890 the number of communicants was 1,161,666, of whom only 520 were colored. There were 4862 travelling and 6269 local preachers all embraced in the foregoing figures. Most of the colored members had joined other colored bodies of Methodists. Many of them are connected with the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church in America, which was organized in 1870 by the sanction of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, with a distinct connection in fraternal relation with this Church, the bishops of the latter consecrating as bishops two colored ministers chosen by a colored General Conference; One of them died in 1872; but the Connection is prosperous, having a number of Annual Conferences, and at a special General Conference, held in Augusta, Ga., in 1873, three other bishops were elected. Their Discipline, *mutatis nmutandis*. is the same as that of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. The bishops of the Southern Church have been: Soule, Andrew, Bascom, Capers, Pierce, Early, Kavanagh, Wightman, Doggett, Marvin, and McTyeire; and they now are Keener, Wilson, Granberry, Hargood, Duncan, Galloway, Hendrix, Key, Haygood, and Fitzgerald. There are 46 Annual Conferences, composed of travelling ministers and lay delegates-four of the latter (one of whom may be a local preacher) from every district. The General Conference is constituted of an equal number of ministers and laymen. District Conferences are held in all the districts once a year, for the purpose of review, etc., but without legislative or judicial power. - Quarterly Conferences are held in all the pastoral charges, at which exhorters and local preachers are licensed, and preachers are recommended to the Annual Conference for ordination or admission into the travelling ministry. Church Conferences are- ordered once a month, to review all the spiritual and temporal affairs of the pastoral charges. Sunday-schools, love-feasts, class-meetings, and prayermeetings enter into the economy of the Church. The General Conference ordered a revised edition of the Liturgy, as abridged by Mr. Wesley for the Methodist Episcopal Church in America, to be published for those congregations that might desire to use it; but few, if

any, do so. The Ritual is still in use for all occasional services, and it has been carefully revised and improved, as also has been the psalmody of the Church. The Sunday-school cause has received a great impulse, and many valuable publications are issued to meet its demands. Universities, colleges,- and academies, for both sexes, have been multiplying all over the Connection. Many original works, which are held in high estimation, such as histories, biographies, sermons, commentaries, and other works on theology, have been issued from the publishing-house of the Church; and the great staple-works of the Wesleyan press have been carefully revised and re-printed. The publishing-house was in part destroyed by fire in February, 1872, but a magnificent edifice, approaching completion, is to take its place. The missionary work of the Church was well-nigh broken up by the war; but it is recuperating -except the missions to the colored people, which were considered the crowning glory of the Southern Methodist Church. The missions to China and Brazil have received a great impetus and promise well; so do the Indian missions. A mission has been established in Mexico under favorable auspices. But the destitute portions of the South-destroyed by the war — require a vast amount of missionary work, and in rendering this the Church is restricted, for want of sufficient men and means, from extending its work in the foreign field *Disciplines, General Minutes, Journals* of the General Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Churches North and South; Emory's *History of the Discipline*; *Methodist Church Property Case*; Redford's *History of the Organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South*. **SEE METHODISM.** (T. O. S.)

## Methodist Protestant Church

is the name assumed by a body of Christians who seceded from the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1830. The primary causes for this step were opposition to the episcopate, and the decided refusal of the Methodist Episcopal ministry to vest any authority in the laity. From the very outset efforts were made by a minority in the Methodist Episcopal Church to secure the representation of the laity in the conferences. **SEE KILHAMITES; SEE LAY REPRESENTATION.** In 1824 a so-called Union Society was founded at Baltimore, Md., for the purpose of agitating the question of a change of the Church government, and a periodical was established called *The Mutual Rights of the Ministers and Members of the Methodist Episcopal Church*. In the spring of 1826 the Baltimore Union Society initiated a movement to inquire into the expediency of making a united petition for a general representation to the General Conference of

1828. The convention was held in November, 1827, and the petition was presented, but received an unfavorable reply. The Union Society, persisting in its efforts, a number of individuals were expelled in Tennessee, North Carolina, and Baltimore. This provoked many friends of the radicals, and caused the secession of considerable numbers. A convention which met at Baltimore, Md., Nov. 12, 1828. drew up provisional articles of association; and on Nov. 2, 1830, another convention, composed of an equal number of clerical and lay delegates from various states of the Union, assembled at the same place, and, after a session protracted for three weeks, adopted a Constitution and a Book of Discipline, and formed a new society, under the name of *Methodist Protestant Church*. The Reverend Francis Waters, DD., of Baltimore, was president of this convention.

The Methodist Protestant Church holds the same doctrinal views as the parent body, and differs from it only in a few points of ecclesiastical government. Following the example of the British Wesleyans, the Episcopal office is abolished, and a president called to rule over each Annual Conference, elected by the ballot of that body. The laity is admitted to an equal participation with the clergy in all Church legislation and government. The General Conference, which at first met every seventh, but now congregates every fourth year, is composed of an equal number of ministers and laymen, who are elected by the Annual Conferences at the ratio of one delegate of each order from every one thousand communicants. The General Conference has authority, under certain restrictions, to make such rules for the government of the Church as may be necessary to carry into effect the laws of Christ; to fix the compensation and duties of travelling ministers and preachers, etc.; to devise means for raising money, and to regulate the boundaries of Annual Conference districts. The Annual Conference, which consists of all the ordained itinerant ministers of the district, has power to elect to orders, station ministers, preachers, and missionaries; make rules for defraying the expenses of their support, and fix the boundaries of circuits and stations. It elects its own president yearly. The Quarterly Conference is composed of the trustees, ministers, preachers, exhorters, leaders, and stewards in the circuit of which it is the immediate official meeting. It examines the official character of its members, licenses preachers, recommends candidates for ordination to the Annual Conference; etc. There are classes, leaders, and stewards, as in the Methodist Episcopal Church.

The slavery question divided the Methodist Protestant Church into two bodies—the *Methodist Protestant Church of the North-western' States*, and the *Methodist Protestants of the Southern States*. The head-quarters of the former were established at Springfield, Ohio; those of the latter at Baltimore, Md. The members of the Methodist Protestant Church were at that time scattered mainly o-er the Border States and certain parts of the West; their principal strength has since developed in Virginia, Maryland, and in some portions of Ohio and Pennsylvania. Of late years a union of all non-Episcopal Methodists having been proposed, the Protestant Methodists North changed their official name to the *Methodist Church*. Their head-quarters were lately removed from Springfield, Ohio, to Pittsburgh, Pa. Each body has a board of foreign and domestic missions and a Book Concern—the Protestant Church South at Baltimore, Md.; the Methodists at Pittsburgh, Pa. At the beginning the Methodist Protestant Church counted 83 ministers and about 5000 members; and at the seventh General Conference in 1858 there were 2000 stationed ministers, 1200 churches, 90,000 members, and \$1,500,000 worth of property. In their present divided form they figure, according to the *New York Observer Year-book* of 1873 as follows:

- (1) The Methodist Church counts 28 conferences, 766 preachers, and about 75,000 members, with a Church property of \$1,609,425; and
- (2) the Methodist Protestant Church, within 25 conferences employs 423 preachers, and has about 70,000 members.

The Methodist Protestants have three colleges: the Western Maryland, at Westminster, Carroll County, Md.; Yadkin College, North Carolina; and one in West Virginia. *The Methodist Protestant*, a weekly paper, of which the Revelation LW. Bates, DD., is the editor, published at their Book Concern, is the official organ. The eleventh General Conference of this body is to be held at Lynchburg, Virginia, on the first Friday of May, 1874.

The Methodist Church issues a weekly newspaper, the *Methodist Recorder*, edited by Alexander Clark, and published by the Book Concern at Pittsburgh, Pa. Also a semi-monthly Sunday-school journal, edited by the same. A new Hymn-book. entitled *The Voice of Praise*, has just been compiled and published, which compares favorably with that of any other denomination. Among the recent literary productions of the Church are the following works: *Pulpit Echoes*, by John Scott, DD.; *Non.-Episcopal Methodism*, by T. H. Colhouer, AM.; *Wonders of the East*, by J. J. Smith,

DD.; *The Impending Conflict*, by J. J. Smith, DD.; *Recollections of Itinerant Life*, by George Brown, DD.; *The Lady Preacher*, by the same; *The Gospel in the Trees*, by Alexander Clark, AM.; *Work-day Christianity*, by the same; etc. Adrian College, Adrian, Mich., is under their control, and is in a most promising condition. Its president is George B. McElroy, DD. It admits both males and females. The Missionary Board-William Collier, DD., president, and C. H. Williams, corresponding secretary-is devising large plans for the West, and initiating foreign work. The Board of Ministerial Education- J. B. Walker, corresponding secretary-is doing a good work for young men preparing for the ministry. There is a fair prospect that at an early day an organic reunion with the Methodist Protestant Church will be effected. The initiatory steps have already been taken, and will probably lead to a united Methodist Church of nonepiscopal order. The General Conference of the Methodist Church will meet at Pittsburgh, Pa., May 17, 1874. See the *Discipline of the Methodist Church*, and *Discipline of the Methodist Protestant Church*; also Stevens, *Hist. of Methodism*, 3:463; Bangs, *Hist. Meth. Ch.* 3:432 sq.; Sprague, *Annals Amer. Pulpit*, vol. vii, Introd. p. 18. **SEE METHODISM.**

### Methodists, Camp

is a term of reproach which in the days of early Methodism was fastened upon those Methodists in the Western States of North America who, with a view to promote revivals of religion, adopted camp-meetings, at which religious services were conducted. Now that camp-meetings have become popular, in this country the term is no longer employed.

### Methodists, Dialectic, Or Romish

as they have also been called, flourished near the middle of the 17th century. They were priests of 'the Church of Rome, who attempted, by ingenious sophistry, to refute the arguments employed against them by the Protestant (Huguenot.) party. Mosheim (*Ecclesiastes Hist.* vol. iii) arranges these "Methodists" under two classes. According to his classification, the one party' in their controversies urged their opponents to adduce direct proof of their doctrines by an appeal to the statements of the Holy Scripture. The other party refused to encounter the Protestants by arguing with them on the various disputed points, but sought to overcome them by adducing certain great principles involving the whole subject. Thus

they insisted that the Church which was chargeable with changing or modifying its doctrines could not have the Holy Spirit for its guide.

In England the term *Methodist* is frequently applied to a person who becomes religious, without reference to any particular sect or party, and especially to ministers of the Church of England who are evangelical and zealous in their preaching.

### Methodists, Free

(properly “THE FREE METHODIST CHURCH”). This body, the youngest of the Methodist family, an offshoot of the Methodist Episcopal Church, dates its existence from Aug. 23, 1860, when it was organized at a convention held at Pekin, Niagara Co., NY., composed of laymen and ministers who were then or had been of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

**I.** *Origin, etc.*-The causes for the establishment of this independent body were manifold. Most prominent, however, were a desire for primitive Methodist *simplicity*, and more faithful adherence to the doctrines and usages of Wesley and his associates. Its’ organizers were ministers expelled from the “parent” body because of their course in opposing what they called innovations or departures from the rules of the Discipline. It was and is claimed by those engaged in the Free Methodist movement that the Methodist Church has declined in spirituality since their early history, and that in the rapid progress made by the Church in adding numbers, acquiring property, etc., sufficient care has not been taken to guard its purity, and preserve its primitive power and spiritual efficiency-the *toleration* of many worldly practices, and a departure from correct doctrine on several important points. In proof of this it is asserted that widely divergent and contradictory teachings are heard from the pulpit on the doctrine of entire sanctification without official rebuke, some preachers claiming sanctification as a work done concomitantly with justification, others regarding it as a result to be reached by a gradual process of spiritual growth,’ and yet others preaching it as a second distinct attainment to be received instantaneously by faith. The Free Methodists also hold that hearty and thorough repentance, evinced by honest confession, and complete -abandonment of all sin, is practically not enough insisted on, and that many are accepted as converts who are not even scripturally awakened; that a merely intellectual belief, born of human reason, is allowed to take the place of the supernatural faith taught by Paul and

Wesley; that the direct witness of the Spirit is not now enjoyed by multitudes of professed Methodists; that power over all sin is not experienced; that entire sanctification is even professedly a rare attainment; that the execution of discipline is so neglected as to become difficult, and in many societies impossible; that Methodists generally have abandoned plainness of dress, and are as fashionably attired as the world itself; that they are allowed and countenanced in the transaction of unscriptural business enterprises, and transact lawful business on worldly principles; and especially that secret and oath-bound fellowship with societies composed in large part of unsaved men is tolerated and encouraged; and that the relaxing of the rule requiring attendance at class is especially fatal to spirituality. It is also further asserted that other evidences of the spiritual decline of the Church are exhibited by the partial and frequent abandonment of the free-seat system in its houses of worship; and in the substitution of choir singing and instrumental performances for congregational praise; by the reading instead of preaching of sermons; by the building of extravagantly costly churches, and resorting to improper modes of Church support, such as Church fairs, picnics, donation parties, etc.

The movement for the organization of this independent body had its commencement within the bounds of the Genesee Conference (NY.) of the Methodist Episcopal Church. A number of ministers of that body had written and spoken against these alleged departures from the primitive faith of Methodism. By the year 1855 a state of feeling had been engendered which resulted in acrimonious disputes, accusations, Church trials, etc., and finally, in the year 1858, in the expulsion of the Revelation B. T. Roberts and the Rev. Joseph M'Creery on a charge of contumacy. Mr. Roberts had been tried the previous year by his Conference for alleged "immoral and unchristian conduct." (Said conduct consisted in publishing an article in the *Northern Independent* entitled "New-school Methodism," in which the writer set forth views such as have been recited above, and which he offered to retract and confess as publicly as they had been promulgated if proved untrue or incorrect.) His article was assumed to be slanderous, however, and he was found guilty, and was sentenced to be rebuked by the bishop. The contumacy charged against him in the following year consisted in publishing and circulating a second edition of *New-school Methodism*, and a pamphlet signed by George W. Estes, which gave a short account of the trial of the year preceding. On this charge

(which was disproved as to the *publishing*), and on the testimony of one witness (whose veracity was impeached) as to the circulation, Mr. Roberts, in connection with one or two colleagues, was expelled from the Genesee Conference and the Methodist Episcopal Church. This proceeding was regarded as a measure of high-handed persecution by many ministers and laymen of the Church, and during the ensuing year one hundred and ninety-five prominent laymen met in convention at Albion, Orleans County, NY., and passed resolutions expressing their entire and unabated confidence in the expelled preachers, and recommending them to continue to labor for the salvation of souls. This sympathy of the laymen was, shared by many of the ministers of the Conference, and this was so publicly expressed that at the ensuing Conference four of them were expelled on charges of "contumacy," while two others were located for the same cause. A large number of the lay members were also excluded from the Church. The ensuing General Conference, held at Buffalo in 1860, was respectfully petitioned by fifteen hundred members of the Methodist Episcopal Church within the bounds of the Conference from which these expulsions had taken place to investigate the judicial action of said Conference in relation to these matters. A committee was appointed for this purpose; but was finally discharged. B. T. Roberts had appealed from both of the decisions of the Conference in his case. The first only was entertained, and on that, "The verdict of reproof," the appeal committee stood equally divided. The other appeal was not entertained, Thus these ministers and members were shut out of the Church. As they believed that the causes which had led to their expulsion existed more or less in all the other churches bearing the Methodist name, they felt compelled to organize a new denomination, that would, in their judgment, more fully carry out the purposes and designs of Methodism.\*

\* In adherence to our rule respecting denominational articles, we have permitted our contributor to state his case in his own way. Justice to all parties concerned, however, requires us to add that several of the above statements relative to the origin of the Church in question are made from a partisan point of view, and consequently fail to give a fair representation of the grounds of controversy. This is true, at least, in the following particulars: (1) The original difficulty grew out of a spilt of censoriousness and insubordination exhibited by the parties in question. (2) The expulsion of the ministers from the Annual Conference was in accordance with the regular forms of ecclesiastical discipline; and the private members were dropped, in accordance with an episcopal decision,



after they had really abandoned their former communion. (3) The appeal to the General Conference was dismissed, as being unsustainable by adequate reasons. In all these proceedings, the Church from which they were excluded acted in the sovereign right of self-defense, and its legitimate authorities were the ultimate judges of the necessity and propriety of the course pursued. Those who had incurred the penalty had therefore no just cause to complain of the action taken, however severe it might seem to them.-ED.

**II. Organization, Doctrines, etc.**-In the formation of the new Church, while everything calculated to sustain and cherish the original spirit of Methodism has been carefully retained, care has been taken to incorporate into its modes of government everything shown by the progress of Methodism for a century past to be necessary. The Episcopacy is abandoned, and general superintendency substituted; the incumbents of the office are elected every four years. Quadrennial, Annual, and Quarterly Conferences are retained as in the parent body, while the last addition to the machinery of the Methodist Episcopal government, viz. the District Conference, adopted in 1872, has been in use among the Free Methodists from their beginning. In all the before-named Church courts a number of laymen, equal to the ministry, are admitted, and their right to speak and vote is fully guaranteed. The official board is retained, and there is provision for annual meetings of all members of the societies for the appointment of delegates to the Annual Conferences, and stewards. Class-meetings are held, and attendance is a condition of membership in the Church. The preachers in charge nominate and the classes elect the class-leaders. The office of presiding elder is retained, but the name of the officer is *district chairman*.

The articles of faith adopted are the same as those of the Methodist Episcopal Church, with two additions, designed to secure uniformity of belief, and guard against the introduction of errors on the important points to which they relate. The first is on entire sanctification, and the first part is in the words of John Wesley, viz.: "Justified persons, while they do not outwardly commit sin, are nevertheless conscious of sin still remaining in the heart. They feel a natural tendency to evil, a proneness to depart from God, and cleave to the things of earth. Those that are sanctified wholly are saved from all inward sin-from evil thoughts and evil tempers. No wrong temper, none contrary to love remains in the soul. All their thoughts, words, and actions are governed by pure love. Entire sanctification takes

place subsequently to justification, and is the work of God wrought instantaneously upon the consecrated, believing soul. After a soul is cleansed from all sin, it is then fully prepared to grow in grace" (*Discipline*, "Articles of Religion," ch. i, § 1, p. 23). This doctrine is regarded as of so much importance that no person is admitted to the full membership of the Church who does not endorse it, and pledge himself definitely to seek diligently the experience thereof. No minister -would be tolerated in the body who could be truthfully regarded as. out of accordance in views or teaching therewith.

The second new article of faith is on *future reward and punishment*, and reads as follows: "God has appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness by Jesus Christ, according to the Gospel. The righteous shall have in heaven an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away. The wicked shall go away into everlasting punishment, where their worm dieth not, and their fire is not quenched" (*Discipline*, "Articles of Religion," ch.-i, § 1, p. 23).

A noteworthy difference of polity exists between this and all other Methodist bodies in respect to admitting members on probation. None are received simply on expressing "a desire to flee from the wrath to come," but all are required to give evidence of such a desire by confessing a "saving faith in Christ." In other words, none are added to the Church, even on probation, unless it is believed that they "are saved." Free Methodists claim that much of the defection alleged to have taken place in the Methodist Episcopal and other churches is due to the fact that multitudes have joined the Church as seekers of salvation, but have gone no further spiritually.

It is also definitely required of all who join the Free Methodist Church that they shall lay aside all superfluous ornaments in dress, "laying aside gold, pearls, and costly array" (*Discipline*, ch. i, § 3, I 4). That they shall keep free from connection with all societies requiring an oath, affirmation, or promise of secrecy as a condition of membership therein (*ibid.* ¶[ 5). ,Also that they shall refrain from the use of all intoxicating liquors, and from the use of tobacco, except as medicine (*ibid.* p. 31, If 4).

**III. Present Condition, etc.** — The progress of the denomination is rapid, considering the bold stand it makes against many customs and usages quite popular even in the churches, and the nature of the requirements made of those who become members. During the first years of its history it had to

encounter some of the difficulties which beset early Methodism in the form of wild fanaticism and a spirit of insubordination to proper church regulations, and it suffered considerably from the doings and sayings of some who were never members of the Church, but who, taking advantage of the circumstances under which it was formed, and acting somewhat in connection with its movements, promulgated ideas and encouraged practices contrary to pure Gospel; but the young denomination has had power to shake off these parasites, and free itself from these incumbrances, and bids fair to march on its way successfully in the mission of spreading scriptural holiness as understood by Wesley and his immediate coadjutors. The religious services of the Free Methodists are generally characterized by the warmth and fervor so noticeable among early Methodists. Congregational singing is universal.

The Free Methodist Church is at present composed of seven Annual Conferences, embracing portions of nearly every Northern state in the Union. The following is an abstract of statistics taken from the reports of the Conferences for the year ending September, 1890; Members, -208,861; travelling preachers, 700; local preachers, 159; Sabbath-schools, 155; scholars, 4894; teachers, 973; value of Church property, \$263,550.

Two educational institutions have been started under the auspices of the Church, one at North Chili, Monroe County, N. Y., the other at Spring Arbor, Michigan. These are conducted with strict reference to the principles and usages of the people by whom they are sustained, and bid fair to become successful.

The publication of a monthly magazine was commenced by the Revelation B. T. Roberts in the year 1860, entitled *The Earnest Christian*, devoted to the advocacy of Bible holiness. It has been from the first well sustained, and, though it is an exponent of the principles taught by Free Methodists, is still conducted as an independent enterprise, and regarded as an unsectarian publication. It has a large circulation outside the Church, which supplies its chief patronage. A weekly paper, entitled *The Free Methodist*, and edited by the Revelation Levi Wood, was started in the interests of the denomination Nov. 2, 1867. This also is a private enterprise, though depending on the patronage of the body for support. It is now published at Chicago, Ill., and its present editor is the Revelation L. Bailey. It has a very large circulation.

At present the labors of the Free Methodist Church are -confined to the poor and comparatively uneducated classes of the community, and its ministers are mostly drawn from them. It can scarcely claim much denominational literature. The Revelation E. Bowen, DD., wrote a history, entitled *The Origin of the Free Methodist Church*, which is rather a plain, straightforward statement of historical facts than an attempted literary monument. The Revelation B. T. Roberts, who has from its organization been general superintendent of the body, having been thrice re-elected to that position, graduated at Middletown, Conn., and is a writer of considerable power. His editorials, tracts, and essays display argumentative ability, and the faculty of uttering truths concisely.

## Methodists, The

*SEE METHODISM.*

## Methodius, ST

(surnamed also *Ebullas* and *Eubulius*), a noted theologian of the Eastern Church of the 3d century, one of the “fathers” and “martyrs” of the Church, flourished first as bishop of Olympus and Patara, in Lycia (hence also oftentimes surnamed Patarensis), and later presided over the see of Tyre, in Palestine. He is supposed to have died early in the 4th century. According to Suidas, he suffered a martyr’s death at Chalcis (*Ἀνατολῆς*) during the reign of Decius (249-251) and Valerian. This seems improbable, however, since Valerian reigned after and not contemporary with Decius, and since the chronology of the reign of these emperors is far from accurate. It seems pretty well established now that Methodius was a contemporary of Porphyry; and if he died in a persecution, it was probably, as Cave supposes, in that of AD. 303, or, as Fabricius thinks, in that of AD. 311. The last-named date is quite generally accepted as the year of Methodius’s decease. Epiphanius says that “he was a very learned man, and a strenuous assertor of the truth.” Jerome has ranked him in his catalogue of Church writers, but Eusebius has not mentioned him; which silence is attributed by some, though merely upon conjecture to Methodius’s having written very sharply against Origen, who was favored by Eusebius. His principal works are, *Περὶ Ἀναστάσεως*, *De Resurrectione*, against Origen, divided into two or three parts; fragments of it are to be found in Epiphanius (*Panarium*), in Photius (*Bibliotheca*), and in the works of Damascenus:- *Περὶ τῶν γενετῶν*, *De Creatis*, in

Photius :- Περὶ Αὐτεξουσίου καὶ πόθεν τὰ κακὰ, *De Libero Arbitrio*. Leo Allatius gave the full text, together-with a Latin version, but the work, as contained in Combdfis's edition of Methodius, is not complete:- Περὶ τῆς ἀγγελουμένητου παρθενεαίς καὶ ἀγνεαίς, *De Angelica Virginitate et Castitate*, written in the form of a dialogue: it is a curious work, partaking at once of the character of Plato's *Banquet* and of the *Song of Solomon*, thoroughly Christian in its doctrines, but very free in its language. Photius claims that it was interpolated, and contains traces of Arianism, these, however, have disappeared from the MSS. at present extant, from which the work was first published by Leo Allatius, under the title *S. Methodii, episcopi et martyris, Convivium decent Virginum Leo Allatius hactenus non editum primus Greece vulgavit, Latine verit; notas et diatriben e Methodiorum scriptis adjecit* (Rome, 1656, 8vo). About the same time Possinus prepared another edition, which was published at Paris under the title *S. Methodii Convivium Virginum Greece et Latine nunc primum editum* (1657, 8vo). - It is also to be found in Combefis, *Auctuar. Bibl. Patr.* (Paris, 1672) — *Oratio de Sinteone et Anna, sen In Festum Occursus et Purificationis B. Marica*, published by Petris Plantinus (Antwerp, 1598); this has by some been considered as the work of a later Methodius. but this opinion is contradicted by Allatius:- *Λόγος περὶ Μαρτύρων, Sermo de Martyribus*: — *Εἰς τὰ Βαΐα, In Ramos Palmarum*: Photius gives extracts of this oration, but some doubt Methodius being its author:-*Libri Adversus Porphyrium*, fragments of which are given by Damascenus:- *De Pythonissa contra Origenem*, lost: — *Commentarii in Cantica Canticoꝝ*, of which only fragments remain: — *Ἐξέων*, lost: etc. Another work, *De Revelatione*, sometimes attributed to him, is more likely from a later Methodius. The *De Libero Arbitrio, De Resurrectione, De Angelica Virginitate et Castitate*, two homilies, and the extracts contained in Photius, were published by Combefis in Greek and Latin, with notes (Paris, 1644, fol.), together with the works of Amphilocheus and Andreas Cretensis. Galland has collected the preserved works supposed to be the production of Methodius, as well as all fragments, and published them in his *Biblioth. Patr.* vol. 3: See Photius, *Cod.* p. 234-237; Mai, *Script. vet. nov. coll.* 7:1; Cave, *Histor. Litt.*; Henschenin the Bollandists, *Acta Sanctorum*, vol. iv; Nath. Lardner, *Credibility of the Gospel History*, vol. v; Oudin, *Comment. de Scriptoribus eccles.* vol. i; Andrea Sixt, *Dissert. de Methodio* (Altorf, 1787, 4to); Fabricius, *Bib. Græca* (edit. of Harless), 7:746 et al.; Donaldson, *Hist. Ch. Lit.*; Milman, *Hist. Lat. Christianity* (see Index); Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 1:356

sq., 511; Neander, *Christ. Dogmas*, 1:121, 256; *Meth. Qu. Revelation* 1871, January, p. 164.

## Methodius Of Bohemia

a native of Thessalonica, who flourished 'during the 9th century, became distinguished by his missionary zeal, his learning, and his skill as a painter. He first entered a convent at Constantinople, and afterwards spent some time in Rome, where he acquired that remarkable skill as an artist which leads Le Beau (*Hist. du Bas Empire*, 14:362) to speak of him as the most eminent painter of his time -a high compliment, indeed, when we note that among his contemporaries were Modallulph, in France, Tutilo, in Germany, and Lazarus, in Constantinople, all of whom are considered artists of great ability. After his return to Constantinople, he received an invitation from Bogoris, king of Bulgaria, to visit his court, and instruct him and his subjects in the principles of Christianity. This king's heart had been softened towards the Christian religion by the influence of his sister, who had shortly before returned from Constantinople,' whither, thirty-eight years before, she had been conveyed as a captive, and where she had been brought up and educated a Christian. A severe pestilence oppressed Bulgaria, and led Bogoris formally to implore the aid of his sister's God. The plague was stayed, and the king acknowledged the might and goodness of the Christian's God in hearing and answering his prayer; but still he shrank from deserting entirely the faith of his fathers, lest his subjects should revolt against him in defence of paganism. At this critical moment he bethought himself of the strange expedient of using the skilful pencil of Methodius, knowing that his people could be more readily affected by images of terror than by eloquent words of persuasion. By his advice Methodius painted the last judgment, and so vividly represented the tortures of the damned that the heart of the king himself was struck with terror, and he sought to escape this terrible destiny by numbering himself among the soils of the Church. He was accordingly baptized in 863 or 864; and, though much opposition was shown, paganism was rapidly compelled to yield to the Christian religion as introduced by Methodius. After working with such success in Bulgaria, Methodius was sent into Greek Moravia, where, in conjunction with his brother Cyril (q.v.), he accomplished a great work, his holy zeal meeting with grand results. Christianity had already found its way to some parts of the tribe by its connection with the Frankish empire under Charlemagne, but the nation, as a whole, was still devoted to paganism. Its ruler, Radislav or Rastices, had

formed an alliance with the Greek empire for political purposes. This afforded an opportunity for the sending forth of these two missionary brothers. Methodius rendered valuable assistance to his brother Cyril in his task of inventing an alphabet for the Sclavonic language, and in the work of translating the Bible, as well as several liturgical works, into the language of the people.

A schism breaking out between the Latin and the Greek churches, the Moravian prince was induced, by political changes, to enter into a closer relation with the German empire and the Western Church. Methodius and Cyril, in this emergency, proved themselves to be men who valued Christianity more highly than sect. They repaired to Rome, where they easily entered into an understanding with pope Adrian I, so that party strife caused no delay in the good work. Cyril remained in Rome as a monk, while Methodius, after acknowledging submission to the Romish Church, and giving a satisfactory confession of faith, was consecrated archbishop of the Moravian Church. It was while Methodius was laboring in Moravia that duke Borzivoy. of Bohemia, visited the court of Swatopluk (871), and becoming acquainted with the Christian religion, acknowledged his belief in it by causing himself, his wife, and his attendants to be baptized. On his return to Bohemia, Methodius accompanied him, and for a short time 'labored successfully, converting many, and causing several convents and churches to be erected. From this new field he returned to Moravia, where he remained until the wars with which the country was then distracted obliged him to transfer the field of his labors to the adjacent provinces connected with the German empire. The clergy of Salzburg, envious of his success, and prejudiced against the Eastern Church, complained to pope John VIII that Methodius was attached to the customs of the Greek Church, and that he made use of the Sclavonic language in public worship, and accused him of infringing on the see of the archbishop of Salzburg. The pope, though little inclined to listen to accusations which German bishops might make against any prelate ordained at Rome, could not altogether allay his suspicions as to the relations between Methodius and the Eastern Church, especially at a time when there were constant bickerings between the Latin and the Greek churches. Methodius hastened to Rome in obedience to the call of the pope (879), and an interview took place, which resulted in a complete refutation of the charges made against him. The pope even defended the use of the Sclavonic instead of the Latin language, in a letter written to the Moravian prince, in which he says: " The

alphabet invented by a certain philosopher, Constantine (Cyril), to the end that God's praise may duly sound forth in it, we rightly commend; and we order that in this language the messages and works of our Lord Christ be declared; for we are exhorted by Holy Scripture to praise the Lord, not in three languages alone, but in all tongues and nations (Psalm 117, and Philip. ii). And the apostles, full of the Holy. Ghost, proclaimed in all languages the great works of God. And the apostle Paul exhorts us (1 Corinthians 14) that, speaking in tongues, we should edify the Church. It stands not at all in contradiction with the faith to celebrate the mass in this language, to read the Gospel or lessons from the Scriptures properly translated into it, or to rehearse any of the Church hymns in the same, for the God who is the author of the three principal languages created' the 'others also for his own glory. Only it is necessary, in order to greater solemnity, that in all the Moravian churches the Gospel should, in the first place, be publicly read in Latin, and then repeated in the Sclavonic language, so as to be understood by the people" (Neander, 3:318). The pope also formed the Moravians into a separate diocese. independent of the German Church, and confirmed Methodius as their archbishop, making him directly responsible to himself instead of to the German prelate. This led to new disputes, in which the German clergy succeeded in influencing the Moravian prince against Methodius. One of his subordinate bishops, named Wichin, also attached himself to the German party. His difficulties and controversies became so numerous that he reported the matter in detail to the pope, and requested permission to appear before him in person. John VIII granted this request, and, though expressing a desire to hear both sides of the controversy, assured him of his kindly feelings towards him, and exhorted him not to allow the work to suffer, but to prosecute it faithfully. In 881 Methodius went to Rome, after which time his name disappears from the records of history. It cannot be determined whether he died soon after, or whether the hostile party in Moravia prevented his return. He was canonized by the Church. The Greeks and Slavonianm celebrate him on May 11, although in the Martyrologium the day is March 9. See F. X. Richter, *Cyril und Method der Slaven Apostel* (1825); Ginzell, *Gesch. der Slaven Apostel* (1857); Baxmann, *Politik der Papiast* (Elberf. 1869), vol. ii; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 3:318 sq.; Hardwick, *Ch. Hist. Middle Ages*, p. 111 sq.; Maclear *Hist. of Missions in Middle Ages*, p. 284 sq. (HW. T.)



## Methodius Of Constantinople

a patriarch in the Eastern Church who flourished about 1240, is probably the author of *De Revelatione*, which some attribute to Methodius Eubulus. The Greek text, with a Latin version, is contained in the first volume of the *Græcia Orthodoxa*, as well, as in some of the *Biblioth. Patrum*. He also wrote *Ænigmata*, in iambic tristichs, extant in MS. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Græc.* 7:275; Cave, p. 662 (ed. Geneva).

## Methodology

(μέθοδος and λόγος) is the scientific plan of investigating any department of knowledge. In the science of theology, it is the practical application of encyclopedia. The one leads to the other. A clear insight into the nature and connections of any science will lead to a right mode of treating it; and as the complete knowledge of a science is essential to a good method, so, on the other hand, a good method is the best test and verification of knowledge. The aims of methodology are to furnish a plan of theological study, showing the order in which the topics should be taken up, and indicating the best methods of study, and necessary books and helps of all kinds. Some writers hold that methodology should be treated and studied entirely apart from encyclopedia. In a strictly scientific sense, this view is correct; but, for practical purposes, these two branches are generally blended into one connected whole. The whole treatment taken together is therefore called by the double name of theological encyclopedia and methodology. Of these, encyclopedia is the objective side, the outline of the science itself; methodology is the subjective side, having reference to the work of the student of the science.

The science of theological encyclopedia and methodology is a comparatively recent study. The history of the science has been so fully treated in the article on ENCYCLOPEDIA *SEE ENCYCLOPEDIA* (q.v.), and the methods of the chief writers on the subject so amply set forth, that we simply refer to it. Since the publication of that article, however, an important work, *Lectures by the late John McClintock, DD., LL.D., on Theological Encyclopedia and Methodology* (NY. 1873, 12mo), has appeared, which contains so many new thoughts that we here insert Dr. McClintock's division of the subject. He divides theological science into the following four departments:

1. *Exegetical* Theology, which is concerned with the records of revelation.

**2.** *Historical Theology*, which is concerned with the development of revelation in the life and thought of the Church. This definition gives a twofold division of Historical Theology:

- a.** The Life of the Church; that is, *Church History*.
- b.** The Thought of the Church; that is, *Doctrinal History*.

**3.** *Systematic Theology*, which is concerned with the matter of revelation—with the scientific treatment of its contents; making a fourfold subdivision’:

- a.** *Apologetics*, or the defence of Christianity from attacks from without.
- b.** *Dogmatics*, or the scientific statement of doctrines as admitted by the Church.
- c.** *Ethics*, or a scientific statement of duty in which man stands to God
- d.** *Polemics*, or the vindication of doctrine from heretical attacks from within the Church.

**4.** *Practical Theology*, which is concerned with the preservation of revelation and its propagation in and through the Church, as the outward and visible form of the kingdom of Christ among men. Here we have two general divisions:

- a.** *The Functions of the Church*; and
- b.** *The Organization and Government of the Church*.

This treatment, which has largely prevailed since the 16th century, rests upon the theory that Christianity is a system founded upon divine revelation, and that theology is really the product of the application of the human intellect, to the conceits of revelation.

See Crooks and Hurst, *Theol. Encycl. and Methodology* (N. Y. 1884); also *Jahrb. Deutsch. Theol.* Oct. 1871.

## Methu

([**Wtm**] construct-state of **tmi** an adult *man*, used like the old English *folk*), a frequent prefix in Hebrews proper names, as those here following; so likewise in the old Punic names *Metuastartus*, *Methymatus*, etc. (Gesenius, *Monum. Phoen.* p. 399, 411).

## Methu'sael

(Hebrews *Methushatl'*, [מֶתוּשָׁאֵל] *man that is from God*; Sept.

Μαθουσαΐλα, Vulg. *Mathusael*), the son of Mehujael and father of Lamech, of the family of Cain (<sup><Q048></sup>Genesis 4:18). BC. cir. 3770. The resemblance of the name to the following, on which (with the coincidence of the name Lamech in the next generation in both lines) some theories have been formed, is apparent rather than real.

## Methu'selah

(Ieb. *Methushe'lach*, [מֶתוּשֶׁלַח] *man of the dart*; Sept. and N.T.

Μαθουσαΐλα; Josephus, Μαθουσαΐλας, *Ant.* 1:3, 3 and 4; Vulg. *Mathusala* and *Mathusale*; Auth. Vers. "Mathusala," in <sup><Q187></sup>Luke 3:37), the son of Enoch, and eighth of the Sethite antediluvian patriarchs (Genesis v. 21, 22, 25, 26, 27; <sup><Q001></sup>1 Chronicles 1:3). He was born (according to the Hebrews text) BC. 3484. When he had attained the age of 187 years, his son Lamech was born, after which he lived 782 years, and died (BC. 2516) only a few months before the flood, at the extreme age of 969; which, being the greatest term attained by any on record. has caused his name to become a proverb of long life. *SEE LONGEVITY.*

## Metochita, Georgius

(Γεώργιος ὁ Μετοχίτης), a Greek theologian, flourished in the latter half of the 13th -century. He was the archdeacon of the Church at Constantinople, the intimate friend and zealous partisan of the emperor Andronicus, and favored a union of the Greek Church with the Latin. Under the reign of Andronicus the Younger he was ostracized on account of his religious opinions, and died in exile. He was the relative, perhaps the father, of Theodorus Metochita, with whom he has often been confounded. He wrote several works of great importance for their bearing on the history of his times; but his literary style, although energetic, is rude and well-nigh barbarous. His *Refutation* (Ἀντίρρησις) of the three Chapters of Planude, and his *Reply to Manuel Nepos of Crete*, were published by Leo Allatius, in the *Graecia Orthodoxa*, vol. 2 The same publisher has given to the public a fragment of Metochita's *Discourse on the Union of the Churches*, together with a portion of the fourth book of his treatise *On the Procession of the Holy Ghost*, bound in one volume with *Diatriba contra*

*Hottingerum*. See Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Græca*, 10:412; Cave, *Hist. Litt.* s.v.

## Metochita, Theodorus

(θεόδωρος ὁ Μετοχίτης), a Greek theologian, flourished in the days of the emperor Andronicus the Elder, who appointed him the chief *logothete*, or chancellor, of the Church at Constantinople, and intrusted him with several missions. Amid all his official duties, Metochita found time to compose sundry works which reflect honor upon: his learning. He was banished from the country shortly after the usurpation of power by Andronicus the Younger, in 1328. The emperor was not slow to recall him; but Metochita being disgusted with the complexion which matters had assumed, retired into a convent, where he died about 1332. His principal works are *Commentaries* (Παράφρασις) on several treatises by Aristotle: *Physica*, *De Anima*, *De Coelo*, *De Ortu et Interitu*, *De Memoria et Reminiscentia*, *De Somno et Vigilia*. These commentaries were published in Latin by Gent. Hervet (Basle, 1550, 4to; Ravenna, 1614, 4to); but the original Greek text of the *Commentaries* has remained inedited. He also wrote two books on ecclesiastical history, and several works of a secular character, which were never printed. See Fabricius, *Bibl. Græca*, 10:412 sq.; C. F. de Bodenbourg, *De Th. Metochitæ Scriptis Notheias vulgo insimulatis*, in the *Miscellan. Lipsiensia*, vol. xii.

## Metonymy

(μετωνυμία, “*denominatio nominis pro nomine posita*,” Quintilian, 8, 6, 23), a technical term in rhetoric designating a “trope, in which a word is used to express a thing differing from its original meaning in kind” (E. D. Haven, *Rhetoric*, p. 78). Metonymies are a little bolder than synecdoches (q.v.), and, as Aristotle observes, may be employed either to elevate or to degrade the subject, according to the design of the author. The substance may be named for the quality, the cause for the effect, the precedent for the consequent, or the reverse, e.g. “Addison was smooth, but Prescott smoother.” Here *Addison* means the *writings of Addison*; *smooth* means *pleasing to the ear*. Both words are metonymic. “Always respect *old age*” a metonymy for *aged people*. Thus, “*gray hairs*” may stand for “*old age*,” the name of Virgil for that of his writings, the “*head*” for the “*intellect*,” and the “*olive-branch*” for “*peace*.” Metonymies may be classified as follows:

(1.) *The sign for the thing signified*, signum pro signato. *Sword* for war; **θρόνος** for power (<sup><413></sup>Luke 1:32; <sup><8008></sup>Hebrews 1:8); **ἀνατολή, δυσμή**, for east and west (<sup><4008></sup>Matthew 2:3; <sup><413></sup>Luke 13:29; <sup><39466></sup>Psalms 46:6); *red tape*, for the difficulties in obtaining the completion of a work that must pass the inspection of several officers; a *pen* for literature—"The pen is mightier than the sword."

(2.) *The container for the thing contained*, continens pro contento. "The *country* is jealous of the *city*." "The *army* yielded, but the *navy* resisted;" **ὁ οἶκος**, world, for the human beings contained in the world (<sup><4807></sup>Matthew 18:7; <sup><4000></sup>John 1:10; iii, .16, 17); **ὁ κόσμος**, the house, for domestics (<sup><4053></sup>John 4:53; <sup><4000></sup>Acts 10:2, 11, 14,16).

(3.) *A cause may be put for an effect, and an effect for a cause*. "The *savage* desolation of war." The *cause* of the desolation is a savage spirit; here it is transferred to the effect. In an opposite transference, we may speak of *pale* death, joyful *health*, a *proud* testimony. This is sometimes called a *transferred epithet*.

(4.) *A man may be named for his works*. Thus we speak of "Shakespeare," meaning his writings. "Blackstone," meaning his works on law. So the "Prophets" are referred to (<sup><4000></sup>Mark 1:2; <sup><2169></sup>Luke 16:29; 24:44; <sup><4033></sup>Acts 8:28), meaning their writings. This is akin to personification (q.v.).

## Metre

(*Gr. μέτρον*) is, in its almost extensive signification, the *measure* by which any thing is determined with exactness, and due proportion. In its classical sense the word is used for the subdivision of a verse. The Greeks measured some species of verses (the dactylic, choriambic, antispastic, Ionic, etc.) by considering each foot as a metre; in others (the iambic, trochaic, and anapaestic), each dipodia, or two feet, formed a metre. Thus the dactylic hexameter (the heroic verse) contained six dactyls or spondees; the iambic, almapaestic, and trochaic trimeter, six of those feet respectively. A line is said to be acatalectic when the last syllable of the last foot is wanting; brachycatalectic, when two syllables are cut off in the same way; hypercatalectic, when there is one superfluous syllable.

In religious poetry, as adapted to music, metre denotes the regular consecution in a stanza of lines containing a certain number of syllables of a given kind of verse. The usual number of lines is four, and these may be

alike or different in length. For example, in what is called *Long Metre*, each line consists of four iambic measures; in *Common Metre*, the lines contain alternately four and three iambs, or their prosodiac equivalents; and in *Short Metre* every line has three iambs, except the third, which has four. All other kinds are called "*particular metres*," as 6 lines of 8 syllables each, 4 lines of 7, 6 lines of 7, 4 lines of 10, 4 of 6 and 2 of 8, 8 of 8 and 7 alternately, etc.

## Metretes

See *FIRKIN*.

## Metrical Psalms And Hymns

Several of the Psalms were translated into English metre, during the latter part of the reign of Henry VIII, by Sir Thomas Wyatt, and printed in 1549. This version, however, is supposed to be lost. It has been thought that a reference to some metrical psalms existed in the 7th section of the 1st Act of Uniformity in the reign of Edward VI, 1549, authorizing the use of the Prayer-book, where it was enacted "that it shall be lawful for all men, as well in churches, chapels, oratories, or other places, to use openly any psalm or prayer taken out of the Bible at any due time; not letting or omitting thereby the service, or any part thereof, mentioned in the said book." But this was several years antecedent to the appearance of any regular version. The metrical Psalms, called the "Old Version," originated with Sternhold, who was groom of the robes to Henry VIII and Edward VI, and was continued by others until 1641, when the revisers of the Prayer-book declared that "singing of hymns in metre is no part of the liturgy," and therefore they refused to consider them, as not in their commission. See Proctor, *On Common Prayer* (see Index); Cardwell, *Conferences*, s.v.; Bates, *Christ. Antiq.* s.v.; Staunton, *Ecclesiastes Dict.* s.v. *SEE PSALMS, VERSIONS OF*.

## Metrodorus

a leading Epicurean philosopher, was, according to the best authorities, a native of Lampsacus, although some claim that he was an Athenian. He flourished in the second half of the 3d century BC. From his earliest connection with this school of philosophy until his death, he lived in daily and intimate intercourse with Epicurus, absenting himself only six months during the whole period. He is regarded as the founder of that baser and

more sensual form of Epicurean philosophy which many, who sought for “pleasure as the chief good,” substituted for the intellectual enjoyment adopted by Epicurus as his ideal good. According to Cicero, he made perfect happiness to consist in having a well-constituted body, and knowing that it would always remain so. One of his sayings, as quoted by Athenaeus, was that “the belly is the foundation of all philosophy.” He claimed that all pertaining to a happy life should be tested and measured by this organ. Metrodorus became the favorite disciple of Epicurus, and may justly be ranked second only to him in importance. He died in 277 BC., at the age of fifty-three, seven years before the death of his master, who had intended to make him his successor. He left two children, a son and daughter, whom Epicurus protected while he was living, and for whom he generously provided in his will.

Metrodorus left to the world some of his thoughts in the tangible form of thirteen volumes, as enumerated by Diogenes. All these have disappeared, except some fragments found among the Herculanean Papyri: the most important of which is a portion of his treatise . *Περὶ Αἰσθησίων*, contained in the sixth volume of the Neapolitan collection. For many years the Epicureans kept the 20th of each month as a festal day in honor of their master and of Metrodorus, whose name will ever be linked with that of Epicurus. Another philosopher of like name flourished in *Chios*, in Greece, about 400 BC. He was the author of a *Treatise on Nature*, which was very celebrated. See Bayle, *Hist. and Crit. Dict.* s.v.; Fabricius, *Biblioth. Graeca*, 3:606 Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* 35:40; Plutarch, *Paulus AEmilius*, 32. (H.W.T.)

## Metrology

the science of determining the relative value of measures, whether these belong to pecuniary standards or to fixed quantities of capacity or extent. Indeed, these three are intimately connected, for coins can only be accurately determined by weight, and the bulk of solids or liquids is ultimately ascertained by linear measurements in cubic dimensions, or by a given weight of a certain substance of uniform density. Specific gravity, therefore, lies at the basis of all quantitative admeasurements. In the present article we are, of course, strictly concerned only with the Biblical, especially Hebrew, weights and measures; but as the value of these has come down to us chiefly in Greek equivalents, it becomes necessary to take the latter also into consideration. “The Roman measures came from

Greece, the Grecian from Phoenicia, the Phoenician from Babylon. Accordingly each system will throw light on the other, and all may be made to contribute something to the elucidation of the Hebrew weights and measures. This method of viewing the subject, and the satisfactory lessons which have been hence deduced, are to be ascribed to Bockh (*Metrologischen Untersuchungen*, Berlin, 1838), who, availing himself of the results ascertained by English, French, and German scholars, and of the peculiar facilities afforded by a residence in the midst of the profound and varied erudition of the Prussian capital, has succeeded, by the application of his unwearied industry and superior endowments, in showing that the system of weights and measures of Babylon, Egypt, Palestine, Phoenicia, Greece, Sicily, and Italy, formed one great whole, with the most intimate relationships and connections.” To these researches must be added later investigations and comparisons by different antiquarians as to the value of particular specimens of coins and measures still extant, which sometimes considerably modify the conclusions of Bockh.

### I. *Coins and Weights.*

**1. Names of the principal Hebrew Standards.**-The following are the regular gradations, beginning with the highest:

(1.) The *talent*, תַּלְתָּיִם, strictly a *circle*. hence any round object; and thus a circular piece of money. It was of two kinds, the talent of gold (<sup>1094</sup>1 Kings 9:14) and the talent of silver (<sup>1092</sup>2 Kings 5:22). **SEE TALENT.**

(2.) The *maneh*, מָנֶה; the Greek *mina*, or μνᾶ, strictly a *portion*, i.e. a subdivision of the “talent.”

(3.) The *shekel*, שֶׁקֶל, Graecized σίκλος, properly a *weight*, the usual unit of estimation, applied to coins and weights. It likewise was of two kinds, the sacred (Leviticus v. 15) and the royal (<sup>1045</sup>2 Samuel 14:26).

(4.) The *beka*, בֶּקָה, strictly a *cleft* or fraction (<sup>1022</sup>Genesis 24:22).

(5.) The *gerdh*, גֶּרְדָּה, properly a *kernel* or bean, like our “grain,” and the Greek ὀβολός.

**2. Values of these as compared with each other.**-The relation of the talent to the shekel is determined by the statement in <sup>1013</sup>Exodus 30:13, that every Israelite above twenty years of age had to pay the poll-tax of half a shekel



as a contribution to the sanctuary. <sup><12826></sup>Exodus 38:26 tells us that this tax had to be paid by 603,550 men. The sum amounted to 100 talents and 1775 shekels (<sup><12825></sup>Exodus 38:25), which are, therefore, equal to 603,550 half shekels, or 301,775 full shekels. This gives for the value of the talent in shekels,

$(301,775-1775)/100= 3000$ . The relation of the maneh to the shekel, and consequently to the talent, is not so clear.

In <sup><3613></sup>Ezekiel 45:13, it seems to have consisted of 60 shekels (20+25+15); but a comparison of <sup><1107></sup>1 Kings 10:17 with <sup><4916></sup>2 Chronicles 9:16 would make it to consist of 100 shekels (3 manehs = 300 shekels). Some explain these discrepancies by supposing that the sacred shekel was double the commercial, or that the talent and maneh of gold were respectively double those of silver. In this uncertainty it is generally agreed to reckon 60 manehs to the talent. and 50 shekels to a maneh. The beka was a half-shekel (<sup><12826></sup>Exodus 38:26); and the gerah was no the shekel (<sup><12013></sup>Exodus 30:13; <sup><12725></sup>Leviticus 27:25; <sup><14147></sup>Numbers 3:47; <sup><2650></sup>Ezekiel 45:20).

**3. Values of the Hebrew Weights as determined by a Comparison with the Greek and Roman.** — Josephus states (*Ant.* 3:6, 7) that the Hebrew talent of gold contained 100 minse (μνᾶς), but whether by this latter he means the Greek or the Hebrew weight corresponding to that term, is not clear. Again he states (*Ant.* 14:7, 1) that the gold mina (μνᾶ) was equal to two and a half Roman pounds (λίτρας). On the presumption that the same kind of mina is spoken of in both passages, the talent would be equivalent to 250 pounds. On the other hand, Epiphanius (*De Pond. et Mens. Heb.*) estimates the Hebrew talent at 125 Roman pounds. This difference, being just one half, leads to the suspicion that it is connected with the above variation in the value of the talent, maneh, and shekel; and this, in connection with the nearer correspondence to the Greek measures of similar name, renders the lower estimate the more probable. Taking the Roman pound (presumed to be equivalent to the Greek λίτρα) at 5204 grains (Smith, *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s.v. *Libra*), we have the Hebrew talent equal to 650,500 grains, or 112.79 pounds troy, or 92.9 pounds avoirdupois. Once more, Josephus says the gold shekel was equal to a daric (*Ant.* 3:8, 10), a Persian coin in Greek circulation, specimens of which have come down to us weighing an average of 128.5 grains (Smith, *ibid.* s.v. *Daricus*). This would yield a talent of 385,500 grains; which is much less, yet confirms the above conclusion sufficiently for an

approximate equivalent, as it evidently was meant to be, especially as the darics extant have of course lost considerable weight by time. Moreover, foreign coin usually passes 'for less than its true value.

**4. Absolute Determination of the Value of the Hebrew Weights** — This has been attempted by means of the coins that have actually come down to our time. The heavier specimens of silver of the Maccabean mintage that have been found give an average weight to the shekel of 220 grains. *SEE SHEKEL*. This affords a talent of 660,000 grains, very nearly agreeing with the above result. The copper coins of the same period that have survived are on the average much heavier, being about double the weight, showing a variation in the standard for that metal similar to that noticed above in the case of gold. Bockh, by averaging the shekels of every kind of metal, arrives at a mean weight of 274 grains; but this is too high for the preceding estimates. *SEE MONEY*.

"In the New Testament (<sup>4072b</sup>Matthew 17:24) the Temple tax is a *didrachm*; from other sources we know that this 'tribute' was half a shekel; and in verse 27 the *stater* is payment of this tax for two persons. Now the stater—a very common silver Attic coin, the *tetradrachm*—weighed 328.8 Parisian grains: thus considerably surpassing the sacred shekel. Are we, then, to hold the stater of the New Testament for an Attic tetradrachm? There is reason in the passage of Matthew and in early writers for regarding the two as the same. The Attic tetradrachm sank from its original weight of 328.8 to 308 and 304. This approximation must have gone on increasing, for under the empire a *drachm* was equal to a Roman *denarius*, which in the time of Tiberius weighed 69.8 Parisian grains. Four denarii were equal to 279 Parisian grains; so that, if the denarius is regarded as an Attic drachm, the sacred shekel may be correctly termed a tetradrachm. 'With this Josephus agrees (*Ant.* 3:8, 2), who says that the shekel (σίκλος), a Hebrew coin, contains four Attic drachms.'" *SEE DRACHMA*.

**II. Measures of Dimension or Extent.** — These are chiefly taken from some natural standard, such as the various portions of forearm and hand, or the distance of travel, etc.; so, among other nations, the *foot*, fathom, etc. In the descriptive portion of this and the following section we shall endeavor to bring these disputed questions to something like a practical conclusion.

**1. Measures of Length.**

(1.) The principal of these were as follows:

(a) The [ ~~Bææ~~ *etsba*, or finger-breadth, mentioned only in ~~2571~~ Jeremiah 52:21.

1 The *j pif*, *tephach*, or hand-breadth (~~1225~~ Exodus 25:25; I Kings 7:26; ~~4010~~ 2 Chronicles 4:10), applied metaphorically to a short period of time in ~~4915~~ Psalm 39:5.

(c) The *trz*, *zeeoth*, or span, the distance between the extremities of the thumb and the little finger in the extended hand (~~12316~~ Exodus 28:16; ~~19704~~ 1 Samuel 17:4; ~~3593~~ Ezekiel 43:13), applied generally to describe any small measure in ~~2302~~ Isaiah 40:12.

(d) The *hMaj*, *anmadh*, or cubit, the distance from the elbow to the extremity of the middle finger. This occurs very frequently in the Bible in relation to buildings, such as the Ark (~~1065~~ Genesis 6:15), the Tabernacle (Exodus 26, 27), and the Temple (~~11032~~ 1 Kings 6:2; Ezekiel 40, 41), as well as in relation to man's stature (~~19704~~ 1 Samuel 17:4. ~~4167~~ Matthew 6:27), and other objects (~~1754~~ Esther 5:14; ~~3812~~ Zechariah 5:2).

(e) The *dmḡogomed*, lit. a *rod*, applied to Eglon's dirk (~~10616~~ Judges 3:16). Its length is uncertain, but it probably fell below the cubit, with which it is identified in the A. V. (f) The *hnq*, *kaneh*, or reed (comp. our word "cane"), for measuring buildings on a large scale (~~2505~~ Ezekiel 40:5-8; 41:8; 42:16-19).

(2.) Little information is furnished by the Bible itself as to the relative or absolute lengths described under the above terms. With the exception of the notice that the reed equals six cubits (~~2505~~ Ezekiel 40:5), we have no intimation that the measures were combined in anything like a scale. We should, indeed, infer the reverse from the circumstance that Jeremiah speaks of "four fingers," where, according to the scale, he would have said "a hand-breadth," that in the description of Goliath's height (~~19704~~ 1 Samuel 17:4), the expression "six cubits and a span" is used instead of "six cubits and a half;" and that Ezekiel mentions "span" and "half a cubit" in close juxtaposition (~~2593~~ Ezekiel 43:13, 17), as though they bore no relation to each other either in the ordinary or the long cubit. That the denominations held a certain ratio to each other, arising out of the proportions of the members in the body, could hardly escape notice; but it does not follow

that they were ever worked up into an artificial scale. But by comparing together <sup><12510></sup>Exodus 25:10 with Josephus (*Ant.* 3:6, 5), we find the span equal to half a cubit; for the length which Moses terms two cubits and a half, Josephus designates five spans. The relation of tephach (hand-breadth) and etsba (finger) to ammah (cubit) appears from their several names and their import in other systems. The hand-breadth is four fingers; the span contains three times the breadth of the hand, or twelve fingers. This is the view which the rabbins uniformly take. We find a similar system among the Greeks, who reckoned in the cubit twenty-four fingers, six hand-breadths, and two spans. The same was the case with the Egyptians.

The most important conclusion usually drawn from the Biblical notices is to the effect that the cubit, which may be regarded as the standard measure, was of varying length, and that, in order to secure accuracy, it was necessary to define the kind of cubit intended, the result being that the other denominations, if combined in a scale, would vary in like ratio. Thus in <sup><18111></sup>Deuteronomy 3:11, the cubit is specified to be “after the cubit of a man;” in <sup><14112></sup>2 Chronicles 3:3, “after the first,” or, rather, “after the older (hmmwar) measure;” and in <sup><34113></sup>Ezekiel 41:8, “a great cubit,” or, literally, “a cubit to the joint,” which is further defined in <sup><34114></sup>Ezekiel 40:5 to be “a cubit and a hand-breadth.” These expressions involve one of the most knotty points of Hebrew archaeology, viz. the number and the respective lengths of the scriptural cubits. A cubit “after the cubit of a man” implies the existence of another cubit, which was either longer or shorter than it, and from analogy it may be taken for granted that this second cubit would be the longer of the two. But what is meant by the “; ammdah of a man ?” Is it the *cubitus* in the anatomical sense of the term—in other words, the bone of the forearm between the elbow and the wrist? or is it the full cubit in the ordinary sense of the term, from the elbow to the extremity of the middle finger? What, again, are we to understand by Ezekiel’s expression, “cubit to the joint?” The term **l r Xaj atstsil**, is explained by Gesenius (*Thesaur.* p. 144) of the *knuckles*, and not of the “armholes,” as in the A. V. of <sup><24115></sup>Jeremiah 38:12, where our translators have omitted all reference to the word *yadeka*, which follows it. A- “cubit to the knuckles” would imply the space from the elbow to the knuckles, and as this cubit exceeds by a hand-breadth the ordinary cubit, we should infer that it was contradistinguished from the cubit that reached only to the wrist. The meaning of the word is, however, contested: Hitzig gives it the sense of a *connecting wall* (*Comm. on Jer.*). Sturmius (*Sciagr.* p. 94) understands it

of the *edge* of the walls, and others in the sense of a *wing* of a building (Rosenmuller, *Schol. in Jer.*). Michaelis, on the other hand, understands it of the knuckles (*Supplem.* p. 119), and so does Saalschitz (*Archaol.* 2:165). The expressions now discussed, taken together, certainly favor the idea that the cubit of the Bible did not come up to the full length of the cubit of other countries. (See below.) A further question remains to be discussed, viz. whether more than two cubits were in vogue among the Hebrews. It is generally conceded that the “former” or “older” measure of <sup><4RB></sup>2 Chronicles 3:3 was the Mosaic or legal cubit, and that the modern measure, the existence of which is implied in that designation, was somewhat larger. Further, the cubit “after the cubit of a man” of <sup><4RB></sup>Deuteronomy 3:11 is held to be a *common* measure, in contradistinction to the Mosaic one, and to have fallen below this latter in point of length. In this case we should have three cubits—the common, the Mosaic or old measure, and the new measure. We turn to Ezekiel and find a distinction of another character, viz. a long and a short cubit. Now it has been urged by many writers, and we think with good reason, that Ezekiel would not be likely to adopt any other than the old orthodox Mosaic standard for the measurements of his ideal, temple. If so, his long cubit would be identified with the *old* measure, and his short cubit with the one “after the cubit of a man,” and the *new* measure of <sup><4RB></sup>2 Chronicles 3:3 would represent a still longer cubit than Ezekiel’s long one. Other explanations of the prophet’s ϕ language have, however, been offered: it has been sometimes assumed that, while living in Chaldaea, he and his countrymen had adopted the long Babylonian cubit (Jahn, *Archceol.* § 113); but in this case his short cubit could not have belonged to the same country, inasmuch as the difference between these two amounted to only three fingers (Herod. 1:178). Again, it has been explained that his short cubit was the ordinary Chaldaean measure, and the long one the Mosaic measure (Rosenmuller, in <sup><4RB></sup>Ezekiel 40:5): but this is unlikely, on account of the respective lengths of the Babylonian and the Mosaic cubits, to which we shall hereafter refer. Independently of these objections, we think that the passages previously discussed (<sup><4RB></sup>Deuteronomy 3:11; <sup><4RB></sup>2 Chronicles 3:3) imply the existence of three cubits.

It remains to be inquired whether from the Bible itself we can extract any information as to the length of the Mosaic or legal cubit. The notices of the height of the altar and of the height of the lavers in the Temple are of importance in this respect. In the former case three cubits is specified

(<sup><1271></sup>Exodus 27:1), with a direct prohibition against the use of steps (<sup><1211></sup>Exodus 20:2.6); in the latter, the height of the base on which the laver was placed was three cubits (<sup><1072></sup>1 Kings 7:27). If we adopt the ordinary length of the cubit (say 20 inches), the height of the altar and the base would be '5 feet. But it would be extremely inconvenient, if not impossible, to minister at an altar or to use a laver placed at such a height.' In order to meet this difficulty without any alteration of the length of the cubit, it must be assumed that an inclined plane led up to it, as was the case with the loftier altar of the Temple (Mishna. *Middoth*, iii, § 1, 3). But such a contrivance is contrary to the spirit of the text; and, even if suited to the altar would be wholly needless for the lavers. Hence Saalschutz offers that the cubit did not exceed a Prussian foot, which is less than an English foot (*Archaeol.* 2:167). The other instances adduced by him are not so much to the point. The molten sea was not designed for the purpose of bathing (though this impression is conveyed by <sup><1416></sup>2 Chronicles 4:6, as given in the AV.), and therefore no conclusion can be drawn from the depth of the water in it. The height of Og, as inferred from the length of his bedstead (9 cubits, Dent. 3:11), and the height of Goliath (6 cubits and a span, <sup><1174></sup>1 Samuel 17:4), are not inconsistent with the idea of a cubit about 18 inches long, if credit can be given to other recorded instances of extraordinary stature (Pliny, 7:2, 16; Herod. 1:68; Josephus, *Ant.* 18:4, 5). At the same time the rendering of the Sept. in <sup><1174></sup>1 Samuel 17:4, which is followed by Josephus (*Ant.* 6:9, 1), and which reduces the number of cubits to four, suggests either an error in the Hebrew text, or a considerable increase in the length of the cubit in later times.

**(3.)** We now turn to collateral sources of information, which we will follow out, as far as possible, in chronological order. The earliest and most trustworthy testimony as to the length of the cubit is supplied by the existing specimens of old Egyptian measures. Several of these have been discovered in tombs, carrying us back at all events to BC. 1700, while the Nilometer at Elephantine exhibits the length of the cubit in the time of the Roman emperors. No great difference is exhibited in these measures, the longest being estimated at about 21 inches, and the shortest at about 20½, or exactly 20.4729 inches (Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* 2:258). They are divided into 28 digits, and in this respect contrast with the Mosaic cubit, which, according to rabbinical authorities, was divided into 24 digits. There is some difficulty in reconciling this discrepancy with the almost certain fact of the derivation of the cubit from Egypt. It has generally been surmised

that the Egyptian cubit was of more than one length, and that the sepulchral measures exhibit the shorter as well as the' longer by special marks. Wilkinson denies the existence of more than one cubit (*Anc. Eg.* 2:257-259), apparently on the ground that the total lengths of the measures do not materially vary. It may be conceded that the measures are intended to represent the same length, the variation being simply the result of mechanical inaccuracy; but this does not decide the question of the double cubit, which rather turns on the peculiarities of notation observable on these measures. For a full discussion of this point we must refer the reader to Thenius's essay in the *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* for 1846, p. 297-342. Our limits will permit only a brief statement of the facts of the case, and of the views expressed in reference to them. The most perfect of the Egyptian cubit measures are those preserved in the Turin and Louvre museums. These are unequally divided into two parts, the one on the right hand containing 15, and the other 13 digits. In the former part the digits are subdivided into aliquot parts from I to A-, reckoning from right to left. In the latter part the digits are marked on the lower edge in the Turin, and on the upper edge in the Louvre measure. In the Turin measure the three left-hand digits exceed the others in size, and have marks over them indicating either fingers or the numerals 1, 2, 3. The four left-hand digits are also marked off from the rest by a double stroke, and are further distinguished by hieroglyphic marks supposed to indicate that they are digits of the old measure. There are also special marks between the 6th and 7th, and between the 10th and 11th digits of the left-hand portion. In the Louvre cubit two digits are marked off on the lower edge by lines running in a slightly transverse direction, thus producing a greater length than is given on the upper side. It has been found that each of the three above specified digits in the Turin measure =  $\frac{1}{3}$  of the whole length, less these three digits; or, to put it in another form, the four left-hand digits =  $\frac{1}{3}$  of the 25 right-hand digits: also that each of the two digits in the Louvre measure =  $\frac{1}{3}$  of the whole length, less these two digits; and further, that twice the left half of either measure the whole length of the Louvre measure, less the two digits. Most writers on the subject agree in the conclusion that the measures contain a combination of two, if not three, kinds of cubit. Great difference of opinion, however, is manifested as to particulars. Thenius makes the difference between the royal and old cubits to be no more than two digits, the average length of the latter being 484.289 millimetres, or 19.066 inches, as compared with 523.524 millimetres, or 20.611 inches, and 523 millimetres, or 20.591 inches, the lengths 'of the Turin and Louvre

Measures respectively. He accounts for the additional two digits as originating in the practice of placing the two fingers crosswise at the end of the arm and hand used in measuring, so as to mark the spot up to which the cloth or other article has been measured. He further finds, in the notation of the Turin measure, indications of a third or ordinary cubit 23 digits in length. Another explanation is that the old cubit consisted of 24 or 25 new digits, and that its length was 462 millimetres, or 18.189 inches, and, again, others put the old cubit at 24 new digits, as marked on the measures. The relative proportions of the two would be, on these two hypotheses, as 28: 26, as 28: 25, and as 28: 24. (See below.)

The use of more than one cubit appears to have also prevailed in-Babylon, for Herodotus states that the “royal” exceeded the “moderate” cubit (πῆχυς μέτριος) by three digits (i 178). The appellation “royal,” if borrowed from the Babylonians, would itself imply the existence of another; but it is by no means certain that this other was the “moderate” cubit mentioned in the text. The majority of critics think that Herodotus is there speaking of the ordinary Greek cubit (Bockh, p. 214), though the opposite view is affirmed by Grote in his notice of Bockh’s work (*Class. Mus.* 1:28). Even if the Greek cubit be understood, a further difficulty arises out of the uncertainty whether Herodotus is speaking of digits as they stood on the Greek or on the Babylonian measure. In the one case the proportions of the two would be as 8:7, in the other case as 9:8. Bockh adopts the Babylonian digits (Without good reason, we think), and estimates the Babylonian royal cubit at 234.2743 Paris lines, or 20.806 inches (p. 219). A greater length would be assigned to it according to the data furnished by M. Oppert, as stated in Rawlinson’s *Herod.* 1:315; for if the cubit and foot stood in the ratio of 5:3, and if the latter contained 15 digits, and had a length of 315 millimetres, then the length of the ordinary cubit would be 525 millimetres, and of the royal cubit, assuming, with Mr. Grote, that the cubits in each case were Babylonian, 588 millimetres, or 23.149 inches.

Reverting to the Hebrew measures, we should be disposed to identify the new measure implied in <sup><4RB></sup>2 Chronicles 3:3, with the full Egyptian cubit; the “old” measure and Ezekiel’s cubit with the lesser one, either of 26 or 24 digits; and the “cubit of a man” with the third one of which Thenlus speaks. Bickh, however, identifies the Mosaic measure with the full Egyptian cubit, and accounts for the difference in the number of digits on the hypothesis that the Hebrews substituted a division into 24 for that into



28 digits, the size of the digits being of course increased (p. 266, 267). With regard to the Babylonian measure, it seems highly improbable that either the ordinary or the royal cubit could be identified with Ezekiel's short cubit (as Rosenmeiller thinks), seeing that its length on either of the computations above offered exceeded that of the Egyptian cubit.

In the Mishna the Mosaic cubit is defined to be one of six palms (*Celim*, 17, § 10). It is termed the moderate cubit (**תַּנְוִיבָה שָׁא**), and is distinguished from a lesser cubit of five palms on the one side (*Celim*, *ib.*), and on the other side from a larger one, consisting, according to Bartenora (*in Cel.* 17, § 9), of six palms and a digit. The palm consisted, according to Maimonides (*ibid.*), of four digits; and the digit, according to Arias Montanus (*Ant.* p. 113), of four barleycorns. This gives 144 barleycorns as the length of the cubit, which accords with the number assigned to the *cubitus justus et mediocris* of the Arabians (Bickh, p. 246). The length of the Mosaic cubit, as computed by Thenius (after several trials—with the specified number of barleycorns of middling size, placed side by side), is 214.512 Paris lines, or 19.0515 inches (*Stud. u. Krit.* p. 110). It seems hardly possible to arrive at any very exact conclusion by this mode of calculation. Eisenschmid estimated 144 barleycorns as equal to 238.35 Paris lines (Bickh, p. 269), perhaps from having used larger grains than the average. The writer of the article on “Weights and Measures” in the *Penny Cyclopaedia* (xviii. 198) gives, as the result of his own experience, that 38 average grains make up 5 inches, in which case  $144 = 18.947$  inches; while the length of the Arabian cubit referred to is computed at 213.058 Paris lines (Bockh, p. 247). The Talmudists state that the Mosaic cubit was used for the edifice of the Tabernacle and Temple, and the lesser cubit for the vessels thereof. This was probably a fiction; for the authorities were not agreed ‘among themselves as to the extent to which the lesser cubit was used, some of them restricting it to the golden altar, and parts of the brazen altar (*Mishna, Cel.* 17, § 10). But this distinction, fictitious as it may have been, shows that the cubits were not regarded in the light of *sacred* and *profane*, as stated in works on Hebrew archæology. Another distinction, adopted by the rabbinites in reference to the palm, would tend to show that they did not rigidly adhere to any definite length of cubit; for they recognised two kinds of palms, one wherein the fingers lay loosely open, which they denominated a *smiling* palm; the other wherein the fingers were closely compressed, and styled the *grieving* palm (Carpzov, *Appar.* p. 674, 676).

## Picture for Metrology

(4.) Prof. T. O. Paine, the acute and accurate author of *Solomon's Temple*, etc. (Bost, 1861) presents some original and ingenious views on the subject, which appear to us to solve most of the above difficulties. He maintains that there was but one cubit in use among the Hebrews, and that essentially the same with the Egyptian cubit. The “hand-breadth” he regards as an addition ( $a b$ ) to the rod itself ( $b c$ ), for convenience of holding, as in the annexed figure. This, he thinks, likewise explains the peculiar phraseology in <sup><3613></sup>Ezekiel 43:13: **hMaihMaij pifw** A cubit [i.e. the rule] is *a cubit and a hand-breadth* long (p. 72). So also by means of the following figure -he shows that only six cubits were counted on the reed ( $b c$ ), while the hand-breadth ( $a b$ ) was a handle to hold the reed by. Thus <sup><3616></sup>Ezekiel 40:5, “And in the man’s hand a measuring-reed six cubits by the [regular] cubit, and a handbreadth” [additional] ;” again, <sup><3618></sup>Ezekiel 41:8, “A full reed of six great cubits,” **hnQhihl yXai t/Mai vvel** literally, as the Masoretic accents require, *the reed, six cubits to the joint*, i.e., as Mr. Paine shrewdly interprets the *joint of the reed*, one of its knots’ or sections, as in the subjoined cut (*ibid.*). All this suggests the surmise that the three larger and separate digits over the cubits described above as extant were actually no part of the measure itself, but only the finger-marks or *handle* by means of which lit was grasped in use. If these be deducted, the cubit will be reduced to the usual or traditionary reckoning, which is about 18 inches.

We take the liberty of adding some interesting researches from a private communication by the same writer, in which he believes that he has discovered *the cubit locked up in the sockets* of the Tabernacle walls. Having determined that these were each 1 cubit square and 1 cubit thick, he makes the following curious calculation: The 96 silver sockets of the planks (<sup><4265></sup>Exodus 26:15-25) would make 4 cubit cubes, i.e., if piled together, a solid mass 2 cubits in each dimension; or, in other terms, 24 sockets made a solid cubit. As each socket weighed a talent (<sup><4267></sup>Exodus 38:27), we have the formula,

$$1 \text{ cubit (in inches)} = (24 \text{ talents in silver} / 1 \text{ cub. inch of silver})^{1/3}$$

As the talent contained 3000 shekels, and as silver weighs 2651 grains per inch, we have, by substitution,

$$1 \text{ cubit} = (72,000 \text{ shekels silver} / 2651 \text{ grains})^{1/3}$$

or, assuming the ancient shekel to have weighed (as above) 220 grains,  
 1 cubit (in inches) =  $(15840000/2651)^{1/3} = (5975)^{1/3} = 18.14$  inches.

This strikingly agrees with the result attained above. Prof. Paine remarks that the *cores* for the tenons in the sockets may safely be neglected, as the dross would fully counterbalance them. The alloy, if at all used in manufacturing, would not materially raise the value of the cubit in this calculation.

(5.) Land and area were measured either by the cubit (<sup>06504</sup>Numbers 35:4, 5; <sup>3607</sup>Ezekiel 40:27) or by the reed (<sup>3520</sup>Ezekiel 42:20; 43:17; 45:2; 48:20; <sup>6216</sup>Revelation 21:16). There is no indication in the Bible of the use of a square measure by the Jews. Whenever they wished to define the size of a plot, they specified its length and breadth, even if it were a perfect square, as in <sup>35816</sup>Ezekiel 48:16. The difficulty of defining an area by these means is experienced in the interpretation of <sup>06504</sup>Numbers 35:4, 5, where the suburbs of the Levitical cities are described as reaching outward from the wall of the city 1000 cubits round about, and at the same time 2000 cubits on each side from without the city. We can hardly understand these two measurements otherwise than as applying, the one to the width, the other to the external boundary of the suburb, the measurements being taken respectively perpendicular and parallel to the city walls. But in this case it is necessary to understand the words rendered “from without the city,” in ver. 5, as meaning *to the exclusion of the city*, so that the length of the city wall should be added in each case to the 2000 cubits. The result would be that the size of the areas would vary, and that where the city walls were unequal in length, the sides of the suburb would be also unequal. For instance, if the city wall were 500 cubits long, then the side of the suburb would be 2500 cubits; if the city wall were 1000 cubits, then the side of the suburb would be 3000 cubits. Assuming the existence of two towns, 500 and 1000 cubits square, the area of the suburb would in the former case = 6,000,000 square cubits, and would be 24 times the size of the town; while in the latter case the suburb would be 8,000,000 square cubits, and only 8 times the size of the town. This explanation is not wholly satisfactory, on account of the disproportion of the suburbs as compared with the towns; nevertheless any other explanation only exaggerates this disproportion. Keil, in his comment on <sup>06404</sup>Joshua 14:4, assumes that the city wall was in all cases to be regarded as 1000 cubits long, which with the 1000 cubits outside the wall, and measured in the same direction as the wall, would

make up the 2000 cubits, and would give to the side of the suburb in every case a length of 3000 cubits. The objection to this view is that there is no evidence as to a uniform length of the city walls, and that the suburb might have been more conveniently described as 3000 cubits on each side. All ambiguity would have been avoided if the size of the suburb had been decided either by absolute or relative acreage; in other words, if it were to consist in all cases of a certain fixed acreage outside the walls, or if it were made to Vary in a certain ratio to the size of the town. As the text stands, neither of these methods can be deduced from it. *SEE LEVITICAL CITY.*

**2.** The measures of distance noticed in the Old Testament are the three following:

(a) The **d[*k*i** *tsd'ad*, or pace (<sup><0163></sup>2 Samuel 6:13), answering generally to our yard.

(b) The **/rah; trbKa** *kibrath ha-arets*, rendered in the A. V. “a little way” or “a little piece of ground” (<sup><0156></sup>Genesis 35:16; 48:7; <sup><0159></sup>2 Kings 5:19). The expression appears to indicate some definite distance, but we are unable to state with precision what that distance was. The Sept. retains the Hebrew word in the form **Χαβραθά**, as if it were the name of a place, adding in <sup><047></sup>Genesis 48:7 the words **κατὰ τὸν ἵππόδρομον**, which is thus a second translation of the expression. If a certain distance was intended by this translation, it would be either the ordinary length of a race-course, or such a distance as a horse could travel without being overfatigued—in other words, a stage. But it probably means a locality, either a race-course itself, as in 3 Mace. 4:11, or the space outside the town walls where the racecourse was usually to be found. The Sept. gives it again in <sup><047></sup>Genesis 48:7 as the equivalent for Ephrath. The Syriac and Persian versions render *kibrath* by *parac sang*, a well-known Persian measure, generally estimated at 30 stades (Herod. 2:6; v. 53), or from 3½ to 4 English miles, but sometimes at a larger amount, even up to 60 stades (Strab. 11:518). The only conclusion to be drawn from the Bible is that the *kibrath* did not exceed and probably equalled the distance between Bethlehem and Rachel’s burial-place, which is traditionally identified with a spot 11 miles north of the town.

(c) The **μ/γ ĒrD**, *derek yom*, or **μωϕ Ēl hñi** *mahaldk yom*, a day’s journey, which was the most usual method of calculating distances in travelling (<sup><016></sup>Genesis 30:36; 31:23; <sup><018></sup>Exodus 3:18; 5:3; <sup><043></sup>Numbers

10:33; 11:31; 33:8; <sup><1100></sup>Deuteronomy 1:2; <sup><1190></sup>1 Kings 19:4; <sup><1200></sup>2 Kings 3:9; <sup><1210></sup>Jonah 3:3; 1 Macc. v. 24, 28; 7:45; Tobit 6:1), though but one' instance of it occurs in the New Testament (<sup><1244></sup>Luke 2:44). The distance indicated by it was naturally fluctuating, according to the circumstance of the traveller or the country through which he passed. Herodotus variously estimates it at 200 and 150 stades (iv. 101; v. 53); Marinus (*ap. Ptol.* 1:11) at 150 and 172 stades; Pausanias (x. 33, § 2) at 150 stades; Strabo (i. 35) at from 250 to 300 stades; and Vegetius (*De Re Mil.* 1:11) at from 20 to 24 miles for the Roman army. The ordinary day's journey among the Jews - Was thirty miles; but when they travelled in companies, only ten miles. Neapolis formed the first stage out of Jerusalem, according to the former, and Beeroth according to the latter computation (Lightfoot, *Exerc. in Luc.* 2:44). It is impossible to assign any distinct length to the day's journey: Jahn's estimate of 33 miles, 172 yards, and 4 feet, is based upon the false assumption that it bore some fixed ratio to the other measures of length.

In the Apocrypha and New Testament we meet with the following additional measures:

(d) The Sabbath day's journey, **σαββάτου ὁδός**, a general statement for a very limited distance, such as would naturally be regarded as the immediate vicinity of any locality.

(e) The **στάδιον**, *stadium*, or "furlong," a Greek measure introduced into Asia subsequently to Alexander's conquest, and hence first mentioned in the Apocrypha (2 Macc. 11:5; 12:9, 17, 29), and subsequently in the New Testament (<sup><12413></sup>Luke 24:13; <sup><1199></sup>John 6:19; 11:18; <sup><11411></sup>Revelation 14:20; 21:16). Both the name and the length of the stade were borrowed from the foot-race course at Olympia. It equalled 600 Greek feet (Herod. 2:149), or 125 Roman paces (Plin. 2:23), or 6063 feet of our measure. It thus falls below the furlong by 531 feet. The distances between Jerusalem and the places Bethany, Jamnia, and Scythopolis, are given with tolerable exactness at 15 stades (<sup><11118></sup>John 11:18), 240 stades (2 Macc. 12:9), and 600 stades (2 Macc. 12:29). In 2 Macc. 11:5 there is an evident error, either of the author or of the text, in respect to the position of Bethsura, which is given as only 5 stades from Jerusalem. 'The Talmudists describe the stade under the term *res*, and regarded it as equal to 625 feet and 125 paces (Carpzov, *Appar.* p. 679). (f) The mile, **μίλιον**, a Roman measure, equalling 1000 Roman paces, 8 stades, and 1618 English yards. See each in its place.

### III. Measures of Capacity. —

1. Those for *liquids* were:

- (a) The **gl** *log* (<sup><1840></sup>Leviticus 14:10, etc.), originally signifying a “basin.”
- (b) The **yh**~~h~~*hui*, a name of Egyptian origin, frequently noticed in the Bible (<sup><1294></sup>Exodus 29:40; 30:24; <sup><1454></sup>Numbers 15:4, 7, 9; <sup><1341></sup>Ezekiel 4:11; etc.).
- (c) **tB**i **β**άτος, the *bath*, the name meaning “measured,” the largest of the liquid measures (<sup><1073></sup>1 Kings 7:26, 38; <sup><1420></sup>2 Chronicles 2:10; <sup><1372></sup>Ezra 7:22; <sup><2350></sup>Isaiah 5:10; <sup><2166></sup>Luke 16:16).

With regard to the relative values of these measures we learn nothing from the Bible, but we gather from Josephus (*Ant.* 3:8, 3) that the bath contained 6 hins (for the bath equalled 72 *xestce* or 12 *chos*, and the bin 2 *choes*), and from the rabbinites that the hin contained 12 logs (Carpzov, *Appar.* p. 685).

2. The dry *measure* contained the following denominations:

- (a) The **bq**i *cab*, mentioned only in <sup><1165></sup>2 Kings 6:25, the name meaning literally *hollow* or *concave*.
- (b) The **rm** **]** *omer* mentioned only in <sup><1216></sup>Exodus 16:16-36. The same measure is elsewhere termed **w**oC **]** *assaron*, as being the tenth part of an ephah (compare <sup><1216></sup>Exodus 16:36), whence in the A. V. “tent] deal” (<sup><1840></sup>Leviticus 14:10; 23:13; <sup><1454></sup>Numbers 15:4, etc.). The word omer implies a *heap*, and secondarily a *sheaf*.
- (c) The **has** **]** *seah*, or ‘measure,’ this being the etymological meaning of the term, and appropriately applied to it, inasmuch as it was the ordinary measure for household purposes (<sup><1186></sup>Genesis 18:6; <sup><1258></sup>1 Samuel 25:18; <sup><1271></sup>2 Kings 7:1, 16). The Greek equivalent, **σ**άτον, occurs in <sup><1133></sup>Matthew 13:33; <sup><1271></sup>Luke 13:21. The seah was otherwise termed **vyl** **]** *æshalish*, as being the third part of an ephah (<sup><2302></sup>Isaiah 40:12; <sup><1816></sup>Psalms 80:5).
- (d) The **hpya**~~e~~*ephdh*, a word of Egyptian origin, and of frequent recurrence in the Bible (<sup><1216></sup>Exodus 16:36; <sup><1851></sup>Leviticus 5:11; 6:20; <sup><1455></sup>Numbers 5:15; 28:5; <sup><1069></sup>Judges 6:19; <sup><1827></sup>Ruth 2:17; <sup><1024></sup>1 Samuel 1:24; 17:17; <sup><2651></sup>Ezekiel 45:11, 13, 14; 46:5, 7, 11, 14).

(e) The ἔτλ, *lethek*, ἡμίκοπος, or “half-homer,” literally meaning what is *poured out*: it occurs only in <sup><3882></sup>Hosea 3:2.

(f) The ῥμῆφdmer, meaning *heap* (<sup><18276></sup>Leviticus 27:16; <sup><14113></sup>Numbers 11:32; <sup><21510></sup>Isaiah 5:10; <sup><3513></sup>Ezekiel 45:13). It is elsewhere termed *cor*, ῥκφ from the circular vessel in which it was measured (<sup><11022></sup>1 Kings 4:22; 5:11; <sup><4420></sup>2 Chronicles 2:10; 27:5; <sup><15722></sup>Ezra 7:22; <sup><3514></sup>Ezekiel 45:14). The Greek equivalent, *copoc*, occurs in <sup><21617></sup>Luke 16:7.

The relative proportions of the dry measures are to a certain extent expressed in the names *issarḥn*, meaning a tenth, and *shalish*, a third. In addition, we have the Biblical statement that the omer is the tenth part of the ephah (<sup><12635></sup>Exodus 16:36), and that the ephah was the tenth part of a homer, and corresponded to the bath in liquid measure (<sup><3511></sup>Ezekiel 45:11). The rabbinites supplement this by stating that the ephah contained three seahs, and the seah six cabs (Carpzov, p. 683).

The scale is constructed, it will be observed, on a combination of decimal and duodecimal ratios, the former prevailing in respect to the omer, ephah, and homer, the latter in respect to the cab, seah, and ephah. In the liquid measure the duodecimal ratio alone appears, and hence there is a fair presumption that this was the original, as it was undoubtedly the most general principle on which the scales of antiquity were framed (Bockh, p. 38). Whether the decimal division was introduced from some other system, or whether it was the result of local usage, there is no evidence to show.

**3.** The absolute values of the liquid and dry measures form the subject of a single inquiry, inasmuch as the two scales have a measure of equal value, viz. the bath and the ephah (<sup><3511></sup>Ezekiel 45:11): if either of these can be fixed, the conversion of the other denominations into their respective values readily follows. Unfortunately, the data for determining the value of the bath or ephah are both scanty and conflicting. Attempts have been made to deduce the value of the bath from a comparison of the dimensions and the contents of the molten sea as given in <sup><11023></sup>1 Kings 7:23-26. If these particulars had been given with greater accuracy and fulness, they would have furnished a sound basis for a calculation: but, as the matter now stands, uncertainty attends the statement. The diameter is given as 10 cubits, and the circumference as 30 cubits, the diameter being stated to be “from one brim to the other.” Assuming that the vessel was circular, the proportions of the diameter and circumference are not sufficiently exact for

mathematical purposes, nor are we able to decide whether the diameter was measured from the internal or the external edge of the vessel. The difference, however, in either respect, is not sufficiently great to affect the result materially. The shape of the vessel has been variously conceived to be circular and polygonal, cylindrical and hemispherical, with perpendicular and with bulging sides. The contents are given as 2000 baths in <sup><1026></sup>1 Kings 7:26, and 3000 baths in <sup><1015></sup>2 Chronicles 4:5, the latter being probably a corrupt text. The conclusions drawn have been widely different, as might be expected. If it be assumed that the form of the vessel was cylindrical (as the description *prima facie* seems to imply), that its clear diameter was 10 cubits of the value (often estimated) of 19.0515 English inches each, and that its full contents were 2000 baths, then the value of the bath would be 4.8965 gallons; for the contents of the vessel would equal 2,715,638 cubic inches, or 9793 gallons. If, however, the statement of Josephus (*Ant.* 8:3, 5), as to the hemispherical form of the vessel, be adopted, then the estimate would be reduced. Saigey, as quoted by Bickh (p. 261), on this hypothesis calculates the value of the bath at 18.086 French litres, or 3.9807 English gallons. If, further, we adopt Saalschitz's view as to the length of the cubit, which he puts at 15 Dresden inches at the highest, the value of the bath will be further reduced, according to his calculation, to 10½ Prussian quarts, or 2.6057 English gallons; while at his lower estimate of the cubit at 12 inches, its value would be little more than one half of this amount (*Archdol.* 2:171). On the other hand, if the vessel bulged, and if the diameter and circumference were measured at the neck or narrowest part of it, space might be found for 2000 or even 3000 baths of greater value than any of the above estimates. It is therefore hopeless to arrive at any satisfactory conclusion from this source. Nevertheless, we think the calculations are not without their use as furnishing a certain amount of presumptive evidence. For, setting aside the theory that the vessel bulged considerably, for which the text furnishes no evidence whatever; all the other computations agree in one point, viz. that the bath fell far below the value placed on it by' Josephus, and by modern writers on Hebrew archaeology generally, according to whom the bath measures between 8 and 9 English gallons. *SEE BRAZEN SEA.*

We turn to the statements of Josephus and other early writers. The former states that the bath equals 72 *xestce* (*Ant.* 8:2, 9); that the hin equals 2 Attic *choes* (*ibid.* 3:8, 3; 9, 4); that the seah equals 1½ Italian *modii* (*ibid.* 9:4, 5); that the cor equals 10 Attic *medimni* (*ibid.* 15:9, 2); and that the



issaron or omer equals 7 Attic *cotylk* (*ibid.* 3:6, 6). It may further be implied from *Ant.* 9:4, 4, as compared with <sup><1165</sup>2 Kings 6:25, that he regarded the cab as equal to 4 *xestcae*. Now, in order to reduce these statements to consistency, it must be assumed that in *Ant.* 15:9, 2, he has confused the medimnus with the *metretes*, and in *Ant.* 3:6, 6, the *cotyle* with the *xestes*. Such errors throw doubt on his other statements, and tend to the conclusion that Josephus was not really familiar with the Greek measures. This impression is supported by his apparent ignorance of the term *metriets*, which he should have used not only in the passage above noticed, but also in 8:2, 9, where he would naturally have substituted it for 72 *xestfe*, assuming that these were Attic *xestce*. Nevertheless, his testimony must be taken as decisively in favor of the essential identity of the Hebrew bath with the Attic *metretes*. Jerome (*in Matt.* 13:33) affirms' that the seah equals 1 n *modii*, and (*in* <sup><1165</sup>*Ezekiel* 45:11) that the cor equals 30 *modii*: statements that are glaringly inconsistent, inasmuch as there were 30 seahs in the cor. The statements of Epiphanius, in his treatise *De Mensuris*, are equally remarkable for inconsistency. He states (ii. 177) that the cor equals 30 *modii*. On this assumption the bath would equal 51 *sextarii*, but he gives only 50 (p. 178); the seah would equal 1 *nodius*, but he gives 1k *modii* (p. 178), or, according to his estimate of 17 *sextarii* to the *modius*, 214 *sextarii*; though elsewhere he assigns 56 *sextarii* as its value (p. 182); the omer would be 5 *sextarii*, but he gives 7, (p. 182), implying 45 *zodii* to the cor; and, lastly, the ephah is identified with the Egyptian *artabe* (p. 182), which was either 4 or 3 *maodii*, according as it was in the old or the new measure, though, according to his estimate of the cor, it would only equal 3 *modii*. Little reliance can be placed on statements so loosely made, and the question arises whether the identification of the bath with the *metretks* did not arise out of the circumstance that the two measures held the same relative position in the scales, each being subdivided into 72 parts; and, again, whether the assignment of 30 *modii* to the cor did not arise out of there being 30 seahs in it. The discrepancies can only be explained on the assumption that a wide margin was allowed for a long measure, amounting to an increase of fifty per cent. This appears to have been the case from the definition of the seah or *οαιρον* given by Hesychius (μόδιος γέμων, ἡγουν ν ἡμισυ μόδιον Ἰταλικόν), and again by Suidas (μόδιον ὑπερπεπληρωμένον, ὡς εἶναι μόδιον ἕνα καὶ ἡμισυν). Assuming, however, that Josephus was right in identifying the bath with the *metretes*, its value would be, according to Bickh's estimate of the latter (p. 261, 278), 1993.95 Paris

cubic inches, or 8.7053 English gallons; but, according to the estimate of Bertheau (*Gesch.* p. 73), 1985.77 Paris cubic inches, or 8.6696 English gallons.

The rabbinites furnish data of a different kind for calculating the value of the Hebrew measures. They estimated the log to be equal to six hen eggs, the cubic contents of which were ascertained by measuring the amount of water they displaced (Maimonides. *in Cel.* 17, § 10). On this basis, Thenius estimated the log at 14.088 Paris cubic inches, or .06147 English gallon, and the bath at 1014.39 Paris cubic inches, or 4.4286 gallons (*St. ur.* p. 101, 121). Again, the log of water is said to have weighed 108 Egyptian drachme, each equalling 61 barleycorns (Maimonides, *in Peah*, 3, § 6, ed. Guisius). Thenius finds that 6588 barleycorns fill about the same space as 6 hen eggs (*St. u. Kr.* p. 112). Again, a log is said to fill a vessel 4 digits long, 4 broad, and 2i- high (Maimonides, *in Pranf. Menachoth*). This vessel would contain 21.6 cubic inches, or .07754 gallon. The conclusion arrived at from these data would agree tolerably well with the first estimate formed on the notices of the molten sea.

In the New Testament we have notices of the following foreign measures:

- (a) The *metretes*, **μετρητής** (<sup><RB></sup>John 2:6; AV. “firkin”), for liquids
- (b) The *chcenix*, **χοῖνιξ** (<sup><RB></sup>Revelation 6:6; AV. “measure”), for dry things.
- (c) The *xestes*, **ξέστης**, applied, however, not to the particular measure so named by the Greeks, but to any small vessel, such as a cup (<sup><RB></sup>Mark 7:4, 8; AV. “pot”).
- (d) The *modius*, similarly applied to describe any vessel of moderate dimensions (Matthew v. 15; <sup><RB></sup>Mark 4:21; <sup><RB></sup>Luke 11:33; AV. “bushel”); though properly, meaning a Roman measure, amounting to about a peck.

The value of the Attic *metretes* has already been stated to be 8.6696 gallons, and consequently the amount of liquid in six stone jars, containing on the average 21/2 *metretae* each, would exceed 110 gallons (<sup><RB></sup>John 2:6). Very possibly, however, the Greek term represents the Hebrew *bath*, and if the bath be taken at the lower estimate assigned to it, the amount would be reduced to about 60 gallons. Even this amount far exceeds the requirements for the purposes of legal purification, the tendency of

Pharisaical refinement being to reduce the amount of water to a minimum, so that a quarter of a log would suffice for a person (Mishna, *Yald.* 1, § 1). The question is one simply of archaeological interest as illustrating the customs of the Jews, and does not affect the character of the miracle with which it is connected. The *chonnix* was -g of an Attic *medinnus*, and contained nearly a quart. It represented the usual amount of corn for a day's food, and hence a *chonix* for a penny, or denarius, which usually purchased a bushel (Cicero, *Verr.* 3:81), indicated a great scarcity (~~4416~~ Revelation 6:6).

With regard to the use of fair measures, various precepts are expressed in the Mosaic law and other parts of the Bible (~~4085~~ Leviticus 19:35, 36; ~~4254~~ Deuteronomy 25:14,15; ~~4110~~ Proverbs 20:10; ~~4650~~ Ezekiel 45:10), and in all probability standard measures were kept in the Temple, as was usual in the other civilized countries of antiquity (Bockh, p. 12).

**IV.** The following are the various Biblical weights and measures of all kinds, in the alphabetical order of the original terms, with their correct and conventional renderings, and the nearest modern representative:

Hebrews or Gr.	Name.	AV.	Equivalent.
Adarkon	<i>Dar</i>	“dram”	<i>quarter-eagle.</i>
Argurion	<i>Silverling</i>	“piece of silver,” etc	<i>half-crown.</i>
Assarion	<i>Assarius</i>	“farthing”	<i>penny.</i>
Ammah	<i>Cubit</i>	cubit	<i>half-yard.</i>
Bath	<i>Bath</i>	“bath”	quarter barrel.
Batos	<i>Bath</i>	“measure”	<i>quarter barrel.</i>
Beka	<i>Beka</i>	“bekah,” etc.	<i>quarter-ounce.</i>
Chenix	<i>Choenix</i>	“measure”	<i>quart.</i>
Darkemnu	<i>Daric</i>	“dram”	<i>quarter-eagle.</i>
Denilrion	<i>Denarius</i>	“penny”	<i>shilling.</i>
Derek, etc	<i>Travel</i>	“journey”	[general].
Didrchmon	<i>Didrachm</i>	“tribute”	<i>quarter-dollar.</i>
Drachmae	<i>Dracha</i>	“piece of silver”	<i>shilling.</i>
Ephsh	<i>Ephahe</i>	“ephah”	<i>half-bushel.</i>
Etsba	<i>Finger</i>	“finger”	<i>finger-length.</i>
Gerah	<i>Gerah</i>	“gerah”	<i>half-penny.</i>
Gomed	<i>Span</i>	“cubit”	<i>quarter-yard.</i>
Hin	<i>Hin</i>	“bin”	<i>gallon.</i>

Homer	Homer	“homer”	<i>double-barrel.</i>
Issaron	<i>Tenth</i>	“tenth deal”	<i>halfpeck.</i>
Kab	<i>Kab</i>	“cab”	<i>quart.</i>
Kaneh	<i>Reed</i>	“reed”	<i>half-rod.</i>
Kesheth, etc.	<i>Bow</i>	“bow,” etc	<i>bow-shot.</i>
Kesitah	<i>Kesita</i>	piece of money”	<i>ingot.</i>
Kibrlath, etc	<i>Space</i>	“way,” etc.	<i>short distance.</i>
Kikkar	<i>Talent</i>	“talent”	<i>hundred-weight.</i>
Kodrantas	<i>Quadraans</i>	farthing”	<i>farthing</i>
Komets,	<i>Handful</i>	“handful”	<i>handful.</i>
Kor	<i>Kor</i>	“cor”	<i>hogshead.</i>
Koros	<i>Kor</i>	“measure”	<i>hogshead.</i>
Lepton	<i>Scale</i>	“mite”	<i>mill.</i>
Lethek	<i>Lethek</i>	“measure”	<i>half-hogshead.</i>
Lithos, etc	<i>Stone</i>	“stone’s throw”	<i>stone-throw.</i>
Litra	<i>Pound</i>	“ pound”	<i>pound.</i>
Log	<i>Log</i>	“lo”	<i>half-pint.</i>
Maneh	<i>Maneh</i>	“maneh”	<i>double-pound.</i>
Metrete	<i>Metretes</i>	“firkin”	<i>firkin.</i>
Milion	<i>Mile</i>	“mile”	<i>mile.</i>
Mina	<i>Mina</i>	“pound”	<i>triple-half-eagle.</i>
Modios’	<i>Modius</i>	“bushel”	<i>pec.</i>
Omer	<i>Omer</i>	“omer”	<i>half-peck.</i>
Orguia	<i>Fathom</i>	“fathom”	<i>fathom.</i>
Pechus	<i>Ell</i>	“cubit”	<i>half-yard.</i>
Reba	<i>Fourth</i>	“fourth”	<i>half-quarter-ounce..</i>
Saton	<i>Seah</i>	“measure”	<i>peck.</i>
Seah.	<i>Seah,</i>	“seah”	<i>peck.</i>
Shalish.	<i>Third</i>	“third”	<i>peck.</i>
Shekel	<i>Shekel</i>	“shekel”	<i>½alf-ounce. half-dollar.</i>
Stadios or Stadion }	<i>Stade</i>	“furlong”	<i>furlong.</i>
Stater	<i>Stater</i>	“piece of money”	<i>half-crown.</i>
Talantion	<i>Talent</i>	“talent”	<i>thousand dollars.</i>
Tephach	<i>Hand-breadth</i>	“hand-breadth”	<i>hand-breadth.</i>
Tsaade	<i>Pace</i>	“pace”	<i>pace.</i>
Xestes	<i>Sextarius</i>	“measure”	<i>pint.</i>

Zereth	<i>Span</i>	“span”	<i>span.</i>
--------	-------------	--------	--------------

V. The following tables exhibit at one view the approximate results of the foregoing investigations:

### I. HEBREW WEIGHTS.

Troy Weight					Grains	Lbs	Oz.
Gerah					11		1/40
10	Beka				110		¼
20	2	Shekel			220		½
1000	100	50	Maueh		11,000	1	11
60,000	6000	3000	60	Kikkar	660,000	114	7

### II. SCRIPTURE MONEYS.

Name	Nation	Metal	Prop. Valuation			Current Worth		
			\$	cts.	mills	\$	cts.	mill
Lepton	Greek	Copper						1.9
Quadrans	Roman	“			3.8			3.8
Assarius	“	“		1	5.4		1	5.4
Denarius	“	Silver		15	4.7		15	4.7
Drachma	Greek	“		17	5.9		15	4.7
Didrach	“	“		35	1.9		30	9.4
Stater	“:	Gold		70	3.7		61	8.9
Shekel	“Jewish	Silver		60				
Mina	Greek	“	17	59	3.2	15	47	3.8
Talent	“	Gold	1058	59		928	43	

### III. HEBREW MEASURES OF LENGTH.

					Inches.
Finger					0.75
4	Palm				3.02
12	3	Span			9.07

24	6	2	Cubit		18.14
144	36	12	6	Reed	108.84

#### IV. HEBREW LIQUID MEASURES.

				JOSEPHUS.			RABBINS		
				gals	qts	pts	gals	qts	pts
Lo						0.99			0.56
12	Hin			1	1	1.85		3	0.72
72	6	Bath		8	2	3.20	5	0	0.32
720	60	10	Cor	89			50	1	1.20

#### V. HEBREW DRY MEASURES

					JOSEPHUS				RABBINS			
					bsh	pk s	qts	pts	bs h	pk s	qts	pts
Cab							2				1	0.24
1 4/5	Omer						2	1.1			2	
6	3 1/3	Seah				1	3	1.7			6	1.44
18	10	8	Ep hah		1	0	1	3.2		2	4	0.32
180	100	30	10	H o m e r	11	0	4		6	1	1	1.2

**VI. Literature.** — J. D. Michaelis, *Supplem. ad Lex. Hebr.* p. 1521; Hussey, *Essay on the Ancient Weights, Money, etc.* (Oxford, 1836); F. P. Bayer, *De Numumuis Hebrceo-Samaritanis* (Valentia Edetanorum, 1781: written in reply to *Die Unichtheit der Jiid. Miinzen, Butzow, 1779*); Hupfeld, *Betrachtung dunkler Stellung der A. T. Textgeschichte, in the Studien und Kritiken*, 1830 2:247-301; Thenius, *ibid.* 1846, 1:78 sq.; G. Seyffarth, *Beitrage zur Kenntniss der Literatur, Kunst, Mythol. und Geschichte des alten Aegypten*; Cumberland, *Essay on Weights and Measures*; Arbuthnot, *Tables of Ancient Coins, etc.*; Bockh's *Metrologische Untersuchungen*; Mommsen's *Geschichte des Romischen*

*Miunzwesens*; Don VVazquez *Queipo's Essai sur les Systemes Metriques et Monetaires des Anciens Peuples*; Müller, *Ueb. d. heil. Maase der Hiebrder und Hellenen* (Freib. 1859); Hezfeld, *Metrologische Voruntersuchungen* (Leips. 1863-5); Tuckermanu, *Dasjiidische Maas-System* (Breslau, 1867).

## Metrophanes

(Μητροφάνης), a Greek theologian, bishop of Smyrna, flourished in the 9th century. He is particularly known for his opposition to Photius. He was already bishop of Smyrna when his friend, the patriarch Ignatius, was replaced by Photius, and, although he at first recognised the new patriarch, he subsequently opposed him so fiercely as to be himself deposed and cast into prison. When Ignatius was restored by emperor Basil I, Metrophanes regained his see, and in the Council of Constantinople (869) showed himself one of the most ardent of Photius's adversaries. After the death of Ignatius, in 879, Photius became again patriarch, and Metrophanes was again deposed. He nevertheless continued to speak and to write against Photius, and was excommunicated in 880. We have no details concerning his life after that date. He wrote a letter to Manuel concerning the dispute with Photius from 858 to 870, which is preserved both in Greek and Latili in Labbe, *Concilia*, vol. viii, and in Raderus, *Acta Concilii* (Ingolstadt, 1604, 4to). See Fabricius, *Biblioth. Graca*, 11:700; Baronius, *Annal. ad ann.* 870; Hankius, *Scriptores Byzantini*, 17:1; 18:66; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Genrcale*, 35:220. (J. N. P.)

## Metrophanes, Critopulus

a Greek theologian of the 17th century, was born in Bercea, and was educated at the convent school at Athos. Afterwards he served in an intimate relation to the celebrated patriarch, Cyril Lucar, who in 1616 sent him to England to be instructed in the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England, and to continue his education at the University of Oxford, even then a very celebrated educational institution. Lucar, in a letter to George Abbott, archbishop of Canterbury, at this time complained bitterly of the progress made by the Jesuits in the Eastern Church, and of the inability of his clergy to successfully resist them for want of sufficient instruction (see that letter in P. Colomesii *Clarorum ver. epist.* [Lond. 1687], Ep. 46; also in his *Opp.* ed. Fabric. [Hamb. 1709], p. 557). Metrophanes, on his arrival in England, was well received by archbishop Abbott and king James. In

1620 or 1621 Metrophanes went to Germany, where he visited the Protestant universities of Wittenberg, Tubingen, Altdorf, Strasburg., and Helmstadt. In the latter place he made the acquaintance of Conrinsr, Calixtus, and Conrad Hornejus, at whose suggestion he wrote, in 1625, a confession of the tenets of the orthodox Greek Church, with an exposition of its principal customs. This was subsequently published, together with a Latin translation, by John Hornejus, son of Conrad, and an introduction by Conring (see Conringii *Opp.* vi, p. 391), at Helmstadt, in 1661. Among his other productions in Germany we find, *De vocibus quibusdam liturgicis epist.* ed. J. J. Crudelius (Jiiterb. 1737):- *Oratio Graeca panegyrica et dogmatica in nativitatem domini Latine versa*, per M. G. Queccium (Alt. 1626) :-*Responsio ad quæstionem de dicto apostolico “ Spiritu ambulate,” Gr. et Lat.* ed. a M. Rindero, *Emendationes et aninadversiones in Joh. Meursii Gloss. Graeco-barb(aum ed. Franzius (Stendal, 1787) :-Depronunciatioze literse O, ed. Schwenterus (Norimb. 1625); and letters to be found in G. Richteri Epistolis, p. 729, and in J. Chr. Wolfii Conspectu supell. epist. p. 26, 66, 129. He next went for some time to Venice as a teacher of Greek, and finally returned to Constantinople, in what year is uncertain. He subsequently became patriarch of Alexandria. The most important of all his works is the above-mentioned confession ( Ὁμολογία τῆς ἀνατολικῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς, κ. τ. λ.). ῥ It is a rather full, clear exposition of the doctrines and customs of the Greek Church, more in the form of a theological analysis than of a strictly symbolic work. He shows in it great opposition to the Romish Church, but at the same time avoids all Protestant polemics. The charge that Metrophanes was *Lutheran* in tendency is unjust, and is ignored by all able theologians. According to Metrophanes, the Greek doctrines can be divided into two parts, forming a “simple” and an “economical” system of theology (*Con.* page 13, ed. Weissenb.). The first treats of God and of the Trinity, leading naturally to the exposition of the Greek doctrine concerning the Holy Ghost (*Confess.* page 15 sq.). If we compare the doctrine of the author on the point with the tradition of the Greek fathers, we find ‘the doctrine much more complete, and somewhat similar to that of the Latin Church. Each of the three divine persons stands in a definite relation to the two others, and at the same time constitute one form of the Deity. The first person stands as the father of the second and the sender (προβολεύς), but embraces them both in himself as νοῦς. The second person, or son, possesses a λόγος, the third the πρόβλημα of the first, as πνεῦμα, an identity with both. See*



Weissenborn, *Prefatio* to his *Appendix litt. Symbol. Eccles. Orientalis* (Jena, 1850); Ditelmaier, *De Metrophane Critopule* (Altenb. 1769), Neale, *Florent. Council*, page 168.