

Mr. Thomson holds that the introduction of a supreme will into the system of Kapila was not the work of Patanjali himself, but of some other persons intervening between him and Kapila. Judging from the mere form of the doctrine as it appears in the Yoga Sûtras, we might naturally incline to the same opinion, as this form is not sufficiently apologetic to have been the earliest authoritative statement of the doctrine; but when we remember that one great obstacle to the satisfactory study of Hindu philosophy is the fact that we seldom see *processes*, but only *results*; that, further, the real utterances of a great teacher have rarely, if ever, come down to us, save in the scholastic formulas of his disciples; and that when any new statement of a doctrine had gained currency, all former treatises upon the subject have usually fallen into disuse, — we may hesitate before refusing Patanjali the honor of having remedied (so far as he did) the prominent defect of the Sânkya philosophy. As it now stands, however, the Yoga philosophy is less a system of metaphysics than a religious scheme, offered as a substitute both for the atheistic speculations of the philosophers, and the irrational superstitions of the common people.

(To be concluded).

---

### ARTICLE III.

#### SOME REMARKS ON AN EXPRESSION IN ACTS, XXV. 26. — A MONOGRAPH.

BY REV. THEODORE DWIGHT WOOLSEY, D. D., PRESIDENT OF YALE COLLEGE, NEW HAVEN.

THE words "of whom I have no certain thing to write τῷ κυρίῳ," suggest the inquiry whether a Roman official, like Festus, when speaking of the emperor, could, in conformity with Roman usage about the year 60 of our era, have uttered the words τῷ κυρίῳ, which are here attributed to him. This inquiry has not been overlooked or unan-

swered. We name only among the commentators on the scriptures, Wetstein, in his edition of the New Testament, as having furnished a valuable collection of materials for a satisfactory answer; and, among other writers, Lipsius, in an excursus on the Annals of Tacitus, ii. 87, and Zell, in his *Röm. Epigraphik*, as having elucidated a parallel use of *dominus*. We propose to go into this inquiry at greater length than others within our knowledge have done, with the result, as we hope, of setting forth the accuracy of the evangelist Luke.

The first question to be answered in considering these words is: Whether Luke wishes to represent Festus as talking in the Roman or in the Oriental style. On the latter supposition, he might, one may say, attribute to the procurator, without any accurate knowledge of the usages of speech prevailing among Roman gentlemen, expressions similar to those which he met with in the Septuagint; or again, Festus, adopting a more Oriental style than was his wont at home in Italy, and accommodating himself to his companion king Agrippa, might call the emperor *κύριος*, when he would not call him *dominus* at Rome. This latter part of the alternative, however, seems too refined; if any one chooses to adopt it, he will, of course, rate the accuracy of Luke highly. It is natural enough to suppose that Romans of rank accommodated themselves in a degree to eastern forms of address, while living in the eastern parts of the empire; but if it can be shown that the use of *dominus* and of *κύριος*, as titles of the emperor, went along together, this of itself will be good proof that Festus in these words was talking as a Roman would. The Greeks employed *αὐτοκράτωρ* as an equivalent of *imperator*; they also used *βασιλεύς* of the emperor, while the Romans, for reasons obvious from their history, were avoiding *rex*. But we shall endeavor soon to show that the two agreed in the use of the title *κύριος* and *dominus*, in whatsoever part of the empire this use may have originated.

But might not Luke put *τῷ κυρίῳ* into the mouth of Festus without any exact knowledge of what he said, and in

imitation of the style of address and of reference which prevails in the ancient scriptures? If such were the case, he would only follow the approved custom of many accurate ancient historians, and could not be found fault with if he did what such truthful writers as Thucydides and Tacitus have sanctioned. This ground is taken by Lekebusch, who otherwise has done much to vindicate the honesty and accuracy of Luke. But this cannot be conceded beyond the point of admitting that the evangelist reduced his materials, derived from his own notes or recollection or from other sources, to a Greek style substantially the same everywhere; for the adaptation of the speeches to the characters shows too great a historic art to have proceeded simply from the author of the rest of the narrative. In the present case, however, the only way of showing the contrary, as far as it can be shown, is to show that Festus would be altogether likely to have used the expression which is ascribed to him, and that the writer, who accompanied Paul a short time afterward on his voyage to Italy, was very naturally his attendant on this occasion.

But before proceeding to our main point, let us briefly consider the use of *κύριος* among the Jews in addresses to persons of rank, and also the resemblances and differences in the Greek and Roman terms translated commonly by our word *Lord*. First, then, *κύριος*, in the Seventy and in the Apocrypha, is the usual equivalent not only for *ādōn* (Lord), but also for *Jehovah*, both when spoken of and when addressed. Examples in proof will not be called for. We cite, as being nearer to the times of the New Testament, *Judith* 11 : 10, 11; 12 : 6, 13, 14; 1 *Esdras* 11 : 17, 18; 4 : 46. In the New Testament the usage is the same: in hundreds of instances both God and Jesus are thus spoken of. Indeed, in the Acts, so common is it to call the risen Saviour by the title of *κύριος*, that the reference in a number of passages is ambiguous. In the first and most noticeable of these ambiguous cases, *Acts* 1 : 24, we feel compelled to believe that Christ is addressed by the title *κύριε, καρδιογνώστα πάντων*, as continuing that choice of his apostles which he began on earth. Of other beings

besides God and Christ, *κύριος* is rarely used in the New Testament; yet the reason for this lies most probably in the infrequency of the other occasions where it could be introduced. The "Greeks," in John 12: 21, apply the term to the apostle Andrew; and Mary, in John 20: 15, to the supposed gardener, no doubt *more patrio*; and in the Greek town of Philippi, which had become a Roman colony, the jailer (Acts 16: 30) calls Paul and Silas thus, which is due, perhaps, to the awe which they had inspired in him as being in some sort divine persons. Many, however, of the more fanatical Jews, at this time, either from religious motives or from political, because a Roman *κύριος* reminded them of subjection, and that to heathen authority, refused to call even the emperor by this title. Such were the teachings of Judas of Galilee to his followers, who regarded God (Joseph. Antiq. xviii. 1, 6) alone as *ἡγεμών* and *δεσπότης*; so that, as Theophylact (on Luke xiii. cited by Wetstein) says, many were severely punished *ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ εἰπεῖν κύριον τὸν Καίσαρα*. Others, on the contrary, of the less fanatical Jews, did not scruple to use such words of the highest personage in the Roman world. Philo-Judaeus, writing on the legation to Caligula, in which he had a part (de leg. § 36), gives the words *καὶ ἐγὼ τίς εἰμι τῶν εἰδότην ὅτι δεσπότην ἔχω καὶ κύριον*, as part of a letter of Herod Agrippa the first, and in the same letter the emperor Caius is more than once called *δεσπότης*.

A few words are needed here to discriminate between the terms which answer to our word *Lord*. Of the Latin ones, *herus* is the strict correlative of *servus*, and differs from *dominus* in that the latter is the wider term, embracing the relations of the master to the slave, and of the owner to the property. Derived from *domus*, it denoted first the house-master, and then the proprietor. The *dominus* was such in relation to his chattels, including his slaves, but not in relation to his wife and his children, great as was his power over them. This relation was expressed in the word *dominium*, so important in the civil law. The special applications of *dominus*, which concern us in this essay, we pass over for the present.

*Δεσπότης*, like *herus*, was in its strict sense a correlative of slave, *δούλος*; and in an extended sense was used of the master over men in political bondage, like the Great King, as well as of the gods. In a still wider sense it denoted proprietor or *absolute owner* of things; as *δ. ὄρνυγος*, the owner of a *quail*; *δ. οἰκίας*, the master of a *house* or household; whence the *οἰκοδεσπότης* of the sacred writers. A Greek would have resented the calling of any magistrate over free Greeks a *δεσπότης*, because the term reminded him of its correlate, and he had for the holder of usurped and absolute power another word, *τύραννος*, which although the same at its origin with *κοίρανος*, took on in time a bad sense. Examples of these uses of *δεσπότης* are too frequent for citation. We adduce only, Eurip. Hippolyt. v. 88, *Ἀναξ· Θεοὺς γὰρ δεσπότης καλεῖν χρεών*. Comp. a fine contrast between *κοίρανος* and *δεσπότης* in Eurip. Alcest. 210—212. It is only a seeming exception to what has been said, if in a few passages the tragic poets intend by *δεσπότης* the sovereign or king who is conceived of as having a more uncontrolled power in mythical times than was known in historical Greece. Thus the chorus of free persons in the *Electra* of Sophocles, v. 764, says:

Φεῦ, φεῦ· τὸ πᾶν δὴ δεσπότησιν τοῖς πάλοι  
Πρόβριζον, ὡς εἴκεν, ἐφάρται γένος.

*Κύριος* is a word of wider meaning, and originally an adjective derived from *κύρος*, denoting *having authority, power, or validity*. The authority or highest power in a state might thus be called *τὸ κύριον*, as by Aristot. (Polit. iii. 10), and a person who was his own master, was said to be *κύριος αὐτὸς ἑαυτοῦ, sui juris*. With the genitive of a person following it, *κύριος* denotes having power over or in respect to that person. A noted case of this was where, in Attic law, a husband was called his wife's *κύριος*, as having the representative power for her in legal proceedings, since in Attic law married women could, no more than minors, sue or be sued in person. In this sense the word has been used to

illustrate the Hebrew Baal, denoting, first, *possessor, lord*, then *husband*; but without reason, for the husband was not the wife's κύριος, save in the forensic sense just mentioned. As implying the possession of authority or power, κύριος is a broad term, applicable to the relations of political and social life, and has no bad sense like δεσπότης, nor the notion of property, like dominus. It can describe all who have authority, men and gods, and thus became fitted to take that place which it occupies in Hellenistic Greek. In the Greek classics it is rarely spoken of a sovereign, although a few examples of such a use are to be met with. Comp. Soph. Oed. Col. 1644, 288, and Ajax 734. Ellendt., in his *Lexicon of Sophocles*, defines it "*penes quem jus, potestas, arbitrium est.*" The distinction between it and δεσπότης is exhibited in a rude way by Ammonius, the writer on synonymes. Under δεσπότης, he has δ. ὁ τῶν ἀργυρωνήτων, κύριος δὲ καὶ πατὴρ υἱοῦ καὶ αὐτὸς τις ἑαυτοῦ; and again voce κύριος, κ. τῆς γυναικὸς ὁ ἀνὴρ, καὶ τῶν υἱῶν ὁ πατὴρ· δεσπότης δ' ἀργυρωνήτων (ἦ) τινῶν ἄλλων.

In turning dominus into Greek, both δ. and κ. would occur to the mind of the Greek writer. When dominus is used in its strict sense of house-master, slave-master, no other word was so apposite as δεσπότης; and in the civil law, we believe, δεσποτεία answers to dominium. In the later applications of dominus, especially where it is used of the Roman emperor, either word might be used, but κύριος more readily, as being without that odor of slavery which adhered to the other term. On the other hand, in turning κύριος, when used of a person possessed of power, into Latin, dominus is its equivalent, as in countless instances where the Vulgate expresses the κ. of the Seventy and the New Testament by this word.

We are now prepared to remark that, about the end of the republic, dominus came to be used of others besides the master of slaves, the proprietor of a thing, and a divinity; it came to be applied, as Dirksen, in his manual of the foundations of the civil law expresses it, "*principi et personis domus Augustae, aliisque dignitati conspicuis, adfective nobis devinctis.*"

The first time in which it is known to have been applied to the emperor finely illustrates the change in the use of words produced by moral and social changes in the nation making use of them. The old free Roman could never have shaped his lips to call any man his own *dominus*. But with the empire came in a feeling of subjection. The power of the prince, though in theory conferred on him by people, was in degree and kind that of a master, or *αὐτοκράτωρ*; as the Greeks called him; and a population, like the vast majority of the inhabitants of the imperial city, made up of freedmen and of foreigners from countries where rulers had been masters, would feel no great reluctance in telling the truth by this ill-sounding title. Accordingly, on one occasion, when Augustus was in the theatre and a mime had uttered the words, "O dominum aequum et bonum," the audience expressed loud applause, as if it had been spoken of the emperor. Augustus, too prudent to show his liking of this, and possibly too old-fashioned to like it, by his hand and countenance checked the unbecoming adulations of the people, and on the next day rebuked the practice "gravissimo edicto." So Suetonius (August. § 53). Other writers refer to the same occurrence, as Dion Cas. (lv. § 12), Philo Jud. (de legat ad Caium § 23), and Tertullian (Apol. § 34). Dion says: *καὶ δεσπότης τότε ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου ὀνομασθεὶς*, etc. Philo says that "the clearest proof that he was not enchanted and puffed up by excessive power, was *τὸ μὴ δεσπότην μητὲ θεὸν ἑαυτὸν ἐθελῆσαι προσεπεῖν, ἀλλὰ κἀν, εἰ λέγοι τις, δυσχεραίνειν*." Tertullian's words, where he alludes to the same event, are these: "Augustus imperii formator ne dominum quidem dici se volebat. Et hoc enim dei est cognomen. Dicam plane imperatorem dominum, sed *more communi*, sed quando non cogor ut dominum dei vice dicam. Ceterum liber sum illi: dominus enim meus unus est, Deus omnipotens et aeternus, idem qui et ipsius. Qui pater patriae est, quomodo dominus est?" This passage is important as showing at once that this was a common appellation of the emperor, when Tertullian wrote, about A. D. 222, that the old unpleasantness of the word to a free mind had not left it,

and that a new consecration of it to God had grown up in Christian minds.

Augustus was not able to effect much by his edict in regard to the title *dominus*. Under Tiberius the usage of addressing the emperor in this way continued, but that wary prince rejected the title, as his stepfather had done before him. "Acerbe increpuit," says Tacitus of him (Annal. xi. 87) "eos qui divinas occupationes ipsumque dominum dixerant." To the same effect Suetonius (Tiber. § 27): "Dominus appellatus a quodam denunciavit ne se amplius contumelie causa nominaret," etc. A verse in Phaedrus (ii. 5),

Perambulante laeta domino viridia,

has been cited, as illustrating this usage; but *domino* here has relation to the slave of Tiberius, of whom the story is told. So, too, when Virgil says (Aen. vi. 397) *Hi dominam Ditis thalamo deducere adorti*, we cannot infer, with Lipsius, although he has the authority of Servius for it, that Proserpine is so called as being the wife (the lady) of Pluto. Charon styles her thus, as his mistress, or else there is allusion to the title *Δέσποινα*, which she especially bore.

The successor of Tiberius, the infamous Caligula, can have had no scruple in regard to this title, since he arrogated the higher ones of Hero and God, and called Jupiter his brother. (Comp. Dion. Cass. lv. 26. Sueton. Calig. § 22.) Philo (de legat. § 11) reports him as reasoning that, since the rulers over sheep and goats are of a higher nature than sheep and goats, so the ruler over mankind is something more than mortal. It was in this spirit that the insane wretch ordered Petronius, praefect of Syria, to raise a statue to his honor at Jerusalem, and even after Herod Agrippa had induced him to abandon the project, he returned to it, intending to have the temple called by the name of *Διὸς ἐπιφανοῦς νέου Γαλου*. About the same time a sedition broke out between the Jews and the Greeks at Alexandria, in which the latter endeavored to put statues of the emperor in the *proseuchae* of the former. In reference to this



difficulty, Philo and others went to Rome as a delegation from their countrymen to mitigate the emperor's mind, and there encountered deputies of the other faction. In his memoir on this embassy, which we have already cited more than once, Philo makes Herod Agrippa address the emperor several times with the title of *δεσπότης*, and puts the same word in the mouth of one of his adversaries, in reply to whose calumnious charges the Jewish deputies cry out *κύριε Γάιε συκοφαντούμεθα*. The word, if they spoke Latin, was *dominus*, in both cases; if Greek, Philo means to mark the servility of the other faction (u. s. § 48). To Philo *κύριος* seemed a very fit word to use towards the emperor. 'Ἡ γὰρ 'κύριος' προσρῆσις, says he (de nom. mut. ed. Mangey, 1. 581) ἀρχῆς καὶ βασιλείας ἐστὶ.

The style of *speaking* of the emperor, as the *dominus* or *κύριος*, went along with, or somewhat after, that of *addressing* him by such a title; but the former would be the less common, among the Romans at least, on account of the associations of *dominus* with slavery. Under Domitian we find the poet Statius (Silv. iv. praef.) writing "multa ex illis jam domino Caesari dederam." This emperor affected the title, as we learn from Sueton. (Domit. § 13) and from Eutropius; the latter of whom is incorrect when he says "dominum se et Deum primus appellari jussit," for Caligula had already done as much. He began a circular letter, according to Suetonius, with the words "dominus et Deus noster," and gladly listened to the acclamation, in the theatre, "domino et dominae feliciter." It is with reference to this that Martial writes :

Frustia, blanditiae, venitis ad me  
 Attritis miserabiles labellis :  
 Dicturus dominum Deumque non sum.  
 Jam non est locus hac in urbe vobis :  
 Non est hic dominus sed imperator.

Pliny, also, in his panegyric on Trajan, § 2, alludes to the same thing : "Nusquam ut Deo blandiamur; non enim de tyranno sed de cive, non de domiivo sed de parente loquimur." (Comp. §§ 55, 63.) *Dominus* then, in a distinct

political acceptance, as where a vile tyrant like Domitian wanted men to feel that he was their master, had not lost its old twang; and yet the style of politeness continually made use of it,—the best proof of which is afforded by the fact that the same Pliny, in his letters to Trajan, calls him *dominus* more than seventy times.

It is needless to trace the uses of this word further down in the empire. Some emperors, as Alexander Severus, refused to be so called. Avidius Cassius (Vulcat. Gallic. in Vita § 5), addressing Mark Antonine, says: *recte consuluisti mi domine*; and Antoninus Diadumenus (Ael. Lamprid. in Vita § 9) in writing to his mother concerning his father, Opilius Macrinus the emperor, says: “*dominus noster et Augustus nec te amat nec ipsum se,*” which he might have said of his father, though not an emperor, as will presently appear.

The *lapidary* style affords frequent examples of the same mode of designating the emperor. In Latin inscriptions the form generally was *dominus noster* (D. N.; and in the plural, DD. NN.), and the earliest extant examples belong to the age of Domitian. Thus in Orelli's Collection (1. 143, No. 521) we have the following Egyptian epigraph, one of the very many yet extant on the statue of Memnon.

Sex. Licinius Pudens legionis xxii  
xi. K. Januarius anno iiii D. N.  
Domitiani Caesaris Augusti  
Germanici, audi [audii] Memnonem.

Another, found at Corduba in Spain (Orelli 1. 185, No. 766), begins thus:

D. N. Imperator Caesar  
Divi Vespasiani Augusti, etc.,

and belongs to the same reign.

In Mommsen's Latin Inscriptions of the kingdom of Naples (p. 212), occur the words: “*Pro salute optumi principis et domini nostri,*” relating to the same emperor.

On Greek inscriptions *κύριος* is found frequently enough;

but *δεσπότης*, if we are not deceived, almost never. Wetsstein's only reference is to a marble of Smyrna, in which occur the words *τοῦ κυρίου Καίσαρος Ἀδριανοῦ*; but we have not found this in Boeckh's Collection, perhaps have overlooked it. Without making an exhaustive search, we have noticed among the inscriptions of Asia Minor one of Aphrodisias in Caria, of uncertain date; another of Stratonicea in Caria, of the reign of Adrian, and another of Bagae on the Hermus, belonging to the reign of Diocletian, in which the title is employed. But it is found most abundantly on the monuments of Egypt. Nearly fifty instances have fallen under our eye. The earliest pertains to the reign of Tiberius. Then occur Nero, and the emperors of the second century, the latter very often. With equal frequency, the gods of Egypt, as Isis, Ammon, etc.; or imported gods, as Pan. We have noticed no cases in which the line of Lagidae received this title, and may infer that it came into vogue under the Romans. Inscriptions with this appellation of *κύριος* abound especially on the statue of Memnon, at Philae, in Elephantina, etc. One, discovered in the oasis of Thebes, and belonging to the reign of Galba, is remarkable, as containing the words: "the ordinance sent to me *ἰπὸ τοῦ κυρίου ἡγεμόνος*, Tib. Julius Alexander," praefect of Egypt, — the person speaking being the strategus of the nome.

The passage which we have quoted from Suetonius, in his life of Augustus, affords us another early use of *dominus*. After the occurrence in the theatre, Augustus "*dominum se appellari ne a liberis quidem aut nepotibus, vel serio vel joco, passus est; atque hujusmodi Blanditiis etiam inter ipsos prohibuit.*" From this it appears to have grown already into a custom for children, adopting perhaps the style of slaves in the household, to address their parents by this title, and even thus to address one another. That this practice continued to be rife, is shown by a passage of Seneca (Epist. 104), which is regularly quoted by the commentators on Acts for another reason. "*Illud mihi,*" says he, "*in ore erat domini mei Gallionis [his brother]; qui, quum in Achaia febrem habere coepisset, protinus navem ascendit, clamitans non*

corporis esse sed loci morbum." Martial, half a century afterward, refers to the custom of calling a father *dominus*, in the following epigram (i. 82) :

E servo scis te genitum, blandeque fateris,  
Cum dicis dominum, Sosibiane, patrem.

The same usage is pointed at by Palladas, an epigrammatist of the end of the fourth century. He speaks of a person who, in the hope of getting some present from a friend, addressed him as *δόμινε φράτερ*, and when he had no such expectation, used *φράτερ* alone. "*Αὐτὰρ ἔγωγε*," continues the poet :

"Ὀὐκ ἐδέλω δόμινε, οὐ γὰρ ἔχω δόμεναι,"

which seems, by the way, to indicate that *ε* and *αι*, in that age, did not differ in their sound.

For another use of *dominus*, in polite discourse, Seneca is again, our earliest voucher. In his third epistle he says : "Sic illum amicum vocasti, quomodo omnes candidatos bonos viros dicimus; quomodo obvios, si nomen non succurrit, dominos salutamus." So, too, a crowd was addressed, under the emperors, as *domini* or *κύριοι*. When Nero, in the character of a citharoedus, exhibited himself to the Romans in the theatre, he began : *κύριοί μου εὐμενῶς μου ἀκούσατε* (Dion. Cass. lxi. 20). We may add here that in addresses to *known* persons, of no very high rank, the title was employed. It is thus employed by Petronius, and if the judgment of Dr. Charles Beck, lately professor at Harvard, referring him to the first century, should be sanctioned by the critics, he would become a very early voucher for it. It is found, again, in Apuleius, as *Luci domine* (Metam. ii. 30.; iii. 50), *domine* alone (iv. 75), and *domine fili*, "sir, son," spoken by Jupiter to Cupido. See also a passage in Quintil. vi. 3. 100, a part of which we do not understand. It closes : *et verus inquit domine*.

It is natural that the use of *domina*, *κυρία*, should go on pari passu with that of *dominus*, *κύριος*. An example or two may be produced. When the vile and crazy Nero associated

with himself Pythagoras as husband and Sporus as wife. *καὶ κυρία καὶ βασιλῆς καὶ δέσποινα ὠνομάζετο* (Dion. Cass. lxxiii. 13). Another infamous emperor, Elagabalus, affected to be a woman, and when Aurelius Zoticus said to him *κύριε αὐτοκράτωρ χαῖρε*, replied, *μή με λέγε κύριον· ἐγὼ γὰρ κυρία εἰμί* (Dion. Cass. lxxix. 16, comp. 14). The Roman women, says Epictetus (Enchirid. 40), at the age of fourteen, are called *κυρίαί* by their husbands; but this means no more than that, when married at that early age, a girl is called *domina*, i. e., mistress of the family or slaves. In the Pastor of Hermas, *domina* is a constant form of address. So *dominus* (e. g., lib. i. vis 1, lib. ii. mand. 5).

Here we may touch upon the question: What is the proper translation of 2 John vv. 1, 5, where our translation is "lady"? dismissing as impossible the view which is expressed by the translation "the lady Eclecta," as giving her the same name with her sister (ver. 13), or as requiring the rendering "Eclecta" in the one case, and "elect" in the other, and regarding as nearly absurd, the opinion of Huther, which finds in *κυρία* the *κυρία ἐκκλησία*, we have remaining the two renderings, "the elect Lady," or "the elect Kyria." The former is opposed by the absence of the article before *ἐκλεκτῆ*, while in the latter case this absence, although not usual, can be better endured. *Kyria* seems to have been a rare proper name.

In concluding this monograph, which is already longer than we could have wished, we desire to present to our readers, in a brief form, our most important conclusions.

1. About the beginning of the empire the custom grew up of *addressing* the emperor as *dominus* or *κύριος*; nay, sometimes even *δεσπότης* was heard. This usage became a part of established etiquette.

2. When the emperor spoke of *himself* as a *dominus*, it grated on Roman ears, as savoring of slavery.

3. When the emperor was *spoken of* in inscriptions, he was freely called by these titles. The same probably was true of other modes of speaking of him.

4. When an *unknown* person, or one whose name *was not*

remembered, or a crowd was addressed, these words were used.

5. Other persons besides the emperor were so addressed or spoken of. This is true of parents, brothers, even of children, and perhaps of other persons important in the view of the speaker, and that both with and without appending the individual's name.

6. The same remarks hold of the corresponding female terms.

7. Finally, whatever can be argued with regard to *dominus* in Italy, can with more force be argued of *κύριος* in the Greek-speaking parts of the Roman empire, and especially in the East.

It can therefore be readily believed, that when Luke, in the passage before us, attributes to Festus the words *τῷ κυρίῳ*, spoken of the emperor, he attributes to him what he would be likely to say, even as a Roman official. Furthermore, as we have already observed, he was probably on the spot, seeing that he sailed soon after with the apostle, and he may have been an ear-witness to words which were spoken in a public assembly.

---

#### ARTICLE IV.

##### METHOD IN SERMONS.

BY REV. LEONARD WITHINGTON, D. D., NEWBURYPORT, MASS.

VERY much attention has been paid by most sermonizers to the method, the order, and the division of their discourses. In some associations, it is a constant exercise to exhibit the skeleton of a sermon as a subject of criticism; and yet the success of this labor, it seems to us, has borne no proportion to the labor itself. We have known some cases in which the order of a sermon has been bad just in propor-