

great success in removing the objections which had been advanced by his antagonists against the comparatively recent formation of the present continents. According to Cuvier, he ranked among the first geologists of his age. His principal geological work, *Lettres physiques et morales sur l'histoire de la terre* (6 vols. 8vo, The Hague, 1778), was dedicated to Queen Charlotte. It dealt with the appearance of mountains and the antiquity of the human race, explained the six days of the Mosaic creation as so many epochs preceding the actual state of the globe, and attributes the deluge to the filling up of cavities supposed to have been left void in the interior of the earth. This attempt to reconcile religion and science, so often since repeated, was ingenious and for a time successful with most minds. The theory of the Mosaic days was maintained in one form or other by several later geologists of high repute, though it is scarcely now thought worth discussion by any to whom that title can justly be applied.

Deluc's original experiments relating to meteorology are more valuable to the natural philosopher than most of his geological work; and he discovered many facts of considerable importance relating to heat and moisture. He noticed the disappearance of heat in the thawing of ice about the same time that Black founded on it his ingenious hypothesis of latent heat. He ascertained that water was more dense about 40° Fahr. than at the temperature of freezing, expanding equally on each side of the maximum; and he was the originator of the theory afterward re-advanced by Dalton, that the quantity of aqueous vapour contained in any space is independent of the presence or density of the air, or of any other elastic fluid; though it appears difficult to reconcile this opinion with some of the experiments of Deluc's great rival, Saussure, a philosopher who, as he very candidly allows, made in many respects more rapid progress in hygrometry than himself. Deluc's comparative experiments on his own hygrometer and on Saussure's show only that both are imperfect; but it may be inferred from them that a mean between the two would in general approach much nearer to the natural scale than either taken separately. It appears also probable that Saussure's is rather less injured by time than Deluc's, which has been found to indicate an increasing amount of mean moisture every year.

Deluc was a man of warm feelings, and of gentle and obliging manners, and his literary and scientific merits, as well as his unremitting attention to the service of the queen, insured her respect and kindness. He saw her daily for many years, and in his last illness, which was long and painful, she showed him repeated marks of benevolent regard. He died at Windsor on the 7th of November 1817.

A brief notice of his more important works, in addition to that mentioned above, will give a clear idea of the nature and range of his scientific activity. His *Recherches sur les modifications de l'Atmosphère* (2 vols. 4to, Geneva, 1772; 4 vols. 8vo, Par. 1784), contains many accurate and ingenious experiments upon moisture, evaporation, and the indications of hygrometers and thermometers, applied to the barometer employed in determining heights. In the *Phil. Trans.*, 1773, appeared his account of a new hygrometer, which resembled a mercurial thermometer, with an ivory bulb, which expanded by moisture, and caused the mercury to descend. The first correct rules ever published for measuring heights by the barometer were those he gave in the *Phil. Trans.*, 1771, p. 158. His *Lettres sur l'histoire physique de la Terre* (8vo, Par. 1798) were addressed to Professor Blumenbach. The substance had already appeared in the *Journal de Physique*, for 1790, 1791, and 1798. The volume contains an essay written for a prize at Haarlem in 1791, but without success, on the existence of a General Principle of Morality. It also gives an interesting account of some conversations of the author with Voltaire and Rousseau. Deluc was an ardent admirer of Bacon, on whose writings he published two works, — *Bacon tel qu'il est* (8vo, Berlin, 1800), showing the bad faith of the French translator, who had

omitted many passages favourable to revealed religion, and *Précis de la Philosophie de Bacon* (2 vols. 8vo, Paris, 1802), giving an interesting view of the progress of natural science. *Lettres sur le Christianisme* (Berlin and Hanover, 1801, 1803) was a controversial correspondence with Dr Teller of Berlin in regard to the Mosaic cosmogony. His *Traité élémentaire de Géologie* (8vo, Paris, 1809, also in English, by Delafite, the same year), was principally intended as a refutation of the Vulcanian system of Hutton and Playfair, who deduced the changes of the earth's structure from the operation of fire, and attributed a higher antiquity to the present state of the continents than is required in the Neptunian system adopted by Deluc after Dolomieu. He sent to the Royal Society, in 1809, a long paper on separating the chemical from the electrical effect of the pile, with a description of the electric column and aerial electroscopes, in which he advanced opinions so little in unison with the latest discoveries of the day, that the council deemed it inexpedient to admit them into the *Transactions*. He had, indeed, on other occasions shown somewhat too much scepticism in the rejection of new facts; and he had never been convinced even of Cavendish's all-important discovery of the composition of water. The paper was afterwards published in Nicholson's *Journal* (xxvi.), and the dry column described in it was constructed by various experimental philosophers. Many other of his papers on subjects kindred to those already mentioned are to be found in the *Transactions* and in the *Philosophical Magazine*. See *Philosophical Magazine*, November 1817.

DELUGE, a submersion of the world, related by various nations as having taken place in a primitive age, and in which all, or nearly all, living beings are said to have perished. By this definition we exclude all partial floods, and also the theory which would account for deluge-stories as exaggerations of traditions of local inundations. Upon a low level of culture, as Von Hahn has shown, the memory of the most striking events is hardly preserved even for a few generations. It is best therefore to regard the story of the deluge as a subdivision of the primitive man's cosmogony. The problem with which he had to deal was a complicated one,—given the eternity of matter to account for the origin of the world. The best solution which presented itself (and that only to the shrewder races) was to represent creation as having taken place repeatedly, and the world as having passed through a series of demolitions and reconstructions. (See COSMOGONY). This explains the confusion between the creation and the deluge noticed by various travellers, e.g., among the Iroquois and the Santals—a confusion, however, which is only apparent, for the deluge is, when thoroughly realized, practically a second creation. Thus Manui the hero of the Indian flood-story, was, by permission of Brahma, the creator of the present human race. Noah is called by Arabic writers "the second Adam," and Maui might with as good a right be called the Noah of New Zealand. We, in the adult age of the world, have renounced those mythical forms of expression, but we still retain much of the feeling which prompted them. The wonder of creation is even to us constantly renewed in spring; to primitive man it was renewed in a special sense in each of the great world-cycles of mythology. We may lay it down, then, as a canon at the outset, that the various deluge-stories must be viewed in combination, and explained on a common principle. At the same time we must be careful not to confound different "deposits" of tradition, and must regard primarily the earliest and most original forms of myths. As in the case of the cosmogonies, a few typical specimens will be all that can here be described.

I. Among the Semitic races the seniority belongs to the Babylonians. Till lately, the only version of their story known to us was that of Berosus (Müller, *Fragmenta*, ii. 501), who relates that the god Kronos appeared to Xisuthrus; tenth king of Babylon [cf. Noah, tenth patriarch] in a dream, and warned him of the coming deluge. The details remind us a good deal of the biblical narrative, except that Xisuthrus is also accompanied by a steersman and by his near friends. Even the thrice repeated letting-out

of the birds is mentioned. At last the ship (as it is called) grounded "on a certain mountain," where Xisuthrus erected an altar and sacrificed; after which both he and his companions disappeared [cf. the "translation" of Enoch]. The duration of the deluge is not stated, and its cause is left to be inferred from the special commendation of Xisuthrus for his piety. Berosus has evidently drawn from cuneiform sources, but those sources have not yet been discovered. Our most valuable authority for the Babylonian deluge-story is the portion of the 11th lay of the great mythological epic, discovered by Mr George Smith. It came from the library of King Assurbanipal, and dates from about 660 B.C., but the Accadian original from which it was translated may well (says the cautious Assyriologist, Dr Schrader) have been composed between 1000 and 2000 B.C., while the myths themselves will of course be much older. The hero of the deluge bears the name of Tam-zi ("the sun of life," cf. Tammuz), for so, with Mr Sayce, the signs should most probably be read. He is called the son of Ubara-tutu, an Accadian name meaning "the splendour of sunset" (Lenormant, Sayce). This version of the story differs in several respects from that of Berosus. The deity who warns Tamzi is Hea (god of knowledge and of the waters), who orders him to build a ship, and to put into it his household and his wealth and the beasts of the field. All this is related by Tamzi to the (solar) hero "Izdubar." He tells how he coated the ship within and without with bitumen (cf. Gen. vi. 14), how he intrusted all to a "seaman," how Samas, the sun-god, and other gods (Hea is not now mentioned) sent rain, and how the ruin-flood "destroyed all life from the face of the earth." (Why the deluge was sent is a little uncertain, owing to the mutilated condition of the tablets.) On the seventh day there was a calm, and the ship stranded on the mountain Nizir. Another seven days, and Tamzi let out "a dove" (?), then a swallow, both of which returned; and a raven which did not return. Then he left the ship and made a libation; Mr Smith's "altar" is uncertain. Finally, Hea intercedes with Bel that there be no second deluge, after which "Tamzi and his wife, and the people, were carried away to be like the gods." Such are the leading authentic features of the Babylonian narrative, or rather narratives, for its inconsistencies and repetitions are such as to force upon us the hypothesis that two documents originally existed, which have been welded together by an editor.

II. The Jewish narrative, like the Babylonian, has been thought to consist of two documents, an Elohist and a Yahvistic, which have been connected by an editor. They appear to differ in various details,—e.g., in the duration of the flood (the Elohist extends it to a whole solar year), and in the description of the introduction of the animals into the ark (the Elohist alludes to the legal distinction between clean and unclean). But they have certainly the same origin, for they entirely coincide in the main outlines (e.g., in ascribing the flood to the depravity of mankind, in the mode of Noah's rescue, and in the promise that the catastrophe should not recur), and even in not a few expressions, among which are the names for the flood and the ark. They agree, further, in this important point, that some expressions point to a universal deluge, others to one which only affected a level inland region like that of Mesopotamia. We naturally ask, therefore, are the former involuntary exaggerations? or "survivals" of a primeval myth? Both views are held by respectable critics; but the latter is more favoured by analogy and by the remarkable parallelism between both the biblical narratives (especially the Yahvistic) and the Babylonian.

These two—the Babylonian and the Jewish—are the only fully developed deluge-stories told by any of the

Semitic nations. In what relation, then, do they stand to each other? Was the Babylonian borrowed from the Jewish (or from some earlier form of the story, of which the Jewish is an abridgment), or vice versa? On the one hand, the Babylonian story as a whole perhaps produces an impression of greater originality than the Jewish; for (not to mention other points) in the former the order in which the birds are sent out is much more natural. On the other, the "ark," or rather "chest," of the Jewish narrative sounds more archaic than the "ship" of the Babylonian. The word for "deluge" in Genesis is also evidently archaic, as appears from the facts that it only occurs once again (Psalm xxix. 3), and that the editor in Genesis needed to explain it by the word "water" (Gen. vi. 17, "the flood, viz., water"). It is possible, therefore, to hold that the Jewish story is a distinct offshoot of a common Semitic tradition. Bolder critics will maintain that the account in Genesis must be taken in connection with the other narratives which can be explained by, and are therefore possibly dependent upon, parallel Babylonian narratives. (See BABYLONIA and COSMOGONY). They will urge that "chest" may have been substituted for "ship" to avoid an anachronism, mankind in Noah's time not having perhaps reached the sea; and that the archaic word for "deluge" does not prove the antiquity of a developed deluge-story; also that there are traces in Genesis (see iv. 17–24, vi. 1–3) of another and presumably native Hebrew view, according to which the moral degeneration of man was explained without a deluge. The question is a large one, but may perhaps be reduced to this—Can the Yahvistic narrative in Genesis be safely broken up into several? There is some evidence, both internal and (see the prophetic references to Genesis) external to show that it can, but it would be premature in this place to pronounce whether the evidence is sufficient. It will hardly be possible, however, to derive the Yahvistic flood-story from Babylonia, and not the Elohist, as has been suggested; for though the former is nearest to the Babylonian story (e.g., it ascribes the flood entirely to a rain-storm, whereas the latter introduces also the waters below the firmament), the latter agrees with it in all essential points, and even in the minor point of the bitumen. Let it be remarked in passing that, even if the material of the biblical narratives be taken from the Babylonian, the former have received a peculiar and original stamp, both by their monotheism and by the moral significance so emphatically given to the catastrophe, just as by the addition of the lovely story of the rainbow the Elohist has produced a conclusion far superior, artistically speaking, to that of his Babylonian predecessor.

III. Another of the great countries by which the Israelites might have been influenced was Egypt; but in this, even more than in a former, case a direct Egyptian influence is out of the question. The deluge-story was entirely unknown in the Nile-valley. It is commonly said, but erroneously, that this was owing to the absence of sudden catastrophes of the nature of an inundation. But if the terrestrial deluge is really (see below) only a transformation of the celestial, there is no reason why the story should not have grown up in Egypt, if the imagination of its inhabitants had invited such a development; for the germs of the deluge-story certainly existed in Egypt. The *Book of the Dead* constantly refers to the sun-god, Ra, as voyaging in a boat on the celestial ocean; and a story in an inscription of the archaic period (Seti I.) embodies a conception altogether analogous to that of the narrative in Genesis. According to this myth—which is described by M. Naville—Ra, the creator, being disgusted with the insolence of mankind, resolves to exterminate them. The massacre causes human blood to flow to Heliopolis,

upon which Ra repents, and swears with uplifted hand not to destroy mankind again.

IV. The deluge-story exists in several forms in Indian literature. It does not, however, appear to be a genuine Aryan myth, for there is no clear reference to it in the *Rig Veda*. The *Satapatha Brahmana*, where it first occurs, was written (Weber) not long before the Christian era. Another version, in which the lacunae of the earlier one are filled up, is given in the *Mahābhārata*, but this poem, though it existed in part before the Christian era, did not assume its present form till long afterwards. A third version, still more decidedly Indian in character, is given in the *Bhāgavata Purāna*, but the earliest possible date of this work is the 12th century A.D., which deprives its account of the deluge of all claim to originality. It is worth noticing, however, that it agrees with the biblical narrative in two subordinate points—the introduction of animals into the ark or box, and the interval of seven days between the warning and its fulfilment. The principal feature of the oldest flood-story is the part assigned to the fish, which warns Mann of the deluge, and ultimately saves him by drawing his ship to a northern mountain. The selection of the fish (which is clearly divine) is so out of character with the most genuine portions of Aryan mythology that it proves the foreign origin of the Indian narrative, perhaps we may even say, the Semitic origin. Not that the fish-god is peculiar to the Semitic world, but that he is un-Indian, and can so easily have reached India from a Semitic source. If the Indians sent apes, sandalwood, and purple (both names and things) to Assyria, why should not the flood-story have been sent in exchange with other products of Mesopotamia? True, the fish does not appear in the present form of the Mesopotamian story, but it probably did appear in the original myth, for among the titles of the god who warned Tamzi (see above) are "fish of the abyss," "beneficent, saviour fish." We admit the strong local colouring of the Indian story, which deceived even Weber (but not Burnouf), but this is exactly paralleled by the Hottentot colouring (Bleek) of several South African stories of Christian origin. Whether the early Iranians had a flood-story is perhaps uncertain, since the *Avesta* gives but little information respecting mythology, and it has not come down to us complete. But none was known to the Persians about 1000 A.D. (al-Biruni).

V. In Greece there appear to have been several floating flood-stories, which in time became localized and attached to the names of heroes. They all represent the flood as destroying all but a few men, and even in their least original forms they still contain many peculiar features which can only have arisen from an independent exercise of the mythopoetic faculty. The most famous of them is that of Deucalion, and of this the earliest and simplest form is in Pindar (*Olymp. ix. 64*), who identifies the mountain where Deucalion and Pyrrha landed, and where without marriage they "got themselves a race from stones" (not a late Greek etymological fancy, for it recurs among American tribes), with Mount Parnassus. Apollodorus (about 100 B.C.) has infused fresh life into this story, perhaps from a Semitic source; he extends the range of the flood to "most parts of Greece," and states that Deucalion (like Noah and Xisuthrus) offered sacrifice after the flood. Lucian (160 A.D.), laughing in his sleeve, gives a still more conspicuously Semitic account (*De dea Syria*, § 12, 13), in which we hear for the first time of a "great box," and of "children and wives," "swine and horses, and the kinds of lions and serpents, &c., all by pairs," as entering the ark. It was a confusion of this kind which led to the charge of Celsus, that the authors of the books of Moses had "put a new stamp on the story of Deucalion,"—reason sufficient for

confining ourselves as much as possible to primitive versions of mythic narratives.

VI. America, which abounds in cosmogonies, is naturally not deficient in deluge-stories. Mr Catlin says, that "amongst 120 different tribes that he has visited in North and South and Central America, not a tribe exists that has not related to him distinct or vague traditions of such a calamity, in which one, or three, or eight persons were saved above the waters on the top of a high mountain" (*Okeepa*, p. 2). It is extremely difficult to tell how far Christian influences may have determined the form of these stories. When, for instance, we find such a peculiar point as the sending out of the birds to see whether the flood had abated, we are disinclined to build any argument on the circumstance. We do find, it is true, strange points of agreement between the Greek and the Polynesian myths, yet considering the vast extent of Christian missionary activity in America, we are bound to special caution.

In addition to this, the American deluge-stories convey an impression that they have lost much of their original accuracy. The Polynesian myths, on the contrary, are still almost as transparent as ever. But we shall have occasion to speak of these presently.

Instead of proceeding further with a detailed examination of myths, let us briefly touch on three general questions arising out of the subject. (1.) Is the deluge-story found among all nations? The Egyptians and (probably) the Persians had none; and it is doubtful whether it exists in non-Mahometan Africa. Probably, too, large deductions should be made from the myths of savage tribes, on the ground of Christian influences, even when related by well-informed travellers. (2.) Was the deluge-story propagated from a single centre? An affirmative answer has often been returned, e.g., by Hugh Miller, *Testimony of the Rocks*, p. 232. It is impossible, however, to justify this from the mere fact of the superficial resemblance of the different narratives. These may be accounted for (on the ordinary historical theory of the flood-story) from the similarity of the circumstances of partial floods everywhere; or (if we regard it as based on a nature-myth) from the fact that, by a fundamental law of psychology, the universal wonders of nature everywhere receive (within certain limits) a similar mythic expression. Granting, therefore, in its fullest extent the non-originality of many deluge-stories, we maintain that the evidence points on the whole to the existence of several independent centres from which these stories were propagated. (3.) Restricting ourselves to the consideration of the non-biblical forms of the narrative, we now inquire, what was their original significance? A provisional answer, it is true, has already been given, but one which does not account for the peculiar details of the most original deluge-stories. The only explanation of these which has yet been offered is derived from comparative mythology. It is agreed by mythologists that the exclusive subjects of really primitive traditional stories are frequently recurring natural phenomena. Consequently the elementary mythic descriptions or pictures of these phenomena were the most available material when, at a later period of mental growth, the attempt was made to construct a rude cosmogonical theory. Those "demolitions and reconstructions" of the world of which we spoke at the outset could only be narrated on the basis of these earliest, simplest, most primitive myths. What then was the natural phenomenon which, in a mythic dress, formed the substratum of the deluge-stories? Not merely an annually recurring river-flood, such as those of the Euphrates, for the phenomenal basis of myths must be something strikingly wonderful as well as frequently recurring. This the inundations of a river are not, neither could they be regarded as calamities. But the phenomena of the sky and especially

of the sun are, to the primitive man, daily miracles. Hence the theory (Schirren and Gerland) that the deluge of the stories we are considering has been transferred from the sky to the earth, that it is in a word an ether-myth. This mode of explanation is not set aside by referring to quasi-historical details in the deluge-stories. For as soon as the mythic stage begins to be outgrown, rationalism appears. In this transitional period (commonly of long duration) the old nature-myths are modified. Some mythic elements remain, others are turned into prose. The attempt to explain the existence of the world on the basis of an ether-myth was an early symptom of the denaturalization of which we have spoken. At a still more advanced stage of the process, the flood often ceased to be universal, and was restricted to the home of those who related the story, or to the region from which they supposed themselves to have migrated. At last the shrewder intellects (e.g., among the Tahitians and some of the American Indians) even clutched at phenomena like those of fossil-shells found on hills to prove the literal truth of their deluge.

The most plausible arguments for the celestial deluge-theory are derived from the Polynesian mythology. In the flood-story of Raiatea, given by Ellis (*Polynesian Researches*, ii. 58-9), the flood rose "as the sun approached the horizon;" and the island where the fisherman found refuge is called *Toa-marama*, i.e., moon-tree (tree reaching up into the moon), which reminds us of the Teutonic world-ash-tree, *Yggdrasil*, and the mythic mountain of the Babylonians (see below) and other nations. At Hawaii the flood was even called "flood of the moon," and at New Zealand "flood of day's eye" (i.e., the sun). Schirren explains all these myths as pictures of sunset, just as he derives the cosmogonies from myths of sunrise. But most of them are more easily explained, with Gerland, as ether-myths. The sun and moon were imagined as peaks emerging out of a flood—sometimes as canoes, sometimes as a man and his wife—the sole survivors (except perhaps the stars, their children) from the inundation. There was, however, no fixity of meaning. The stars were sometimes regarded as ships; but so too were the clouds, "Tangaloa's ships." The Babylonian story, as represented in the 11th Izdubar lay, suggests a similar theory. The names of the hero and his father mean "the (morning) sun" and "the evening-glow." The flood is a rain-flood, and the "father of the rain" (cf. *Job xxxviii. 28*) is the celestial ocean, which in the original myth must have been itself the deluge; and the "ship" is like that in which the Egyptian sun-god voyages in the sea of ether. The mountain on which the survivors come to land was originally (as in Polynesia) the great mythic mountain (cf. the Accadian *Kharsak kurra*, "mountain of the east"), which joins the sky to the earth, and serves as an axis to the celestial vault. Traces of an ether-myth have also been discovered in the Indian deluge-story, as indeed is only natural if it be based on the Babylonian. In the *Mahābhārata*, the divine fish has a horn issuing from his head, which reminds us of other horned deities, whose solar origin is admitted, such as Baal and the Berosian Oannes. (See also Schirren, *Wanderungen der Neuseeländer*, p. 193, who is, however, too fanciful to be a safe guide).

Two points should be mentioned in conclusion. (1.) Though a moral significance is by no means always attributed to the deluge, it is more common than might have been expected. In the *Mahābhārata* (line 12,774) it takes the form not of retribution but of purification, which agrees with Plato's view (*Timæus*, p. 22). We find it in America among the Quichés, but this may perhaps be a later addition, as is certainly the case in one of the forms of the Tahitian myth (Waitz, vi. 271). And (2.) the deluge is not always the last of those periodical

destructions alluded to at the beginning of this article. A few races suppose the last link in the series to be a great fire which swept every living thing from the earth, except (as some American Indians say) a few who took refuge in a deep cave. This last feature, however, has a slightly suspicious resemblance to Gen. xix. 29, and, to say the least, the conflagration is not a myth of such proved antiquity and spontaneity as the deluge. It is too suggestive of artificial systems like that of the Stoics.

Authorities.—Babylonian story: Mr George Smith's papers in *Transactions of Biblical Archaeological Soc.*, ii. 213-34, iii. 530-96; Lenormant, *Les premières civilisations*, tom. ii. 3-146; Delitzsch, *George Smith's Chald. Genesis*, 318-21. Biblical narrative: Commentaries on Genesis, by Knobel and Dillmann, Delitzsch, Kalisch; Ewald, *Biblische Jahrbücher*, vii. 1-23. Indian: Muir *Sanskrit Texts*, i. 196-201; Burnouf, *Bhāgavata Purāna*, ii. 191; Weber, *Indische Studien*, i. 161-232; Turnour, *Mahavanso*, i. 131 (referring to a local flood in its present form). Greek: Preller, *Aufsätze*, 165-7. Vogul (Altaic): Hunfalvy, summarized by L. Adam, *Revue de philologie*, i. 9-14. Lap: Früs, *Lappisk Mythologie*, reviewed in *Lit. Centralblatt*, March 1, 1873. America: Bancroft, *Native Races*, &c., v. 12-16; Schoolcraft, *Notes on the Iroquois*, p. 358. Polynesia: Schirren, *Wanderungen der Neuseeländer* (Riga, 1856); Gerland, Waitz's *Anthropologie*, vi. 296-73. General works: Pictet, *Origines Indo-européennes*, ii. 620, &c.; Lüken, *Die Traditionen des Menschengeschlechts* (Münster, 1869). (T.K.C.)

DEMADES, an orator and demagogue who flourished in the 4th century B.C. He was originally of humble position, and was employed at one time as a common sailor, but he rose partly by his eloquence and partly by his unscrupulous character to a prominent position at Athens. He espoused the cause of Philip in the war against Olynthus, and was thus brought into bitter and life-long enmity with Demosthenes. Notwithstanding his sympathies he fought against the Macedonians in the battle of Charonea, after which he was instrumental in procuring a treaty of peace between Macedon and Athens through his influence with Philip. He continued to be a favourite of Alexander, and, prompted by a bribe, saved Demosthenes and the other obnoxious Athenian orators from his vengeance. His conduct in supporting the Macedonian cause, yet receiving any bribes that were offered by the opposite party, caused him to be heavily fined more than once; and his flagrant disregard of law and honour ultimately led the citizens of Athens to pass upon him the sentence of atimia. This was recalled in 322 on the approach of Antipater, to whom the citizens sent Demades and Phocion as ambassadors. Before setting out he persuaded the citizens to pass sentence of death upon Demosthenes and his followers who had fled from Athens. Harpalus and Antipater both succeeded in bribing him to their cause; but the latter, discovering while Demades was with him on another embassy in 318 a correspondence which showed him to have been at the same time in communication with Perdicas, put him to death along with his son Demeas. A fragment of a speech bearing his name is to be found in the *Oratores Attici*, but its genuineness is exceedingly doubtful.

DEMERARA, or DEMERARY, a river and county of British Guiana. See GUIANA.

DEMETER. See CERES, vol. v. p. 345.

DEMETERIA, a festival in honour of Demeter, held at seed-time, and lasting ten days. It appears to be the same as that generally called *Thesmophoria*.

DEMETRIUS I., king of Macedonia, a son of Antigonos and Stratonice, surnamed *Poliorketes*, or the Besieger. Both father and son play an important part in the vicissitudes of the Macedonian empire after the death of Alexander the Great. Demetrius grew up to be a beautiful young man, reared in the fulness of the new Macedonian life, devoted to Greek science, and inspired with an eager ambition to rival the ancient heroes of his race. He united with these lofty aims a love of Oriental magnificence which formed at once the chief splendour and the principal weak-

ness of his Macedonian prototype. At the age of twenty-two he was sent by his father against Ptolemy, who had invaded Syria; he was totally defeated near Gaza, but soon repaired his loss by a victory which he obtained over Ciltes, in the neighbourhood of Myus. After conducting an expedition against Babylon, and engaging in several campaigns against Ptolemy on the coasts of Cilicia and Cyprus, Demetrius sailed with a fleet of 250 ships to Athens, and restored the Athenians to liberty, by freeing them from the power of Cassander and Ptolemy, and expelling the garrison which had been stationed there under Demetrius Phalereus. After this successful expedition he besieged and took Munychia, and defeated Cassander at Thermopylae. His reception at Athens, after these victories, was attended with the greatest servility; and under the title of "The Preserver" the Athenians worshipped him as a tutelary deity. In the next campaign he defeated Menelaus by land, and completely destroyed the naval power of Ptolemy. After an interval spent at Cyprus, he endeavoured to punish the Rhodians for having deserted his cause; and his ingenuity in devising new instruments of siege, in his unsuccessful attempt to reduce the capital, gained him the appellation of Poliorcetes. He returned a second time to Greece as liberator. But traces of Oriental despotism showed themselves, and the licentiousness and extravagance of Demetrius made the Athenians regret the government of Cassander. He soon, however, roused the jealousy of the successors of Alexander; and Seleucus, Cassander, and Lysimachus united to destroy Antigonos and his son. The hostile armies met at Ipsus, 301 B.C. Antigonos was killed in the battle, and Demetrius, after sustaining a severe loss, retired to Ephesus. This reverse of fortune raised him many enemies; and the Athenians, who had lately adored him as a god, refused even to admit him into their city. But he soon afterwards ravaged the territory of Lysimachus, and effected a reconciliation with Seleucus, to whom he gave his daughter Stratonice in marriage. Athens was at this time oppressed by the tyranny of Cassander; but Demetrius, after a protracted blockade, gained possession of the city, and pardoned the inhabitants their former misconduct. The loss of his possessions in Asia recalled him from Greece; and he established himself on the throne of Macedonia by the murder of Alexander, the son of Cassander, 294 B.C. But here he was continually threatened by Pyrrhus, who took advantage of his occasional absence to ravage the defenceless part of his kingdom; and at length the combined forces of Pyrrhus, Ptolemy, and Lysimachus, assisted by the disaffected among his own subjects, obliged him to leave Macedonia after he had sat on the throne for seven years. He passed into Asia, and attacked some of the provinces of Lysimachus with varying success; but famine and pestilence destroyed the greater part of his army, and he retired to the court of Seleucus to seek support and assistance. Here he met with a kind reception; but, nevertheless, hostilities soon broke out: and after he had gained some advantages over his son-in-law, Demetrius was totally forsaken by his troops in the field of battle, and became an easy prey to the enemy. His son Antigonos offered Seleucus all his possessions, and even his person, in order to procure his father's liberty: but all proved unavailing, and Demetrius died in the fifty-fourth year of his age, after a confinement of three years, 284 B.C. His remains were given to Antigonos, honoured with a splendid funeral at Corinth, and thence conveyed to Demetrias. His posterity remained in possession of the Macedonian throne till the time of Perseus, who was conquered by the Romans. See MACEDONIA.

DEMETRIUS II., king of Macedonia, son of Antigonos Countas, who was a son of Demetrius Poliorcetes. He

occupied the throne for ten years, but little is known of him. His reign coincided with the period of the Achæan league, which was then strengthened by an alliance with the Etolians. Only a fragment of Macedonian power remained in Greece; a few towns in the Peloponnesus were held by Macedonian governors. Demetrius offered a slight opposition to the two patriotic leagues, and wrested Bœotia from the Etolians. At his death in 232 B.C. Antigonos Doson undertook the government for his son Philip, who was under age.

DEMETRIUS I., named *Soter*, king of Syria, was sent to Rome as a hostage during the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes. He contrived, however, to escape from confinement, partly through the assistance of the historian Polybius, and established himself on the throne. He acquired his surname from the Babylonians on account of the expulsion of Heracles from their capital, and is famous in Jewish history for his contests with the Maccabees. Demetrius fell in battle against the usurper Balas, about 150 B.C.

DEMETRIUS II., surnamed *Nicator*, the son of the preceding, lived in exile during the usurpation of Balas. At the head of a body of Cretan mercenaries, and with the assistance of Ptolemy Philometer, whose daughter he married, he regained the throne of Syria. His cruelties and vices, however, ultimately procured his expulsion from the kingdom; and Antiochus, the infant son of Balas, was proclaimed king in his stead. After ten years' captivity in Parthia he succeeded in establishing himself once more upon the throne; but his wife Cleopatra, indignant at his subsequent marriage with a daughter of the Parthian king, procured his assassination (126 B.C.).

DEMETRIUS III., called *Eucerus*, also Euergetes and Philometor, king of Syria, was the fourth son of Antiochus Grypus. By the assistance of Ptolemy Lathyrus he recovered part of his Syrian dominions from Antiochus Eusebes, and held his court at Damascus. He assisted the Jews against Alexander Jannæus. In attempting to dethrone his brother Philip he was defeated by the Arabs and Parthians and taken prisoner. He was kept in confinement in Parthia by king Mithridates until his death.

DEMETRIUS, an orator and Peripatetic philosopher, surnamed *Phalereus*, from the Attic demos of Phalerus, where he was born. He was the son of a poor man named Phanstratus, and was a scholar of Theophrastus. He governed the city of Athens as representative of Cassander for ten years, and 360 statues were erected to his honour. On the restoration of the old democracy by Demetrius Poliorcetes, he was obliged to leave the city, and escaped into Egypt, where he was protected by Ptolemy Lagus. This king, it is said, having asked his advice concerning the succession of his children to the throne, was advised by Demetrius to leave his crown to the children of Eurydice, rather than to Philadelphus, the son of Berenice. This displeased Philadelphus so much, that when his father died he banished Demetrius; and the unfortunate exile put an end to his life by the poison of an asp (282 B.C.) Demetrius composed more works in prose and verse than any other Peripatetic of his time. His writings treated principally of poetry, history, politics, rhetoric, and accounts of embassies, but none are extant. The treatise *περί ἐπισημείας*, which is often ascribed to him, is probably the work of a later Alexandrian of the same name.

DEMETRIUS, a Cynic philosopher, was a disciple of Apollonius of Tyana, to whom he afterwards proved an able antagonist. He spent the greater part of his life at Corinth, and first became famous during the reign of Caligula. The emperor, wishing to gain the philosopher to his interest, sent him a large present; but Demetrius refused it with indignation, and said, "If Caligula wishes to bribe me, let him send me his crown." Vespasian was

displeased with his insolence, and banished him; but the Cynic derided the punishment, and bitterly inveighed against the emperor. He lived to an advanced age; and Seneca observes that nature had brought him forth to show mankind how an exalted genius may live uncorrupted by the vices of the world.

DEMETRIUS, or DMITRI. See RUSSIA.
DEMIDOFF, a Russian family honourably distinguished in various ways in the history of their country.

I. DEMIDOFF, NIKITA, the founder of the family, originally a blacksmith serf, was born about 1665. His skill in the manufacture of arms won him notoriety and fortune; and an iron foundry which he established for the Government became another source of wealth to him. Peter the Great, with whom he was a favourite, ennobled him in 1720.

II. DEMIDOFF, AKINFJ, son of the former, greatly increased the wealth he had inherited by the discovery (along with his son) of gold, silver, and copper mines, which they worked with permission of the Government for their own profit. He died about 1740.

III. DEMIDOFF, PAUL GRIGORJEVICH, nephew of the preceding (born in 1738, died in 1821), was a great traveller, and devoted himself to scientific studies, the prosecution of which among his countrymen he encouraged by the establishment of professorships, lyceums, and museums. He founded the annual prize of 5000 roubles, adjudged by the Academy of Sciences to the author of the most valuable contribution to Russian literature.

IV. DEMIDOFF, NIKOLAY NIKITITCH, nephew of the preceding, was born in 1774, and died at Florence in 1828. During the invasion of Napoleon he commanded a regiment equipped at his own expense. He also greatly increased his resources as a capitalist by successful mining operations, and like his uncle used his wealth to multiply facilities for the scientific culture of the inhabitants of Moscow. The erection of four bridges at St Petersburg was mainly due to his liberality. In 1830 a collection of his pamphlets, *Opuscules d'Économie Politique et Privée*, was published at Paris.

V. DEMIDOFF, ANATOLI, son of Paul, was born at Florence in 1812, and died at Paris in 1870. Educated in France, his life was chiefly spent in that country and in Italy. After his marriage with the daughter of Jerome Bonaparte, he lost for a time the favour of the Emperor Nicholas on account of provision having been made in the contract for the education of his children as Roman Catholics. During the Crimean war he was a member of the Russian diplomatic staff at Vienna. Like other members of his house, he expended large sums to promote education and to ameliorate the physical condition of his fellows. His munificence as a patron of art gave him European celebrity. The superb work, *Voyage dans la Russie méridionale et la Crimée, par la Hongrie, la Valachie, et la Moldavie*, was conjointly written and illustrated by him and the French scholars and artists who accompanied him. It has been translated into several European languages; the English version was published in 1853.

DEMISE. See LEASE.

DEMMIN, a town of Prussia, at the head of a circle in the government of Stettin, is situated on the Peene, which in the immediate neighbourhood receives the Trebel and the Tollense, 72 miles W.N.W. of Stettin. It has manufactures of woollen cloths, linens, hats, and hosiery, besides breweries, distilleries, and tanneries, and an active trade in corn and timber. Demmin is a town of Slavonian origin and of considerable antiquity, and was a place of importance in the time of Charlemagne. It was besieged by a German army in 1148, and captured by Henry the Lion in 1164. In the Thirty Years' War it was the object of frequent conflicts, and even after the Peace of Westphalia was taken

and retaken in the contest between the electoral prince and the Swedes. It passed to Prussia in 1720, and its fortifications were destroyed in 1759. In 1807 several engagements took place in the vicinity between the French and Russians. Population in 1875, 9856.

DEMOCRITUS, one of the founders of the Atomic philosophy, was born at Abdera, a Thracian colony, the inhabitants of which were notorious for their stupidity. Nearly all the information that we possess concerning his life consists of traditions of very doubtful authenticity. He was a contemporary of Socrates; but the date of his birth has been fixed variously from 494 to 460 B.C. His father (who is called by no less than three names) was a man of such wealth as to be able to entertain Xerxes and his army on their return home after the battle of Salamis. On coming into his inheritance, Democritus, there is good reason to believe, devoted several years to travel. He visited the East, and is supposed with great probability to have spent a considerable time in Egypt. The intensity of his thinking was figured by the ancients in the story that he put out his eyes in order that he might not be diverted from his meditations. But of the way in which he obtained the vast learning for which he was famed, and of his intercourse with other philosophers, even with Leucippus, we have no certain information. According to one very doubtful tradition, he was so honoured in his native city that, his patrimony being all spent, the incredible sum of 500 talents was voted him by his fellow-citizens, together with the honour of a public funeral; but, according to another tradition, his countrymen regarded him as a lunatic and sent for Hippocrates to cure him. All are agreed that he lived to a great age; Diodorus Siculus states that he was ninety at his death, and others assert that he was nearly twenty years older. He left, according to Diogenes Laertius, no less than 72 works, treating of almost every subject studied in his time, and written in Ionic Greek, in a style which for poetic beauty Cicero deemed worthy of comparison with that of Plato. But of all these works nothing has come down to us beyond small fragments.

The cosmical theory propounded by Democritus—which in part at least was adopted from the doctrines of Leucippus—is of all the materialistic explanations of the universe put forth by the Greeks the one which has held the most permanent place in philosophical thought. All that exists is vacuum and atoms. The atoms are the ultimate material of all things, including spirit. They are uncaused, and have existed from eternity. They are invisible, but extended, heavy, and impenetrable. They vary in shape; though whether Democritus held that they vary also in density is debated. And, lastly, these atoms are in motion. This motion, like the atoms themselves, Democritus held to be eternal. According to some, he explained it as caused by the downward fall of the heavier atoms through the lighter, by which means a lateral whirling motion was produced; but whether this explanation was given by Democritus is extremely doubtful. Another principle also is said by some to have been used by Democritus to explain the concurrence of the atoms in certain ways, viz., that there is an innate necessity by which similar atoms come together. However this may be, he did declare that by the motion of the atoms the world was produced with all that it contains.

Soul and fire are of one nature; the atoms of which they consist are small, smooth, and round; and it is by inhaling and exhaling such atoms that life is maintained. It follows that the soul perishes with, and in the same sense as, the body. There is, in fact, no distinction made between the principle of life and the higher mental faculties.

The Atomic theory of perception was as follows. From

every object εἰδωλα (or images) of the object are continually being given off in all directions; these enter the organs of sense, and give rise to sensation. The rest of the theory remarkably anticipates certain famous modern theories of perception (1) by its reduction of all sensation, on the objective side, to touch, and (2) by the distinction which it involves between the qualities of extension and resistance, which are said to be the only qualities that really belong to objects of sense, and the other (or secondary) qualities, which are said to exist only through the action of the organs of sense modifying the εἰδωλα.

Sensation, Democritus appears to have taught, is our only source or faculty of knowledge; indeed his first principles admit the existence of no mental faculty of a nature distinct from sensation. He was classed among the most extreme sceptics of antiquity, and tradition attributes to him such sayings as—"There is nothing true, and if there is, we do not know it," "We know nothing, not even if there is anything to know."

The system of Democritus was altogether anti-theological. He denied that the creation of the world was in any way due to reason. He also rejected all the popular mythology; but, according to one account, he taught that, as men were produced by the motion of the atoms, so was produced a race of grander beings, of similar form, and, though longer-lived, still mortal, who influence human affairs, some benevolently, some malevolently, and who appear to men in dreams.

The moral system of Democritus is strikingly like the negative side of the system of Epicurus. The *summum bonum* is placed in an even tranquillity of mind. Fear, and too strong desire, and all that is likely to bring sorrow or even care, are to be avoided, as, for example, notably marriage, to which Democritus cherished the strongest objections. This habit of mind Democritus is said to have himself so well attained that the merry spirit with which he regarded all that happened earned him the title of "the laughing philosopher." Another version, however, asserts that he received the name on account of the scorn which he poured on human ignorance and weakness.

See Mullach, *Democriti Abderitæ operum fragmenta*, Berlin, 1843; Franck, "Fragments qui subsistent de Démocrite," in the *Mémoires de la Société royale de Nancy*, 1836; Ritter, *Geschichte der Philosophie*, vol. i.; Brandis, *Rhein. Museum*, vol. iii., and *Geschichte der Griech. und Röm. Philosophie*, vol. i.; H. Stephanus, *Poesis Philos.*; Burchardt, *Commentaria critica de Democriti de sensibus philosophia*, 1839; and *Fragmente der Moral des Democrit.*

DEMOIVRE, ABRAHAM (1667-1754), an eminent mathematician, was born at Vitry, in Champagne, May 26, 1667. He belonged to a French Protestant family, and was compelled to take refuge in England at the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, in 1685. Having laid the foundation of his mathematical studies in France, he prosecuted them further in London, where he read public lectures on natural philosophy for his support. The *Principia Mathematica* of Newton, which chance threw in his way, made him comprehend at once how little he had advanced in the science which he professed; but he pursued his studies with vigour, and soon became distinguished among first-rate mathematicians. He was among the intimate personal friends of Newton, and his eminence and abilities secured his admission into the Royal Society of London, and afterwards into the Academies of Berlin and Paris. His merit was so well known and acknowledged by the Royal Society that they judged him a fit person to decide the famous contest between Newton and Leibnitz. The life of Demoivre was quiet and uneventful. His old age was spent in obscure poverty, his friends and associates having nearly all passed away before him. He died at London, November 27, 1754. The *Philosophical Transactions* of London

contain several of his papers, all of them interesting. He also published some excellent works, such as *Miscellanea Analytica de Seriebus et Quadraturis*, 1730, in 4to. This then contained some elegant and valuable improvements on then existing methods, which have themselves, however, long been superseded. But he has been more generally known by his *Doctrine of Chances, or Method of Calculating the Probabilities of Events at Play*. This work was first printed in 1618, in 4to, and dedicated to Sir Isaac Newton. It was reprinted in 1738, with great alterations and improvements; and a third edition was afterwards published with additions. He also published a *Treatise on Annuities*, 1724, in 8vo, dedicated to Lord Carpenter.

DEMONOLOGY. The word *demon* (or *dæmon*) is the Greek δαίμων, the etymology of which is too doubtful to explain its original signification (see Pott, *Etym. Forsch.*, ii. 1, 947). Setting aside the use of the word in the general sense of deity (as in *Iliad*, i. 222), we find it employed in classic Greek literature with the more specific meaning under which it becomes an important term in the science of religion. Among the most instructive passages are those in which Hesiod tells how the men of the golden race became after death demons, guardians or watchers over mortals (*Hesiod, Op. et Dies*, 109, &c.; see Welcker, *Griech. Götterlehre*, vol. i. p. 731), and where the doctrines of Empedocles, Plato, and other philosophers are set forth, showing how the demons came to be defined as good and evil beings intermediate between gods and men (*Plutarch, De Defect. Orac., De Isid. et Osir., De Vitand. Ær. Alien.*, &c.; *Plato, Symposium*, 28; *Diog. Laert., Vit. Pythag.*; see Grote, *History of Greece*, vol. i. chaps. 2, 17). The religions of the world usually recognize an order of spiritual beings, below the rank of governing deities, and distinguished from nature-spirits such as elves and nymphs by being especially concerned with living men and their affairs; these beings, very often themselves considered to be ghosts of dead men, are the demons. The earlier and wider notion of demons includes the whole class of such spirits, who may be friendly or hostile, good or evil, persecuting and tormenting man or acting as his protecting and informing patron-spirits; while, when they are mediators or ministers of some higher deity, they will be, like the god himself, kindly or ill-disposed. A narrower definition was introduced in Christian theology, where the ideas of a good demon and guardian genius were merged in the general conception of good "angels," while the term demon was appropriated to evil spirits, or "devils." For scientific purposes, it is desirable to use the term in the wider sense. Demonology, the branch of the science of religion which relates to demons, is much obscured in the treatises of old writers by their taking the evidence too exclusively from among civilized nations, and neglecting what is to be learnt from barbarous tribes, whose ideas of demons, being nearer their primitive state, are comparatively clear and comprehensible. When savage notions of the nature and functions of these spirits are taken as the starting-point, the demon appears as only a more or less modified human soul—whether it is still actually considered to be a human ghost, or whether part of the human quality has fallen away, so that only traces are left to show that man's soul furnished the original model. But when such early and natural animistic conceptions were carried on into higher stages of culture, their original use as explaining natural phenomena was gradually superseded by the growth of knowledge, and they came to be maintained as broken-down and confused superstitions, only to be understood by comparison with their earlier forms. Such comparison, however, is facilitated by the primitive demon-ideas cropping up anew even in civilized life, as in the so-called "spirit-manifestations" of the present day. The following details will show the main

purposes which the doctrine of demons served in the philosophy of the primitive and savage world, as well as its large contribution to civilized superstition. The authorities, when not mentioned, will mostly be found referred to in Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, chaps. xiv. xv. Other cases are given in Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, vol. i., and every reader may supplement them with similar instances from the works of travellers and missionaries. Prof. Adolf Bastian's *Der Mensch in der Geschichte und Beiträge zur Vergleichenden Psychologie* are of great value to students.

Among races of low culture, the conception of a ghost-soul being made to account for the phenomena of life (see article ANIMISM) readily leads to a corresponding theory of morbid states of body and mind. As the man's proper soul causes the functions of normal life by its presence, while its more or less continued absence induces sleep, trance, and at last death, so the abnormal phenomena of disease have a sufficient explanation at hand in the idea that some other soul or soul-like spirit is acting on or has entered into the patient. Among the cases which most strongly suggest this are—first, such derangements as hysteria, epilepsy, and madness, where the raving and convulsions seem to bystanders like the acts of some other being in possession of the patient's body, and even the patient is apt to think so when he "comes to himself," and, second, internal diseases where severe pain or wasting away may be ascribed to some unseen being wounding or gnawing within. The applicability of demoniacal possession as a theory to explain disease in general is best proved by the fact that it is so often thus applied by savage races. Especially, reasoning out the matter in similar ways, rude tribes in different countries have repeatedly arrived at the conclusion that diseases are caused by the surviving souls or ghosts of the dead, who appear to the living in dreams and visions, thus proving at once their existence after death, and their continued concern with mankind. This notion being once set on foot, it becomes easy to the savage mind to identify the particular spirit, as when the Tasmanian ascribes a gnawing disease to his having unwittingly pronounced the name of a dead man, who thus summoned has crept into his body, and is consuming his liver; or when the sick Zulu believes that some dead ancestor he sees in a dream has caused his ailment, wanting to be propitiated with the sacrifice of an ox; or when the Samoan persuades himself that the ancestral souls, who on occasion reveal themselves by talking through the voices of living members of the family, are the same beings who will take up their abode in the heads or stomachs of living men and cause their illness and death. Here, then, the demon appears in what seems its original character of a human ghost. We may notice in the last example the frequent case of the man's mind being so thoroughly under the belief in a spirit possessing him that he speaks in the person of that spirit, and gives its name; the bearing of this on oracular possession will appear presently. In many, perhaps in most cases, however, the disease-demon is not specially described as a human ghost; for instance, some Malay tribes in their simple theory of diseases are content to say that one kind of demon causes small-pox, another brings on swellings, and so on. The question is whether in such cases the human character has merely dropped away, and this seems likely from the very human fashion in which the demons are communicated with; they are talked to with entreaties or threats, enticed out with offerings of food, or driven away with noises and blows, just as though they were human souls accessible to the same motives as when they were in the body. Thus the savage theory of demoniacal possession has for its natural result the practice of exorcism or banishment of the spirit as the regular means of cure, as where, to select

these from hundreds of instances, the Antilles Indians in Columbus's time went through the pretence of pulling the disease off the patient and blowing it away, bidding it begone to the mountain or the sea or where the Patagonians till lately, believing every sick person to be possessed by an evil demon, drove it away by beating at the bed's head a drum painted with figures of devils.

That such modern savage notions fairly represent the doctrine of disease-possession in the ancient world is proved by the records of the earliest civilized nations. The very charms still exist by which the ancient Egyptians resisted the attacks of the wicked souls who, become demons, entered the bodies of men to torment them with diseases and drive them to furious madness. The doctrine of disease among the ancient Babylonians was that the swarming spirits of the air entered man's body, and it was the exorcist's duty to expel by incantations "the noxious neck-spirit," "the burning spirit of the entrails which devours the man," and to make the piercing pains in the head fly away "like grasshoppers" into the sky. (See *Records of the Past*, vols. i., iii., &c.; Birch's trans. of the *Egyptian Book of the Dead*, see below; Maspero, *Histoire Ancienne des Peuples de l'Orient*, p. 41; Lenormant, *La Magie chez les Chaldéens*, &c.) The transition-stage of the ancient belief in the classical period of Greece and Rome is particularly interesting. The scientific doctrine of medicine was beginning to encroach upon it, but it was still current opinion that a fit was an attack by a demon (ἐπιληψία = "seizure," hence English *epilepsy*), that fury or madness was demoniacal possession (δαμονιάω = to be possessed by an evil spirit, hence English *demoniac*, &c.), that madmen were "larvati," i.e., inhabited by ghosts, &c. No record shows the ancient theory more clearly than the New Testament, from the explicit way in which the symptoms of the various affections are described, culminating in the patient declaring the name of his possessing demon, and answering in his person when addressed. The similarity of the symptoms with those which in barbarous countries are still accounted for in the ancient way may be seen from such statements as the following, by a well-known missionary (Rev. J. L. Wilson, *Western Africa*, p. 217):—"Demoniacal possessions are common, and the feats performed by those who are supposed to be under such influence are certainly not unlike those described in the New Testament. Frantic gestures, convulsions, foaming at the mouth, feats of supernatural strength, furious ravings, bodily lacerations, gnashing of teeth, and other things of a similar character, may be witnessed in most of the cases." Among the early Christians the demoniacs or energumens (ἐνεργούμενοι) formed a special class under the control of a clerical order of exorcists, and a mass of evidence drawn from such writers as Cyril, Tertullian, Chrysostom, and Minutius Felix, shows that the symptoms of those possessed were such as modern physicians would class under hysteria, epilepsy, lunacy, &c. (See their works, and refs. in Bingham, *Antiquities of the Christian Church*; Maury, *La Magie et l'Astrologie*, part ii. ch. 2, &c.) Some theologians, while in deference to advanced medical knowledge they abandon the primitive theory of demons causing such diseases in our own time, place themselves in an embarrassing position by maintaining, on the supposed sanction of Scripture, that the same symptoms were really caused by demoniacal possession in the 1st century. A full statement of the arguments on both sides of this once important controversy will be found in earlier editions of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, but for our times it seems too like a discussion whether the earth was really flat in the ages when it was believed to be so, but became round since astronomers provided a different explanation of the same phenomena. It is more profitable