

Institutions of this character have invariably been held to be "charities, within the legal definition of that term."

A charity was defined by Mr. Binney, in his celebrated argument in *Vidal vs. Girard*, 2 Howard, to be

"Whatever is given for the love of God or for the love of your neighbor, in the catholic and universal sense; given from these motives and to these ends, free from the stain or taint of every consideration that is personal, private and selfish."

So Lord Camden, in *Jones vs. Williams*, Amb., 652, described a charity as "a gift to a general public use which extends to the poor as well as the rich."

So in *Gerke vs. Purcell*, 25 Ohio St., 243, it was said, "The meaning of the word 'charity,' in its legal sense, is different from the signification which it ordinarily bears. In its legal sense it includes not only gifts for the benefit of the poor, but endowments for the advancement of learning, or institutions for the encouragement of science and art, and, it is said, for any other useful and public purpose. 2 Steph. Com., 229."

But, perhaps the most lucid definition is contained in *Jackson vs. Phillips*, 14 Allen, 556, wherein Mr. Justice Gray said, "A charity in a legal sense may be more fully defined as a gift, to be applied consistently with existing laws, for the benefit of an indefinite number of persons, either by bringing their hearts under the influence of education or religion; by relieving their bodies from disease, suffering or constraint; by assisting them to establish themselves for life, or by erecting or maintaining public buildings or works, or otherwise lessening the burdens of government. It is immaterial whether the purpose is called charitable in the gift itself, if it is so described as to show that it is charitable in its nature."

