## Menasseh Ben-Israel[[@Headword:Menasseh Ben-Israel]]

             SEE MANASSEH BENISRAEL.

## Menasseh Vital[[@Headword:Menasseh Vital]]

             SEE VITAL.

## Menche, Heinrich Gottlieb[[@Headword:Menche, Heinrich Gottlieb]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born April 24, 1799. He studied at Marburg, entered the ministry in 1820, was pastor at Roddenau, Hanover, from 1851 to 1882, and died June 21, 1884, at Munden, doctor of theology. (B.P.)

## Mencius (Or Meng)[[@Headword:Mencius (Or Meng)]]

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

Men often owe their greatness to their mothers. The mother of Meng is celebrated throughout China as a model of feminine wisdom in family training. The first home of her widowhood was near a cemetery, and her little boy, with the instinctive imitativeness peculiar to children, began to practice funeral ceremonies, and to perform Liliputian burial-rites. “This will never do,” said Madam Meng, “my son will grow up an undertaker,” and she promptly removed to a house in the marketplace. Here the boy imitated the cries, disputes, and chafferings of the buyers and sellers. “This will not answer,” said the watchful mother, “ he will make only a pedler or an auctioneer,” and again she removed and took up her abode in the vicinity of a school. The youth forthwith took to chanting lessons in concert with the loud chorus peculiar to the Chinese school-room. “This will do,” said the prudent dame, “my son will become a scholar,” and she was not disappointed in her forecasting. Nevertheless he was, like all boys, indifferent and careless, and we are told that, to quicken his zeal and give him a striking lesson, his mother one day surprised and alarmed him by suddenly cutting asunder the web she was weaving.

Upon his inquiring why she did it, she replied that thus, by' his idleness, he was cutting asunder the web of opportunity, and destroying his prospects for life, just as she had destroyed the product of the loom. The boy was affected, and gave greater diligence to his studies. These are all the glimpses we have of philosopher Meng, until we meet him in public life at forty years of age. He must have spent his early years in diligent study of the classics, but how, or under what masters, we are not informed. In his writings he says,  “Although I could not be a disciple of Confucius myself, I have endeavored to cultivate my character and knowledge by means of others who were.” Like his master Confucius, Mencius doubtless assumed the office of a teacher-not a teacher or professor in our Western sense, but a peripatetic advocate of morals, political philosophy, and good government — one to whom youthful and perplexed inquirers resorted for counsel and encouragement. In the times of Confucius and Mencius, China was not a consolidated empire as at present, but consisted of a number of states or provinces under independent chieftains or kings. To the court of one of these Mencius resorted at about the age of forty years, and at the court of one or another of these petty rulers he lingered for nearly a quarter of a century the period which his published works cover-when he retired to obscurity, and spent the remaining twenty years of his life with his disciples in social converse, or the preparation of the seven books that constitute his writings. It was a long time before his reputation became national; but the time came at last, when a native writer says, “Since the time when Han, duke of Literature, delivered his eulogium Confucius handed the scheme of doctrine to Mencius, on whose death the line of transmission was interrupted all the scholars of the empire have associated Confucius and Mencius together.” Meng lived to an advanced age, dying BC. 288. The influence of his doctrines and opinions in China is second only to that of Confucius. “Confucius,” says a native writer, “spoke only of benevolence; Mencius speaks of benevolence and righteousness.” “ Confucius spoke only of the will or mind; Mencius enlarged on the nourishment of the passion-nature.

The pet doctrine of Mencius was the intrinsic goodness of human nature, although he admitted that by far the greater part of mankind had, through unfavorable circumstances or influences, become perverted. He says, “The way in which a man loses his natural goodness is like the way in which trees are deprived by the woodman of their branches and foliage; and, if they still send forth some buds or sprouts, then come the cattle and goats and browse upon them. As in the tree all appearance of life and beauty is destroyed, so in man, after a long exposure to evil influences, all traces of native goodness seem to be obliterated.” But he maintains that “ there is an original power of goodness in the race,” and that “all men may, if they will, become like Yao and Shun, two of the early sages and kings, who were pre-eminent for their virtue.” Mencius attributed the decline in morals to the neglect of the precepts of Confucius. He was determined, therefore, to  correct the evils which had sprung up, and, by securing the attention of the people to the study of morals, to restore the virtues of the primitive ages. One well versed in Chinese scholarship says, “The great object of Mencius is to rectify men's hearts. ‘If a man once rectify his heart,': says he, ‘little else will remain for him to do.' In another place he says, ‘The great or superior man is he who does not lose his child's heart,'” an expression which vividly recalls those beautiful lines of the great German poet

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

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

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

## Mencke, Johann[[@Headword:Mencke, Johann]]

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

## Mencke, Otto[[@Headword:Mencke, Otto]]

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

## Mendaeans (Or Mendians)[[@Headword:Mendaeans (Or Mendians)]]

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

Names. — The name מנְדָּיֵא, Mandaye, derived from Manda de-Chaye, דְּחִיֵּא, the λόγος τῆς ζωῆς, or word of life, is equivalent to οἱ λογικοί, in opposition to those holding different views, who are designated by them as ἄλογοι. But it is only among themselves they use that appellation; in  public they call themselves Sobba (from the Arabic tsabbah), and allow themselves to be considered by the Mohammedans as the followers of the Sabceans mentioned in the Koran. This erroneous opinion, it is said, took its rise from their habit of turning to the polar star when praying. The name of Christians of St. John was never assumed by them, and originated with travellers. Their most learned and distinguished men are called by them Nasoraye, נָצוֹרָיֵא.

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

1. the סַדְרָא רִבָּא, Sidra Rabba, “the great book ;” also called גַּנְזָא, Gensa, “the treasure.” This is their principal work, and contains their doctrines, only in unconnected fragments, evidently the production of a number of different persons. It is divided into two parts, the first forming about two thirds of the whole, is written for the living, and is called יָמַינָא, “the right;” the other, smaller, for the dead, is called סְמָלָא, “the left,” and contains an account of the death of Adam, as also the prayers to be used by the priests on the occasion of deaths and funerals. Norberg has given some information on that work under the title “Liber Adami,” which is quite improper, and which he probably took from Abraham Ecchellensis; his version also is full of errors arising from erroneous interpretation of the text, which he gives also incorrectly, so that this work can only be used with great caution.

2. סַדְרָא נֶשְׁמָתָא, “the book of souls;” it contains the prayers of the priests, and constitutes the liturgy, which every priest is to know by heart.

3. קוֹלִסְתָּא. This contains the marriage ritual.

4. בָּאוָתָא דְרִחְמֵא, in which are found the prayers for each day.

5. עֶנְיָנֵי דַדְרִבְשָׁא, prayers to be recited before the cross, both at home and in the church, but exclusively by the priests.

6. דְּרָשָׁא דְיִחְנָא, a history of John the Baptist.

7. אִסְפִּר מִלְוָשֵׁיא, a treatise on astrology. Aside from these they have formulas for all kinds of sorcery, and amulets for sickness and other misfortunes which evil spirits may bring; these charms are to born on the  breast. Those used against incurable diseases are called קְמָחֵיא, those against curable disorders פַּשְׁרֵיא. According to Ignatius a Jesu, they also possess another work, entitled “Divan,” of which he gives an account; yet the characteristics he furnishes of it seem to apply equally to the Sidra Rabba, and it is thought that the latter may be the work he refers to.

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

In a single abstract from the Sidra Rabba (i. 130236) we find no less than three conflicting accounts of the creation. They agree in placing at the beginning of all things פַּירָא רִבָּא, Pira Rabba, “the great fruit,” the בְּצוֹ פַּירָא רִבָּא, Bego Pira Rabba, “in the great fruit.” This recalls the Orphean myth of a world's egg, containing the germ of all that exists. Norberg, in his preface, remark 3, not being able to understand פירא, transformed it into פֶרְחָא, which, in his Onomasticon, he explains “volucris, sc. Phoenix,” and translates the preceding words “(fuit) Ferho per Ferho,” which, in the Onom., he explains by “Summum Numen per se exstitit.” At the same time with the great fruit was the מָאנָא רִבָּא דֶעֶקָרָא, “Mana the Lord of Glory,” and the אָיִר זַיוָא רִבָּא, “the Ether of great brilliancy,” which latter is the world, in which the Mana Rabba reigns, and which contains the יָרְדְּנָא רִבָּא, “ the great Jordan” (they call all rivers Jordans), which proceeds from him. Mana Rabba finally called forth “the life,” חיא(sc. קִדְמָיֵא, “the first”). This accomplished the act of creation, and the Mana Rabba at once went into the most absolute retirement, where he dwells invisible to all but the purest emanations, and the most pious among the Mendaeans, who, after their death, are permitted, but only once, to contemplate the Almighty. As the revealed, active, and governing deity-but not similar to the semigods of the Gnostics-stands the Chaye Kadnaye, “the first life,” which is therefore entitled to the first worship and adoration. Hence also it is it, and not the Mana Rabba, who is first invoked in all prayers, and with whose name every book begins. It is designated under a variety of names, even sometimes by those applied to the Mana  Rabba, with whom it is occasionally confounded. Like him, it dwells in the pure, brilliant ether, which is considered as a world in itself, in which all that exists is pervaded by the waters of the fire of life, and is inhabited by numberless Uthre, עיּתְרֵיא, “angels,” who dwell there in eternal blessedness. From the Chaye Kadmhye emanated first the Chayi Thinyane, חִיֵּא תַנְיָנֵיא, “the second life,” often called also יוּשָׁמַין, and then the מִנְדָּא דְחִיֵּא. Mande de-Chaye. This is sometimes (ii. 208) called : דִּכְיָא, the “pure,” yet is described as susceptible of impure thoughts: thus it attempted to usurp the place of the first life, and was on that account exiled from the pure ether into the world of light, being separated from it by the הֲפַיקֵיא מָיֵא(the Cabalists call them מים אפיקי).

It is similar to Cain, while its younger brother, Mandi de-Chaye, represents Abel. He is called the father, master, and king of the UthrE, lord of the worlds, the beloved son, the good shepherd, the high-priest, the word of life, the λόγος, the teacher and redeemer of mankind, who descended into hell and chained the devil: he is, in short, the Christ of the Mendseans; and as the followers of our Saviour, so are they named after the founder of their faith. He dwells with the father, who is supposed to be sometimes Chaye Kadmaye, sometimes Mana Rabba, and is, like the “first life,” called קִדְמָיָא אָדָם(comp. in the Cabala, אָדָם קִדְמוֹן). He revealed himself, however, to humanity in his three sons, who are also called his brothers, הַיבַיל, שַׁיתַיל, and אָנוּשׁ: (Abel, Seth, and Enoch). In another place it is said that Hebil alone is his son, Shethil his grandson, and Anush his great-grandson. Hebil, the most important among them, is almost equally venerated with the Manda de-Chay, receives the same names, and is often confounded with him. He is generally named זַיוָא הַיבַיל. Among the Uthre, “ angels,” who emanated from Chaye Thinyank, the first and most eminent is. תְלַיתָיֵא חִיֵּא, “the third life;” often also called אָבָתוּר, Abathur. This is not the “buffalo,” as erroneously asserted by Gesenius (in Ersch und Gruber, Encyklop. s.v. Zabier), but only has that name because of his being called κατ᾿ ἐξχήν, “the father of the Uthre,” דְעוּתְרֵיא אָבָא. He is also called “the old, the hidden, the watcher.” He sits at the limit of the world of light, where, at the door which leads to the middle and lower regions, and in a scale which he always holds in his hand, he weighs the deeds of the departed as they appear before him to gain admittance. Under him there was in the beginning an immense void, and at the bottom of it the troubled,  black waters, מִיֵּא סַיָאוֵיא.

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

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

Although the Mendaeans were originally Christians. they have entirely estranged themselves from the true principles of Christianity. When in the Syriac N.T. they found the Holy Spirit called Rucha de-Kodsha, as for them Rucha, as ψυχή, was the mother of the devil, they identified them, considered the Messiah as her son, and therefore looked upon him as a sorcerer, and, as Mercury, placed him among the planets. They consider the earth as altogether 480,000 years old, during which it has been alternately under the influence of the various planets for an equal length of time; the human race has been three times destroyed by the sword, fire, and water, only one couple remaining alive after each time. At the time of Noah the world was 466,000 years old; 6000 years after him, when the sun (whom they call also אַיל אַיל, אֲדוּנִי, קָרוּשׁ) came to reign over the world, and Jerusalem (called אוּרִשְׁלִם) was built at its command, her first  prophet, Abraham, אִבְרָחַים, appeared; her second was. Moses, מַישָׁא, after whom came Shlimun bar-Davith, to whom the daemons yielded obedience. As' the third false prophet, they name מְשַׁיחָא יַשׁוּ, whom they consider as an impostor, taught by the Rucha de-Kodsha, calling himself God and the son of God, but was unmasked as an impostor by Anush (perhaps so called in view of the בִּר אֶנָשָׁאof the Syriac N.T.), and was put to death by the Jews. Anush himself was baptized by John the Baptist, the only true prophet, and he performed the miracles and resurrections attributed by Christians to Christ. The last of the false prophets was Mohammed, whom they call Achmat, and there will be none after him. After 4000 or 5000 years mankind will again be destroyed: this time by a terrific storm. But the world will be again repeopled by a man and a woman from the upper world, and their descendants shall dwell on the earth for 50,000 years in piety and innocence. Then will the fire, also called leviathan, destroy the earth and the other medium worlds, as well as the nether worlds; their spirits will be annihilated, and the universe become a realm of light.

Priesthood. — There are different degrees in their priesthood. The lower class is called Sheganda, שְׁגִנְדָּא, and forms a sort of medium between the clergy, properly so called, and the laity. The members of it are actually but assistants, διάκονοι, of the priests, and can be received into it while yet mere boys. They are consecrated to that office by the imposition of hands, and the recital of a short formula at baptism. Many remain always in this subordinate position; if they desire to go higher, which they are not permitted to do before they are fifteen years of age, they must study diligently the religious books and customs of their people, undergo a strict trial for sixty days, and pass seven days and nights awake and in prayer with a priest; if admitted, they then become Tarmides, תִּרְמַידָא(probably for תִּלְמַידָא, “scholars”), to which office they are consecrated by seven priests. This is the true ‘priestly order, which qualifies them for every ecclesiastical office. Those who distinguish themselves by their science and conduct can become גִּנְזבְרָאwhich probably is equivalent to גַּזָּבָר, גַּזְבָּר, Ezr 1:8; Ezr 7:21, or “thesaurarius,” he who possesses the great treasure in himself. It corresponds to the office of high-priest or bishop, and requires only a short probation and the consecration by another of that rank. His functions are only to consecrate others, and to preside at marriages, which can, however, be legally administered by the tarmides, without his  participation. A priest who officiates at the marriage of a woman not a maiden, a widow, or a woman divorced from her husband loses the right to perform afterwards any religious ceremony except such marriages; he is then called פּוֹיְסֵק, “ one cut off.”

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

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

Religious Worship, Practices, and Observances.-Their year is the solar year of 365 days, divided into twelve months of thirty days each; the remaining five days do not belong to any month. Their months are generally named after the signs of the zodiac; they have also retained for  them the Jewish appellation, with a few alterations. They observe the Sabbath, and have besides four ecclesiastical festivals:

1, on New-year's-day, at the beginning of the “Waterman;”

2, on the 18th day of “Taurus;”

3, between the Virgin and the Balance;

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

Number. — In the 17th century the Mendaeans still counted some 20,000 families; they have since considerably decreased in number. They are located, some on the Euphrates and Tigris, south of Bagdad, or between the two rivers; some in various cities of Kurdistan, where they carry on the trades of jewellers, blacksmiths, shipbuilders, carpenters, or joiners. The statement of Germanus Conti, that there are persons of the same creed in Lebanon, appears to have originated in a mistake between them and the Nosairians. The Mendaeans do not outwardly distinguish themselves from the Mohammedans among whom they reside. They should, however, according to their law, dress entirely in white; but, as the Mohammedans claim the exclusive use of that color, the Mendaeans wear mostly brown, or brown and white garments. They must void dark colors, as belonging to the kingdom of darkness, yet this rule cannot always be observed. Polygamy is not only permitted, but advised, as their “great book” repeatedly recommends them to diligently increase the race. It is a very general practice with them, although, according to the statement of the priests, they do not usually have more than two wives. See Herzog, Real- Encyklop. 9:318 sq.; also Farrar, Ecclesiastes Dict. s.v.; Deutsche Zeitschri tf; christl. Wissenschaft u. christl. Leben, 1854, No. 23; 856, No. 42, 43,46,49; Burckhardt, Les Nazorses ou Mcandai-Jahja appelgs ordinairement Zabiens et Chretiens de St. Jean Baptiste (Strasb. 1840) ;  Chwolsohn, Die Szabier (Petersb. 1856); Petermann, Reisen imn Orient, (1861), vol. ii.

## Mende Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Mende Version Of The Scriptures]]

             The Mende is spoken by a considerable population to the south and south- east of Sierra Leone. A version of Matthew had been prepared at an early period by American missionaries, who had settled on the border of the Mende country. A translation of the four gospels was made by the Reverend J.F. Schon, of the Church Missionary Society, the standard  alphabet of Prof. Lepsius (q.v.) being adopted for the version. Mr. Schon was aided in the work of translation by Harvey K. Ritchell, of the Mende country. In 1871 the Acts of the Apostles were printed by the British and Foreign Bible Society; the translation having been made by the Reverend H. Johnson, a native African clergyman. In 1872 the Epistle to the Romans was published. The remainder of the New Test. is still in manuscript. (B.P.)

## Mendelssohn, Bartholdy-Felix[[@Headword:Mendelssohn, Bartholdy-Felix]]

             the first musical composer of-eminence who, since Bach and Handel bequeathed to the world their sacred harmonies, devoted his best efforts and great talents chiefly to sacred music. Felix was the grandson of Moses Mendelssohn, the philosopher; his father was the eminent Jewish banker, Abraham Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, who embraced the Christian religion and became a member of the Lutheran Church. Felix was born Feb. 3, 1809, at Hamburg. As a boy he displayed a wonderful talent for music, which attracted the attention of the poet Goethe, who warmly interested himself in Felix, and greatly encouraged him to develop that talent with which the Creator had so largely endowed him. Upon the removal of his parents to Berlin in 1812, his instruction in music was intrusted to Zelter and Berger, both masters in the are the former a profound musical theorist, and the latter a renowned pianist and teacher. It is not to be wondered at that; under the care and guidance of such masters, the progress of Felix in his musical studies more than fulfilled their expectations. At the age of nine we find him giving his first concert in Berlin, delighting the audience by his graceful performance on the piano. He now commenced to write musical compositions of every form. At the early age of sixteen, he composed his first opera, the music of which is not only charming, but full of dramatic element.

This composition shows what Mendelssohn might have accomplished in operatic music had he not left this field for a higher and nobler one that of sacred music. Another proof of his dramatic power is in his music to Shakespeare's Midsummer Night's Dream, which is regarded as one of his best efforts in dramatic music. In 1821 he composed his second opera, and finished one half of a third one, besides writing six symphonies, one quartette for the piano and stringed instruments, a cantata, six fugues, and a number of etudes, sonatas, and songs. At the age of twenty Mendelssohn visited England for the first time, and was there deeply influenced for the whole course of his afterlife. He arrived in London in 1829, and, being known by reputation to the most eminent musicians, was most cordially received. At the first concert with the Philharmonic Society, his overture to Midsummer Night's Dream was most enthusiastically received by those who had not even heard his name. In the same year Mendelssohn visited Scotland, and was warmly welcomed by literary and musical societies fully' able to appreciate his genius. He  made an extended tour through the Highlands, being deeply impressed with the wild and romantic beauty of the old Caledonian music, which some years after gave rise to his celebrated Scotch symphony ‘in A minor. His music to the Isles of Fingal also owes its origin to the impression made upon his mind by the wild and stormy shores of the Hebrides. In the following year he visited Italy, and two years afterwards Paris. Later he revisited London, and from that time to the end of his life was a frequent sojourner there. He began to be even more appreciated in England than in his native country, and it became to him, as it were, the land of his adoption. Benedict, in his life of Mendelssohn, says: “The mean cabals which were always at work against him in Berlin increased his dislike to that city, so much so as to induce him to leave it, as he then thought, forever.” At Leipsic he accepted the conductorship of the celebrated Gewandhaus concerts, and remained there until 1844, when, induced by the invitation of the king of Prussia, he returned to Berlin.

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

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

## Mendelssohn, Moses[[@Headword:Mendelssohn, Moses]]

             (also' called RAMBAN [רמבמ8ן], from the initials of ר8 משה בן מנחם מנדל, R. Moses ben-Menachem Mendel, and MOSES DESSAU), whom Mirabeau describes as “un homme jete par la nature au sien d'une horde avilie, ne sans espece de fortune, avec un temperament faible et mdme infirme, un caractere timide, une douceur peutetre excessive, enchaine toute sa vie dans une profession presque mdchanique, s'st eleve  rang des plus grands ecrivains que ce sincle a vu naltre en Allemagne” (Sur Moses Mendelssohn, London, 1787), was born at Dessau, Germany, Sept. 6,1729. His father was a copier (סופר) of Biblical writings upon parchment. Moses gave early tokens of an intelligent and scrutinizing mind. Fortunately for his nascent talents, the rabbi of the congregation, David Herschel Frankel, perceiving the eagerness of the boy for learning, undertook to instruct him in all those branches which then constituted a Jewish education-the Bible in the original Hebrew, with its chief commentaries, and rabbinical literature. At an early age Mendelssohn also became acquainted with Maimonides's (q.v.) famous work, the More Nebuchim, or “Guide of the Perplexed,” the intense study of which made anew aera in his life, and that in two ways-it laid the foundation of his mental culture, and also of his bodily disease and suffering. (Mendelssohn was hump-backed, and extremely small, and feeble in person.) The German language the rabbins of Mendelssohn's early days proscribed as Gentile learning, and hence his studies had been entirely confined to the Hebrew; but as he branched out in his studies he also acquired the German tongue.

When hardly fourteen years of age he was obliged to relinquish learning for the choice of a profession. He went to Berlin in search of employment, and there gained his scanty subsistence by following the occupation of copyist and corrector for the press, carefully making use of every leisure moment to learn the ancient languages, and to gain instruction in general literature and philosophy. Chance favored him with the acquaintance of a Polish Jew who possessed a profound knowledge of mathematics. The Pole became his instructor in Euclid, which ‘he studied from a copy of the vork in Hebrew, this being the only language understood by his teacher. Besides Locke's Essay on the Human Understanding, he studied the writings of Wolf, Leibnitz, and Spinoza, which exercised the greatest influence upon his mental development. Thus passed seven of the most laborious years of his life; it was the period of apprenticeship served to science. Gradually this most; reserved but most persevering and highly-cultivated. youth became known in wider circles. His fortune now began to turn. A rich co- religionist of Berlin, Isaac Bernhard, a silk manufacturer, engaged him as tutor for his children. Henceforth he was in easy if not affluent circumstances. His connection with the house of Bernhard continued throughout life, first as tutor in the family, afterwards as book-keeper in the manufactory, and eventually as manager if not as partner in the concern. In the intervals of business he published, in' concert with his friend, Tobias Bock, some essays on natural philosophy in Hebrew, for the  use of young men studying the Talmud. This publication, which appeared in the קֹהֶלֶת מוּסָר, i.e. “The Hebrew Preacher,” gave some offence to the rabbins, and he escaped persecution only by his strict observance of the Oral Law, to which he undeviatingly submitted all the rest of his life, although his internal convictions' were little in accordance with its practices. About this time (1754) he became acquainted with Lessing (q.v.) and Nicolai (q.v.). With the former he formed an intimate friendship, always regarded by Mendelssohn as among the most fortunate circumstances of his life; for in “Lessing, than whom no man was ever more free from the prejudices of creed and nation, Mendelssohn found a hearty sympathy and an effective fellow-laborer in his projects for bettering the condition of the German Jews, an object which then and at all times lay nearest his heart. Indeed, the known friendship of so eminent a man for one of that tribe, in defiance of all the prejudices of his age, was scarcely less important to the Jews in general than it was to Mendelssohn in particular.” For two hours every day regularly they met and discussed together literary and philosophical subjects, a circumstance which led Mendelssohn to write his Philosophische Gespriche,the very first effort by which he became ‘distinguished beyond the pale of Judaism. The MS. of these dialogues Mendelssohn left with Lessing for examination; but how great was the former's surprise when one day Lessing returned his dialogues in print, published without the author's knowledge. He next sent forth Pope; ein Metaphysiker (together with Lessing [1755]), and several other essays, and finally his Briefe uber die Empfindungen (1764).

In the same year he also wrote Abhandlungen uber die Evidenz der metaphysischen Wissenschaften as a prize essay for the Berlin Academy, which was crowned by that learned body, who besides unanimously resolved to elect him a member of their number. Frederick the Great, however, generally prejudiced against the Jews, struck the name off the list, and the Jew had to content himself with the consciousness that he enjoyed less than his contemporaries believed him entitled to. Mendelssohn afterwards, at the instigation of Nicolai and Lessing, collected all his philosophical lucubrations, and published them in 1761 under the title of Philosophische Schriften, of which in a short time three editions were published (3d ed. 1777, 2 vols. 8vo). At thirty-one Mendelssohn married a lady from Hamburg, by whom he had several children, among them a son. whose birth gave rise to one of his most celebrated works, the Morgenstunden, which treats on the existence of God. in refutation of Pantheism and Spinozism-the result of many years' inquiry on that subject. Mendelssohn had formerly defined the  universe as a creation out of the divine substance, a view involving the main principle of Spinozism, and directly opposed to the notions of deity and creation prevalent in his day. He now attempted, by concessions and modifications, to get rid of the ethical objections usually brought against kindred theories. The work is a fragment; only the first volume appeared (in 1785), the death of the author arresting its progress. The most popular work, however, was his Phadon, oder iiber die Unsterblichkeit der Seele, a colloquy on the doctrine of immortality. The characters are taken from Plato's dialogue of the same name, and the descriptive parts are mere translations of the original. The Jewish philosopher, however, has made Socrates produce new arguments in place of those attributed to him by his disciple Plato, thinking these substitutions better adapted to modern readers. The following is his principal, and, indeed, his only peculiar argument, the rest of the dialogue being employed in its defence, and in expressions of reliance on the goodness of the Deity. For every change three things are required: first, a state of the changeable thing prior to its change; secondly, the state that follows the change; and, thirdly, a middle state, as change does not take place at once, but by degrees. Between being and not-being there is no middle state. Now the soul being simple, and not, as a compound body, capable, of resolution into parts, must, if it perish, be absolutely annihilated; and in its change from death to life, it must pass at once from being to not-being, without, of course, going through any middle state-a change which, according to the three requisitions of change, is impossible.

Thus by “reductio ad absurdum” the immortality of the soul was proved. Kant, in his Kritik der reinen Vernunft (2d ed.; it is not in the 1st ed.; see the complete edition of Kant's works by M. Rosenkianz [Leipsic]), has shown the futility of Mendelssohn's argument, while he admits his acuteness in perceiving that mere incapability of resolution into parts was of itself not sufficient to preserve the immortality of the soul, as had been supposed by many philosophers of the time. Mendelssohn, by assuming that change must be gradual and not sudden, thought that he had established his point, as the soul, being simple, could not admit of gradual resolution. Kant, however, shows that we may conceive a gradual annihilation even without resolution into parts-or, to use his own expression, a diminution of the “intensive magnitude.” Thus a deep red color may grow fainter and fainter till at last all the redness is gone, and this without any diminution of the surface colored. Another fallacy in Mendelssohn's argument is that his definition of change applies only to a transition from one state of being to another, and therefore does  not include a transition from being to not-being. For if not-being be considered a state of being, there is no occasion for an argument at all, as the continuance of being is assumed in the definition of change, nor would anything be gained by supposing the soul in such a paradoxical state as nonentity with still a sort of being attached to it. This work not only immortalized its author's name, but conferred upon him for the strength of his reasoning the name of “ the Jewish Socrates,” and “the Jewish Plato” for the amenity of his diction. In less than two years after its first appearance (1767) it went through three large editions, and was translated into Hebrew, and into almost every modern language; English editions were published in 1789 and 1838. Mendelssohn's fame was at its height both among Christians and Jews, and he was lauded both as a philosopher and literary character. Zealous Christians were wondering that so enlightened and exemplary a man should retain the faith of his fathers, and regarded it as. a sacred duty to bring him over to the Church. Foremost among them was John Caspar Lavater (q.v.), who sought to drag him into theological controversy, though with no unkind intentions. In order to bring about this result, he dedicated to Mendelssohn his translation of Bonnet's Inquiry into the Evidences of Christianity, with the request that he would refute it in case he should find the argument untenable; and that, if it should seem to him conclusive, he would “ do what policy, love of truth, and probity demanded-what Socrates doubtless would have done, had he read the work and found it unanswerable ;” thus offering him the alternative either to incur the odium of his own people by formally abjuring the faith of his fathers, or to draw upon himself the wrath of the Christian clergy by a public assault on their religion. ‘his was in the year 1769. The position in which Mendelssohn was thus placed was not only most delicate, but also not without peril. He clung to the ancestral religion not only with the tenacity of early habits, but also with the fulness of conviction which profound study of the subject had given him. How was it possible to reply to the arguments brought forward in favor of Christianity without giving offence to the dominant churches, and becoming liable to the severe penalties enacted by the laws against the assailants of the established creeds? Mendelssohn, however, did reply. He wrote a courteous but decided letter to the pastor of Zurich, in which he not only speaks of his “veneration for the moral character of the founder of Christianity,” but also defines very fully his position as a liberal-minded and enlightened Jew. This letter not only satisfied all parties, but also drew from Lavater a public apology and retraction of his peremptory challenge.

The agitation caused  by this transaction aggravated Mendelssohn's constitutional complaints, threatening his life, and for a long time incapacitating him for intellectual labor. After his recovery he published a Hebrew commentary on Ecclesiastes (Berl. 1769; ibid. 1788), translated into German by Rabe (Anspach, 1771), and into English by Preston (Lond. 1845). The author complains that “nearly all the commentators who have preceded me have almost entirely failed in doing justice to their task of interpretation .. I have not found in one of them an interpretation adequate to the correct explanation of the connection of the verses of the book, but, according to their method, nearly every verse is spoken separately and unconnectedly; and this would not be right in a private and insignificant author, much less in a wise king.” As to the design of the book, Mendelssohn thinks “ that Solomon wrote it to propound the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, and the necessity of leading a cheerful and contented life, and interspersed these cardinal points with lessons of minor importance, such as worship, politics, domestic economy, etc.” Soon after this appeared a German translation of the Pentateuch, made by himself, with a grammatical and exegetical commentary in Hebrew, contributed by several Jewish literati, viz. Sal. Dubno (q.v.), Aaron Jaroslaw, N. IL Wessely (q.v.), and H. Homberg. This important work, which is entitled נְתַיבוֹת הִשָּׁלוֹם סֵפֶר, i.e. The Book of the Paths of Peace (Berlin, 1780-83), is preceded by an elaborate and most valuable introduction, written in Hebrew, called לַנְתַּיבָה אוֹר,.A Light to the Path, in which Mendelssohn discusses various topics connected with Biblical exegesis and literature. The introduction, which was published separately before the completion of the commentary (Dec. 1782), now accompanies the translation and commentary, and is given in German in his Collected Works (Leips. 1845), 7:18 sq.; and in English in the Hebrew Review, edited by Breslau (Lond. 1860). The work soon found its way into the principal synagogues and schools in Germany, and, thus encouraged, he produced afterwards a version of the Psalms and the Song of Solomon, which are considered classical. “It was in this especially,” says Da Costa, “that the philosopher kept up the striking resemblance to Maimonides, his celebrated predecessor and model. Both, under the outward forms of Rabbinical Judaism, desired to give an entirely new direction to the religion of the Jews-to reform it, to develop it.” Nothing, indeed, could have more powerfully affected the Orientalism of his countrymen than these efforts of Mendelssohn for Biblical criticism from a modern Platonic stand-point. The new medium of vision brought  new insight; critical inquiry took the place of fanaticism; the divergences of Shemitic and European thought proved not so irreconcilable after all. Cabalism and other kindred superstitions quietly dropped out of sight; the old dialectical barbarism was extirpated; the Jews who read his Scriptures in the translation attained purity of idiom, and with it the power of appreciating the writings of the great minds of Germany, to whom they had remained strangers. Ere long the best minds of the race became thoroughly associated with the intellectual movement of Germany, content to abandon mystical ambitions and theocratic pretensions; and to find their Canaan in Europe. Mendelssohn's next work declared more clearly (though always with a degree of vagueness) his own ideas on religion than any other work hitherto published. It was written in answer to the treatise of his friend the councillor Dohm (Ueber die biirgerliche Verbesserung der Juden). The statesman in his work “had started from the principle that every amendment must proceed from liberty and equality of rights in society bestowed upon the Jew; from an entire reform in the systems of instruction and education; from free admission to the practice of all arts and sciences, and even a participation in some posts and offices of state; the authority of the synagogue over its members to be maintained, in cases of religious difference, by the power of casting them out of its bosom for a time or entirely.”

On this last point Mendelssohn took exception. He would not allow the synagogue or any other religious society to impose any restriction whatever on the rights of thinking and teaching. In the preface to his German translation of Manasseh ben-Israel's (q.v.) Salvation of Israel, he plainly declared his conviction.” that every society had certainly the right to exclude its members when they ceased to conform to the principle of the society; but that this rule could not in any way apply to a religious society, whether church or synagogue, because true religion exerts no authority over ideas and opinions, but, being all heart and spirit, only desires to use the power of conviction; and Jews especially should take from Christians, among whom they live, an example of charity, and not of hatred or intolerance, and begin by loving and bearing with each other, that they might themselves be loved and tolerated by others.” The influence produced by the writings of Mendelssohn was to destroy all respect. for the Talmud and the rabbinical writers among the Jews, who approved his opinions. This is the more remarkable, inasmuch as Mendelssohn professed all them while to be himself an admirer of those works; and this obvious inconsistency called forth a publication entitled Ein Brief an Mendelssohn, in which this contradiction was clearly pointed out,  and the assertion made that he was in reality a Christian, without having the courage to avow his true sentiments. To this attack he replied by his Jerusalem, oder fiber religiose Macht und Judenthum (Berlin, 1783), in which he contended that “the state, which has the right to compel actions, cannot justly attempt to constrain its citizens to unanimity in thought and sentiment; it should, however, seek by wise provisions to produce those sentiments from which good actions spring.

Religious differences should not prejudice civil equality; the true ideal is not unity, but freedom of belief.” He says, “All religion is solely a matter of the heart, and should not be under any control, either of the State, Church, or Synagogue;” while at the same time he insists that “ the law of Moses was not a law of faith, but merely of statutes and prohibitions.” “Whatever may have caused the inward struggles of the philosopher of Berlin,” says Da Costa, “it is certain that, without wishing or suspecting it, Mendelssohn-as, six centuries earlier, Maimonides-stirred up among his co-religionists a feeling of void.” Soon, however, Mendelssohn was doomed to experience another trial of his sensibility in an attack on his deceased friend Lessing by Jacobi (q.v.), who published Briefe an Mendelssohn iiber die Lehre des Spinoza, in which he charged Lessing with being an “implicit Spinozist” — a charge then much severer than at present, when many German philosophers are avowed admirers of Spinoza. Mendelssohn endeavored to refute the charge in a work entitled Moses Mendelssohn an die Freunde Lessing's (1786), in which he stated that “if Lessing was able absolutely and without all further limitation to declare for the system of any man, he was at that time no more in harmony with himself, or he was in a strange humor to make a paradoxical assertion which, in a serious hour, he himself rejected.” The answer was considered triumphant, and drew from Kant the remark, “It is Mendelssohn's fault that Jacobi thinks himself a philosopher.” In a hurried preparation of this latter work Mendelssohn overtasked his physical powers, and the exhaustion thus produced led to his premature death, which took place Jan. 4, 1786. Ramler wrote this epitaph on Menelssohn : “True to the religion of his forefathers, wise as Socrates, teaching immortality, and becoming immortal like Socrates.” Besides many Hebrew and German essays which we have not room to mention, Mendelssohn contributed freely to the Bibliothek der schonen Wissenschaften, edited by Lessing (q.v.). His complete works were collected and edited by his grandson, G. B. Mendelssohn (Leips. 1843-5, 7 vols.). The influence which he exercised. over the Jewish nation is incalculable. He roused the Jews of Germany, if not of the world, from the mental apathy with which in his day  they regarded all that had not a distinct reference to religion, On the other hand, he acted in the most beneficial manner on his Christian contemporaries by exterminating the brutal prejudices which they entertained against Jews. and through his most distinguished Christian friends brought about the abrogation of the disgraceful laws with respect to them. SEE JEWS.

He effected a reformation in Judaism, and founded that new school of Hebrew literature and Biblical exegesis which has now produced so many and such distinguished Jewish literati not only in Germany, but throughout Europe. No wonder that the Jews express their gratitude to-him and reverence for him in the saying, “ From Moses (the law-giver) to Moses (Maimonides) and Moses (Mendelssohn), no one hath arisen like Moses” (למשה ועד משה לא הם כמשה ממשה). See Kayserling, M. Mendelssohn, seine Leben u. s. Werke (Leips. 1862); Samuels, Memoirs of Moses Mendelssohn, etc. (2d ed. Lond. 1827); Hedge, Prose Writers of Germany, ‘p. 99 sq.; Adler, Versihnung von Gott, Religion, und Menschenthum durch M. Mlendelssohn (Berlin, 1871); Axenfeld, Moses Mendelssohn im Verhdltniss zum Christenthum (Erlangen, 1865); Griatz, Gesch. d. Juden, xi, I sq.; Ueberweg, History of Philosophy, 2:118, 523, 528 (Engl. transl. by Morris, New York, 1874); Milman, Hist. of the Jews, 3:408 sq.; McCaul, Sketches of Judaism and the Jews, p. 43 sq.; Da Costa, Israel and the Gentiles, p. 544 sq.; Schmucker, Hist. of the Modern Jews (Philadelphia, 1867), p. 239 sq.; Kalkar, Israel u. d. Kirche (Hamburg, 1869), p. 117 sq.; Jewish Intelligence (Lond. 1866), p. 31 sq.; Etheridge, Introduction to Hebrew Literature, p. 475 sq.; Miscellany of Hebrew Literature (Londo 1872), p. 22 sq.; Dessauer, Gesch. d. Israeliten (Bres. lau, 1870), p. 497 sq.; Stern, Gesch. d. Judenthums (ibia 1870), p. 54 sq.; Cassel, Zeitfaden fur Jiid. Gesch. u. Literatur (Berlin, 1872), p. 108 sq.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:359-367; De Rossi, Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei (German transl. by Hamberger), p. 224 sq, id., Bibliotheca Judaica antichristiana, p. 69; Jost, Gesch. d. Israeliten, 9:66; id., Gesch. d. Juden. u. s. Sektel, 3:293 sq.; Zedner, Auswahl historischer Stiicke (Berl. 1840), p. 204 sq.; Farrar, Crit. History of Free Thought; Hurst's Hagenbach, Church Hist. 18th and 19th Century; Christian Remembrancer, Oct. 1866, p. 267. (B. P.)

## Mendeniall, James William, D.D[[@Headword:Mendeniall, James William, D.D]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Centreville, Ohio, November 8, 1844. Graduating from Ohio Wesleyan University in 1864, he joined the Cincinnati Conference. With the exception of two years spent as president of the Fremont Collegiate Institute at Sidney, Iowa, he was in the pastorate until 1888, when he was elected editor of the Methodist Review; and re- elected in 1892. He died June 18, 1892. He was the author of Plato and  Paul: — and Echoes from Palestine. See Minutes of the Annual Conferences (Fall), 1892.

## Mendez, Alphonso[[@Headword:Mendez, Alphonso]]

             a noted missionary of the Roman Catholic Church, flourished in Abyssinia in the early part of the 17th century. He was a Portuguese by birth, but we  know little of his personal history disconnected from his labors in the East. He belonged to the Society of Jesus, and was created patriarch of the Abyssinians in 1626, by the emperor Suscenius, or Socinios, who, quite contrary to general practices, not only himself paid allegiance to the Roman pontiff, but also obliged his subjects to abandon the religious rites and tenets of their ancestors, and to embrace the doctrine and worship of the Rornish Church. Mendez, as patriarch, by his intemperate zeal, imprudence, and arrogance, ruined the cause in which he had embarked, and occasioned the total subversion of the Roman pontiff's authority and jurisdiction, which seemed to have been established upon solid foundations. “ He began his ministry,” says Mosheim (Ecclesiastes Hist., Harper's edit., 2:193), “with the most inconsiderate acts of violence and despotism. Following the spirit of the Spanish Inquisition, he employed formidable threatenings and cruel tortures to convert the Abyssinians; the greatest part of whom, together with their priests and ministers, held the religion of their ancestors in the highest veneration, and were willing to part with their lives and fortunes rather than forsake it. He also ordered those to be rebaptized who, in compliance with the orders of the emperor, had embraced the faith of Rome, as if their former religion had been nothing more than a system of paganism. Nor did the insolent patriarch rest satisfied with these arbitrary and despotic proceedings in the Church; he excited tumults and factions in the state, and, with an unparalleled spirit of rebellion and arrogance, encroached upon the prerogatives of the throne, and attempted to give law to the emperor himself.

Hence arose civil commotions, conspiracies, and seditions, which excited in a little time the indignation of the emperor, and the hatred of the people against the Jesuits, and produced at length, in 1631, a public declaration from the throne, by which the Abyssinian monarch annulled the orders he had formerly given in favor of popery, and left his subjects at liberty either to persevere in the doctrine of their ancestors or to embrace the faith of Rome. This rational declaration was mild and indulgent toward the Jesuits, considering the treatment which their insolence and presumption had so justly deserved; but in the following reign much severer measures were employed against them. Basilides, or Facilidas, the son of Segued, who succeeded his father in 1632, thought it expedient to free his dominions from these troublesome and despotic guests, and accordingly, in 1634, he banished from his territories the patriarch Mendez, with all the Jesuits and Europeans who belonged to his retinue, and treated the Roman Catholic missionaries with excessive severity. From this period the very name of Rome, its religion, and its  pontiff, were objects of the highest aversion among the Abyssinians.” Le Grand, himself a Roman Catholic, makes the following remark upon the conduct of the patriarch Mendez: “It is to be wished that the patriarch had never intermeddled in such a variety of affairs” (by which mitigated expression the author means his ambitious attempts to govern in the cabinet as well as in the Church), “or carried his authority to such a height as to behave in Ethiopia as if he had been in a country where the Inquisition was established; for by this conduct he set all the people against him, and excited in them such an aversion to the Roman Catholics in general, and to the Jesuits in particular, as nothing has hitherto been able to diminish, and which subsists in full force to this day” (in the fourth dissertation subjoined to vol. ii of Lobo's Voyage d'Abyssinie, which the reader will do well to consult, especially p. 116, 130, 144). See also Ludolfi Histor. tithiopica, lib. iii, cap. xii; Geddes, Ch. Hist. of Ethiopia, p. 233; La Croze, Hist. du Christianisme d'Ethiopie, p. 79; Lockman; Travels of the Jesuits, 1:308 sq.- (J. HW.)

## Mendez, Gonzalez Juan[[@Headword:Mendez, Gonzalez Juan]]

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

## Mendez, Gonzalez Pedro[[@Headword:Mendez, Gonzalez Pedro]]

             a noted Roman Catholic prelate in the Church of Spain, called the “grand cardinal,” was born at Guadalajara in 1428, of an ancient and noble family. He made rapid progress in his studies, especially in the languages, in civil and canon law, and in belles-lettres. His uncle, Gautier Alvarez, archbishop of Toledo, gave him an archdeaconry in his church, and sent him to the court of John II, king of Castile. His merit and quality soon made him friends and he acquired the bishopric of Calahorra. Henry IV who succeeded John, trusted him with the most important affairs of state, and with the bishopric of Sigtenca, and finally procured a cardinal's hat for him, from Sixtus IV, in 173. When Henry died, in the year following, he named cardinal Mendez for his executor, and dignified him. at the same time with  the title of the Cardinal of Spain. He did great service afterwards to Ferdinand and Isabella, in the war against the king of Portugal, and in the conquest of the kingdom of Granada from the Moors. He was then made archbishop of' Seville and Toledo successively; and, after governing some years in his several provinces with great wisdom and moderation, he died Jan. 11, 1495. He founded the magnificent college of Santa Cruz at Valladolid, and a hospital at Toledo. See Salazar de Mendoza, Chronica del gran Cardinal de Espana (1625).

## Mendicants, Order Of[[@Headword:Mendicants, Order Of]]

             also known as Begging Friars, is the name of several religious organizations within the boundaries of the Roman Catholic Church, intended to depend for support on the voluntary contributions of the laity. This sort of society began in the 13th century, and the members of it, by the tenor of their institution, were to remain entirely destitute of all fixed revenues and possessions. Innocent III was the first of the popes who perceived the necessity of instituting such an order; and though his far- seeing eye took in the possible dangers of fierce and ascetic enthusiasm, he nevertheless felt constrained to give those monastic societies making a profession of poverty the most distinguishing marks of his protection and favor. The peculiar state and circumstances of the time seem to have rendered such an establishment very essential for the preservation of the Church. The monastic orders then existing wallowed in opulence, and were by the corrupting influence of their ample possessions lulled into a luxurious indolence. They lost sight of all their religious obligations, trampled upon the authority of their superiors, suffered heresy to triumph unrestrained, and the sectaries to form various assemblies; in short, they were incapable of promoting the true interests of the Church, and abandoned themselves, without either shame or remorse, to all sorts of crimes. On the other hand, the “heretics” of the Church, the sects which had left its communion, followed certain austere rules of life and conduct, which formed a strong contrast between them and the religious orders, and contributed to render the licentiousness of the latter still more offensive and shocking to the people. These sects maintained that voluntary poverty was the leading and essential quality in a servant of Christ; obliged their doctors to imitate the simplicity of the apostles; reproached the Church with its overgrown opulence, and the vices and corruptions of the clergy, that flowed thence as from their natural source; and, by their commendation of poverty and contempt of riches, acquired a high degree  of respect, and gained a prodigious ascendency over the minds of the ‘multitude. In consequence, the great desire of the Church was the formation of a society composed of a set of men who-by the austerity of their manners, their contempt of riches, and the external gravity and sanctity of their conduct and maxims-might resemble those doctors that had gained such reputation for the heretical sects, and who might rise so far above the allurements of worldly profit and pleasure as not to be seduced by the promises or threats of kings and princes from the performance of the duties which they owed to the Church, or from persevering in their subordination to the Roman pontiffs.

The favors which the Mendicants received at the hands of Innocent III were extended to them likewise by his successors in the pontifical chair, as experience had demonstrated their public and extensive usefulness. But when it became generally known that they had such a peculiar place in the esteem and protection of the rulers of the Church, their number grew to such an enormous and unwieldy multitude, and swarmed so prodigiously in all the European provinces, that they became a burden, not only to the people, but to the Church itself. The great inconvenience that arose from the excessive multiplication of the Mendicant orders was first attempted to be remedied by Gregory X in a general council which he assembled at Lyons in 1272; for here all the religious orders that had sprung up after the council held at Rome in 1215, under the pontificate of Innocent III, were suppressed; and the extravagant multitude of Mendicants, as Gregory called them, were reduced to a smaller number, and confined to four societies or denominations, viz. the Dominicans, the Franciscans, the Carmelites. and the Augustines, or Hermits of St. Augustine (see each). As the pontiffs allowed these f bur Mendicant orders the liberty of travelling wherever they thought proper, of conversing with persons of every rank, of instructing the youth and multitude wherever they went, and as these monks exhibited in their outward appearance and manner of life more striking marks of gravity and holiness than were observable in the other monastic societies, they arose all at once to the very summit of fame, and were regarded with the utmost esteem and veneration through all the countries of Europe. The enthusiastic attachment to these sanctimonious beggars went so far that, as we learn from the most authentic records, several cities were divided or cantoned out into four parts, with a view to these four orders: the first part being assigned to the Dominicans, the second to the Franciscans, the third to the Carmelites, and the fourth to the  Augustines. The people were unwilling to receive the sacraments from any other hands than those of the Mendicants, to whose churches they crowded to perform their devotions while living, and were extremely desirous to deposit there their remains after death. Nor did the influence and credit of the Mendicants end here, for we find in the history of this and the succeeding ages that they were employed not only in spiritual matters, but also in temporal and political affairs of the greatest consequence-in composing the differences of princes, concluding treaties of peace, concerting alliances, presiding in cabinet councils, governing courts, levying taxes, and other occupations, not only remote from, but absolutely inconsistent with the monastic character and profession. However, the power of the Dominicans and Franciscans greatly surpassed that of the other two orders, insomuch that these two orders were, before the Reformation, what the Jesuits have been since that period-the very soul of the hierarchy, the engines of the state, the secret spring of all the motions of the one and the other, and the authors and directors of every great and important event, both in the religious and political world.

By very quick progression, the pride and confidence of the Mendicants arrived at such a pitch that they had the presumption to declare themselves publicly possessed of a divine impulse and commission to illustrate and maintain the religion of Jesus. They treated with the utmost insolence and contempt the priesthood; they affirmed without a blush that the true method of salvation was revealed to them alone; proclaimed with ostentation the superior efficacy and virtue of their indulgences; and vaunted beyond measure their interest at the court of heaven, and their familiar connections with the Supreme Being, the Virgin Mary, and the saints in glory. By these impious wiles they so deluded and captivated the ignorant and blinded the multitude that they would not intrust any others but the Mendicants with the care of their souls. They retained their credit and influence to such a degree nearly to the close of the 14th century that great numbers of both sexes-some in health, others in a state of infirmity, others at the point of death-earnestly desired to be admitted into the Mendicant order, which they looked upon as a sure and infallible method of rendering Heaven propitious. Many made it an essential part of their last wills that their bodies, after death, should be wrapped in old, ragged Dominican or Franciscan habits, and interred among the Mendicants; for such was the barbarous superstition and wretched ignorance of this age, that people universally believed they should readily obtain mercy from  Christ at the day of judgment if they appeared before his tribunal associated with the Mendicant friars. About this time, however, the Mendicants fell under a universal odium; but, being resolutely protected against all opposition, whether open or secret, by the popes, who regarded them as their best friends and most effectual supports, they suffered little or nothing from their numerous adversaries.

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

## Mendoza[[@Headword:Mendoza]]

             SEE MENDEZ.

## Mends, Herbert[[@Headword:Mends, Herbert]]

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

## Mene[[@Headword:Mene]]

             a word Anglicized in the Auth. Vers. of the Chaldee sentence MENE, MENE, TEKEL, UPHARSM (מְנֵא תְּקֵל וּפִרְסַין מְנֵא, mene', mene', tekel, upharsin', numbered, numbered, weighed, and dividing, as each  term is. immediately interpreted, the last being given in its sing. and pass. form פְּרֵס, peres', divided; Sept. [i.e. Theodotion ] in both passages μανή, θεκέλ, φάρες; Vulg. mane, thecel, phares), an inscription supernaturally written “ upon the plaster of the wall” in Belshazzar's palace at Babylon (Dan 5:5-25); which “ the astrologers, the Chaldmans, and the soothsayers” could neither read nor interpret, but which Daniel first read and then interpreted. Yet the words, as they are found in Daniel, are pure Chaldee, and, if they appeared in the Chaldee character, could have been read, at least, by any person present on the occasion who understood the alphabet of his own language. To account for their inability to decipher this inscription, it has been supposed that it consisted of those Chaldee words written in another character. Dr. Hales thinks that it may have been written in the primitive Hebrew character, from which the Samaritan was formed, and that, in order to show on this occasion that the writer of the inscription was the offended God of Israel, whose authority was at that moment peculiarly despised (Jdt 2:2-4), he adopted his own sacred character, in which he had originally written the decalogue, in which Moses could transcribe it into the law, and whose autograph copy was found in Josiah's days, and was most probably brought to Babylon in the care of Daniel, who could therefore understand the character without inspiration, but which would be unknown to “the wise men of Babylon” (New Analysis of Chronology [Lond. 1811], 1:505). This theory has the recommendation that it involves as little as possible of miraculous agency. Josephus makes Daniel discourse to Belshazzar as if the inscription had been in Greek. “He (Daniel) explained the writing thus: MANH. ‘This,' said he, ‘in the Greek language, may mean a number ; thus God hath numbered so long a time for thy life and for thy government, and that there remains a short time for thee. ΟΕΚΕΑ. This signifies weight; hence he says, ‘God having weighed in a balance the time of thy kingdom, finds it already going down. ΦΑΡΕΣ. This also, according to the Greek language, denotes a fragment; hence ‘ he will break in pieces thy kingdom, and divide it among the Medes and Persians'“ (Ant. 10:11, 3).

It has been supposed by some that “ the wise men” were not so much at fault to read the inscription as to explain its meaning, which, it is said, they might' sufficiently understand to see its boding import to the monarch, and be unwilling to consider further-like the disciples in regard to the predictions of our Lord's death (Luk 9:45), where it is said, “This saying was hid from them, they perceived it not; and they feared to ask him of that saying.” Certainly it is said throughout our narrative that “the wise men could not read the writing, nor make known  the interpretation of it,” phrases which would seem to mean one and the same thing; since, if they mean different things, the order of ideas would be that they could not interpret nor even read it, and Wintle accordingly translates, “could not read so as to interpret it” (Improved Version of Daniel, Lond. 1/807). At all events, the meaning of the inscription by itself would be extremely enigmatical and obscure. To determine the application, and to give the full sense, of an isolated device which amounted to no more than “he or it is numbered, he or it is numbered, he or it is weighed, they are divided” (and there is even a riddle or paranomasia on the last word פרס; comp. Susannah, Luk 9:54-55; Luk 9:58-59, Greek, and Jer 1:11-12, Hebrew; which may either mean “they divide,” or “the Persians,” with little difference of pronunciation in the sing. [ פְּרֵסand פָּרִס] and none in the plur. [פִּרְסַין]), must surely have required a supernatural endowment on the part of Daniel-a conclusion which is confirmed by the exact coincidence of the event with the prediction, which he propounded with so much fortitude (Dan 5:30-31).

## Menedemus[[@Headword:Menedemus]]

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

Life.-He was born in Eretria of a noble family, the Theopropidae. Being poor, he labored as a tent-maker and builder for a livelihood. According to Diogenes Laertius, he was sent on some military service to Megara, where he profited by the occasion to hear Plato. He then relinquished the army, and devoted himself to philosophy. But it is not probable that he was old enough to have' heard Plato before ‘the death of the latter. If the length of his life as Diogenes gives it is correct, it would not have been possible; for at the period of Plato's death he would have been only four years of age. According to the story in Athenseus (iv, p. 168), he and his friend Asclepiades labored for a maintenance as millers, passing the night in toil in order to gain time for philosophy during the day. They subsequently became pupils of Stilpo at Megara, whence they proceeded to Elis, to profit by the instructions of some disciples of Phaedo. Menedemus, onhis return to Eretria, established a school of philosophy, which was- called the Eretrian. He did not devote himself entirely to philosophy, but was an active-participant in the politics of his native city, becoming the most influential man in the state, although in his earlier days he was regarded with dislike. He was sent on various missions to Ptolemaeus (probably Ptolemaeus Ceraunus), to Lysimachus, and to Demetrius, and obtained for  his native city a repeal of a portion of the tax paid to Demetrius. During some portion of his life he visited Cyprus, and greatly enraged the tyrant Nicocreon by his freely-expressed opinions. The story of his being in Egypt, and sharing in the making of the Septuagint version, which is found in Aristeas, is doubtless unworthy of credence. He enjoyed the favor of Antigonus Gonatus, and persuaded the Eretrians to present to him a public congratulation after his victory over the Gauls. This induced the suspicion of an intention on his part of betraying Eretria into the power of Antigonus. According to one account, these surmises led him to depart secretly from Eretria, and take refuge in the sanctuary of Amphiaraus at Oropus. Some golden vessels, the property of the temple, being lost while he was there, the Boeotians compelled him to leave, when he fled to the court of Antigonus, where he soon died of grief, probably in the year BC. 277, at the age of seventy-four. Another account says that he went to Antigonus to solicit his interference in behalf of the! freedom of his native city.

As a Philosopher and Teacher.-As a teacher, Menedemus, in his intercourse with his disciples, was characterized by the absence of formality and restraint, although noted for the severity with which he rebuked all dissoluteness and intemperance, so that the fear of his censure seems to have acted as a check. He lived with his friend Asclepiades, between whom and himself there existed a close friendship. In the latter part of his life he seems to have lived in affluence. Of the philosophy of Menedemus little is known, excepting that it closely resembled that of the Megarian school, and that of Phaedo of Elis. Indeed, he may be said to have continued Philo's philosophy. Its leading feature was the dogma of the oneness of the Good, which he carefully distinguished from the Useful. All distinctions between virtues he regarded as merely nominal. The Good and the True he looked upon as identical. In dialectics he rejected all merely negative propositions, maintaining that truth could be predicated only of those which were affirmative, and of these he admitted such alone as were identical propositions. He was a vehement and keen disputant, but none of his philosophical controversies or doctrines were committed to writing. Epicrates, in a passage quoted by Athenseus (ii, p. 59), classes Menedemus with Plato and Speusippus; but it appears from Diogenes Laertius that his opinion of Plato and Xenocrates was not very high. Stilpo he greatly admired. See Diogenes Laertius, 2:125144; Plutarch, De Adul.  et Amic. Disc. p. 55; Strabo, ix, p. 393; Ritter, Geschichte der Philosophie, bk. vii, c. 5.

## Menelaius[[@Headword:Menelaius]]

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

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

## Menes[[@Headword:Menes]]

             was the name of the first king of the first Egyptian dynasty. He marks a great chronological epoch, being placed by different chronologers as early as BC. 3643, 3892, or even 5702. Stricter Egyptologists make his accession BC. 2717. This name, which signifies the conductor. has been found on inscriptions, but no contemporary monuments of him are known. Menes is the most usual form of his name, but it is also written Menas, Menis, Meinis, Men, Min, and Mein. It is singularly in accordance with the Indian Menu, the Greek Minos, the Teutonic Mannus, and similar appellations of a primeval king; although the oldest Egyptian language seems to have had nothing akin with the Aryan family, to which the others  belong. Herodotus says that he built Memphis on the original bed of the Nile,'which he turned from its former course, and erected therein a beautiful temple to Hephaestus or Pthah II (comp. Diod. 1:50, ed Wess. ad loc.). Diodorus informs us that he introduced into Egypt the worship of the gods, the practice of sacrifices, and many luxuries. For this last innovation he was subsequently held in great dishonor, as Plutarch mentions a pillar at Thebes, in Egypt, on which was inscribed an imprecation against Menes as an introducer of luxury. There is a legend preserved by Diodorus which narrates-in defiance of chronology, unless Mendes is to be substituted for Menas — his being saved from death in Lake Mceris by a-crocodile, in gratitude for which he inaugurated the worship of that animal, and built a city in the neighborhood of the lake called the City of Crocodiles, and a pyramid to serve as his own tomb. During his reign there was a revolt of the Libyans. That he made foreign conquests we learn from an extract from Manetho, preserved by Eusebius. By Marsham and others he is considered as identical with the Mizraim of Scripture. According to some accounts he was killed by a hippopotamus. See Lepsius, Konigsbuch, Quellentaf, p. 5; Bockh, Manetho, p. 386; Poole, Hor. Egypt. p. 219; ‘Herodotus, 2:4, 99; Diodorus, 1:43, 45, 89 (ed. Wess. ad loc.); Plutarch, De Isaiah et Osir. p. 8; Perizon, Orig. Egypt. c. 5; Shuckford's Connection, bk. iv; Bunsen, Egyptens Stelle in der Weltgeschichte, 2:38-45. SEE EGYPT; SEE MEMPHIS.

## Meneses, Aleixio De[[@Headword:Meneses, Aleixio De]]

             a Portuguese prelate and statesman, was born Jan. 25, 1559. His father had directed the education of king Sebastian. Brought up in the palace, he entered, contrary to his parent's wishes, the convent of the Augustines at Lisbon, Feb. 24,1574, and finished his studies at Coimbra. He was appointed archbishop of Goa by Philip II, and took possession of his see in September, 1595. He convened a provincial synod, in which useful reforms were established; he organized many missions, and evangelized, among others, the savage inhabitants of the island of Socotra. He devoted himself also to the Christians of Abyssinia, and, above all, to those schismatic Nestorians known under the name of “Christians of St. Thomas,” who have taken refuge for centuries in the mountains of Malabar. That in which the bishop of Cochin, the Jesuits, the Dominicans, and even the disciples of St. Francis were unsuccessful, he was enabled to accomplish, and after many centuries of division the Roman Church received into its bosom the greater part of this branch of the Christian family. Pope Clement testified to  Meneses his satisfaction by a brief April 1,1599. Meneses was subsequently appointed to the government of the Indies, and performed the duties of viceroy from May 3, 1606, to May 28, 1609. He showed himself stern and severe towards some of the Mohammedan princes, but tranquillity at least was preserved in the Indies during his administration. He died May 3, 1617. His memorable journey in the mountains is published under this title: Jornadado Arcebispo de Goa D. Aleixo de Menezes quandofoi a serras do Malavar, em que mordo os antiguos Christaos de S.-Tome poi Fr. Antonio de Gouvea (Coimbra, 1606, fol.). There is added generally to this curious narration: Sinodo diocesano de igreja e bispado de antiguos Christaos de S.-Tome das serras de Malavar celebrado pot D. Fr. Aleixo de Menezes (ibid. 1606; translated into Spanish in 1608 by Francis Mufios . He also wrote Histoire Orientale des grands progres de l'Eglise catholique en la reduction des anciens Chritiens dits de St. Thomas,avec la messe des anciens Chretiens ens l'evche d'A ngamae (Bruxelles, 1609. 8vo; the translator, J. B. de Glen, has unfortunately left many blanks in his. version). See Barbosa Machado, Bibliotheca Lusitana; Ternaux-Compans, Biblioth. Asiatique et Africaine; Veyssiere la Croze, Hist. du Christianisme des Indes; Pedro Barreto de Regende, Tratado dos Vizos- Reis da India, in MS. in the Biblioth. imp. de Paris.

## Menestheus[[@Headword:Menestheus]]

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

## Meng[[@Headword:Meng]]

             SEE MENCIUS.

## Mengs, Anton Rafael[[@Headword:Mengs, Anton Rafael]]

             a distinguished artist of the 18th century, was born at Aussig, in Bohemia, in 1728. His father, also a painter, adopted a very cruel course of treatment to his son, forcing him, at the age of six years, to draw the entire day without other nourishment than a crust of bread and a bottle of water, and chastising him severely if the task given was unfinished in the allotted time. In 1741, at the age of thirteen, he was taken to Rome, where he was employed in copying the works of Raphael in miniature for Augustus III, elector of Saxony and king of Poland. In 1744 he returned to Dresden, and  was appointed court-painter by Augustus, with permission to return to Rome to continue his studies. He there painted several original pictures, among which was a lovely Virgin and Child, in which the Virgin was painted from a beautiful peasant girl, of whom he became so enamoured that he turned Roman Catholic for her sake and married her. Soon after this he again returned to Dresden, where he remained three years, when the tyranny of his father became so oppressive that he received permission from his royal patron to visit Rome again, in order to execute his commission for an altar-piece for the royal chapel. Shortly after his arrival he was deprived of his pension, the king's finances having suffered by the Seven-Years' War; and thus suddenly thrown upon his own resources, Mengs painted at low prices for the support of his family. In 1754 he received an appointment as director of the new academy at Rome, and in 1757 was employed by the Celestines to paint the ceilings of the Church of St. Eusebio. In 1761 the king of Spain invited Mengs to his court at Madrid, and granted him a liberal pension. Here he executed, among other works, a Descent from the Cross and the Council of the Gods. The air of Spain proved detrimental to his health, and he returned to Rome, and was there engaged, immediately upon his arrival, by Clement XIV, to paint in the Vatican a picture of Janus dictating to History, and one of the Holy Family. One of his finest productions is the Nativity, painted for the royal collection of the king of Spain. He died in 1779. See Giobals, Eloge historique de Mengs (1781); Bianconi, Elogio storico di R. Mengs (1780); Spooner, Biographical History of the Fine Arts (N. Y. 1865, 2 vols. 8vo), vol. ii; Chev. Don Joseph Nicholas d'Azara, The Works of Anthony Raphael Mengs (Lond. 1796,2 vols. 12mo); Kugler's Hand-book of Painting (transl. by Waagen, Lond. 1860, 2 vols. 12mo), 2:519, 521.

## Mengs, Antonio Raphael[[@Headword:Mengs, Antonio Raphael]]

             a distinguished painter, was born at Auszig, in Bohemia, March 12, 1728, and studied the works of Raphael at Rome when but thirteen years of age. In 1744 he was appointed painter at Dresden by the emperor Augustus, with a salary. His first great work was The Holy Family, which was exhibited at Rome, and gained him great reputation. In 1754 he received the direction of the new academy at Rome, and in 1757 was employed by the Celestines to paint the ceilings of the church of St. Eusebius. In 1761 he was invited to Madrid by Carlos III, and granted a liberal pension. He executed, among other works. The Descent from the Cross and The Council of the Gods, for the king's court. He returned to Rome, where he was engaged by Clement XIV to paint in the Vatican a picture of Janus Dictating to History, and The Holy Family. After an absence of three years he returned to Madrid, where he commenced. his celebrated work in the dome of the grand saloon of. the royal palace at that place. But his health was failing, and he died at Rome, June 29, 1779. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

## Meni[[@Headword:Meni]]

             (Hebrews Meni', מְנַי, from מָנָה, to distribute; Sept. τύχη, Vulg, i.e .fortuna, just mentioned, SEE GAD; Auth. Vers. “that number,” marg. “Meni”), apparently an idol which the captive Israelites worshipped by libations (lectisternia), after the custom of the Babylonians (Isa 66:11), and probably symbolical of destiny (a sense indicated by the first clause of the next verse), like the Arabic mananfate (from the same root), and the Greek μοῖρα. Pococke (Specim. hist. Arab. p. 92) has pointed out the resemblance to Manat, an idol of the ancient Arabs (Koran, Sur. 53:19. 20), “What think ye of Allat, and AI-Uzzah, and Manah, that other third  goddess?” Manah was the object of worship of “the tribes of Hudhey and Kuza'ah, who dwelt between Mekkeh and El-Medineh, and, as some say, of the tribes of Ows, EI-Khazraj, and Thakik also. This idol was a large stone, demolished by one Saad in the eighth year of the flight, a year so fatal to the idols of Arabia” (Lane's Sel. from the Kur-an, pref. p. 30, 31). But Al-Zamakhshari, the commentator on the Koran derives Manah from a root signifying “to flow,” because of the blood which flowed at the sacrifices to this idol, or, as Mill explains it, because the ancient idea of the moon was that it was a star full of moisture, with which it filled the sublunary regions. “That the word is a proper name, and also the proper name of an object of idolatrous worship cultivated by the Jews in Babylon, is a supposition which there seems no reason to question, as it is in accordance with the context, and has every probability to recommend it. But the identification of Meni with any known heathen god is still uncertain. The versions are at variance. In the Sept. the word is rendered ‘fortune' or ‘luck.' The old Latin version of the clause is ‘impletis dcemoni potionem;' while Symmachus (as quoted by Jerome) must have had a different reading, מַנַּי, minni, ‘ without me,' which Jerome interprets as signifying that the act of worship implied in the drink-offering was not performed for God, but for the daemon (‘ ut doceat non sibi fieri sed daemoni). The Targum of Jonathan is very vague-' and mingle cups for their idols;' and the Syriac translators either omit the word altogether, or had a different reading, perhaps לָמוֹ, lamo, ‘for them.' Some variation of the same kind apparently gave rise to the super eam of the Vulgate, referring to the ‘table' mentioned in the first clause of the verse. From the old versions we come to the commentators, and their judgments are equally conflicting. Jerome :(Comm. in Es. 65:11) illustrates the passage by reference to an ancient idolatrous custom which prevailed in Egypt, and especially at Alexandria, on the last day of the last month of the year, of placing a table covered with dishes of various kinds, and a cup mixed with mead, in acknowledgment of the fertility of the past year, or as an omen of that which was to come (comp. Virgil, AEn. 2:763). But he gives no clue to the identification of Meni, and his explanation is evidently suggested by the renderings of the Sept. and the old Latin version; the former, as he quotes them, translating Gad by ‘fortune,' and Meni by ‘demon,' in which they are followed by the latter. In the later mythology of Egypt, as we learn from Macrobius (Saturn. 1:19), Δαίμων and Τύχη/ were two of the four deities who presided over birth, and represented respectively the Sun and Moon. A passage quoted by Selden (De Dis Syris, i, c. 1) from a MS. of  Vettius Valens of Antioch, an ancient astrologer, goes also to prove that in the astrological language of his day the sun and moon were indicated by δαίμων and τύχη, as being the arbiters of human destiny. This circumstance, coupled with the similarity between Meni and Μήν or Μήνη), the ancient name for the moon, has induced the majority of commentators to conclude that Meni is the Moon god or goddess, the Deus Lunus, or Dea Luna of the Romans; masculine as regards the earth which she illumines (terrce maritus), feminine with respect to the sun (solis uxor), from :whom she receives her light. This twofold character of the moon is thought by David Mill to be indicated in the two names Gad and Meni, the former feminine, the latter masculine (Diss. v, § 23); but as both are masculine in Hebrew, his speculation falls to the ground. Le Moyne, on the other hand. regarded both words as denoting the sun, and his double worship among the Egyptians: Gad is then the goat of Mendes, and Meni =Mnevis worshipped at Heliopolis. The opinion of Huetius that the Meni- of Isaiah and the Μήν of Strabo (xii, c. 31) both denoted the sun, was refuted by Vitringa and others. Among those who have interpreted the word literally ‘ number' may be reckoned Jarchi and Abarbanel, who understand by it the ‘number' of the priests that formed the company of revellers at the feast, and later Hoheisel (Obs. ad. diffc. Jes. loca, p. 349) followed in the same track. Kimchi, in his note on Isa 65:11, says ofMeni, ‘It is a-star, and some interpret it of the stars which are numbered, and they are. the seven stars of motion,' i.e. the planets. Buxtorf (Lex. Hebr.) applies it to the ‘number' of the stars which were worshipped as gods; Schindler (Lex. Pentagl.) to the ‘ number and multitude' of the idols, while according to others it refers to ‘ Mercury, the. god of numbers;' all which are mere conjectures, quot homines, tot sententice, and take their origin from the play upon the word Meni, which is found in the verse next following that in which it occurs (‘therefore will I number [וּמָנַיתַי, um- ninithi], you to the sword'), and which is supposed to point to its derivation from the verb מָנָה, manah, to number. But the origin of the name of Noah, as given in Gen 5:29, shows that such plays upon words are not to be depended upon as the bases of etymology. On the supposition, however, that in this case the etymology of Meni is really indicated, its meaning is still uncertain. Those who understand by it the moon, derive an argument for their theory from the fact that anciently years were numbered by the courses of the moon.”  The fact of Meni being a Babylonian god renders it probable that some planet was worshipped under this name: but there is much diversity of opinion as to the particular planet to which the designation of destiny would be most applicable (see Lakemacher, Observ. philol. 4:18 sq.; David Mill's diss. on the subject in his Dissert. selectee, p. 81-132). Miinter considers it to be Venus (see Gesenius, Comment. ad loc.), as the lesser star of good fortune (the Naneea of the Persians [2Ma 1:13] or Anctis [Strabo, 15:733] of the Armenians [xi. 532.; 12:559]); Ewald takes it to be Saturn, the chief dispenser of evil influences; and Movers (Phonic. 1:650) has returned to the old opinion that Meni is the moon which was also supposed to be an arbitress of fortune: the best arguments for which last view are collected by Vitringa (ad loc.). It also deserves notice that there are some, among whom is Hitzig, who consider Gad and Meni to be names for one and the same god, and who chiefly differ as to whether the sun or the moon is the god intended. It would seem on the whole that, in the passage under consideration, the prophet reproaches the idolatrous Jews with setting up a table to Fortune, and with making libations to Fate; and Jerome (ad loc.) observes that it was the custom as late as his time, in all cities, especially in Egypt, to set tables before the gods, and furnish them with various luxurious articles of food, and with goblets containing a mixture of new wine, on the last day of the month and of the year, and that the people drew omens from them in respect to the fruitfulness of the year; but in honor of what god these things were done he does not state. Numerous examples of this practice occur on the monuments of Egypt (Wilkinson, Anc. Eg. 1:265). SEE GAD.

## Menifee, Quinn M[[@Headword:Menifee, Quinn M]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, son of Hon. William Menifee, was a native of Texas. He first studied law, and took his place at the bar with a good prospect of success in that profession. At the call of duty, however, he relinquished the practice of jurisprudence, and entered the Methodist itinerancy in 1857. During the war he served, for nearly two years, as a private soldier in the army of Virginia, losing a leg at the battle of Sharpsburg. After the restoration of peace he entered upon ministerial work in Texas, and there labored faithfully till his death in 1867. “Quinn Menifee was a young man of noble and generous impulses, a high-toned. gentleman, and a pure-minded Christian... Notwithstanding the loss of one of his limbs, his friends predicted for him a useful and successful career in  the ministry. But his sun of life went down ere it had reached its meridian.” See Thrall, Hist. of Meth. in Texas, p. 164.

## Menippus[[@Headword:Menippus]]

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

## Menius (Or Menig), Justus[[@Headword:Menius (Or Menig), Justus]]

             an eminent German theologian of the Reformation period, noted for his part in the spread of the Protestant doctrines, was born at Fulda Dec. 13,1499. He studied for the Church. and intended to become amonastic in order to serve the cause of Rome the more faithfully, but, while living as deacon at Meilberg, he was made acquainted with the doctrines of Luther, and he became so interested in the reformatory movement that he decided to go to the very stronghold of the heretics and judge for himself. He accordingly set out for Wittenberg to hear Luther preach, and while there was made a convert to the new cause, and at once identified himself with the Protestants. In 1546 he was made ecclesiastical superintendent of Gotha, and afterwards he became pastor of St. Thomas's Church at Leipsic, which situation he retained until his death, Aug. 11, 1588. Menius was a devoted friend of Luther, whom he accompanied to the Colloquy of Marburg (q.v.) and in 1532 he signed the articles of Smalcald (q.v.). Together with George Spalatin, Cruciger, Myconius, and John Webern, he drew up the first ecclesiastical ritual used in Saxony. Among his works, we notice Commentaria in lib. Samuelis et Acta Apostolorum (Wittenb. 1532,  8vo):-Sepultura Lutheri (1538, 4to) :- Vom Geist d. Wiedertauffer (Wittenb. 1544, 4to) : - Von d. Nothwehr (Wittenb. 1547,8vo) :-Historica Doescriptio de Bello Gothico (1568, 8vo). See Motschmann, Efordia Literata; Albrecht, Sichsische Kirchengesch. 1:306; Tentzel, Suppl. Reliqua Hist. Gothance, p. 787; Schmidt, Justus Menius, der Reformator Thiiuingens (1867, 2 vols. 8vo); Jahrb. deutsch. Theol. 1870, No. iv; Herzog, Real-Encyklopidie, 9:325 sq.

## Menken, Gottfried, DD[[@Headword:Menken, Gottfried, DD]]

             an eminent German Protestant divine, was born at Bremen May 29,1768. His early education was somewhat imperfect, from want of means, but in 1788 he entered the University of Jena, bringing with him only his Bible, a lexicon, and the works of Jacob Bohme. The rationalistic tendency which prevailed in the German universities at that time was thoroughly repugnant to his nature, and he determined to give himself to a close and quiet study of his Bible, and of those languages which could assist him in that object, leaving entirely aside the divers purely theological systems. He wrote at the time a number of essays and expositions, which, however, not being satisfied with them, he afterwards destroyed at Wetzlar, with the exception of some valuable pieces forming one volume of about 150 pages. In 1790 he went to the University of Duisburg, where he found the same general tendency prevailing as at Jena. He met, however, with some kindred spirits, such as Achelis (a judge at Duisburg in 1857) and Schlechtendal, earnest evangelical men, with whom he formed a friendship which lasted all his life. About 1791 he became an inmate in the family of the rector, Fr. A. Hasenkamp, whose example and precepts appear to have exerted a lasting influence over him. In 1794 he became assistant preacher at Frankfort-on- the-Main; in 1796, pastor of the Protestant Church at Wetzlar; removed in the same capacity to Bremen in 1802, and died there June 1, 1831. He was a great admirer of Bengel, and opposed not only Wolf and Baumgarten's views, but also those of such men as Lavater,Pfenninger, Hafeli, Stolz, Ewald, and Yung Stilling, whom he accused of conceding too much to the philosophical notions of the times. Among his numerous works we notice Beitrag z. Dimonologie, oder Widerlegung d. exegetischen Aufsdtze d. H. Prof. Grimm (Frankf. and Leips. 1793) :- Ueber Glick u. Sieg d. Gottlosen (Frankf. and Leips. 1795) — both of which were published anonymously:- Christliche Homilien (Nurenb. 1798):-Neue Sammlung (1802) :-Homilien u. d. Propheten Elias (1804):-Predigten (1825). After his death there appeared Letzte Sammlung christlicher Predigten (Cologne, 1847): —  Anleitung z. eigenen Unterricht in d. Wahrheiten d. Heiligen Schrift (Frankf. 1805; 2d edit. 1825):-—Leitfaden z. Unterricht f. Confirmanden (1817; - d edit. 1826). See Osiander-(J. E.), in the Tibinger Zeitschrift, 1832, vol. ii; also, separately, Menken als Schrift. steller (Bremen, 1832); Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 9:328 sq. (JN.P.)

## Menluchah[[@Headword:Menluchah]]

             (Hebrews Menuchah', מְנוּחָה, rest, as often) appears in the marg. of the A. V. at Jdg 20:43 (Sept. [Vat.] ἀπὸ Νουά, Vulg. and A. V. “with  ease,” as if מַנּוּחָה), and Jer 51:59 (Sept. δώρων, Vulg. prophetice, AV. “quiet”). The Sept. likewise, in the remarkable list of additional towns in Judah (Jos 15:59), seems to make mention of it (Μανοχώ). Furst (Hebrews Lex. s.v.) thinks it the place in Benjamin called Manochath (1Ch 8:6) or Hatsi-ham-Menuchoth (1Ch 2:54). But all this is doubtful, and the word is rather an appellative. SEE MENUCHITE.

## Mennander, Carl Fredrik[[@Headword:Mennander, Carl Fredrik]]

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

## Mennas[[@Headword:Mennas]]

             a patriarch of the Eastern Church, flourished in the first half of the 6th century. He was for a time superintendent of the great hospital “ Holy Samson,” at Constantinople. In 536 he became patriarch of that city by the choice of the emperor Justinian and the clergy, to supersede the Monophysite Antimus I, who had left his episcopal seat at Trapezunt, and had usurped the patriarchal dignity. Mennas was the first among Oriental patriarchs who was consecrated as bishop by a Roman pope (March 13, 563) (see Labbe, Concil. col. 47 sq.; also Baronius, Annal. ad ann. 536, n. 27; Pagi, Critica, ad ann. 536, n. 6). Mennas attended quietly to his duties at the Church of Constantinople till the war of the “Three Chapters” broke out and involved him, SEE CHAPTERS, THREE, and finally brought about his deposition from Rome, because of his adhesion to the side of the emperor against the Roman pontiff. In this trying hour Mennas displayed a most amiable disposition, and acted the part-of a truly honorable man. He bowed submissively to the severe decision of the pope, and even used his influence to persuade the other bishops of the Eastern Church, who had suffered like him the displeasure of the papal vicegerent, to bear patiently with the holy father and to approve his decisions, and to revoke their previous approval of the imperial decrees (Hardouin, 3:10; Labbe, v. 338). Mennas soon after died, August, 552. He had presided over the Church of Constantinople for sixteen years and six months. He is commemorated in  the Latin Martyrologium Aug. 25, and in the Greek Menologium Aug. 24. A pretty full account of the life of Mennas is furnished both in the Latin and Greek Martyrologies under the dates of commemoration. See also Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, 7:57.

## Menno, Simon[[@Headword:Menno, Simon]]

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

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

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

e censure against the erroneous opinions and vile practices of John of Leyden in 1535), and his views of baptism were so peculiar that to this day the Mennonites stand alone in their mode of observing this sacrament. The only thing he held in common with the Anabaptists was opposition to infant baptism. Menno, however, associated quite freely with the Anabaptists, and exerted a most salutary influence over them, making many friends among that sect. In 1537 he was actually invited by a number of Anabaptists of Groningen to assume among them the rank and functions of a public teacher; and as he looked upon the persons who made this proposal as exempt from the fanatical frenzy of their brethren at Miinster, he yielded to their entreaties. His conversion from Romanism he himself alludes to in the following strain: “I besought my God with sighing and tears that to me, a troubled sinner, he would grant the gift of his grace; that he would endue me with wisdom, spirit, frankness, and manly fortitude, so that I might preach his worthy name and holy word unadulterated, and proclaim his truth to his praise. At length the great and gracious Lord, perhaps after the course of nine months, extended to me his fatherly spirit, help, and mighty hand, so that I freely abandoned at once my character, honor, and fame, which I had among men, as also my antichristian abominations, mass, infant baptism, loose and careless life, and all, and put myself willingly in all trouble and poverty under the pressing cross of Christ my Lord. In my weakness I feared God; I sought pious people, and of these I found some, though few, in good zeal and doctrine. I disputed with the perverted, and some I gained through God's help and power, and led them by his word to the Lord Christ; but the stiff-necked and obdurate I commended to the Lord. . Thus has the gracious Lord drawn me, through the free favor of his great grace. He first stirred in my heart: he has given me a new mind; he has humbled me in his fear; he has led me from the way of death, and, through mere mercy, has called me upon the narrow path of  life into the company of the saints. To him be praise forever. Amen.” According to Van Oosterzee (in Herzog's Real-Encyklopadie, 9:339 sq.), Menno was led to separation from Rome by the cruel treatment of the Anabaptists in 1535. Many of the sufferers at this time had been hearers of the word of God as dispensed by Menno, and had been made disciples of the new sect by his declarations against infant baptism and the opinion of a “real presence” in the Eucharist. Indeed, his own brother had suffered a martyr's death on this occasion, and this may have contributed in no small measure to the decided step which Menno took shortly after.

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

Menno as a Protestant.-Mosheim (Ecclesiastes Hist. 16th century) thus speaks of Menno's labors after his establishment at Groningen as a Protestant minister: “East and West Friesland, with the province of Groningen, were first visited by this zealous apostle of the Anabaptists; whence he directed his. course into Holland, Guelderland, Brabant, and Westphalia; continued ,it through the German provinces that lie on the coast of the Baltic Sea, and penetrated so far as Livonia. In all these places his ministerial labors were attended with remarkable success, and added to his sect a prodigious number of followers. Hence he is deservedly considered as the common chief of almost all the Anabaptists, and the  parent of the sect that still subsists under that denomination.” As Mosheim persists in mentioning Menno in connection with the Anabaptists, and as the public is prejudiced against all who were known under that name, we think it but just to insert here Menno's own account of his labors: “Through our feeble service, teaching, and simple writing, with the careful deportment, labor, and help of our faithful brethren, the great and mighty God has made so known and public, in many cities and lands, the word of true repentance, the word of his grace and power, together with the wholesome use of his holy sacraments, and has given such growth to his churches, and endued them with such invincible strength, that not only many proud, stout hearts have become humble, the impure chaste, the drunken temperate, the covetous liberal, the cruel kind, the godless godly, but also, for the testimony which they bear, they faithfully give up their property to confiscation, and their bodies to” torture and to death; as has occurred again and again to the present hour.

These can be no fruits nor marks of false doctrine (with that God does not co-operate); nor under such oppression and misery could anything have stood so long were it not the power and word of the Almighty. See, this is our calling, doctrine, and fruit of our service, for which we are so horribly calumniated, and persecuted with so much enmity. Whether all the prophets, apostles, and true servants of God did not through their service also produce the like fruits, we would gladly let all the pious judge. He who bought me with the blood of his love, and called me to his service, unworthy as I am, searches me, and knows that I seek neither gold and goods, nor luxury, nor ease on earth, but only my Lord's glory, my salvation, and the souls of many immortals. Wherefore I have had, now the eighteenth year, to endure so excessive anxiety, oppression, trouble, sorrow, and persecution, with my poor, feeble wife and little offspring, that I have stood in jeopardy of my life and in many a fear. Yes, while the priests lie on soft beds and cushions, we must hide ourselves commonly in secret corners. While they at all nuptials and christenings, and other times, make themselves merry in public with fifes, drums, and various kinds of music, we must look out for every dog, lest he be one employed to catch us. Instead of being greeted by all as doctors and masters, we must be called Anabaptists, clandestine holders- forth, deceivers, and heretics. In short, while for their services they are rewarded in princely style, with great emoluments and good days, our reward and portion must be fire, sword, and death. What now I, and my true coadjutors in this very difficult, hazardous service, have sought, or could have sought, all the well-disposed may easily estimate from the work  itself and its fruit. I will then humbly entreat the faithful and candid reader once more, for Jesus's sake, to receive in love this my forced acknowledgment of my enlightening, and make of it a suitable application. I have presented it out of great necessity, that the pious reader may know how it has happened, since I am on all sides calumniated and falsely accused, as if I were ordained and called to this service by a seditious and misleading sect. Let-him that fears God read and judge.”

In the article ANABAPTISTS we have already alluded to the general mistake of supposing that all Anabaptists were engaged in the Munster excesses, and that usually persons fail to make a distinction between the sober Christians and the worst fanatics of the party. In our sketch of the life and labors of David Joris (qv.), we had occasion to point out the earnestness which characterized his followers of the “ Anabaptists ;” but it is in this place that we would enlist our reader's attention to the injustice of suffering a whole sect to be despised and forsaken because of the faults of a few who may have secured membership in order to make their religious garb a stepping-stone to abused power. The two large Protestant bodies of Lutheran and Reformed have always been characterized by jealousy towards any new sects, and have quickly charged their weaker rivals with all the infirmities which flesh is heir to, if any one member of the new comers was open to criticism. Even in our very day the Methodists and Baptists suffer more or less persecution from the communicants of the State churches in Germany; how much more likely in those days of the 16th century, when first the iron hold of the papacy, which had cramped the Church for ages, was suddenly relaxing. From all the sources now at our command, we gather the fact that Menno was a gentle, earnest, modest man, of a. spiritual nature, with no trace about him of wild fanaticism; ready to encourage all that was noble, pure, and good in his fellow-men, constantly reproving those of his followers who appeared guilty of misdemeanors of any sort. Flourishing in the Reformation period, he was frequently involved in controversies; thus hi 1543 he was visited by the celebrated John a Lasko, who was determined to draw Menno into the party of the Reformed or Lutherans. For three or four days the two eminent divines held public disputations upon Christ's humanity, infant baptism, etc., etc., but so gentle was Menno in his manner that at the close of the controversy the two combatants parted in peace, promising good- will towards each other. In 1550 he published a special tract to defend the doctrine of the Trinity against the Unitarians, who were coming to his  country from Italy and Switzerland; in 1552, A thorough Confession on Disputed Points, for the use of other religious bodies than his own.

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

Like the other Protestant Reformers, Menno accepted the formal and material principles of the Reformation; but, besides these, he aimed at a moral, practical end. It was his earnest desire to restore the kingdom of God, or the Christian Church, to that purity which is taught in the New Testament, and which he believed had existed in the Apostolic Church. To bring back this golden age of Christianity, and to organize a congregation μὴ ἔχουσαν σπῖλον, ἢ ῥυτίδα, ἤ τι τῶν τοιούτων (Eph 5:27), was the constant aim of all his efforts. This accounts for the singular asceticism of the sect, and explains why the Mennonites did not, like other evangelical bodies, concern themselves about abstract religious speculations, but about moral laws and duties. For the same reasons they also separated themselves from the unbelieving world, and tried to purify the Church by administering the ordinance of baptism only to those who  had made a personal profession of faith in Christ. The validity of infant baptism was rejected, while only adults “who do actually profess repentance towards God and obedience to our Lord Jesus Christ” were considered proper subjects of this ordinance. We quote here article seven of a Mennonite Confession of Faith: “We confess of baptism that all repenting believers, who by faith, regeneration, and renewal of heart by the Holy Spirit, have been united with God, and whose names are written down in heaven, are to be baptized in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, to show forth in. a solemn and beautiful emblem their faith in the crucified, buried, and risen Redeemer, with its effect to live up to whatsoever things Christ taught his followers.” The necessity of the power of excommunication in the Church was earnestly asserted by Menno, “for without the right usage of excommunication the spiritual kingdom of God on earth cannot exist intact in purity and piety. A Church without the proper apostolical ban or excommunication is like a city without walls or gates, like a field or garden without a fence, or like a house without walls or doors. For without it the Church would stand open to all seducers and evil-doers, to idolators and wilfully persistent sinners.”. He insisted upon excommunication to such an extent that members of his congregation at Wismar who had listened to the sermons of Lutheran clergymen were excommunicated as if they had committed public crimes, or indulged in gross passions.

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

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

## Mennonites[[@Headword:Mennonites]]

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

Mennonites, the Anabaptists of the Netherlands first called themselves in 1536, the year in which the hitherto scattered community celebrated its union. Menno, seeing clearly that “in union lies strength,” had obtained a regular state of Church order, separate from all Dutch and German Protestants, and thus secured an ecclesiastical establishment. He laid down rules for the guidance of the congregations, and furnished them with a sort of “confession of faith.” His doctrines were free from the anti-social and licentious tenets and the pretensions to inspiration which are ascribed to the Anabaptists; but he agreed with them in condemning the baptism of  infants (Mat 28:19), in expecting a personal reign of Christ on earth for a thousand years at the millennium, in excluding magistrates from the Christian Church (Schyn, 1:214), and in maintaining that all war was unlawful (Mat 26:52), that the taking of oaths was prohibited by Christ (Mat 5:37), and that human science is useless and pernicious to a Christian. But these tenets were so explained and modified by Menno as to differ very little from the doctrines generally held by the Reformed churches, securing a high degree of credit to the religious system of this famous teacher, and thus contributing to the rapid progress of his followers both in numbers and in influence. He insisted upon the strictest attention to moral duties, and exercised a most severe discipline upon offenders, and in a very short time succeeded in excluding from this fellowship those fanatics that had so dishonored the name of Anabaptists, and gradually built up a large and flourishing sect.

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

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

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

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

In the 17th and 18th centuries the persecution of the Mennonites in Germany and Switzerland drove many to Holland, and the “parent” body was thus largely increased. It was estimated about the middle of the 18th century at some 160,000. Since that time the Dutch Mennonites have again considerably decreased in number. An important event in their history was the provision of the theological training of their ministry by the establishment of a seminary in 1735. There are no buildings connected with this college, but the students receive theological instruction in a room, containing the library, over the Mennonite chapel. The lectures are  delivered in Latin; and each student before his entrance must be acquainted with Latin and Greek. They attend at a literary institution for instruction in Hebrew, ecclesiastical history, physics, natural and moral philosophy, etc. They have private lodgings in different parts of the city. The college was established nearly a century ago, and was at first supported by the Amsterdam Mennonites alone; but lately other churches send in their contributions. Some of the students receive support from the public fund; they are all intended for the Christian ministry. Thus provided with an educated ministry, they were placed on a more equal footing with the other Protestant bodies of the country. The names Oosterbaan, Stinstra, and Hesselink are mentioned with pride as theologians of Holland, and not simply as Mennonite ministers, by every Dutchman. In 1795 they were granted equality with the other Protestants, and soon after they began gradually to drop peculiar characteristics, so as to form substantially only one national body. In 1811 all Mennonites united in the formation of a society for the support and encouragement of theological education. In 1835 the tercentennial date of Menno's withdrawal from the Papal Church was unitedly observed by all his followers. A missionary society, sustaining three laborers in Java, is supported by all Mennonites, and so is the Teyler Theological Society at Harlem. According to the Mennonite “ Year-Book” of 1850 (the last published by the denomination), they had then in Holland 127 congregations and 140 ministers, not counting the retired preachers and those engaged as professors.

The Mennonites in Germany, etc. — In Germany the Mennonites were rather numerous in the 17th century. In Moravia alone they counted some 70,000. They were expelled from that country by Ferdinand II in 1622, and, after a short stay in Hungary and Transylvania, finally found a resting- place in Russian territory (see below). The Mennonites were very largely represented in Eastern Prussia. They were particularly numerous at Dantzic, Marienburg, and Elbing. Their Dutch neatness and Dutch industry soon made these desolate and swampy regions to flourish like a garden. But almost incessant persecution largely reduced their number by emigration. In 1730 and in 1732 they were threatened with expatriation on account of their refusal to serve in the army; but the storm passed by, and king Frederick II gave them additional privileges-not, however, until the order had been Weakened by emigration. Gradually they increased again until 1789, when they were forbidden to purchase landed property. But, notwithstanding all difficulties, the Mennonites have remained, in part at  least, on Prussian soil, particularly the valley of the Vistula, called “ the Garden Spot of Prussia.” Their number in all Germany is estimated at about 50,000.

The Mennonites in Russia. — Russia gladly availed herself of Prussia's intolerance, and did much to secure these valuable citizens for her own territory. Catharine II in 1786 had invited the Mennonites to Russia, along with other German colonists, and in 1789 228 families arrived in Russia, and between 1793 and 1796 there was an immigration of 118 more families. These all settled on and near the island of Khortitz, on the Lower Dnieper, below Tekaterinoslav. The conditions on which they came to Russia were: Protection from all attacks, freedom of worship, a gift of lands to the amount of 190 acres for each family, exemption from all taxes and imposts for ten years, money for their journey, and money and wood with which to establish themselves, freedom of trade and manufactures, the administration of oaths in their own way, and exemption forever from military service.! These privileges were confirmed by the emperor Paul, and extended to all Mennonites who should come thereafter. In spite, therefore, of the repeal and mitigation of the severe laws against them in Prussia, there was a continued and large immigration of Mennonites into Russia up to the year 1817. These colonists settled near their brethren in the government of Taurid, in the region between the rivers. Molotchna, Dnie per, and Tokmak, not far from the town of Berdiansk; From that time the Mennonites have gone on increasing and prospering, until they now number about 40,000 souls. They have always been protected and favored by the government, so that they have almost entirely governed themselves, and have preserved their German character and institutions intact. This they in great part owe to the character and efforts of Johann Cornies, who, up to his death in 1848, exercised a very powerful influence over them, though he held no office and no rank. Titles and orders were on several occasions offered to him by the imperial government, which highly appreciated his services, but they were always refused. His advice was several times asked by the minister of domains, and the governor-general of New Russia rarely took an important measure without first consulting Cornies. These Mennonites not only had their own schools and churches, and retained in their integrity the language, habits, and usages of their ancestors, but had a sort of self-government, each group of villages being under a governor appointed by themselves from their own ranks, who acted as the organ of communication between them and the general  government. In 1861, the present czar (Alexander II) granted new lands and renewed all the old concessions to a colony of Mennonites who settled on the Volga. These lands, however, as also those ceded by Catharine, were not given in fee simple. The receivers were allowed to leave them to their children and to sell them to each other, but could not dispose of them to any other than a Mennonite without special permission of the government.

In our own day the attitude of the Russian government towards the Mennonites has decidedly changed, and a harsh and unfriendly spirit been manifested in regard to them. The sharp-sighted among them foresaw an invasion of their liberties from the tone of the Russian newspapers and the attitude of Russian officials. On June 4,1871, the expected blow came. An edict, addressed to all the colonists in the empire-German Lutherans and Roman Catholics, as well as Mennonites, Bulgarians, and others, to all of whom, as to the Mennonites, grants of lands and special privileges had been given-set the limit of ten years as the terminal period of exemption from military service, with the proviso that, as to furnishing recruits, the laws ruling colonists should remain in force only till the publication of a general law on military duty. Such a law might be promulgated at any day, and the Mennonites, with others, be obliged: to furnish recruits, in spite of their religious convictions against bearing arms. By the general law of Russia emigration is not permitted; but, for the benefit of the aggrieved colonists, ten years were given them in which to take themselves out of Russia,' if unwilling to come under the full intent of Russian law. After that time no emigration is to be permitted. Meanwhile some of the Mennonites had been busy making inquiries to guide them in the selection of new homes. Cornelius Jonsen, a leading Mennonite, acting as German consul at Berdiansk, had written letters to members of the sect in this country and Canada, asking information as to the advantage of America for settlement by their people. Very full and encouraging replies were received from John Funk, at Elkhart, Indiana, and from others in Canada, Pennsylvania, and the West. Jonsen had these letters printed, and distributed them, together with little pamphlets, telling of the attractions of America. So enthusiastic did the people become over the hope of freer and happier homes in the New World, that in a short time $20,000 was raised to aid a deputation to America, to visit its finest sections, and to return to Russia with a report of the result of their spying out of the land. The delegates sent were twelve in number, and left Russia for this country at various times from February to  May, 1873, and the result is manifest in the large arrival of this people, who have purchased lands on the Western prairies, and in some of our Southern states. The; probability is that all the Mennonites of Russia will settle in the United States.

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

The Mennonites in the United States. — These newcomers are not by any. means the first Mennonites in the United States. They came as early as  1683. Holding much in common with the Friends, the Mennonites received an invitation from William Penn to settle in the new province of Pennsylvania. Many accepted the kind offer of the Quaker leader, and in little more than half a century the sect had migrated to the number of about 500 families. In 1708 a school and meeting-house were erected by them in Germantown, Pa. In the following year another colony was established in what is now known as Lancaster County, Pa. Other emigrations followed in 1711,1717,1727, and 1733 successively. In 1735 there were nearly if not quite 500 families settled in Lancaster County. Afterwards their. families settled also in various parts of Maryland, Ohio, Indiana, New York, and Canada; and. they are now found in nearly every part of the Union and of Canada, though they are most numerously presented in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Maryland, and Virginia. It is difficult to arrive at their whole number, as they keep, no accessible records for that purpose, believing public displays of this nature to be only one of the vanities of denominations, and of no good service, as the Great Head of the Church well sees and knows how many are his. They probably number, however, as nearly as can be ascertained, about 350 ministers and 66,000 members. They have a publishing- house at Elkhart, Indiana. Their bishops, ministers, and deacons meet semi-annually in district conferences for the purpose of learning the state of the Church, and deliberating upon suggested methods for advancing her spiritual prosperity.' Their religious views are similar to those held by their brethren in Europe. They have, however, distinguishing peculiarities. Their office-bearers-bishops, ministers, and deacons are all of them chosen by lot. Their pastors give their services gratuitously. Their views and character as a body meeting with much misrepresentation, and exciting considerable prejudice against them, they translated and published at Philadelphia, in 1727, their Confession of Faith. For details, see American Christian Record, p. 145 sq.

Besides the Old Mennonites, there are in America:

1. The Reformed or Strict Mennonites, who in 1811 branched off from the parent American body. They follow strictly the injunctions Of Simon Menno in regard to foot-washing, non-resistance of evil, abstinence from oaths, and separation from all excommunicated persons. This sect numbers not more than 4000, and is confined chiefly to Pennsylvania, where it first originated. Their doctrines are too rigid for general acceptance, and they progress but slowly. They are a worthy, honest, and exemplary people.  2. The New Mennonites, numbering about 10,000, organized in 1847 by J. H. Oberholtzer and ten other ministers of the Old Mennonites in Eastern Pennsylvania. They introduced various reforms, and spread rapidly, not only in Pennsylvania, but in other states, and were the first Mennonites to found a theological seminary, located at Wadsworth, Ohio. In 1872 they had three teachers and twenty-two pupils They also have a publishing- house at Milford Square, Pa.

3. The Evangelical Mennonites, organized from the preceding body in 1856, who hold stated meetings for prayer as a Christian necessity. They number only about 300.

4. The Omish Mennonites, numbering about 22,500, followers of Jacob Amman, of Alsace, and very much like the Reformed. They discard the use of buttons on their clothes, substituting the hook, and hence are frequently called Hookers.

The Mennonites all over the world count probably 300,000. Their oldest authoritative “Confession of Faith” dates from 1580, entitled De Waterlandsche Belydenis; in 1591 was published the Concept von Koln; in 1617, De Friesche Belydenis; and later (1766), the most complete and generally accepted Confession-was prepared by John Ries, preacher of the Waterlanders in Alcmar, and by Lubbert Gerard, in Latin (comp. Schyn, 2:78, 279; 1:172).

For information respecting the Mennonites, see Ottus, Annales Anabaptistici (Basle, 1672, 4to); Grundiche Historie von den Begebenheiten, Streitigkeiten, und Trennungen, so unter den Tvaufgesinnten bis 1615 vorgegangen (from the Dutch of Van Gent), by Jehring (Jena, 1720); Schyn, [Hist. Christianorum, qui in Belgio foderato Mennonitce appellantur (Amstelod. 1725); id., Historice Mennonittarum plenior Deductio (Amsterd. 1729), which is a defence of the sect, and in which the author protests against their being confounded with the Anabaptists; Van Huyzen, Epitome doctr. Mennonitarus ; Botsace, Wiederbelebung der Wiedertufferischen Lehre; Crichton, Gesch. der. Mennoniten; Starck, Gesch. d. Taufe u. Taufgesinnten; V. Reiswitz u. Wadzeck, Glaubensbekenntniss der Mennoniten u. Nachricht von ihren Colonieen nebst Lebensbeschreib. Menno Simonis (Berl. 1824) ; Reiswitz, Beitrage zur Kenntniss der Mennoniten (Breslau, 1829); Blaupot Ten Cate, Geschiedenis der Doopsgezinden in Friesland, Holland, Zeeland, etc. (Amsterd. 1837-50); Cornelius, Gesch. d. Miinstersch.  Aufruhrs (Leips. 1855); Wigandus, In Dognatibus Anabaptistarum; Hase, Neue Propheten; De Bussiere, Les Anabaptistes (Paris, 1853); Rues, Gegenwdrtiger Zustand der Mennoniten; Moshelm, Ecclesiastes Hist. cent. xvi, § iii, pt. ii, c. 3; and cent. xvii, § ii, pt. ii, c. 5 (it is to be wished that Mosheimn had written the history of this sect in a spirit of greater candor); Gieseler, Ecclesiastes Hist. 4:371.sq.; Mohler, Symbolics, p. 355 sq.; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, vol. ii (see Index); and Van Oosterzee, in Herzog, Real-Encyklop. vol. ix, s.v.

## Menochius, Giovanni Steffano[[@Headword:Menochius, Giovanni Steffano]]

             a learned Italian, the son of Jacques Menochius, a celebrated lawyer, was born at Pavia in 1576. At the age of seventeen he entered the Order of the Jesuits. He taught theology in different colleges of his order, was principal of those of Modena and Rome, then became inspector for the province of Milan, next for that of Venice, and was finally appointed assistant to the superior-general. He died at Rome Feb. 4, 1655. Of his works we mention Hieropoliticon, sive institutiones politicce e Scripturis de promptce (Lyons, 1625, 8vo)':-Institutiones economice e Scripturis depromptce (Lyons, 1627, 8vo):Brevis Expositio sensus litteralis totius Scripture (Cologne, 1630, 2 vols. fol.: this estimable work was reprinted several times; the best edition is that published at Paris [1719, 2 vols fol.],.by P. Tournemine reproduced at Avignon [1768, 4 vols. 4to], it contains an appendix to the commentaries on the Bible, and to different Jesutitical authors. See Simon, Histoire critique lTis pinicipux Commentateurs du Nouv. Test. 1). 651 ) ;-Stoie tessute di varie eruditione sacrca, inorule e profina (Rome, 1646-54, 6 vols. 4to); the first published under the fictitious name of J. Corona: -De Republica Hebraeorum (Paris, 1648 and 1652, fol. ): - De (Econonmi Christiana (Venice, 1656, 4to): -Storia Miscellanea Sacra ‘(Venice, 1658, 4to). See also Alegambe and Sottwell, Scriptores Societatis Jesu; Dupin, Bibl. des Auteurs Eccls. vol.

## Menologium[[@Headword:Menologium]]

             (μηνηλόγιον, from μήνη and λόγος), a name given by the Greek Christians to such of their Church books as contained, besides the Mencea (q.v.), or special prayers and hymns for each festival and saint's day, short biographical notices and descriptions of the death of the saints and martyrs. The menologia were generally divided into monthly parts; sometimes into two semi-annual volumes. There are yet a number of them extant in MS.,  and extracts of them for the use of the Greek Church were repeatedly printed in the 17th century. It nearly corresponds to the Martyrology of the Roman Church. The Greeks give the names of the saints, together with short biographical notices of them, taken from the μηναῖα, and also the Gospel lessons for the day. Allatius, in ‘De libris Graecorum, p. 83-88, gives an account of their origin and contents. Several of them are very ancient, and known to us by the accounts of Assemani, Genebrardus, and Ant. Contius. The most important are: Menol. ex versione Cardinalis Sirleti in, Canisii lectt. anztiqua-ruan (tome v):-Menol. ex Menceis Graccorum eruturn et in linguamn vern. versum a Maximo Margunio ed. Anton. Pinello (Venet. 1529): Menol. Graecorumn jussu Basilii Imperatoris Greece olim editum — nunc psrimum Gr. et Lat. prodit studio et opera Annibalis Tit. ‘S. Clementis (Urbini. 1727). Still more remarkable than this edition of the so-called Menologium Basilianum is the Μηνολόγιον τῶν εὐαγγέλων ἑορταστιχῶν sive ‘Calendarium Ecclesice Constantinopolitanoe primitus ex Bibliotheca Romuna Albanorum in lucemn editum, etc., ‘cursa' Steph. Anton. Morcelli (Rome, 1788, 2 vols.). The text in this edition, revised with great care, was, according to the opinion of the author, written during the, reign of Constantinus Copronymus. See ‘Augusti, Denkwiirdigkeiten, 6:208; 12:300; Suicer and Du Fresle, Lexicon, s.v.; ‘Siegel, Christl. Alterthiinme (see Index); Neale, ‘Introd. Hist. East. Church.

## Menot, Michel[[@Headword:Menot, Michel]]

             a French preacher, was born about 1440. He belonged to the Order of the Gray Friars, among whom he taught theology for several years; His sermons were of a peculiar make up half in barbarous Latin, half in burlesque French,. and filled with coarse jests and trivialities; he nevertheless gained great reputation, rather for his oddity than any display of ability, and his enthusiastic hearers surnamed him “the golden trigend. Menot died at Paris in 1518. The printer Claude Chevalier collected a certain number of Menot's sermons, which appeared under the title Sermones quadragesimales olim Turonis declamati (Paris, 1519 and 1525, 8vo), very rarely seen at present. See Niceron, Memoires, etc., vol. xxiv; Dict. Hist. (ed. of 1822), s.v.; Le Bas, Dict. Encycl. de la France, s.v.

## Menoux, Joseph De[[@Headword:Menoux, Joseph De]]

             a French Jesuit, was born October 14, 1695, at Besancon. He belonged to an ecclesiastical family, and, destined for the Church, he entered the Society of Jesus at an early age, studied the classics at different colleges, and applied himself with success to preaching. He obtained the confidence of king Stanislas, who appointed him preacher and superior of the seminary of missions for Lorraine. He is represented as a man of mind, intriguing and serviceable, a useful friend and a dangerous enemy.' Voltaire says that he persuaded pope Benedict XIV, the author of some large treatises in folio on the canonization of the saints, that he should translate them into French. He sent several pages of it to him, and obtained a good benefice for his ‘seminary, of which the Benedictines were robbed. Voltaire, who in his secret correspondence calls Menoux a false brother, was assured of the protection of the learned Jesuit in all circumstances; but the alliance established between them was not sincere on either side. Menoux was one of the first members of the Academy of Nancy, and was associated with those of the Arcades of Rome. He wrote: Notions Philosophiques des writes fondamentales de la Religion, ouvrage didactique d'un ordre nouveau (7th edition, revised and corrected; Nancy, 1758, 8vo. This work appeared at first under the title of Defi geneial a l'incredulite. “There are few,” says Freron, “so methodical, so clear, so precise, so consistent”): Heures du Chretien, a l'usage des Missions (Nancy, 1741, 12mo): — Discours prononce en 1753 a ha seance publique de la Societe Litteraire de Nanci (ibid. 1753, 4to; translated into Italian by order of pope Benedict XIV) i-Coup d'eiil sus l'ari'et du'Parlement de Paris concernant l'institut des Jesuites (Avignon, 1761, in two parts, 8vo). Menoux is regarded as the author of this writing, signed by P. Griffet, and he furnished to Cerutti the materials for L'Apologie generale de l'institut des Jesuites. He was a co- laborer in the moral and religious works of Stanislas. See Freron, Anne litteraire, 1753, 1758; Durival, Descript. de la Lorractine, 1:236; J. J. Rousseau, Confessions, bk. viii.

## Mensa Capitularis And Mensa Episcopalis[[@Headword:Mensa Capitularis And Mensa Episcopalis]]

             are the technical terms severally given to the table support of chapter members and the incumbents of the episcopal office. So long as communistic life prevailed in churches endowed by monastic institutions, the expense for the table was provided for by the common property of the chapter. But in the 10th and 11th centuries, when canonical life was done away with, and the canons supported their own private establishments, the endowment was reduced by deducting therefrom the amount necessary to defray the expense of the table, and this sum was apportioned, and consequently the term

(1) mensa capitularis for that share of the table endowment which was to defray the table expenses of the chapter members, and

(2) mensa episcopalis for the episcopal share. The chapter's portion was again subdivided according to the number of members belonging to a chapter, and the proportion of allowance for each particular person was determined by rank. The administration of the capitular property was usually intrusted to the provost, and that of the episcopal table estate to an official appointed by the bishop himself (vice-dominus) (Carol. M., capit I ao. 802, c. 13; Lothar I, capit ao. 824, c. 8). If any of the capitulary estates were to be sold, a permit of the bishop and all capitularies must be secured (c. 1, 2, 3,8, x, De his quaefuint a prelat. 3:10; sext. c. 2, De reb. eccl. non alien. 3:9). If any of the episcopal estates were to be sold, a permit of the pope had to be asked for (c. 8, x, De reb. eccl. non alien.). In cases where the episcopal chair is endowed with such goods, this regulation remains yet in force. See Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, s.v.

## Mensa Dei[[@Headword:Mensa Dei]]

             (the Lord's table), a term which has immediate reference to the Lord's Supper. The opposition between the expressions, “table of the Lord” and  “table of daemons” (see 1 Corinthians 11), at once marks it out as a table set apart for sacred purposes. SEE ALTAR; SEE TABLE.

## Mensa, Mensal[[@Headword:Mensa, Mensal]]

             (table), a name anciently given to a church erected over a martyr's grave. SEE MARTYR. Such edifices received this appellation from the distinctive altar or communion table. Thus Augustine speaks of a church called mensa Cypriani-Cyprian, as he explains, not having eaten there, but having there been offered up. Prior to the Reformation in Scotland, when the revenue of  a popish bishopric arose from the annexation of parish churches, those allotted to the bishop himself were called mensal churches, as furnishing his table; the other churches being called common, as bishop and chapter had an interest in them. Mensa is used by some writers in the same sense as Martyriumn (q.v.). See Eadie, Ecclesiastes Cyclop. s.v.; Riddle, Christian Antiquities (Index); Walcott, Sacred Archceol. s.v.

## Menses Papales[[@Headword:Menses Papales]]

             is the technical term for one form of papal investiture claimed by the incumbent of St. Peter's chair, in case the vacancy occurs within certain stated months. The present rules of the Roman chancel on this point are: “Cupiens Sanctissimus Dominus Noster pauperibus clericis et allis benemeritis personis providere omnia beneficia ecclesiastica cum cura et sine cura, saecularia et quorumvis ordinum regularia qualitercumque qualificata, et ubicumque existentia in singulis Januarii, Februarii, Aprilis, Maii, Julii, Augusti, Octobris, et Novembris mensibus, usque ad sue voluntatis beneplacitum extra Romanam curiam, alias, quam per resignationem quocumque modo vacatura, ad collationem, provisionem, praesentationem, electionem, et quamvis aliam dispositionem quorumcunque collatorum et collatricium saecularium et quorumvis ordinum regularium (non autem S. R. E. cardinalium, aut aliorum sub concordatis inter sedem apostolicam et quoscunque alios initis, et per eos qui illa acceptare et observare debuerant acceptatis, quae laedere non intendit, comprehensorum) quomodolibet pertinentia dispositioni suae generaliter reservavit,” etc. It is to be remarked that the term alternativa mensium is sometimes used to designate the papal months, although they do not really have the same meaning. In the case of patriarchs, archbishops, or bishops, residing in their dioceses, the papal months are reduced from eight to six, the pope retaining only the uneven months (January, March, May, July, September, November).

The papal months originated in the 12th century. The reason was a desire of the popes to secure benefices to worthy but destitute members of the clergy. At first this was done by recommendations (preces); when this did not succeed, a real command was issued (mandatum deprovidendo). Gratian's decretal of 1151 contains no such mandate, as they originated shortly afterwards. One example of them, of the times of Innocent II, is given by Peter, abbot of Cluny, in his Epistol. lib. ii, ep. 33-35 (quoted in Gonzales Tellez, cap. 37, x, De rescriptis, 1:3, No. 4); another from Adrian IV (11541159), epist. 13 (Wirdtwein, Subsidia diplomatica [Heidelb. 1774], tom. iv, p. ix); Mansi, Collectio Conciliorum, 21:805. If these mandates were not obeyed, it was then the practice to issue successively literce monitorice, pracecptorice. and executorice. The  mandata de providendo came afterwards to be issued not only for actually vacant benefices, but- also in advance (c. 19, x, De rescriptis, 1:3: “Si qua [praebenda] tune in eorum vacaret ecclesia vel proxima vacaturam”). The Council of Lateran of 1179, however, forbade to present to or even to promise benefices before they were vacant (c. 2, x, De concess. prceb. non vacatis, 3:8), and this defence was renewed by Innocent III, Honorius III, and Boniface VIII; the practice was however, justified on the ground that the promise did not specify any particular benefice. The churches often resisted these papal encroachments (see Richter, Lehrbuch d. Kirchenrechts, § 148; Thomassin, Vetus ac nova ecclesice disciplina, pt. ii, lib. i, cap. xliii, xliv) but their protestations were disregarded until, in the Council of Costnitz (1418), pope Martin V declared: “Ultra reservationes juris duae partes sint in dispositione Papa?, et tertia pars remaneat in dispositione Ordinariorum; ita, quod duo prima cedant Papae et tertium Ordinario, ita, quod per quamcumque aliam reservationem aut praerogativas non minuatur” (Van der Ilard, Concilium Constantiense, 1:1022 sq.). In France this was understood, in 1425, to give the pope eight months, the bishops four. By the Concordat of Vienna, in 1448, the pope was to have the disposal of vacant benefices during the six uneven months, and the bishops during the six others. The text of the concordat further states: “De caeteris dignitatibus et bencficiis quibuscunque, secularibus et regularibus vacaturis, ultra reservationes jam dictas, majoribus dignitatiblis post pontificales in cathedralibus et principalibus in collegiatis exceptis, de quibus jure ordinario provideatur per illos inferiores, ad quos alias pertinet; idem. sancti simus dominus.. non impediet, quo minus de illis, cum vacabunt de mensibus Februarii libere disponatur per illos, ad quos collatio, provisio, praesentatio, electio aut alia quaevis dispositio pertinebit..” This seems evidently to signify that the other dignities are excepted from the alternativa mensium; but from the first this was understood to take the appointment to such dignities out of the alternatira to confer it on the pope. That the first was the true interpretation is apparent from its being the view. taken by Martin V in the Council of Costnitz, whose tenor was more favorable even than that of the Concordat of Vienna to the papal cause. The later interpretation, however, was asserted by Pins II.

Vacancies occurring in consequence of a simple resignation, or of an exchange of benefices, are excepted from the alternativa mensium (Schlor, De reservatione beneficiorum et dignitatum ex qualitate vacationis per resignationem [Francf. ad M. 1777, 4to]), as also benefices under lay  patronage (Ferraris, Bibliotheca Canonica, s.v. Beneficium, art. xi, note 18-20); most curacies, and other subordinate offices, are also excepted (Hedderich, Dise. de parochiis in Germania, etc. [Bonn, 1780, 4to], vol. i; Koch, Sanctio pragmatica Germanorum illustrata [Argentorati. 1789, 4to], p.228, note 64).

Some dioceses, however, managed to elude the papal months entirely, by means of special papal edicts rendered for the purpose of securing other advantages (see Probst, Tuirnarii ecclesiarum Germanice, in Ullheimer, Ad concordata nationis Germ. integra documentorum, fasc. iv [Frankf. and Leips. 1777], p. 360,.376; Gudenus. Codex diplomat. tom. iv, No. cccxxiv, p. 717; Le Bret, Magazin z. Gebrauche Staaten- u. Kirchengesch. pt. viii, p. 4, etc.).

This law is still in force, but has in later times undergone various modifications. In Bavaria, the Concordat of 1817, art. x, states:” Regia Majestas ad canonicatus in sex mensibus apostolicis sive papalibus nominabit” For Prussia, the bull De salute animarum, of 1821, regulates that “Futuro autem tempore... canonicatus in mensibus Januarii, Martii, Maii, Julii, Semtembris, ac Novembris... vacantes conferentur, quemadmodum hactenus in capitulo Wratislaviensi hactenus factum est” (see Laspeyre, Gesch. u. heutige Venfawsung d. Kath. K. Preussens [Halle, 1840], 339, 369, 370). In several other countries the law has fallen into disuse. and the appointments are made by the dioceses. See Herzog, Real- Encyklop. 9:359.

## Mensurius[[@Headword:Mensurius]]

             bishop of Carthage, of whose personal history but little is known, figured very prominently during the Diocletian persecutions. He seems to have been identified with the liberal or Arian party, and to have entertained heretical opinions, to which he gave publicity in books published under the title of “Sacred Scriptures.” He opposed the enthusiastic veneration of the confessors who were kept in prison At the synod held at Ceuta, AD. 305, he was arraigned for these acts, but, as most of the African bishops were accused of the same crime, the matter was passed over. Later a new charge was brought against Mensurius, and he had to defend himself at Rome in 311. It seems that he there cleared himself, but on his return home he died. Under his successor in the bishopric the Donatist quarrels opened. SEE DONATISTS.

## Mental Reservation[[@Headword:Mental Reservation]]

             is a term for withholding or failing to disclose something that affects a statement, promise, oath, etc., and which, if disclosed, would materially vary its import. As this is a false and deceitful way of acting, it can not be approved by true morality. The Jesuits, indeed, allowed and taught their pupils to delude people by all kinds of mental reservations and deceitful intentions. With many of them the end sanctified the means, and so they taught that even deceit by false promises and perjuries is allowable, if only good things were attained thereby in the end. They defended this manner of action by the shallow pretext that mentally something very different has been promised or sworn to from what the spoken words declared. SEE CASUISTRY; SEE MORAL PHILOSOPHY.

## Mentone, Bernard De[[@Headword:Mentone, Bernard De]]

             SEE BERNARD.

## Mentzer, Balthasar[[@Headword:Mentzer, Balthasar]]

             (2), son of the preceding, was born May 14, 1614, at Giessen, and was educated at the University of Marburg, which he entered in 1628, but completed his education at Strasburg and Jena. In 1640 he became professor at Marburg, in 1648 at Rinten. He returned four years after and got a position at the University of Giessen, and died July 28,1679. His most important works are, Compendium Theol. Christ. (Rinteln, 1649):- Quaestt. Theol. ad Aug. Conf. (Darmst. 1668; often republished; at last at Rintem, 1753):De termino vitce (1647), and Abgeniothigte frere Erklarung der Frage vom Ziel des mnenschlichen Lebens (Rinteln, 1649):- Kurzes Bedenken uber Wahrenberg's Gesprach von der Polygamie (Darmst. 1671); etc.

## Mentzer, Balthasar (1)[[@Headword:Mentzer, Balthasar (1)]]

             a German Lutheran divine, greatly noted for his decided opposition to the Reformed Church theologians, was born in Allendorf Hesse, February 27, 1565. He studied at the University of Marburg, where he excelled by the display of unusual talents and knowledge. After preaching for several years at Kirtorf, he was appointed in 1596 professor of theology at his alma mater. While in this position he was involved in many controversies  because of his prince's tendency towards the doctrines of the Reformed Church. Mentzer was especially radical in his opposition to their views on the doctrine of Ubiquity, on Iconoclasm, the Lord's Supper, and the Decalogue, and in 1605 was actually forced to quit Marburg, and, together with' his colleagues, Winckelmann and Leuchter, removed to Giessen; to take a position in the new university founded by landgrave Lewis, and there became one of the most renowned teachers. He died Jan. 6, 1627, at Marburg, to which place the university had been removed in the mean time.

Mentzer was a pure Lutheran; his Christian faith was a truly orthodox belief in the Christological dogma as furnished in the idiomatic and ubiquistic doctrine. He published many works, most of which bore a polemic character. His Latin works were afterwards collected and published by his son: Opera theologica Latina (Frankf. 1669,2 vols. 8vo). His apologetic works against Romanism aid the Reformed Church contain the Exegesis Confessionis Augustance (Giessen, 1603). Similar to this is his Repetitio Chemnitiana. Challenged by the work of the Romanist John Pistorius (Wegweiser fur alle ves fuhrte Christen), he wrote Anti-Pistorius sui disputatio de prcecipuis quibusdam controversis capitibus (Marburg, 16 ( “Engelischer Wegweiser (Marburg, 1603); and many others. He engaged in a controversy with John Crocius, profesor Marburg, against whom he sent forth Abstersio calumniarum J. Crocii, Apologetica, Anticrocia, Collatio Augustance Confessionis cum doctrina Calvini, Bezoe et sociorun (1610). He had also a controversy with John Sadeel, of Paris and Geneva, Matthias Martinius, at Herborn, Paul Stein, at Cassel, Schinfeld, and Pareus: Elencheus errorumn J. Sadeelis in libello de veritate humance naturce Christi (Giessen, 1615): — Elencheus errorunm J. Sadeelis in libello de sacramentali manducatione (Giessen, 1612): Anti Martinius sive modesta et solida responsio, etc. (Giessen, 1612); and many others. These polemics concerning the human nature of Christ, the sacramental use of the Lord's Supper, and the idiomatic use of impanation, give an idea of the logic of the Reformed criticism and the tenacity of the Lutheran defence. The humanity of Christ, the “Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us,” are the principal points of Mentzer's theological grounds. He condemns his opponent's view as Arianistic: “ Non igitur existimo, unquam exstitisse inter Christianos, qui Christo homini vel naturse ejus humanae minus gloriae et auctoritatis et potentale tribuendum censuerint, quam Martinium hunc Freienhagensem” (Anti-Martinius, p. 167). In a communication to Martinius, Mentzer's assertion, “Ipsa divina  pruesentia juxta sacras literas est actio,” provoked another controversy with his colleagues at Giessen, professors Winckelmann and Gisenius. This controversy was settled by the landgrave's personal interference only, who in 1607 imposed silence and peace on all parties. Mentzer's principal work is Necessaria et justa defensio contra injustas criminationes L. Osiandri, M. Nicolai, Th. Tummii, in qua multi de persona et officio Christi erroris deteguntur et refutantur (1624). This was answered in 1625 in Thummi's Acta. In 1618 Mentzer was called to Wolfenbittel to give his opinion on Calixtus's Epitome theologice. He never went thither, but sent a criticism to his son-in-law, superintendent Wiedeburg, acknowledging the eminent talents of the author, but judging his epitome from his own narrow and exclusive stand-point. See Witten, Mem. Theol. 1:223 sq.; Strieder, Hessische Gelehrtengeschichte, vol. viii; Walch, Relig. Streitigkeiten innerhalb der Luth.-Kirche; also, Streitigkeiten ausserhall der' Luther. Kirche, 3:505; Henke, Georg. Calixtus, 1:123, 282, 307, 321; 2:23; Memor. Theol. 1:223 sq.; Gasz, Gesch. der protest. Theol. 1:277, 278; Walch, Biblioth. theologica, 2:654; Dorner, Doctrine of the Person of Christ, 2:243 et al. (J. H. W.)

## Mentzer, Johann[[@Headword:Mentzer, Johann]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Jahmen, in Upper Lusatia, July 27, 1658. He studied at Wittenberg, was in 1691 preacher at Merzdorf, in 1693 at Hauswalde, in 1696 at Kemnitz, near Bernstadt, and died Feb. 24,1734. He wrote about thirty-four hymns, some of which are translated into English, as Lob sei dir, treuer Gott und Vater (in Chorale Book for England, No. 8, "I praise Thee, O my God and Father"); O dass ich tausend Zungen hatte (by Mills, in Horae Germanicae, page 189, "Oh that I had a Thousand Voices!"); Wer das Kleinod will erlangen (in Lyra Germanica, 2:222, "He who'd make the Prize his Own"). See Otto, Lexikon der oberlausitzischen Schriftsteller, 2:581-584; Koch; Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes, 5:220 sq. (B.P.)

## Menu[[@Headword:Menu]]

             SEE MANU

## Menuchite Or Menuchoth[[@Headword:Menuchite Or Menuchoth]]

             is given in the margin of the A. V. at 1Ch 2:52; 1Ch 2:54, in place of “MaUVthf of the textual rendering, as ai alternative rendering of the Hebrews Menuchoth' (מְנֻחוֹת, 1Ch 2:52) or Menachti' (מְנִחְתַּי, 1Ch 2:54), which, as far as can be gathered from the obscure and confused passage, seems to be assigned as a general name of certain descendants of Judah, classified according to some locality settled or inhabited by them. Some (as -apparently the A. V.) have referred this presumed place to the Manahath (q.v.) of 1Ch 8:6; but this was either in Benjamin or Moab, certainly not in Judah. Others have found it in the Menuchah (q.v.) supposed to be referred to in Jdg 20:43; but of the existence of this latter there is very great doubt. The ancient versions are able to make nothing intelligible out of the passage. Thus much is clear, that the Hatsi- ham-Menuchoth of 1Ch 2:52 corresponds as one half either of a lineage or of a district to the other half which appears in 1Ch 2:54 as Hatsiham-Menachti; but the relation between the noun Monuchoth and the adjective Menachthite we cannot discover. The latter of these two moieties is predicated of the son of Salma, the former of the son of Shobal. As of Shobal, however, sons are announced, we must recognise in Haroeh the name of another son; moreover, in chap. 1Ch 4:2, Reaiah appears as a son of Shobal, and this name so closely resembles Haroeh that we may suppose them identical. Haroeh and Reaiah are thus associated as the two sons of Shobah, and the I connective (“and”) may have originally stood between them in the text. Haroeh, indeed, may be resolved into the article and a participle ( הָרֹאֶה= the seer), and thus be reduced to a mere appellation or attribute, but this would not help the narrative. Hatsi-ham-Menuchoth, on the other hand, is a less natural form for a patrial name than Hatsi-ham- Menachti, and this would seem to designate an original or ancestor by the name of Manachath (מָנִחִת), a form which actually occurs elsewhere as the name of a man. SEE MANAHATH. Now as Shobal is repeatedly stated  to be the “ father” (founder) of Kirjath-jearim, his sons of course, in part at least, settled there. We may therefore clear up 1Ch 2:52 by interpreting it as meaning that Shobal had two sons, Reaiah and Manahath, and that part of the descendants of the. latter settled at Kirjath-jearim, becoming the heads of the families named in 1Ch 2:53. The other portion of the Manahathites appear to have colonized at Zorah, in the adjoining territory of Dan; and are hence, for some reason not clear, classed in 1Ch 2:54 with the descendants of Shobal's brother Salma as “Zorites,” that city being perhaps chiefly occupied by the latter. Yet it is a singular circumstance that in chap. 1Ch 4:1-2, :Keaiah's posterity are said to have peopled this city, if, indeed, that be the just interpretation of “Zorathites.” SEE ZORAH.

## Menymeni[[@Headword:Menymeni]]

             (Μενυμένοι, the initiated) was the name given, especially in the 4th and 5th centuries, to full members of the Church of Christ. It originated in the supposed analogy between baptism and the rites of initiation into the sacred mysteries of the heathen. The phrase ἴσασιν οἱ μεμυημένοι, “the initiated know,” occurs about fifty times in the works of Augustine and Chrysostom. In like manner μώσται, μυσταγώγητοι, μυσταγωγοί, and other terms borrowed from the heathen mysteries, are applied to the Christian rites. All these expressions, which came into general use in the 4th century, mark the prevalence of that system of secret instruction or doctrine which we noticed in the article SEE ARCANI DISCIPLINA. See Riddle, Christian Antiquities, p. 195.

## Menzel, Karl Adolph[[@Headword:Menzel, Karl Adolph]]

             a German historian, was born at Grunberg, December 7, 1784. He studied at Halle, was in 1809 professor and in 1814 pro-rector at St. Elizabeth's, in Breslau. He died Aug. 19,1855. He is the author of, Staats- und Religionsgeschichte der Konigreiche Israel und Juda (Breslau, 1853): — Religion und Staatsidee in der vorchristlichen Zeit (edited by Wuttke, Leipsic, 1872). (B.P.)

## Menzel, Wolfgang[[@Headword:Menzel, Wolfgang]]

             a German historian and critic, was born at Waldenburg, June 21, 1798. He studied at different universities, was for some time teacher at Aarau, went in 1824 to Heidelberg, in 1825 to Stuttgart, and died April 23, 1873. Of his many works we only mention,. Christliche Symbolik (Mayence, 1854, 2 volumes): — Kritik des modernen Zeitbewusstseins (2d ed. 1873): — Die vorcharistliche Unsterblichkeitsfrage (1869, 2 volumes). His Denkwiirdigkeiten were published by his son Karl (Bielefeld, 1877). (B.P.)

## Meon[[@Headword:Meon]]

             SEE BAAL-MEON; SEE BETH-BAAL-MEON; SEE BETH-MEON.

## Meonenim[[@Headword:Meonenim]]

             (Hebrews Meonenim') occurs in the Auth. Vers. (Jdg 9:37) in the proper name Elon-Meonenim (אֵלוֹן מְעוֹנַים), “the plain;” or, as it should be rendered, the oak of Meonenim (Sept. ῞Ηλων Μαωνενίμ v. r. δρύος ἀποβλεπόντων, marg. “regarders of times”). Meonenim (variously rendered in the Auth. Vers. “sooth-sayers,” “regarders of times,” etc.) means sorcerers, and is derived either from עוֹנָה, “time” (Exo 21:10), from עִיַן, “the eye,” or else, which is more probable, from עָנָן, “a cloud;” it means. therefore, those dealers in forbidden arts who-observe  times, or practice fascination, or take auguries from the signs of the sky. SEE DIVINATION.

Whatever was its original meaning, Meonenim was afterwards used in a perfectly general sense (Deu 18:10; Deu 18:14; 2Ki 21:6; Mic 5:12) for wizards. In this article, therefore, we are only concerned with “the oak of the sorcerers,” a celebrated tree near Shechem, mentioned in Jdg 9:37, where Gaal, son of Ebed, the Shechemite conspirator, standing “in the entering of the gate,” saw the soldiers of Abimelech first on the hilltops, and then in two companies, of which one approached by the “oak of the sorcerers,” which is evidently pointed out as a conspicuous land-mark. It would be the better suited for this purpose because oaks are rare in Palestine, except in the hills. For other trees used as land-marks, see Gen 35:8; 1Sa 22:6; x,3; 14:2, etc. Now it happens that in Scripture no less than four other celebrated trees in the immediate neighborhood of Shechem are prominently mentioned in connection with important events, and it is interesting to inquire whether all or any of these can be identified with “ the sorcerer's oak.” SEE OAK.

1. In Gen 12:6 we are told that Abraham “.passed through the land unto the place of Sichem, unto the oak of Moreh” (Sept. τὴν δρῦν τὴν ὑψηλήν), where the use of the singular points to one tree of note, although at Shechem there was a grove of oaks (Deu 11:30). It was, therefore, in all probability conspicuous for size and beauty, and the vision which Abraham there commemorated by building an altar would add to it a sacred and venerable association. SEE ABRAHAM.

2. In Gen 35:4 we read that Jacob, on his way to Bethel, took from his family all the strange gods which were in their hand, and all their ear- rings which were in their ears, and hid them under the oak which was by Shechem (הָאֵלָה אֲשֶׁר עַםאּשְׁכֶם). The use of the article in this verse is not, indeed, absolutely decisive, but would lead naturally to the supposition that this tree was the one. already so famous in the religious history of the Israelitish family. That אֵלָהis used (Sept. τερεβινθος) and not אֵלוֹן, is a consideration of no importance, for it seems certain that the two words are synonymous (see Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 50, 51), or at any rate are used interchangeably. SEE TEREBNTH.

3. In Jos 24:26, Joshua, after addressing the assembled tribes at Shechem. “took a great stone and set it up there under an oak (the oak, הָאִלָּה) that was by the sanctuary of the Lord.” The use of the definite  article again renders it probable that this is the same tree as that which had been connected with the' memories of Abraham's vision, and Jacob's rejection of idolatrous possessions; and the probability is strengthened into certainty by the fact that Joshua's injunction in ver.14 (“put away the gods which your fathers served on the other side of the flood”) is almost identical with that which Jacob had addressed to his family on that very spot (Gen 35:2) some 300 years before. Kalisch, indeed, objects that a “ sanctuary of the Lord” would never have been erected at the place of idols (Genesis, p. 586); but, to say nothing of the fact that several of the Jewish high-places seem to have been also connected with the, worship of the Canaanites, a place where idols had been buried, and so rejected, and scorned, would surely be most fitted for the sanctuary', especially if it had been hallowed by a previous protest made by the great forefather of the race against the idolatry which there surrounded him (Gen 12:7).

4. In Jdg 9:6, we read that “ all the men of Shechem... made Abimelech king, by the oak (AV. plain) of the pillar that was in Shechem” (מֻצָּב אֲשֶׁר בַּשְׁכֶם עַםאּאֵלוֹן. The word מֻצָּב, mutstsab', is very obscure. and Jerome's version, “quercus quas stabat in Sichem,” seems to show that it may once have followed אֲשֶׁר. The Sept. renders it πρὸς τῇ βαλάνῳ (τῇ ευρετῇ τῆς στάσεως τῆς ἐν Σικίμοις, where στασις. means “a military station,” a rendering approved, by Gesenius (Thesaur. p. 904), who compares Isa 29:3. Our AV. refers it to the sacred stone set up by Joshua, and this seems a very probable rendering, from the constant use of the word matstsebah for similar erections (Gen 28:18; Exo 24:4; 2Ki 3:2; Mic 5:13, etc.). It seems further possible that during the confusions which prevailed in the country after Joshua's death, the stone which he had erected beneath it, and which he invested, even though only in metaphor, with qualities so like those which the Canaanites attributed to the stones they worshipped -during these confused times this famous block may have become sacred among the Canaanites, one of their “matstsebahs” [SEE IDOL], and thus the tree have acquired the name of “the oak of Mutstsab” from the fetish below it. - The argument that this tree cannot be identical with Jacob's, because that is spoken of as near'(עַם), and this as in (ב) Shechem, is quite unconvincing, both because the use of the prepositions by Hebrew writers is by no means minutely accurate, in this way corresponding to. their general ἀγεωγραφία, and because Shechem may. mean the district round the city, as well as the city itself. -(For a decisive case in point, see Jos 5:13,  where the Vulgate rightly renders בַּירַיחוֹby “in agris urbis Jericho.”) We believe, therefore, that all these trees are one and the same, which thus becomes connected with four most memorable events in the lives of Abraham, Jacob, Joshua, and Abimelech.

Was this tree also the “ oak of the sorcerers ?” There might at first seem to be a positive reason against the identification, because (1.) The name “ sorcerers,” or “ enchanters,” would not be particularly suitable to the tree, which Kalisch also thinks might with more propriety have been called the “ oak of idols,” or of “witchcraft,” than the oak of enchanters (Genesis, p. 586); and (2.) Because Gaal evidently points to the Elon-Meonenim at a distance from the city, whereas Jacob's tree was in it. Of this second argument we have already disposed; and-besides, Gaal's expression may merely mean that one company was on the road which led by “the sorcerer's oak.” As regards the first argument, the Elon Meonenim may have been the same as Jacob's tree, and yet not have received its name from the idols and amulets which Jacob buried there. The close connection of ear-rings with talismans and magic arts is well known, and in the Chaldee the word used for ear-ring is קִדַּישָׁא so that it does seem reasonable to suppose that there is a connection between the name and the event. But if not, may not the nane have originated in some use made of the tree by the priests and necromancers of the neighboring shrine of Baal-Berith ? (Jdg 8:33; Jdg 9:36). If it be asked how it was that a tree so sacred as this could have received an opprobrious name, it must be borne in mind that this name only occurs on the lips of Gaal, who in all probability was an aboriginal Canaanite of the old royal family (Jdg 9:28; comp. Gen 34:2; Gen 34:6), and who would therefore be likely to call the tree by a name derived from its associations with idolatrous rather than with Jewish worship. SEE GAAL.

## Meonothai[[@Headword:Meonothai]]

             (Hebrews Meonothay', מְעוֹנֹתִי, my habitations; Sept. Μαναθί v. r. Μαωναθεί), the father (? founder) of Ophrah, and apparently the brother of Hathath, the son of Othniel (1Ch 4:14). BC. post 1612.

## Mepeham, Simon[[@Headword:Mepeham, Simon]]

             archbishop of Canterbury, was born at Meopham, in Kent, and educated at Merton College. He devoted himself chiefly to the study of the sacred Scriptures, and became a Biblical divine. He was ordained priest at Canterbury on St. Matthew's day, 1297, and became rector of Tunstall, in the diocese of Norwich. He was elected archbishop on December 11, 1327, and received .the temporalities from the king at Lynn on September 19, 1329. His attention was chiefly directed to the state of morals and discipline in the Church. We occasionally find him interposing his good offices to effect a reconciliation between parties at variance. His endeavor to compel diocesans to attend to their spiritual duties rendered him anything but popular among his suffragans. Notwithstanding, he was in all things respectable, in nothing great. But the age demanded something more than respectable mediocrity, and Simon Mepeham, by confining himself to his religious duties, was regarded as mean-spirited by those who looked, in his position, for one who could lead them in temporal as well as in spiritual things. He died October 12, 1333. See Hook, Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury, 3:492 sq.

## Mephaath[[@Headword:Mephaath]]

             [some Mepha'ath] (Hebrews Meypha'ath, מֵיפִעִת, prob. splendor; once defectively written מֵפִעִת. Jos 13:18, and once [Kethib] מוֹפִעִת,  Jer 48:21; Sept. Μηφάαθ in Josh., Φαάθ v. r. Μαεφλά in Chron. And Μαφάς v. r. Μωφάθ in Jer.), a Levitical (Merarite) city (Jos 21:37; 1Ch 6:79) of the tribe of Reuben (Jos 13:18), doubtless originally (like Heshbon, of which it formed a dependency) in the hands of the Amorites (Num 21:26), but afterwards belonging to Moab (Jer 48:21); probably situated near Kedemoth and Jahazah, in connection with which it is always mentioned. Eusebius (Onomast.) calls it Mephath (Μηφάθ), and states that it was still occupied by a Roman garrison as a defence against the Arabs of the neighboring desert. As the name implies a conspicuous position, the site may possibly correspond with that of the modern village with ruins on an eminence marked as Umn el- Weled on Van de Velde's Map, east of Medeba. “The extended, and possibly later, form of the name which occurs in Chronicles and Jeremiah, as if Mey Phaath, ‘waters of Phaath,' may be, as in other cases, an attempt to fix an intelligible meaning on an archaic or foreign word;” although the fuller form appears to be radical (so both Gesenius and Ftirst, from

יָפִע, to glitter, be eminent).

## Mephibosheth[[@Headword:Mephibosheth]]

             (Heb. Mephioo'sheth, מְפַיבשֶׁת[twice' defectively' מְפַבשֶׁת, 2Sa 19:24; 2Sa 21:8], exterminator of the shame, i.e. idols or Baal, see Simonis Lex. V. T. p. 160; Ewald, Isr. Gesch. 2:383; Sept. Μεφιβόσεθ v. . Μεμφονπσθέ, Vulg. Miphiboseth, Josephus Μεμφίβοσθος), the name of two of king- Saul's descendants. “Bosheth appears to have been a favorite appellation in Saul's family, for it forms a part of the names of no fewer than three members of it — Ish-bosheth and the two Mephibosheths. But in the genealogies preserved in 1 Chronicles these names are given in the different forms of Esh-baal and Merib-baal. The variation is identical with that of Jerub-baal and Jerubbesheth, and is in accordance with passages in Jeremiah (Jer 11:13) and Hosea (Hos 9:10), where Baal and Bosheth appear to be convertible or, at least, related terms, the latter being used as a contemptuous or derisive synonyme of the former. One inference from this would be that the persons in question were originally named Baal; that this appears in the two fragments of the family records preserved in Chronicles; but that in Samuel the hateful heathen name has been uniformly erased, and the nickname of Bosheth substituted for it. It is some support to this to find that Saul had an ancestor named Baal, who appears  in the lists of Chronicles only (1Ch 8:30; 1Ch 9:36). But such a change in the record supposes an amount of editing and interpolation which would hardly have been accomplished without leaving more obvious traces, in reasons given for the change, etc. How different it is, for example, from the case of Jerub-besheth, where the alteration is mentioned and commented on. Still the facts are as above stated, whatever explanation may be given of them.” SEE ISHBOSHETH.

W. Saul's son by his concubine Rizpah, the daughter of Aiah (2Sa 21:8). He and his brother Armoni were among the seven victims who were surrendered by David to the Gibeonites, and by them crucified in sacrifice- to Jehovah, to avert a famine from which the country was suffering. There is no doubt about this being the real meaning of the word יָקִע, translated here and in Num 25:4 “hanged up” (see Michaelis's Supplement, No. 1046; also Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 620; and Furst, Handwb. p. 539 b). Aquila has ἀναπήγνυμι, understanding them to have been not crucified but impaled. The Vulgate reads crucifixerunt (Num 25:9), and qui afixifuerant (Num 25:13). The Hebrew term is entirely distinct from תָּלָה, also rendered “to hang” in the AV., which is its real signification. It is this latter word which is employed in the story of the five kings of Makkedah; in the account of the indignities practiced on Saul's body, 2Sa 21:12; on Baanah and Rechab by David, 2Sa 4:12; and elsewhere.

The seven corpses, protected by the tender care of the mother of Mephibosheth from the attacks of bird and beast, were exposed on their crosses to the fierce sun of at least five of the midsummer months, on the sacred eminence of Gibeah. This period results from the statement that they hung from barley harvest (April) till the commencement of the rains (October); but it is also worthy of notice that the Sept. has employed the word ἐξηλιάζειν, “to expose to the sun.” It is also remarkable that on the only other occasion on which this Hebrew term is used-Num 25:4 - an express command was given that the victims should be crucified “in front of the sun.” At the end of that time the attention of David was called to the circumstance, and also possibly to the fact that the sacrifice had failed in its purpose. A different method was tried: the bones of Saul and Jonathan were disinterred from their resting-place at the foot of the great tree at Jabesh-Gilead, the blanched and withered remains of Mephibosheth, his brother, and his five relatives, were taken down from the crosses, and father, son, and grandsons found at last a restingplace together in the  ancestral cave of Kish at Zelah. When this had been done, “ God was entreated for the land,” and the famine ceased. BC. 1053 -1019. SEE RIZPAH.

2. The son of Jonathan and grandson of king Saul (2Sa 4:4; in which sense “ the son of Saul “ is to be taken in 2Sa 19:24; sec Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 216); called also by the equivalent name of MERIBBAAL (1Ch 9:40). The following account of his history and character is sufficiently detailed to set forth the important relations which he held to the adventures and reign of his father's successor.

1. His life seems to have been, from beginning to end, one of trial and discomfort. The name of his mother is unknown. There is reason to think that she died shortly after his birth, and that he was an only child. At any rate, we know for certain that when his father and grandfather were slain on Gilboa he was an infant of but five years old. BC. 1053. He was then living under the charge of his nurse, probably at Gibeah, the regular residence of Saul. The tidings that the army was destroyed, the king and his sons slain, and that the Philistines, spreading from hill to hill of the country, were sweeping all before them, reached the royal household. The nurse, perhaps apprehending that the enemy were seeking to exterminate the whole royal family, fled, carrying the child on her shoulder. This is the statement of Josephus (ἀπὸ τῶν ὤμων, Ant. 7:5, 5); but it is hardly necessary, for in the East children are always carried on the shoulder (see Lane's Mod. Egyptians, ch. i, p. 52, and the art. CHILD). But in her panic and hurry she stumbled, and Mephibosheth was precipitated to the ground with such force as to deprive him for life of the use of both feet .(2Sa 4:4). These early misfortunes threw a shade over his whole life, and his personal deformity-as is often the case where it has been the result of accident-seems to have exercised a depressing and depreciatory influence on his character. He can never forget that he. is a poor lame slave (2Sa 19:26), and unable to walk; a dead dog (ix. 8); that all the house of his father were dead (19:28); that the king is an angel of God (ib. 27), and he his abject dependent (9:6, 8). He receives the slanders of Ziba and the harshness of David alike with a submissive equanimity which is quite touching, and which effectually wins our sympathy.

2. After the accident which thus embittered his whole existence, Mephibosheth was carried with the rest of his family beyond the Jordan to  the mountains of Gilead, where he found a refuge in the house of Machir ben-Ammiel, a powerful Gadite or Manassite sheik at Lo-debar, not far from Mahanaim, which during the reign of his uncle Ishbosheth was the head-quarters of his family. By Machir he was brought up (Josephus, Ant. 7:5, 5); there he married, and there he was living at a later period, when David, having completed the subjugation of the adversaries of Israel on every side, had leisure to turn his attention to claims of other and less pressing descriptions. The solemn oath which he had sworn to the father of Mephibosheth at their critical interview by the stone Ezel, that he “would not cut off his kindness from the house of Jonathan forever: no, not when Jehovah had cut off the enemies of David each one from the face of the earth” (1Sa 20:15); and again, that “Jehovah should be between Jonathan's seed and his seed forever” (1Sa 20:42), was naturally the first thing that occurred to him, and he eagerly inquired who was left of the house of Saul, that he might show kindness to him for Jonathan's sake (2Sa 9:1). So completely had the family of the late king vanished from the western side of Jordan that the only person to be met with in any way related to them was one Ziba, formerly a slave of the royal house, but now a freed man, with a family of fifteen sons, who, by arts which, from the glimpse we subsequently have of his character, are not difficult to understand, must have acquired considerable substance, since he was possessed of an establishment of twenty slaves of his own. From this man David learned of the existence of Mephibosheth. Royal messengers were sent to the house of Machir at Lo-debar, in the mountains of Gilead, and by them the prince and his infant son Michah (comp. 1Ch 9:40) were brought to Jerusalem. The interview with David was marked by extreme kindness on the part of the king, and on that of Mephibosheth by the fear and humility which have been pointed out as characteristic of him. He leaves the royal presence with all the property of his grandfather restored to him, and with the whole family and establishment of Ziba as his slaves, to cultivate the land and harvest the produce. He himself is to be a daily guest at David's table. From this time forward he resided at Jerusalem (2 Samuel ix). BC. cir. 1037. See Kitto's Daily Bible Illust. ad loc.

3. An interval of about fourteen years now passes, and the crisis of David's life arrives. SEE DAVID. Of Mephibosheth's behavior on this occasion we possess two accounts-his own (2Sa 19:24-30), and that of Ziba (16:1-4). They are naturally at variance with each other.

(1.) Ziba meets the king on his flight at the most opportune moment, just as David has undergone the most trying part of that trying day's journey, has taken the last look at the city so peculiarly his own, and completed the hot and toilsome ascent of the Mount of Olives. He is on foot, and is in want of relief and refreshment. The relief and refreshment are there. There stand a couple of strong he-asses ready saddled for the king or his household to make the descent upon; and there are bread, grapes, melons, and a skin of wine; and there-the donor of these welcome gifts-is Ziba, with respect in his look and sympathy on his tongue. Of course the whole,. though offered as Ziba's, is the property of Mephibosheth: the asses are his, one of them his own riding animal (חֲמוֹר, both in 17:2, and 19:26); the fruits are from his gardens and orchards. But why is not their owner here in person ? Where is the “son of Saul?” He, says Ziba, is in Jerusalem, waiting to receive from the nation the throne of his grandfather, that throne from which he has so long been unjustly excluded. Such an aspiration would be very natural, but it must have been speedily dissipated by the thought that he at least would be likely to gain little by Absalom's rebellion. Still it must be confessed that Ziba's tale at first sight is a most plausible one, and that the answer of David is no more than was to be expected. So the presumed ingratitude of Mephibosheth is requited with the ruin he deserves, while the loyalty and thoughtful courtesy of Ziba are rewarded by the possessions of his master, thus reinstating him in the position which he seems to have occupied on Mephibosheth's arrival in Judah.

(2.) Mephibosheth's story which, however, he had not the opportunity of telling until several days later, when he met David returning to his kingdom at the western bank of the Jordan — was very different from Ziba's. He had been desirous to fly with his patron and benefactor, and had ordered Ziba to make ready his ass that he might join the cortege. But Ziba had deceived him, had left him, and not returned with the asses. In his helpless condition he had no alternative, when once the opportunity of accompanying David was lost, but to remain where he. was. The swift pursuit which had been made after Ahimaaz and Jonathan (2 Samuel 17) had shown what risks even a strong and able man must run who would try to follow the king. But all that he could do under the circumstances he had done. He had gone into the deepest mourning possible (the same as in 12:20) for his lost friend. From the very day that David left he had allowed his beard to grow ragged, his crippled feet were unwashed (Jerome,  however, pedibus infectis-alluding to false wooden feet which he was accustomed to wear, Quaest. Hebrews ad loc.) and untended, his linen remained unchanged. That David did not disbelieve this story is shown by his revoking the judgment he had previously given. That he did not entirely reverse his decision, but allowed Ziba to retain possession of half the lands of Mephibosheth, is probably due partly to weariness at the whole transaction. but mainly to the conciliatory frame of mind in which he was at that moment. “Shall, then, any mall be put to death this day ?” is the key note of the whole proceeding. David could not but have been sensible that he had acted hastily, and was doubtless touched by the devotedness of his friend's son, as well as angry at the imposition of Ziba; but, as he was not wholly convinced of Mephibosheth's innocence, and as there was at the time no opportunity to examine fully into the matter, perhaps also actuated by the pride of an already expressed judgment or by reluctance to offend Ziba, who had adhered to him when so many old friends forsook him, he answered abruptly, “Why speakest thou any more of thy matters? I have said Thou and Ziba divide the land.” The answer of Mephibosheth was worthy of the son of the generous Jonathan, and, couched as it is in Oriental phrase, shows that he had met a better reception than he had expected: “Yea, let him take all; forasmuch as my lord the king. is come again in peace unto his own house” (2Sa 19:24-30). BC. cir. 1023.

4. We hear no more of Mephibosheth, except that David was careful that he should not be included in the savage vengeance which the Gibeonites were suffered to execute upon the house of Saul for the great wrong they had sustained during his reign (2Sa 21:7). BC. cir. 1019. Through his son Micah the family of Saul was continued to a late generation (1Ch 9:40 sq.).

On the transaction between David and Mephibosheth, see J. G. Elsner, Ueb. die gerechte Unschuld u. Redlichkeit Mephiboseths (Frankf. u. Leipz. 1760); Niemever, Charakt. 4:434 sq.; Kitto's Daily Bible Illust. ad loc.; Blunt, Undesigned Coincidences, ad loc.; Hall, Contemplations, ad loc.; H. Lindsay, Lectures, 2:102; Doddridge, Sermons, 1:177; Ewald, Hist. of Israel (Engl. transl. 3:191). SEE ZIBA.

## Merab[[@Headword:Merab]]

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

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

## Merage, Leilat Al[[@Headword:Merage, Leilat Al]]

             (the night of the ascension), a night accounted sacred by the Mohammedans, because in it the prophet made his famous journey to heaven. It is commemorated on the 28th of the month Regeb.

## Meraiah[[@Headword:Meraiah]]

             (Hebrews Merayah', מְרָיוֹת, resistance; Sept. Α᾿μαρία v. r. Μαρέα; Vulg. Maraja), a chief priest, the “son” of Seraiah, contemporary with the high-priest Joiakim (Neh 12:12). BC. post 536.

## Meraioth[[@Headword:Meraioth]]

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

1. The son of Zerahiah and father of Amariah, a high-priest of the line of Eleazar (1Ch 6:6-7; 1Ch 6:52; Ezr 7:3). BC. considerably ante 1062. It was thought by Lightfoot that he was the immediate predecessor of Eli in the office of high-priest, and that at his death the high-priesthood changed from the line of Eleazar to the line of Ithamar (Temple Service, iv, § 1). In 1Ch 9:11; Neh 11:11, his name appears to have become transposed between those of Zadok and Ahitub, instead of its proper place after the latter, as may be seen from 1Ch 6:6-12. SEE HIGH-PRIEST.

2. A chief priest whose son Helkai was contemporary with the high-priest Joiakim (Neh 12:15); doubtless identical with the MEREMOTH of Neh 12:3.

## Meran[[@Headword:Meran]]

             (Μεῤῥαν,Vulg. Me-rrha), a place mentioned along with Theman as famous for its merchants and its wise men (Bar 3:23). The association with the Hagarenes leads us to seek for Meran in Arabia. It may be Mohrah in Desert Arabia, or Marane, of which Pliny speaks (N. H. 6:28,32). Strabo (xvi. 4, p. 776) and Diodor. Sic. (iii. 43) also mention the Μαρανῖται. The conjecture of Grotinus that it is the Mearah mentioned in Jos 13:4, and that of Havernick (De librno Baruch, p. 5) that it is the Syrian town Maarah, are mere guesses (comp. Fritzsche, Exeqet. Hdb. z. Apok. ad loc.).-Kitto. The suggestion of Hitzig (Psalmen, ii 119) that Meran is merely a corruption of “Medan” or “ Midian.” owing to the ready mistake: by a translator of דfor ר, is more plausible, although there is little evidence of a Hebrew original for this portion of Baruch. Junins and Tremellius give Medancei, and their conjecture is supported by the appearance of the Midianites as nomade merchants in Genesis 37, Both  Medan and Midian. are enumerated among the sons of Keturah in Gen 25:21 and are closely connected with the Deaanim, whose “ travelling companies,” or caravans, are frequently alluded to (Isa 21:13; Eze 27:15).

## Merari[[@Headword:Merari]]

             (Hebrews Merari', מְרָרַי, sad; Sept. Μεραρί), the youngest son of Levi, probably born in Canaan (Gen 46:11; Exo 6:16; Num 3:17; 1Ch 6:1). BC. 1874. Of Merari's personal history, beyond the fact of his birth before the descent of Jacob into Egypt, and of his being one of the seventy who accompanied Jacob thither, we know nothing whatever (Gen 46:8; Gen 46:11). He became the head of the third great division (מַשְׁפָּחָה) of the Levites, whose designation in Hebrew is the same as that of their progenitor, only with the article prefixed, viz. הִמְּרָרַי, i.e. the Merarites (Exo 6:19), who during the march through the desert had charge of the materials of the Tabernacle (Num 3:36; Num 4:30 sq.), for the transportation of which they were provided with four carts, each drawn by a yoke of oxen (Num 7:8). In Palestine they were assigned twelve trans-Jordanic cities for a residence (Jos 21:7; Jos 21:34 sq.). SEE MERARITE.

## Merari (2)[[@Headword:Merari (2)]]

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

## Merarite[[@Headword:Merarite]]

             (Hebrews same as Merari, Sept. Μεραρί, Auth. Vers. “ Merarites”), the patronymic title of the descendanlts of MERARI (Num 26:57). Their prominence among the Levitical families justifies a somewhat copious treatment of the subject.

At the time of the exodus, and the numbering in the wilderness, the Merarites consisted of two families, the Mahlites and the Mushites, Mahli and Mushi being either the two sons or the son and grandson of Merari (1Ch 6:19; 1Ch 6:47). Their chief at that time was Zuriel, and the whole number of the family, from a month old and upwards, was 6200;  those from thirty years old to fifty were 3200. Their charge was the boards, bars, pillars, cockets, pins, and cords of the Tabernacle and the court, and all the tools connected with setting them up. In the encampment their place was to the north of the Tabernacle, and both they and the Gershonites were “under the hand” of Ithamar, the son of Aaron. Owing to the heavy nature of the materials which they had to carry, four wagons and eight oxen were assigned to them; and in the march both they and the Gershonites followed immediately after the standard of Judah, and before that of Reuben, that they might set up the Tabernacle against the arrival of the Kohathites (Num 3:20; Num 3:33-37; Num 4:29-33; Num 4:42-45; Num 7:8; Num 10:17; Num 10:21). In the division of the land by Joshua, the Merarites had twelve cities assigned to them, out of Reubenn Gad, and Zebulon, of which one was Ramoth-Gilead, a city of refuge, and in later times a frequent subject of war between Israel and Syria (Jos 21:7; Jos 21:34-40; 1Ch 6:63; 1Ch 6:79-81). In the time of David Asaiah was their chief, and assisted with 220 of his family in bringing up the ark (1Ch 15:6). Afterwards we find the Merarites still sharing with the two other Levitical families the various functions of their caste (1Ch 23:6; 1Ch 23:21-23). Thus a third part of the singers and musicians were Merarites, and Ethan or Jeduthun was their chief in the time of David. SEE JEDUTHUN.

A third part of the door-keepers were Merarites (1Ch 23:5-6; 1Ch 26:10; 1Ch 26:19), unless, indeed, we are to understand from 1Ch 26:19 that the door-keepers were all either Kohathites or Merarites, to the exclusion of the Gershonites, which does not seem probable. In the days of Hezekiah the Merarites were still flourishing, and Kish, the” son of Abdi, and Azariah, the son of Jehalelel, took their part with their brethren of the two other Levitical families in promoting the reformation, and purifying the house of the Lord (2Ch 29:12; 2Ch 29:15). After the return from captivity Shemaiah represents the sons of Merari, in 1Ch 9:14; Neh 11:15, and is said, with other chiefs of the Levites, to have “had the oversight of the outward Busiless of the house of God.” - There were also at that time sons of Jeduthun under Obadiah or Abda, the son of Shemaiah (1Ch 9:16; Neh 11:17). A little later again, in the time of Ezra, when he was in great want of Levites to accompany him on his journey from Babylon to Jerusalem, “a man of good understanding of the sons of Mahli” was found, whose name, if the text here and at Neh 11:24 is correct, is not given. “Jeshaiah, also, of the sons of Merari,” with twenty of his sons and brethren, came with him at the same time (Ezr 8:18-19). But it seems pretty certain that Shirebiah, in Ezr 8:18, is the name of the Mahlite, and that  both he and Hashabiah, as well as Jeshaiah, in Ezr 8:19, were Levites of the family of Merari, and not, as the actual text of Ezr 8:24 indicates, priests. The copulative ו has probably fallen out before their, names in Ezr 8:24, as appears from Ezr 8:30 (see also 1Ch 9:14; Neh 12:24). SEE LEVITE.

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

## Merathaim[[@Headword:Merathaim]]

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

## Merati, Gaetano Maria[[@Headword:Merati, Gaetano Maria]]

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

## Merault, Athanase Renee[[@Headword:Merault, Athanase Renee]]

             a noted French educator, was born at Paris in 1744, and was educated at the College of Jeuilly. Although possessing a very large fortune, he entered the Oratory in order to devote himself to the instruction of the young. After his twenty-fifth year he was director of the house of education. Compelled to leave Paris by the Revolution, he retired to Orleans, where his parents resided. Imprisoned in 1793, and set free again after the 9th of Thermidor, he remained in the city, and became in 1805 grand vicar of the bishopric of Bernier, which placed him at the head of the great, seminary. The Church of Orleans is indebted to the abbot Merault for several  religious and charitable institutions, to the foundation of which he devoted a large portion of his money. He died at Orleans June 13, 1835. His works are, Les Apologistes Involontaires ou la Religion eternelleprouvee et defenduepar les objections memes des incredules (Paris, 1806, anonymous, and 1820, 12mo);-Les Apologistes, ou la Religion Chretienne prouvee par ses ennemis comme par ses amis (Orleans, 1821, 8vo and 12mo); a continuation of the preceding work: - Conspiration de l'impiete contre l'humanite (Paris, 1822, 8vo): -Rapport sur Phistoire des Hebreux rapprochee des temps contemporains (Orleans, 1825, 12mo):Enseginements de la Religion (Orleans, 1827, 5 vols. 12mo) : - Recueil des Mandements sur l'instructipn des peiiles (Paris, 1830, 12mo).

## Merbes, Bon De[[@Headword:Merbes, Bon De]]

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

## Mercado, Moses Ben-Israel de[[@Headword:Mercado, Moses Ben-Israel de]]

             a rabbi of Amsterdam, who flourished in the 17th century, is the author of פ קהלת ותהלים, or a commentary on Ecclesiastes and the Psalms, published after the author's death by Jacob de Mercado (Amsterdam, 1653). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:368. (B.P.) Mercersburg Theology. SEE GERMAN REFORMED CHURCH IN AMERICA.

## Mercati, Giovanni Baptista[[@Headword:Mercati, Giovanni Baptista]]

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

## Mercator, Marius[[@Headword:Mercator, Marius]]

             SEE MARIUS.

## Mercein, T. F. Randolph[[@Headword:Mercein, T. F. Randolph]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in New York City Nov. 27, 1825. He was converted in early youth, and joined the  Presbyterian Church, to which his parents belonged. His educational advantages were very superior, as he was intended for the ministry. In his second year at college his health failed, and he was obliged to desist from all study. While at home he fell in with books that gave him a distaste for Calvinistic theology. He promptly joined the Methodists, was licensed to preach, and exercised his power as a Christian pastor for eleven years. He died at Sheffield, Mass., Sept. 15, 1856. “Of a high order of intellect, carefully educated, deeply serious and thoughtful, with a profound sense of ministerial responsibility, bold and faithful in the discharge of duty, gentle, amiable, and genial, he was eminently fitted to adorn both public and private life. His deep, ardent piety pervaded and beautified his whole being. He was emphatically a pure, humble, heavenly minded man. His rare gifts made him an attractive speaker, a fine writer, a successful author, an accomplished debater, a choice friend. He was loved even more than he was admired” (Smith, Sacred Memories of the N. Y. and N. Y. East Conf: p. 75 sq.). His published works are, Natural Goodness:-The Wise Master Builder:- Childhood and the Church; and numerous essays, etc., in the periodicals of the Church. All these evince great genius and earnest study, deeply imbued with the spirit of Christian love.-Minutes of Conferences, 6:321; Dr. Dewey's Lecture (p. 298). of the “Pitt's Street Chapel Lectures” (Boston, Jewett & Co., 1858).

## Mercer, Alexander Gardiner, D.D[[@Headword:Mercer, Alexander Gardiner, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, January 4, 1817. He graduated from the College of New Jersey in 1837, and studied one year in Princeton Theological Seminary; became rector of St. John's Church, Clifton, N.Y., in 1847; in 1853 professor in the University of Pennsylvania; in 1855 rector of Trinity Church, Newport, R.I.; in 1860 assistant at Trinity Church, Boston; in 1862 rector of All- Saints' Chapel, Newport, where he remained until his death, November 3, 1882. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1883, page 43.

## Mercer, Jesse, DD[[@Headword:Mercer, Jesse, DD]]

             a Baptist minister, was born in Halifax County, N. C., Dec. 16, 1769. His early education was limited, yet he began to preach when only eighteen years of age; was ordained Nov. 7,1789, and soon became pastor of a Church at Hutton's Fork (now Sardis), in Wilkes County. In 1793 be accepted a call to Indian Creek (or Bethany), in Oglethorpe County, whence he removed in 1796 to Salem, where he became preceptor in the academy, and also succeeded his father in the charge of the Phillips Mill, Powelton, and Bethesda churches for some time, and finally removed to the fork of the Little River, in Green County. In 1826 he attended the General Convention in Philadelphia, and at the end of the next year accepted a call from the Church at Washington, Wilkes County, where he continued until 1833, when he became editor of the Christian Index, a religious periodical. He was made DD. by Brown University in 1835. He was for many years identified with the Georgia Association,' acting as clerk of that body from 1795 till 1816, and afterwards as moderator till 1839; he was also connected with the Baptist Convention of the State of  Georgia from its beginning in 1822, being its moderator until 1841, when his impaired health obliged him, to resign. He became also one of the trustees of the college at Washington, and president of the mission board of the Georgia Association from 1830 to 1841. He died Sept. 6, 1841. Dr. Mercer published a large number of Addresses, Circular Letters, Essays, etc. See Mallory, Memoir of the Revelation Jesse Mercer, DD.; Sprague, Annals, 6:283.

## Merchant[[@Headword:Merchant]]

             this and kindred terms, as merchandise, etc., are properly expressed by some form of the Hebrews סָחִר, sachar', to travel about, Gr. ἔμπορος, a passenger to and fro; sometimes also by רָכִל, rakal', to go about; and occasionally by the title CANAANITE). Trade is of very great antiquity in the East (Niebuhr, Trav. 3:4 sq.), and was sometimes carried on by sea (Pro 31:14; Psa 107:23), but more commonly on land by means of a company associated for a mercantile journey (Gen 37:25; Job 6:18). SEE CARAVAN.

The itinerant character and temporary location which appear in all the ancient notices of Oriental merchants, whether individuals or an association of several persons, is still a marked trait of the same class in the East (Hackett's Illustrat. of Script. p. 63). In the patriarchal times such parties of Ishmaelites passed through Canaan on their way to Egypt (Gen 37:25; Gen 37:28), and bartered with the nomades for various products of their herds in exchange for implements, apparel, and similar articles, and sometimes purchased slaves (Gen 37:28; Gen 39:1). After the Hebrews became settled in Palestine, they were drawn into those forms of commercial relations that early existed, but rather passively than actively, since the Mosaic law little favored this profession (Michaelis, Mos. Recht, 1:238 sq.; Josephus's denial of all mercantile pursuits by his nation, Apion, 1:12, is probably too strong an expression), although the geographical position of their country would seem to be in general advantageous for it; but the circumscribed extent of their territory, the prevailing direction of the population to agriculture, which left few poor, their almost total want of those natural and artificial products most in demand for general traffic, and the preoccupation of the trade between Asia and Africa by two mercantile nations (the Phoenicians and Arabians), mostly precluded them from an independent commerce, for which, indeed, they were further incapacitated  by the continuance of their sea-coast for the most part in the hands of the Canaanites and Philistines, who had, more over, secured to themselves the great commercial route to Damascus, through the prominence of several cities in the northern part of Palestine (Bertheau, Isr. Gesch. p. 287). Yet the north-western Israelites appear quite early to have occupied a post in the Phoenician marts (Gen 49:13; Deu 33:18; Jdg 5:17). Solomon not only (as a royal monopoly) imported horses from Egypt, and traded them away in Syria by governmental salesmen (1Ki 10:26; 2Ch 1:16-17), but formed a commercial treaty with the king of Tyre for maritime enterprise (1Ki 9:26), and launched from the Edomitish ports of Ezion-geber and Elath, which David had acquired on the Red Sea, a fleet that sailed under the pilotage of Tyrian seamen into the Indian Ocean, and, after a three years' voyage, brought back gold, silver, ivory, sandal-wood, ebony, apes, peacocks, and other products of Chin-India (1Ki 10:11; 1Ki 22:22; 1Ki 22:50; 2Ch 9:10; 2Ch 9:21). SEE OPHIR. After the death of Solomon this marine commerce shared the neglect of all the royal affairs, and the trade never revived,-with the ‘single exception of Jehoshaphat's undertaking (1Ki 22:49), until these harbors passed entirely out of the control of the Israelites. SEE EDOMITE.

What position the Jews held in the Phoenician traffic, or what profit the transit of Phoenician merchandise brought them, is only to be gleaned indirectly from the historical records- (Bertheau, Isr. Gesch. p. 354); but that both these were not inconsiderable is clear from Eze 26:2; Eze 27:17. The kingdom of Israel was probably more favored in this latter particular than that of Judah, as the principal thoroughfares of trade passed through its bounds. Commercial relations subsisted between Tyre and Judaea after the exile (Neh 13:16), and even in New- Testament times (Act 12:20). From the Phoenicians the Hebrews imported, besides timber for edifices (1 Kings 5; 1Ch 14:1), and sea-fish (Neh 13:16), a great many foreign necessaries, and even luxuries (such as variegated stuffs, unguents, and peltries, purple garments, etc.), which for the most part came from Arabia, Babylonia, and India (comp. Ezekiel 27), and sold in exchange wheat (comp. Act 12:20), oil (1Ki 5:11), honey, dates, balsam (Hos 12:2; see Eze 27:17), and also a fine species of fancy fabric, which the diligent hands of the women had prepared (Pro 31:24)., Respecting the balance of trade we have no certain means of judging, and it is the more difficult to ascertain how this was adjusted, inasmuch as Palestine must have derived its supply of the metals likewise from foreigners. Yet we  nowhere find any indication that the national wealth had sensibly diminished; on the contrary, the Israelites were able to endure an almost unbroken series of hostile attacks, often resulting in pillage, and always very exhaustive of money (1Ki 14:26; 1Ki 15:18; 2Ki 12:18; 2Ki 14:14; 2Ki 16:18, etc.), while certain periods (Isa 2:7),-and even individual tribes (Hos 12:9), were distinguished for opulence and luxury; perhaps the revenue was derived through the surrounding districts of Edom, Moab, and Phoenicia (see T. C. Tychsen, De commerciis et naigationibus Hebsrceor. ante exil Bab., in the Comment. Gott. vol. xvi; Class. Hist. p. 150 sq.; Hartmann, Ueb. Pentat. p. 751 sq.).' After the exile the Hebrew commerce had a wider range, especially as many Jews had become scattered in foreign countries where they experienced many favors, so that the nation took a greater relish in this avocation and in its safe emoluments. Prince Simon invited commercial intercourse by the improvement of the harbor of Joppa; the Palestinian Jews, however, being still restrained by the discouragement of their law and their early mercantile prejudices, appear not to have risen to any great degree of activity in trade; and Herod's improved port at Caesarea (Josephus, Ant. 15:9, 6) was mostly occupied by foreigners, while under the Romandominion traffic was encumbered by tolls and imposts, many commodities being even included in the list of government monopolies. Still Jewish love of gain prevailed wherever a favorable opportunity offered (Josephus, Life, p. 13), and laid claim to trading privileges (Josephus, War, 2:21, 2). Internal, especially retail trade (enactments relative to which are contained in Lev 19:36; Deu 25:13 sq.; comp. Hos 12:8), was particularly promoted by the high festivals, to which every adult Israelite resorted in pursuance of the national religion. In the cities open spaces at the gates were designated for the exposure of wares, and even Tyrian merchants frequented the market at Jerusalem (Neh 13:16; see Hartman, ad loc.;' comp. Zephaniah i,.10; Zec 14:2; and see Movers, Phonic. 1:50); ;a mart for sacrificial victims and sacred shekels being established in the outer court of the Temple itself (Joh 2:14 sq.; Mat 21:12). The Mishna contains notices of the early practice of beating down in price (Nedar. 3:1), and of shop-keepers (Maaseroth. 2:3). For the commerce of the Phoenicians, Egyptians (Isa 45:14), Babylonians (Nah 3:16), and Arabians, see those articles respectively. SEE COMMERCE.

In modern Oriental cities the retail trade is chiefly carried on in small shops, usually gathered -together in a particular quarter or street, like the stalls in an Occidental market. SEE BAZAAR.

## Merchants Lecture[[@Headword:Merchants Lecture]]

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

## Mercier (Or Le Mercier), Jean[[@Headword:Mercier (Or Le Mercier), Jean]]

             in Latin Mercerus, a distinguished Huguenot, was born in Uzes, France, near the beginning of the 16th century. Destined for the bar, he studied law in Avignon, and also in Toulouse. -But the dead languages having' a powerful attraction for him, he devoted much of his time to the study of Greek, and ere long confined himself entirely to the pursuit of Hebrew and' other Shemitic tongues. After having been the most noted pupil of Vatable, he became his successor, in 1546; to the chair of professor of Hebrew in the Royal College of France. Casaubon believed that Mercier was the most learned Hebraist of his day. When the second religious war broke out, Mercier was constrained to quit Paris. After the treaty of peace at Saint- Germain, he returned to France, but while passing through his native city he was carried away by the pestilence. He died a Protestant in 1562. Mercier-published almost the whole of Jonathan's Targum on the Prophecies. He also wrote in Latin valuable commentaries on all the books of the Old Testament, and on the Gospel according to Matthew. His commentaries furnished matter to the Synopsis Criticorum of Utrecht (1634). He is also the author of Tractatulus de accentibus Jobi, Proverbiorum, et Psalmorum, auctore R. Juda, jilio Betham Hispano, a translation from Hebrew (Paris, 1556, 4to):-Liber de accentibus Scripturce, auctore R. Juda, filio Balaam (Paris, 1565, 4to):-In Decalogum commentarius Rabbini A braham, cognomento JBen-Ezra, interpr. J. Mercero (-Lyons, 1568, 4r,) ,- Notae in Thesaurum Linguce  Sanctce Pagnizi (Lyons, 1575-95, fol.) -Observationes ad Horcepollinis hieroglyphica (Strasburg, 1595, 4to). He also published a Commentary on the Canticles and Lectures on Genesis. See Haag, La France Protestante.

## Mercier, Barthelemi[[@Headword:Mercier, Barthelemi]]

             a learned French ecclesiastic and bibliographer, was born at Lyons April 4,1734. At the age of fifteen he became a novice among the regular prebendaries of the collegiate church of Saint-Genevieve, in Paris, and after one year of probation he was allowed to take the vow. Immediately thereafter he was sent to the Abbey of Chatrices, in Champagne, and there studied rhetoric and philosophy. In 1754 he was made assistant to the learned Perigre, librarian of Saint-Genevieve, and in 1760 was appointed his successor. Four years later Mercier was invested with the abbotship of Saint-Leger, which was then vacant, at Soissons. In 1772, in consequence of some trouble which he had with his associates, he resigned his functions as an abbot. Being thus liberated from official duties, he travelled through Holland and the Netherlands, where he was in hopes of collecting the materials necessary for the compilation of certain works on which he was engaged. Although he had yet published only the Supplement to the history of printing by Marchand he was warmly greeted wherever he went. In 1792 he was appointed a member of the so-called Monument Commission. In this capacity he exerted himself to rescue from destruction all private and public collections of art and literature. He also drew up for the use of librarians minute instructions touching the books intrusted to their custody, and a method for classifying them. Towards the latter part of his life Francois de Neufchateau, a clergyman and a fosterer of letters, granted him a pension of 2400 francs, the first annual installment of which was paid to him in 1798. - This assistance enabled Mercier to decline the generous offer of La Serna Santander, who had proposed to relinquish in favor of Mercier his own office of librarian at Brussels. He died in 1799. His writings are characterized by an evidence of profound erudition, together with system and perspicuity in all his researches. He published a large number of works, among which we may cite, Lettres sur la Bibliographie instructive de M. Debure (Paris, 1763, 8vo):Lettre sur le veritable auteur du Testament politique du Cardinal de Richelieu (Paris, 1765, 8vo; all of which were extracted from the memoires de Treveux):-Consultation sur la  question de savoir si les religieux de Sainlt-Genevieve sont onu ne sont pas Chanoines Reguliers (new ed. Paris, 1772, 4to).:-Opinion sur de pretendues propheties qu'on applique aux evenements presents (Paris, 1791):-Dissertations sur l'auteur de l'Imitation de Jesus-Christ, par l'abbe Ghesquiere (1775, 12mo). See Notice sur la vie etles ecrits de Mercier de Saint-Leger, by Chardon de la Rochette.

## Mercier, Christopher[[@Headword:Mercier, Christopher]]

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

## Mercurianus, Father[[@Headword:Mercurianus, Father]]

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

## Mercurius[[@Headword:Mercurius]]

             (the Roman name of the god Mercury, the Hermes of the Greeks, ῾Ερμῆς, Act 14:12; comp. Rom 16:14; the name is of uncertain etymology), properly, a Greek deity, whom the Romans identified with their god of commerce and bargains. In the Greek mythology Hermes was the son of Zeus and Maia, the daughter of Atlas, and is constantly represented as the companion of his father in his wanderings upon earth. On one of these occasions they were travelling in Phrygia, and were refused hospitality by all save Baucis and Philemon, the two aged peasants of whom Ovid tells the charming episode in his Metam. 8:620-724, which appears to have formed part of the folk-lore of Asia Minor. SEE LYCAONIA.

Mercury was the herald of the gods (Homer, Od. v. 28; Hym. in Herm. 3), and of Zeus (Od. 1:38, 84; Il. 24:333; 461), the eloquent orator (Od. 1:86; Horace, Od. 1:10, 1), inventor of letters, music, and the arts. He was equally characterized by-adroitness of action -and readiness of speech, being the representative of intelligence and craft among men (see Pauly's Real-Encyklop. 4:1842). He was usually-represented as a slender, beardless youth ,but in an older Pelasgic figure he was bearded. The fact that he was the customary attendant of Jupiter when he appeared on earth (Ovid, Fast. v. 495; comp. Metam. 2:731 sq.), explains why the inhabitants of Lystra (Act 14:12), as soon as they were disposed to believe that the gods had visited them in the likeness of men, discovered Hermes in Paul, as the chief speaker, and as the attendant of Jupiter (see Kuinol,  Comment. ad loc.). It seems unnecessary to be curious whether the representations of Mercury in ancient statues accord with the supposed personal appearance of Paul (see Walch, Diss. ad Acta Ap. 3:183 sq.), and especially in the matter of the beard of the latter, for all known representations of the god differ in much more important particulars from the probable costume of Paul (e.g. in the absence of any garment at all, or in the use of the short chlamys merely; in the caduceus, the petasus,. etc. (see Muller, Ancient Art, § 379381). It is more reasonable to suppose that those who expected to see the gods mixing in the affairs of this lower world, in human form, would not look for much more than the outward semblance of ordinary men.

## Mercurius (2)[[@Headword:Mercurius (2)]]

             SEE HERMES TRISMEGISTUS.

## Mercy[[@Headword:Mercy]]

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

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

Mercy is an essential attribute of Jehovah, for the knowledge of which we are indebted wholly to revelation. By the propitiatory sacrifice of our Divine Redeemer a way is opened for the exercise of mercy and grace towards the human family perfectly honorable to the attributes and government of God. He appears a just God and a Saviour: “He is just, and yet he justifieth him that believeth in Jesus.” Thus the plan of salvation by Jesus Christ provides for the exercise of infinite mercy, consistently with the most rigid demands of truth and righteousness; so that, under this gracious dispensation, “mercy and truth” are said to “have met together,” and “righteousness and peace have kissed each other” (Gen 19:19; Exo 20:6; Exo 34:6-7; Psa 85:10; Psa 86:15-16; Psa 103:17; Luk 18:13; Rom 9:15-18; Heb 4:16; Heb 8:12). The expression “I will have mercy, and not sacrifice” (Hos 6:6; Mat 9:13), signifies, as the connection indicates, that God is pleased with the-exercise of mercy rather than with the offering of sacrifices, though sin has made the latter necessary (1Sa 15:22; Mic 6:6-8). SEE ATONEMENT.

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

## Mercy, Sisters Of[[@Headword:Mercy, Sisters Of]]

             SEE SISTERS OF MERCY.

## Mercy, Wilhelm [[@Headword:Mercy, Wilhelm ]]

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

## Mercy-Seat[[@Headword:Mercy-Seat]]

             (כִּפֹּרֶת, kappo'reth, a covering, i.e. lid of a vessel, spoken only of the top of the sacred ark; ‘Sept. and, New Test. ἱλαστήριον, Vulg, propitiatorium), the cover of the box or ark containing the tables of the Sinaitic law, and overspread by the cherubim, between which appeared the shekinah, or visible radiant symbol of the divine presenite; it is properly represented as a plank of acacia overlaid with gold, for it was not probably a solid plate or sheet of the purest gold (Exo 25:17 sq.; Exo 30:6; Exo 31:7, etc.). Hence the holy of holies is sometimes called the “house of the mercy- seat” (1Ch 28:11, Heb.). Josephus simply calls it a lid (ἐπίθεμα, Ant. 3:6, 5); but the versions have all regarded the term as indicative of propitiation (as if from the Piel of כָּפִר, and the same view appears to be taken by the New-Testament writers, who compare it with the throne of grace in heaven, access to which has been opened by the blood of Christ (Heb 9:5; Rom 3:24). SEE ARK. Comp. 1Ch 28:11, where the holy of holies is called the הִכִּפֹּרֶת בֵּית, “house of the mercy-seat.” “It was that whereon the blood of the yearly atonement was sprinkled by the high-priest; and in this relation it is doubtful whether the sense of the word in the Hebrews is based on the material fact of its ‘ covering' the ark, or from this notion of its reference to the ‘covering' (i.e. atonement of sin. SEE ATONEMENT. But in any case the notion of a ‘seat,' as conveyed by the name in English, seems superfluous and likely to mislead. Jehovah is indeed spoken of as ‘dwelling' and even as ‘sitting' (Psa 80:1; Psa 99:1) between the cherubim, but undoubtedly his seat in this conception would not be on the same level as that on which they stood (Exo 25:18), and an enthronement in the glory above it must be supposed. The idea with which it is connected is not merely that of ‘mercy,' but of formal atonement made for the breach of the covenant (Lev 16:14), which the ark contained in its material vehicle-the two tables of stone. The communications made to Moses are represented as made ‘from the mercy- seat that was upon the ark of the testimony' (Num 7:89; comp. Exo 25:22; Exo 30:6); a sublime illustration of the moral relation and responsibility into which the people were by covenant regarded as brought before God” (Smith). It is not without significance that the mercy-seat was above the ark and below the symbols of the divine presence and attributes, as if to foreshadow the supersedence of the law of ordinances contained in the ark by the free grace of the Gospel. See Pratenius, De Judcea arca  (Upsal. -1727); Werner, De Propitiatoria (Giessen, 1695). SEE SHEKINAH.

## Mered[[@Headword:Mered]]

             (Hebrews id., מֶרֶד, rebellion, as in Jos 22:22; Sept. Μωράδ and Μωρήδ,Vulg. Mered), a person named as the second son of Ezra (or Ezer), of the tribe of Judah (1Ch 4:17). SEE EZRAH. Great confusion prevails in the account of his lineage and family. and indeed in the whole chapter in question. 1Ch 4:17, after mentioning the four sons of Ezra, immediately adds, “and she bore Miriam,” etc.; where the Sept., by an evident gloss, attributes these children to Jethro, the first named of Ezra's sons; the Vulg. has genuit, referring them to Ezra as additional sons, in defiance of the text וִתִּהִר, which is undoubtedly feminine; while Luther renders this word as a proper name, Thahar, equally at variance with the text, which joins the following word by the accus. Particle אֵת, a construction that does not here allow the resolution by the rendering with. In 1Ch 4:18 we find several sons attributed to “his wife Jehudijah,” and the statement added, “And these are the sons of Bithiah, the daughter of Pharaoh, which Mered took:” the Sept., Vulg., and Luth. follow the Heb., which yields no intelligible connection. 1Ch 4:19 : “And the sons of hiswife Hodiah, the sister of Naham, the father of Keilah the Garmite, and Eshtemoa the Maachathite ;” where, however, the Hebrews text would be more naturally rendered “the, sons of the wife of Hodijah,” בְּנֵי אֵשֶׁת הוֹדַיָּה, the form אֵשֶׁתbeing rarely absolute (see Nordheimer's Hebrews Gamm. § 604); the Sept. renders: “And the sons of the wife of his Jewish sister [υἱοὶ γυναικὸς τῆς Ι᾿ουδαίας ἀδελφῆς] were Nachem, and Danra the father of Keeila, and Someion the father of Joriam. And the sons of Naem, the father of Keeila, were Garmi and Jesthemoe, Machatha” [various readings, “of the Idumaean sister” (or “of Odia the sister”) of Nachain, the father of Keeila, were Garmi (others “Hotarmi” or “Hogarmi”) and Eshthaimon, Nochathi]; the Vulg. and Luther are like the Heb., except the ambiguous renderings, “Et filii uxoris Odajae,” “Die Kinder des Weibes Hodija.” The Syr. and Arab. omit 1Ch 4:17-18 (Davidson's Revis. of the Hebrews Text, ad loc.). The corruption of the text is evident. We suggest a conjectural restoration by transposing the latter part of 1Ch 4:18 to the middle of 1Ch 4:17, and the whole of 1Ch 4:19 to the end of 1Ch 4:17; these simple changes will supply the manifest incongruities as follows: “And the sons of Ezra [or Ezer] were Jether, and  Mered, and Epher, and Jalon. And these are the sons of Bithiah (the daughter of Pharaoh), whom Mered [first] married; she bore Miriam, and Shammai, and Ishbah (founder of Eshtemoa): and the sons of his [second] wife Hodijah (the sister of Naham, father [founder] of Keilah the Garinite [? strong city] and of Eshtemoa the Maachathite)-this Jewish wife bore Jered (founder of Gedor), and Heber (founder of Socho), and Jekuthiel (founder of Zanoah).” This essentially agrees with Bertheau's rectification of the passage (Erkldr. ad loc.), adopted by Keil (Comment. ad loc.).

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

Mered's wife Bithiah “is enumerated by the rabbins among the nine who entered Paradise (Hottinger, Smegma Orientale, p. 515), and in the Targum of R. Joseph on Chronicles she is said to have been a proselyte. In the same Targum we find it stated that Caleb, the son of Jephunneh, was called Mered because he withstood or rebelled against (מְרִד) the counsel of the spies, a tradition also recorded by Jarchi. But another and very curious tradition is preserved in the Quaestiones in libr. Paral., attributed to Jerome. According to this Ezra was Amram; his sons Jether and Mered were Aaron and Mos'es; Epher was Eldad, and Jalon Medad. The tradition goes on to say that Moses, after receiving the law in the desert, enjoined  his father to put away his mother because she was his aunt, being the daughter of Levi: that Amram did so, married again, and begat Eldad and Medad. Bithiah, the daughter of Pharaoh, is said, on the same authority, to have been ‘taken' by Moses, because she forsook idols, and was converted to the worship of the true God. The origin of all this seems to have been the occurrence of the name ‘Miriam' in 1Ch 4:17, which was referred to Miriam the sister of Moses. Rabbi D. Kimchi would put the first clause of 1Ch 4:18 in a parenthesis. He makes Bithiah the daughter of Pharaoh the first wife of Mered, and mother of Miriam, Shammai, and Ishbah; Jehudijah, or ‘the Jewess,' being his second wife.”

## Meredith, C. G[[@Headword:Meredith, C. G]]

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

## Meredith, Thomas[[@Headword:Meredith, Thomas]]

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

## Meredith, William C., D.D[[@Headword:Meredith, William C., D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was rector of Tillotson Parish, Curdsville,Va., for many years, until 1861, when he became rector of Christ Church in Winchester, and remained in this pastorate until his death, November 1, 1875. See Prot. Episc. Almanac. 1876, page 150.

## Meremoth[[@Headword:Meremoth]]

             (Heb. Meremoth', מְרֵמוֹת, exaltations), the name of two men at the close of the captivity.

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

2. (Sept. Μαριμώθ, Vulg. Marimuth.) An Israelite of the “sons” (? inhabitants) of Bani, who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (Ezr 10:36). BC. 459.

## Mererius[[@Headword:Mererius]]

             a French prelate, flourished in the latter half of the 6th century as bishop of Angouleme. He was originally count of Angouleme. At that period of history the civil government differed so little from the ecclesiastical that, without any change of habits or alteration of moral life, the appellation of count was not unfrequently exchanged for that of bishop, in order to transmit to a son, or perhaps a nephew, the title thus relinquished. In this way the prerogatives of both titles were retained in the same family. But it was considered an abuse of authority to have any one person inveeted with the combined privileges and distinctions of a count and of a bishop. The count Mererius was canonically settled in the see of Angouleme by St. Germain, bishop of Paris, and St. Euphrone, archbishop of Tours, with the consent of king Charibert. Nantin, the nephew of Mererius, inherited the immunities and possessions attached to the title of count. This occurred. about 570. After seven years of episcopacy Mererius was poisoned by Frontonius, who seized the bishop's mitre, and was apparently recognised without opposition as the bishop of Angouleme. It is worthy of notice that  in those troublesome times it was not uncommon through such crimes to reach the highest offices. The authors of L'Histoire Litteraire and the Gallia Christiana have fancied the identity of Mererius, bishop of Angonlnme, with one Maracharius, who, according to Fortunatus, attended the dedication of the church at Nantes in 568 but father Lecointe would rather believe that this Maracharius Romacharius was the bishop of Coutances, Yet neither the bishop of Coutances nor the bishop of Angouleme was a fellow provincial of the bishop of Nantes. It is much more likely that the Maracharius mentioned by Fortunatus is the same with Maclianus, bishop of Vannes, who died probably in 577. It is said that some writings by Mererius were deposited in the library of Cluni, but they seem to have been lost.

## Meres[[@Headword:Meres]]

             (Hebrews id., מֶרֶס, from the Sanscrit meresh, worthy, according to Beinfey, p. 200; Sept. Μέρες, but most copies omit; Vulg. Mares), one of the seven satraps or viziers of Xerxes (Est 1:14). BC. 483.

## Mergilet, Andreas[[@Headword:Mergilet, Andreas]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born December 17, 1559, anti died March 21, 1606, at Muhlfeld. He is the author of, Biblidia, etc. : — Sententiae Insignes Patrum Ecclesiae: — Papa Homo Peccati. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:368; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Meri, Francois[[@Headword:Meri, Francois]]

             a French Benedictine monk, was born at Vierzon in 1675. He died Oct. 18,17231 in the Abbey of Saint-Martin de Magai, province of Berry. Merin published a work entitled Discussion critique et theologique des Reniarques de M. sur le dictionnaire de Moreri, under the nom de plume M.' Thomas-(1720). He has sometimes been mistaken for Dom Philippe Billouet, his contemporary, who never published any work.

## Meria-pujah[[@Headword:Meria-pujah]]

             an annual festival among the Khonds in Orissa, in which human sacrifices were offered until the practice was forbidden by the British government. The victims are called merias, and consist of Hindis procured by purchase in the plains by the Panwas, a class of Hindu servitors. The design of this barbarous ceremony was to propitiate Bura-Pennou (q.v.), their earth-god, and thus to secure a favorable harvest.

## Meriadec, St[[@Headword:Meriadec, St]]

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

## Merian, Hans Bernhard[[@Headword:Merian, Hans Bernhard]]

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

## Merib-Baal[[@Headword:Merib-Baal]]

             (Hebrews Merib'-Ba'al, מְרַיב בִּעִל, contender with Baal, 1Ch 8:34; Sept. Μεριβαάλ v.r. Μεφριβαάλ,Vulg. Meribaal; also in the contracted form Meri'-Ba'al מְרַי בִעִל, 1Ch 9:40; Sept. Μεριβαάλ v r. .Μεχριβαάλ,Vulg. Meribaal, the son of Jonathan, elsewhere called MEPHIBOSHETH (2Sa 4:4, etc.), apparently from an unwillingness to pronounce the idolatrous name of Baal. SEE ISHBOSHETH.

## Meribah[[@Headword:Meribah]]

             (Hebrews Meribah', מְרַיבָה, quarrel, or “strife,” as in Gen 13:8; Num 27:14), the designation of two places, each marked by a spring.

1. (Sept. λοιδόρησις; Vulg. joins with the preceding name in one, tentatio, Exo 17:7; but in Psa 81:8, λοιδορία, contradictio.) The latter of the two names given by Moses to the fountain in the desert of Sin, on the western gulf of the Red Sea, which issued from the rock which he smote by the divine command, the other equivalent name being MASSAH; and the reason is assigned, “because of the chiding of the children of Israel, and because they did there tempt the Lord” (Exo 17:1-7). This spot is only named once again by this title (Psa 82:8). The general locality is designated by the name REPHIDIM (Psa 82:1; Psa 82:8). SEE EXODE.

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

2. (Sept. ἀντιλογαί, in Num 20:13; Num 27:14; Deu 32:51; λοιδορία in Num 20:24; Vulg. contradictio; but in Psa 95:8, πειρασμός, tentatio, AuthVers. “provocation;” and in Eze 47:19, Μαριμώθ; 48:28, Βαριμώθ-in which last two passages, as well as in Psa 106:32, the AuthVers. has “ strife.”) Another fountain produced in the same manner, and under similar circumstances, in the desert of Zin (Wady Arabah), near Kadesh; to which the name was given with a similar reference to the previous misconduct of the Israelites (Num 20:13; Num 20:24; Deu 33:8). In the last text, which is the only one where the two places are mentioned together, the former is called Massah only, to prevent the confusion of-the two Meribahs, “Whom thou didst prove at Massah, and with whom thou didst strive at the waters of Meribah.” Indeed, this latter Meribah is almost always indicated by the addition of “waters,” as if further to distinguish it from the other  (Num 20:13; Num 20:24; Deu 33:8; Psa 81:8; Psa 106:32; Eze 47:19; Eze 48:28), a title that is but once applied to the other Meribah (Psa 81:8); and the locality we are now considering is still more distinctly called “waters of Meribah in Kadesh” (Num 27:14), and even Meribah of Kadesh (AV. “Meribah-Kadesh,” Deu 32:51). Only once is this place called simply Meribah (Psa 95:8). It is strange that, with all this carefulness of distinction in Scripture, the two places should rarely have been properly discriminated. Indeed many commentators have regarded the one as a mere duplicate of the other, owing to a mixture of earlier and later legend. The above monkish tradition has contributed to confound the two localities. But, besides the differences already noted, there was this very important one, that in smiting the rock at the second place Moses himself exhibited impatience with the multitude (Num 20:10-12); whereas he showed no signs of passion on the former occasion. SEE MOSES. The distance of place from the former Meribah, the distance of time, and the difference of the people in a new generation, are circumstances which, when the positive conditions of the two wells were so equal, explain why Moses might give the same name to two places. SEE KADESH.

## Merici, Angela[[@Headword:Merici, Angela]]

             foundress of the Order of Ursulines, was born at Desenzano, on the lake of Guarda, in 1511. Her family name was De Brescia. She was brought up by her uncle, and at an early age entered the Order of St. Francis. She made a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, and after her return established at Brescia, in 1537, a new order of nuns, of which she was appointed superior. Angela Merici died March 21,1540. Her order was so successful that at the end of a century after its organization it counted in France alone over three hundred and fifty convents. See Helyot, Hist. des ordres monastiques,  4:150; D'Emillianne, Hist. des ordres monustiques, p. 247-249; Moreri, Dict. hist. s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Bioy. Generale, 2:638. SEE URSULINES.

## Meridian[[@Headword:Meridian]]

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

## Merino, John Anton Diaz[[@Headword:Merino, John Anton Diaz]]

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

## Merit[[@Headword:Merit]]

             signifies desert, or that which is earned.; originally the word was applied to soldiers and other military persons, who, by their labors in the field, and by the various hardships they underwent during the course of a campaign, as also by other services they might occasionally render to the commonwealth, were said, mserere stipendio, to merit, or earn their pay; which they might properly be said to do, because they yielded in real service an equivalent to the state for the stipend they received, which was therefore due to them in justice. Here, then. we come at the true meaning of the word merit; from which it is very clearly to be seen that, in a theological sense, there can be no such thing as merit in our best obedience. One man may merit of another, but all mankind together cannot merit from the hand of God. This evidently appears, if we consider the  imperfections of all our services, and-the express declaration of the divine Word (Eph 2:8-9; Rom 11:5-6; Tit 3:5; Rom 10:1; Rom 10:4). The scholastic distinction between merit of congruity and merit of condignity is thus stated by Hobbes (Of Man, pt. i, ch. iv): “ God Almighty having promised Paradise to those that can walk through this world according to the limits and precepts prescribed by him, they say he that shall so walk shall merit Paradise ex congruo. -But because no man can demand a right to it by his own righteousness, or any other power in himself, but by the free grace of God only, they say no man can merit Paradise ex condigno.” SEE MERITUM. See South's Sermons, The Doctrine of Merit stated, vol. iii, ser. 1; Toplady's Works, 3:471; Hervey's Eleven Letters. to Wesley; Robinson's Claude, 2:218. SEE ALSO WORKS.

## Merits Of Christ[[@Headword:Merits Of Christ]]

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

## Merits Of Saints[[@Headword:Merits Of Saints]]

             SEE SUPEREROGATION.

## Meritum De Condigno, Or De Congruto[[@Headword:Meritum De Condigno, Or De Congruto]]

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

1. According to the substance of the work itself, in so far as proceeding from beings endowed with free will, it is an effect of their free volition.

2. As proceeding in a measure from the grace of the Holy Spirit. Under the last aspect, being, in fact, an effect of the divine grace in man, it is meritorium vitae aeternae ex condigno. While considered as a result of free will, the immense disproportion between the creature and the supernatural communicated grace prevents there being any condignitas, any absolute desert, bhut only a congruitas, propter quandam sequalitatem proportionis.  For it appears suitable that “ut homini operanti secundum suam virtutem Deus recompenset secundum excellentiam suce virtutis.” From this Thomas Aquinas concludes:

1. That no one but Christ can gain by meritum condigni any primam gratiam for another.

2. That, on the contrary, it is possible to all as regards meritum congrui, since “ secundum amicitime proportionem Deus implet hominis voluntatem in salvatione alterius.” The conclusion, which opens wide the door to the practice of supererogatory works, is consequently this, that “fides aliorum valet alii ad salutem merito congrui, non condigni.” Duns Scotus goes even further in this Pelagian direction, and asserts that man can, de congruo, prepare (disponere) himself for the reception of the grace offered him. By Protestants this distinction is of course rejected, as well as the whole doctrine of good works. ‘The Apol. Conf: (ii. 63) declares that this scholastic distinction is but a screen for Pelagianism: “Nam si Deus necessario dat gratiam pro merito congrui, jam non est meritum congrui, sed condigni;” elsewhere (iii. 127) it opposes to it the following arguments:

1. That this doctrine tends to diminish the mediatorial character of Christ; quiperpetuo est mediator, non tantum in principio justificationis.

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

## Merlat, Elie[[@Headword:Merlat, Elie]]

             a French theologian, was born at Saintes in March, 1634, and was educated at Saumur and Mont-auban; he afterwards visited Switzerland, Holland. and England, and in 1658 secured a position as minister at the church of All Saints. In 1678 he presided over the provincial synod at Jonzac. His reply to Reversement de la Morale d'Arnauld brought upon him the displeasure of the government in 1679; he was sent to prison, and in 1680 the Parliament of Guienne banished him from the country. Merlat escaped to Lausanne, where he was appointed professor of theology. He  died there Nov. 18, 1705. His most celebrated works are, Response generale au livre de M. Arnauld: Le Reversement de la Morale de Jesus Christ (Saumur, 1672, 12mo):Le noyen de discerner les esprits; this sermon was directed towards the visionaries, -and created great disturbance: Le vai et le faux Pielisme (Lausanne, 1700, 12mo).

## Merle Daubigne, Jean Henri, D.D.[[@Headword:Merle Daubigne, Jean Henri, D.D.]]

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

Jean Henri was educated in the Academy, or, as it is more commonly called, the University of Geneva. Determined to enter the ministry, he inaugurated his theological course at his alma mater. While engaged in his studies, under the leadership of a faculty decidedly rationalistic in tendency, he fell in with the Haldanes, and was led to dedicate himself to Christ as a faithful and devoted servant. In his' own account of his conversion, Dr. d'Aubigne states that his professor of divinity disbelieved the doctrine of the Trinity, and that, instead of the Bible, “St. Seneca and St. Plato were the two saints whose writings he held up for admiration.” The pupil followed the master throughout. He was chairman of a meeting of students who protested most vehemently, in a public document, against “ the odious aggression” of a pamphlet entitled” “Considerations upon the Divinity of Jesus Christ,” by Henri Empeytaz, which was addressed to them, and had  produced a great excitement. “But Soon,” he continues, “I met Robert Haldane, and heard him read from-an English Bible a chapter from Romans about the natural corruption of many doctrine of which I had never before heard. In fact, I was quite astonished to hear of man being corrupt by nature. I remember saying to Mr. Haldane, ‘Now I see that doctrine in the Bible.' ‘Yes,' he replied; ‘but do you see it in your heart?' That was but a simple question, yet-it came home to my conscience. It was the Sword of the Spirit; and from that time I saw that my heart was corrupted, and knew from the Word of God that I can be saved by grace alone. So that, if Geneva gave something to Scotland at the time of the Reformation-if she communicated light to John Knox Geneva has received something from Scotland in return in the blessed exertions of Robert Haldane.” SEE HALDANE; SEE MALAN.

Upon the completion of his theological course at Geneva, Merle d'Aubignd went abroad and studied at the universities of Leipsic and Berlin. In the last-named place he attended the lectures of the “ father of modern Church history,” Neander. On his way to Berlin he had passed through Eisenach, and visited the castle of Wartburg, made famous by Luther's sojourn. It was in this spot that he first conceived the purpose of writing the “ History of the Reformation.” His stay at Berlin and association with the immortal Neander, only confirmed the purpose, and he rested not until the work was in the possession of the world. In 1817 he was ordained to preach, and became the pastor of an interesting French Protestant Church at Hamburg., There he labored diligently for his people and his God for some five years, when he was invited to Brussels, by the late king himself, as pastor of a newly-formed French conglegation. He rapidly rose in favor and distinction, and enjoyed the position of president of the Consistory of the French and German Protestant churches of the Belgian capital. :In 1830, the revolution delivering the country from Protestant rule and Dutch authority, all persons friendly to the king of Holland were regarded as enemies of the Belgians, and Merle d'Aubigne, fearing for his life, determined to return to his native country. The pious “Switzers” were actively canvassing at this time for the establishment of an independent theological school a training place for the ministry of the orthodox churches. His arrival gave a new impetus to the project, and resulted in the formation of the “ Evangelical Society” in 1831, and the founding of the long-desired seminary. Merle was appointed professor of Church history, and intrusted with the. management of the school, a position which he  continued to hold for the remainder of his life, adorning it by his piety, learning, and eloquence, and sanctified by the divine blessing upon his ever-memorable labors. His associates in the school were Gaussen, celebrated as the author of a work on “Inspiration,” Pilet, and La Harpe. Though possessed of an ample fortune, Dr. Merle d'Aubigne lived a life of laborious activity. At seventy-eight he was still vigorous, and went to bed on Sunday night, October 20, after partaking of the sacrament, and subsequent devotions. with no sense of pain or illness. Like Dr. Chalmers, whom in some points he may be said to have resembled, he was found to have died quietly in his room at night, and to have been some hours dead before his family knew their loss. His death occurred on Oct. 21,1872, at Geneva. Upon his country's loss, the Christian Intelligencer (Oct. 24, 1872) thus comments in a beautifully-written obituary of our subject: “Not since the impressive death-scene of John Calvin, which took place 308 years ago, has Geneva been called to mourn over the loss of a more illustrious citizen and minister of the Lord Jesus Christ. The Free Church, of which he was founder, pastor, professor which differs from the Established Church in having no connection with the State government partakes largely of the nature of Calvinistic Methodism. But the man himself was broader and greater than any sect. His beautiful tribute to the memory of Calvin is his own most appropriate epitaph: ‘He was not a Genevan; he was not a Swiss; he was of the City of God.”' Henry Baylies, in a short report of “An Evening with D'Aubigne” (Zion's Herald, Nov. 14,1872), has furnished a description of Merle's appearance of late years: “D'Aubigne stood, I should say, full six feet, rather more than less; was large, but not corpulent. His face was long, not full, and smooth, I think. His iron-gray locks were combed back, exposing a high forehead; his eyebrows were heavy and black. His features and expression were somewhat severe, and marked, as if he had inherited the spirit and fought the battles of the old Scotch Covenanters. He conversed in English with tolerable readiness. His health was then feeble, but he was hopeful of improvement.”

Merle d'Aubigne as an Author. — The duties incumbent upon a professor of theology are so varied, especially at Geneva, where the influences, as in most large European cities, are decidedly rationalistic, that the manner in which D'Aubigne discharged his duty towards his pupils was of itself sufficient to entitle him to the very highest regards on the part of all followers of Jesus the Christ. The task, however, which D'Aubigne had set  for himself at Eisenach, the writing of a history of the great Reformation, was the one that mainly occupied him; and while a most devoted pastor and a truly laborious professor, he yet found time for the completion of a work that has immortalized the name of its author. His Histoire de la Reformation au Seizieme Siecle (Paris, 1835-53, 5 vols. 8vo) ‘gained for him literally a world-wide reputation. His warm, devotional manner made him singularly popular as a preacher and speaker, and threw a charmover his hearers; His vigorous Protestantism, and his belief in the special providential mission of the evangelical forms of Protestant Christianity, made his history almost a manifesto of Protestantism. His style is brilliant, and generally. clear, and, as was said of him by one of. the most eminent of the English reviewers, “ He wrote for time, and his writings will endure for eternity.” The sale of this work was immense. More than 200,000 copies were sold in France alone; while the English translation has circulated in more than 300,000 copies in Great Britain and the United States. In Germany also the work proved an immense success.

But while the fascinations of its style, as well as the transcendent interest and importance of its matter, captivated the people, there are many scholars who ‘have taken exception to his “one-sidedness,” and have declared it uncritical and unscholarly. One of the latest writers on the subject, Prof. Fisher, of Yale, ‘actually ignores D'Aubigne as an authority, and refuses to place him by the side of such men as Gieseler and Ranke. This we think a great injustice to D'Aubigne. We do not ourselves believe that he has done anything more than popularize the great Protestant story; but to ignore him who may be said to have been virtually the first to write the history of the Reformation is a shortcoming to be regretted. See Preface to Fisher, The Reformation (N. Y. 1873, 8vo); and compare Baird, D'Aubigne and his Writings, with a Sketch of the Life of the Author (NY. 1846, 12mo), p. 20. Says the writer in the Christian Intelligencer, whom we have already had occasion to quote: “It is impossible to estimate the far-reaching influence of this work in reproducing the characters, scenes, and struggles of the Reformation times, and in its strong hold upon the popular mind. We are well aware of the critical ordeal which it has passed through among the scholars of Europe, and that its scientific value is not rated so high as that of histories written for learned men. But as a book for the people it has no rival, either in its immense circulation, or in its acknowledged power in behalf of the great principles of the Protestant Reformation. The work is, moreover, the bright and best reflection of its gifted author's genius, learning, and grace. Brilliant in style, picturesque in description,  sententious, fill of striking thoughts and powerful word-painting, it also glows with his profound love for the dear old faith, and with burning zeal against the corruptions and iniquities of the great apostasy of Rome. In no other book in our language do Luther and Erasmus, Melancthon, Farel, Calvin, Tetzel, and Dr. Eck, the great emperor and the greater elector, Leo X, and other characters, so live and move, and act in all their personal traits and historical deeds.”

In 1862 he supplemented his great work by the publication of The History of the Reformation in Europe in the Time of Calvin, the fourth volume of which was published in 1868. The other works of M. d'Aubigne, although less widely celebrated, are in their way scarcely inferior to his greatly-renowned production. They are: Le Lutheranismne et la Reforme (Paris, 1844):-Le Protecteur, ou -la Republique d'Angleterre aux Jours de Cromwell (ibid. 1848, 8vo): rendered into English, and largely circulated under the title, “The Protector, or the English Republic in the Days of Cromwell,” a thoughtful and admirably written review of the rule of the Puritan dictator. It is based upon Carlyle's famous monogram on the Protector, and was expressly designed as an exhibit of that “Protestantism which in Cromwell's mind was far above his own person” Germany, England, and Scotland, or Recollections of a Swiss Minister (London, 1848, 8vo), a work that showed great powers of observation and clearness of expression:-Three Centuries of Struggling in Scotland, or Two Kings and Two Kingdoms (Paris, 1850, 18mo): a brief if we may so style it in which are presented the main features of the Scottish Reformation: L'Ancien. et le Ministre (1856):-and Character of the Reformer and the Reformation of Geneva (1862, 8vo). M. Merle d'Aubigne has also contributed largely to periodical publications, the most noted of his papers being a series on the Archives of Christianity. See, besides the writers already quoted, La France Protestante, ou vies des Protestants Francais (1853); Charles de Remusat, Melanges de Litterature et Philosophie; Vapereau, Dict. des Contemporains, sv.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Genrale, s.v.; Brit. and For. Evang. Revelation 1843, 101 sq.; New-Englander, 4:344; Harper's Magazine, 1872, Nov. (J. H W.)

## Merle, Matthieu[[@Headword:Merle, Matthieu]]

             a noted Huguenot soldier, was born at Uzis, Languedoc, in 1548. He was not, as De Thou represents, the son of a wool-carder, nor did he follow in his youth the trade of wool-carding. He belonged to a noble but poor family of Lower Languedoc, did not receive any school education,, and  never learned either to read or to write. Having a decided liking for war and the profession of arms, Merle, at the age of twenty; enlisted in a guard commanded by D'Acier, who subsequently became the duke of Uzes. As a member of that guard, Merle went through the campaign of 1569 in Poitou. After the pacifiction in 1570. he entered the service of Francois de Pevre, a gentleman of the horse, who intrusted him with the supervision” of his castle in Gdnaudau. Shortly after the massacre of St. Bartholomew, hostilities having been kindled afresh, Merle inflicted the bloodiest retaliation upon the Romanists, and by his deeds of valor and prowess became so redoubtable that the mere mention of his name was sufficient to cause far and near the direst consternation among his enemies. He died about 1590. Goudin, in his Memores, published a brief sketch of Merle, and his career as a soldier. See De Thou, Historia sui temporis; M. Imberais, Hist. des guerres religieuses en Auvergne; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Geneale, s.v.

## Merlin, Charles[[@Headword:Merlin, Charles]]

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

## Merlin, Jacques (1)[[@Headword:Merlin, Jacques (1)]]

             a French theologian, was born n Saint-Victurnin, Limousin, about the latter part of the 15th century. After having received his diploma as a doctor of theology at Navarre (1499), he became lecturer on divinity to the chapter of Saint-Etienne de Limoges. Subsequently he was ordained curate of Montmartre, near Paris. In 1525 he was appointed chief penitentiary of the cathedral of Notre-Dame, of which he had previously been resident canon.  In 1527, king Francis I caused his arrest and incarceration for preaching against certain courtiers who were suspected of sympathy with the reform movement. He was cast into the dungeon of the Louvre. At the entreaties of the prebendaries of Paris he was liberated, after having suffered incarceration ‘for two years, but even then was confined in his residence at Nantes. He was allowed, however, to return to Paris in 1530, when he was installed grand-vicar' to the bishop of Paris, and also curate and archpriest of La Madeleine. In the introduction to the edition of Origen's works, which he published in 1511, he wrote an Apologie d'Origene. This apology, wherein, for the first time, the errors imputed to Origen are justified, caused Merlin's condemnation by the Paris Faculty of Theology, and by the impetuous syndic Noel Beda. He likewise published a Collection de tous les Coriciles, the first ever issued from the press (Paris, 1524, fol.; Cologne, 1530, 8vo; and Paris, 1535, 8vo). He also edited the works of Richard de Saint-Victor. (Paris, 1518):-Pierre de Blois (Paris, 1519): — Durand de Saint-Poursain (1515),; and six Homelies en Franfais, surces paroles de l'Evangile: Missus est angelus Gabrniel (Paris, 1538, 8vo). Merlin died in Paris Sept. 26,1541, and was buried in the crypt of Notre-Dame. See Dupin, Aut. eccl. du seizime siecle, 4:545; Salmon, Trait de l'Etude des Conciles, p. 197, 474.

## Merlin, Jacques (2)[[@Headword:Merlin, Jacques (2)]]

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

## Merlin, Jean-Raymond[[@Headword:Merlin, Jean-Raymond]]

             (surnamed Monroy), a Protestant theologian, was,; born at Romans, France, about 1510. He was a professor of Hebrew at Lausanne, probably  from 1537 to 1558, when he resigned his position in order the better to protest against the removal from office of two of his colleagues, Pierre Viret and Jacob Valier, by act of-the Bernese government. He afterwards retired to Geneva, where he was pastor for three years. Called to Paris in 1561, at the instance of Coligny, he was intrusted -with a mission to La Rochelle, and attended the Conference at Poissy, where he took, however, only a secondary part. Jeanne d'Albret then invited -him to visit the Bearn, and engaged him to propagate the doctrines of the Reformation. He returned to Geneva about the middle of 1564. Shortly thereafter he came in conflict with the civil authorities, and, because of his decided opposition to civil interference in ecclesiastical affairs, was removed. Merlin then went into the Dauphine, from which the massacre of St. Bartholomew drove him away. He sought refuge in Geneva. He died about 1578. Merlin wrote a French -translation entitled Commentaires d'OEcolampade sur Job. et Daniel (Geneva, 1561, 8vo). He also published Catechisme extiait decelui de Geneve, pour examiner. ceux qu'on veut recevoir .' la C ane, avec la translation en langue Bearnoise ‘(Limoges, s. d. 8vo):Les dix Commandements de la loi de Dieu, translates d'Hebreu en Franfais, et exposes avec six autres translations (Geneva, 1561, 8vo). See Marchand, Dict. Historique.; Haag, La France Protestante.

## Merlin, Pierre[[@Headword:Merlin, Pierre]]

             a French Protestant theologian, the son of Jean-Raymond, was born about 1535.' After having been a disciple of Theodore de Beza, according to De Thou, he became religious adviser to the prince de Conde. D'Aubigne, however, maintains that he was a minister of the Gospel under admiral de'Chatillon. The latter version is the likelier of the two. Certain it is that he was with admiral de Chatillon during the St. Bartholomew massacre. Through a fortunate circumstance he escaped the slaughter and fled to Geneva, where he formed the acquaintance of J. J. Scaliger. In process of time, however, he returned to France, and then became the pastor in ordinary of a nobleman named Laval, residing at Vitre. He was highly esteemed by his co-religionists, and presided at the general synods held respectively at Sainte-Foi, in 1578, and at Vitre, in 1583. As a delegate from the churches in Brittany, he also attended the Synod of Saumur in 1596. Pierre de L'Estoile relates that the impetuous Covenanter, Jean Boucher, in a sermon preached in July, 1591, represented that Merlin was really the father of Henry of Navarre (Henry IV). From this singular fabrication likewise sprang the other story that he had clandestinely married  Jeanne d'Albret, the queen of Navarre, and that the celebrated D'Aubigne was the issue from that union. Prosper Marchand, in his Dictionnaire, took great pains to refute all these allegations made by the Covenanters,' or opposers of Henry IV. Merlin died about 1603. He wrote: Vingt Sermons sur le livre d'Esther (La Rochelle, 1591, 8vo; Geneva, 1594, 8vo):-Job Commentariis illustratus (Geneva, 1599, 18mo): Sainctes Prikre s recueillies de plusieur passages de. ‘Ancien et. du Nouveau Testament (Geneva, 1609, 8vo):-Discours theologiques de la tranquillite et vrai repos de l'ame (Geneva, 8vo). See Haag, La France Protestante.-Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale,. S. V.

## Mero[[@Headword:Mero]]

             SEE MEROTH

## Merodach[[@Headword:Merodach]]

             (Hebrews Merodak', מְרֹדִךְ, apparently a syncopated form of מְראֹדִךְ; Sept. Μαιρωδάχ v. r. Μεωδάχ and Μαιωδάχ; Vulg. Merodach) occurs in Jer 50:2, in such connection with idols as to leave no doubt that it is the name of a Babylonian god. In conformity with the general character of Babylonian idolatry, Merodach is supposed to be the name of a planet; and, as one of the Tsabian and Arabic names for Mars is Mirrich, “arrow” (the latter of which Gesenius thinks may be for Mirdich, which is very nearly. the same as Merodach), there is some presumption that it may be Mars, but in other respects he more closely resembles Jupiter. As for etymologies of the word, Hitzig has suggested (Comment. on Isa 39:1) that it is the Persian mardak, the diminutive of mard, “man,” used as a term of endearment; but more probably it is from the Persian and Indo- Germanic mord, or mort (which' means death, and is so far in harmony with the conception of Mars, as the lesser star of evil omen), and the affix och, which is found in many Assyrian names, as Nisroch, etc. (Gesenius, Thes. Hebrews p. 818). The bloody rites with which Mars was worshipped by the ancient Arabs are described in Norberg's Onomast. Codicis Nasar. p. 107. Of the worship of this idol by, the Assyrians and Babylonians, besides the passages in Isa 39:1; Jeremiah 1, 2, we have testimony in the proper names of the kings of Assyria and Babylonia, which are often compounded with this name, as Evil-Merodach, and Merodach-Baladan, who is also called BerodachBaladan (see Gesenius, Comment. zu Jesa. 1:281). In the above passage of Jeremiah, “Bel and Merodach are coupled  together, and threatened with destruction in the fall of Babylon. It has commonly been concluded from this passage that Bel and Merodach were separate gods; but from the Assyrian and Babylonian inscriptions it appears that this was not exactly the case. Merodach was really identical with the famous Babylonian Bel or Belus, the word being probably at first a mere epithet of the god, which by degrees superseded ‘his proper appellation. Still a certain distinction appears to have been maintained between the names. The golden image in the great temple at Babylon seems to have been worshipped distinctly as Bel rather than Merodach, while other idols of the god may have represented him as Merodach rather than Bel. It is not known what the word Merodach means, or what the special aspect of the god was, when worshipped under that title. In a general way Bel- Merodach may be said to correspond to the Greek Jupiter. He is the old man of the gods; ‘the judge,' and as the gates of heaven under his especial charge. Nebuchadnezzar calls him ‘the great lord, the senior of the gods, the most ancient, and Neriglissar ‘the first-born of the gods, the ‘layer-up of treasures.' In the earlier period of Babylonian history ‘he seems to share with several other deities (as Nebo, Nergal, Bel-Nimrod, Anu, etc.) the worship of the people, but in the later times he is regarded as the source of all power and blessings, and thus concentrates in his own person the greater part of that homage and respect which had previously been divided anong the various gods of the Pantheon.” See Rawlinson, Herodotus, 1:267 sq.; Ancient Monarchies, 1:169.

## Merodach-Baladan[[@Headword:Merodach-Baladan]]

             (Hebrews Merodak'-Baladan', מְראֹדִךְ בִּלְאֲדָן, Mars [or Jupiter] is his lord, SEE MERODACH; Bohen less well compares the Persian mardak balaudaun, honored man; Sept. Μαρωδὰχ Βαλαδάν v. r. Μαιωδὰχ Α᾿λαδάν,Vulg. Merodach Baladan), a king of Babylonia, the son of Baladan, and contemporary of Hezekiah (BC. 711), with whom he cherished friendly relations (Isa 39:1; 2Ki 20:12; 2Ch 32:31; in two of which passages the name is written BERODACH-BALADAN, by an interchange of letters). He is unquestionably the Mardokempad (Μαδοκέμπαδος) of Ptolemy's Canon (comp. Ewald, Isr. Gesch. 3:344), who reigned at Babylon for twelve years, BC. 721-709. Josephus (Ant. 10:2, 2) calls him simply Baladas (Βαλάδας), apparently identifying his name with that of his father. He is usually identified (Gesenius, Comment. on Isaiah ad loc.) with the  Merodach-Baladan mentioned by Berosus (in Eusebius, Chron. Armen. 1:42, ed. Aucher) as a viceroy of the king of Assyria, who rebelled and seized the kingdom of Babylon for himself (see Knobel, Comment. on Isaiah p. 282); but this person is probably one who fell in a part of the two years' interregnum some years later (BC. 702-699), since he is said to have been slain by Elibus (the Belibus of Ptolemy's Canon) after a reign of only six months (see Hitzig, Comment. on Isaiah p. 450). Merodach Baladan is mentioned in the Assyrian inscriptions at Khorsabad, deciphered by Dr. Hincks and Colossians Rawlinson, according to which he was conquered by Sennacherib in the first year of the latter's reign. Merodach Baladan is there called king of Kar-Duniyas, a city and country frequently mentioned in the Assyrian inscriptions, and comprising the southernmost part of Mesopotamia, near the confluence of the Tigris and Euphrates, together with the districts watered by these two rivers, to the borders of Susiana.

This king, with the help of his Susianian allies, had recently recovered Babylon, from which Sargon, Sennacherib's father, had expelled him in the twelfth year of his reign. The battle seems to have been fought considerably to the north of that city. The result was that Semnacherib totally defeated Merodach-Baladan, who fled to save his life, leaving behind him all his military equipments. In the cuneiform annals of the fourth year of Sennacherib's reign, Merodach-Baladan is further mentioned as having escaped to an island, where himself and all his family were finally captured by Sennacherib (Layard's Nineveh and Babylon,.p. 140, 145). The dates of these notices would seem to identify the Merodach-Baladan of the monuments with the temporary usurper of the same name alluded to by Berosus, rather than with the one of Scripture; possibly future investigations may show that they were all three identical, as also the Mardokempadus of the Canon, since the records of the inscriptions appear to speak of an occupancy of Babylon by him at two distinct periods, the first during the reign of Sargon (being probably that referred to in the Scriptures and the Canon), and the second for a shorter space and after a considerable interval, in the first of Sennacherib (being that alluded to by Berosus). A different but analogous solution of the above difficulty is to suppose two kings of the same name at the two periods in question. SEE HEZEKIAH

“Putting all our notices together, it becomes apparent that Merodach- Baladan was the head of the popular party, which resisted the Assyrian monarchs, and strove to maintain the independence of the country. It is  uncertain whether he was self-raised or was the son of a former king. In the second book of Kings be is styled ‘the son of Baladan;' but the inscriptions call him ‘the son of Yagin;' whence it is to be presumed that Baladan was a more remote ancestor. Yagin, the real father of Merodach- Baladan, is possibly represented in Ptolemy's Canon by the name Jugeuss- which in some copies replaces the name Elulaeus, as the appellation of the immediate predecessor of Merodach-Baladan. At any rate, from the time of Sargon, Merodach Baladan and his family were the champions of Babylonian independence, and fought with spirit the losing battle of their country. The king of whom we are here treating sustained two contests with the power of Assyria, was twice defeated, and twice compelled to fly his country. His sons, supported by the king of Elam, or Susiana, continued the struggle, and are found among the adversaries of Esar Haddon, Sennacherib's son and successor. His grandsons contended against Asshur- bani-pal, the son of EsarHaddon. It is not till the fourth generation that the family seems to become extinct, and the Babylonians, having no champion to maintain their cause, contentedly acquiesce in the yoke of the stranger. The increasing power of Assyria was at this period causing alarm to her neighbors, and the circumstances of the time were such as would tend to draw Judaea and Babylonia together, and to give rise to negotiation's between them. The astronomical marvel, whatever it was, which accompanied the recovery of Hezekiah, would doubtless have attracted the attention of the Babylonians; but it was probably rather the pretext than the motive for the formal embassy which the Chaldaean king despatched to Jerusalem on the occasion. The real object of the mission was most likely to effect a league between Babylon, Judaea, and Egypt (Isa 20:5-6), in order to check the growing power of the Assyrians. Hezekiah's exhibition of ‘all his precious things' (2Ki 20:13) would thus have been, not a mere display, but a mode of satisfying the Babylonian ambassadors of his ability to support the expenses of a war. The league, however, though designed, does not seem to have taken effect. Sargon, acquainted probably with the intentions of his adversaries, anticipated them. He sent expeditions both into Syria and Babylonia-seized the stronghold of Ashdod in the one, and completely defeated Merodach- Baladan in the other. That monarch sought safety in flight, and lived for eight years in exile. At last he found an opportunity to return. In BC. 703 or 7.02 Babylonia was plunged in anarchy-the Assyrian yoke was thrown off, and various native leaders struggled for the mastery. Under these circumstances the exiled monarch seems to have returned, and recovered  his throne. His adversary, Sargon, was dead or dying, and a new and untried prince was about to rule over the Assyrians. He might hope that the reins of government would be held by a weaker hand, and that he might stand his ground against the son, though he had been forced to yield to the father. In this hope, however, he was disappointed. Sennacherib had scarcely established himself on the throne when he proceeded to engage his people in wars, and it seems that his very first step was to invade the kingdom of Babylon. Merodach-Baladan had obtained a body of troops from his ally, the king of Susiana; but Sennacherib defeated the combined army in a pitched battle; after which he ravaged the entire country, destroying 79 walled cities and 820 towns and villages, and carrying vast numbers of the people into captivity. Merodach-Baladan fled to ‘the islands at the mouth of the Euphrates' (Fox Talbot's Assyrian Texts, p. 1)-tracts probably now joined to the continent-and succeeded in eluding the search which the Assyrians made for him. If we may believe Polyhistor, however, this escape availed him little. That writer relates ‘(ap. Euseb. Chron. Son 1:5) that he was soon after put to death by Elibus, or Belibus, the viceroy whom Sennacherib appointed to represent him at Babylon. At any rate, he lost his recovered crown after wearing it for about six months, and spent the remainder of his days in exile and obscurity.”' SEE BABYLONIA.

## Merode, Francois Xavier Marie Frederic Ghislain De[[@Headword:Merode, Francois Xavier Marie Frederic Ghislain De]]

             a Roman Catholic prelate, was born at Brussels in March, 1820. He was descended from a noble Spanish family, and entered the Belgian army in 1841, serving with distinction as a volunteer in Algeria under marshal Bugeaud. He began the study of theology at Rome in 1848, and took  priest's orders in 1850. He was then appointed chamberlain to the pope and canon of St. Peter's, and in 1860 was made minister of military affairs. He resigned this office in 1865, in consequence of a disagreement with cardinal Antonelli, but was appointed archbishop of Melitene, June 22, 1866, and private almoner to the pope. He opposed the dogma of papal infallibility in 1869, but in 1870 accepted the decision of the Vatican Council. He died at Rome, July 24, 1874. His wealth was largely devoted to the founding of charitable institutions, to the improvement of the streets and squares in Rome, and to archaeological excavations.

## Meroe[[@Headword:Meroe]]

             SEE SEBA.

## Merom[[@Headword:Merom]]

             (Hebrews Merom', מֵרוֹם,height; Sept. Μερώμ), a lake (מִיַם, “waters”) among the hills (hence the name, Burckhardt, Trav. 2:553) of northern Palestine, whose shores were the scene of the great victory of the Hebrews over the northern Canaanites (Jos 11:5-7); doubtless the same with that through which the Jordan flows three miles from its source, called by Josephus Samechonitis (Σαμοχωνῖτις or Σεμεχωνῖτις, Ant. v. 5, 1; War, 3:10, 7; 4:1, 1). In his account of the battle (Ant. v. 1. 18), the confederate kings encamp “ near Beroth, a city of upper Galilee, not far from Kedes ;” nor is there any mention of water. In the Onomasticon of Eusebius the name is given as “Merran” (Μερράν), and it is stated to be “a village twelve miles distant from Sebaste'(Samaria), and near Dothaim.” Abulfeda (Tab. Syr. p. 155) calls it the Sea of Banias, but its usual modern name is Bakrat el-Hlekh (Burckhardt, Trav. 1:87). It was visited by Lieut. Lynch  (Expedition, p. 471), and is most fully described by Thomson (in the Bibliotheca Sacra, 1846,p. 185; see also 1843, p. 12, and map; 1854, p. 56; Robinson's Res. new ed. p. 395; comp. Reland, Palaest. p. 261 sq.; Hamelsveld, 1:482 sq. Schwarz, Palaest. p. 47). As regards the modern name of Huleh, by which the native inhabitants of the district commonly designate the lake, there are some grounds for tracing it also to a very ancient source. Josephus (Ant. 15:10, 3) speaks of Herod as having obtained from Caesar the territory of a troublesome prince named Zenodorus-a territory that lay between Trachon and Galilee, and which “contained Ulatha (Οὐλάθαν) and Paneas.” The country so described is the very region in which Lake Meromis situated; and Οὐλάθα has every appearance. of being the Greek form of Huleh. It is also conjectured that this Ulatha of Josephus and Huleh of modern times may derive their common origin from a period so remote as that of Hul, the son of Aram, mentioned in the book of Genesis (Gen 10:23), a personage whom Josephus calls ῎Ουλος (Ant. 1:6, 4). Hence, not improbably, the name (see Ritter, Palest. und Syr. 2:234; Stanley, Sin. and Pal. p. 283). The word, both in Hebrew and Arabic, seems to have the force of depression-the low land (see Michaelis, Suppl. Nos. 687,720); and Michaelis most ingeniously suggests that it is the root of the name Κοιλησυρία, although in its present form it may have been sufficiently modified to transform it into an intelligible Greek word (Spicilegium, 2:137,138). The name Samechonitis may perhaps he derived from the. Arabic root samak, “to be high,” and would thus be identical in meaning with the Hebrew Merom (Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 1276; Reland, Palaest. p. 262). Perhaps the phrase מי מרוםmight be rendered “the upper waters;” that is, the upper lake or collection of waters formed by the river Jordan (see Reland, p. 262). Several other explanations of the Greek name as found in Josephus have been given:

1. It is derived from the Chaldee סמק, “red,” because of the ruddy color of its water.

2. From סב,ִ “a thorn,” because its shores abound with thorn-bushes (Lightfoot, Opp, 2:172). 3. From the Arabic samk, “ a fish” (Reland, p. 262). These explanations appear to be all too fanciful (Stanley, Sin. and Pal. p. 383, note). Josephus mentions a city called Meroth (Μηρώθ or Μηρώ, Life, p. 37; War, 2:20, 6), which Ritter connects with the Hebrews name of the lake (Pal. und Syr. 2:235).  This interesting lake-Merom, Samechonitis, or Hileh lies embedded in the midst of one of the finest scenes in Palestine. The Ard el-Huleh, the centre of which the lake occupies, is a nearly level plain of sixteen miles in length, from north-to south; and its breadth, from east to west, is from seven to eight miles. On the west it is walled in by the steep and lofty range of the hills of Kedesh-Naphtali; on the east it is bounded by the lower and more gradually ascending slopes of Bashan; on the north it is shut in by a line of hills hummocky and irregular in shape, and of no great height, and stretching across from the mountains of Naphtali to the roots of Mount Hermon, which towers up, at the north-eastern angle of the plain, to a height' of 10,000 feet. At its southern extremity the plain is similarly traversed by elevated and broken ground, through which, by deep and narrow clefts, the Jordan, after passing through Lake Huleh, makes its rapid descent to the Sea of Galilee, the level of which is from 600 to 700 feet lower than that of the waters of Merom (Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 181). This noble landscape, when seen, for the first time and suddenly, from the lofty brow of the mountains of Naphtali, can never fail to excite the liveliest admiration: the intense greenness, so unusual in Palestine, of the abundantly-watered plain — the bright blue lake reflecting from its bosom the yet brighter and bluer sky-the singularly-picturesque ranges-of the surrounding hills; and, rising far above them all, the Jebel esh-Sheikb, the monarch of the mountains, the mighty Hermon, dark and shaggy to its shoulders with the forests that clothe its sides, and with its double summit covered with perpetual snow. The lake itself in form is not far from a triangle, the base being at the north and the apex at the south; and, though lo exact measurement of it seems ever to have been made, it is about four and a half miles in length by about three miles in breadth. According to Josephus (War, 4:1, 1) it is sixty stadia long and thirty wide, and full of fish (Burckhardt, Trav. 2:554). Robinson states (Researches, 3:339 sq.) that its size varies somewhat according to the season, being when he saw it (in summer) about two miles long, but in the northern part bounded by an extensive marsh, which explains the length sometimes assigned of eight or ten miles (Seetzen, in Zach's Monatl. Corresp. 18:344).

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

## Meron[[@Headword:Meron]]

             SEE SHIMRON-MERON.

## Meron, PHILIPPE VAN[[@Headword:Meron, PHILIPPE VAN]]

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

## Meronoth[[@Headword:Meronoth]]

             SEE MERONOTHITE.

## Meronoth (2)[[@Headword:Meronoth (2)]]

             It has been suggested (Memoirs to the Ordnance Survey, 3:314) that this may be represented by Khar bet Marrina, a ruined site seven miles north of Hebron.

## Meronothite[[@Headword:Meronothite]]

             (Hebrews Meronothi', מֵרֹנֹתַי, gentile from מֵרֹנוֹת. Meronoth', signif. uncertain, a place elsewhere unknown; Sept. ἐκ Μεραθών or Μαραθών, Μηρωνωθύτης,Vulg. Meronothites), an epithet applied to Jehdeiah, the herdsman of the royal asses in the time of David and Solomon (1Ch 27:30), and also to Jadon, one of those who repaired the walls of Jerusalem (Neh 3:7); apparently as being natives of some town called MERONOTH, of the position or existence of which no other notice is extant, but from the latter passage it may be conjectured to have lain not far from Gibeon and Mizpah, and appears to have been inhabited after the captivity.

## Merorim[[@Headword:Merorim]]

             SEE BITTER (HERBS).

## Meroth[[@Headword:Meroth]]

             (Μηρώθ) or Mero (Μηρώ), a fortified town of Galilee (Josephus, War, 2:20, 6; Life, p. 37), probably the Meiron (מירון) of the Talmud (Reland,  Palaest. p. 817); now the village of Meiron, about 13 hours west-north- west of Safed; famous for Jewish pilgrimages to the tombs of their ancient rabbis (Wilsoi, Lands of the Bible, 2:311; Carmoly, Itin. p. 133, 260; Robinson, Researches, 3:334; Later Res. p. 73, 74; Schwarz, Palest. p. 70 note, 186; Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 334). SEE AERYTHA; SEE MEROM; SEE MEROZ.

## Meroz[[@Headword:Meroz]]

             (Hebrews Meroz', מֵרוֹז, perh., as suggested by Gesenius, for מֶארֵוֹז, from the Arabic, refuge; but Furst disapproves of this etymology; Sept. Μηρώζ, V ulg. terra Meroz), a place in the northern part of Palestine, the inhabitants of which were severely reprehended (Jdg 5:23) for not having taken the field with Barak against Sisera (comp. Jdg 21:8-10; 1Sa 11:7). It would seem as if they had had an opportunity of rendering some particular and important service to the public cause which they neglected (see Dr. Robinson's note in the Bib. Repos. 1831, p. 606). The tradition of its site was lost as early as the time of Procopius of Gaza, who had attempted in vain to recover it (Reland, Palaest. p. 896). Possibly the city was utterly destroyed in consequence of the curse. In the Jewish traditions preserved in the Commentary on the Song of Deborah attributed to Jerome, Meroz, which may be interpreted as secret,, is made to signify the. evil angels who led on the Canaanites, and are cursed by Michael, the angel of Jehovah, the leader of the Israelites. Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. s.v. Merrus) fix it twelve Roman miles from Sebaste, on the road to Dothaim; but this position would place it south of the field of battle, and therefore scarcely agrees with the history. Schwarz (Palest. p. 36) says it is mentioned in the Talmud under the name of Marchesheth or Maresheth, and locates it (ib. p. 168) at the village, of Murussus, two or three miles north or north-west of Bethshan, on the line of hills separating the basin of Tayibeh from the valley of Jezreel (Robinson's Researches, new ed. 3:339). The town must have commanded the Pass, and if any of Sisera's people attempted, as the Midianites did when routed by Gideon, to escape in that direction, its inhabitants might no doubt have prevented their doing so, and have slaughtered them. Furst (Lex. s.v.) suggests that it was a locality in a district of Galilee partly inhabited-by Gentiles (1Ki 9:11), not far from Kedesh-Naphtali, and consequently in the neighborhood of the Lake Merom, perhaps the locality (reading מֵרוֹם, high place) which gave name to the lake itself. Wilson (Lands of the Bible, 2:89) identifies it  with the Kefr-Mesr, on the southern slope of Mount Tabor, and this Van de Velde approves (Memoir, p. 334). Thomson thinks it may be the present Meiron, a famous Jewish cemetery six miles west of Safed; this would be between Barak's residence and Tabor (Jdg 4:12), and therefore render the inhabitants liable to a summons to arms by the Hebrew general (Land and Book, 1:424). This last place is possibly the Meroth, strongly fortified by Josephus (Life, p. 37; War, 2:20, 6; 3:3, 1).

## Meroz (2)[[@Headword:Meroz (2)]]

             Tristram (Bible Places, page 230) identifies this site with that of Murussas, about four miles northwest of Bethshan, remarking that "it would command the passage from the plain of Jezreel to the Jordan;" but there do not seem to be any traces of antiquity there (Memoirs to the Ordnance Survey, 2:85).

## Merriam, Edwin Elisha[[@Headword:Merriam, Edwin Elisha]]

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

## Merriam, W. W[[@Headword:Merriam, W. W]]

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

## Merrick (or Meryek), Rowland[[@Headword:Merrick (or Meryek), Rowland]]

             an English prelate of the 16th century, was born at Bodingan, Anglesea, was educated at Oxford, where he became principal of New Inn Hall, and  afterwards a dignitary in the Church of St. David's, and here he and others, in the reign of Edward VI, violently prosecuted Robert Farrar, his diocesan, and prevailed so far that the latter was imprisoned (see Fox, Acts and Monuments, an. 1555). Dr. Merrick was consecrated bishop of Bangor, December 21, 1559, and died January 24, 1566. See Fuller, Worthies of England (ed. Nuttall), 3:509.

## Merrick, James[[@Headword:Merrick, James]]

             an English divine, noted for his theological and, especially, for his poetical productions, called by Lowth “one of the best of men and most eminent of scholars,” was born Jan. 8,1720, and was educated at Trinity College, Oxford. He became a “ probation fellow” at his alma mater in 1744, took holy orders shortly after, and became noted for his philanthropic labors. Owing to infirm health he never undertook the task of supplying the pulpit. He died Jan. 5, 1769. When yet a mere boy at school at Reading, Merrick published a poetical production that deserves to be placed among the classical writings of the English. His chief works are, A Dissertation on Proverbs, ch. ix (Lond. 1744, 8vo): Prayers for a Time of Earthquakes and Violent Floods, written in 1756, soon after the earthquake at Lisbon:- Annotations, Critical and Grammatical, on the Gospel of St. John  (Reading, 1764, 8vo; 2d pt. 1767, 8vo) :-Annotations on the Psalms (ibid. 1767, 8vo; 1768 4to), of which only part were his own; archbishop Seeker, bishop Lowth, and Kennicott were contributors: -An Encouragement to a Good Life, particularly addressed to soldiers quartered at Reading, among whom he labored much for the good of the Christian cause. Indeed, he appears to have paid great attention to this class of men, who at that time especially required it. He also wrote Poems on Sacred Subjects, and made an excellent Translation of the Psalms into English Verse. This, beyond all doubt the best poetical translation in English, was unfortunately not adapted for parochial choirs, inasmuch as it was divided into stanzas for music. This work is not perhaps as generally known as its merits-would justify. He published several other minor religious treatises. See Orme, Bibliotheca Biblica, p. 313; Allibone,- Dict. Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; English Cyclop. s.v.; Holland, Psalmists of Great Britain, 2:210 sq.

## Merrick, James Lyman[[@Headword:Merrick, James Lyman]]

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

## Merrick, John Austin, D.D[[@Headword:Merrick, John Austin, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was a missionary in 1853, in Fort Ripley, Minnesota; in 1857 he was rector in Paris, Kentucky, being pastor of St. Peter's Church, and professor of Oriental and Biblical literature in Shelby College. In 1865 he became rector of St. Luke's Church, Hastings, Minnesota; in 1866 was president of the Sewanee Mission and Training School, in Winchester, Tennessee. The next year he went to San Jose, California, as a missionary. The year following he was a professor in St. Augustine College, Benicia. In 1870 he was officiating in Martinez; in 1872 he removed to West Farms, N.Y., where he resided without charge until his death, July 16, 1877, aged fifty years. See Prot. Episc. Almanac, 1878, page 169.

## Merriken, Joseph[[@Headword:Merriken, Joseph]]

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

## Merrill, Daniel[[@Headword:Merrill, Daniel]]

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

## Merrill, David[[@Headword:Merrill, David]]

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

## Merrill, Franklin[[@Headword:Merrill, Franklin]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in 1819. He was educated at Princeton College, studied divinity at the Princeton Theological Seminary, ald was ordained pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Hempstead, Long Island, N. Y., in 1848. In 1853 he accepted a call to the Presbyterian Church of Stillwater, NY., and in 1858 to the Reformed Dutch Church of Schuylerville, NY., where he died, March 31, 1861. Mr. Merrill was an earnest and instructive preacher, and possessed the high art of impressing  the message of God with peculiar directness and pungency. See Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1862, p. 206.

## Merrill, Joseph A[[@Headword:Merrill, Joseph A]]

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

## Merrill, Thomas Abbott, D.D.[[@Headword:Merrill, Thomas Abbott, D.D.]]

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

## Merritt, Timothy[[@Headword:Merritt, Timothy]]

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

## Merriwether, John T[[@Headword:Merriwether, John T]]

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

## Merseburg, Menahem[[@Headword:Merseburg, Menahem]]

             SEE MENAHEM OF MERSEBURG

.

## Mersennus (Fr., Mersenne), Marin[[@Headword:Mersennus (Fr., Mersenne), Marin]]

             a. very learned French ecclesiastic and philosopher, was born in 1588 at Oyse, in the present department of Maine. He received his education at the College of La Fleche, where he was a fellow-student of Des Cartes, and with him he formed an intimacy, which a similarity of pursuits ripened into  a friendship dissolved only by death. He also studied at the University of Paris, and subsequently at the Sorbonne. In 1612 he took the vows at the Minimes, in the neighborhood of Paris. In the year following entering the priesthood, :he deemed it incumbent on him to study the Hebrew language, and addressed himself to the accomplishment of this task. In 1615 he filled the chair of philosophy at Nevers, and there taught till the year 1619, when he was chosen superior of the convent, and, on completing the term of his office, he travelled in Germany, Italy, and the Netherlands. He finally settled in Paris, where his gentle temper and polite and engaging manners procured him a number of distinguished friends. Of these the chief was the founder of the Cartesian philosophy, who entertained the highest opinion of his abilities, and consulted him upon all occasions. It has been stated - though the story seems highly improbable that Des Cartes, by the advice of Mersenne, at once changed his intention of founding his system on the principle of a vacuum, and adopted that of a plenum. The discovery of the cycloid has been ascribed to him and also to Des Cartes, but it now seems pretty clear that to neither are we indebted for the first notice of this curve. Mersenne died at Paris in 1648.

Pere Mersenne was undoubtedly a man of great learning and unwearied research, and deserved the esteem. in which he was held by the philosophers and literati of his age; but, except his Harmonie Universelle, his works are now unread and almost unknown. If by some he was overrated, by others he has been undervalued; and when Voltaire mentioned him as “Le minime et tres minime Pere Mersenne,” he' indulged his wit at the expense of one with whose writings, it is to be suspected, he was very little acquainted. His eulogist, however, in the Dictionnaire Historique, admits that Mersennus very ingeniously converted the thoughts of others to his own use; and the abbe Le Vayer calls him “Le bon Larron” a skilful pilferer. Nevertheless, the work above named, L'Harmonie Universelle, contenant la Theorie et la Pratique de'la Musique (1637,2 vols. fol.), has proved of the utmost value to all later writers on the subject. The work was, in 1648, translated into Latin and enlarged by the author; but both the original and translation have now become as rare as they are curious. Another, but earlier production of his, La Verite des Sciences contre les Sceptiques (Paris, 1625), discusses at considerable length the nature of mathematical evidence, and concludes by maintaining that mental philosophy, jurisprudence, and all the arts and sciences, should be taught and illustrated through the aid of mathematics (liv. i, ch. 8, 10, 13, 14). “The mind itself,” he held, “is the real and effective source of all its powers and perceptions of abstract truth” (p.  193). See Hilarion de Coste, Vie du R. P. Marin de Mersenne; Niceron, Hommes illustres, vol. 32; Blakey, Hist. of the Philosophy of Mind, 2:423 sq. (J. H W.)

## Merton, Walter[[@Headword:Merton, Walter]]

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

## Meru Or Merus[[@Headword:Meru Or Merus]]

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

## Meruth[[@Headword:Meruth]]

             (Ε᾿μμερούθ, vulg. Emerus), put (1 Esdr. v. 24) for IMMER (Ezr 2:37).

## Merwan Ibe-Ganach[[@Headword:Merwan Ibe-Ganach]]

             SEE IBN-GANACH.

## Merwin, Samuel[[@Headword:Merwin, Samuel]]

             an early and eminent Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Durham, Conn., Sept. 13, 1777; was converted while young; entered the New York Conference in 1800; in 1803 was stationed at Montreal, Canada; in 1804 at New York; in 1806 at Boston; in 1807-8. at Newport, R. I.; in 1812-13 at Albany; in 1814 at Brooklyn; from 1815 to 1818 was presiding elder on New York District; in 1819 preached in New York; in 1820 in Albany;  from 1821 to 1823 was on the New Haven District; in 1824-5 at Baltimore; in 1826-7 at Philadelphia; in 1828-9 at Troy; in 1830-31 at New York; from 1832 to 1835 on the New York District; in 1836 at New York; in 1837-8 at Rhinebeck, NY., where he died, Jan. 13, 1839. Mr. Merwin was a man of great influence and usefulness in his whole public career. His ministerial and administrative talents were of the highest order. He possessed a mind of great richness and power, a vivid imagination, a commanding voice and person, and fervent piety; these, combined with the gift of utterance, made him one of the most eloquent men of his time; and the important stations which he filled in the New England, New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore Conferences, testify to the opinion of his brethren respecting his abilities.' In the presiding eldership his masterly judgment and influence over men made him conspicuous as a peace-maker and an organizer. Many souls were converted through his labors, and his memory in the church is blessed. See Minutes of Conferences 2:669; Sprague, Annals of American Pulpit, vol. 7:(GL.T.)

## Merz, Philipp Paul[[@Headword:Merz, Philipp Paul]]

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

## Mesa, Christobal De[[@Headword:Mesa, Christobal De]]

             a Spanish poet, was born at Zafra (Estramadura) in 1550. The little that is known of him is gathered from his own poetical compositions, and particularly his two epistles to the count de Lemos, together with that addressed to the count de Castro. From these productions it appears that in his youth Mesa was the pupil of Sanchez, the most eminent of Spanish philologists, and that he had also deeply studied both Fernand de Herrera  and Louis de Soto. In afterlife he spent some years in Italy, where he became intimately acquainted with the poet Tasso. He died, poor and obscure, about 1620. One of his poems is founded upon the tradition that the corpse of St. James, after his martyrdom in Jerusalem, was miraculously translated to Spain and deposited at Compostella, where from that day to this James has been honored as the patron saint of the realm. SEE JAMES.

Another of his poems treats of Pelagius and the struggles of the Christians against the Moors up to the battle of Covadonga.; His third poetical work relates the battle of Tolosa, which destroyed the power of the Mohammedans, and secured the emancipation of the Peninsula. He also wrote El Patron de Espaia (Madrid, 1611, 12mo). See Ticknor, History of Spanish Literature, 2:462; Hoefer, Nouv; Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Mesech[[@Headword:Mesech]]

             (Psa 120:5). SEE MESHECH.

## Mesengui, Francois Phillippe[[@Headword:Mesengui, Francois Phillippe]]

             a French ecclesiastic, celebrated for his connection with Jansenism, was born at Beauvais, in August, 1677. His parents being poor, friends defrayed the expenses of his education in the College of Beauvais and at the Seminary of Trente-Trois in Paris. After having been invested with the first minor orders, he became a professor of humanities in his native city. On his return to Paris in 1707, through the influence of his friends he was appointed superintendent of the department of rhetoric in the college at Beauvais. Coffin, who succeeded Rollin as the director of that institution, selected the abbe Mesengui for his coadjutor, and upon him devolved the duty of teaching the catechism to the students. The opposition, however, which he manifested to the papal bull known as Unigenitus constrained him in 1728 to resign his official functions. He subsequently became a member of the clergy at Saint-Etienne-du-Mont. Suspected of harboring the doctrines of Jansenism, he was in consequence prohibited from all ecclesiastical avocations, and confined to privacy and obscurity. He took up his residence in Paris, and devoted himself to the composition of various works designed for the propagation of the Jansenistic doctrines, which he finally adopted. He died in February, 1763, at Saint-Germain-enLaye. Mesengui published: Idee de la vie et de lesprit de N. Choart de Buzauval, eveque de Beauvais, avec un abrege de la vie de AM. Hermant (Paris, 1717, 12mo):Abrege de l'histoire et de la morale de I'Ancien Testament  (Paris, 1728, 12mo) :-Le Nouveau Testament, trad. en Francais, avec des notes litterales (Paris, 1729, 12mo; 1752, 3 vols. 12mo):-Vie des Saints pour tons les jours de l'annee (Paris, 1730, 6 vols. 12mo).-: Abrege de l'histoire de l'Ancien Testament, avec des eclaircissements et des reflexions (Paris, 1735-53, 10 vols. 12mo): -Abrige de l'histoire de ‘Ancien et du Nouveau Testament (Paris. 1737-38, 3 vols. 12mo): — Epitres et Evangiles, avec des reflexions (Paris, 1737; Lyons, 1810,12mo): -Exposition de la doctrine Chretienne, ou instructions sur les principales verites de la religion (Utrecht [Paris], 1744, 6 vols. 12mo; new edition, revised and enlarged, Paris, 1754-58, 4 vols. 12mo). Some writers state that the duke of Orleans endeavored to prevail upon Mesengui to expunge from his works such passages as reflected upon the religious controversies of his day; but Mesengui evidently turned a deaf ear to the duke's entreaties. A new edition of the last work, issued in Italy, was placed in the Index Expurgatorius by an apostolic brief from pope Clement XIII in 1761. In a posthumous Memoire, addressed to the cardinal Passionei, Mesengui attempted to justify his religious views. Among his other works may be mentioned, La Constitution Unigenitus, avec des Remarques (Paris, 1746, 12mo): Entretien de Theophile et d'Eugene sur la religion (ibid. 1760, 12mo). Mesengui took. part with Vigier and Coffin in the liturgical writings which' M. de Vintimille, archbishop of Paris, disseminated in his diocese. See Legneux, Memoire abrege sut la aie et les ouvrages de l'abb ie Mesengui (Paris, 1763, 8vo). .

## Mesenguy, Francois Philippe[[@Headword:Mesenguy, Francois Philippe]]

             an ascetic writer of France, was born at Beauvais, August 22, 1677. He was educated at Paris, and when the famous Rollin (q.v.) had charge of the college at Beauvais, Mesenguy was tutor there. Under Rollin's successor he became subprincipal of the college, but being opposed to the bull Unigenitus, had to resign. At last he retired to St. Germain-en-Laye, and died February 19, 1763. He published, Le Nouveau Testament Traduit en Franqais, Avec des. Notes Litterales (Paris, 1729, 1752, 3 volumes): — Vies des Saints (1730, 6 volumes; new ed. 1740, 2 volumes): — Abrege de l'Histoire et de la Morale (1728): — Abreg de. l'Histoire de l'Ancien Testament, etc. (1737-38, 3 volumes): — Missel de Paris (1738): — Le Processional de Paris (1739): — Expositions de la Doctrine Chretienne (1744, 6 volumes): — Exercises de Pidete (1760): — La Constitution Unigenitus (1748), etc. See Lequeux, Memoire de Feu M. 'Abbe Francois- Philippe Mesenguy, in Necrologe des Plus Celebres Defenseurs et Amis de. la Vite, 6:202-218; Picot, Memoires du Dix-luitieme Siecle, volume 4; Notice Historique sur les Rites de l'Eglise de Paris; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Mesha[[@Headword:Mesha]]

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

1. (Hebrews Mesha', מֵשָׁא, probably of Arabic origin; Sept. Μασσῆ, Vulg. Messq.) A place mentioned in describing the boundaries of that part of Arabia inhabited by the descendants of Joktan (Gen 10:30), where it is stated that “their dwelling was from Mesha even unto Sephar, (and beyond even unto) a mount of the east.” In this passage it has been assumed by. many that “the mountain of the east” (הִר הִקֶּדֶם) is not put by apposition in conjunction with Sephar, but is some third locality to which the boundary extends, as Saadias interprets; and, if so, it is doubtless none other than the chain running across the middle of Arabia from the region of Mecca and Medina as far as the Persian Gulf, now called Nesjd,  the highlands (see Jomard, Notice sur le pays de l'A rabie centale, Paris, 1823). Sephar would then be the modern Sephr, the chief city of the district Shehr in the province of Hadramant. SEE SEPHAR.

Bochart (Phaleg, 2:20) thinks that Mesha, from which the boundary extends, is the Musa or Muza (Μοῦσα, Ptol. 6:8; Μοῦζα, Arrian, Peripl.; Muza, Pliny, 6:23) spoken of as a maritime city on the western coast of Arabia, not far from Mocha, where Muzaa (Niebuhr, Arabien, p. 223; Janaen, Hist. Jemance, p. 286), or rather Mausi (Niebuhr, p. 224, 225; Mannert, Geogr. 6:1, p. 63), now stands. It was a town of note in classical times, but has since fallen into decay, if the modern Musa be the same place. The latter is situated in about 130 40' N. lat., 43° 20' E. long., and is near a mountain called the Three Sisters, or Jebel Musa, in the Admiralty Chart of the Red Sea, drawn from the surveys of captain Pullen, RN. But as neither of these Arabic names can well be compared with that of Mesha, it may be better (with J. D. Michaelis, Spicileg. ii, p. 214; Suppl. No. 1561) to understand Mesene or Meisan, situated among the mouths of the Tigris (in the Shat el- Arab) on the Persian Gulf- a place described by Philostogius (iii. 7; comp. Dion Cass. 68. 28.; Asseman. Bibl. Orient. 3:2, p. 430, 603; Abulfeda in Tab. Iracce ap. Michael. in Spicil. 1. c.; D'Anville, l'Euphrate et le Tigre, p. 135), the name perhaps signifying the river island, from its being enclosed by the. branches of the Tigris, as often alluded to by the Greek geographers (see Steph. Byz. s.v. Orathra and Messene; Pliny, v. 27,31; Cellar. Notit. ii, p. 749; D'Anville, p. 130, 131). The sacred writer would thus in his description begin with the eastern limits of the Joktanidse, and end with the western and northern, Sephar being sought between them. “But it is very doubtful whether the island, which has been formed by the deposits of the river, was in existence in the days of Moses; and it is still more doubtful whether such a spot could at that early period have attained to any political or geographical notoriety. Besides, it is not likely that an accurate writer would describe a purely Arabian territory as commencing on the east side of the Tigris.

The theory of Mr. Forster is much more probable than either of the preceding. He identifies Mesha with a mountain-range called Zames by Ptolemy (vi. 7), which commences near the Persian Gulf, and runs in a south-western direction nearly across the peninsula. It is an undoubted fact that the various Joktanitic tribes, or Beni- Kahtan, as they are called by Arab writers, are still found, and have been from the earliest period, in the wide region extending from Mount Zames to the Indian Ocean and Red Sea; and that this range separates them from the Ishmaelitish Arabs (Forster, Geography of Arabia, 1:95 sq.). Forster  further conjectures that the name Zames is radically identical with Mesha, the syllables being inverted, as is very common in Arabic words -thus Mesza= Mesha. The Zames range is now called by the general name of the ‘Nejd Mountains,' and the country extending thence to the Indian Ocean on the east, and the Red Sea in the south,. embraces the most fertile part of Arabia the classic Arabia Felix, now called Yemen (Ritter, Erdkunde, 12:708 sq.). The mountains of Nejd are famous for their pastures and for their horses, which are considered the best in — Arabia (Ritter, p. 918- 1035; Fresnel, Lettres sur la Geog. de l'Arabie, in Journ. Asiat. vol. “The position of the early Joktanitic colonists is clearly made out from the traces they have left in the ethnology, language, and monuments of Southeri Arabia; and, without putting too precise a limitation upon the possible situation of Mesba and Sephar, we may suppose that these places must have fallen within the south-western quarter of the peninsula; including the modern Yemen on the west, and the districts of Oman, Mahreh, Shihr, etc., as far as Hadramaut, on the east. These general boundaries are strengthened by the identification of Sephar with the port of Zafari, or Dhafari; though the site of Sephar may possibly be hereafter connected with the old Himyeritic metropolis in the Yemen, but this would not materially alter the question. In Sephar we believe we have the eastern limit of the early settlers, whether its site be the sea-port or the inland city; and the correctness of this supposition appears from the Biblical record, in which the migration is apparently from west to east, from the probable course taken by the immigrants, and from the greater importance of the known western settlements of the Joktanites, or those of Yemen.”

2. (Hebrews Meysha', מֵישָׁע, deliverance; Sept. Μαρισάς v. r. Μαρισά, Vulg. Mesa.) The eldest son of Caleb or Chelubai (brother of Jerahmeel and son of Hezron), and the father (founder) of Ziph, of the tribe of Judah (1Ch 2:42). BC. cir. 1618.

3. (Hebrews Meysha', מֵישָׁא, retreat; Sept. Μωσά v. r. Μισά, Vulg. Mosa.) One of the sons of Shaharaim of the tribe of Benjamin, by the latter of his two wives, Baara or Hodesh (1Ch 8:9). BC. cir. 1612. SEE SHAHARAIM.

4. (Hebrews Meysha', מֵישִׁע, deliverance; Sept. Μεσά v. r. Μωσά, Vulg. Mesa.) A king of Moab, who possessed an immense number of flocks and herds (2Ki 3:4). Probably the allegiance of Moab, with that of the tribes east of the Jordan, was transferred to the northern kingdom of Israel  upon the division of the monarchy, for there is no account of any subjugation of the country subsequent to the war of extermination with which it was visited by David, when Benaiah displayed his prowess (2Sa 23:20), and “ the Moabites became David's servants, bearers of gifts” (2Sa 8:2). When Ahab had fallen in battle at Ramoth Gilead, Mesha seized the opportunity afforded by the confusion consequent upon this disaster, and the feeble reign of Ahaziah, to shake off the yoke of Israel, and free himself from the burdensome tribute of a “hundred thousand lambs and a hundred thousand rams with their wool.”

These numbers may seem exaggerated if understood as the amount of yearly tribute. It is therefore more probable that the greedy and implacable Ahab had at some one time levied this enormous impost upon the Moabites; and it is likely that it was the apprehension of a recurrence of such ruinous exactions which incited the revolt (2Ki 1:1; 2Ki 3:5). The country east of the Jordan was rich in pasture for cattle (Num 22:1), the chief wealth of the Moabites consisted in their large flocks of sheep, and the king of this pastoral ‘people is described as noked (נוֹקֵד), “a sheepmaster,” or ownerof herds. About the signification of this word noked there is not much doubt, but its origin is obscure. It occurs but once besides in Amo 1:1, where the prophet Amos is described as “among the herdmen (נוֹקְדַים, nokedim) of Tekoah.” On this Kim-chi remarks that a herdsman was called noked, because most cattle have black or white spots (comp. נָקוֹד, nakod, Gen 30:32, AV. “speckled”), or, as Buxtorf explains it, because sheep are generally marked with certain signs so as to be known. But it is highly improbable that any such etymology should be correct, and Furst's conjecture that it is derived from an obsolete root, signifying to keep or feed cattle, is more likely to be true (Concord. s.v.). SEE HERD.

When, upon the death of Ahaziah, his brother Jehoram succeeded to the throne of Israel, one of his first acts was to secure the assistance of Jehoshaphat, his father's ally, in reducing the Moabites to their former condition of tributaries, The united armies of the two kings marched by a circuitous route round the Dead' Sea, and were joined by the forces of the king of Edom. SEE JEHORAM. The disordered soldier of Moab, eager only for spoil, were surprised by the warriors of Israel and their allies, and became an easy prey. In the panic which ensued they were slaughtered without mercy, their country was made a desert, and the king took refuge in his last stronghold and defended himself with the energy of despair. With  700 fighting men he made a vigorous attempt to cut his way through the beleaguering army, and, when beaten back, he withdrew to the wall of his city, and there, in sight of the allied host, offered his first-born son, his successor in the kingdom, as a burnt-offering to Chemosh, the ruthless fire- god of Moab.

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

The exploits of “Mesha, son [i.e. votary] of Chemosh, king of Moab,” are recorded in the Phoenician inscription lately discovered by M. Ganneau on a block of black basalt at Dibon in Moab (see Quarterly Statement, No, 5, of” The Palestine Exploration Fund,” Lond. 1870); which, according to the decipherment given by him in the Revue Archeologique (Jan. and June, 1870), is as below (see the Wesleyan. Magazine, April, 1870). Prof. Neubauer has published the text in modern Hebrew characters in Gratz's Monatschrift, and Prof. J. Derenbourg a translation in the Revue Israelite (April 8, 1870), substantially as below. See also the Church Gazette, N. Y. 1871, No. 6. Several other commentaries have been published upon it, especially by Dr. Deutsch of the British Museum. See also Noldeke, Inschrift des Mesa (Kiel, 1870); Schlottman, Siegessaule Mesa's (Halle, 1870); De Costa, The Moabite Stone (NY. 1871). The fullest exhibit,  together with the literature of the subject, is that of Dr. Ginsburg (2d ed. Lond. 1871).

1. I, Mesha, son of Chemosh,. King of Moab, [son]

2. of Yabni My father reigned over Moab (thirty years), and I reigned

3. after him; I made this altar for Chemosh at Karhah on account

4. of the assistance he gave me in all battles, and because he made me successful against my enemies the men

5. of the King of Israel, who oppressed Moab a long time, for Chemosh was angry against

6. his land. His son succeeded him, and he also said, I will oppress Moab. In my days he (Chemosh) said, [I will go]

7. and appear (be favorable) to Moab and his temple; then Israel wasted continually. Omri took [the plain of]

8. Mahdeba and dwelt in it built forty [and dwelt].

9. Chemosh. there in my days. I built Baal-Meon and made (sacrifices) there and I [built]

10. Kiryathan. The men of Gad [dwelt] in [this] land from early times, and there built the King

11. of Israel [Yazer]; I besieged the city, took it, and killed all [who dwelt]

12. in the city, to the gratification of Chemosh and Moab; I made captive there...

13. [and brought] it to Chemosh at Keriyoth. I remained here with the chiefs and [the soldiers until]

14. the next day. Then Chemosh bade me go and take Nebo from Israel. I arose and]

15. went in the night and fought against it from the break of day till noon: I

16. took it, killed all, seven thousand.. [to please Astor].

17. for Chemosh devoted to Astor:.. I took from there all

18. the vessels of Jehovah, and Coffered] them to Chemosh. And the King of Israel built

19. Yahaz, and dwelt there, when I made war upon him. Chemosh drove him out from thence; I ..

20. took from Moab two hundred men, all chiefs, transferred them to Yahaz, and began

21. to make war against Dibon. I built Kirhah, Hamath-ha-Yearim, and Hamath.

22. I constructed their gates and their towers I

23. built the palace, and I made aqueducts'(?) in the interior

24. of the town. There were no cisterns in the interior of the town of Kirhah, and I said to all the people, Make,

25. every one a cistern in his house. And I made a ditch round Kirhah with [the men]

26. of Israel. I built (Aro)ir, and I made the passage over the Arnon.

27. I built Beth-Bamoth, which had been overthrown, and Bezer, which had been destroyed.

28. I fortified Dibon to hold it in subjection, and I constructed

29. fortresses in the towns which I added to [my] land. I built

30. Beth-Diblathan, Beth-Ball-Meon, and transported thither [Moabites]

31. [in order to take possession of] the land. AtHoronan dwelt [the children of Reuben] ..

32. Chernosh told me, Go, fight against Horonan [I fought against it and took it],

33. [and there dwelt] Chemosh in my days.

## Meshach[[@Headword:Meshach]]

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

## Meshech[[@Headword:Meshech]]

             (Hebrews Me'shek, מֶשֶׁךְ, a drawing out, as in Psa 136:6; or possession, as in Job 28:18; Sept. Μοσόχ, Vulg. Mosoch; a pronunciation which the Samaritan codex also exhibits, מוֹשׁוֹךְ; but in Eze 38:2-3; Eze 39:1, Sept. v. r. Μοσόκ and Μεσόχ ; in Eze 27:1, τὰ παρατείνοντα ; in Psa 120:5, Sept. ἐμακρύνθη, Vulg. polongatus est, AuthVers. “Mesech”), the sixth son of Japheth, BC. cir. 2500 (Gen 10:2), and founder of a tribe mentioned among his descendants (1Ch 1:5), and later (Eze 27:13) as engaged in traffic with Tyre, in connection with Gog (Eze 38:2-3; Eze 39:1). In nearly every instance they are coupled with Tubal or the Tibareni as neighbors (Gen 10:2; Eze 27:13; Eze 32:26; Eze 38:2-3; Eze 39:1 : so also Herodotus, 3:94; 7:78; comp. Hengstenberg, Moses, p. 206; Wilkinson, i,, 378 sq.); and from one passage at least (Eze 32:26) they appear to have lived near Assyria and Elymais. They are without doubt the same with the Moschi (Bochart, Phaleg, 3:12), a barbarous people of Asia, inhabiting what were known as the Moschian Mountains (Ptol. v. 6,1; 13, 5), between the Black and Caspian seas (Strabo, 11:344, 378, 498 sq. i Pliny, 6:11), in the later Iberia (comp. Josephus, Ant. 1:6,1), who are named by  ancient authors as forming a single department of the Persian empire under a separate jurisdiction with the Tibarenians (Herod. 3:94; 7:78). In confirmation of the trade alluded to in Eze 27:13, Reineggs remarks (Beschreib. des Caucas. 1:6; 2:61) that the Moschian Mountains contain rich copper-mines, and this region has always been noted for the. export of slaves, especially females, whose beauty usually commands a ready market for the Turkish harems (see Rosenmiller, Alterth. I, 1:248 sq.). In Psa 120:5, the name occurs in connection with Kedar as a synonyme for foreigners or barbarians (Michaelis, Suppl. p. 1569), like the modern phrase “Turks and Hottentots.” — Winer, 2:86. The same name. but in a plural form, appears. according to some, in Isa 66:19 (משְׁכֵי קֶשֶׁת, Sept. Μοσόχ,Vulg. tendentes sagittam, Auth. Vers. “that draw the bow”), but it there is rather an appellation of the archers (comp. Jer 46:9); also, but with still less probability, in Jer 5:8 (מִשְׁכַּים, Sept. θηλυμανῖς,Vulg. emissarii, AuthVers. “fed”). “The Colchian tribes, the Chalybes more especially, were skilled in working metals, and hence arose the trade in the ‘vessels of brass' with Tyre; nor is it at all improbable that slaves were largely exported thence as now from the neighboring district of Georgia. Although the Moschi were a comparatively unimportant race in classical times, they had previously been one of the most powerful nations of Western Asia. The Assyrian monarchs were engaged in frequent wars with them, and it is not improbable that they had occupied the whole of the district afterwards named Cappadocia. In the Assyrian inscriptions the name ‘appears under the form of Muskai: a somewhat similar name, Mashoash, appears in an Egyptian inscription which commemorates the achievements of the third Rameses (Wilkinson, Anc. Eg. 1:398, Abridg.). The subsequent history of Meshech is unknown; Knobel's attempt to connect them with the Ligurians (Volkertaf. p. 119, etc.) is devoid of all solid ground.” “The names of the Moschians and Tybarenians are also joined frequently on the Assyrian inscriptions (Rawlinson's Herodotus, 1:651; comp. Pliny, 6:4). The primitive seat of the Moschi appears to have been among the Caucasus Mountains, on the south-eastern shores of the Black Sea, immediately north of Armenia (Strabo, xi, p. 498 sq.); and, according to Strabo, a part of the great chain or group of mountains took their name (xi, p. 521). The Moschi were, however, a wild and warlike race, and extended their depredations and conquests far beyond the confines of their native hills. Cappadocia appears to have been, at least in part, occupied by them (Josephus, Ant. 1:6, 1), and probably from them its capital city took its name Mazaka (Strabo, xii, p. 538; Rawlinson's  Herodotus, 4:222). In the time of the Hebrew prophets their power was felt even in Syria and Egypt in conjunction with their Scythic allies, Gog and Magog, under whose command they had. apparently placed themselves. It is interesting to observe how Ezekiel's description of their equipments bucklers, small shields (מגן), and swords' (Eze 38:1-5)- corresponds with that of Herodotus (vii. 78). During the ascendency of the Babylonians and Persians in Western Asia the Moschi were subdued; but it seems probable that a large number of them crossed the Caucasus range and spread over. the northern steppes, mingling with the Scythians. There they became known as Muskovs, and gave that name to the Russian nation, and its ancient capital, by which they are still universally known throughout the East (Rawlinson's Herod. 4:222).” SEE ETHNOLOGY. :

## Meshed-Ali And- Meshed-Hossein[[@Headword:Meshed-Ali And- Meshed-Hossein]]

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

## Meshelemiah[[@Headword:Meshelemiah]]

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

## Meshezabeel[[@Headword:Meshezabeel]]

             (Hebrews Mesheyzabel', מְשַׁיזִבְאֵל, whose deliverer is God; Sept. Μαζαβήλ, Μεσωζεβήλ, and Βασηζά v.r. Μασεζειήλ; Vulg. Mesezebel  and Mesizebel), one of the chief Israelites that subscribed the sacred covenant after the captivity, BC. cir. 410 (Neh 10:21); apparently the same with the father of Pethahiah the Zerahite of Judah, which latter had previously (BC. cir. 440) assisted in the administration of civil affairs (Neh 11:24); and perhaps the same with the father of Berechiah and grandfather of Meshullam, which last had (BC. 446) assisted in repairing the walls of Jerusalem (Neh 3:4).

## Meshi[[@Headword:Meshi]]

             SEE SILK.

## Meshia and Meshiana[[@Headword:Meshia and Meshiana]]

             ancestors of the human race according to the system of the ancient Persians. Ahriman (q.v.) and Ormuzd (q.v.) were the primary principles of creation, and from the antagonism which the universe thus presented man was the only exception. Ahriman, the evil principle, had no other resource but to slay Kaiomorts, the primitive human being, who was at once man  and woman. From the blood of the slain Kaiomorts sprang Meshia and Meshiana., who were soon seduced by Ahriman, and became worshippers of the Devs, to whom they offered sacrifices. Evil was thus introduced into the world, and the conflict between the good and evil principles extended also to man.

## Meshilemith[[@Headword:Meshilemith]]

             (1Ch 9:12). SEE MESHILLEMOTH.

## Meshillemoth[[@Headword:Meshillemoth]]

             (Hebrews Meshillemoth', מְשַׁלֵּוֹמוֹת, requitals; Vulg. Mosollamoth), the name of two men.

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

2. (Sept. Μεσαριμίθ.) A priest, son of Immer and father of. Ahasai (Neh 11:13); doubtless the same with the priest MESHILLEMITH ‘(Hebrews Meshillenith', מְשַׁלֵּמַית, retribution; Sept. Μοσολλαμώθ v. r. Μασελμώθ, Vulg. Mosollamith), the son of Immer and father of Meshullam'(1Ch 9:12). BC. long ante 440.

## Meshobab[[@Headword:Meshobab]]

             (Hebrews Meshobab', מְשׁוֹבָב, returned; Sept. Μεσωβάβ), one of the chief Simeonites, whose enlarged family induced him to migrate to Gedor in the time of Hezekiah (1Ch 4:34). BC. cir. 711.

## Meshullam[[@Headword:Meshullam]]

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

1. One of the chief Gadites resident in Bashan in the time of Jotham's viceroyship (1Ch 5:13). B. C. 781.

2. The father of Azaliah and grandfather of Shaphan, which last was the scribe sent by Josiah to direct the contributions for repairing the Temple (2Ki 22:3). BC. considerably ante 623.

3. A priest, son of Zadok and father of Hilkiah (1Ch 9:11; Neh 11:11). Probably the same as SHALLUM (q.v.), the high- priest (1Ch 6:13; Ezr 7:1).

4. A Levite of the family of Kohath, one of the overseers of the Temple repairs undertaken by Josiah (2Ch 34:12). BC. 623.

5. One of the chief Benjamites of the family of Elpaal resident at Jerusalem (1Ch 8:17). BC. ante 589. He is perhaps the-Benjamite (son of Hodaviah, and grandson of Hasenuah) whose son (or descendant) Sallu resided at Jerusalem after the captivity (1Ch 9:7); but this person seems elsewhere to be called the son of Joed (Neh 11:7).

6. The eldest of the children of Zerubbabel (1Ch 3:19). BC. cir. 536.

7. A chief priest, son of Ezra, contemporary with Joiakim (Neh 12:13). BC. post 536.

8. A chief priest, son of Ginnethon, contemporary with Joiakim (Neh 12:16). BC. post 536.

9. One of the leading Israelites sent for by Ezra to accompany his party to Jerusalem (Ezr 8:16). BC. 459. He appears to be the same with one of those who assisted in the investigation concerning the foreign marriages of those who had returned (Ezr 10:15). He was perhaps the same with one of the Temple wardens, as afterwards arranged (Neh 12:25). BC. cir. 440. This last is also called MESHELEMIAH (1Ch 26:1), SHELEMIAH (1Ch 26:14), and SHALLUM (Neh 7:45). -: ;.'

10. An Israelite, of the “ sons” ‘(or residents) of Bani, who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (Ezr 10:29). BC. 459.

11. A priest, son of Meshillemith and father of Jahzerah (1Ch 9:12; comp. Neh 11:13). BC. long ante 440.

12. The son of Berechiah and grandson of Meshezabeel; he repaired two portions of the walls of Jerusalem after the captivity (Neh 3:4; Neh 3:30). BC. 446. It was his daughter that Tobiah's son Johanan married (Neh 6:18).

13. The son of Besodeiah, who, in connection with Jehoiada, repaired the “old gate” of Jerusalem after the exile (Neh 3:6). BC. 446.

14. One of the Jewish leaders who made the tour of the walls of Jerusalem on their completion after the captivity (Neh 12:33). BC. 446.

15. A chief Benjamite (son of Shephathiah), who dwelt at Jerusalem after the captivity (1Ch 9:8). BC. cir. 440.

16. One of the principal Israelites who supported Ezra on the left while expounding the law to the people (Neh 8:4). BC. cir. 410. He may have been identical with No. 9, 12, 13, 14, or 15. He is probably the same with one of those who subscribed the sacred covenant on the same occasion (Neh 10:20).

17. One of the priests who joined in Nehemiah's solemn bond of allegiance to Jehovah (Neh 10:7). BC. cir. 410. He is perhaps the same with either. No. 6 or No.7.

## Meshullemeth[[@Headword:Meshullemeth]]

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

## Mesitys[[@Headword:Mesitys]]

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

## Mesmer, Franz[[@Headword:Mesmer, Franz]]

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

## Mesmerism[[@Headword:Mesmerism]]

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

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

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

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

The art of inducing the magnetic state, as practiced by its discoverer, Mesmer, involved the use of apparatus the baquet, or magnetic tub, iron rods, etc.; but the means which De Puysegur first used, and which became the more common, are passes made by the hands of the magnetizer from the head of the “subject” or patient downward, or simply making him fix his eves on the operator. “Ordinarily,” we are told, “ the magnetizer and the patient are seated opposite to each other; the former, with each hand, lays hold of the opposite hand of the latter, with the balls of the thumbs resting against each other. Thus they sit for five or ten minutes, or until the influence begins to be felt. The magnetizer then withdraws his hands, and makes slow passes with open hands and outspread fingers over the patient from the head to the foot, turning the hands away while moving them upward, and while making the downward passes keeping the points of the fingers within an inch or two of the patient's clothing. After making a dozen or two of such passes, the magnetizer resumes his former position.  During the whole of this process he keeps his attention on the patient, and exercises his will in silent commands that he shall become somnambulic. The patient should be still, quiet, and resigned. Some persons cal be mesmerized within a few minutes; others can not be affected by trials of an hour daily for weeks; but after the experiment has once succeeded, it can be more easily repeated. The patient becomes more susceptible, and the magnetizer more powerful, by every successful trial. The patient who could not, at first, be thrown into the mesmeric sleep in less than an hour of constant contact with the operator, may at last be magnetized in a few minutes or seconds, without contact, by the mere outstretched hand, glance, or even will of the mesmerist.” According to the mesmeric theory, the nervous energy of the operator has overpowered that of the subject, as a powerful magnet does a weak one, and the two are in rapport, as it is termed. In some cases the mesmeric trance assumes the form of clairvoyance.

The various stages of the magnetic influence mesmerizers distinguish as six different classes. “The first stage is that of waking magnetization. The patient feels a singular influence pervading his body, frequently a pricking, somewhat like that felt in a limb asleep. Sometimes there is an increase of temperature and sweat. The second stage is that of drowsiness. The pulse becomes fuller, the breathing slower; there is a feeling as though warmth were radiating from the stomach; there is a heavy pressure on the eyelids, which close against the will of the patient, and he is unable to open them; but still he retains his normal consciousness and sensation. The third stage is that of coma, or senseless sleep, wherein he is insensible to the loudest noises, and all the nerves of sensation are as if benumbed. The fourth stage is that of magnetic somnambulism. The patient awakes from the third stage into a new sphere of existence, and as another person. He has consciousness and sensation, but they differ greatly from those of his normal condition. He hears only the voice of his magnetizer, or of some person in contact with him. The magnetizer can make his muscles rigid in almost any position, and has the power of governing his physical motions. His own senses of touch, taste, and smell appear to be dormant, but he perceives all the impressions produced on those senses in the magnetizer's frame. The fifth stage is that of clairvoyance. This is a heightened condition of the fourth stage. The patient has means of perception unknown to man in his normal state, and so singular that the assertion of their possession, measured by the general experience of the race, appears to be an impudent  falsehood or imposture. The somnambulist can see with his eyes closed and bandaged; he can then even see what waking men in his place can not see with their eyes open. He can read the contents of letters unopened; he can see through clothing, wood and metal boxes, and walls of brick or stone; he can tell what is going on in the room above him or in the room below. Sometimes the sense of sight, or a faculty capable of perceiving things which the normal man perceives only by means of the organ of vision, seems to reside in the forehead, in the back-head, in the fingers, or in the knuckles of the hand. Thus the clairvoyant will sometimes move about holding his fist in front of him for the purpose of seeing where he is going. How this means of perception can exist apart from the organs of vision, why it exists in one part of the body more than another, and why one should have it in the hand, another in the forehead, and a third in the back- head, are questions very proper to be asked, but to which there is no satisfactory answer.. The clairvoyant not only sees things outside of his body, but even in it. His whole physical frame is transparent to him; he looks through and sees all the functions of life as though they were going on in a glass case. He can see through the bodies of others placed in magnetic connection with him in the same way. Frequently he will describe, with the accuracy of high anatomical, physiological, and pathological knowledge, the operations of healthy and diseased organs; and will even prescribe remedies for disease.” While in this state the functions of the body are liable to be much affected the pulsations of the heart and the respirations are quickened or retarded, and the secretions altered, and that chiefly at the will of the operator. At his direction the limbs are made rigid, or become endowed with unnatural strength; one liquid tastes as any other, and is hot or cold, sweet or bitter, as the subject is told; in short, every thought, sensation, and movement of the subject obeys the behest of the mesmerizer, if we may take the word of mesmerists for the subject's experience. The sixth and last stage finally, the mesmerists claim to be that of “perfect clairvoyance,” and a far more exalted position than the fifth. “The perfect clairvoyant,” we are told, “sees what is going on at a distance of hundreds of miles. reads the thoughts of all persons about him, reads the past, and can truly foretell the future. His soul dwells in light and delight; he often regrets that he cannot continue in that state forever; he shudders at the necessity of being brought down into the dull, tiresome, base world of normal life.” Between these different stages of the mesmeric condition, as here described, no precise line can be drawn. The transition from one stage to the other is gradual, and generally imperceptible at the time. Thus  many of the characteristics of the clairvoyant stage belong also to the somnambulic stage, in which they are, indeed, most frequently observed.

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

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

In the Illustrations of Modern Mesmerism, from Personal Observation, published by Dr. (the late Sir John) Forbes in 1845, we have. in small compass a complete exposure of- the pretended clairvoyant powers of some of the most notorious persons of this class. In the preface he states  that he only professes, by a simple narrative of facts, to illustrate the actual pretensions and performances of the mesmerists of the present day, and to show on what sandy foundations the popular belief in their marvels rests. He expresses the modest hope that what is contained in this little book may teach a useful lesson to those numerous unscientific persons who are accustomed to attend mesmeric exhibitions. public or private, from motives of rational curiosity, or with the commendable object of investigating what seem to be important truths. He believes that such persons must now feel convinced that no reliance whatever is to be placed on the results presented at such exhibitions as evincing the truth and powers of mesmerism. He found that it was impossible for the ordinary visitor at these exhibitions to discriminate the true from the false, and that the coarsest juggling might pass with the trusting spectator, seated at a distance from the scene of action, for mysterious and awful truths. Mesmerism or clairvoyance may be true or false, and he professes to be ready to believe them on obtaining sufficient proof of their reality. If, however, we find the most eminent, and apparently the most trustworthy of the clairvoyants, not only uniformly unsuccessful when the necessary precautions are taken to test their powers, but actually detected, and confessing with shame that they have been guilty of the grossest imposture and deceit where are we to look for the means of establishing the truths of this mysterious science? If we were-to believe a fiftieth part of the pretensions put forth in the works and lectures of professional mesmerists, it would be the easiest matter in the world to carry off the prizes offered to any one who could read writing contained in an envelope so secured that it could not be read in the ordinary way. If it is an easy matter to see what is going on in the arctic regions, it cannot surely be difficult to see what is contained in a deal-box. In July, 1839, M. Bourdin, a member of the French academy of science and medicine, as one of a commission of that celebrated body, appointed to inquire into the merits of clairvoyance, made the following offer to the mesmerists: “Bring us a person magnetized or not magnetized, asleep or awake; let that person read with the eyes open, through an opaque substance, such as tissue of cotton, linen, or silk, placed at six inches from the face, or read even through a simple sheet of paper, and that person shall have 3000 francs.” No candidate appeared. (Bull. de ‘Acad. 3:1123.) If such a power as seeing in any other way than by the organ of vision really existed, as was vaunted to be possessed by so many persons both before the prize was offered and since, surely some one of the clairvoyants would have come forward and established a just claim to the prize, but, as none appeared, we  may conclude with safety that both then and now no such marvellous power exists or is developed in the human constitution.

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

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

1. That it has not been proved that there is any magnetic influence, or nervous fluid, which passes from the operator to the person operated on, and produces in him the various phenomena of magnetic somnambulism.

2. That it has been proved that all the phenomena recorded, which have received sufficient scientific scrutiny to convince men of their truth and reality, can be accounted for on ordinary principles, without the aid of mesmerism.

3. That the lower phenomena-such as sleep, diminished or exalted sensibility, loss of voluntary motion, muscular rigidity, and the like, can be produced by persons acting on themselves by means of fixed staring at objects; which are incapable of giving out- any nervous or magnetic influence.

4. That the evidence which can be obtained of the reality of the existence of magnetic somnambulism, in any case, is inconclusive; that it is possible that the person supposed to be in such a state may really be awake, and simply feigning sleep; and that in many cases there is the most conclusive evidence that the persons pretending to be so affected are impostors, while in other cases, in which no intention to deceive may have existed, the patients have acted under a peculiar state of mind, to which only the weak and nervous are liable.

5. That though numerous cases of surgical operations are recorded in which the patients are reported not to have felt pain, it is probable that some at least may have really experienced painful sensations without giving  any outward expression of their sensations; that we have no evidence or means of knowing, except from their own testimony, that they did not really feel pain; but that it is very probable that in some cases, from a peculiar state of the mind acting upon the nervous system, the patients were really rendered unconscious of pain.

6. That it does not appear from experiment that immunity from pain in operations can be induced, in any but exceptional cases, in Europeans; though it appears, from the experience of Dr. Esdaile, that it can be produced with comparative facility in the natives of India.

7. That the higher phenomena of clairvoyance, pre-vision, intro-vision, and retro-vision, do not rest on adequate and satisfactory evidence. That it has never been proved in a single instance, when the necessary precautions have been taken, that a person could read or see objects through opaque substances; and that the alleged instances of the possession of such a power, when put to the test, have proved uniformly unsuccessful, and have amounted to nothing more than attempts at vague guessing. That it has been proved in some cases that the persons pretending to know events which happened at a distance were fully acquainted with the events through ordinary channels of information. That the description of events pretended to have been discovered by means of clairvoyance has not been in accordance with the truth, unless it has been possible for the patient to employ the usual means of discovering them; and that in most instances there are observed the most manifest attempts, on the part of their friends, to assist clairvoyants by suggestions and leading questions. That the attempts to describe what is going on in the interior of their own bodies, to diagnose diseases in themselves or others, and to prescribe remedies for the cure of the diseases which they pretend to discover, have been complete failures, and mere repetitions of such notions of anatomy, of disease, and of treatment, as they may have acquired by casual reading, conversation, or more careful study.

8. That there is. no recorded instance, worthy of credit, of transference of the senses-that is, of persons being able to read, taste, smell, or hear, by the fingers, stomach, or any other part of the body, other than the organs by which these functions are naturally performed-and that pretended instances of the possession of such powers have been proved to be cases of fraud and wilful imposition.

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

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

## Mesobaiah [[@Headword:Mesobaiah ]]

             SEE MESOBAITE.

## Mesobaite[[@Headword:Mesobaite]]

             (Hebrews Metsobayah', מְצֹבָיָה, garrison of Jehovah, being apparently the name of the place itself, used for a gentile, the preceding noun being regarded as in the construct; Sept. Μεσωβία v. r. Μειναβεία, Vulg.  Masobia), a designation of Jasiel, the last named of David's body-guard (1Ch 11:47), probably meaning of Mesobaiah, as being his place of residence; but, no other clue being given to its locality there is no room even to conjecture its position. Possibly it is rather the name of a person from whom he was descended; but the form and construction are equally difficult as a patronymic. Perhaps we should point הִמַּצֹּבָיֹה, and thus refer to ZOBAH as the place of his nationality. Kennicott's conclusion (Dissertation, p. 233, 234) is that originally the word was “the Metsobaites” (הִמְּצֹבָיַם), and applied to the three names preceding it.

## Mesopotamia[[@Headword:Mesopotamia]]

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

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

Of the history of this whole country we have but little information till the time of the Persian rule. “According to the Assyrian inscriptions, Mesopotamia was inhabited in the early times of the empire (BC. 1200- 1100) by a vast number of petty tribes, each under its own prince, and all quite independent of one another. The Assyrian monarchs contended with these chiefs at great advantage. and by the time of Jehu (BC. 880) had fully established their dominion over them. The tribes were all called ‘tribes of the Nai'ri, a term which some compare with the Naharaim of the Jews, and translate ‘tribes of the stream lands.' ‘But this identification is very uncertain. It appears, however, in close accordance with Scripture, first, that Mesopotamia was independent of Assyria till after the time of David; secondly, that the Mesopotamians were warlike, and used chariots in battle; and; thirdly, that not long after the time of David they lost their independence, their country being absorbed by Assyria, of which it was thenceforth commonly reckoned a part.” The Mesopotamian king Chushan Rishathaim, who for eight years (BC. 1575-1567) held the (trans-Jordanic) tribes of Israel in subjection (Jdg 3:8; Jdg 3:10), was probably only the petty chieftain of one of the principalities nearest the Euphrates. In the time of David (BC. 1040) the kings of Syria-Zoba appear to have had dominion  over the Mesopotamiain clans (2Sa 10:16). SEE ZOBAH.

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

## Mesorion[[@Headword:Mesorion]]

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

## Mespelbrunn, Johann Ech-Ter Von[[@Headword:Mespelbrunn, Johann Ech-Ter Von]]

             an eminent German theologian, of princely birth, was born at Mespelbrunn, near Mayence, March 18, 1545. In 1555, when but ten years old, he obtained a canonicate in Witrzburg, and in 1559 one in Mayence. He studied at Mayence, Cologne, Louvain, Douay, Paris, and Pavia; became prebendary of Wirzburg in 1569, and soon after dean of the cathedral, and finally prince bishop of Wtirzburg, Dec. 1, 1573. He was ambitious of honors and consideration, but aimed at the same time at the moral and  religious improvement of his diocese. The emperor Rudolph II often employed him, particularly in 1578-79, to quell the disturbances in the Spanish Netherlands, and as envoy on affairs of state; in this capacity Echter was one of the prime motors of the Ligue. Yet in a difficulty he had with the abbot of Fulda concerning that abbey, both the pope and, in 1602, the emperor decided against him. In order to check the progress of the evangelical doctrines of the Reformation in Wirzburg, he occupied himself zealously with the interior affairs of his diocese, and endeavored to reform its Church. In 1576 he took part in the Diet of Regensburg, and in 1582 in that of Augsburg. He improved the system of education, organized several public schools, and in 1582 founded the University of Wirzburg. The chairs of philosophy and theology he filled with Jesuits, and founded three colleges, which were afterwards united into one under the name of Seminary of St. Kilian. On the other hand he deposed and exiled all the evangelical ministers and preachers, and even the civil officers of his diocese who favored the principles of the Reformation, whenever an occasion presented. He sought to retain the people in their allegiance to the Roman Catholic Church by means of preaching and visiting tours, while he tried to reform the immorality of the clergy, and to restore them to a better standing. With this view he wrote his Constitutiones pro cultu divino, statuta ruralia pro Clero (1584; in German, 1589); several Antiphonien u. Psalterien (1602), and a Missal. He also founded the Julius Hospital at Wuirzburg. He died Sept. 13, 1617. See J.N. Buchinger, J. Echter v. Mespelbrunn (Wurzb. 1843). (J. HW.)

## Mesplede, Louis[[@Headword:Mesplede, Louis]]

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

## Mesrop[[@Headword:Mesrop]]

             also called Mashtoz, the noted translator of the Armenian version of the Bible, was born in the latter half of the 4th century in a small village of the province Taron. He was at first secretary of the Armenian patriarch Nerses the Great, and afterwards became his minister of ecclesiastical affairs. After filling this position seven years, he went into a convent, but, failing to find any satisfaction there, he went into a desert, where he gathered about him a number of young men as scholars. Under the government of the patriarch Isaak (Sa'ak) the Great (AD. 390-440) Mesrop was commissioned to preach as missionary, for which position he was especially fitted by his thorough knowledge of foreign languages. He now found need of an Armenian version of the Scriptures, the version of the clergy being in the Syriac, a language but little understood by the populace. After having spent several years in the arduous task, and that with but little show of success, he resolved to throw himself upon the mercy of his Lord and God, and seek at his hands the wisdom and knowledge required for the successful accomplishment of his undertaking. Nor did he wait long for answer to his prayer. While sojourning at Samosata, we are told, he was led to see the different types engraved in a rock, and that he could remember every single letter so plainly that he was able to describe them to the distinguished calligraph Rufanus, who finally composed the desired alphabet. He immediately commenced the gigantic work of translating the Bible from the Greek into the Armenian, a version which was introduced afterwards into that part of Armenia governed by his king Vramshapuh. By request of other sovereigns, he made also translations for the Georgian and Albanian countries. A change in the government obliged him to quit Persian territory, and he sought a new home in Grecian Armenia, where he continued his activity under the special protection of the emperor Theodosius of Constantinople and the patriarch Atticus. In spite of the severe crusades against the members of the new religion, he continued to inspire his scholars and friends with confidence in their final success, and defeated several times the various attempts to introduce idolatry in the practices of a pure Catholic religion. One of his later great works was the translation of the liturgical books of the Greeks into the modern Armenian language. After the death of his old companion Isaak I, Misrop was elected patriarch of Armenia, but he died the next year, February 19, 441. A critical edition of Mesrop's translation of the Bible appeared in Venice in 1805, in four volumes. As an energetic and scientific man, Mesrop ranks  among the most important combatants of the Christian religion in the early centuries, when the communication of the new religion met especially with great obstacles in the East for want of written languages. Mesrop furthered literature among his countrymen not only by his own literary productions, but by founding “ a whole school of remarkable thinkers and writers, that created what is called ‘the golden period' for the enlightenment of ancient Armenia” (Malan). See Naumann, Versuch einer Gesch. d. Armenischen Lit. (Leips. 1836, 8vo); Quadro della storia letteraria di Armenia estesa da Mons Placido Tukias Somal. etc. (Yen. 1829), p. 14.sq.; Quadro delle opere di vari autori anticamente tradotte in Armeno (Ven. 1825), p. 7-9; Goriund, Life of St. Mesrop; Malan, Life and Times of Gregory the Illuminator, etc. (Lond. 1868, 8vo), p. 28 sq. SEE ARMENIAN VERSION. (J. H.W.)

## Mess[[@Headword:Mess]]

             (מִשְׂאֵת, maseth', a lifting up, as of the hands, Psa 141:2; or of flame, Jdg 20:38; Jdg 20:40; so of a sign, Jer 6:1; hence an oracle or “burden,” Lam 2:14), properly a gift (“ oblation,” “reward,” etc., Est 2:18; Jer 40:5; Amos v. 11); also tribute (“oblation,” “collection,” 2Ch 24:6; 2Ch 24:9; Eze 20:40); specially a portion of food to a guest (Gen 43:34; 2Sa 11:8). SEE EATING.

## Mess Johns[[@Headword:Mess Johns]]

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

## Message[[@Headword:Message]]

             (prop. for מִלאָכוּת, Hag 1:13; ἀγγελία, 1Jn 3:11; elsewhere דָּבָר, a word; ἐπαγγελία, a promise; πρεσβεία, an embassy). SEE MESSENGER.

## Messalians[[@Headword:Messalians]]

             (from Chald. מִצְלַין), or EUCHITES (from εὔχομαι, to pray) is the name borne by two heretical sects of Christian mendicants.

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

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

## Messemakers, Engelbert[[@Headword:Messemakers, Engelbert]]

             (Latin, Cultrificus), a Belgian theologian, was born at Nimegue about the opening of the 15th century. He joined the Dominican friars, became a doctor of theology, probably at Cologne,' and in 1465 undertook to  establish a convent in Zwolle, of which he was appointed the first friar. He died about 1492. Among other works, he wrote Epistola declaratoria privilegiorum F. F. Mendicantium contra curawos parochales et Epistola de simonia vitanda in receptione noviciorum (Nimegue, 1479, 4to; Cologne, 1497, 8vo; Paris, 1507, 8vo; Delft, 1508, 16mo) :-Carmen de Pane: - Manuale Confessorunm metricum (Cologne, 1497, 4to). See De Jonghe, Desolata Batavia Dominicana, p. 186-87; Hartzheim, Prodromus Hist. univers. Colouiensis, vol. ii.

## Messenger[[@Headword:Messenger]]

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

Messer, Asa, Dd., LLd.

a noted American educator and Baptist minister, was born in Methuen, Mass., in 1769. He studied at Brown University, where he graduated in 1790. The next year he became a tutor in that institution; a professor of languages in 1796. of mathematics and natural philosophy in 1799, and president in 1802, which latter position he held until 1826. Having been licensed in 1792, and ordained in 1801, he preached occasionally, both while professor and president, for congregations of different  denominations. After retiring from the presidency, he was elected to several civil offices of trust by the citizens of Providence. He died Oct. II. 1836. Dr. Messer published a number of discourses and orations. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 6:326.

## Messer, Leon[[@Headword:Messer, Leon]]

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

## Messiah[[@Headword:Messiah]]

             the special title of the Saviour promised to the world through the Jewish race. We have space for the discussion of a few points only ofthis extensive  theme, and we here treat especially those points not particularly discussed under other heads. SEE REDEEMER.

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

The official persons (“ the Christs of the O.T. Perowle, Coherence of O.T. and N. T) who were consecrated with oil were priests (Exo 28:41; Lev 4:3; Lev 4:5; Lev 4:16; Num 35:3-5), kings (1Sa 9:16; 1Sa 16:3; 2Sa 12:7; 1Ki 1:34), and prophets (1Ki 19:16). The great Antitype, the Christ of the N.T., embraced and exhausted in himself these several offices, which, in fact, were shadows of  his threefold functions as the Prophet, Priest, and King of his people. It is the preeminence which this combination of anointed offices gave him that seems to be pointed at in Psa 45:8, where the great Messiah is anointed “above ‘his fellows;” above the Christs of old, whether of only one function, as the priest Aaron, or the prophet Elisha, or the king Saul; or of two functions, as Melchizedek the priest and king, or Moses the priest and prophet, or David the king and prophet. In our Saviour Christ is uniquely found the triple comprehension, the recapitulation in himself of the three offices (see Eusebius, Hist. Ecc 1:3, vol. i, p. 24, by Burton [Oxon. 1848]). But not only were the ancient offices typical, the material of consecration had also its antitype in the Holy Ghost (Cyril of Jerusalem, Catech. Ilium. 10:99; Catech,. Neoo. p. 202, 203; Basil, contra Eunom. v; Chrysostom on Psalms 45; Theodoret, Epit. divin. Decret. xi, p. 279; Theophylact on Matthew 1; (Ecumenius on Romans i, etc.). The prophecy of Isa 11:1 The Spirit of the Lord Jehovah is upon me, because Jehovah hath anointed me”) was expressly claimed by Jesus for fulfilment in the synagogue at Nazareth (Luk 4:16-21) on his return to Galilee “in the power of the Spirit” (Luk 4:14), which he had plenarily received at his recent baptism (Luk 4:1), and by which he was subsequently led into the wilderness (Luk 4:1).

This anointing of our Lord to his Messianic functions is referred to in a general sense in such passages as Isa 11:2 and Act 10:38. But from the more specific statement of Peter (Act 2:36), it would appear that it was not before his resurrection and consequent ascension that Christ was fully inducted into his Messianic dignities. “He was anointed to his prophetical office at his baptism; but thereby rather initiated to be, than actually made Christ and Lord. Unto these two offices of everlasting Priest and everlasting King he was not actually anointed, or fully consecrated, until his resurrection from the dead” (dean Jackson, Works, 7:368). As often as the evangelists style him Christ before his resurrection from the dead, it is by way of anticipation (ibid. p. 296). On this point, indeed, the grammatical note of Gersdorf (Sprachchar. 1:39, 272), as quoted by Winer (Gramn. des N.T. sprachid. 3:18, p. 107; Clark, p. 130), is interesting: “The four evangelists almost always write ὁ Χριστός [the expected Messiah, like ὁ ἐρχόμενος], while Paul and Peter employ Χριστός, as the appellation had become more of a proper name. In the epistles of Paul and Peter, however, the word has the article when a governing noun precedes” (for extremely elaborate tables, containing every combination of the sacred names of Christ in the N.T., the reader is referred to the last edition of bishop Middleton's Doctrine of the  Greek Article, by H. J. Rose, BD., App. ii, p. 486-496). Twice only in the N.T. does the Hebrew form of it (Messias) occur, in Joh 1:41; Joh 4:25; and twice only in the O.T. have our translators retained the same form (Messiah), in Dan 9:25-26. In these passages, both in the Greek of the evangelist [Μεσσίας, or (as Griesbach preferred to read) Μεσίας, more closely like the original] and in the Hebrew of the prophet [מָשַׁיח], there is an absence of the article-the word having, in fact, grown out of its appellative state, which so often occurs in the earlier books, into a proper name; thus resembling the course of the Χριστός of the Christian Scriptures. SEE CHRIST.

II. The gradual Growth of the Messianic Revelation.

1. First or Patriarchal Period.

(1.) In the primeval promise (Gen 3:15) lies the germ of a universal blessing. The tempter came to the woman in the guise of a serpent, and the curse thus pronounced has a reference both to the serpent which was the instrument, and to the tempter that employed it; to the natural terror and enmity of man against the serpent, and to the conflict between mankind redeemed by Christ its Head, and Satan ‘that deceived mankind. Many interpreters would understand by the seed of the woman the Messiah only; but it is easier to think with Calvin that mankind after they are gathered into one army by Jesus the Christ, the Head of the Church, are to achieve a victory over evil. The Messianic character of this prophecy has been much questioned by those who see. in the history of the fall nothing but a fable: to those who accept it as true, this passage is the primitive germ of thei Gospel. “The seed of the woman,” the vagueness and obscurity of which phrase was so suited to the period of the protevangelium, is cleared in the light of the NT. (see Gal 4:4, where the γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός explains the original זִרְעָהּ). The deliverance intimated was no doubt understood by our first parents to be universal, like the injury sustained, and it is no absurdity to suppose that the promise was cherished afterwards by thoughtful Gentiles as well as believing Jews; but to the latter it was subsequently shaped into increasing precision by supplementary revelation's, while to the former it never lost its formal vagueneess and obscurity. The O.T. gives us occasional gleams of the glorious primeval light as it struggled with the gross traditions of the heathen. The nearer to Israel the clearer the light; as in the cases of the Abimelechs (Gen 20:6; Gen 26:28), and Melchizedek (Gen 14:18), and Job (Job 19:25), and Balaam (Num 24:17), and the magi (Matthew 2), and the Samaritan woman (Joh 4:25; and see, on the Christology of the Samaritans, Westcott's Introduction, p. 148, 149). But even at a distance from Israel the light still flickered to the last, as “the unconscious prophecies of heathendom” show, as archbishop Trench happily designates-though in a somewhat different sense-the yearnings of the Gentiles after a deliverer (Hulsean Lectures for 1846; see also bishop Horsley's Dissert. on the Messianic Prophecies dispersed among the Heathen, in Sermons, ed. 1829, 2:263-318; and comp. Virgil's well-known eclogue Pollio, and the expectations mentioned by Suetonius, Vit. Vespasian. 4:8,- and Tacitus, Hist. v. 9, 13, and the Sibylline oracles, discussed by Horsley [ut sup.], with a strong leaning to their authenticity). See below, § 4:1 (3). But although the promise was absolutely indefinite to the first father of man (on which see bishop Horsley, Sermon xvi, p. 234, 235, comp. with Faber's Prophetical Dissert. 7:4 and 5), additional light was given, after the deluge, to the second father of the human race.

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

(3.) The principle of limitation goes on. One of Shem's descendants has three sons. Only one of these is selected as the peculiar treasurer of the divine favor. But not for himself alone was Abraham chosen. As in Shem's instance, so here again Abraham was to be the centre of blessing to even a larger scope. More than once was he assured of this: “In thy seed [“ in thee,” 12:3] shall all the nations of the earth be blessed” (Gen 22:18). The Messianic purport of this repeated promise cannot be doubted after Christ's own statement (Joh 8:56) and Paul's comment (Gal 3:16). The promise is still indefinite, but it tends to the undoing of the curse of Adam by a blessing to ‘all the earth through the seed of Abraham, as death had come on the whole earth through Adam. When our Lord says “Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he  saw it and was glad” (Joh 8:56), we are to understand that this promise of a real blessing and restoration to come hereafter was understood in a spiritual sense, as a leading back to God, as a coming nearer to him, from whom the promise came; and he desired with hope and rejoicing (“gestivit cum desiderio,” Bengel) to behold the day of it.

(4.) In Abraham's son-the father of twin sons we meet with another limitation; Jacob not only secures the traditional blessing to himself, but is inspired to concentrate it at his death on Judah, to the exclusion of the eleven other members of his family. “Judah, thou art he whom thy brothers praise... The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come” (Gen 49:8; Gen 49:10; see Perowne's Essay, p. 26,188; Delitzsch, ad loc.; bishop Pearson, Creed, art. ii; Hengstenberg, Christol. 1:59, 60; Davison, On Prophecy, p. 106; Dollinger, Gentile and Jew in the Courts of the Temple of Christ, translated by Darnell, 2:392. Onkelos and Raschi, it may be worth while to add, make Shiloh here to refer to the Messiah, as do D. Kimchi and Abendana). To us the Messianic interpretation of the passage seems to be called for by the principle of periodical limitation, which amounts to a law in the Christological Scriptures. We accept the conclusion, therefore, that the שַׁילֹהof this verse is the : שִׂראּשָׁלוֹם, “ Prince of Peace,” of Isa 9:5 [6]; and the זֶה שָׁלוֹם, “ This man is peace,” of Mic 5:4; and the

דַבֶּר שָׁלוֹם, “the peace-speaker,” of Zec 9:10.; and the Εἰρήνη ἡμῶν, “our peace,” of Paul, Eph 2:14 in a word, our Messiah, Jesus Christ. This, then, is the first case in which the promises distinctly centre in one person; and he is to be the man of peace; he is to wield and retain the government, and the nations shall look up to him and obey him. SEE SHILOH.

2. Mosaic Period.

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

(2.) The prophecy of Moses (Deu 18:18),” I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my  words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him,” claims attention. Does this refer to the Messiah? The reference to Moses in Joh 5:45-47 He wrote of me seems to point to this passage; for it is a cold and forced interpretation to refer it to the whole types and symbols of the Mosaic law. On the other hand, many critics would fain find here the divine institution of the whole prophetic order, which, if not here, does not occur at all. Hengstenberg thinks that it does promise that an order of prophets should be sent, but that the singular is used with direct reference to the greatest of the prophets, Christ himself, without whom the words would not have been fulfilled. “The spirit of Christ spoke in the prophets, and Christ is in a sense the only prophet” (1Pe 1:11). Jews in earlier times might have been excused for referring the words to this or that present prophet; but the Jews whom the Lord rebukes (John 5) were inexcusable; for, having the words before them, and the works of Christ as well, they should have known that no prophet had so fulfilled the words as he had.

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

3. Period of David.-Here another advance is found in prophetic limitation. Jacob had only specified the tribe, now the particular family is indicated from which Messiah was to spring. From the great promise made to David (2Sa 7:11-16), and so frequently referred to afterwards (1Ki 11:34; 1Ki 11:38; Psa 89:30-37; Isa 55:3; Act 13:34), and described by the sweet psalmist of Israel himself as “an everlasting covenant ordered in all things, and sure” (2Sa 23:5), arose that concentrated expectation of the Messiah expressed by the popular phrase Son of David, of which we hear so much in the N.T. (comp. Mat 9:27; Mat 12:23; Mat 21:9; Mat 22:42; Mar 10:47-48; Mar 11:10; Luk 1:32; Luk 18:38-39; Joh 7:42; Rom 1:3; Rev 22:16; with Jer 23:5).

In the promises of a kingdom to David and his house “forever” (2Sa 7:13), there is more than could be fulfilled save by the eternal kingdom in which that of David merged; and David's last words dwell on this promise of an everlasting throne (2 Samuel 23). Passages in the Psalms are numerous which are applied to the Messiah in the N.T. such are Psalms 2, 16, 22, 40, 110. Other psalms quoted in the N.T. appear to refer to the actual history of another king; but only those who deny the existence of  types and prophecy will consider this as an evidence against an ulterior allusion to Messiah; such psalms are 45, 68, 69, 72. The advance in clearness in this period is great. The name of Anointed, i.e. King, comes in, and the Messiah is to come of the lineage of David. He is described in his exaltation, with his great kingdom that shall be spiritual rather than temporal (Psalms 2, 21, 40, 110). In other places he is seen in suffering and humiliation (Psalms 22, 16, 40).

Having now confined the Messiah's descent to the family of the illustrious king who was “the man after God's own heart,” prophecy will await God's own express identification of the individual (see it given in Mat 3:17; Mat 17:5; Mar 1:11; Mar 9:7; Luk 3:22; Luk 9:35; and referred to in 2Pe 1:17). But it will not idly wait. It has other particulars to announce, to give point and precision to a nation's hopes.

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

All the more important events of the coming Redeemer's life and death, and subsequent kingdom and exaltation, were foretold. Bethlehem was to be his birthplace (Mic 5:2; comp. with Mat 2:1-6); Galilee his  country (Isa 9:1-2; comp. with Mat 4:14-16); a virgin his mother (Isa 7:14; comp. with Mat 1:23); he was to preach glad tidings to the meek and to bind up the broken-hearted (Isa 61:1; comp. with Luk 4:17-21); though her king, he was to come to the daughter of Zion, just and having salvation, lowly and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt, the foal of an ass (Zec 9:9; comp. with Joh 12:14-15); he was to be despised and rejected of men; was to be led like a lamb to the slaughter (Isa 53:3; Isa 53:7; comp. with Psa 22:6; Joh 1:11; Joh 18:40; Mar 14:61; Mar 15:5); his garments were to be parted, and lots cast upon his vesture (Psa 22:18; comp. with Joh 19:23-24); his hands and feet were to be pierced (Psa 22:16; comp. with Luk 23:33, and Joh 20:25); he was to have vinegar give in to him to drink (Psa 69:21; comp. with Mat 27:34; Mat 27:38); he was to pour out his soul unto death; was to be numbered with the transgressors; and his grave, though intended to be with wicked men (see this translation in Mason and Bernard's Hebr. Gram. 2:305), was in reality destined to be with a rich man (Isa 53:9; comp. with Mat 27:57-58); his soul was not to be left in hell, nor his flesh to see corruption (Psa 16:10; comp. with Act 2:31; Act 13:34-36); he was to sit on the right hand of Jehovah till his foes were made his footstool (Psa 110:1; comp. with 1Pe 3:22; Heb 1:3; Mar 16:19, and 1Co 15:25) his kingdom was to spread until ultimately “the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, should be given to the saints of the Most High” (Dan 7:27; see Perowne, Coherence, p. 29, 30). Slight as is this sketch of the prophetic announcements with which God was pleased to sustain human hope amid human misery, “as a light that shineth in a dark place” (2Pe 1:19), “shining more and more unto the perfect day” (Pro 4:18), it is yet enough to suggest to us how great must have been the longing for their Deliverer which such persistent and progressive promises were likely to excite in the hearts of faithful men and women.

The expectation of a golden age that should return upon the earth was,, as we have seen, common in heathen nations (Hesiod, Works and Days, p. 109; Ovid, Met. 1:89; Virgil, Ecl. iv; and passages in Eusebius, Prcep. Ev. 1:7; 12:13). It was doubtless inspired by some light that had reached them from the Jewish revelation. This hope the Jews also shared, but with them it was associated with the coming of a particular person, the Messiah. It has been asserted that in him the Jews looked for an earthly king, and that  the existence of the hope of a Messiah may thus be accounted for on natural grounds and without a divine revelation. But the prophecies refute this: they hold out not a King only, but a Prophet and a Priest, whose business it should be to set the people free from sin, and to teach them the ways of God, as in Psalms 22, 40, 110; Isaiah 2, 11, 53, In these and other places, too, the power of the coming One reaches beyond the Jews and embraces all the Gentiles, which is contrary to the exclusive notions of Judaism. A fair consideration of all the passages will convince us that the growth of the Messianic idea in the prophecies is owing to revelation from God. The witness of the N.T. to the O.T. prophecies can bear no other meaning; it is summed up in the above-cited words of Peter (2Pe 1:19-21; comp. the elaborate essay on this text in Knapp's Opuscula, vol. i). Our Lord affirms that there are prophecies of the Messiah in the O.T., and that they are fulfilled in him (Mat 26:54; Mar 9:12; Luk 18:31-33; Luk 22:37; Luk 24:27; Joh 5:39; Joh 5:46). The apostles preach the same truth in Act 2:16; Act 2:25; Act 8:28-35; Act 10:43; Act 13:23; Act 13:32; Act 26:22-23; 1Pe 1:11, and in many passages of Paul. Even if internal evidence did not prove that the prophecies were much more than vague longings after better times, the N.T. proclaims everywhere that although the Gospel was the sun, and O.-T. prophecy the dim light of a candle, yet both were light, and both assisted those who heeded them to see aright; and that the prophets interpreted, not the private longings of their own hearts, but the will of God, in speaking as they did (see Knapp's Essay for this explanation) of the coming kingdom.

5. The period after the close of the canon of the O.T. is known to us in a great measure from allusions in the N.T. to the expectation of the Jews. From such passages as Psa 2:2; Psa 2:6, ‘8; Jer 23:5-6; Zec 9:9, the Pharisees, and those of the Jews who expected the Messiah at all, looked for a temporal prince only. The apostles themselves were infected with this opinion till after the resurrection (Mat 20:20-21; Luk 24:21; Act 1:6). Gleams of a purer faith appear (Luk 2:30; Luk 23:42; Joh 4:25). On the other hand, there was a sceptical school which had discarded the expectation altogether. No mention of the Messiah appears in the Book of Wisdom, nor in the writings of Philo; and Josephus avoids the doctrine. Intercourse with heathens had made some Jews ashamed of their fathers' faith.

It is quite consistent with the prospects which, as we have seen, the prophecies were calculated to raise, that we are informed by Luke of the  existence of what seems to have been a considerable number of persons “that looked for redemption in Israel” (Luk 2:38). The demeanor of these believers was exhibited in a close and conscientious adherence to the law of Moses, which was, in its statutes and ordinances, at once the rule of pious life and the schoolmaster to guide men to their Messiah (Gal 3:24). As examples of these “just and devout” persons, the evangelist presents us with a few short but beautiful sketches in his first and second chapters. Besides the blessed Mary and faithful Joseph, there are Zacharias and Elisabeth, Simeon and Anna-pictures of holiness to be met with among men and women, married and unmarried, whose piety was strongly toned with this eminent feature, which is expressly attributed to one of them, “ waiting for the consolation of Israel” (comp. Luk 1:6 with Luk 2:25, and Luk 2:37-38). Such hopes, stimulated by a profound and far-sighted faith, were exhibited at the birth and infancy of the Messiah Jesus by these expectant Jews; and they were not alone. Gentiles displayed a not less marvellous faith, when “the wise men from the East” did homage to the babe of Bethlehem, undeterred by the disguise of humiliation with which the Messiah's glory was to the human eve obscured (Mat 2:2; Mat 2:11). But at his death, no less than at his birth, under a still darker veil of ignominy, similar acknowledgments of faith in his Messiahship were exhibited. Mark mentions it as one of the points in the character of Joseph of Arimathaea that he “waited for the kingdom of God;” and it would seem that this faith urged him to that holy “boldness” of using his influence with Pilate to rescue the body of Jesus, and commit it to an honorable tomb, as if he realized the truth of Isaiah's great prophecy, and saw in the Crucified no less than the Messiah himself (Mar 15:43). To a like faith must be imputed the remarkable confession of the repentant thief upon the cross (Luk 23:42)a faith which brought even the Gentile centurion who superintended the execution of Jesus to the conviction that the expiring sufferer was not only innocent (Luk 23:47), but even “the Son of God” (Mat 27:54, and Mar 15:39). This conjunction of Gentile faith with that of Hebrews is most interesting, and, indeed, consistent with the progress of the promise. We have seen above how, in the earliest stages of the revelation Gentile interests were not overlooked. Abraham, who saw. the Messiah's day (Joh 8:56), was repeatedly assured of the share which all nations were destined to have in the blessings of his death (Gen 12:3; Gen 22:18; Act 3:25). Nor was the breadth of the promise afterwards narrowed. Moses called “ the nations” to rejoice with the chosen people (Deu 32:43). Isaiah proclaimed the  Messiah expressly as “ the light of the Gentiles” (Isa 42:6; Isa 49:6); Haggai foretold his coming as “the desire of all nations” (Hag 2:7); and when he came at last, holy Simeon inaugurated his life on earth under the title of “a light-to lighten the Gentiles” (Luk 2:32). When his Gospel was beginning to run its free course, the two missionaries for the heathen quoted this great prophetic note as the warrant of their ministry: “I have set thee to be a light of the Gentiles, that thou shouldest be for salvation unto the ends of the earth” (Act 13:47). Plain, however, as was the general scope of the Messianic prophecies, there were features in it which the Jewish nation failed to perceive. Framing their ideal not so much from their Scriptures as from their desires, and impatient of a hated heathen yoke, they longed for an avenging Messiah who should inflict upon their oppressors retaliation for many wrongs. ‘his wish colored all their national hopes; and it should be borne in mind by the student of the Gospels, on which it throws much light. Not only was the more religious class, such as Christ's own apostles and pupils, affected by this thought of an external kingdom, even so late as his last journey to Jerusalem (Mar 10:37); but the undiscriminating crowds, who would have forcibly made him king (Joh 6:15) so strongly did his miracles attest his Messianic mission even in their view (Joh 6:14) and who afterwards followed him to the capital and shouted hosannas to his praise, most abruptly withdrew their popular favor from him and joined in his destruction, because he gave them no signs of an earthly empire or of political emancipation. Christ's kingdom was “not of this world” — a proposition which, although containing the very essence of Christianity, offended the Jewish people when Jesus presented himself as their veritable Messiah, and led to their rejection of him. Moreover, his lowly condition, sufferings, and death, have been a stumbling-block in the way of their recognition of him ever since. SEE SAVIOUR.

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

1. Early Jewish Opinions.-The portrait of an afflicted and suffering Messiah is too minutely sketched by the Psalmist (Psalms 22, 42, 43, 69), by  Isaiah (ch. 53), by Zechariah (ch. 11-13), and Daniel (Dan 9:24-27), to be ignored even by reluctant Jews; and strange is the embarrassment observable in Talmudic Judaism to obviate the advantage which accrues to Christianity from its tenure of this unpalatable doctrine. Long ago did Trypho, Justin Martyr's Jew, own the force of the prophetic Scriptures, which delineated Messiah as “a man of sorrows” (Justin. Dial. 89). In later times. after the Talmud of Babylon (7th century) became influential, the doctrine of two Messiahs was held among the Jews. For several centuries it was their current belief that Messiah Ben-David was referred to in all the prophecies which spoke of glory and triumph, while on Messiah Ben- Joseph of Ephraim fell all the predicted woes and sufferings. By this expedient they both glorfied their traditional idea which exonerated their chief Messiah, of David's illustrious race, from all humiliation, and likewise saved their nominal deference to the inspired prophets who had written of the sorrows of Messiah. (For a popular sketch of this opinion of two Messiahs, the reader is referred to Smith's sermons On the Messianic Prophecies of Isaiah, p. 177-181; see also Buxtorf's Lexicon Talmud. s.v. משיח, p. 1126, 1127, and s.v. אִרְמַילוּס; Eisenmenger's nedecktes Judenthum, 2:720-750; Otho's Lexicon Rabbin. Schittgen, Horae Hebrews et Rabbin. 2:1-778.) All the references to a suffering Messiah made by great writers, such as Rashi, Ibn-Esra, and D. Kimchi, are to “Messiah Ben-Joseph;” while of the more than seventy quotations cited by Buxtorf from the Targums, including Onkelos, not one refers to the Messiah as suffering.

This early Targumistic literature (as distinguished from the latter Rabbinical) dwells on the glories, triumphs, and power of a conquering Messiah. However absurd this distortion was, it was yet felt to be too great a homage to the plain interpretation of the prophetic Scriptures as given by Christian writers, who showed to the votaries of the Talmud that their earlier authors had applied to the Son of David the very passages which they were for referring to the Son of Joseph. From the tenth and eleventh centuries, therefore, other interpretations have been sought for. Maimonides omits the whole story of Messiah Ben-Joseph in his account of the Messiah; see Pococke, Append. on Malachi. The Messiah has been withdrawal together from the reach of all predicted sufferings. Such passages as Isaiah 53, have been and still are applied to some persecuted servant of God, Jeremiah especially, or to the aggregate Jewish nation. This anti-Messianic exegesis is prevalent among the Neologians of Germany and France, and their “free-handling” disciples of the English school (see Dr. Rowland Williams, Essays and Reviews, p. 71-75 [edit. 2]).  Thus Jewish sentiment has either reverted to that low standard of mere worldly expectation which recognises no humiliation in Messiah, but only a career of unmixed triumph and glory, or else has collapsed in a disappointment and despair which forbid all speculation of a Messiah whatever (Eisenmenger, Entdecktes Judezth. i,. 677). Jewish despair does not often resolve itself into Christian hope. Here and there affecting instances of the genuine change occur, such as the two mentioned by bishop Thirlwall (Reply to Dr. W.'s earnestly respectful letter, p. 78); in the second of which-that of Isaac da Costa-conversion arose from his thoughtful reflections on the present dispersion of the Jewish race for its sins. His acceptance of Jesus as the Messiah solved all enigmas to him, and enabled him to estimate the importance of such prophetic promises as are yet unfulfilled to Israel. But the normal state of Jewish Messianic opinion is that sickness of heart which comes from deferred hopes. This despair produces an abasement of faith and a lowering of religious tone, or else finds occasional relief in looking out after pretended Messiahs. Upwards of thirty cases of these have deluded the nation in its scattered state since the destruction of Jerusalem. SEE MESSIAHS, FALSE.

The havoc of life and reputation caused by these attempts has tended more than any thing else to the discouragement of Messianic hopes among the modern Jews. Foremost in the unhappy catalogue of these fanatics stands the formidable rebellion under Bar-Cocheba, in the 2d century. Rabbi Akiba, “the second Moses,” the great light of the day in Jewry, declared before the Sanhedrim that Bar- Cocheba was the Messiah. Rabbi Jochanan alone made opposition, and said, “Grass, O Akiba, will grow out of thy jaws, and yet the Son of David not have come.” We know not what was the fate of Bar-Cocheba (or Bar- Coseba, “the son of lying,” as his disappointed dupes at length called him), but the gray-headed Akiba was taken by the Romans and executed. More are said to have perished in this attempt than in the previous war of Titus. Embarrassing as all these failures are to the Jews, they only add one more to the many proofs of the Messiahship of Jesus of Nazareth, who expressly foretold these delusions of “false Christs” (Mat 24:24; Mar 13:22), as one class of retributions which should avenge on Israel the guilt of his own rejection. Not only, however, from the lowliness and suffering of the Christian Messiah, but in a still greater degree from his exalted character, there arises a difficulty of faith to the Jewish objection. The divinity of nature which Jesus claimed is perhaps the greatest doctrinal obstacle to his reception among the Jews. See Gfrorer, Gesch. d.  Urchristenthums (Stuttg. 1838); Solani, Croyances Messianiques (Strasb. 1864). SEE SON OF GOD.

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

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

(2) To the second class belong those Jews generally denominated Reformed. “They would sweep away Talmudism and the ceremonial law, claiming a complete emancipation from religious thraldom as their indefeasible right. They question the propriety of interpreting the prophets as predicting a personal Messiah, and deny the possibility of a restoration of Israel as a nation of political entity. In 1840 they for the first time gave public expression to their belief in a meeting at Fraakfort, when they declared that “a Messiah who is to lead back to Palestine is neither expected nor desired by the associated, and they acknowledge that alone to be their country to which they belong by birth or civil relation.' In 1869 a meeting of the educated Jews of Germany was held in the city of Leipsic, at which eighty-four different Jewish congregations were represented.  Twenty-four of the attendants were rabbis of high repute; the lay members men who had secured the highest places in the gift of the nation, among them the late Dr. First, then professor at the University of Leipsic, the learned Lazarus, of the University of Berlin, etc In 1840 the gathering had been composed of a handful of rationalistic Jews; in 1869 the meeting at Leipsic was attended by Israel's ablest and most devoted adherents, Yet these men rejected the belief in Israel's restoration, and passed the following resolution: “Those portions of our prayers which refer to the re- establishment of the annual sacrifices at the Messianic period, or to the return of the Jews to Jerusalem, must be modified.” Now widespread the opinion represented at this time owing may be best judged if such a conservative journal as the London Jewish Chronicle is led to comment that “ Although every Jew is bound to believe in a Messiah, the question whether that expression indicates a person or a time, and whether he or it has arrived or not, is, according to the Talmud, an open question.”.

(3) The main portion of modern Judaism consists of the moderate party, embracing those Jews who seek to develop a higher spirituality from the old form of Judaism. With them the ceremonial law is valuable only as a hedge to keep the people apart from other forms of religion till the times are fulfilled. Like Kimchi, Abrabanel, and other Jewish commentators, they apply the oracle in Isa 11:1-10 to the age of the Messiah, whose advent they place at the very time when the final gathering of the Jewish people is to be accomplished. “ The one,” says the Revelation Prof. Marks (Jewish Messenger, January, 1872), His to be immediately consequent upon the other; or, rather, they are prophesied as synchronous events.” Denying the accuracy of Christian interpretation, which refers the 11th chapter to the first, and the 12th chapter to the coming of Christ in the final day, they insist that the Hebrew Scriptures teach only one Messianic appearance, and that chapter 11 warrants no distinction in point of time between “the clearly-defined occurrences which are to mark Messiah's advent;” “and,” continues Prof. Marks, “so far from representing the complete regeneration of the moral world as the result of many centuries after the promised Messiah shall have appeared, the prophet of the text mentions the universal peace and harmony that shall prevail, as well as the ingathering of the dispersed of Judah and of Israel, as the especial events which are to characterize the inauguration of the Messianic age. The promised regenerator of mankind is to be known by the accomplishment of these his appointed tasks; and no one, according to the Jewish view of  prophetic Scripture, is entitled to the name of ‘the Messiah' who does. not vindicate his claim to that high office by means of the fulfilment of the conditions which the word of inspiration has assigned to his coming.”

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

(1) the arrival of the golden age (Isa 11:7-9);

(2) the rallying of the nations, unsought and uninvited, around the Messianic banner (Isa 11:10); and

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

Jesus the Christ they refuse to recognise as that “ remarkable individual,” “because,” as one of their number has declared, “we do not find in the present comparatively imperfect stage of human progress the realization of that blessed condition of mankind which the prophet Isaiah associates with the era when Messiah is to appear. And as our Hebrew Scriptures speak of one Messianic advent only, and not of two advents (even those in the synagogue who speak of a Messiah from the house of Joseph concurrently with one from the house of David make their advent synchronous); and as the inspired Book does not preach Messiah's kingdom as a matter of faith, but distinctly identifies it with matters of fact which are to be made evident to the senses, we cling to the plain inference to be drawn from the text of the Bible, and we deny that Messiah has yet appeared, and upon the following grounds: First. Because of the three distinctive facts which the inspired seer of Judah inseparably connects with the advent of the Messiah, viz. the cessation of war and the uninterrupted reign of peace, the prevalence of a perfect concord of opinion on all matters bearing upon the worship of the one and only God, and the ingathering of the remnant of Judah and of the dispersed ten tribes of Israel-not one has, up to the present time, been accomplished. ‘Second. We dissent from the proposition that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah announced by the prophets, because the Church which he founded, and which his successors developed, has offered, during a succession of centuries, a most singular contrast to what is described by the Hebrew Scriptures as the immediate consequence of Messiah's advent, and of his glorious kingdom. The prophet Isaiah declares that when the Messiah appears, peace, love, and union will be permanently established; and every candid man must admit that the world has not yet realized the accomplishment of this prophecy. Again, in the days of Messiah, all men, as Scripture saith, ‘are to serve God with one accord;' and yet it is very certain that since the appearance of him whom our Christian brethren believe to be Messiah, mankind has been split into more hostile divisions on the grounds of religious belief, and more antagonistic sects have sprung up, than in any historic age before Christianity was preached.” For the articles of confession, see the article. SEE JUDAISM, 4:1057, Colossians 1 (9 and 12),  1058, and especially those portions in Conservative and Reformed JUDAISM; also SEE RESTORATION OF THE JEWS.

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

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

(1.) The first is the passage above commented on, occurring in Gen 49:8; Gen 49:10, where Jacob is giving his sons his parting benediction, etc. When he comes to Judah, he says: “The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the obedience of the people be.” It is evident that by Judah is here meant, not the person, but the tribe; for Judah died in Egypt, without any pre- eminence. By sceptre and lawgiver are obviously intended the legislative and ruling power, which did, in the course of time, commence in David, and which for centuries afterwards was continued in his descendants. Whatever variety the form of government-whether monarchical or aristocratical might have assumed, the law and polity were still the same. This prediction all the ancient Jews referred to the Messiah. Ben-Uzziel renders it, “Until the time when the king Messiah shall come.” The Targum of Onkelos speaks to the same effect, and that of Jerusalem paraphrases it thus: “ Kings shall not cease from the house of Judah, nor doctors that teach the law from his children, until that the king Messiah do come, whose the kingdom is; and all nations of the earth shall be subject unto him.” Now that the sceptre has ‘departed from Judah, and, consequently, that the Messiah has come, we argue from the acknowledgments of some most learned Jews themselves. Kimchi thus comments on Hosea: “These are- the days of our captivity, wherein we have neither king nor prince in Israel; but we are in the power of the Gentiles, and under their kings and princes.” Again, Abarbanel, commenting on Isaiah 53, says that it is a great part of their misery in their captivity that they have neither kingdom nor rule, nor a sceptre of judgment! The precise time when all authority departed from Judah is disputed. Some date its departure from the time when Herod, an Idumnean, set aside the Maccabees and Sanhedrim. Thereupon the Jews are said to have shaved their heads, put on sackcloth, and cried, “ Woe to us, because the sceptre is departed from Judah, and a lawgiver from beneath his feet !” Others think that it was when Vespasian and Titus destroyed Jerusalem and the Temple that the Jews lost the last vestige of  authority. If, therefore, the sceptre has departed from Judah-and who can question it who looks at the broken-up, scattered, and lost state of that tribe for ages? the conclusion is clearly irresistible that the Messiah must have long since come! To avoid the force of this conclusion the Jews now say that the שֵׁבֶט, she'bet, which we render sceptre, may be translated rod, and metaphorically signifies, in the above passage, affliction. That the word cannot bear this meaning here is evident, because, for a long while after the prophecy was uttered, especially in the reigns of David and Solomon, the tribe of Judah was in a most prosperous state. SEE SCEPTRE.

(2.) The next proof that the Messiah has long since come we. adduce from Dan 9:25-27. It is evident that the true Messiah is here spoken of. He is twice designated by the very name. If we consider what the work is which he is here said to accomplish, we shall have a full confirmation of this. Who but he could finish and take away transgression, make reconciliation for iniquity, bring in everlasting righteousness, seal up the vision and prophecy, confirm the covenants with many, and cause to cease the sacrifice and oblation? Indeed, there is a saying extant in the Talmud, as the tradition of former times, “In Daniel is delivered to us the end of the Messiah,” i.e. the term wherein he ought to come, as it is explained by Jarchi. Grotius (De Veritat. v) speaks of a Jew, R. Berachia, who lived fifty years before our Lord, and who declared that the time fixed by Daniel could not go beyond fifty years! If then it be the true Messiah who is described in the above prophecy, it remains for us to see how the time predicted for his coming has long since transpired. This is expressly said to be seventy weeks from the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem. That by seventy weeks are to be understood seventy sevens of years, a day being put for a year, and a week for seven years, making up 490 years, is allowed by Kimchi, Jarchi, rabbi Saadias, and other learned Jews, as well as by many Christian commentators. It is clear that these seventy weeks cannot consist of weeks of days, for all put together make but one year, four months, and odd days-a space of time too short to crowd so many various events into as are here specified; nor can any such time be assigned between the two captivities, wherein like events did happen (see Prideaux, Connect. lib. v, pt. -1). This period of time then must have long since elapsed, whether we date its commencement from the first decree of Cyrus (Ezr 1:1-2), the second of Darius Hystaspes (vi.  15), or that of Artaxerxes (viii. 1). See Grotius, De Veritat. v; Josephus, War, 7:12, 13. SEE SEVENTY WEEKS.

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

That there was, at the time of our Lord's birth, a great expectation of the Messiah, both among Jews and Gentiles, may be seen from three celebrated historians, as well as from the sacred Scriptures. Tacitus (Hist. c. 13) says: “Pluribus persuasio inerat, antiquis sacerdotum literaris contineri, eo ipso tempore fore ut valesceret Oriens, profectique Judaea rerum potirentur.” Again, Suetonius (in Vespas. 4) says: “Percrebruerat Oriente toto vetus et constans opinio, esse in fatis ut eo tempore Judsei profecti rerum potirentur.” Josephus, not being able to find any calculation by which to protract the general expectation of the Messiah, applies it in the following words to Vespasian (War, 7:31): “That which chiefly excited the Jews to war was an ambiguous prophecy, which was also found in the sacred books, that at that time some one within their country should arise who  would obtain the empire of the whole world.” We are, moreover, informed again by Suetonius (Octav. 94), that, upon the conception of Augustus, it was generally thought that Nature was then in labor to bring forth a king who would rule the Romans. Some suppose that the words of Virgil (Eclog. iv) point at our Saviour, but they were intended by him to apply to the son of Pollio. We may just add that as there was a general expectation of the Messiah at this time, so there were many impostors who drew after them many followers (Josephus, Ant. 20:2, 6; War, 57:31). See also a full account of the false Christs who appeared by John h Lent, Schediasnz. c. 2; Maimonides, Ep. ad Judceos Marsilienses, Christ prophesies of such persons (Mat 24:24; Mat 24:29).

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

(1.) What was predicted of the Messiah was fulfilled in Jesus. Was the Messiah to be of the seed of the woman (Gen 3:15), and this woman a virgin? (Isa 7:14). So we are told (Gal 4:4; Mat 1:18; Mat 1:22-23) that Jesus was made of a woman, and born of a virgin. Was it predicted that he (Messiah) should be of the tribe of Judah, of the family of Jesse, and of the house of David ? (Mic 5:2; Gen 49:10; Isa 11:10; Jer 23:5). This was fulfilled in Jesus (Luk 1:27; Luk 1:69; Mat 1:1). SEE GENEALOGY OF CHRIST.

(2.) If the Messiah was to be a prophet like unto Moses, so was Jesus also (Isaiah 18; Joh 6:14). If the Messiah was to appear in the second Temple, so did Jesus (Hag 2:7; Hag 2:9; Joh 18:20).

(3.) The Messiah was to work miracles (Isa 35:5-6; comp. Mat 11:4-5). SEE MIRACLE.

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

(5.) Was the Messiah to rise from the dead ? So did Jesus. How stupendous and adorable is the providence of God, who, through so many  apparent contingencies, brought such things to pass! See Kidder, Demonstration of the Messiah (Lond. 1726, fol.); Olearius, Jesus d. wahre Messias (Leips. 1714, 1737); MCaul, Messiahship of Jesus (Warburton Lect. 1852); Black, Messiahs and anti-Messiahs (Lond. 1853); Browne, Messiah as foretold and expected (Lond. 1862); Higginson, Hebrew Messianic Hope and Christian Reality (Lond. 1871). Comp. also Malcolm's Theological Index, s.v.; Volbeding's Index Progranammatum, p. 38 sq.; Hase's Leben Jesu, p. 86; and Danz, Worterbuch, p. 855 sq. SEE CHRISTOLOGY.

## Messiahs, False[[@Headword:Messiahs, False]]

             Jesus warned his disciples that false Christs should arise (Mat 24:24), and the event has verified the prediction. No less than twenty-four such impostors have been enumerated as having appeared in different places and at different times; and even this does not exhaust the list. One by the name of Simeon was the first of any note who made a noise in the world. Being dissatisfied with the state of things under Hadrian, he set himself up as the head of the Jewish nation, and proclaimed himself their long-expected Messiah. He was one of those banditti that infested Judaea, and committed all kinds of violence against the Romans; and had become so powerful that he was chosen king of the Jews, and by them acknowledged their Messiah. However, to facilitate the success of this bold enterprise, he assumed the name of Bar-Cocheba (q.v.), alluding to the star foretold by Balaam; for he pretended to' be the star sent by heaven to restore his nation to its ancient liberty and glory. This epithet was changed by his enemies into that of Bar-Cozeba, i.e. son of a lie. He chose a forerunner, raised an army, was anointed king, coined money inscribed with his own name, and proclaimed himself Messiah and prince of the Jewish nation.

Hadrian raised an army, and sent it against him: he retired into a town called Bither, where he was besieged. Bar-Cocheba seems to have been killed in the siege, the city was taken, and a dreadful havoc succeeded. The Jews themselves allow that during this short war against the Romans in defence of this false Messiah they lost five or six hundred thousand souls. This was in the first half of the 2d century. In the reign of Theodosius the Younger, AD. 434. another impostor arose, called Moses Cretensis. He pretended to be a second Moses, sent to deliver the Jews who dwelt in Crete, and promised to divide the sea and give them a safe passage through it. Their delusion proved so strong and universal that they neglected their lands, houses, and other concerns, and took only so much  with them as they could conveniently carry. On the day appointed, this false Moses, having led them to the top of a rock, men, women, and children threw themselves headlong down into the sea, without the least hesitation or reluctance, till so great a number of them were drowned. as to open the eyes of the rest, and make them sensible of the cheat. They then began to look for their pretended leader, but he had disappeared, and escaped out of their hands.

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

The 12th century was particularly fruitful in producing Messiahs. About 1137 there appeared one in France, who was put to death, and numbers of those who followed him. In AD. 1138 the Persians were disturbed with a Jew who called himself the Messiah. He collected a vast army; but he, too, was put to death, and his followers were treated with great inhumanity. A false Messiah stirred up the Jews at Cordova, in Spain, AD. 1157. The wiser and better part looked upon him as a madman, but the. great body of the Jewish nation believed in him. On this occasion nearly all the Jews in Spain were destroyed. Another false Messiah who arose in the kingdom of Fez, AD. 1167, under the name of David Alrui (Alroy),'brought great troubles and persecutions upon the Jews that were scattered throughout that country. Disraeli has taken this historical event as the plot of his Alroy.

In the same year an Arabian professed to be the Messiah, and pretended to work miracles. When search was made for him, his followers fled, and he was brought before the Arabian king. Being questioned by him, he replied that he was a prophet sent from God. The king then asked him what sign he could show to confirm his mission. “Cut off my head,” said he, “and I will return to life again.” The king took him at his word, promising to believe him if his prediction was accomplished. The poor wretch, however, never came to life again, and the cheat was sufficiently discovered. Those  who had been deluded by him were grievously punished, and the nation was condemned to a very heavy fine. Not long after this, a Jew who dwelt beyond the Euphrates called himself the Messiah, and drew vast multitudes of people about him. He gave this for a sign of it, that he had been leprous, and had been cured in the course of one night. He, like the rest, perished, and brought great persecution on his countrymen. A magician and false Christ arose in Persia, AD. 1174, who seduced many of the common people, and brought the Jews into great tribulation (see Maimonides, Epistol. ad Judceos in Massilia agentes). Another of these impostors, a great cabalist, arose, AD. 1176, in Moravia, who was called David Almasser. He pretended he could make himself invisible; but he was soon taken and put to death, and a heavy fine laid upon the Jews. A famous cheat and rebel exerted himself in Persia, AD. 1199, called David el-David. He was a man of learning, a great magician, and pretended to be the Messiah. He raised an army against the king, but was -taken' and imprisoned; and, having made his escape, was afterwards retaken and beheaded. Vast numbers of the Jews were butchered for taking part with this impostor.

In the 13th and 14th centuries the Messiah imposition had come to a comparative stand-still. It is true the most learned of the rabbis, the celebrated Saadia. Abraham Ibn-Chija, Nachman, and Gersoni, had taken upon themselves to calculate the time of the actual coming of the veritable deliverer, and had fixed upon 1358 as the Messiah year; but no one came forward and sought to impose himself upon the waiting multitude. Towards the close of the 15th- century, however. the opportunity was renewed by the terrible fate of the Jews, especially in the Iberian peninsula, where for so many years they had enjoyed a haven of rest. On the Continent the Jews had suffered from the very start of the Crusading movement, but in the Iberian peninsula they had found a pleasant home and a quiet retreat, frequently even positions of power and of honor. Gradually, however, their position was undermined. First the Church of Rome trained men as polemics against the Jews. Later it was determined to make converts of them at any price, and if they could not be secured peacefully, to subject them to bloody persecution. This policy was inaugurated at Seville in 1391-92, and soon spread over the peninsula. Escape was difficult, and, if made, hardly augured a brighter future in other lands; and thus reasoning, they remained, and some 200,000 Jews were made to accept baptism at the point of the sword. This event forms the saddest  turning-point in Jewish history. Persecution upon persecution followed. The Jew, finding no alternative, was forced to play the part of the hypocrite, and, while. pressing the cross to his lips, vowed in his heart more faithful devotion to the cause of Israel. The gloomiest day came with the date of America's discovery. The year that shed new light upon Europe shrouded the Jew in darkness, and forms at the same time the grandest and the most melancholy hour of modern history. But though at first many had been made converts in the hours of oppression, they gradually came to believe in the vital, truths of Christianity; and though the examples before them were no, promotive of a true Christian life, the fact that no deliverer had come to Israel in the most trying hour made them not only faint but wavering, and there seemed danger that, if not soon inspired with new hope, the last day had come for the Jewish race.

There remained, it is true, a small remnant that had continued thus far in open defiance to all demands of the government, and valiantly contended for liberty of conscience. But even these successive trials had broken their courage, and had robbed them of the prospect of a more auspicious future. Not only the uneducated, but even the learned and the devoted, were yielding up the long cherished Messianic hope, as a sweet dream, an idle fancy, which lacked all chance of reality. The Jewish race, they declared, was born to suffer forever, and the day would never come for deliverance from oppression; never should they see a day of freedom and independence. This hopeless and hapless condition of his countrymen determined the learned Jewish rabbi Abrabanel (q.v.) to employ his pen in defence of the O.-T. Scriptures, and of Jewish interpretation. Aware that if this spirit of discontent and unbelief were suffered to grow it would result in the ultimate defunction of the Jewish ranks, he essayed to combat it by inspiring them anew with the prospects of an early delivery from oppression, and the dawn of a happy change. Though hoary with age, he wrote with trembling hands book after book to explain the principal Messianic passages of the 0. T., especially those of Daniel, and argued that Israel could safely depend upon a glorious future, and that the day of the Messiah was near at hand. He even went so far as to determine the date, and fixed upon 1503 as the year of their delivery. As a leader in Israel, Abrabanel's word commanded attention, and the wretched people were encouraged to take new hope.

At such a moment there was room for imposition, and it came immediately with the very opening of the 16th century. Enthusiasts declared that the time had arrived for removal to the Holy Land, to anticipate the change so  near at hand. One German rabbi, Ascher Lammlein (or Limmlin), a resident within the Austrian dominions, actually gave himself out as the forerunner of the approaching Messiah, and, as pseudo-John, about AD. 1502, called the people to. repentance, and urged an immediate removal to the East. He pulled down his own house, presaging that by another year he and his brethren who would follow him should live in peace under the reign of the “ King of the Jews.” Linmmlein lived near Venice, but his admonitions travelled all through Germany, Italy, Spain, and France. Everywhere his cause made converts; even Christians are said to have believed in his mission (see Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 9:243). But the prophet died suddenly, and all hopes lay prostrate in the dust. The agony of the people, so basely deceived, lacks description. A few flocked. to the cross of Christ, and in this their most trying hour declared that Jesus was the Christ; but the greater number, with that stubbornness characteristic of the Shemitic race, yet refused to look for help from the great Physician.

The Messiah-hope still lingered, however faintly, in the heart of the Jew, particularly in the Iberian peninsula, where he now suffered most; and it was not long before a new impostor arose to abuse the confidence of his munch dejected brethren. This time the pretender played his part more acutely, and it was some time before his deception was discovered. During the eventful reign of Charles V a person suddenly turned up at' the court of the king of Portugal, who, calling himself David Reubeni, declared that he had come from India as ambassador of his brother, the king of the Jews, to propose an alliance for the recovery of the Holy Land from the Mussulman. He had so carefully prepared himself for his role that he appeared natural, and his story apparently bore truth upon its face. He readily found friends both among Jews and Gentiles, and he was favorably received wherever he went. To persuade the Iberian government of the verity of his mission, he had brought papers confirming his claims; and he kept at such a respectful distance from the Jews that they became doubly anxious to approach him. Those who had been forcibly converted to Christianity fairly worshipped the ground he had stood upon; and great was the joy among the Jews of Italy when David found favor in the eyes of Clement VII (1523-34), and gained distinctions at the papal-court. In the midst of his successes he was joined by one Solomon Alolcho (q.v.), a Portuguese New-Christian, who openly apostatized to Judaism, and set up as the prophet of the movement. He submitted to circumcision, and in many other ways sought to prove his sincerity. At first he travelled with  David but, anxious to visit the Holy Land, he parted with the prince and set out for the East. On his return he visited Clement VII, and found even greater favor with the pope than David. Indeed, Molcho enjoyed Clement's protection thereafter, and, though an apostate, he was suffered to pour out his apocalyptic rhapsodies without restraint. But he finally came to a woful end. He had met David again, and together they had gone to Ratisbon, the seat of Charles V, to convert the emperor. Charles was hardhearted, and both David and Solomon were thrown into prison; the former escaping, we hardly know how, the latter expiating his daring at the stake. This put an end to the Messiah promises of the 16th century.

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

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

Another false Christ that made any considerable number of converts was one rabbi Mordecai, a Jew of Germany: he appeared AD. 1682. It was not long before he was found out to be an impostor, and was obliged to flee from Italy to Poland to save his life: what became of him afterwards does not seem to be recorded. About the middle of the 18th century an extraordinary adventurer, named Frank, by birth a Polish Jew, and by profession, in his younger days, a distiller of brandy, suddenly came to the front, and revived the expiring Sabbathaic party by the propagation of a new creed, which leaned towards Christianity, while it was really neither that nor Judaism. This lofty eclectic rejected the Talmud, but insisted on a hidden sense in the Scriptures. He admitted the trinity and the incarnation of, the Deity, but preserved an artful ambiguity as to the person in whom the Deity was incarnate. He was himself a believer in Sabbathai Zebi, and yet he dared not to speak out against Christ; consequently he preferred to leave the. question unsettled, until his connection with the Christian world seemed to demand a more decided confession, when he openly embraced Christianity as a member of the Roman Catholic Church. In his last years he flourished as “ baron” Frank, and his followers dared even to presume that he was of royal lineage, and closely related to the reigning house of Russia. The extent of his influence may be fairly estimated by our readers when we tell them that 800 persons attended his funeral. A cross was set up over his tomb. For some time a daughter whom he had left guided his followers; but these gradually dispersed, and, deprived of pecuniary aid, the family of Frank gave to the world a work written by him many years before his decease, counselling the Jews to embrace the Christian religion. SEE FRANK, JACOB.

Frank evidently preferred to continue the work of Sabbathai Zebi rather than declare himself a Messiah. He frequently declared that his mission was to unite together all religions, sects, and confessions. Among the paradoxical opinions he is said to have advanced was the idea that the Lord Jesus Christ is still upon earth, and that he would soon again send forth twelve apostles to publish the Gospel. All that now remains of the Frankists is contained within the Roman Catholic Church of Poland; they are therefore virtually Christians, though distinguishing themselves by marked remains of Judaism. Some consider that they still retain in secret a belief in the religion of the synagogue. They are found in Poland, especially at Warsaw, dispersed among all, even the highest, classes of society, chiefly in the profession of law and medicine. They are said to have taken a considerable share in the war of insurrection against Russia in the year 1830; it has even been said that the chief of the  Frankists was a member of the Diet of Poland, and afterwards obliged to take refuge as an exile in France. But little is known of them at present, as they mix so largely With the Christians as such.

In our own day the Messiah question is again enlivened by the appearance of new claimants. One of these lately made his debut in the far East, at Sana, in the kingdom of Yemen, and created much excitement, which has scarcely subsided yet. The well-known Eastern traveller, baron De Maltzahn, furnishes the following account of this modern Messiah of the Orient: The pretender, of a fascinating exterior, remarkably brilliant eyes, and a melodious voice, after studying the mysteries of the great cabalistical work, the Zohar. withdrew from intercourse with his fellow-men, and eventually retired into a desert, where he submitted to bodily mortifications and self-denial. He soon became distinguished as a worker of miracles, and as such attracted the attention of the superstitious Bedouins. These, seeking to obtain his good graces, brought various descriptions of food, and were pleased that he condescended to accept their offerings. The increase of their flocks and of their household, and even their success in the attack upon hostile troops, were attributed to the power peculiar to this worker of marvels. His reputation spread far and wide among the Arabian population, and many incredible stories were circulated about this “wise man.” It was said of him that his face had the splendor of the sun; that the name, “Son of David,” was engraved upon his hand; that he possessed the valuable power of discovering treasures; that he was invulnerable, etc.

His Jewish compatriots, not pleased with the connection between their favorite scholar and the members of a strange religion, were about to bring him back to his own people, when a sudden calamity gave the position of this man a new turn. An epidemic broke out among the flocks of the Bedouins, who in consequence' of this calamity were in a short time reduced to extreme want. These changes in the fortune of the Arabs were assigned to the secret influence of the mysterious man. It was then remembered that he was a Jew, and he all at once became the object of bitter hatred. The recluse had meanwhile quitted his solitude and returned to his native place. Here he was declared, chiefly by the Arabs, to be a Messiah, and he became a dreaded and unapproachable power even in the eyes of his fiercest enemies. His Jewish countrymen were in expectation that he would crush the Arabs and lead his own brethren to the Holy Land. His heated imagination accepted the messianic part which the delusion of the people had conferred upon him; and he beheld in the opinion of the multitude an  evidence of his high mission. He received everywhere munificent presents, lived in a princely style, was reverenced by his own people, and dreaded by the Moslems, until some daring Arabs finally waylaid and killed him, and thus proved that he was vulnerable. But superstition is more invulnerable than false Messiahs. Ari Shocher (such was his name) is not considered as dead by his followers. He appeared after the murder, they say, under another form, in the neighborhood of Sana, and proclaimed that, at a later time, he would assumeagain his former shape. The government has taken steps to seize him, but he has since disappeared, and his present whereabouts are unknown.

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

See Buxtorf, Lex. Chald. Talm. et Rabbin. (Basle, 1640, fol.), coll. 1267 sq.; id. Synagoga Judaica, ch. i; Hulsius, Theol. Jud. (Bredse, 1653, 4to); Pocock, Theol. Works, 1:159 sq.; Johannes a Lent, Hist. of Fkalse Messiahs (in Ugolini's Thesaurus, entitled De Pseudo-Messiis); Eisenmenger, Entdecktes Judenthum (Konigsb. 1711, 2 vols. 4to), 2:647 sq., a book to be read very guardedly; Jortin, Remarks on Eccl. Hist. 3:330; Birch, De Messia (Havn. 1789); Harris, Sermons on the Messiah;  Simpson, Key to the Prophecies, sec. 9; Maclaurin, On the Prophecies relating to the Messiah; Fuller, Jesus the true Messiah; Stehelin, Traditions of the Jews (Lond. 1751-52, fol.); De Rossi, Della vana aspettazione degli Ebrei del loro Re Messia (Parma, 1773, 4to); Bertholdt, Christologia Jud. Jesu apostolorumque AEtate (Erlangen, 1811) - convenient but superficial; Lange, Life of Christ (see Index); Liddon, Divinity of Christ, p. 69, 77, 91; Alger, Hist. Fut. Life, p. 169, 219, 353; Sadler, Emanuel, p. 97 sq.; Milman, Hist. of the Jews, 2:432 sq.; 3:366; Allen, Mod. Judaism, p. 253 sq.; Young, Christology of the Targums (Edinb. 1853); Jost, Gesch. der Israeliten, vol. viii; Gratz, Gesch. der Juden (see Index in vol. vi, vii, viii, and x); Michel Nicolas, Des doctrines rel. des Juifs pendant les deux siecles anterieurs a l'ere Chretienne (Paris, 1860, 8vo), p. 266 sq.; Langen, Judenth. zur Zeit Christi (Freib. 1866), p. 391 sq.; Grau, Semiten und Indogermanen (2d ed. Stuttg. 1867, sm. 8vo), Introd. and chap. v; Rule, Karaites (Lond. 1870, 12mo), p. 132 sq.; Journ. Sac. Lit. 1873, Jan. art. viii; Jahrb. deutsch. Theol. 1867, 2:340 sq.; Christian Examiner, 1869. p. 96; Engl. Revelation 8:182; Christian Monthly, 1844, Nov. p. 581; National Revelation April, 1863, p. 46'6 sq.; 1864, p. 554 sq.; Old and New, 1870, April, p. 545; New-Englander, v. 360 sq.; 10:102 sq.; Biblioth. Sac. 11:609 sq.; Hamburger, Real Encyklop. Bibel u. Talmud, art. Messias. (J. HW.)

## Messianic Hope[[@Headword:Messianic Hope]]

             By way of supplement to the article MESSIAH SEE MESSIAH (q.v.), we give in general outlines a history of the expectation of the Messiah as developed in the apocalyptic writings.

Of the deepest influence upon the development of the messianic idea were the prophecies of Daniel, the essence of which is the reign of the pious (see 2:44; 7:14, 27). The apocrypha of the Old Test. contain but few messianic allusions, because, for the most part, they are historical or didactic, and not prophetic. But this does not mean that the messianic idea was not entertained by the authors. Besides the hope of a return of the dispersed of Israel (Bar 4:36-37; Bar 5:5-9; 2Ma 2:18), of a conversion of the Gentiles (Tob 13:11-18; Tob 14:6-7), and the-perpetual existence of the Jewish nation (Sir 37:25; Sir 44:13), we also find the idea of an everlasting kingdom of the house of David (Eccles. 47:11; 1Ma 2:57).

The richer, however, flows the stream of messianic prophecies in the oldest Jewish Sibylline Oracles (q.v.), especially 3:652-794. Very few messianic comments are found in the groundwork of the Book of Enoch (q.v.; see 90:16-38), but more in the Psalter of Solomon (q.v.; see Psa 17:11; Psa 18:6-9) and in the Assumption of Moses (q.v.). The messianic time is also depicted in the Book of Jubilees (q.v.). All these documents prove sufficiently that the messianic hope had not been dead in the last centuries before Christ, and this is corroborated by the Targum of Onkelos and Jonathan. Another important witness is Philo, who, in De Execrationibus, § 8, 9 (ed. Mang. 2:435 sq.) and De Prmmiis et Poenis, § 15-20 (ibid. 2:421-428), speaks of the messianic hope.

But, aside from these witnesses, we have the New Test., which fully proves that the messianic idea in the time before Christ was by no means extinguished in the consciousness of the people (see Mat 11:3; Mat 16:13 sq.; Mat 16:21; Mar 8:27; Mark 11; Luk 7:19-20; Luk 9:18 sq.; Luk 9:19; John 12). For the time after Christ we need no evidence. The many political events prove, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that the people expected the  beginning of the kingdom of God on earth. Josephus himself confesses that the messianic hope was one of the most powerful instruments in the insurrection against Rome, although, to please the Romans, he referred the messianic prophecies to Vespasian.

As for the messianic hope after the destruction of Jerusalem, the apocalypses of Baruch and Ezra give ample descriptions. What is expressed there finds its reflection in the Jewish prayer called Shemoneh Esreh (q.v.), especially in the 10th, 11th, 14th, 15th, and 17th petitions. Thus far the historical outline. We come now to the systematic arrangement of messianic dogmatics.

1. Signs of the Last Times. — Almost everywhere, when reference is made to eschatology, we meet with the same thought, that the beginning of the time of salvation is to be ushered in by great tribulations. The basis for these speculations was no doubt Dan 12:1, "There shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation, even to that same time." Thus originated in the rabbinic dogma the doctrine of the חבלי המשיח, "the birth-pains of the Messiah" (see Mat 24:8 : πάντα δὲ ταῦτα ἀρχὴ ὠδίνων). Glowing descriptions of the signs of the last times are found in Orac. Sibyll. 3:795-807 (comp. 4 Ezra 5:1-13; 6:18-28; 9:1-12; 13:29-31; Apocalypse of Baruch, 70:2-8; Book of Jubilees see Ewald's Jahrbuchern, 3:23 sq.]; Mishna, Sota. 9:15). See also Mat 24:7-12; Mat 24:21; Mar 13:19; Luk 21:23; 1Co 7:26; 2Ti 3:1; and comp. Schottgen, Horae Hebraicae, 2:509 sq., 550 sq.; Bertholdt, Christologia Judaeorum, pages 45-54; Gfrorer, Das Jahrhundert. des Heils, 2:225 sq. 300-304; Oehler, in Herzog's Real- Encyklop. 9:436 sq. (2d ed. 9:666); Hamburger, Real-Encyklop. art. "Messianische Leidenszeit," pages 735-738.

2. Elijah the Forerunner of the Messiah. — From Malachi 3:23, 24 (A.V. Mal 4:5-6) it was inferred that the prophet Elijah was to return to prepare the way for the Messiah. This idea is already presupposed, Sir 48:10-11 (see also Mat 17:10; Mar 9:11; also Mat 11:14; Mat 16:14; Mar 6:15; Mar 8:28; Luk 9:8; Luk 9:19; Joh 1:21). The object of his message is to make peace on earth (see Mishna, Eduyoth, 8:7), and to harmonize differences (Baba Mezia, 3:4, 5; 1:8; 2:8). Besides these things, he was to anoint the Messiah (Justin, Dial. cum Tryph. c. 8, 49), and to raise the dead (Soat, 9:15 s. f.). Besides Elijah, some also expected the prophet like Moses (Deu 18:15; comp. Joh 1:21; Joh 6:14; Joh 7:40), while still others thought that Jeremiah (Mat 16:16) was to be the forerunner of the Messiah. In Christian writings, Enoch is mentioned as one who was to come back (Ev. Nicodemi, c. 25; see also Thilo, Codere Apocryph. Nov. Testamenti, pages 756-768). On the forerunner of the Messiah, compo Schottgen, u.s. page 533 sq.; Lightfoot, Horae Hebr. on Mat 17:10; Bertholdt, u.s. page 58-68; Gfrorer, u.s. pages 227-229; Alexandre, Orac. Sibyll. 1st ed. 2:513-516; Der Prophet Elia in der Legende (Frankels Monatsschrift, 1863, pages 241-255, 281-296); Elias who was to Come (Journal of Sacred Literature and Biblical Record, new series, 1867, 10:371-376); Castelli, Il Messia secondo gli Ebrei, pages 196-201; Weber, System der altsynagogalen paldstinischen Theologie, pages 337-339.

3. Appearance of the Messiah. — After these preparations, Messiah comes. It is by no means correct to say that pre-Christian Judaism expected the Messiah only after the judgment, and that through the influence of Christianity the idea had become prevalent that the Messiah himself was to judge his enemies. For in the books of Baruch and Ezra, Enoch, and in the Targums, in the Psalter of Solomon, and in Philo, Messiah appears everywhere as conquering hostile powers.

As to his names, the common one is the Anointed, the Messiah (Enoch 48:10; 52:4; Baruch 29:3; 30:1; 39:7; 40:1; 70:9; 72:2; Ezra 7:28, 29, where the Latin translation is interpolated; 12:32: "unctus"); Greek, χριστὸς κυρίου Psalt. of Sol. 17:36; 18:68), Hebrew, הִמָּשַׁיח(Mishna, Berachoth, 1:5), Aramaic, מְשַׁיחָא(ibid. Sota, 9:15), or מִלְכָּא מְשַׁיחָא(in the Targums). Peculiar to the Book of Enoch are: "the Son of man" (46:1- 4; 48:2; 57:7, 9, 14; 63:11; 69:26, 27; 70:1), and the "Elect One" (45:3, 4; 49:2; 51:3, 5; 52:6, 9; 53:6; 55:4; 61:8; 12:1). Very seldom is he called the "Son of God" (105:2, 4 Ezra 7:28, 29; 13:32, 37, 52; 14:9), and only once he is called "Son of the woman" (Enoch 62:5). He was to comefrom the tribe of David (Psalt. of Sol. 17:5, 23; Mat 22:42; Mar 12:35; Luk 20:41; Joh 7:42; Joh 7:4 Ezra 12:32; Targum on Isa 11:1; Jer 23:5; Jer 33:15). Hence "Son of David" is the common designation of the Messiah (in the New Test. after ὑιὸς Δανίδ, in the Targum on Hos 3:5 : בִּר דָּוַד, in the Shemoneh Esreh, 15th petition, צֶמִח דָּוַד). As belonging to the tribe of David he must also be born at Bethlehem, in the city of David (Mic 5:1, and the Targum in loco; Mat 2:5; Joh 7:41-42).  Whether the pre-Christian Judaism thought of the Messiah as a mere man or as a being imbued with higher power, especially whether it ascribed to him preexistence, cannot be decided with certainty. In general it can be said that he was expected as a humanm king and ruler, but endowed with special gifts and powers by God. This is especially evident from the Psalter of Solomon (17, 23, 47, 35, 41, 46, 42). The same idea we find in Orac. Sibyll. 3:49. But his pre-existence is also described in the Book of Enoch, 46:1, 2; 62:7; 48:3, 6; 46:1, 3; 49:2-4; comp. also 4 Ezra 12:32; 13:26, 52. And this idea of pre-existence cannot be ascribed to Christian influences, because it fully harmonizes with the Old-Test. idea concerning the Messiah (comp. Mic 5:1; Dan 7:13-14).

4. The Last Enemies. — On the appearance of the Messiah the enemies of the Israelites and of God will muster their forces for a last decisive conflict. The picture which Ezekiel drew of the armies of Gog and Magog, and the representation given in Daniel 11, are abundantly reproduced in Orac. Sibyll. 3:663 sq.; 4 Ezra 13:33 sq.; Enoch 90:16, except that the conflict does not concern the Messiah, but the congregation of God. In general, it is supposed that the leader in this conflict is the antichrist, who is called in rabbinic writings Anrmilus (ארמילוס).

5. Destruction of the Enemies. — From the dangers which will thus gather round them the Israelites are to be delivered by the signal destruction of their foes. Comp. Assumptio Mosis 10; Enoch 90; Orac. Sibyll. 3:652 sq.; Psalt. of Sol. 17:27, 39; Apoc. Baruch 39:7-40:2; 70:9; 72:2-6; 4 Ezra 12:32, 33; 13:27, 28,35-38.

6. Renovation of Jerusalem. — Since the messianic kingdom is to be founded in the Holy Land, Jerusalem must be renewed. This renovation will take place by purifying the holy city from the Gentiles, who now live in it (Psalt. of Sol. 17:25, 33). Besides this view there was another, that there already existed in the pre-messianic time a more glorious Jerusalem than the earthly one, with God in heaven, and that this was to come down on earth at the beginning of the messianic time (Enoch 53:6; 90:28, 29; 4 Ezr 7:26; Apoc. Baruch 32:4). See also Schottgen, De Hierosolyma Coelesti ( Horae Hebr. 1:1205-1248 ); Meuschen, Novum Testamentum ex Talmude, page 199 sq.; Wetstein, Novum Test. ad Galatas, 4:26; Eisenmrenger, Entdecktes Judenthum, 2:839 sq.; Bertholdt, u.s. pages 217-221; Gfrorer, u.s. 2:245 sq. 308; Weber, u.s. page 356 sq.

7. Gathering of the Dispersed. — That the dispersed of Israel should have part in the messianic kingdom and return to Palestine was a matter of course, even. though there were no prophecies of the Old Test. In a poetical manner this is described (Psalt. of Sol. 11:17; Bar 4:36-37; Bar 5:5-9; Philo, De Excrationibus, § 8, 9; 4 Ezra 13:39-47). As this hope was so general, it is strange that rabbi Akiba should have doubted the return of the ten tribes (Sanhedrin, 10:3 s. f.).

8. The Kingdom of Glory in Palestine. — The messianic kingdom has, it is true, the messianic king at its head, but its supreme ruler is God (see Orac. Sibyll. 3:704-706, 717, 756-759; Psalt. of Sol. 17:1, 38, 51; Shemoneh Esreh, 11th benediction; Joseph. War, 2:8, 1). Hence it is often called the kingdom of God (βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, so especially in the New Test. by Mark and Luke; Orac. Sibyll. 3:47, 48; βασιλεία μεγίστη ἀθανάτον βασιλῆος; see Psalt. of Sol. 17:4; Assumptio Mosis 10:1, 3). Besides, we also find “kingdom of heaven," βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν. For the latter expression, see Schittgen, De Regno Caolorum ( Horae Hebr. 1:1147- 1152); Lightfoot, Horae ad Mat 3:2; Wetstein, in Mat 3:3; Bertholdt, u.s. pages 187-192; De Witte, Biblische Dogmatik, pages 175-177; Tholuck, Bergpredigt, page 66 sq.; Fritzsche, Evang. Matthaei, page 109 sq.; Kuinoel, in Mat 3:3; Wichelhaus, Commentar. zu der Leidensgeschicht (1855), page 284 sq.; Keim, Geschichte Jesu, 2:33 sq.; Schtirer, Der Begrif des Himmelreiches aus judischen Quellen erlautert (Jahrbucher fur prot. Theologie, 1876, pages 166-187); Cremer, Bibl. Theolog. Worterbuch, s.v. βασιλεία.

To the glory of the messianic kingdom belongs, above all things, the dominion over the world (see Isa 2:2 sq.; Isa 42:1-6; Isa 49:6; Isa 51:4-5; Jer 3:17; Jer 16:19 sq.; Mic 4:1 sq.; Mic 7:16 sq.; Zep 2:11; Zep 3:9; Zec 8:20 sq.; and especially Dan 2:44; Dan 7:14; Dan 7:27). This hope has also been held by later Judaism, but in a different manner; see Orac. Sibyll. 3:698-726, 766-783; Philo, De Proem. et Pon. § 16; Enoch 90:30, 37; Psalt. of Sol. 17:32-35. Otherwise the messianic time, mostly on the basis of Old-Test. passages, is represented as a time of pure joy and happiness. There is no war (Orac. Sibyll. 3:371-380, 751-760; Philo, De Proem. et Poen. § 16; Apocal. Baruch 73:4, 5). Even the wild beasts serve man (Orac. Sibyll. 3:787-794; Philo, u.s. § 15; Targum on Isa 11:6). Earth is very fertile (Orac. Sibyll. 3:620-623, 743-750; Baruch 29:5-8); men are rich and well to do (Philo, § 17, 18); they become nearly one thousand years old, and yet do not feel their age, but  are like boys (Ewald, Jubilees, 3:24). All enjoy bodily strength and health; women bear children without pains, etc. (Philo, § 20; Baruch 73:2, 3, 7; 74:1). But these external gifts are not the only ones. They are but the consequence of the fact that the messianic congregation represents a holy people, sanctified by God, and led in righteousness by the Messiah. He allows no unrighteousness to dwell among them, nor is any one who knows malice in their midst. Hence they are all holy (Psalt. of Sol. 17:28, 29, 36, 48, 49; 18:9, 10). The life in the messianic kingdom is a perpetual λατρεύειν θεῷ ἐν ὁσιότητι καὶ δικαιοσύνη ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ (Luk 1:74-75).

With this kingdom of glory in Palestine the eschatological expectation generally closes; indeed, many regard it as without an end. But afterwards the messianic kingdom is described as of a limited period, and in the Talmud the duration of this time is a matter of debate (Sanhedrin, fol. 99, Colossians 1). The same view we find in the Apoc. Baruch 40:3, and 4 Ezra 12:34; 7:28, 29. Wherever, therefore, a temporal duration is ascribed to the messianic' kingdom, at the end of the time a renovation of the world and the last judgment is still expected.

9. Renovation of the World. — The hope of a renovation of heaven and earth is founded on Isa 65:17; Isa 66:22 (see also Mat 19:28; Rev 21:1; 2Pe 3:13). Accordingly, a distinction was made between the present world and the world to come, הָעוֹלָם הִזֶּה and הִבָּאהָעוֹלָם; in the New Test., ὁ αἰών ουτος and 6 ὁ αἱών ὁ μέλλων or ὁ ἐρχόμενος. But there was a difference of opinion. Some would make the new world commence with the beginning of the messianic time (Enoch 45:4, 5), others with its end (4 Ezra 7:30, 31). In accordance with these different views, the messianic time is either identified with the world to come, or is still reckoned to the present world. But the older and more original view is the one which identifies the days of the Messiah with the world to come. On the "world to come," see Mishna, Berachotk, 1:5; Psa 1:1; Kiddushin, 4:14; Baba Mezia, 2:11; Sanhedrin, 10:1-4; Aboth, 4:1, 16; 5:19; Apoc. Baruth 45:15; 48:50; 73:3; 4 Ezra 6:9; 7:12, 13, 42, 43; 8:8. Comp. also Rhenferdius, De Saeculo Futuro (in Meuschen, u.s. pages 1116-1171); Witsius, De Saeculo hoc et Futuro, u.s. pages 1171-1183; Schottgen, u.s. 1153-1158; Lightfoot, ad Mat 12:32; Wetstein, ad Mat 12:32; Koppe, Novum Test. 6; Epist. ad Ephes. Exc. 1; Bertholdt, u.s. pages 38-43; Gfrorer, u.s. 2:212-217; Bleck,  Hebraerbrief, 2:1, 20 sq.; Oehler, in Herzog's Real Encyklop. 9:434 sq.; 2d ed. 9:664 sq.; Geiger, Judische Zeitschrift, 1866, page 124; Weber, u.s. page 354 sq.

10. General Resurrection. — Before the last judgment is held, a general resurrection of the dead occurs. In general, there was a firm belief in the resurrection of the dead, which is for the first time intimated in Dan 12:2, and this belief was held by all who were more or less influenced by Pharisaism. Only the Sadducees denied the resurrection (Joseph. Ant. 18:14; War, 2:8, 14), and the Alexandrian theology substituted for it an immortality of the soul (Wisdom of Sol. 3:1 sq.; 4:7; 5:16). The time between death and resurrection is for the righteous a time of preliminary happiness, and for the wicked a preliminary state of misery. The literature on that subject is very rich. See Bertholdt, u.s. pages 176-181, 203-206; Gfrorer, u.s. 275-285, 308 sq.; Herzfeld, Gesch. d. Volkes Israel, 3:307- 310, 328-333, 349-351, 504-506; Langen, Das Judenthum in Palastina, page 338 sq.; Rothe, Dogmatik, 2:2, 68-71, 298-308; Oehler, Theologie des Alten Testaments, 2:241 sq.; Hermann Schultz, Alttestamentliche Theologie, 2d ed. page 713 sq. 807 sq.; Hamburger, Real-Encycklop. 2:98 sq. (art. "Belebung der Todten"); Stahelin, Jahrb. fur deutsche Theologie, 1874, page 199 sq.; Weber, u.s. page 371 sq.; Grobler, Die Ansichten uber Unsterblischkeit und Auferstehung in der judischen Literatur der beiden letzten Jahrh. vor Christus, in Studien und Kritiken, 1879, pages 651-700.

11. Last Judgment. Eternal Blessedness and Damnation. — A last judgment after the end of the messianic period can only be thought of where the messianic kingdom is of a finite duration (see Bar 1:4; Baruch 4 Ezra 7:33-35). God himself is the judge of all men (Baruch 51:4, 5; 4 Ezr 6:2). In general it may be said that all Israel have a part in the future world (Satnhedrin, 10:1), with the exception of the wicked in Israel (10:1-4). They, together with Israel's enemies, go down into the fire of Gehenna (Baruch 45:15; 51:1, 2:4-6; 4 Ezra 5:1-3, 59). As a rule this damnation is regarded as everlasting; but there is also the view which ascribes a limited duration of hell-punishment (Mishna, Eduyoth, 2:10). The righteous and pious will be received into paradise, and will behold the majesty of God and of his holy angels. Their face shall shine like the sun, and they shall live forever (Baruch 51:3, 7-14; 4 Ezra 6:1-3, 68-72; Assumptio Mosis 10:9, 10).

Literature. — Besides the works of Schottgen, Bertholdt, De Wette, Gfrorer, Weber, Hamburger, already mentioned, see Moraht, De iis, quae ad Cognoscendam Judweorum Palestinensium, qui Jesu Tempore Vivebant, Christologiam Evangelia Nobis Exhibeant, Deque Locis Messianis in Illis Allegatis (Gottingen, 1829); Von Colln, Biblische Theologie (1836), 1:479-511; Mack, Die messianischen Erwartungen und Ansichten der Zeitgenossen Jesu (in Tub. Theol. Quartalschrift, eod. pages 356, 193-226); Bruno Bauer, Kritik der evangelischen Geschichto der Synoptiker (1841), 1:391-416; Zeller, Ueber die Behauptung dass das vorchristliche Judenthum noch keine messianische Dogmatik gehabt habe (Theol. Jahrbucher, 1843, pages 35-52); Hellwag, in Theol. Jahrbucher von Bauer und Zeller (1848), pages 151-160; Hilgenfeld, Die judische Apocalyptik in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwickelung (Jena, 1857); Oehler, art. "Messias," in Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 9:408 sq.; 2d ed. 9:641 sq.; Colani, Jesus-Christ et les Croyances Messianiques de son Temps (2d ed. Strasburg, 1864), pages 1-68; Langen, Das Judenthum in Paldstina zur Zeit Christi (Freiburg, 1866), pages 391-461; Ewald, Geschichte des Volkes Israel (3d ed. 1867), 5:135-160; Kkim, Geschichte Jesu (cod.), 1:239-250 (Engl. transl. pages 308-321; Lond. 1873); Holtzmann, Die Messiasidee zur Zeit Jesu (Jahrb. fur deutsche Theologie, 1867, pages 389-411); the same, in Weber and Holtzmann's Geschichte des Volkes Israel (cod.), 2:191-211; Hausrath, Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte (i868), 1:172-184; 2d ed. (1873), page 165-176; Engl. transl. (Lond. 1878) 1:191-204; Weiffenbach, Quae Jesu in Regno Caelesti Dignitas sit Synopticorum Sentia Exponitur (Giessen, 1868), pages 47-62; Ebrard, Wissenschafiliche Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte (3d .ed. eod.), pages 835-849; Wittichen, Die Idee des Reiches, Gottes (Gottingen, 1872), pages 105-165; Anger, Vorlesungen uber die Geschichte der messianischen Idee (edited by Krenkel; Berlin, 1873), pages 78-91; Castelli, Il Messia Secondo gli Ebrei (Florence, 874); Vernes, Histoire des Idees Messianiques depuis Alexandre Jusqu'a l'Empereur, Hadrien (Paris, cod.); Schbnefeld, Ueber die messianische Hoffnung von 200 vor Christo bis gegen 50 nach Christo (Jena, eod.); Drummond, The Jewish Messiah (Lond. 1877); Stapfer, Les Idees Religieuses en Palestine a l'Epoque de Jesus-Christ (2d ed. 1878), pages 111-132; Reuss, Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des Alten Testaments (1881), § 555, 556; Hamburger, Real- Encyklop. fur Bibel und Talmud, II Abtheilung (1883), articles: "Messianische Leidenszeit," "Messias," "Messiasleiden," "Messias Sohn Joseph," "Messiaszeit" (pages 735-779); also Armilus, Belebung der  Todten. Ewiges Leben, Lohn und Strafe, Paradies, Vergeltung, Zukunftsmahl; Pick, Talmudic Notices concerning Messiah (Presbyterian Review, July 1884); Old Testament Passages Messianically Applied by the Ancient Synagogue (Hebraica, October, 1884 and seq.); Schurer, Lehrbuch der Neutestamentlichen Zeitgeschichte (Leipsic, 1874), page 563 sq.; 2d ed. with the title Geschichte des judischen Voikes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi (1886), 2:417 sq. (B.P.)

## Messias[[@Headword:Messias]]

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

## Messina, Antonella Da[[@Headword:Messina, Antonella Da]]

             an Italian painter, was born at Messina some time between 1414 and 1426: studied in the Netherlands in the school of Johann van Eyck, where he learned the secret of the preparation and use of oil-colors, and spread the knowledge of it afterwards among the Venetians. Authors differ widely as to this artist, and very little is known of his life. His principal works are the head of St. Sebastian and a Madonna and Child, in the Berlin Museum. A Christ bound to a Pillar is in the Manfrini Gallery at Venice, and a Dead Christ, with three weeping angels, in the Imperial Gallery of Vienna. A Crucifixion, with the Virgin and St. John, is in the Antwerp Museum; and in the Academy of Venice is a Weeping Nun. Two altarpieces by him are recorded, which were painted for the two churches of the Dominante,  besides several Madonnas and sacred subjects for individuals. He died about 1490. See Vasari, Lives of the Painters, transl. by Foster (London, 1850, 5 vols. 8vo), 2:55; Spooner, Biographical History of the Fine Arts (N. Y. 1865, 2 vols. 8vo), vol. ii, s.v.

## Messmer, Joseph Anton[[@Headword:Messmer, Joseph Anton]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, was born October 17, 1829, and died at Munich, December 23, 1879, doctor and professor of theology. He published, Ueber den Ursprung, die Entwickelung und Bedeutung der Basilika in der christlichen Baukunst (Leipsic, 1854): — Johann Michael Sailer (Mannheim, 1875 ): — Dr. Joseph. Hubert — Reinkens, katholischer Bischof (Linz, 1874). (B.P.)

## Mestrezat, Jean[[@Headword:Mestrezat, Jean]]

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

## Mestrezat, Philippe[[@Headword:Mestrezat, Philippe]]

             a Reformed theologian, son of Jean, was born at Geneva. In 1641 he was a professor of philosophy in his native city; in 1644 the pastor of a church; and in 1649 a professor of theology. He acquired the reputation of being an  original thinker and a good preacher. He died at Geneva in 1690. He published many dissertations, among which may be mentioned: De Unione Personarum in Christo (Genesis 1682, 4to) :-De Conmunicatione idiomatum toti Christo facta (ibid. 1675, 4to):-De Tolerantia fratrum dissidentium in praeter-fundamentalibus (1663, 4to) :-Qucestionum philosophico-theologicarum de libero aritrio Decas (1655, 4to). See Senebier, Hist. Litter. de Geneve; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Metabolism[[@Headword:Metabolism]]

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

## Metagnostics[[@Headword:Metagnostics]]

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

## Metal[[@Headword:Metal]]

             a term that nowhere occurs in the AuthVer, although the various metals and operations with then are frequently referred to. The allusions indeed are ot such a character as to show that the art of metallurgy was well advanced in those ancient times. The mountains of Palestine contained metals, noi were the Hebrews ignorant of the fact (Deu 8:9) but they do not appear to have understood the art of mining, unless indeed the numerous allusions apparently to mining operations in Job 28 are an evidence that these were carried on in the period of the monarchy. SEE MINE. They therefore obtained from others the superior as well as the inferior metals, and worked them up. They received also metal utensils ready made, or metal in plates (Jer 10:9), from neighboring and distant countries of Asia and Europe. The Hebrews, in common with other ancient nations, were acquainted with nearly all the metals known to modern metallurgy, whether as the products of their own soil or the results of intercourse with foreigners. The trade in these metals was chiefly in the hands of the Phoenicians (Eze 27:7), who obtained them from their  colonies, principally those in Spain (Jer 10:9; Eze 27:12). Some also came from Arabia (Eze 27:19), and some apparently from the country of the Caucasus (Eze 27:13).

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

Tin is first mentioned among the spoils of the Midianites which were taken when Balaam was slain (Num 31:22), and lead is used to heighten the imagery of Moses's triumphal song (Exo 15:10).

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

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

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

With the exception of iron, gold is the most widely diffused of all metals. Almost every country in the world has in its turn yielded a certain supply; and as it is found most frequently in alluvial soil, among the debris of rocks washed down by the torrents, it was known at a very early period, and was procured with little difficulty. The existence of gold and the prevalence of gold ornaments in early times are no proof of a high state of civilization, but rather the reverse. Gold was undoubtedly used before the art of working iron or copper was discovered. We have no indications of gold streams or mines in Palestine. The Hebrews obtained their principal supply from the south of Arabia, and the commerce of the Persian Gulf. The ships of Hiram, king of Tyre, brought it for Solomon (1Ki 9:11; 1Ki 10:11), snd at a later period, when the Hebrew monarch had equipped a fleet and manned it with Tyrian sailors, the chief of their freight was the gold of  Ophir (1Ki 9:21; 1Ki 9:28). It was brought thence in the ships of Tarshisl: (1Ki 22:48), the Indiamen of the ancient world; and Parvaim (2Ch 3:6), Raamah (Eze 26:2), Sheba (1Ki 10:2; 1Ki 10:10; Psa 72:15; Isa 60:6; Eze 27:22), and Uphaz (Jer 10:9), were other sources of gold for the markets of Palestine and Tyre. It was probably brought in the form of ingots (Jos 7:21; A. V. “wedge,” lit. “ tongue”), and was rapidly converted into articles of ornament and use. Ear-rings, or: rather nose-rings, were made of it-those given to Rebecca were half a shekel (1 oz.) in weight (Gen 24:22) — bracelets (Gen 24:22), chains (Gen 41:42), signets (Exo 35:22), bullae, or spherical ornaments suspended from the neck (Exo 35:22), and chains for the legs (Num 31:50; comp. Isa 3:18; Pliny, 33:12). It was used in embroidery (Exo 39:3; 2Sa 1:24; Pliny, 8:74); the decorations and furniture of the Tabernacle were enriched with the gold of the ornaments which the Hebrews willingly offered (Exodus 35-40); the same precious metal was lavished upon the Temple (1Ki 6:7); Solomon's throne was overlaid with gold (1Ki 10:18), his drinking-cups and the vessels of the house of the forest of Lebanon were of pure gold (1Ki 10:21), and the neighboring princes brought him as presents vessels of gold and silver (1Ki 10:25). So plentiful indeed was the supply of the precious metals (luring his reign that silver was esteemed of little worth (1Ki 10:21; 1Ki 10:27). Gold and silver were devoted to the fashioning of idolatrous images (Exo 20:23; Exo 32:4; Deu 29:17; 1Ki 12:28). The crown on the head of Malcham (AV. “their king”), the idol of the Ammonites at Rabbah, weighed a talent of gold, that is, 125 lbs. troy, a weight so great that it could not have been worn by David among the ordinary insignia of royalty (2Sa 12:30). The great abundance of gold in early times is indicated by its entering into the composition of every article of ornament and almost all of domestic use. ‘Among the spoils of the Midianites taken by the Israelites, in their bloodless victory when Balaam was slain, were ear-rings and jewels to the amount of 16,750 shekels in gold (Numbers 21:48-54), equal in value to more than $150,000. 1700 shekels of gold (worth more than $15,000) in nose jewels (AV.” ear-rings”) alone were taken by Gideon's army from the slaughtered Midianites (Jdg 8:26).

These numbers, though large, are not incredibly great, when we consider that the country of the Midianites was at that time rich in gold streams, which have since been exhausted, and that, like the Malays of the present day and the Peruvians of the time of  Pizarro, they carried most of their wealth about them. But the amount of treasure accumulated by David from spoils taken in war is so enormous that we are tempted to conclude the numbers exaggerated. From the gold shields of Hadadezer's army of Syrians and other sources he had collected, according to the chronicler (1Ch 22:14), 100,000 talents of gold, and 1,000,000 talents of silver; to these must be added his own contribution of 3000 talents of gold and 7000 of silver (1Ch 29:2-4), and the additional offerings of the people, the total value of which, estimating the weight of a talent to be 125 lbs. troy, gold at 73s. per oz., and silver at 4s. 41/2d. per oz., is reckoned by Mr. Napier to be £939,929,687. Some idea of the largeness of this sum may be formed by considering that in 1855 the total amount of gold in use in the world was calculated to be about $4,100.000,000. Undoubtedly the quantity of the precious metals possessed by the Israelites might be greater in consequence of their commercial intercourse with the Phoenicians, who were masters of the sea; but in the time of David they were a nation struggling foi political existence, surrounded by powerful enemies, and without the leisure necessary for developing their commercial capabilities. The numbers given by Josephus (Ant. 7:14, 2) are only one tenth of those in the, text, but the sum, even when thus reduced, is still enormous.

But though gold was thus common, silver appears to have been the ordinary medium of commerce. The first commercial transaction of which we possess the details was the purchase of Ephron's field by Abraham for 400 shekels of silver (Gen 23:16); slaves were bought with silver (Gen 17:12); silver was the money paid by Abimelech as a compensation to Abraham (Gen 20:16); Joseph was sold to the Ishmaelite merchants for twenty pieces of silver (Gen 37:28); and generally in the Old Testament, “money” in the A. V. is literally silver. The first payment in gold is mentioned in 1Ch 21:25, where David buys the threshing-floor of Oman, or Araunah, the Jebusite, for “ six hundred shekels of gold by weight.” But in the parallel narrative of the transaction in 2Sa 24:24, the price paid for the threshing floor and the oxen is fifty shekels of silver. An attempt has been made by Keil to reconcile these two passages, by supposing. that in the former the purchase referred to was that of the entire hill on which the threshing-floor stood. and in the latter that of the threshing-floor itself. But the close resemblance between the two narratives renders it difficult to accept this explanation, and to imagine that two different circumstances are described. That there is a discrepancy between the numbers in 2Sa 24:9 and 1Ch 21:5 is admitted, and it seems impossible to avoid the conclusion that the present case is but another instance of the same kind. With this one exception there is no case in the O.T. in which gold is alluded to as a medium of commerce; the Hebrew coinage may have been partly gold, but we have no proof of it. SEE GOLD.

Silver was brought into Palestine in the form of plates from Tarshish, with gold and ivory (1Ki 10:22; 2Ch 9:21; Jer 10:9). The accumulation of wealth in the reign of Solomon was so great that silver was but little esteemed: the king made silver to be in Jerusalem as stones” (1Ki 10:21; 1Ki 10:27). With the treasures which were brought out of Egypt, not only the ornaments, but the ordinary metal-work of the Tabernacle was made. Silver was employed for the sockets of the boards (Exo 26:19), and for the hooks of the pillars and their fillets (Exo 38:10). The capitals of the pillars were overlaid with it (Exo 38:17); the chargers and bowls offered by the princes at the dedication of the Tabernacle (Num 7:13, etc.), the trumpets for marshalling the host (Num 10:2), and some of the candlesticks and tables for the Temple, were of silver (1Ch 28:15-16). It was used for the setting of gold ornaments (Pro 25:11) and other decorations (Son 1:11), and for the pillars of Solomon's gorgeous chariot or palanquin (Son 3:10). SEE SILVER.

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

Brass, or more properly copper, was a native product of Palestine, “a land whose stones are iron, and out of whose hills thou mayest dig copper” (Deu 8:9; Job 28:2). It was so plentiful in the days of Solomon that the quantity employed in the Temple could not be estimated, it was so great (1Ki 7:47). Much of the copper which David had prepared for this work was taken from the Syrians after the defeat of Hadadezer (2Sa 8:8), and more was presented by Toi, king of  Hamath. The market of Tyre was supplied with vessels of the same metal by the merchants of Javan, Tubal, and Meshech (Eze 27:13). There is strong reason to believe that brass, a mixture of copper and zinc, was unknown to the ancients. To the latter metal no allusion is found. But tin was well known, and from the difficulty which attends the toughening of pure copper so as to render it fit for hammering, it is probable that the mode. of deoxidizing copper by the admixture of small quantities of tin had been early discovered. “We are inclined to think,” says Mr. Napier, “that. Moses used no copper vessels for domestic, purposes, but bronze, the use of which is less objectionable.

Bronze, not being so subject to tarnish, takes on a-finer polish, and being much more easily melted and cast, it probably was more extensively used than copper alone. These practical considerations, and the. fact that almost all the antique castings and other articles in metal which are preserved from these, ancient times are composed of bronze, prove in our opinion that where the word ‘brass' occurs in Scripture, except where it refers to an ore, such as Job 28:2 and Deu 8:9, it should be translated bronze” (Metals of the Bible, p. 66). Arms (2Sa 21:6; Job 20:24; Psa 18:34) and armor (1Sa 17:6; 1Sa 17:38) were made of this metal, which was capable of being so wrought as to admit of a keen and hard edge. The Egyptians employed it in cutting the hardest granite. The Mexicans, before the discovery of iron, “ found a substitute in an alloy of tin and copper; and with tools made of this bronze they could cut not only metals, but, with the aid of silicious dust, the hardest substances, as basalt, porphyry, amethysts, and emeralds” (Prescott, Conq. of Mexico, ch. 5). The great skill attained by the Egyptians in working metals at a very early period throws light upon the remarkable facility with which the Israelites, during their wanderings in the desert, elaborated the works of art connected with the structure of the Tabernacle, for which great acquaintance with metals was requisite. In the troublous times which followed their entrance into Palestine this knowledge seems to have been lost, for when the Temple was built the metal-workers employed were Phoenicians. SEE COPPER.

Iron, like copper, was found in the hills of Palestine. The “ iron mountain” in the trans-Jordanic region is described by Josephus (War, 4:8, 2), and was remarkable for producing a particular kind of palm (Mishna, Succa, ed. Dachs. p. 182). Iron mines are still worked by the inhabitants of Kefr Huneh in the S. of the valley Zaharani; smelting-works are found at Shemuster, three hours W. of Baalbek, and others in the oak-woods at  Masbek (Ritter, Erdkunde, 17:73,201); but the method employed is the simplest possible, like that of the old Samothracians, and the iron so obtained is chiefly used for horse-shoes. SEE IRON.

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

Antimony (2Ki 9:30; Jer 4:30; A. V. “painting”), in the form of powder, was used by the Hebrew women, like the kohl of the Arabs, for coloring their eyelids and eyebrows. SEE PAINT.

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

The Hebrew workers in iron, and especially such as made arms, were frequently carried away by the different conquerors of the Israelites (1Sa 13:19; 2Ki 24:14-15; Jer 24:1; Jer 29:2); which is one  circumstance among others to show the high estimation in which this branch of handicraft was anciently held.

The following are the metallic -manufactures named in the Old Testament: Of iron, axes (Deu 19:5; 2Ki 6:5); saws (2Sa 12:31); stone-cutters' tools (Deu 27:5); sauce-pans (Eze 4:3); bolts, chains, knives, etc., but especially weapons of war (1Sa 17:7; 1Ma 6:33). Bedsteads even were sometimes made of iron (Deu 3:11); “chariots of iron,” i.e. war-chariots, are noticed frequently. Of copper we find vessels of all kinds (Lev 6:28; Num 16:39; 2Ch 4:16; Ezekiel 8:27); and also weapons of war, principally helmets, cuirasses, shields, spears (1 Samuel 17:5; 6:38; 2Sa 21:16); also chains (Jdg 16:21); and even mirrors (Exo 38:8). Gold and silver furnished articles of ornament, also vessels, such as cups, goblets, etc. The holy vessels of the Temple were mostly of gold (Ezr 5:14). Idolaters had idols and other sacred objects of silver (Exo 20:20; Isa 2:20; Act 17:29; Act 19:24). Lead is mentioned as being used for weights, and for plumb-lines in measuring (Amo 7:7; Zec 5:8). Some of the tools of workers in metal are also mentioned: פִּעִם, pa'am, the anvil (Isa 41:7); מִקָּבָה, makkabah', the hammer for carpenters (Isa 44:12); פִּטַּישׁ, pattish', the stone-hammer (Isa 41:7); מִל קָחַים, mal kachim', the pincers; מִפֻּח, ma alappu'ach, the bellows (Jer 6:29); מִצְרֵŠ, matzreph', the crucible (Pro 17:3); כּוּר, kur, the melting-furnace (Eze 22:18). See each of these articles in alphabetical order.

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

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

(2.) The casting of images (Exo 25:12; Exo 26:37; Isa 40:19), which are always of gold, silver, or copper. The casting of iron is not mentioned, and was perhaps unknown to the ancients (Hausmann, in Commentatt. Soc. Gott. 4:53 sq.; Miiller, Archdol. p. 371).

(3.) The hammering of metal, and making it into broad sheets (Num 16:38; Isa 44:12; Jeremiah 10).

(4.) Soldering and welding parts of metal together (Isa 41:7)

(5.) Smoothing and polishing metals (1Ki 7:45).

(6.) Overlaying with plates of gold, and silver, and copper (Exo 25:11-24; 1Ki 6:20; 2Ch 3:5; comp. Isa 40:19). The execution of these different metallurgic operations appears to have formed three distinct branches of handicraft before the exile; for we read of the blacksmith, by the name of the “ worker in iron” (חֹרֵשׁ בִּרְזֶל, Isa 44:12); the brass-founder (1Ki 7:14); and the gold and silver smith (Jdg 17:4; Mal 3:2). SEE MECHANIC.

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

## Metallurgy[[@Headword:Metallurgy]]

             SEE METAL; SEE MINE.

## Metamorphoses[[@Headword:Metamorphoses]]

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

## Metaphor[[@Headword:Metaphor]]

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

## Metaphrastes, Simeon[[@Headword:Metaphrastes, Simeon]]

             a Byzantine writer of the Middle Ages, acquired great reputation by his compilation of the lives of many saints and martyrs. Very little is known of his individual history. It appears, however, to be proved that he lived at Constantinople, and there filled an official position. The name Metaphrastes was given him on account of the manner in which he commented and paraphrased (ἐμετέφρασε) the materials for his biographical work. The greatest variety of opinion prevails as to the time when he lived: Blondell, Vossius, Ceillier, Baronius, Simler, Volaterra, Allatins, Cave, Oudin, Fabricius, all give different dates, varying from the 9th to the 14th century. It even appears uncertain whether there may not have existed two men of that name at different times. The more ancient date is that of Leo Allatius, who in his work De Simeonum Scriptis (Par. 1664, p. 49 sq.) enters into deep researches concerning Metaphrastes, the result of which is adopted by Cave (Histor. Litter. [Lond. 1688], p. 573) and Fabricius (Bibl. Gr. 6:509; in ed. Harl. 10:180 sq.). His conclusions were opposed by Oudin in his Dissertatio de cetate et scriptis Sim. Met. (Comment. 2:1300 sq.). From various passages in works undoubtedly written by Metaphrastes, it appears to be pretty well established that he lived during the reign of the emperor Leo VI (Philosophus), and was sent  as ambassador to the Arabs of Crete in 902, and in 904 to those who had conquered Thessalonica, whom he persuaded not to destroy that city, as they originally intended. It seems also well established that he was still alive in the time of the emperor Constantine VII (Porphyrogenitus).

His principal works are: Vitae Sanctorum, undertaken, it is said, at the suggestion of the emperor Constantine. This assertion, however, has often been contradicted. The work is not original; Metaphrastes only arranged and paraphrased, in very good style for the times, various biographies which existed previously in the libraries of churches and convents. He omitted many details which he considered useless or unproved, and substituted others which he looked upon as more important or authentic. He has been accused of having by these modifications destroyed the simplicity of the ancient biographies. His own work has undergone many alterations and additions, as well as curtailment, so that, according to Fabricius, out of 539 biographies generally ascribed to him, only 122 are undoubtedly genuine. Cave, on the other hand, maintains that the greater part of the 417 manuscript biographies extant in the various libraries of Europe are the work of Metaphrastes. Agapius, a monk, gave an extract of them under the title Liber dictus Paraclitus, seu illustrium sanctorum vitce desumptce ex Simeone Metaphraste (Venice, 1541, 4to). The most important among these biographies were published, in Greek and Latin, in the Bollandists' Acta Sanctorum: Annales, commencing with the emperor Leo the Armenian (813-820), and ending with Romanus, the son of Constantine Porphyrogenitus (959-963). It is evident that Metaphrastes, who was already an ambassador in 902, could not have been the historian of events which occurred sixty years later. Some critics consequently consider the later part of the Annales to have been written by another Metaphrastes, while Baronius thinks that the whole work was composed by a writer living in the 12th century. These Annales, which are of great historical value, were published with a Latin translation by Combofis in his Hist. Byzantince Scriptores. post Theophanem. of which the edition by Immanuel Bekker (Bonn, 1838, 8vo) is a carefully-revised reprint:- — Epistolac IX, published in Greek and Latin by Leo Allatius, Diatriba de Simeonibus; Carmina pia duo politica, ii Allatius; and in Lectius, Potcta Grceci veteres (Geneva, 1614, fol.):-Sermo in Diem Sabbati sancti, in Latin only, by Combefis, Biblioth. Concionator. vol. iii :- Εἰς τὸν θρῆνον τῆς ὑπεραγίας θεοτόκου, etc., in Greek and Latin by Allatius; several hymns, or canons, still in use in the Greek Church : — ᾿Ηθικοὶ λόγοι, an extract from the works of St. Basil, and published in Greek and Latin by  Morel (Paris, 1556, 8vo). See Fabricius, Biblioth. Graeca, vii. 683; 10:180; Cave, Histoire Litt.; Hankius, Scriptores Byzant. ch. 24; Oudin, Dissert. de AEtate et Scriptis Simeonis Metaphrastis, in his Comment. de script. eccles.; Baronius, Annales ad ann. 859. Herzog, Real-Encykl. 9:446; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Genesis 35:188; Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Romans Biog. and Mythol. 2:1055. (J. N. P.)

## Metaphysics[[@Headword:Metaphysics]]

             in its strictest sense, is applied, as a term. to that department of philosophy which has for its object the investigation of existences out of ourselves “that knowledge of causes and principles which we should carry with us into every department of inquiry.” Inasmuch as mind cannot properly know what is not in contact with itself, the question, “ What is the nature of our knowledge of the external world?” has been asked by philosophers, and answered in various ways; and this is the great question of metaphysics, if the term is applied in a strictly historical sense. Among modern writers of note in the field of philosophy, Prof. Ferrier, in his Institutes of Metaphysics (Edinb. and Lond. 1854, 12mo), accordingly occupies himself solely with the questions connected with knowledge, or the nature of our perception of an external world; his explanatory title is, The Theory of Knowing and Being. On the other hand, the lately-deceased Scotch philosopher Mansel, in his article Metaphysics (Cyclopcedia Britannica, 8th ed. vol. 14, s.v.), divided the subject into two parts-” Psychology, or the science of the facts of consciousness [which expresses the science of mind generally] as such; and Ontology, or the science of the same facts considered in their relation to realities existing without the mind”-that is, the problem of perception or metaphysics in the narrower sense. “Metaphysics,” says the writer of the article on that subject in the Edinburgh Cyclopcedia, “have been called the First philosophy, or the Science of Sciences, as their object is to explain the principles and causes of all things existing, and to supply the defects of inferior sciences, which do not demonstrate, or sufficiently explain, their principles.”

Here we have a still further departure from our first and somewhat circumscribed sphere to the vast expanse of the department itself known as philosophy. Of the above two branches of philosophy or metaphysics, psychology (q.v.) investigates the faculties and operations of the human mind, while ontology (q.v.) seeks to develop the nature and laws of real existence. The former deals with the phenomena of consciousness, the constitution of the mind, the laws of thought; the latter with the essential characteristics of being per  se, the constitution of the universe, the laws of things. The former is descriptive, and the latter scientific metaphysics. “Metaphysics,” says Sir William Hamilton (Lect. vii, p. 85), “in whatever: latitude the term be taken, is a science, or complement of sciences, exclusively occupied with mind. Now the philosophy of mind-psychology or metaphysics, in the widest signification of the terms-is threefold, for the object it immediately proposes for consideration may be either, 1, Phenomena in general; or, 2, Laws; or, 3, Inferences and Results.... The whole of philosophy is the answer to these three questions:

1. What are the facts or phenomena to be observed?

2. What are the laws which regulate these facts, or under which these phenomena appear?

3. What are the real results, not immediately manifested, which these facts or phenomena warrant us in drawing?”

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

As regards the origin of the name, the most recent discussions appear, on the whole, to confirm the commonly-received opinion, according to which the term Metaphysics, though originally employed to designate a treatise of Aristotle, was probably unknown to that philosopher himself. It is true that the oldest and best of the extant commentators on Aristotle refers the inscription of the treatise to the Stagyrite (Alexander, inl Arist. Meth. p. 127, ed. Bonitz); but in the extant writings of Aristotle himself, though the work and its subject are frequently referred to under the titles of the First Philosophy, or Theology, or Wisdom (Asclepius, apud Brandis Scholia, p. 519, b. 19; Bonitz, in Arist. Metaph. p. 5), no authority is found for the  latter and more popular appellation. On the whole, the weight of evidence appears to be in favor of the supposition which attributes the inscription τὰ μετὰ τὰ φυσικά to Andronicus Rhodius, the first editor of Aristotle's collected works. The title, as given to the writings on the first philosophy, probably indicates only their place in the collection, as coming after the physical treatises of the author (comp. Bonitz ad Arist. Metaph. p. 3, 5). In this respect the term Metaphysics has been aptly compared to that of Postils; both names signifying nothing more than the fact of something else having preceded. Shakespeare used metaphysical as synonymous with supernatural.

“Fate and metaphysical aid doth seem

To have thee crowned.”- Macbeth, Act i, Scene 3.

Clemens Alexandrinus (Strom. i) considered metaphysical as equivalent to supernatural; and is supported by the Greek commentator Philoponus. But if μετά be interpreted, as it may, to mean along with, then metaphysics, or metaphysical philosophy, will be that philosophy which we should take along with us into physics. and into every other philosophy-that knowledge of causes and principles which we should carry with us into every department of inquiry. Aristotle called it the governing philosophy, which gives laws to all, but receives laws from none (Metaphys. lib. i, cap. 2). Lord Bacon (Advancement of Learning, bk. ii) has limited its sphere, when he says, “ The' one part (of philosophy), which is physics, inquireth and handleth the material and efficient causes; and the other, which is metaphysics, handleth the formal and final cause.” But all causes are considered by Aristotle in his writings which have been entitled Metaphysics. “Aristotle,” says Schwegler (Hist. of Philos. p. 112), “held that every science must have for investigation a determined province and separate form of being, but that none of these sciences reaches the conception of being itself. Hence there is needed a science which should investigate that which the other sciences take up hypothetically, or through experience. This is done by the first philosophy, which has to do with being as such, while the other sciences relate only to determined and concrete being. The metaphysics, which is this science of being and its primitive grounds, is the first philosophy, since it is presupposed by every other discipline. Thus, says Aristotle, if there were only a physical substance, then would physics be the first and the only philosophy; but if there be an immaterial and unmoved essence which is the ground of all being, then must there be also an antecedent, and, because it is antecedent, a universal  philosophy. The first ground of all being is God, whence Aristotle occasionally gives to the first philosophy the name of theology.” “The aim of metaphysics,” says D'Alembert (Melanges, 4:143), “is to examine the generation of our ideas, and to show that they come from sensations.” This is the ideology of Condillac and De Trace. “Metaphysics,” says Stewart (Dissert. pt. ii, p. 475),” was a word formerly appropriated to the ontology and pneumatology of the schools, but now understood as equally applicable to all those inquiries whichῥhave for their object to trace the various branches of human knowledge to their first principles in the constitution of the human mind;” and in the Preface to the same Dissertation he says that by metaphysics he understands the “inductive philosophy of the human mind.” For literature, SEE PHILOSOPHY. (J. H. W.)

## Metastasio, Pietro Bonaventura[[@Headword:Metastasio, Pietro Bonaventura]]

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

## Metatron[[@Headword:Metatron]]

             an angel frequently mentioned by rabbinical writers, and to whom they ascribe superior prerogatives. He is said to, be "the king of angels," and to "ascend to the throne of glory above nine hundred firmaments to carry up the prayers of the Israelites." He is supposed by some to have been the angel who conducted the Israelites through the wilderness, and by others to have been Enoch.

## Metawilah[[@Headword:Metawilah]]

             a heretical Mohammedan sect, who maintain that the allegorical and not the literal meaning of the Koran is: binding on the faithful. They are found principally in the district lying to the south and east of Tyre, in the regions contiguous to the sources of the Jordan, and in Caele-Syria proper. They are Shiites, and recognize the supreme Imamate of Ali (q.v.).

## Metcalf, Kendrick, D.D[[@Headword:Metcalf, Kendrick, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, devoted nearly the whole of his active life to educational work. For many years he was Hobart professor of the Greek and Latin languages and literature in the Hobart Free College, Geneva, N.Y. For some time he was a member of the standing committee of his diocese. In 1867 he was elected professor of rhetoric, and chaplain of the college. The following year he was Horace White professor of  rhetoric and English literature, a position which he retained until his death, October 30, 1872. See Prot. Episc. Almanac, 1873, page 134.

## Metcalfe, William, M.D[[@Headword:Metcalfe, William, M.D]]

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

## Mete-Yard[[@Headword:Mete-Yard]]

             (מַרָּה, middah', Lev 19:35; measure simply, as elsewhere rendered).

## Metel (Lat. Metellus), Hugues[[@Headword:Metel (Lat. Metellus), Hugues]]

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

## Metempsychosis[[@Headword:Metempsychosis]]

             SEE TRANSMIGRATION.

## Meterus[[@Headword:Meterus]]

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

## Meth, Ezeghiel[[@Headword:Meth, Ezeghiel]]

             a noted leader of a mystic sect who at the beginning of the 17th century created great excitement in Thuringia. Meth was practicing medicine in the city of Langensalza, Thuringia, when his uncle, a merchant in the same town, who had become an enthusiastic mystic, presented him with his peculiar conceptions of Christian fellowship and responsibility. Meth was readily won in favor of the heretical doctrines, and became one of the leaders of a sect which soon became numerous. He afterwards moved to Leipsic, where he died in 1640. Stiefel and Meth found their first followers among their own relatives and friends at Langensalza and Erfurt. They also gained access to the house of count Hans Ludwig de Gleichen, whose wife,  the countess Juliana, became so ensnared in their mystic doctrines that she was finally excluded from the Lord's table. But matters did not rest here. She imagined she was a second Virgin Mary, and was to give birth to the new Messiah. She therefore separated herself from the count, and to the day of her death (July 28, 1633) remained steadfast in her hopes that she would bring forth the Messiah. The authorities tried in various ways to bring these enthusiasts to their senses, but kindness as well as punishment proved in vain, until at last Stiefel died-Stiefel who had been considered immortal by Meth and all his followers. A change took place in Stiefel's mind, and he is said to have died a truly converted Christian.

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

## Metheg[[@Headword:Metheg]]

             SEE METHEG-AMMAH.

## Metheg-Ammah[[@Headword:Metheg-Ammah]]

             (Heb me'theg ha-anmmah', הָאִמָּה מֶתֶג, bridle [as in 2Ki 19:28, etc.] of the mother [i.e. mother-city = אֵם, in 2Sa 20:19]; Sept. ἡ ἀρωρισμένη,Vulg. frenum tributi), a figurative term for a chief city, occurring in the statement (2Sa 8:1), “ David took the bit of the metropolis (Auth. Vers. ‘ Metheg-Ammah') out of the hand of the Philistines,” i.e. he subdued their capital or strongest town, meaning GATH, as is expressly affirmed in the parallel passage (1Ch 18:1). Other interpretations may be seen in Glassii Philol. Sacr. ed. Dathe, p. 783. Gesenius (Thes. Hebrews p. 113) compares the Arabic proverb, “I give thee not my bridle,” i.e. I do not submit to thee (see Schultens ad Job 20:11; and Hariri Cons. iv; Hist. Tamerl. p. 243; Vit. Tim. 1:50). On the  other hand, Ewald (Gesch. 3:190) less naturally takes Ammah as meaning the “forearm,” and treats the words as a metaphor to express the perfect manner in which David had smitten and humbled his foes, had torn the bridle from their arm, and thus broken forever the dominion with which they curbed Israel, as a rider manages his horse by the rein held fast on his arm. He objects to the other interpretation that Gath had its own king still in the days of Solomon; but it may be replied that the king in Solomon's time. may have been, and probably was, tributary to Israel, as the kings ‘on this side the Euphrates” (1Ki 4:24) were. It is an obvious objection to Ewald's interpretation, that to control his horse a rider must hold the bridle, not on his arm, but fast in his hand.

## Methen[[@Headword:Methen]]

             SEE MITHNITE.

## Methoar[[@Headword:Methoar]]

             SEE REMMON-METHOAR.

## Methodism[[@Headword:Methodism]]

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

I. Origin. — In November, 1729, the Wesleys, Whitefield, and their associates-about a dozen young men, students at Oxford University- formed themselves into a society for purposes of mutual moral improvement. They had a sincere desire to please God; and, by diligence, self-denial, and active benevolence, they sought to know and do his will. By instructing the children of the neglected poor, by visiting the sick and the inmates of prisons and almshouses, by a strict observance of the fasts ordained by the Church, and by scrupulous exactness in their attendance upon public worship,' they became objects of general notice. Many grave men thought them righteous overmuch, and attempted to dissuade them from an excess of piety; while profane wits treated them with sarcasm and contempt. Nothing could save from ridicule men who in that age and in such a place professed to make religion the great business of life. Hence by their fellow-students they were called in turn, Sacramentarians, Bible- bigots, Bible-moths, The Godly Club. One, a student of Christ-Church  College, with greater reverence than his fellows, and more learning, observed, in reference to their methodical manner of life, that a new sect of METHODISTS had sprung up, alluding to the ancient school of physicians known by that name. The appellation obtained currency, and, although the word is still sometimes used reproachfully as expressive of enthusiasm, or undue religious strictness, it has become the acknowledged name of one of the largest and most rapidly increasing evangelical Christian denominations (comp. Tyerman, The Oxford Methodists, N. Y., Harpers, 1873, 8vo).

From this time Methodism may be said to have started. In 1739 the first Methodist “‘meeting-house” in England was built at Kingswood. “Wesley's idea at this time, and for many years afterwards,” says Skeats (Hist. of the Free Churches of England, p. 363), “was merely to revive the state of religion in the Church; but he knew enough of the condition of society in England, and of human nature, to be aware that unless those who had been brought under the awakening influence of the Gospel met together, and assisted each other in keeping alive the fire which had been lit in their hearts, it must, in many instances, seriously diminish, if not altogether die out.” Originally, therefore, it was no part of the design of Wesley and' his associates to found a new religious sect. He considered them all me-ni'bers of the Church of England-zealous for her welfare, and loyal to her legitimate authorities. For a full discussion of this point, see the article WESLEY. They were all tenacious of her order, and great sticklers for what they deemed decency and decorum. One of them tells us, “I should have thought the saving of souls almost a sin if it had not been done in a church;” and such was the sentiment of John Wesley, when, to his horror he first heard that his bosom friend, Whitefield, had attempted to preach the Gospel in the open air. This was in the year 1739, on Saturday, the 17th of February.

The discourse was addressed to the colliers at Kingswood, near the city of Bristol. “I thought,” said Whitefield, ‘that it might be doing the service of my Creator, who had a mountain for his pulpit, and the heavens for a sounding-board; and who, when his Gospel was rejected by the Jews, sent his servants into the highways and hedges.” In a little while John Wesley was induced to follow his example. Being providentially at Bristol, and a great assembly (estimated at 3000) having come together at a place called Race Green, “I submitted,” he says, “ to be more vile, and proclaimed in the highways the glad tidings of salvation. This was Wesley's first attempt in England. He had previously preached in the open air while in this country as a missionary to the Indians in Georgia, but  he had no intention of resuming the practice in England, till he was stimulated by the example and urgent advice of his friend. His brother Charles was even more opposed to this departure from Church usages, and this apparent breach of ecclesiastical order. He had ‘confined himself to the usual labors of the ministry in such pulpits as were opened to him, preaching the Gospel with earnestness and simplicity, more especially in London, where he also devoted much of his time to the felons in Newgate, not a few of whom were brought through his instrumentality to repentace and faith in Christ. Being strenuously urged by-Whitefield, he-at length consented to make one effort. “I prayed,” he says, “and went forth in the name of Jesus Christ. I found near a thousand helpless sinners waiting for the Word in Moorfields. I invited them in my Master's words, as well as name, ‘Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.' The Lord was with me, even me, the meanest of his messengers, according to his promise..

My load was gone, and all my doubts and scruples. God shone on my path, and I knew this was his will concerning me.” Thenceforth, in various parts of the kingdom, they continued to preach the Gospel in the open air as opportunity was afforded. Immense crowds thronged everywhere to hear the Word, and multitudes were converted from the error of their way. As a consequence of this violation of ecclesiastical order, and more especially because of the earnest and energetic style of the preachers, most of the pulpits of the Established Church were soon closed against them. Many dignitaries of the Church were above measure enraged at this new way, and zealous in opposing it. “Some clergymen,” says Wesley, “ objected to this ‘new doctrine;' salvation by faith; and, because of my unfashionable doctrine, I was excluded from one and another church, and at length shut out of all.” In many places, too, Wesley and his associates were treated as disturbers of the peace, and subjected to annoyance and persecution. They were reviled, mobbed, imprisoned. They bore everything with patience. “Not daring to be silent,” says Wesley, “it remained only to preach in the open air; which I did at first not out of choice, but necessity. I have since seen abundant reason to adore the wise providence of God herein, making a way for myriads of people who never troubled any church, nor were likely so to do, to hear that Word which they soon found to be the power of God unto salvation.”

The result of these labors was not only the conversion of manly souls, but the formation of religious societies. The young converts, neglected, and in  many instances treated contemptuously by the established clergy, were as sheep having no shepherd. They naturally longed for the fellowship of kindred spirits. At their own request, they were united together for mutual comfort and edification. Wesley gives the following account of the origin of what was then called simply “ the United Society.” The rules which were drawn up for them are to the present day recognised, with two or three very slight alterations, as the General Rules of all branches of the great Methodist family in England, in the United States, and elsewhere:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“The singing those songs or reading those books which do not tend to the knowledge or love of God;  “Softness, and needless self-indulgence; “Laying up treasure upon earth; “ Borrowing without a probability of paying; or taking up goods without a probability of paying for them.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

From the time of Maxfield's admission as a preacher, many others of similar piety and gifts offered their services and were accepted. As the work went on, and additions were made to the “societies” in all parts of the kingdom, the demand for preachers increased. Wesley had always thought that preachers would be supplied from the pulpits of the Established Church, but, disappointed in this, he came to favor the admission of those who, although not episcopally ordained, were wholly devoted to the work of preaching the Gospel, and gladly recognised them as ministers of Christ. The employment of this class of auxiliaries constantly increasing, finally led  to a meeting, held annually thereafter, and known as “the Conference” (q.v.). The first of these assemblies was held in 1744, and from this year Methodism began to assume the appearance of an organized system. It was in 1744 that the brothers John and Charles Wesley, with two or three other regularly-ordained clergymen, met with such of the “preachers” as could conveniently attend, to clothe Methodism with the conventional forms of established ecclesiastical government. Of course neither John nor Charles could brook the idea of becoming Dissenters, and Methodism was organized as an independent Church body only after the death of John Wesley. SEE WESLEYANS.

To all intents and purposes the Church was organized at this first Conference in 1744, and yet by this very body one of the questions asked was, “Are we Dissenters?” and its answer an emphatic “No.” “Although we call sinners to repentance in all places of God's dominion, and although we frequently use extemporary prayer, and unite together in a religious society, yet we are not Dissenters in the only sense which our law acknowledges, viz. those who renounce the service of the Church. We do not, we dare not,' separate from it. We are not seceders, nor do we bear any resemblance to them. We set out upon quite opposite principles. The seceders laid the very foundation of their work in judging and condemning others. We laid the foundation of our work in-judging and condemning ourselves. They begin everywhere with showing their hearers how fallen the Church and its ministers are; we begin everywhere with showing our hearers how fallen they are themselves” (Coke, Life of Wesley, p. 287). “Monday, June 25, and the five following days,” says the leader of this little band, “ we spent in conference with our preachers, seriously considering by what means we might the most effectually save our own souls and them that heard us, and the result of our consultations we set down to be the rule of our future practice.” Already had the larger portion of England been divided into “circuits.” to each of which several preachers, were sent for one or two years. A part of the work of each annual assembly was to arrange these appointments and changes. At the early Conferences various theological questions were discussed with reference to the agreement of all the parties in a common standard; and when this was settled, and the doctrinal discussions were discontinued, new regulations of another kind were from year to year adopted, as the state of the societies, and the enlarging opportunities of doing good, seemed to require. The first indication of a desire to see a separate establishment was given by John Wesley in 1784, when he ordained Coke (q.v.) bishop of the Methodist Church in this country. SEE METHODIST  EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

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

II. The theological doctrines of Wesleyan Methodism are, with perhaps two or three modifications, the same as those which, by common consent, are at present deemed evangelical. The articles of religion drawn up by Wesley for his immediate followers, and substantially adopted by all Methodist bodies since, are but slightly modified from those of the Established Church of England. They were originally prepared for the churches in the States. SEE ARTICLES, TWENTY-FIVE.

The sermons of John Wesley, and his notes on the New Testament, are recognised by his followers in Great Britain and America as the. standard of Methodism, and as the basis of their theological creed. The unity of the Godhead, and the coequal divinity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; the death, resurrection, ascension, and intercession of Jesus Christ; salvation by faith; the sufficiency and divine inspiration of the Holy Scriptures; a final day of judgment, and the eternity of future rewards and punishments, are doctrines held in common with other evangelical branches of the Church of Christ. Maintaining man's total depravity through the fall of Adam, and his  utter inability, unless aided by divine grace, to take one step towards his recovery, Methodists hold that this grace is free, extending itself equally, by virtue of the atonement, to all the children of men. Hence they deny the doctrine of special election, with its counterpart, reprobation, as taught in Calvinistic formularies, and maintain, in opposition to those who hold to a limited atonement, that Jesus Christ, “by his oblation of himself once offered, made a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world.”

They recognise two sacraments as ordained by Christ Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Infant children and believing adults have a right to the former; and penitent, seekers of salvation, as well as professing Christians, are invited to partake of the latter, both being regarded not only as “badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but as certain signs of grace and God's good will towards us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in him.” As to the mode of baptism, so that the ceremony be performed by an authorized minister in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, it is optional whether the water be applied by sprinkling or pouring, or by the immersion of the candidate; and although kneeling is the usual mode of receiving the elements at the Lord's table, those who prefer may partake of them in a standing or sitting posture. They deny the doctrine usually styled the “perseverance of the saints,” believing that a true child of God may fall from grace and finally perish; but they hold the doctrine of assurance, in the sense that it is the privilege of the justified sinner now to know his sins forgiven. The Holy Spirit, they teach, bears witness of the fact of present pardon and acceptance; but this is deemed to be the privilege of believers, not the indispensable evidence of regeneration. “It does not follow,” says Wesley, “that all who do not know their sins forgiven are children of the devil.” Methodism teaches also that it is the privilege of believers in this life to reach that maturity of grace, and that conformity to the divine nature, which cleanses the heart from sin. and fills it with love to God and man-the being filled as Paul phrases it, with all the fulness of God. This they call Christian perfection, a state which they declare to be attainable through faith in Christ. Wesley says on this subject, and none of his authorized followers have gone beyond him, “Christian perfection implies the being so crucified with Christ as to be able to testify, ‘I live not, but Christ liveth in me.' It does not imply an exemption from ignorance or mistake, infirmities or temptations. I believe,” he adds, “there is no such perfection in this life as excludes these involuntary transgressions, which I apprehend to be  naturally consequent on the ignorance and mistakes inseparable from mortality. Therefore ‘sinless perfection' is' a phrase I never use, lest I should seem to contradict myself. I believe a person filled with the love of God is still liable to these involuntary transgressions. Such transgressions you may call sins, if you please: I do not, for the reasons above mentioned.” This doctrine Wesley calls “the grand depositum which God has given to the people called Methodists;” and he gives it as his opinion that God raised them up chiefly to preach, and exemplify, and propagate it. SEE WESLEYANISM.

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

1. To examine candidates for the ministry; and without their recommendation no candidate can come before the Annual Conference.

2. To try and suspend ministers who are found immoral, erroneous in doctrine, unfaithful to their ordination vows, or deficient in ability for the work they have undertaken.

3. To decide preliminary questions concerning the building of chapels.

4. To review the demands from the less wealthy churches, which draw upon the public funds of the connection for aid in supporting their ministers.

5. To elect a representative, who is thus made a member of a committee appointed to sit previously to the meeting of “the Conference,” in order to prepare a draft of the stations of all the ministers for the ensuing year; regard being had to the wishes of the people in the allocation of individual pastors. The judgment of this “ stationing committee” is conclusive until Conference, to which an appeal is allowed in all cases, either from ministers or people. But the appointments are made for one year only, and no preacher can be appointed to the same charge more than three years successive. In the District Conference laymen take part, equally with ministers, in all that affects the general welfare of the body; and the lay influence predominates still more in “the quarterly meeting,” which is held, as its name indicates, every three months on every circuit. All local preachers, a numerous and influential body of men, who preach on Sundays, and follow some secular employments for a livelihood; stewards, whose duty it is to attend more especially to the temporalities of the society; class-leaders, of whom mention is made above in the general rules, are members of the quarterly meeting, at which candidates for the sacred office are first proposed, and, if rejected by their fellow-members, they have no appeal to- another tribunal. A similar balance of power is maintained in the “leaders-meeting,” which is held monthly, in regard to various affairs of the particular society to which it belongs. Many of these meetings are attended by one minister only, or, at the most, by two or three, while the lay members are very numerous.

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. Be diligent; never be unemployed; never be triflingly employed; never WHILE away time, nor spend more time at any place than is strictly necessary.  2. Be serious; let your motto be, Holiness to the Lord; avoid all lightness, jesting, and foolish talking.

3. Converse sparingly and cautiously with women, particularly with young women.

4. Take no step towards marriage without solemn prayer to God, and consulting with your brethren.

5. Believe evil of no one; unless fully proved, take heed how you credit it: put the best construction you can on everything-you know the judge is always supposed to be on the prisoner's side.

6. Speak evil of no one. else your word especially would eat as doth a canker; keep your thoughts within your own breast till you come to the person concerned.

7. Tell every one what you think wrong in him, lovingly and plainly, and as soon as may be, else it will fester in your own heart; make all haste to cast the fire out of your bosom.

8. Do not affect the gentleman; a preacher of the Gospel is the servant of all.

9. Be ashamed of nothing but sin; no, not of cleaning your own shoes when necessary.

10. Be punctual; do everything exactly at the time; and do not mend our rules, but keep them, and that for conscience' sake.

11. You have nothing to do but to save souls, and therefore spend and be spent in this work; and go always, not only to those who want you, but to those who want you most.

12. Act in all things, not according to your own will, but as a son in the Gospel, and in union with your brethren. As such, it is your part to employ your time as our rules direct; partly in preaching and visiting from house to house; partly in reading, meditation, and prayer. Above all, if you labor with us in our Lord's vineyard, it is needful that you should do that part of the work which the Conference shall advise, at those times and places which they shall judge most for his glory. Observe: It is not your business to preach so many times, and to take care merely of this and that society, but to save as many souls as you can; to bring as many sinners as you  possibly can to repentance; and with all your power to build them up in that holiness without which they cannot see the Lord; and, remember, a Methodist preacher is to, mind every point, great and small, in the Methodist discipline; therefore you will need all the grace and all the sense you have, and to have all your wits about you.” SEE ITINERANCY.

The latest writer on Methodism (the Revelation L. Tyerman, Life and Times of John Wesley) who dares to hold that it is “the greatest fact in the history of the Church of Christ,” thus comments upon the present condition of the parent body of Methodism, the Wesleyan Methodist Church (q.v.): “The ‘Methodist,' or parent ‘Conference,' employs in Great Britain and Ireland 1782 regular ministers. Besides these, there were, in 1864, in England only, 11,804 lay preachers, preaching 8754 sermons every Sabbath-day. In the same year, the number of preaching-places in England only was 6718, and the number of sermons preached weekly, by ministers and lay preachers combined, was 13,852. To these must be added the lay preachers, preaching-places, etc., in Wales, Scotland, Ireland, Shetland, and the Channel Islands. The number of Church members in Great Britain and Ireland is 365,285, with 21,223 on trial; and, calculating that the hearers are three times as numerous as the Church members, there are considerably more than a million persons in the United Kingdom who are attendants upon the religious services of the parent Conference of ‘the people called Methodists.' Some idea of their chapel and school property may be formed from the fact that, during the last seven years, there has been expended, in Great Britain only, in new erections and in reducing debts on existing buildings, £1,672,541; and towards that amount of expenditure there has been actually raised and paid (exclusive of all connectional collections, loans, and drafts) the sum of £1,284,498. During the ten years from 1859 to 1868, inclusive, there was raised for the support of the foreign missions of the connection £1,408,235; and if to this there be added the amount of the Jubilee Fund, we find more than a million and a half-sterling contributed during the decade for the sustenance and extension of the Methodist work in foreign lands. The missions now referred to are carried on in Ireland, France, Switzerland, Germany, Italy, Gibraltar, India, Ceylon, China, South and West Africa, the West Indies, Canada,. Eastern British America, Australia, and Polynesia. In these distant places the committee having the management of the missions employ 3798 paid agents, including 994 who are regularly ordained, and are wholly engaged in the work of the Christian ministry. Besides these, there are  about 20,000 agents of the society (as lay preachers; etc.) who are rendering important service gratuitously, while the number of Church members is 154,187, and the number of attendants upon the religious services more than half a million. Space prevents a reference to the other institutions and funds of British Methodism, except to add that, besides 174,721 children in the mission schools, the parent connection has in Great Britain 698 day-schools, efficiently conducted by 1532 certificated, assistant, and pupil teachers, and containing 119,070 scholars; also 5328 Sunday schools, containing 601,801 scholars, taught by 103,441 persons who render their services gratuitously; and that the total number of publications printed and issued by the English Book Committee only, during the year ending June, 1866, was four millions one hundred and twenty-two thousand eight hundred, of which nearly two millions were periodicals, and more than a quarter of a million were hymn-books.”

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

1. The WESLEYAN METHODISTS, or main and original body of the Methodists in Great Britain, often spoken of above. SEE WESLEYANS.

2. The CALVINISTIC METHODISTS date from a dispute between Whitefield and the Wesleys on doctrinal points. The former, with his associates, under the special patronage of the countess of Huntingdon, and greatly aided by her liberal contributions, organized societies and built chapels in various parts of England, Scotland, and Wales. For their particular doctrinal tenets, SEE CALVINISM. After the death of Whitefield they were divided into three separate sects.

(1.) The first was known as Lady Huntingdon's Connection, which observed strictly the liturgical forms of the English Established Church, with a settled pastorate instead of an itinerant ministry. They have not increased with much rapidity since her death, having at the present time less than a hundred ministers, and between sixty and seventy chapels. They have maintained from the beginning a theological school for the education of ministers, now known as Cheshunt College, in Hertfordshire, England. SEE HUNTINGDON. Although the name “ connection” continues to be used, the Congregational polity is practically adopted; and, of late years, several of the congregations have become, in name as well as virtually, Congregational Churches. The number of chapels, mentioned in the census  of 1851, as belonging to this connection, was 109, containing accommodations for 38,727 persons, and the attendance on the census Saturday was 19,151.

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

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

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

4. THE BAND-ROOM METHODISTS originated in Manchester in 1806. The name is derived from the Band Room in North Street, Manchester, where a class of overzealous revivalists used to gather, and, contrary to the rules of the Connection, admitted parties not members. They were also guilty of acting independently of leaders' meetings, and when remonstrated  with, withdrew and formed an independent body. The Band-Room Methodists still exist; but are now called The United Free Gospel Churches. They differ from the “parent” body in having no paid ministers. They have, however, annual conferences.

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

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

7. The PRIMITIVE METHODISTS OF IRELAND. This body of Primitive Methodists is of later origin than that of England, and is entirely independent of the other organization of like name, The Primitive Methodists of Ireland date from 1816. The English Conference in 1795 granted to the members the privilege of receiving from their own ministers, under certain guards and restrictions, the sacraments. The Irish Conference thereupon, in the following year; came to the conclusion that among them “it was not expedient;” but in 1816, after the subject had been freely discussed by the people, and numerous petitions asking that it might be  administered were brought before the Conference, the request was granted by a majority of sixty-two against twenty-six. The minority, with the Revelation Adam Averell, one of their most influential ministers, at their head, separated, and took with them about ten thousand members, full one third of the whole. (It is worthy of remark that the secession in 1797 [see 3] was the result of the non-compliance of the English Conference with the wishes of the people to have the sacrament from their own ministers.) The only difference between the Irish Primitive Methodists and the Wesleyans remains to this day the liberty of members in the former body to partake of the sacraments in the churches. The preachers are regarded simply as laymen, because of the failure of this secession among them.- The real lay members, however, have also a voice in the government of the societies. In 1861 the Irish Primitive Methodists numbered 14,247 members. SEE PRIMITIVE METHODISTS.

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

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

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

(c) The REFORMERS, who were organized into a body in 1849. At the Manchester Conference held in that year, six members, suspected of private intrigue with members of the Wesleyan Methodist Association (see b), were placed at the bar, without having received any regular notice of the charges to be preferred against them, as required by the standing laws and usages of the connection, and without a trial, without any evidence that they had violated any law, human or divine, three of them were reprimanded and three were expelled. The act excited the astonishment of the nation, convulsed the connection, and led to the loss of one hundred thousand members. Many of them, after a while, for want of ministers and suitable places of worship, returned to the old body, but others formed  themselves into a distinctive body styled the Reformed Methodists. These amalgamated bodies differ from the “parent” body only in Church government and usages. One of their professed objects is the reformation of the body from which they are separated. Their annual assembly admits lay representatives, circuits with less than 500 members sending one; less than 1000, two; and more than 1000, three delegates. Each circuit governs itself by its local courts, without any interference as to the management of its internal affairs. At their Annual Assembly, held at Bristol, England, in August, 1890, they reported 85,461 members.

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

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

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

In the year 1773 two additional missionaries, Rankin and Shadford, were sent over, and the first American “ Conference” was held at Philadelphia in July of that year. The number of members in the society was stated to be 1160; and resolutions were adopted recommending continued conformity to the discipline and  doctrines of the English Methodists. From that time, all through the stormy season of the Revolutionary War, success seems to have attended their efforts, so that, at the Conference of 1784, there were reported to be about 15,000 members in the connection. In this year Wesley, for the first time, performed the solemn rite of ordination by setting apart two men as elders for the flock in America, and by consecrating to the episcopal office Dr. Thomas Coke, at that time a presbyter in the Church of England. The doctor and his two associates immediately thereafter sailed for America, and were present at the Conference in Baltimore, at which the Methodist Episcopal Church was organized. The first act of that Conference was the ratification with entire unanimity of Coke's ordination, and the election of one of their own number, Francis Asbury, to the same office. The Conference also received Wesley's abridgment of the Articles of the Church of England, which continue to be their standard of doctrine to the present day, and also an abridgment of the Book of Common Prayer, prepared by the same hand, and sent over with the recommendation that it should be used in the Methodist chapels. This was done in some of the large cities for a season, but soon fell into disuse, with the exception of the sacramental services and the forms of ordinations, which are still. retained and used. The bishops are elected by a General Conference, which meets every four years, and is composed of delegates from the several Annual Conferences in the ratio of one delegate for a certain number of members, which has been changed from time to time according to the increase of the general body.

The ratio fixed by the General Conference of 1872 as a basis of future representation is one delegate for every forty-five members of an Annual Conference. At the same Conference lay members, in the ratio of two for every Annual Conference, were also admitted. The bishops, like the preachers, are itinerant; and it is specially enacted that if one of them ceases from travelling without the consent of the General Conference, he shall not thereafter exercise the episcopal office. His powers are similar to those of the president of the English Conference, with the additional duty of fixing the appointments of the preachers, deciding all questions of law in an Annual Conference, and ordaining bishops, elders, and deacons. The limit of three years, beyond which the preachers of the British Wesleyan Connection may not continue in the same place, is now also the rule of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States; and to this is added the regulation that they may not be returned to the same place more than three years in six. Presiding elders in this branch of the Church occupy a position very similar to that of the chairmen of districts in England, except that they  have no separate pastoral charge. They are appointed by the bishops, and may remain four years on the same district. They form a kind of advisory' committee in assisting the bishops to fix the appointments-of the preachers. The “Book Concern,” situated in New York, with a branch at Cincinnati, and depositories in various other cities, has a capital of more than a million of dollars, and is one of the largest publishing houses in the world. Under the patronage and control of the Church are weekly papers published in New York, Syracuse (N. Y.). Pittsburgh (Pa.), Cincinnati (O.), Chicago (Il.), St. Louis (Rio.), San Francisco (Cal.), Portland (Oregon), and Atlanta (Ga.). They publish also several illustrated papers for Sunday-schools, one of a similar kind for the Tract' Society, a monthly Sunday-school journal, a monthly magazine in English, another in German, and a quarterly review. SEE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

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

12. The METHODIST PROTESTANT CHURCH was organized in the city of Baltimore, Md., in the year 1830, by a convention composed of an equal number of clerical and lay delegates from various states of the Union. The convention continued in session three weeks, and adopted a “Constitution” for the new association. Its fundamental doctrines, and most of its usages, are the same as those of the Episcopal Methodists, the body from which it seceded. Following the example of the British Wesleyans, the episcopal office is denied, and a president called to rule over each Annual Conference, elected by the ballot of that body. The laity is admitted to an equal participation with the clergy in all Church legislation and government. The General Conference, which meets every four years, consists of an equal number of ministers and laymen, who are elected by the Annual Conferences. The slavery question divided the Methodist Protestant Church into two bodies the Methodist Protestant Church of the  North-western States and the Methodist Protestants of the Southern States. The head-quarters of the former were established at Springfield, Ohio; those of the latter at Baltimore, Md. Their members were found only in certain parts of the United States. Their greatest strength is in Virginia, Maryland, and in some portions of Ohio and Pennsylvania. Of late years, a union of all nonepiscopal Methodists having been proposed, the Protestant Methodists North changed their official name to The Methodist Church. The Wesleyan Methodist Church was one of the churches expected to be merged into this newly-constituted body, but hitherto all efforts at union have failed, and there seems to be no immediate prospect of their amalgamation. The Methodist Church numbers about 75,000 members; altogether the Methodist Protestants count about 148,000. The head- quarters of the Church South remain at Baltimore, Md.; those of The Methodist Church have been removed from Springfield, Ohio, to Pittsburgh, Pa. SEE METHODIST PROTESTANT CHURCH; SEE METHODISTS. THE.

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

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

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

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

17. The. EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION are in doctrine and Church government nearly allied to the Episcopal Methodists. They date from the year 1800, and are sometimes called Albrights, after one of the founders of the sect. They elect bishops from the body of the elders, and have several Annual Conferences, and a General Conference, the supreme law-making authority, which meets quadrennially. The members are mostly Germans or of German descent, and are numerous only in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and  Illinois. The Methodist Almanac of 1891 reports 1 bishop, 1187 preachers, 428 local preachers, and 145,903 members.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“Who will deny, for instance, that Methodism has exercised a potent and beneficial influence upon other churches: Episcopal, Presbyterian, Independent, and Baptist churches have all been largely indebted to Methodism, either directly or indirectly, for many of the best ministers and agents they have ever had. It is a remarkable fact that, during Wesley's life- time, of the 690 men who acted under him as itinerant preachers, 249 relinquished the-itinerant ministry. These 249 retirers included not a few of the most intelligent, energetic, pious, and useful preachers that Wesley had. Some left him on the ground of health; others began business, because as  itinerant preachers they were unable to support their wives and families; but a large proportion became ordained ministers in other churches. In some instances, the labors of these men, and their brother Methodists, led to marvellous results. To give but one example: David Taylor, originally a servant of lady Huntingdon, was one of Wesley's first preachers, but afterwards left the work. Taylor, however, was the means of converting Samuel. Deacon, an agricultural laborer; and the two combined were the instruments, in the hands of God, in raising up a number of churches in Yorkshire and the midland counties, which, in 1770, were organized into the New Connection of General Baptists; and that connection seventy years afterwards, in 1840, comprised 113 churches, having 11,358 members, a foreign missionary society, and two theological academies” (Methodist Magazine [1856], p. 335).

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

The first British Bible Society that existed, “The Naval and Military,” was projected by George Cussons, and organized by a small number of his Methodist companions. The London Missionary Society originated in an appeal from Melville Hormne, who for some years was one of Wesley's itinerant preachers, and then became the successor of Fletcher as vicar of Madeley. The Church Missionary Society was started by John Venn, the son of Henry Venn, the Methodist clergyman. The first Tract Society was formed by John Wesley and Thomas Coke in 1782, seventeen years before the organization of the present great Religious Tract Society in Paternoster Row-a society, by the way, which was instituted chiefly by Rowland Hill, and two or three other Calvinistic Methodists. It is believed that the first Dispensary that the world ever had was founded by Wesley himself in connection with the old Foundery, in Moorfields. The Strangers' Friend Society, paying every year from forty to fifty thousand visits to-the sick poor of London, and relieving them as far as possible, is an institution to which Methodism gave birth in 1785.  Building churches is one of the great features of the age. Unfortunately, England has had no religious worship census since 1851; but even then, according to the tables of Horace Mann, Methodism had, in England and Wales only, 11,835 places of worship, with 2,231,017 sittings. In America, according to the census of 1860, Methodism nine years ago provided church accommodation for 6,259,799, which was two and a quarter millions more than was provided by any other Church whatever.

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

VI. Outgrowth in Missionary Labors.

1. In English. or chiefly so. — Methodism was from its very inception a. missionary movement, domestic and foreign. It initiated, so to speak, both the spirit and plan of modern English mission work. Protestant England had manifested but a faint interest in this species of Christian labor until the birth of Methodism, and the spirit of life may be said to have been breathed into English missionary societies by Methodism. Nor need this astonish us. The Church of England recognised as its field the territory held by the Anglican throne; cold and almost lifeless at home, the residents in the colonies and other dependencies received but little religious care. Methodism, the outgrowth of a reawakened zeal for holy living, sought its fields not only in England and Ireland, but manifested early a strong desire for the spread of the Gospel into all parts. To this end Dr. Thomas Coke, in 1786, issued “An Address to the Pious and Benevolent, proposing an Annual Subscription for the Support of Missionaries in the Highlands and adjacent Islands of Scotland, the Isles of Jersey, Guernsey, and Newfoundland, the West Indies, and the Provinces of Nova Scotia and Quebec;” and in the year following the Wesleyan missions bore the distinctive title of “Missions established by the Methodist Society.” Even before this organization had been effected, missionary labors were put forth in behalf of the residents of the West Indies. In 1791 Methodism reached out its hand after France, and its great schemes to Christianize Africa were brought to trial as early as 1811. In Asia labor was commenced in 1814; in Australia in 1815; in Polynesia in 1822; until, from the first call of Wesley  for American evangelists, in the Conference of 1769, down to our day, we see the grand enterprise reaching to the shores of Sweden, to Germany, France, and the Upper Alps; to Gibraltar and Malta; to the banks of the Gambia, to Sierra Leone, and to the Gold Coast; to the Cape of Good Hope; to Ceylon, to India, and to China; to the colonists and aboriginal tribes of Australia; to New Zealand, and the Friendly and Fiji Islands; to the islands of the western as well as of the southern hemisphere; and from the Gulf of St. Lawrence to Puget's Sound (comp. Alder, Wesleyan Missions [Lond. 1842], p. 4). From 1803 to the present time Wesleyan Methodism has contributed more than twenty millions of dollars for foreign evangelization. In England the Wesleyan Society to-day enrolls more communicants in its mission churches than. all other British missionary societies combined. The historian of religion during the, last and present centuries would find it difficult to point to a more magnificent monument of Christianity.

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

American Methodism has been aptly termed by Dr. Abel Stevens (Centenary of Amer. Meth. p. 187) “a missionary scheme,” for it was clearly “the great home mission enterprise of the North American continent.” The independent establishment of the colonies as a republic in  1776 largely altered the relation to England, and the -missionary body gradually ripened into a Church organization, from which, in turn, went out enterprises. The year 1819 is memorable in the history of American Methodism as the epoch of the formal organization of its missionary work. But these early labors were confined to the “home” fields, and aimed mainly at the conversion of the aborigines and slaves. It was some thirteen years later, during the session of the General Conference of 1832, that foreign missions were decided upon, and American Methodism commissioned its Gospel harbingers to carry the truth as it is in Jesus to the dark nations of South Africa, the Romish adherents of Mexico, and of South America. We give below some of the details of this-great work in particular fields. Besides its very extensive domestic work, the Methodist Episcopal Church has now missions in China, Corea, India, Africa, Bulgaria Germany, Switzerland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and South America. Its missions, foreign and domestic, in the year 1889 numbered 1239 circuits and stations, 3325 paid laborers (preachers and assistants), and 261,987 communicants. ‘The funds contributed to its treasury, from the beginning down to 1865, amounted to about $6,000,000. About 350 of the missionaries were in 1866 reported to preach in the German and Scandinavian languages, and more than 30,000 of the communicants of German and Scandinavian origin.

“American, like British Methodism,” says Stevens (Centenary of Amer. Meth. p. 199), “has become thoroughly imbued with the apostolic idea of foreign and universal evangelization. With both bodies it is no longer an incidental or secondary attribute, but is inwrought into their organic ecclesiastical systems. It has deepened and widened till it has become the great characteristic of modern Methodism, raising it from a revival of vital Protestantism, chiefly among the AngloSaxon race, to a world-wide system of Christianization, which has reacted on all the great interests of its AngloSaxon field, has energized and ennobled most of its other characteristics, and would seem to pledge to it a universal and perpetual sway in the earth. Taken in connection with the London and Church Missionary societies the British and Foreign Bible Society, the London Tract Society, to all of which Methodism gave the originating impulse, and the Sunday-school institution, which it was the first to adopt as an agency of the Church, it is not too much to say that it has been transforming the character of English-Protestantism and the moral prospects of the world. Its missionary development has preserved its primitive energy. According  to the usual history of religious bodies, if not indeed by a law of the human mind, its early. heroic character would have passed away by its domestic success and the cessation of the novelty and trials of its early circumstances; but by throwing itself out upon all the world, and especially upon the worst citadels of paganism, it has perpetuated its original militant spirit, and opened for itself a heroic career, which need end only with the universal triumph of Christianity. English Methodism was considered, at the death of its founder, a marvellous fact in British history; but to-day (1866) the Wesleyan missions alone comprise more than twice the number of the regular preachers enrolled in the English Minutes in the year of Wesley's death, and nearly twice as many communicants as the Minutes then reported from all parts of the world which had been reached by Methodism. The latest (1865) reported number of missionary communicants in the Methodist Episcopal Church equals nearly one half the whole membership of the Church in 1819, the year in which the Missionary Society was founded, and is nearly double the membership with which the denomination closed the last century, after more than thirty years of labors and struggles.”

2. Methodism among the French. — In the year 1790 Methodism was introduced among the French by English Wesleyan preachers, and in 1791 Dr. Coke ordained in a small village of Normandy the first French Methodist preacher. The work was successful, land a society of 100 members had been gathered when the storm of the Revolution prevented further progress, and in 1817 the work had to be begun anew. In 1819 Methodism was introduced into the south of France by Charles Cook, whose labors were eminently successful among the Protestants, who were then in such a state of ignorance and religious indifference that, out of some 400 ministers, not ten could be found who knew and preached the Gospel. Revivals ensued, classes were formed, societies were organized, preachers were raised, and in 1844 there was in France a Church of nearly 1500 members, with 24 travelling preachers. During the progress of the work the other churches had profited, however, by the reviving influence, and Methodism. being regarded as a “foreign importation,” began gradually to lose in membership, so that by 1852 there were only 900 actual adherents to the Methodist Church, notwithstanding that the work of evangelization had progressed as usual. These circumstances prompted the Wesleyans to counsel the independent establishment of French Methodism in a distinct French Church, dependent upon the “parent body”  for an annual stipend only. The first French Conference was held at Nismes in 1852. From that moment the tide turned again in favor of Methodism; and, notwithstanding the organization of other churches, some of which, it must be owned, have grown more rapidly, the Conference of 1890 reported 1518 members, 184 chapels and preaching-rooms, 53 Sunday- schools, 2539 Sunday-scholars, 101 local preachers, and 36 ministers, and some 9000 regular hearers at the public services. The official title of the Methodist body in France is The Evangelical Methodist Church of France and Switzerland. The French Methodists sustain a publishing-house at Paris, and issue a weekly paper, entitled L'Evaangelist. The “Methodist Episcopal Church” sustains one missionary in the suburbs of Paris, but he is a member of the Swiss Mission Conference, and his labors are intended to benefit only the German residents of the French metropolis.

3. Methodism among the Germans. — The Germans were first brought into direct contact with the Methodists in the United States of America. The United Brethren, who have always been in close communion with the Methodists, may really be said to have paved the way for the success of the work among the Germans. The labors of the Revelation William Otterbein, the founder of the United Brethren Church, and a warm personal friend of bishop Asbury, were thoroughly Methodistic, and the United Brethren Church was for many years considered by the Methodists a co-ordinate branch -of their own Church, having a special mission to labor and spread the doctrines of Methodism among the Germans. Turning their attention to the young generation and its wants, the United Brethren came to drop the tongue of the Fatherland, and thus alienated themselves from the field which Methodism anxiously sought to supply. A helper offered in the hour of need in the person of Jacob Albright, who, having been converted, and feeling himself called of God to preach the Gospel among the Germans of Pennsylvania, prayed for the sympathies of the Methodist Episcopal Church-for his project. Failing to secure the aid asked for, he finally struck out for himself, organized the converts God had given him into a Church, which he called the Evangelical Association, a work that has since been owned of God to the salvation of thousands upon thousands of Germans throughout the land. The Evangelical brethren have always claimed to be Methodists, are known as such among the Germans, and were in former years very much in the habit of styling themselves “The Evangelical Association, commonly called Albrights, or Albright Methodists.” With blut slight modification, they have adopted the Methodist Discipline and  Methodist usages. In the matter of doctrine they are Methodistic throughout, laying peculiar emphasis upon those experimental doctrines of Christianity-repentance, faith, regeneration and adoption, growth in grace,, and the duty and privilege of entire sanctification. Wesley, Watson, and Clarke are their standard authorities. They lay claim to the fathers of Methodism, thus priding themselves in a common origin with Methodists. At a very early date of their history when they numbered but a few hundred members, they proposed organic union with the Methodist Episcopal Church upon the sole condition of being permitted to use the German language in the public worship of their congregations, and of laboring exclusively among the Germans. Strange as it may now seem, the offer was rejected, under the erroneous impression which then prevailed that the German language would necessarily die out in a generation or so. Of course emigration had not then attained its present gigantic dimensions, nor were there any indications of results in this direction such as we witness in our day. Efforts looking to organic union between the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Evangelical Association have since been renewed.

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

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

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

The first Methodists who established themselves on German soil were the converts of a German named Albrecht, or Albright, who having embraced the Methodist doctrines in America, was pressed in spirit to engage actively in caring for the religious wants of his fellow countrymen in the United States. The work which he first organized, about the beginning of the century, has grown into vast proportions, under the name of the  “Evangelical Association,” noticed above. After having extended to thousands of the Germans of America, the Albrecht Methodists, as they are called abroad, began to extend their efforts towards the Germans in Europe. They held their sixtieth Conference in 1872 at Strasburg, where they commenced a work several years since. They have in all Germany 10,231 Church members, 286 Sunday-schools with 11,322 scholars, and 64 itinerant preachers. They have two periodicals, and have lately extended their field to Switzerland.

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

But the grandest and most enterprising of the branches of German Methodism is unquestionably that of the American Methodist Episcopal Church, which, as we have seen above, took its rise from the work among the German emigrants in the United States. In 1852 this missionary field was constituted into an Annual Conference, and it now covers all the German-speaking people in Germany, Switzerland, and France, divided into seven districts: Bremen, Berlin, Frankfort, Ludwigshaven, Carlsruhe, Zurich, and Basle, which comprise more than sixty circuits or stations, with (in 1872) 73 travelling ministers, 386 places of worship, 229 Sunday- schools with 10,071 scholars, 6230 Church members, and 1369 probationers. This mission is thoroughly organized. It has a book publishing-house, which issues, besides a variety of treatises ‘or books, every fortnight the Evangelist and Kinder-Freund; every month the Missionar-Sammler and Monatlicher Bote; and every quarter the Wachter Stimmen. It has also a theological college, which has had as its professors Dr. Warren, of Boston University, and Dr. Hurst, of Drew Theological  Seminary. Its present instructors are Dr. Sulzberger and Nippert. It had had an existence of fourteen years, when, by the timely and princely gift of John T. Martin, of Brooklyn, N. Y., the present commodious and substantial building, four stories high, standing on a lot one hundred by five hundred feet, was erected, free of debt, at Frankfort-on-the-Main. The property is estimated at about $30,000. The following branches are taught: Greek, Latin, English, German, Hebrew, geography, arithmetic, music, homiletics, dogmatics, discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, history of Methodism, Church history, profane history, literature, archaeology, exegesis. There are at present twenty-seven young men in this school preparing for the ministry. Sixty or seventy ministers have already gone forth in the course of twelve years. About fifty-four labor in Germany, and others have come to America and are laboring here.

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

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

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

5. Methodism in Australia.-Methodism at the beginning of this century found its adherents in Australia. The first class was organized March 6,1812. The first missionary to this colony was Samuel Leigh, who landed in 1815. At first the labors of the preacher were confined to the whites, particularly the convicts who had been transported hither from the mother  country. Gradually the work was extended to the natives also. In-1853 Methodism had progressed so well that the formation of an independent Conference was counselled by the home Church, and in January, 1855, the first session of the Wesleyan Conference was held at Melbourne, and was presided over by the Revelation W. B. Boyce, at that time general superintendent of Methodist missions in Australia, now secretary of the Wesleyan Missionary Society, London. At that time there were some 60 preachers and 11,000 members. Now this bough of the vigorous tree planted by John Wesley divides itself into three branches. The first extends over Australia Proper and Van Diemen's Land, the Methodist districts in which adapt themselves to the colonial divisions of New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, Western Australia, and Tasmania. These are the home districts of Methodism in that region, the work in them being missionary only as regards a few surviving relics of the feeble aborigines, or the swarms of immigrant Chinese. The second branch of Australian Methodism divides itself over New Zealand into the two districts of Auckland and Wellington, and the work is of a mixed character, embracing the British settlers and the Maori. The third branch is purely missionary, and extends over the Friendly and the Fiji Islands. “ These,” said the Revelation G. T. Perks, at the anniversary of the Wesleyan Missionary Society, May 5, 1873, “ have been among the most successful of modern missions.” SEE FIJI ISLANDS.

The statistics of these. missions speak for themselves: 23 European missionaries labor in connection with 63 native missionaries, and 906 native catechists, and 1796 local preachers; the number of Church members is 33,149. There are above 133,000 attendants at public worship in 802 chapels and in 357 other preaching-places. The work of education has not been neglected; 1568 day-schools, taught by 148 head teachers, and by 2469 subordinate masters, return 53,804 day- scholars, and about the same number attend the Sunday-schools, in which there are 3551 teachers.” At the fifteenth session of the Conference in 1868, held at Sydney, the reports from all parts of the work were very encouraging. There were then 241 preachers and 57 native helpers. The collective totals of the Australian connection were, in 1868, 30,590 members, with 8953 persons “on trial.” Australian Methodism has three flourishing high-schools-Newington College, at New South Wales; Wesley College, at Victoria; and Horton College, in Tasmania. Of late a theological school has been projected.

6. Methodism in the West Indies. -In no other missionary field has Methodism met with greater success than among this portion of the globe's inhabitants. The West Indies was, moreover, the first foreign field sought by the Wesleyans, and its history is closely linked to that of the founder, John Wesley, and his own associates. One of the natives, Nathaniel Gilbert, from Antigua, came under the influence of the Methodists while on a visit to England, and in 1760 returned to his native land to preach their doctrines to his countrymen. As they were bound by the heavy chains of slavery, he determined to bestow upon them the liberty of the Gospel. When he died two hundred had embraced the cause of Methodism. Their next leader was John Baxter, an Englishman, who had been licensed as “local preacher,” and who had gone to the West Indies as a ship-carpenter. He preached for eight years, and did much good among the blacks. When the missionaries finally arrived, he was able to turn over two thousand adherents as the result of preparatory labors. In 1786 the home society set aside one man for the spread of missions in the West Indies. He was to accompany Dr. Coke to America, and then be transferred to his new field. On the way the company suffered shipwreck, and by mere accident all landed at Antigua, and, when Coke witnessed the glorious work begun, he left the three missionaries by his side-Warrener, Clarke, and Hammetin the country, and sailed alone to the United States. In 1792, when Coke visited the West Indies, and held a Conference at Antigua, the missionaries reported 20 stations, with 12 preachers and 6500 members. In 1873 the progress of Methodism in these parts was thus commented upon by the Revelation G. T. Perks, at the annual meeting of the Wesleyan Missionary Society (May 5): “The West Indian missions occupy a peculiar position in relation to other missions. The colonies of Jamaica, the Windward and Leeward Islands, the Bahamas, British Guiana, Honduras, and Hayti are mainly inhabited by the descendants of the Africans emancipated in 1834. The European population is comparatively small. No missions have had greater difficulties to contend against. Earthquakes, hurricanes, the pestilence, and occasional fires have from time to time destroyed life and property; the changes in the commercial policy of the British government operated for a while most injuriously in reducing the value of the staples of these colonies, and in some localities fearful droughts reduced the population to poverty and starvation. Our Maya mission to Honduras has been disturbed by Indian raids on the colony; and our societies in Ruatan,  an island belonging to the republic of Honduras, have suffered from a political revolution, which is no strange event in the Spanish republics of America. Yet, in spite of these untoward circumstances, the West Indian colonies are gradually improving-agriculturally, commercially, and socially. The great want is an educated native ministry. The time since the emancipation has been but a short period in the history of a nation, and our moral and educational agencies have not been equal to the task of thoroughly changing the character and habits of the people within the lifetime of a generation. Yet over many of our churches we have great reason to rejoice; and, from what has been effected in their case, to look hopefully in reference to the future. In these missions we have 97 missionaries, 44,728 members, and 28,038 scholars.”

7. Methodism in India. — Next in importance is the missionary work in India. The Wesleyans have labored there for years, but their expenditure on the field, both in men and money, is far inferior to that of the Methodist Episcopal Church, which has, especially within a very recent period, met with unprecedented success. But all Methodists have an equal interest in the success of this missionary field, to which the sainted Coke gave his life. SEE COKE.

Work was commenced in 1813 at Ceylon. By 1819 the impression made warranted the establishing of schools in the principal cities along the western coast. In the mean time missionary labors had been commenced (1817) on the continent itself, with head-quarters at Bombay. At the time of the centennial of Methodism (1839) the mission in India counted 21 stations, 43 missionaries and helpers, and 1200 members. At present (1873) the field covering the Tamil and Singhalese districts, Calcutta, Mysore, and Madras. contains 2976 members, with 13,987 children in the schools, guided by 75 missionaries. These statistics do not give, however, an adequate impression of the nature and character of the work itself. In India and Ceylon the missionaries preach in the streets and bazars, as well as in the chapels; they make frequent missionary tours in their respective districts, to preach and converse, and circulate books in the villages. Much time is necessarily occupied in the training of native agents, and in the charge of the higher classes in the schools, as well as in the general superintendence of the educational department of this work.

The Methodist Episcopal Church sent its missionaries to these parts in 1856. The pioneer operations were confined to efforts for the education of the natives. By 1864 the work had progressed sufficiently to warrant the organization of an Annual Conference, divided into three districts. That  field has since been covered by three distinct conferences and the mission of Malaysia. “Four male and five female missionaries left for India in October last; these are included in the above totals here are 541 members, 526 probationers, 735 non-communicant adherents (regular attendants on worship), with 1178 Sabbath-scholars, and the 86 native helpers, making a Christian community of 3066 souls under the charge of the India Conference in Oulde and Rohilcund, all won for Christ since the Great Rebellion closed. In the 34 Sunday-schools there are 107 officers and teachers, 1177 scholars, and 1088 volumes in the libraries; conversions during last year, 56. In the 45 vernacular day-schools for boys there are 1437 pupils; in the 25 Anglo vernacular boys' schools, 1968 scholars; in the 46 vernacular day-schools for girls, 915 pupils; in the Anglo-vernacular schools, 142 girls: being a total of 116 ;schools, 234 teachers, and 4462 scholars, including 138 orphan boys and 142 orphan girls-the entire expense of which, including the two orphanages, was $29,423 for the' past year, the whole of which was contributed by friends in India and the Ladies' Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, with the American patrons of the orphan children.”

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

Very recently the successful labors of the Revelation William Taylor, at Bombay, have added Western India to the missionary field of the Methodist Episcopal Church. No statistics have been published authoritatively, but accounts have appeared in the newspapers of the remarkable revival at Bombay, Poonab, and vicinity. Six itinerants are describing the Bombay circuit, and they do not consider their work as  designed for the English and Eurasian populations alone, but for people in IndiaEuropean, Eurasian, Mahratta, Hindu, nominally Christian, Pagan, or Mohammedan.

8. Methodism among the Chinese and Japanese. — In 1847 the Methodist Episcopal Church opened operations in China, and the field has returned more than it at first promised. The gradual success of the work of this body has been given in the article on China (q.v.). The “ parent” body-the Wesleyans were introduced into this field by the voluntary labors of George Piercy, a preacher, in 1851. Two years later the Missionary Society of his Church came to his aid by sending two assistants. The Methodist Episcopal Church, South. has also an interest in this field. The Wesleyans support at present in the Canton and Wuchang districts 11 missionaries, with 178 members, and 386 children in the schools. Work has recently been commenced by them at Kwang-chi, with prospects of success. They also support medical institutions. The great coolie traffic moved the establishment of a Chinese mission in Australia, and it is prospering. The mission of the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1890 reported its condition in China to be as follows: Missionaries in the field, 40; assistant missionaries, 29; missionaries of the Women's Foreign Missionary Society (a body lately formed as auxiliary to the regular Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church), 6; native preachers ordained, 79; adults baptized the past year, 558; children baptized the past year, 663; total baptisms during the year, 1221; members in full connection, 3987; probationers, 2385; baptized children, 6379; total members, probationers, and baptized children, 4387; increase, 78; Sunday- school scholars, 4387. A Biblical institute for the training of native helpers is supported. A Christian native teacher is employed, and each American missionary devotes part of one day every week to giving instruction in some special part in the course of study. There is a press connected with the mission, and last year one million and a half of pages of tracts were printed and distributed. The property of the mission is valued at $252,620. The mission has also two boarding-schools, one for boys and another for girls; a day- school, with 75 scholars; and a foundling asylum, with 30 inmates. The Woman's Foreign Missionary Society has greatly aided the work in these parts within the past two years by the employment of deaconesses.  The influx of Chinese on our Pacific coast aroused the interest of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and in 1867 a home mission was inaugurated for their conversion. The present status of this field of labor is as follows: Missionaries, 2; members, 115; 1 church, value $20,000; I parsonage, value $1000; missionary collections, $40; missions, 1; money, $3500. The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, has also very recently commenced operations there,

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

9. Methodism in Africa.-Dr. Coke was early drawn towards this field of missionary labor. But all efforts proved unsuccessful until 1811, when a Methodist mission was established at Sierra Leone, commencing its labor with a membership of 110, and three local preachers, who had fostered the work for some time. Gradually the mission extended to the Gambia districts. In these parts of Western Africa the natives are in process of training, under the Christianizing influences of the Wesleyans, to benefit them by the civilization which too often has been made a means of degradation to their race. The majority of the ministers in Africa are natives, educated and trained for their work. Twenty-one missionaries labor in this field, which has 8974 Church members. “In the ‘Cape Colony, the Orange Free State, Trans-VaalRepublic, and Natal, the native and European populations are so mingled that it is impossible to separate the returns of the colonial work from those of the missions in Kaffirland and in the Bechuana country. The early history of the mission is identified with the names of Barnabas and William Shaw, the latter, the honored father of the Kaffir mission, is no longer among us, but his work survives. These missions have been since their beginning, tried by native wars, and by the unsettlement of the population occasioned by emigration, and by' the discovery of the diamond fields; but the work is rapidly advancing. A large number of the Kaffir population have been brought under Christian influence; thousands of scholars have been trained to read the Word of God in their own tongue, and many able native ministers have been raised up. The difficulty now is to meet the enlarged educational wants and requirements of the native people. In these missions 85 ministers labor; the  number of Church members is 13,748, and the scholars reported are 13,821” (Perks, in his address already quoted).

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

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

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

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

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

11. Methodism in South America and Mexico. — In 1836 missionary work was commenced in South America, but the success of the mission has not  yet been fairly established. There are connected with this work 1;8 ordained preachers and 6 assistants, with 985 members. The Sunday- schools number 21.13 teachers and scholars, and the day-school 1379 scholars. About half of these are charity scholars.

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

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

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

Australia42,194West Indies41,592Ireland29,060Africa19,403British Provinces1,297Germany and Switzerland7620France1,884Ceylon1,661Norway1,200India1,000China336South America193Turkey75Total161,515The whole number of Methodists in the world would therefore figure at the present time about as follows:

United States and Canada2,591,875Great Britain and Ireland931,450All others276,675 Total      4,000,000

VII. Literature.-The sources for the history and doctrine of the Methodists are as follows: Works of John Wesley (first complete edition, Bristol, 1771-74, 32 small volumes, full of typographical errors; 2d ed. 1809-13, 16 vols. 8vo, with a register, also containing errors; a critical edition was prepared by Thomas Jackson and published, London, 1831,14 vols. 8vo; NY. 1831, 7 vols. 8vo); Memoirs of the late John Wesley, with a Review of his Life and Writings, and a History of Methodism from its Commencement in 1729 to the present Time, by John Hampson, AB. (Sunderland, 1791, 3 vols. 12mo; translated into German, with remarks and additions by Niemeyer, Halle. 1793, 2 vols.); Burkhardt, Complete History of the Methodists in England (Nurnb. 1795, 2 vols.); Life of the Revelation John Wesley, A.M., including an Account of the great Revival of Religion in Europe and America, of which he was the first and chief Instrument, by Dr. Coke and Mr. Moore (Lond. 1792, 8vo); Life of John Wesley, collected from his private Papers and printed Works, and written at the Request of his Executors; to which is prefixed some Account of his Ancestors and Relations; with the Life of Charles Wesley, collected from his private Journal, and never before published-the whole forming a History of Methodism, in which the Principles and Economy of Methodism are unfolded (chiefly from a London edition published by John Whitehead, MD., Dublin, 1805, 2 vols. 8vo). For the sources of these biographies, see Curry, Remarks, in the. addition to his revision of Southey's edition, 1:405, 406; Sermons by Charles Wesley, with a Memoir of the Author (Lond. 1816); Journals, of Charles Wesley, to which are appended Selections from his Correspondence and Poetry, with an Introduction and Notes by the Rev. T. Jackson (Lond. 2 vols. 8vo); Thomas Jackson, Memoirs of Charles Wesley, comprising Notices of his Poetry, of the Rise and Progress of Methodism, and of contemporary Events and Characters (Lond. 8vo).; William Myles, Chronological History of the People called Methodists, of the Connection of the late Rev. John Wesley, from their Rise in the Year 1729 to their last Conference in the Year 1802 (Lond. 1803, 12mo); Life of Wesley, and Rise and Progress of Methodism, by Robert Southey, Esq., LLD., with Notes by the late Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Esq.; and Remarks on the Life and Character of John Wesley, by the late Alexander Knox, Esq., edited by the Revelation Charles C. Southey, MA. (2d American edition, with Notes, etc., by the  Revelation Daniel Curry, DD. 2 vols. 12m, N. Y. 1847); Richard Watson, Observations on Southey's Life of Wesley (Lond. 1820); R. Watson, Life of the Rev. John Wesley (Lond. 1831); A. Clarke, Memoirs of the Wesley Family (Lond. and N. Y.); Wm. C. Larrabee, Wesley and his Coadjutors (N. Y. 2 vols. 16mo); E. Janes, Wesley his own Historian (NY. 1872, 12mo); the Revelation L. Tyerman, Life and Times of John Wesley, Founder of the Methodists (Lond. and NY. 1872, 3 vols. 8vo); and by the same author, The Oxford Methodists (Lond. and NY. 1873, 8vo); Complete Works of John Fletcher (Lond. 1815, 10 vols. 8vo; N. Y. 1831, 4 vols. 8vo); Joseph Benson, Life of the Revelation John Willian de la Flechere (Fletcher), compiled from the Narrative of the Revelation Mr. Wesley, the biographical Notes of the Revelation Mr. Gilpin, from his own Letters, and other authentic Documents (Lond. 1817, 8vo;. in German, with a Preface by A. Tholuck, Berlin, 1833); Samuel Drew, Life of-the Revelation Thomas Coke, LLD., including in Detail his various Travels and extraordinary Missionary Exertions in England, Ireland, America, and the West Indies, with an Account of his Death (Lond. 1817, 8vo; N. Y.1847, 12mo); Extracts of the Journals of the Revelation Dr. Coke's Five Visits to America (Lond. 1793, 12mo); Stevenson, City Road Chapel, London (Lond. 1863, 12mo); Annual Minutes of the Methodist Conference, from the First held in London by the late Revelation John Wesley, in the Year 1744 (several vols.); Arninian Magazine, from 1778, now styled Wesleyan Methodist Magazine (Lond.); London (Quarterly Review, since 1853; the great ecclesiastical weeklies Watchman, Wesleyan Times, etc. See also Gillie, Life of the Revelation George Whitefield (Lond. 1813); Philip, Life of Whitefield; Life and Times of the Countess of Huntingdon (Lond. 2 vols.); Mudge, Lady Huntingdon Portrayed (N. Y. 1857); Lives of' Early Methodist Preachers, edited by -the Revelation Thomas Jackson (Lond. 1839, 2 vols. 12mo); and numerous biographies from the time of the origin of Methodism.

Sources for the history of the Methodist Episcopal Church especially: Journals of the Revelation Francis Asbury, Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church (new ed., N. Y. 1854. 3 vols. 12mo); Minutes -of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church (N. Y. 29 vols. 8vo); Journals of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church (N. Y. 12 vols. 8vo); Methodist Quarterly Review (NY. 54 vols.); A. Stevens, Memorials of the Introduction of Methodism into the Eastern States (N. Y. 2 vols.); J. B. Finley, Sketches of Western Methodism (N. Y.  12mo); and similar researches by Peck, Raybold, and others; Wakely, Lost Chapters recovered from the Early History of American Methodism ; id. Heroes of Methodism (N. Y. 12mo); Coles, Heroines of Methodism (N. Y. 12mo); Stevens, Women of Methodism (N. Y. 12mo); Revelation W. Reddy, Inside Views of Methodism (N. Y. 18mo); W. P. Strickland, History of Missions of the Methodist Episcopal Church (N. Y. 12mo) ; Bishop Thomson, Our Oriental Missions (N. Y. 2 vols. 16mo); W. C. Smith, Pillars in the Temple, or Lives of Deceased Laymen of the Methodist Episcopal Church (N. Y. 16mo); Deems, Annals of Southern Methodism; Miller, Experience of German Meth. Preachers (Cincinnati. 1859); Strickland, Life of Bishop Asbury; id. Pioneers of the West (NY. 12mo); Stevens, Life and Times of Nathan Bangs (N. Y. 1863); id. Sketches and Incidents (N. Y. 18mo); Larrabee, Asbury and his Coadjutors; Life and Letters of Bishop Hamline (NY. 12mo); Sandford, Wesley's Missionaries to America; G. Peck, Episcopacy and Slavery.

Collective histories of Methodism: the best universal history of Methodism which the Methodist Episcopal Church has ever produced is Dr. Abel Stevens's History of the Religious Movement of the Eighteenth Century called Methodism, considered in its different denominational Forms, and in its Relation to British and American Protestantism (NY. and Lond. 1858-61, 3 vols. 8vo and 12mo). The best history which was ever written in England is by Dr. George Smith: History of Methodism-vol. i, Wesley and his Tines; vol. ii, The Middle Age of Methodism; vol iii, Modern Methodism (Lond. 1857-62, 3 vols. 8vo). Earlier works: Jackson, Centenary of Wesleyan Methodism (Lond. 1839); Jonathan Crowther, Portraiture of Methodism, or the History of the Wesleyan Methodists, showing their Rise, Progress, and present State; Biographical Sketches of some of their most eminent Ministers; the Doctrines the Methodists believe and teach fully and explicitly stated; with the whole Plan of their Discipline, including their original Rules and subsequent Regulations. Also a Defence of Methodism (Lond. 1815, 8vo). Concerning the history of the Methodist Episcopal Church especially: Nathan Bangs, Hist. of the Meth. Episc. Church from the Year 1766 to 1840 (N. Y. 1839-41, 4 vols. 12mo); A. Stevens, Hist. of. the Meth. Episc. Church (N. Y. 1865-67, 4 vols. 8vo and 12mo); Lee, Hist. of the Methodists; Strickland, Hist. of the Missions of the M. E. Church (1st ed. Cincinnati. 1849); Goss, Statistical Hist. of Methodism (N. Y. 1866,. 18mo); R. Emory, Hist. of the Discipline of the M. E. Church, revised and brought down to 1856 by W. P.  Strickland (1st ed. NY. 1843); Charles Elliott, Hist. of the great Secession from the M. E. Church in the Year 1845, eventuating in the Organization of the new Church, entitled the M. E. Church South (Cincinnati. 1855, 8vo);. Hist. of the M. E. Church in the South-west from 1844 to 1864, by the Revelation Charles Elliott, DD., LLD., edited and revised by the Revelation Leroy Vernon, DD. (St. Louis,: Mo., 1872, 12mo). On Canada: G. F. Playter, Hist. of Methodism in Canada (Toronto, 1862, 12mo); Gorrie,: Lives of Eminent Methodist Ministers; etc.

Books on Methodism. (a.) Polemical books. Innumerable anti-Methodistic works have been published since the days of Wesley. A list of 277 such books,. which, however, are now almost forgotten, is given in alphabetic order by H. D. Decanver: Catalogue of. Works in Refutation of Methodism, from its Origin in 1729 to the present Time (Phila. 1846). (b.) Philosophical (pragmatical) studies: Isaac Taylor, Wesley and Methodism (Lond. 1851)-Introduction; 1, Founders of Methodism; 2, Substance of Methodism; 3, Form of Methodism; 4, Methodism of the Future. Mir. Taylor, a copious Calvinistic writer of the Anglican Church, was once a Dissenter; BF. Tefft, Methodism Successful, and the Internal Causes of its Success (N. Y. 1859). (c.) More or less apologetic are, James Porter, Compendium of Methodism, embracing the History and present Condition of its various Branches in all Countries, with a Defence of its Doctrinal, Governmental, and Prudential Peculiarities (N. Y. 1851; 16th ed. 1860, 12mo); George Smith, The Polity of Wesleyan Methodism exhibited and defended (Lond. 1852, 12mo); P. D. Gorrie, Episcopal Methodism as it was and. is (Auburn, N. Y. 1852, 12mo); Bishop Emory, Defence of our Fathers (NY. 8vo); T. E. Bond. Economy of Methodism (NY. 8vo); J. Dixon, Methodism in its Economy (Lond. and NY. 18mo)'; N. Bangs, Responsibilities of the M. E. Church (NY. 18mo); A. Stevens, Church Polity (NY. 12mo); Morris, Church Polity (NY. 12mo); L. S. Jacoby, Handbuch des Methodismus, embracing its history, doctrine, government, and peculiar ceremonies (Bremen, 1853, 12mo); Thomas Jackson, Wesleyan Methodism ai Revival of Apostolical Christianity, a centenary sermon (Lond. and N. Y. 1839); Dixon, Methodism in its Origin, Economy, and present Position (Lond. and N. Y. 1843, 18mo); Wise, Popular Objections to Methodism Considered and Answered (Boston, 1856, 12mo); Rigg, Essay on the Principles of Methodism (Lond.); Shrewsbury, Methodism Scriptural (Lond.); Thomas Bond, The Economy of Methodism Illustrated and Defended (N. Y. 8vo); Jackson, Letter to Dr.  Pusey, being a Vindication of the Tenets and Character of the Wesleyan Methodists against his Misrepresentations and Censures (Lond. and N. Y.); F. Hodgson, Ecclesiastical Polity of Methodism Defended (Lond. and NY.); Henkle, Primary Platform of Methodism (Louisville, Ky., 1851); F. J. Jobson, America and American Methodism (NY. 1857, 12mo); Strickland, Genius and Mission of Methodism (NY. 1851); Turner, Constitution of Methodism (Lond. 12mo); W. J. Sassnett, Progress, considered with particular Reference to the M. E. Church, South (Nashville, 1855, 12mo); N. Bangs, Present State, Prospects, and Responsibilities of the M. E. Church (N. Y. 1850); John Bakewell, Admonitory Counsels to a Methodist, etc. (N. Y. 18mo); Bishop Baker, Guide in the Administration of the Discipline of the 3. E. Church (N. Y. 16mo); Hawley, Manual of Methodism (N. Y. 12mo).

Among the earlier apologetical works of Methodism, Fletcher's Checks to Antinomianism, covering the first two volumes of his whole works (see below), ranks deservedly as the ablest and most learned defence of Arminianism; and, indeed, it proved quite a polemic against Calvinism. The same writer furnished one of the best polemics against Socinianism, provoked by Priestley. The ablest treatise on systematic theology, from a Methodistic stand-point, was furnished by Dr. Richard Watson in his Theological Institutes, a work which to this day remains the text-book of Methodist students in divinity. An elaborate Analysis was prepared for it by the late senior editor of this Cyclopaedia, the Rev. Dr. John M'Clintock. Editions innumerable have been published of the Institutes, with the Analysis, both in this country and in England (1st edition Lond. 1822- 1828, in 6 parts; N. Y. 2 vols. 8vo; Nashville, Tenn., 1 vol. 8vo). There is also a compilation of Methodist doctrines, entitled Wesleyana: a System of Wesleyan Theology (NY. 12mo). See also Meth. Qu. Revelation 1853, Jan. p. 136 sq.; North. Amer. Revelation 1865, April, p. 593 sq.; Wesleyan Meth. Magazine, 1866, Feb.; Good Words, 1866, Jan.; Lond. Qu. Revelation Oct. 1872; D. D. Whedon, in the Bibliotheca Sacra, April, 1862; J. T. Peck, in the Meth. Qu. Revelation April, 1870; J. Porter, in the Meth. Qu. Revelation April, 1871; D. A. Whedon, in the Meth. Qu. Rev. Jan. 1868, and April, 1870; D. D. Whedon, in the Meth. Qu. Rev. 1866, p. 124, 276, 312, 443; 1872, April and Oct. art. iii; 1873, Jan. p. 138 sq.; Lond. Rev. Oct. 1854, art. v; North Brit. Rev. 1852, Feb.; Ch. Examiner, vol. iv; North Brit. Rev. 32:269; Newell Culver, Methodism' Forty Years Ago and Now (NY. 1873, 18mo); Malcom, Theological Index, s.v.; and  the excellent Catalogue of the Boston Library (2d or consolidated edition, July, 1873). Dr. Abel Stevens, in his Hist. of Methodism, reckons that at least 1500 titles would be required to make up a fair bibliography of Methodism. The Revelation William F. Warren, I).D., in his Systematische Theologie einheitlich behandelt (Bremen, 1865, 8vo), besides giving the position of Methodism in systematic theology somewhat in detail, has furnished a very elaborate compilation of Methodist literature, which is quite complete up to the time of the publication of his book; it covers p. 168-186. In England, Dr. Osborn prepared a treatise on the literature of the Wesleyans (Lond. 1868, 8vo). Very recently a work was commenced by the Revelation Dr. Sulzberger, of Frankfort-on-the-Main, which is intended to be a full treatment of Methodist doctrinal theology for the use, especially, of German students. Vol. i appeared in 1873.

## Methodist Episcopal Church In Canada[[@Headword:Methodist Episcopal Church In Canada]]

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

Methodism was introduced into the country about Niagara and westward by the Revelation George Neal, who was born in Pennsylvania Feb. 28, 1751. He was converted under the ministry of the Revelation Hope Hull. Mr. Neal became a local-preacher, and went into Canada in 1786. He settled in the Niagara District, taught school during the week, and preached to the people on the Sabbath, and frequently on week-day evenings. Following the illustrious examples of Nelson, in England, Williams, in Ireland, and Embury, in New York, Neal collected together those who had been converted through his instrumentality, and formed a society in the township of Stamford- in 1790, appointing Christian Warner the class-leader, an office which he continued to fill until his death, March 21, 1833. This class, collected without the intervention of any travelling preacher, as was also the above class in Augusta, embraced among its members a number who afterwards distinguished themselves as pillars in the Church of God (Hist. of the M. E. Church in Canada, p. 34). The ministrations of Mr. Neal were approved by his brethren in the United  States and Canada, and he was therefore ordained deacon by bishop Asbury July 23, 1810, at the Annual Conference held that year at Lyons, in the State of New York.

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

Early Methodism in Canada, as well as in Europe and the United States, had to contend with great opposition. Its most formidable foes were those who were determined upon the aggrandizement and dominancy of what they called the Established Church, although no such thing as a Church establishment had been constituted in those provinces by legal enactment. These would-be adherents of the Church of England were violent in their hostility to Methodism, as were also the members of some other Protestant churches, to say nothing about the Roman Catholics. An instance of the intolerant spirit manifested towards the early Methodist preachers is presented by the following facts. In 1788 Mr. James M'Carty, an adherent of MrWhitefield, went from the United States and settled in Earnestown, near the shore of the Bay of Quinte. Feeling it to be his duty to preach the Gospel to his neighbors, he collected them together in their little log- cabins, and dispensed to them the Word of Life. He was interfered with by parties from Kingston, who, clothed with a little brief authority, caused him to be dragged from the place of worship, from his peaceful and happy home, and from the bosom of his family. They cast him into prison, and, after giving him some sort of a trial, sentenced him to banishment from the country. He was taken awav from Kingston by his persecutors, and his family saw his face no more. -He is supposed to have been murdered. Mr. Neal was likewise ordered to leave the country; but the hand of God  interposed, and finally he was allowed to remain, and to continue. his Christian labors. The spirit of intolerance continued for many years, though, as time advanced, it manifested itself in somer what less violent forms. Lawsuits were entered against some of the early preachers for celebrating marriage between the members of their own congregations, and they were ordered into exile on this account. But none of these things moved the devoted men who were sent by bishop Asbury and the New York and Genesee conferences. Steady to their purpose, namely, the advancement of the cause of Christ, their watchword was “Onward!” At the -commencement of this century, about ten years after Mr. Losee first entered Canada, the work stood as follows: I district, 4 circuits, 7 preachers, and 936 members.

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

Great success attended the preaching of the Word; and the connection continued to prosper until the occurrence of the unhappy War of 1812. Several of the preachers appointed to Canadian circuits were prevented from entering upon their charges because the Canadian government had issued a proclamation ordering all Americans to leave the. country before the 3d of July. A few of the preachers already resident determined to risk the danger of remaining; others were British-born subjects, and these, with the assistance of local preachers, supplied the work. During the unhappy conflict, the societies sustained great loss, as will appear from the statistics of the Church at the Genesee Conference of 1815, which was held shortly after peace was declared. The Canada work was reported at that  Conference as follows: 2 districts, 9 circuits, 14 preachers, and 1765 members- a decrease since 1810 of 1.030 members. The war-cloud having passed over, and the sunshine of peace once more shedding its benign rays upon both countries, the Genesee Conference resumed its care of the Canadian Church. But, though the two nations continued at peace, the Methodist societies were doomed to be agitated and divided by men sent out by the English Methodists as missionaries. The bitterness and heartburnings which were produced by the rivalry that ensued retarded to some extent the advancement of the cause in certain localities; but in the greater part of their field the American Methodists steadily increased in numbers, influence, and spirituality.

The year 1817 was distinguished for the most remarkable revival influence that had vet been witnessed in Canada. The Genesee Annual Conference that year was held in Elizabethtown, Upper Canada, commencing June 21, bishop George presiding. An Annual Conference was a new thing in Canada, and therefore great crowds of people attended the ministry of the Word, especially on the Sabbath. The number of preachers present was large, and all were anxious to build up the walls of Zion. Religious services commenced at eight o'clock on Sabbath morning, and the Lord manifested himself with power. Many were seeking redemption before the hour had arrived at which the bishop was to preach, so that when he entered the house the congregation was aglow with the fire of divine love. Hundreds were present. The bishop preached one of his most able and impressive sermons, and the discourse had a powerful effect upon his hearers. The services continued all day with but little intermission, and it was not until late in the evening that the people dispersed. It is believed that more than one hundred souls were brought to Christ at this Conference. But the work of reformation did not end there. The preachers went from the Conference refreshed and strengthened, preaching with great effect Christ, the power of God, and the wisdom of God. On all the circuits the Word prevailed mightily, sinners were converted, and believers quickened. ‘For more than three years there were constant additions to the Church throughout the Canadian work; and in some instances the revival influence extended to the border circuits in the United States. In 1820 the Genesee Conference was again held in Canada. The church in which it assembled was at the west end of “ Lundy's Lane,” near the spot where six years previously the British and American soldiers had met in deadly conflict. How great the change now. Americans and Canadians, actuated by the love of Christ,  united harmoniously in council and effort to build up the walls of Zion, and rejoiced together in the triumphs of the Gos-' pel of peace. There were about one hundred preachers present at the Conference. Bishop George presided, still exerting the same holy influence upon preachers and people as in 1817. Thirty preachers were ordained at this Conference. Some of this number were local preachers residing in Canada. The ‘state of the work il' 1820 was 2 districts, 17 circuits, 28 preachers, 47 local preachers, 65 exhorters, and 5557 members.

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

The Canada Conference was organized at Hallowell, Upper Canada, August 25, 1824. Bishops George and Hading were present, and presided in turn. The preacher-, numbered, including the two bishops- and those on trial, thirty-three persons. This was a small number compared with the numbers who met at Elizabethtown in 1817, or at Lundy's Lane in 1820. For four years longer the bishops event into Canada and presided at the sessions of the Canada Conference, appointing the preachers to the several charges, both preachers and societies cheerfully accepting such appointments. The work continued to extend and prosper, and Methodism was fast becoming a power in the land. But the good it was accomplishing among the people, instead of removing the prejudices of its opponents, only tended to infuse fear of its great and growing influence among the advocates of a State Church. Among the Methodists, also, there were some who advocated the independent establishment of the Canadian  Methodist Episcopal Church, on the ground that it would secure to the Canadian Methodists greater civil and religious liberty. Prominent among these was the Revelation H. Ryan, who had been agitating for a separation of the societies in Canada from the parent Church in the United States since 1820. The scheme was presented to the people on national and patriotic grounds, and the General Conference was memorialized on the subject, and at its session held at Pittsburgh, May, 1828, the request was granted. Accordingly, the Canadian Methodists were on October 2, 1828, organized into the Methodist Episcopal Church of Canada. In 1828 there were 3 districts, 48 travelling preachers, 7 superannuated preachers, and 32 circuits, with a membership of 9678. The increase for the year was 1033.

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

This unconstitutional movement was resisted by some of the preachers, and by hundreds of the members. Despite remonstrance, however, the Canada Conference consummated its union with the English body, taking with it most of the Church property, nearly all the preachers, and the principal part of the membership. Some of the former, and hundreds of the latter, disapproving of the proceedings of the Conference, yet submitted from- hopelessness of successful resistance. A respectable minority protested  against the action of the Conference, maintaining that the discipline of the Church did not vest in the Conference the powers assumed by it in that action, and that therefore the action was null and void. They also maintained that if the General Conference had possessed the powers it claimed, its action was nevertheless null and void, because persons were allowed to take part in its proceedings who, according to the discipline of the Church, were not ‘members of the General Conference. The protestants further claimed that, having joined an Episcopal Church, they could not without their own consent be made members of a non-Episcopal Church; neither could they, without fault of their own, be deprived of their membership in the Church they had joined; that they therefore were still members of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada, and that said Church remained in its constitution and government intact-the action of the Conference amounting to nothing more than the withdrawal of the Conference and those who followed it from the Church.

Those preachers, travelling and local, who continued to adhere to the Methodist Episcopal Church, therefore exerted themselves to collect together the scattered remnants remaining faithful to the old Church. The win of 1833-34 was spent in this particular work no easy task, because of the extent of country which had to be traversed; but the few preachers who adhered to the original Church organization were indefatigable in their efforts to rebuild the broken-down walls of their beloved Zion. The Conference assembled at Yonge Street in June, 1834, when it was ascertained that only fourteen preachers could be calculated upon who were prepared to take work the ensuing year; with a membership of 1100-a decrease during eight months of 13,899. These statistics, however, did not represent the true status of the Church, for many more of the people returned to the old fold as soon as they found that there was sufficient vitality left in it to reconstruct and carry on the work of Godin the land. Ten years after the disruption of 1833, viz. in 1843, there were seventy effective ministers and preachers supplying circuits and stations in Upper Canada, besides superannuated and supernumerary preachers, and a goodly staff of local preachers, who were doing efficient service in the Master's vineyard. The membership had increased to 8880, and there had been a corresponding increase of Church property. It will be remembered that at the union in 1833 the Church had lost almost all its connectional property, and this made the subsequent increase the more marked.  In January, 1845, the Canada Christian Advocate, a weekly paper, was established to supply the place in Church literature formerly occupied by the Christian Guardian. This medium of communication drew the societies and preachers more closely together, and enabled all better to understand the true position of the Church, and the work accomplished through its agency. It is still the weekly official paper.

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

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

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

The polity of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada is like that of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States: the bishop taking the general oversight of the connection, presiding at the Conferences, and proceeding in almost every respect in a similar manner to that of the bishops of the parent body. The late incumbent of the bishopric, the Revelation J. Richardson, D.D., Yorkville, Ontario, died in 1874. See  Webster, Hist. M. Epis. Ch., Canada; Meth. Qu. Revelation 1863, Jan. p. 169 sq.; 1863, Apr. p. 204; 1868, Apr. p.,264; 1871, Jan. p. 173. (T. W.)

## Methodist Episcopal Church, South[[@Headword:Methodist Episcopal Church, South]]

             I. Early History. — In the year 1766 Philip Embury and Captain Thomas Webb, Methodist local preachers, began to preach in New York, and in the same year Robert Strawbridge, also a local preacher, in Maryland. In 1769 Richard Boardman and Joseph Pilmoor were sent over to America as missionaries by the Rev. John Wesley; and they were followed in 1771 by Francis Asbury and Richard Wright. In 1772 Asbury was made general assistant, that is, superintendent, under Wesley, of the Methodist societies in America. They were all connected with the Colonial Church of England, until that Church was disbanded after the Revolution. As they had no ordained ministers, and the English bishops would not ordain any for them, though importuned to do so by Wesley, he undertook to ordain some for them himself, and to organize his societies into a regular Episcopal Church, to take the place, so far as the Methodists were concerned, of the old Colonial Church. The Methodist Episcopal Church in America, as it was styled, was organized in 1784. The Rev. John Wesley, MA, consecrated the Rev. Thomas Coke, LLD., who was, like himself, a presbyter of the Church of England, to the office of superintendent, or bishop, of the new organization-other clergymen of the Church of England assisting in the consecration. Richard Whatcoat and Thomas Vasey were at the same time ordained elders, or presbyters, for the American Church. Conferences of the preachers had been held annually from the year 1773; but now a special Conference was convened in Baltimore, and bishop Coke consecrated Francis Asbury as bishop, and several elders and deacons were ordained at the same time. The Conference gave its suffrage to all these appointments. Wesley and his associates proceeded upon the true principle that the Episcopacy is derived from the Plesbytery of the Church, so far as it differs from the latter in this respect reverting to the ancient regimen which recognised the bishop as primus inter pares.

Certain functions of government are ordinarily restricted to the Episcopacy to prevent schism and confusion, but with no idea of a jus divinum-as if bishops were, by God's ordinance, a third order in the ministry, and that there can be no Church without one of them. Thus the American Methodists became truly Episcopal, without any tincture of either Romish, Oriental, or Anglican prelacy-that, indeed, being precluded by the repudiation of the dogma of  uninterrupted apostolical succession. The Church being thus organized with a Liturgy and Confession of Faith, judiciously abridged by Mr. Wesley from the Prayer-book and Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, and a Discipline essentially the same as that of the parent Wesleyan body in England, went forward with astonishing success, extending all over the territory of the United States and Canada. As the exigencies required, new bishops were consecrated, and various modifications took place in the discipline of the Church. In 1792 it was ordered that all the travelling preachers in full connection should attend the General Conference; in 1800 this was restricted to all who had travelled four years; in 1804 this was explained to mean “from the time they were received on trial by an Annual Conference.” But as their number multiplied, a delegated General Conference was organized to meet quadrennially the first meeting being in 1812. The ratio of representation was one delegate to every five travelling preachers in full connection. This ratio has been repeatedly altered, in view of the constant increase of the Annual Conferences. The General Conference was bound by the following restrictive rules: “ The General Conference shall have full powers to make rules and regulations for our Church, under the following limitations and restrictions, namely:

1. The General Conference shall not revoke, alter, or change our articles of religion, nor establish any new standards or rules of doctrine contrary to our present existing and established standards of doctrine.

2. They shall not allow of more than one representative for every five members of the Annual Conference, nor allow of a less number than one for every seven.

3. They shall not change or alter any part or rule of our government, so as to do away Episcopacy, or destroy the plan of :our general superintendency.

4. They shall not revoke or change the General Rules of the United Societies.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. Every member of our society who has slaves in his possession shall, within twelve months after notice given to him by the assistant (which notice the assistants are required immediately, and without any delay, to give in their respective circuits), legally execute and record an instrument - whereby he emancipates and send free every slave in his possession who is between the ages of forty and forty-five immediately, or at furthest when they arrive at the age of forty-five; and every slave who is between the ages of twenty-five and forty immediately, or at furthest at the expiration of five years from the date of the said instrument; and every slave who is between the ages of twenty and twenty-five immediately, or at furthest when they arrive at the age of thirty; and every slave under the age of twenty, as soon as they arrive at the age of twenty-five, at furthest; and every infant born in slavery after the above-mentioned rules are complied with immediately on its birth.

2. Every assistant shall keep a journal, in which he shall regularly minute down the names and ages of all the slaves belonging to all the masters in his respective circuit, and also the date of every instrument executed and recorded for the manumission of the slaves, with the name of the court, book, and folio in which the said instruments respectively shall have been recorded; which journal shall be handed down in each circuit to the succeeding assistants.

3. In consideration that these rules form a new term of communion, every person concerned, who will not comply with them, shall have liberty quietly to withdraw himself from our society within the twelve months  succeeding the notice given as aforesaid: otherwise the assistant shall exclude him in the society.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. No slaveholder shall be received into society till the preacher who has the oversight of the circuit has spoken to him freely and faithfully on the subject of slavery.

3. Every member of the society who sells a slave shall immediately, after full proof, be excluded the society. And if any member of our society purchase a slave, the ensuing quarterly meeting shall determine on the number of years in which the slave so purchased would work out the price of, his purchase. And the person so purchasing shall, immediately after such determination, execute a legal instrument for the manumission of such slave at the expiration of the term determined by the quarterly meeting. And in default of his executing such instrument of manumission, or on his refusal to submit his case to the judgment of the quarterly meeting, such member shall be excluded the society. Provided. also, that in the case of a female slave it shall be inserted in the aforesaid instrument of manumission that all her children who shall be born during the years of her servitude shall be free at the following times, namely: every female child at the age of twenty-one, and every male child at the age of twenty-five. Nevertheless, if the member of our society executing the said instrument of manumission judge it proper, he may fix the times of manumission of the children of the female slaves before mentioned at an earlier age than that which is prescribed above.

4. The preachers and other members of our society are requested to consider the subject of negro slavery with deep attention till the ensuing General Conference; and that they impart to the General Conference, through the medium of the Yearly Conferences, or otherwise, any important thoughts upon the subject, that the Conference may have full light, in order to take further steps towards the eradicating this enormous evil from that part of the Church of God to which we are united.”

In 1800 the following new paragraphs were inserted:.

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

6. The Annual Conferences are directed to draw up addresses for the gradual emancipation of the slaves to the legislatures of those states in which no general laws have been passed for that purpose. These  addresses shall urge, in the most respectful but pointed manner, the necessity of a law for the gradual emancipation of the slaves; proper committees shall be appointed by the Annual Conferences, out of the most respectable of our friends, for the conducting of the business; and the presiding elders, elders, deacons, and travelling preachers, shall secure as many proper signatures as possible to the addresses, and give all the assistance in their power in every respect to aid the committees, and to further this blessed undertaking. Let this be continued from year to year till the desired end be accomplished.”

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

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

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

“3. The General Conference authorizes each Annual Conference to form their own regulations relative to buying and selling slaves.”  In 1812 this was altered thus:

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

In 1816 paragraph 1 of 1796 was altered thus:

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

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

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

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

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

The General Rules drawn up by Mr. Wesley for the Methodist societies in England were not placed in the Discipline at the time of the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church in America in 1784. They were inserted, with some alterations, by bishops Coke and Asbury in 1789. The bishops took the liberty of interpolating the rule forbidding “ the buying or selling the bodies and souls of men with an intention to enslave them.” In 1792 it was altered thus: “The buying or selling of men, women, or children, with  an intention to enslave them.” In 1808 thus: “The buying and selling of men, women, and children, with an intention to enslave them.” In view of the time and manner of its introduction, and its peculiar phraseology, this rule was considered to refer to the African slave-trade, and not to the transfer of those already in slavery from one person to another; hence it met with but little opposition in the South, which denounced that odious traffic. The later General Conferences, down to that of 1840, were conservative on this subject, and this latter affirmed the right of local preachers in Maryland and Virginia who held slaves to ordination, from which they had been debarred by the Baltimore Conference. As the Southern States did not allow the emancipation of slaves without expatriation, both ministers and members held them without violation of the Discipline. As slavery was a civil and social institution, it was impossible for the Church to exist in the South without this permission. In this respect the Methodist Episcopal Church only imitated the Apostolic and Primitive Church, which allowed of slavery among both the membership and ministry, and made laws for the regulation of the same. Mr. Wesley pursued the same course in the West Indies, licensing Mr. Gilbert, a slaveholder, to preach, and baptizing his slaves. The British Conference did so too, charging its ministers in the West Indies to have nothing to do with the institution of slavery, as that was a matter belonging to the legislature, but to preach the Gospel alike to master and slave. Thus, after a tortuous legislation on the vexed question, which scarcely knows a parallel in Church history, the Methodist Episcopal Church in America appears to have been settling down upon a satisfactory and permanent basis.

III. The Separation. — But when the General Conference met in 1844, in New York, the Revelation Francis A. Harding, of the Baltimore Conference, appealed to it from the decision of that Conference, which had suspended him from the ministry for hot manumitting slaves belonging to his wife. The General Conference confirmed the decision of the Baltimore Conference, despite the laws of Maryland and of the Discipline. It was ascertained, too, that one of the bishops, James Osgood Andrew, residing in Georgia, had become connected with slavery. Neither he nor Mr. Harding had either bought or sold a slave. Bishop Andrew was legally in possession of a slave, bequeathed him by a lady, and whom he would liberate at any time, but she would not receive her freedom; also a boy, left by his former wife to his daughter without will; him, too, he would  willingly manumit if he could do so by the laws of Georgia; also slaves legally his by his second marriage, whom he could not own, but secured them by deed to his wife, to whom they belonged-the law not allowing their emancipation. But after a lengthened, excited, and very able discussion of the question on both sides, the General Conference adopted the following preamble and resolution: “Whereas, the Discipline of the Church forbids the doing anything calculated to destroy our itinerant and general superintendency; and whereas, bishop Andrew has become connected with slavery, by marriage and otherwise, and this act having drawn after it circumstances which, in the estimation of the General Conference, will greatly embarrass the exercise of his office as an itinerant general superintendent, if not, in some places, entirely prevent it; therefore, Resolved, That it is the sense of this General Conference that he desist from the exercise of this office so long as this impediment remains.”

The vote stood 111 for and 69 against all in the affirmative, except one (and he a Northerner), being from Northern Conferences, the Baltimore Conference being equally divided: several from the Northern Conferences, however, voted in the negative. The bishops had requested the General Conference to suspend action in the premises, suggesting that arrangements might be made to retain bishop Andrew in office, as his services would be “welcome and cordial” in the South. Resolutions declaring the action in the case of bishop Andrew, to be advisory only, and not to be a considered in the light of a judicial mandate, and postponing its final disposition, according to the suggestion of the bishops, were laid on the table by a vote of 75 to 68 the South, of course, voting in the negative. Resolutions proposing two General Conferences were referred to a committee, which could not agree on a report. The Southern delegates then presented the following “Declaration:” “The delegates of the Conferences in the slaveholding states take leave to declare to the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church that the continued agitation on the subject of slavery and abolition in a portion of the Church, the frequent action on that subject in the General Conference, and especially the extra-judicial proceedings against bishop Andrew, which resulted on Saturday last in the virtual suspension of him from his office as superintendent, must produce a state of things in the South which renders a continuance of the jurisdiction of the General Conference over these Conferences inconsistent with the success of the ministry in the slaveholding states.” This declaration was referred to a committee of nine, composed of Northern and Southern delegates, with instructions to devise  a constitutional plan for a mutual and friendly division of the Church, provided the difficulties could not be otherwise adjusted.

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

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

“Whereas, a declaration has been presented to this General Conference with the signatures of fifty-one delegates of the body, from thirteen Annual Conferences in the slaveholding states,  representing that, for various reasons enumerated, the objects and purposes of the Christian ministry and Church organization cannot be successfully accomplished by them under the jurisdiction of this General Conference as now constituted; and whereas, in. the event of a separation, a contingency to which the declaration asks attention as not improbable, we esteem it the duty of this General Conference to meet the emergency with Christian kindness and the strictest equity, therefore, Resolved, by the delegates of the several Annual Conferences in General Conference assembled,

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

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

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

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

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

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

“7. That Nathan Bangs, George Peck, and James B. Finley be, and they are hereby appointed commissioners to act in concert with the same number of commissioners appointed by the Southern organization (should one be formed), to estimate the amount which will fall due to the South by the preceding rule, and to have full powers to carry into  effect the whole arrangements proposed with regard to the division of property, should the separation take place. And if by any means a vacancy occur in this, A Board of Commissioners, the Book Committee at New York shall fill said vacancy.

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

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

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

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

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

The Southern delegates sent out an address to their constituents, showing what they had done, and counselling moderation and forbearance. They called for a convention of the Annual Conferences-in the ratio of one to eleven of their members-to meet in Louisville, Ky., May 1,1845. Meanwhile the Church in the South, in Quarterly and Annual Conferences, took action in the premises, and declared in favor of the plan of separation with a very near approach to unanimity. The convention met in Louisville at the appointed time, bishops Sould, Andrew, and Morris being present. The bishops were invited to preside, and the two former did so. The convention, acting under the plan of separation, declared the Southern  Conferences there represented a distinct connection, under the style of “The Methodist Episcopal Church, South,” and made provision for the holding of its first General Conference in Petersburg, Va., May, 1846. Bishops Soule and Andrew were requested to become regular and constitutional bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South; the latter complied with the request, but the former, in view of outstanding engagements, postponed doing so till the session of the General Conference.

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

III. Present Condition. — The Church has been rapidly recovering from the sad effects of the war. At the time of the separation. in 1844, there were about 450,000 communicants in the Southern Church. In 1860 there were 757,205, of whom 207,766 were colored members. These figures were greatly reduced during the war. In 1890 the number of communicants was 1,161,666, of whom only 520 were colored. There were 4862 travelling and 6269 local preachers all embraced in the foregoing figures. Most of the colored members had joined other colored bodies of Methodists. Many of them are connected with the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church in America, which was organized in 1870 by the sanction of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, with a distinct connection in fraternal relation with this Church, the bishops of the latter consecrating as bishops two colored ministers chosen by a colored General Conference; One of them died in 1872; but the Connection is prosperous, having a number of Annual Conferences, and at a special General Conference, held in Augusta, Ga., in 1873, three other bishops were elected. Their Discipline, mutatis nmutandis. is the same as that of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. The bishops of the Southern Church have been: Soule, Andrew, Bascom, Capers, Pierce, Early, Kavanagh, Wightman, Doggett, Marvin, and McTyeire; and they now are Keener, Wilson, Granberry, Hargood, Duncan, Galloway, Hendrix, Key, Haygood, and Fitzgerald. There are 46 Annual Conferences, composed of travelling ministers and lay delegates-four of the latter (one of whom may be a local preacher) from every district. The General Conference is constituted of an equal number of ministers and laymen.

District Conferences are held in all the districts once a year, for the purpose of review, etc., but without legislative or judicial power. - Quarterly Conferences are held in all the pastoral charges, at which exhorters and local preachers are licensed, and preachers are recommended to the Annual Conference for ordination or admission into the travelling ministry. Church Conferences are- ordered once a month, to review all the spiritual and temporal affairs of the pastoral charges. Sunday-schools, love-feasts, class- meetings, and prayermeetings enter into the economy of the Church. The General Conference ordered a revised edition of the Liturgy, as abridged by Mr. Wesley for the Methodist Episcopal Church in America, to be published for those congregations that might desire to use it; but few, if  any, do so. The Ritual is still in use for all occasional services, and it has been carefully revised and improved, as also has been the psalmody of the Church. The Sunday-school cause has received a great impulse, and many valuable publications are issued to meet its demands. Universities, colleges,- and academies, for both sexes, have been multiplying all over the Connection. Many original works, which are held in high estimation, such as histories, biographies, sermons, commentaries, and other works on theology, have been issued from the publishing-house of the Church; and the great staple-works of the Wesleyan press have been carefully revised and re-printed. The publishing-house was in part destroyed by fire in February, 1872, but a magnificent edifice, approaching completion, is to take its place. The missionary work of the Church was well-nigh broken up by the war; but it is recuperating -except the missions to the colored people, which were considered the crowning glory of the Southern Methodist Church. The missions to China and Brazil have received a great impetus and promise well; so do the Indian missions. A mission has been established in Mexico under favorable auspices. But the destitute portions of the South-destroyed by the war — require a vast amount of missionary work, and in rendering this the Church is restricted, for want of sufficient men and means, from extending its work in the foreign field Disciplines, General Minutes, Journals of the General Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Churches North and South; Emory's History of the Discipline; Methodist Church Property Case; Redford's History of the Organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. SEE METHODISM. (T. O. S.)

## Methodist Episcopal Church, The[[@Headword:Methodist Episcopal Church, The]]

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

I. Organization.-This title was assumed by the American Methodists as a distinct body at what is historically known as the “Christmas Conference,” which commenced its session on Friday, Dec. 24, 1784, and was continued through Christmas week, and until the second day of the new year. Previous to this period the American Methodists had constituted societies, like those in Great Britain, in connection with and under the jurisdiction of the Revelation John Wesley, whom they all alike reverenced and obeyed as their spiritual father and head. The first Methodist service in America is believed to have been held in the year 1766, in the city of New York, by Philip Embury, an Irish immigrant and local preacher, a carpenter by trade, who was moved thereto by the stirring appeals of Barbara Heck, an Irishwoman, whose name is illustrious in the annals of the denomination. Thomas Webb, a captain in the British army, who was then staying in America, Robert Strawbridge, and Robert Williams, all local preachers, were, with Embury, the prosecutors of the work thus begun, until, in the autumn of 1769, Richard Boardman and Joseph Pilmoor arrived at Philadelphia as missionaries sent out by Mr. Wesley. Seven others afterwards came; but the entire service of all Wesley's missionaries in the colonies was less than twenty-eight years, leaving out of the account Francis Asbury, who alone of them remained in the country during the Revolutionary War, and who became the apostle and bishop of the Church.  Though several of them were not fortunate in their associations with their American brethren, two soon becoming Presbyterians, a third, by his active Toryism, causing grave scandal and even persecution, and none, except Asbury, staying long, they, as a whole, by their labors, zeal, and adherence to the well-proved Wesleyan discipline, were instrumental in settling the cause upon a firm basis, and raising up scores of native preachers to carry on the work.

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

Most of the Methodists of 1784 were without the sacraments; for the English clergy upon whom they had generally depended had, with few exceptions, either left the country or forsaken their parishes. Thousands had been received into the societies without baptism; their children were growing up without that sacred rite; and preachers were ministering in their pulpits who had never even partaken of the Lord's Supper. The growing necessity for some provision for the administration of the sacraments had led to so serious thought and discussion in successive Conferences that the regular session of 1779, deeming the exigency sufficient to warrant a departure from ecclesiastical usage, constituted four of their number a presbyter, who with solemn forms proceeded to ordain one another, and afterwards others of their brethren. At the end of a year the sacramental party yielded to the minority for peace' sake; the administration of the sacraments was suspended; and it was agreed to seek the counsel of Wesley, and abide by his judgment. He advised them to “continue on the old plan until further direction.” Wesley found for his American societies  no way of relief until subsequent to the conclusion of the war. Then, after long and mature thought, and consultation with his friends, among whom was Fletcher, the saintly vicar of Madeley, he resolved to use the power which he believed himself as a presbyter to possess, and ordain a ministry that should meet the demands of the thousands who sought aid from him as their spiritual founder. He proposed to the Rev. Thomas Coke, LLD., to receive ordination at his hands as their superintendent, to which Coke, whose sympathies were profoundly stirred in their behalf, consented, when study and reflection had convinced him of Wesley's power to ordain to the Episcopal office. It was also arranged that two of the English preachers should be ordained to accompany him as elders. Accordingly, on the first day of September, 1784, at Bristol, using the convenient and solemn forms of the Church of England, and, assisted by Dr. Coke and the Revelation Thomas Creighton, a presbyter of the English Church, Wesley ordained Richard Whatcoat and Thomas Vasey to the office of deacon. On the next day he ordained them elders, and, assisted by Creighton and Whatcoat, he also ordained Coke superintendent, or bishop, as this officer was afterwards called. He then sent them upon their mission, with instructions to organize the societies into a distinct Church, and to ordain Asbury joint superintendent with Coke. To facilitate their work, he furnished them with a “Sunday Service,” or liturgy, a collection of psalms and hymns, and also “The Articles of Religion.” Upon their arrival in America, a special conference or convention of the itinerant preachers was summoned, and on the 24th of December sixty of them assembled in the Lovely Lane Chapel, in the city of Baltimore. Dr. Coke took the chair, and presented the following letter from Wesley, written eight days after the ordinations, and tersely stating the grounds of what he had done and advised:

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

“By a very uncommon train of providences, many of the provinces of North America are totally disjoined from their mother country, and elected into independent states. The English government has no authority over them, either civil or ecclesiastical, any more than over the states of Holland. A civil authority is exercised over them, partly by the Congress and partly by the provincial assemblies ; but no one either exercises or claims any ecclesiastical authority- at all. In this peculiar situation, some thousands of the inhabitants of these states desire my advice: and, in compliance with their desire, I have drawn up a little sketch.  “Lord King's Account of the Primitive Church convinced me, many years ago, that bishops and presbyters are the same order, and consequently have the same right to ordain. For many years I have been importuned, from time to time, to exercise this right, by ordaining part of our travelling preachers. But I have still refused, not only for peace' -sake, but because I was determined as little as possible to violate the established order of the National Church, to which I belonged.

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

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

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

“It has indeed been proposed to desire the English bishops to ordain part of our preachers for America; but to this I object: (1.) I desired the bishop of London to ordain only one; but could not prevail. (2.) If they consented, we know the slowness of their proceedings; but the matter admits of no delay. (3.) If they would ordain them now, they would likewise expect to govern them and how grievously would this entangle us ! (4.) As our American  brethren are now totally disentangled both from the state and from the English hierarchy, we dare not entangle them again, either with the one or the other. They are now at full liberty simply to follow the Scriptures and the Primitive Church. And we judge it best that they should stand fast in that liberty wherewith God has so strangely made them free.”

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

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

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

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

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

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

5. Wesley, then, intended an Episcopal Church. But an Episcopal Church must have an Episcopacy, and therefore an ἐπίσκοπος, bishop, or superintendent, names alike in signification. He preferred the latter, as did Coke, who spoke in his sermon at Asbury's ordination of “ our bishops, or superintendents, as we rather call them.” When it began to be applied as a personal title to the incumbents of ,the office, Wesley wrote, “ How can you, how dare you, suffer yourself to be called bishop ?” though he well  knew that an Episcopal Church must have its bishop. To the title, not to the thing, he did object, and most strongly, for as it met him in England, its pomp and pretentiousness were far removed from that character of simplicity which he had so laboriously stamped upon Methodism. “I study to be little,” he truly said in the same letter; but when he added, “You study to be great,” he took counsel of his fears, and showed how little he knew the real character of Asbury, to whom he was writing. The truth is, he made a bishop, and called him superintendent. American Methodists early saw fit to sometimes use the other word.

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

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

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

3. Wesley's doctrine of the “Witness of the Spirit,” known to many by the term “Assurance,” holds an important place in the system of the Church. He defines it as “an inward impression on the soul, whereby the Spirit of God immediately and directly witnesses to my spirit that I am a child of God; that Jesus Christ hath loved me, and given himself for me; that all my sins are blotted out, and I, even I, am reconciled to God;” and to effect this persuasion, he supposes that the Holy Spirit “ works upon the soul by his  immediate influence, and by a strong though inexplicable operation.” The possession of this assurance is taught to be the privilege of all believers, and penitents are diligently instructed not to rest until it is received; while it is a constant theme in the pulpit and the social meeting. Such is the emphasis practically placed upon it.

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

III. Government.

1. The General Conference, the highest of the five judicatories of the Church, assembles on the first day of May in every fourth year, and is the only legislative body of the denomination. As in the Christmas Conference, it was for many years, constructively at least, an assembly of the whole ministry; but their increasing number, the impossibility of a general attendance from the constantly-extending field, and the felt necessity of settling the doctrinal and ecclesiastical systems upon a basis less easily changed, led to the arrangement, in 1808, that thenceforth it should be composed of ministerial delegates from the several Annual Conferences, acting under certain clearly-defined restrictions. These restrictive rules, or articles, as they are termed, have been modified from time to time, though the most important change was effected in 1872, providing for the introduction of laymen into the body, with equal powers with the clergy. The General Conference now (1873) consists of one minister for every forty-five members of each Annual Conference, chosen by the clergy, and two laymen, chosen by lay electors from the several Quarterly Conferences within the same territory. The regulations defining its functions are as follows: “The General Conference shall have full powers to make rules and regulations for our Church, under the following limitations and restrictions, namely: Articles of Religion, nor establish any new standards or rules of doctrine contrary to our present existing and established standards of doctrine.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. The District Conference embraces the churches of a presiding elder's district, and is composed of the pastors, local preachers, exhorters, and one steward and Sunday-school superintendent from each pastoral charge. It licenses local preachers, recommends them to the Annual Conference for orders or for admission on trial, and holds jurisdiction over them; it is also charged with a general supervision of the temporal and spiritual affairs of the district. Specifically, it inquires into the work of Sunday-schools, forms plans for the occupation of new fields within its territory, and promotes attention to the charities of the Church. which it exercises entire supervision, subject to the provisions of the Discipline. Its members are the pastor, local preachers, exhorters, stewards, and class-leaders, together with the trustees and Sunday-school superintendent, if members of the Church. Besides the functions of the District Conference. which devolve upon it where no District Conference is held, it inquires carefully into the condition and work of every department of the local society.

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

7. The legislation of 1784 gave new force to the essential features which Rankin and Asbury, who had been trained in the school and under the eye of Wesley. had stamped upon the American societies. Evangelization and supervision, the former to extend the work, the latter to secure and build up what had been won, were fundamental in the methods then adopted, as they were in the measures of Wesley. The bishops were chief evangelists, almost plenary in power, yet sharing with the humblest in fare and labor, inspecting the local societies and classes, meeting leaders and trustees, and holding themselves responsible for even the details of the work throughout the denomination. The preacher in charge of a circuit was the bishop's “assistant,” and the other preachers of the circuit were the assistant's “helpers,” and under his direction. In still closer contact with the membership was the class-leader, appointed by the assistant, and in his subordinate sphere of pastorship aiding him by watching over the little band while he might be in other parts of the circuit. This “military regimen,” as the historian of the Church has styled it, very remote from a democracy, which, indeed, it never pretended to be, gave surprising vigor to all the movements of the system. In all the modifications which have been from time to time effected, and the numerous limitations of power which the ministry have imposed upon themselves, these features of evangelization and supervision have been steadily maintained. The bishop presides in the Conferences; forms the districts according to his judgment; appoints the preachers to their fields, allowing none to remain more than  three years in succession in the same charge, except the presiding elders, who may remain four years, and a few others specially designated; ordains; travels through the connection at large, and oversees, in accordance with the prescribed regulations of the General Conference, to which he is subject, the spiritual and temporal business of the Church. The bishops are not diocesan, but have a joint jurisdiction over the whole Church, constituting and “itinerant general superintendency.” The arrangement and division of their work is annually made by themselves, giving to each-his portion (though their respective residences are assigned by the General Conference), and for its faithful and orderly performance they are responsible to the General Conference. SEE EPISCOPACY; SEE ITINERANCY.

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

9. Admission into an Annual Conference is preceded by a two years' probation in the itinerant work, and a rigid examination in a prescribed course of study; and all preachers thus admitted as members are ordained deacons, and in two years more, on the completion of the required studies, they are ordained elders. It devolves upon the former to “administer baptism, solemnize matrimony, assist the elder in administering the Lord's Supper, and to do all the duties of a travelling preacher;” and upon the latter, in addition to these, to “administer the Lord's Supper” and to “conduct divine worship.” But an elder, deacon, or preacher may be in charge of a circuit or station, with no difference in function except in the matter of the sacraments. He is the chief executive officer of the local society, charged to “take care” of its interests in accordance with the provisions of the Discipline, and- is responsible to the Annual Conference both for the proper discharge of his duties and for his moral conduct. While  he is the pastor of the flock, sub-pastors, denominated class-leaders, are charged with the oversight of small bodiesof the membership, whom they are to meet weekly “for social and religious worship, for instruction, encouragement, and admonition.” The local preachers, without a share in the government of the Church, except in the District and Quarterly Conferences, constitute a lay ministry, a corps of self-supporting evangelists, numerically larger than the travelling preachers, which has been of great efficiency. SEE LAY MINISTRY. All churches and parsonages are the property of the local society, held by trustees chosen in accordance with the law of the state or territory wherever a specific mode is required, and otherwise by the Quarterly Conference.

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

IV. History and Progress. — Under this head we propose to give a rapid sketch of the work performed by the Methodist Episcopal Church and its gradual growths noting, as we pass, its relations to public questions, its changes of internal economy, and the principal controversies that have grown up from time to time, with their effects.  1. Pioneer Work. — “Methodism presented itself to the new nation,” says Stevens, “an Episcopal Church, with all the necessary functions and functionaries of such a body; the only one, of Protestant denomination, now in the nation, for the colonial fragments of the English Establishment had not yet been reorganized.” Led by Coke and Asbury, the little band of itinerants went ‘forth to their self-sacrificing toils with a new sense of consolidation and certainty, and feeling in their souls, as they said, that they were “raised up to reform the continent, and to spread scriptural holiness over these lands.”. Under the new system, the eucharist was immediately administered to thousands of disciples who had never partaken of it, and large numbers of both adults and children were baptized, scores of the latter receiving the rite at a single meeting. The work extended in every direction. The post of hardship and severity was the post of honor. Going in the true spirit of evangelists, with the conviction that they had “nothing to do but to save souls,” they not only held and strengthened the fields already won, but pressed on to the regions beyond, continually forming new circuits, and proclaiming their message wherever men would hear-in churches, in barns and log-cabins, in the forest and highway.

They crossed the mountains, and kept pace with the constantly-advancing frontier; they penetrated Canada, and established themselves in New England and Nova Scotia. Gown, and band, and prayerbook were too cumbersome for their use, and were soon laid aside. The system was providentially adapted to self-propagation. “ Its class and prayer meetings trained most, if not all, the laity to practical missionary labor, and three or four of them, meeting in any distant part of the earth by the emigrations of these times, were prepared immediately to become the nucleus of a Church. {The lay or local ministry, borne on by the tide of population, were almost everywhere found, prior to the arrival of regular preachers, ready to sustain religious services-the pioneers of the Church in every new field.” Such was their success that in sixteen years, at the end of the century, their 15,000 members had become 64,894, and the 84 itinerants had increased to 287, not counting :the scores who had fallen out of their ranks from pure physical inability to endure the terrible severity of the system, but were still working nobly in their local sphere. Bishop Coke's stay in the country at his first visit was but five months, a fair type of his subsequent visits. After 1787 his Episcopal work was limited to ordinations, presiding in Conference when present, itinerating through the country, and preaching, the stationing of the preachers being left with bishop Asbury.  Coke threw himself with zeal into the work of raising funds for the college at Abingdon, Md., whose cornerstone Asbury laid -three days after his first departure for Europe.

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

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

Attempts were made in 1800 to make the presiding eldership elective in the Annual Conferences, to introduce the English method of making the appointments by requiring them to be reading open session, “to hear what the Conference may have to say on each station,” and to aid the bishop in making the appointments by a committee of preachers chosen by the  Conference for the purpose; but they signally failed, though some of them were revived in subsequent years.

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

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

The latter year is the epoch of the plan of a delegated General Conference, adopted to “preserve, strengthen, and perpetuate the union of the connection,” and to render “ the doctrine. form of government, and General Rules, sacred and inviolable.” - The “Council” devised by the bishops, composed of themselves and the presiding elders, had proved  abortive after two trials, and the General Conference, as then constituted, practically placed the doctrinal and administrative systems of the denomination in the power of the more centrally located ministers. The new plan was conservative of every fundamental principle of the Church, and at the same time gave to the remotest Conference equal power with the most central, in proportion to its number of ministers. The first session, held in 1812, was composed of 90 members, representing 688 preachers, and a membership of 195,357; the sixteenth, held in 1872, was composed of 421 members, 292 clerical and 129 lay, representing, according to the Minutes of 1871, 9699 travelling preachers, 11,382 local preachers, and 1,421,323 members and probationers. Taking a fresh departure with the adoption of this measure, the “Church pressed forwards in its practical work with added zeal.

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

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

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

The educational movements of the Church began with. the Church itself. John Dickens, afterwards the first book agent, suggested to Asbury the plan of an academic institution as early as 1780. and at their first meeting the latter submitted it to Coke, who heartily approved it. It was laid before the Christmas Conference, which agreed upon measures to establish a college. Five thousand dollars-a large sum for those days-were raised for it  before the building was begun; its foundations were laid at Abingdon, Md., in the following June, and in the last month of 1787 it was solemnly dedicated under the name of Cokesbury College. The curriculum embraced' “English, Latin, Greek, logic, rhetoric, history, geography, natural philosophy, and astronomy, and, when the finances will admit of it, Hebrew, French, and German.” More than seventy students were at one time within its halls. Unfortunately it was burned down in 1795: “ a sacrifice of £10,000 in about ten years,” says Asbury. A new edifice was soon provided in Baltimore, and the college reopened with fair prospects, but in a year it also was lost by fire. Another college was projected in Georgia in 1789, and several academies were opened before the close of the century. The disastrous fate of Cokesbury led Asbury to think the Lord had “ not called Methodists to build colleges,” a saying of his that has been most sadly perverted. He would have had the same thing, but would have called it a “school,” and not a “college,” and he would place one in every Conference. He actually framed a scheme to bring “two thousand children under the best plan of education ever known in this country.”

In 1818 a second attempt was made to establish a college in Baltimore, but without success. The educational plans of the early Methodists were simply broader than their financial ability. At no time has the slander been just that they were enemies to education. In 1817 an academy was opened in Newmarket, N. H., since removed to Wilbraham, Mass.; and in 1819 another in New York City.

 In 1820 the General Conference took up the subject, and recommended that each Annual Conference establish as soon as practicable a literary institution under its own control. This action was followed by new efforts. Several Conference seminaries were soon opened, and, to meet the increasing demand for higher education, within twelve years no less than five colleges were put in successful operation. Theological schools are of a later date, and assumed at first the modest title of “ Biblical Institute.” The first, projected in 1839, after various fortunes, was located at Concord, N. H., in 1847; in 1867 it removed to Boston, and in 1871 became the school of theology in the Boston University. The Garrett Biblical Institute, at Evanston, Ill., founded in 1855, received an endowment of $300,000 and its name from a liberal Methodist lady of Chicago. The Drew Theological Seminary was originated in the Centenary movement at Madison, N. J., through the munificence of the gentleman whose name it bears. There is also a mission institute at Frankforton-the- Main, in Germany, named Martin Institute, after the gentleman whose munificence mainly endowed the school; and there are similar schools in  India, and at two or three points in the Southern States.' By the close of the centennial year of American Methodism, “the Methodist Episcopal Church alone reported no less than 25 colleges (including theological schools), having 158 instructors, 5345 students, about $4,000,000 in endowments and other property, and 105,531 volumes in their libraries. It reports also 77 academies, with 556 instructors, and 17,761 students, 10,462 of whom are females, making an aggregate of 102 institutions, with 714 instructors, and 23,106 students. The Southern division of the denomination [the Methodist Episcopal Church, South] reported before the Rebellion 12 colleges and 77 academies, with 8000 students, making an aggregate for the two bodies of 191 institutions and 31,106 students” (Stevens's Hist. of Am. Meth. p. 540). In the thank-offerings of the Centenary, education was made a prominent object of the contributions of the people.

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

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

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

The subject of slavery, which for many years agitated the whole country, and finally plunged it into a civil war, could not fail, in the progress of events, to involve in its complications a Church which constantly put slavery under its ban, but did not make absolute non-slaveholding a test of membership. Two important secessions resulted-one in the North, the other in the South. One of the General Rules-the moral code of the Church from the beginning-forbade “ the buying or selling of men, women, or children, with an intention to enslave them.” The legislation of the Church was steadily adverse to the institution, ‘though always embarrassed by the obstacles which the civil laws placed in the way of a legal emancipation. The prohibition, however, of buying or selling slaves with any other intent than their freedom, remained unchanged. Moreover, from the year 1800, the Discipline provided that “when any travelling preacher becomes an owner of a slave or slaves by any means, he shall forfeit his ministerial character in the Methodist Episcopal Church unless he execute, if it be practicable, a legal emancipation of such slaves, conformably to the laws of  the state in which he lives;” from 1816, that “no slaveholder shall be eligible to any official station in our Church hereafter, where the laws of the state in which he lives will admit of emancipation, and permit the liberated slave to enjoy freedom;” and from 1824 it contained provisions for the religious instruction of slaves, and concerning colored local preachers. These regulations were in force at the commencement of the “ abolition movement,” and continued unchanged until 1860, when the formula in the Discipline declares that “ the buying, selling, or holding of human beings, to be used as chattels, is contrary to the laws of God and nature, and inconsistent with the golden rule;” and both preachers and people are admonished to “ keep themselves pure from this great evil, and to seek its extirpation by all lawful and Christian means.” The discussions in Great Britain from the year 1823, that resulted in emancipation in all the British colonies in 1834, drew attention to the system of slavery as it existed in the United States, which was not greatly unlike that of the West Indies. Philanthropic men became aroused by numerous well authenticated facts of the wicked and inhuman treatment of slaves.

They were led to examine the system of chattel slavery and its practical workings, and found them so adverse to the right to himself of every person of full age and sane mind, except for the commission of crime, that they pronounced slaveholding to be a crime in God's sight, and immediate, unconditional emancipation a duty. Leading ministers, chiefly in New England at first, espoused these views, and advocated them in the pulpit, at camp-meetings, in conventions, through the press, and by all those means that could act upon the public mind. In the controversies that followed, in, which some of the most able pens of the denomination were engaged, the question was examined in all its aspects. ‘The subject was introduced into Quarterly and Annual Conferences, and ultimately became involved with questions of Conference rights, Episcopal prerogatives, and the rights of the laity. The General Conference of 1836 passed a vote of censure upon two of its members who had attended and spoken at an anti-slavery meeting in Cincinnati, where the session was held, (a resolution which in 1868, so greatly had opinion. changed with events, it rescinded and pronounced void), and exhorted the “members and friends” of the Church “to abstain from all abolition movements and associations, and to refrain from patronizing any of their publications.” But Methodism had not overlooked the welfare of the slave. At the culmination of these troubles, a hundred thousand colored persons, mostly slaves, were enrolled as members of the Church, amounting to one tenth of the whole. But many apologics for  quietness and tolerance of the legal relation of master were nullified by a resolution of the Georgia Conference, “that slavery, as it exists in the United States, is not a moral evil.” At length, the General Conference of 1840 having found it “inexpedient to express any opinion, or to adopt any measures additional to those already in the Discipline,” many began to abandon all hope of seeing the Church purged of slavery, and to regard withdrawal as necessary to free themselves from the guilt of connection with it. Others, who had been prominent in the anti-slavery ranks, and had advocated such modifications in the law of the Church as would prevent the holding of slaves as chattels, maintained that the Discipline was against slavery, and that secession was not an anti-slavery measure. They preferred to fight the battle within the Church. But Orange Scott, Jotham Horton, Luther Lee, and others, felt impelled by their consciences to withdraw. At a convention held at Utica N. Y., in 1843, they organized the “Wesleyan Methodist Connection.”. This was but the beginning of a struggle in which churches were rent in twain through most of the Northern States. The organization thus formed numbered at one period a considerable number of preachers and members; but time and events have produced such changes that many of its first leaders and warmest friends have returned to the old Church in the belief that the denomination has accomplished its mission.

But a severer convulsion was preparing in the South. The discriminations of the Discipline against slaveholding had come to be distasteful to a generation that held views on slavery widely different from those of the fathers, though six Conferences, lying wholly or partly in slave states, the Baltimore being one, rigidly enforced the old rule requiring ministers to emancipate the slaves of whom they might become owners by inheritance, marriage, or any other means, wherever the civil law allowed it, and never permitted slaveholders in their ranks. It was also the ancient and settled policy and constant usage to place no slaveholder in the Episcopacy; and in 1832 James O. Andrew was put in nomination for that high office by Southern delegates, because, though of the South, he was free from all personal connection with slavery, and was elected. This was upon the principle that a bishop, in a system of general superintendency which gave him equal jurisdiction in Massachusetts and South Carolina, must be free from whatever would prevent the exercise of his functions with acceptance in any part of the Church. A slaveholding bishop could never have presided in the Northern Conferences, and the election of one would be an infraction of the law forbidding the General Conference to “ destroy the  plan of our itinerant general superintendency.” The increasing restiveness under this exclusion from the highest office of the Church led to an attempt by Southern delegates, in 1836, to elect to it a slaveholder, and, upon its failure, to great agitation and threats of secession, if what was termed “this proscriptive system” should not be abandoned. The renewal of the effort in 1844 was fully determined upon, and the purpose of resistance on the part of the Northern Conferences was equally firm, when the marriage of bishop Andrew, in January of that year, with a lady who was the owner of slaves, suddenly gave the friends of the movement precisely what they wanted, but could not have obtained by the suffrages of the General Conference-a slaveholding bishop. That trouble was ahead was evident, and the Southern ministry became at once a unit in sustaining him.

It could not be expected that the Church would quietly submit to the revolutionizing of its ancient policy by a marriage; and nothing could have more astounded the Northern delegates to the General Conference of 1844 than the intelligence, which met them upon their arrival in New York, the place of the session, that slaveholding was already intrenched in the Episcopacy. Early in the session an appeal of the Revelation Francis A. Harding from the action of the Baltimore' Conference was presented. That gentleman having become by marriage the owner of five slaves, the Conference, in pursuance of its old purpose to “not tolerate slavery in any of its members,” required him to legally emancipate them within the year, and, upon his refusal, suspended him from the ministry. The General Conference, after a. full hearing of the case, it being clear that emancipation could be legally effected in Maryland, affirmed the decision of the Baltimore Conference by a vote of 117 to 56. That body, though few were “abolitionists,” certainly was in no mood to yield further to the encroachments of slavery; and it was equally evident that should bishop Andrew be touched. secession would ensue. His voluntary resignation could have saved both the South and the Church; and this step he promptly resolved to take, but he was overruled by the Southern delegates. They preferred disruption to a non-slaveholding Episcopacy. The committee on the Episcopacy was instructed to ascertain and report the facts in relation to the bishop's alleged connection with slavery, when it was found that, besides the legal ownership of several others, he had married a lady owning slaves, and had secured them to her by a deed of trust, thus putting their freedom out of his power. A resolution, with a preamble reciting the facts, was promptly offered by Mr. Griffith, a delegate from Baltimore, affectionately requesting him to resign  his office; but the final action, after ten days' debate, was the adoption of the following substitute by a vote of 111 yeas and 69 nays:

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

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

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

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

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

(1) it is based upon one fundamental condition, namely, a necessity to be found by the slaveholding Conferences for a distinct ecclesiastical connection, produced by the action of the General Conference.

(2) It assumes that such distinct organization, if formed at all, will come into being by the action of those Conferences, and upon their own responsibility.

(3) It does not arrange a division of the Church. For this the General Conference had no power, as was agreed in the Committee; aid that it did  not and could not divide the Church was as freely asserted by Southern as by Northern delegates, both during and after the debate. The term “division” does occur, but solely with reference to property.

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

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

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

By this eminently Christian enactment the General Conference made provision for peace and quiet in view of the threatened withdrawal of a large and powerful portion of the Church. History must, however, record that the Southern delegates, at a meeting held on the day following ‘the adjournment, and without waiting for the “ necessity” to develop itself, and to be found by the Conferences, called a convention of delegates from the slaveholding Conferences, with a defined ratio of representation, to assemble at Louisville, Ky., on May 1, 1845, invited bishop Andrew to attend and preside in their Conferences, and also issued an address to the ministers and members in the South, stating what they term “the facts and reasons connected with the proposed separation of the Southern Conferences into a distinct organization.” This precipitated and virtually decided the question of separation. In the controversies that followed this summary proceeding, the whole Church was stirred. The various questions involved were discussed in public meetings, in Quarterly and Annual Conferences, in Church periodicals and pamphlets. Bishop Soule, the senior bishop of the Church, in September called bishop Andrew into the field, to attend with himself the Conferences, in contravention of the expressed judgment of the General Conference. The slaveholding several of them had not found the ‘ necessity” for a separate organization. The recommendation to change the sixth Restrictive Rule failed by 269 votes to receive the concurrence of the Annual Conferences. The Louisville Convention met May 1, 1845; bishops Soule and Andrew were in attendance, and upon invitation presided over its deliberations. On May 17 the new Church was organized by the adoption of the following resolution, whose language may seem singular to the curious reader who remembers that what is styled the “ provisional plan of separation” gave no direction, authority, or consent for the assembling or action of the convention, and that the provisions referred to relate solely to the action of the Church separated from, and not at all to the action of the parties separating:

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

By this secession the Methodist Episcopal Church lost 1345 travelling and 3166 local preachers, and 495,288 members. Bishop Andrew at once gave in his adhesion to the new Church, and bishop Soule followed him at its first General Conference in May, 1846.  Troubles soon occurred upon the border line of the two churches. The Southern General Conference took summary possession of the newspapers within its territory, and of the Charleston Book Depository, with their books, notes, presses, etc., all of which belonged to the Book Concern. The understanding in relation to boundaries was not kept. Though the rule had not been changed, a pro rata division of the Book Concern was demanded on pain of a suit at law. In this state of affairs, the General Conference of 1848 was met by the Rev. Dr. Lovick Pierce, as delegate from the Church South, bearing the “ Christian salutations” of that body, and proposing fraternal relations between the two churches; but the existing difficulties were so evidently incompatible with the proposed fraternity, that it could not “ at present” be entered into, though all personal courtesies, with an invitation to a seat within the bar, were tendered to Dr. Pierce. As the report on the Declaration was an enactment of the General Conference, it was, like any other enactment, repealable at its pleasure; and in the exercise of its wisdom it said, “ Having found, upon clear and incontestable evidence, that the three fundamental conditions of said proposed plan have severally failed, and the failure of either of them separately being sufficient to render it null and void, and having found the practical working of said plan incompatible with certain great constitutional principles elsewhere asserted, we have found and declared the whole and every part of said provisional plan to be null and void.” But in its desire to amicably adjust the claims made by the Church South upon the funds of the Book Concern, it authorized the book agents to offer to submit them to disinterested arbiters, provided eminent counsel learned in the law should advise them that it could be legally done: otherwise, and in case a suit at law should be commenced, to propose an arbitration under authority of the court; and in case they could not offer arbitration, and no suit should be commenced, it was recommended to the Annual Conferences to “ so far suspend the sixth Restrictive Article of the Discipline as to authorize the book agents at New York and Cincinnati to submit said claim to arbitration.”.

This was going to the utmost limit of its power. The question of the suspension of the sixth article was midway in its progress through the Annual Conferences when it was arrested by the commencement of suits in the civil courts. The case in New York came to a hearing before judge Nelson, but before the issuing of the final decree the matter was amicably adjusted through the friendly offices of judge M'Lean. The Cincinnati case resulted in favor of the defendants in the Circuit Court; but on a hearing of the appeal by the Supreme Court, to which it was carried  by the Southern commissioners, the decision of the court below was reversed, on the alleged ground that the General Conference had full power to divide the Church, and that that body did, in the adoption of the report on the Declaration, actually divide the Church, when the division of the property follows, as a matter of course. The Church at once obeyed the decision; but no intelligent minister or member of the denomination has ever accepted the exposition given by the Supreme Court, through the lips of judge Nelson, of the law of the Church, the facts of its history, or the action of the General Conference of 1844. The relations between the two churches have not as yet become cordial. The bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1869 made some advances towards a reunion, which were ungraciously received; but the General Conference of 1872 ordered the appointment of a delegation of two ministers and one layman to convey its greetings to the General Conference of the Church South at its next ensuing session.

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

7. An important organic change in the economy of the Church was effected in 1872 by the introduction of laymen into the General Conference. In 1860 that body expressed its approval of the measure “ when it shall be ascertained that the Church desires it,” and also provided for the submission of the question to the votes of both the ministry and members. The result showed a large majority against the proposed change. Nevertheless, while the General Conference felt precluded by this  expression of the popular will from adopting it, it reaffirmed in 1864 its approval of it upon the same condition as before. At its next session it took up the subject anew, recommending a definite plan to the consideration of the Church, ordering the submission afresh of the question of lay delegation to the vote of the laity, and proposing to the Annual Conferences the requisite alterations in the second Restrictive Rule. A large majority of the former, and more than the necessary three fourths vote in the latter, having been obtained in favor of the change, the General Conference, with the assent of 283 out of its 292 members, concurred in the same. The lay delegates, who had been provisionally elected in anticipation of this action, were at once admitted to their seats. It is provided that “ the ministerial and lay delegates shall sit and deliberate together as one body, but they shall vote separately whenever such separate vote shall be demanded by one third of either order; and in such cases the concurrent vote of both orders shall be necessary to complete an action.”

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

Thomas Coke.......1784 — Died at sea, May 3, 1814, aged 66.

Francis Asbury .....17 84.-Died in Virginia, March 31,1816, aged 70.

Richard Whatcoat .... 1800 — Died in Delaware, July 5, 1806, aged 71.

William M'Kendree .... 1808.-Died in Tennessee, March 5, 1835, aged 77.

Enoch George .......1816.-Died in Virginia, August 23, 1828, age 60.

Robert R. Roberts .....1816. — Died in Indiana, March 28, 1843, aged 64.

Joshua Soule E......184. -Ent. M. E. Church, South, 1845; died March 6,1867, aged 85.

Elijah Hedding . ....1824.-Died in Poughkeepsie, April 9, 1852, aged 72.

James O. Andrew .....1832.-Bishop M. E. Church, South, 1845 ; died March 2,1871, aged 77.

Then Emory .......1832.-Died in Maryland, Dec. 16, 1835, aged 46.

Beverly Waugh......1836.-Died in Maryland, Feb. 9, 1858, aged 69.

Thomas A. Morris ..... 1836.-Died in Ohio, Sept. 2,1874, aged 80.

Leonidas L. Hamline ...1844.-Resigned, 1852; died in Iowa, March 22, 1865, aged 67.

Edmund S. Janes .....1844.-Died in N. Y. City, Sept. 18, 1816, aged 69.

Levi Scott ........ 1852. Died in Odessa, Del., July 13, 188n , aged 80.

Matthew Simpson .... 1852.-Died in Philadelphia, June 18,1884, aged 73.

Osmon C. Baker .....1852.-Died in Concord, N. H., Dec. 20, 1871, aged 58.

Edward R. Ames.... 1852.-Died in Baltimore, April 25, 1879, aged 73.

Francis Burns ......1858.-Miss. Bp. to Liberia; died in Baltimore, April 18,1863.

Davis W. Clark -......1864.-Died in Cincinnati, May 23, 1871, aged 59.

Edward Thomson 1864. Died in Wheeling, W. Va., March 22, 1870, aged 59.

Calvin Kingsley .... 1864.-Died in Beirut, Syria, April 6, 1870, aged 57.

John W. Roberts ..... 1866.-Died in Liberia, Jan. 30, 876, aged 54.

Thomas Bowman .....1872.-Residence, St. Louis.

William L. Harris .... 1872.-Died in N. Y. City, Sept. 2, 1887, aged 69.

Randolph S. Foster .... 1812.-Residence, Roxbury, Mass.

Isaac W. Wiley ... 1872.-Died in Foochow, China, Nov. 22, 1884, aged 59.

Stephen M. Merrill ....871.-Residence, Chicago Ill.

Edward G. Andrews ... 1872.-Residence, New York City.

Gilbert Haven ...... 1872.-Died in Malden, Mass., Jan. 3, 1880, aged 59.

Jesse T. Peck ......1872.-Died in Syracuse, N. Y., May 15, 1883, aged 72.

Henry W. Warren ....1880.-Residence, Denver, Col.

Cyrus D. Foss...;.... 1880.-Residence, Philadelphia, Pa.

John F. Hurst ......1880.-Residence, Washington, D. C.

Erastus 0. Haven....1880. Died in Salem, Ore., Aug. 2, 1881, aged 61.

William X. Ninde ....1884.-Residence, Topeka, Kan.

John M. Walden .....1884.-Residence, Cincinnati, O.

Willard F. Mallalieu... 1884.-Residence, New Orleans, La.

Charles H. Fowler ....1884.-Residence, San Francisco,

Cal. William Taylor ......1884.-Miss. Bishop to Africa.

John H. Vincent..... 1888.-Residence, Buffalo, N. Y.

James N. Fitzgerald.... 1888.-Residence, Minneapolis, Minn.

Isaac W. Joyce...... 1888.-Residence, Chattaniooga, Tenn.

John P. Newman.....1888.-Residence, Omaha, Neb.

Daniel A. Goodsell.... 1888. — Residence, Fort Worth, Tex.

James M. Thoburn... 1888.-Miss. Bp. to India and Malaysia.

V. Statistics. — There are in the denomination 76 Annual Conferences, whose statistics show in 1872 10,242 travelling preachers, 11,964 local preachers, 1,458,441 members and probationers. 17,471 Sunday-schools, with 1,278,559 scholars and 193,691 officers and teachers, and 14,008 churches and 4484 parsonages, valued together at $8,575,877. The baptisms for the year were 53,459 children and 61,311 adults. The benevolent contributions for the year were, for the Missionary Society,  $671,000 21; Woman's Foreign Missionary Society, $18,755 34; Church Extension Society, $94,572 63.; Tract Society, $21,585 67; Sunday-school Union, $22,674 15; American Bible Society, $42,528 35; Freedman's Aid Society, $12,048 97; Education, $6,660 42; and for necessitous ministers, $150,140 62-making an aggregate of $1,039,966 36. SEE METHODISM. (D.A.W.)

## Methodist New Connection (Wesleyan)[[@Headword:Methodist New Connection (Wesleyan)]]

             a body of English Independents which separated from the regular Wesleyans on questions of ecclesiastical polity.

I. Origin. — The opinion has been held, and is still prevalent in some localities, that the Methodist New Connection had its origin in personal sympathy with Alexander Kilham. Such is not the fact. Most of those who joined the body at its origin were influenced by the publications and public addresses of Mr. Kilham, but the Connection as such originated in principle, not in sympathy. The Methodist; New Connection was originated by a contest for the establishment of the following important and scriptural principles:

1. The right of the people to hold their public religious, worship at such hours as were most convenient, without their being restricted to the mere intervals of the hours appointed for service in the Established Church.

2. The right of the people to receive the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's supper from the hands of their own ministers and in their own places of worship.

3. The right of the people to a representation in the district meetings and in the annual conference, and thereby to participate in the government of the community and in the appropriation of its funds.

4. The right of the Church to have a voice, through its local business meetings, in the reception and expulsion of members, the choice of local officers, and in the calling out of candidates for the ministry; Not any of these privileges were originally enjoyed in, the parent body; they were for  years zealously contended for by the fathers and founders of the New Connection; and when they could not be fully obtained, conscience compelled those men to secede from the parent community and originate a distinct denomination in which such scriptural privileges could be freely enjoyed.

The power of Mr. Wesley was absolute, but it fell into his hands unsought and undesired. It was exercised by him with affection, and solely for the best interests of his societies; and retained from the same motive. He was the father of the community, and was necessitated for a time to be its sole director and governor; but, however proper it was for him to exercise that power during the infancy of the Connection, yet, when surrounded by churches which had grown to maturity, and assisted by ministers and laymen of acknowledged wisdom, integrity, and piety, whose existence and happiness, like his own, were bound up with the prosperity of Methodism, it would have been more conformable to the example of the apostles and the dictates of sound reason to have gradually relaxed his hold of the reins and admitted others to a participation of the same, and finally to have framed a liberal constitution defining the prerogatives of the ministry and the privileges of the people, securing both by suitable regulations and wholesome laws. Mr. Wesley's mind was well qualified for this, but he did it not. He retained absolute power until death; and, instead of framing for the community a liberal constitution, he transferred by legal settlement his own power to the preachers, and made that law which before was only custom, and custom arising from the peculiar relation in which he stood. He made those his successors in absolute power who could not possibly be his successors in paternal relation and influence. That exercise of power was the subject of many remarks and adverse criticism. Just fifty years after the origin of Methodism Mr. Wesley had to defend his conduct in this matter, which he did in these words:

“Some of our helpers say, ‘This is shackling free-born Englishmen;' and they demand a free conference, that is, a meeting of all the preacher is, wherein all things shall be determined by most votes. I answer, It is possible after my death something of this kind may take place, but not while I live. To me the preachers have engaged themselves to submit, to serve me as sons in the Gospel; but they are not thus engaged to any man or number of men besides. To me the people in general will submit, but they will not thus submit to any other.” When Mr. Wesley died, in 1791, only two years after he had written and published the above observations,  there were 380 preachers in his society, some with active, others passive, dispositions. Among the former were some who were of opinion that, being the regularly appointed ministers of their congregations, they ought to exercise all the functions which belong to the pastoral office; but to be deprived of the privilege of administering the sacraments was felt by some of the preachers to be a great hardship, while the laymen, many of them, considered they had a just right to representation in the properly constituted Church courts.

Mr. Alexander Kilham, one of the preachers who had been specially privileged in his ministerial career was one of the most able and courageous advocates of what was considered the full rights and liberties of both preachers and people. In 1792 he published an address to the Newcastle Society, to whom he was then ministering, advocating liberal views. His address met with favor from Dr. Coke, Messrs. Bradburn, Pawson, Moore, Taylor, Crowther, Bramwell, and others. The Church party among the preachers resisted strongly, and the controversy spread and intensified. Mr. Kilham, impressed with the conviction that permanent peace would never be established in the body until such a constitution was adopted as secured to the people New-Test. rights and privileges, felt it a duty to make another effort for the attainment of this important object. Under this impression he wrote a pamphlet entitled The Progress of Liberty. In this work he adverted to the course of Mr. Wesley in the progress of Methodism, showing that he had acted from time to time as altered circumstances required; he glanced at the alterations which had been effected since Mr. Wesley's death, and analyzed “the Articles of Pacification,” pointing out their defects, etc. In the second part of this work he lays down the “Outlines of a Constitution,” which he humbly proposes to the consideration of “The People called Methodists.” This outline embraces the following particulars:

First, That instead of the preachers having the sole power to admit and expel members, these acts should be done with consent of the people.

Second, That the members should have a voice in choosing their own leaders.

Third, That local preachers, instead of being appointed by the circuit preacher, should be examined and approved by the leaders and quarterly meetings; with which meetings also should rest the power of receiving and dismissing them.  Fourth, That as it was impossible to allow the people to choose their own ministers on account of the itinerant plan, yet the quarterly meetings should have a voice in recommending preachers to travel.

Fifth, That lay delegates appointed by the quarterly meetings should attend the district meetings.

And, lastly, he proposes, “with submission to the preachers and the Connection at large, to appoint one or two lay delegates from every district meeting to attend the Conference.” Such were the propositions of Mr. Kilham, and such were the principles adopted as elements of the constitution of the New Connection at its origin, and such remain its essential and distinguishing features at the present day. Many of them have since been substantially adopted in the other Methodist bodies. Nevertheless, for publishing the pamphlet advocating these principles of freedom, Mr. Kilham was tried and expelled from the ministry at the ensuing conference (1796). Being left without a circuit, Mr. Kilham published a detailed account of his trial and expulsion, which sold extensively and was read eagerly. It created a strong feeling of sympathy towards the expelled, who was welcomed in many circuits to preach to and address the people. Several large societies expressed their adhesion to the principles Mr. Kilham advocated, and in May, 1797, a chapel was purchased in Leeds, where he gathered large congregations and preached to them.

The Methodist Conference of 1797 was occupied during its session with the altered circumstances arising from their refusal of the liberties, which had been asked by deputations from the people. A Plan of Pacification was drawn up and published by the Conference, which was one of the most important proceedings connected with the history of Methodism. As, however, that plan did not concede all that the people desired, three of the preachers resigned — William Thom, Stephen Eversfield, and Alexander Cummins-and united with Mr. Kilham. These brethren, with a number of delegates from the people, met together in Ebenezer Chapel, Leeds, on Aug. 9, 1797, when Mr. Thom was elected president and Mr. Kilham secretary, and the basis of a constitution was adopted in conformity with the principles which had been publicly advocated, the full development and formal statement of these principles were reserved until the ensuing conference. The most important places in which friends declared for the New Itinerancy were Alnwick, Ashton, Bolton, Chester, Hanley, Leeds,  Liverpool, Macclesfield, Manchester, Nottingham, Newcastle, and Stockport, which became the nuclei of distinct circuits, consisting altogether of over 5000 members.

II. Doctrines. — The Methodist New Connection has a creed; the doctrines it teaches are Arminian, purely Methodistic. No written creed was considered necessary at the time the Connection was commenced, its founders being all Methodists who held by Mr. Wesley's writings; they retained his hymn-book, and avowed their unabated attachment to the doctrines he taught. False reports on this head having been circulated in the early years, the Conference of 1800 made a specific declaration of their doctrines, which were briefly summed up under the following heads: namely, first, the fall of man; second, redemption by the death of Christ; third, justification by faith; fourth, the complete sanctification of believers; fifth, perseverance in the divine life, or the necessity of continuing in faith and good works to the end, in order to final salvation.

The Conference of 1816 reviewed the whole question of doctrines, and embodied them in twelve articles or propositions, with Scripture references to each. These are the same as those held by the parent society.

III. Church Organization and Polity. — The founders of the Methodist New Connection renounced all connection with the Established Church, and as avowed Dissenters added the administration of the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's supper to the regular duties of the ministry, and laid down as fundamental this principle: “That the Church itself is entitled, either collectively, in the persons of its members, or representatively, by persons chosen out of and by itself, to a voice and influence in all the acts of legislation and government.” That principle is embodied in the entire system of government of the Connection. This will be seen from the following statement of the constitution and functions of the official meetings, briefly summed up under five heads.

1. Conference. — This is held annually, and is composed of an equal number of preachers and laymen, each circuit sending one of its preachers and one of its lay members. When only one representative is sent, the circuit selects a preacher and layman in alternate years. Should any circuit be unable to send a representative, a letter accompanied by the required documents, details, and collections is sufficient. The treasurer of the Connection, the corresponding member of the annual committee, the  steward and treasurer of the book-room, the general secretary of the missions, the superintendent of the Irish mission, a deputed minister or layman, alternately, from the Irish Conference, and the guardians of the Connection, under the deed executed in 1846, are, by virtue of office, members of Conference, without interfering in any way with the privilege of the circuits in which such individuals may reside. The business of Conference is to make laws for the government of the Connection; to decide impartially on charges affecting the character of preachers or other officers, and on appeals referred to it by the quarterly meetings; to disburse the various funds of the Connection; to station the preachers for the year ensuing; to investigate the condition of each circuit; to adjust differences, and to promote, by friendly co-operation and advice, harmony and love throughout the community; and to devise and put into operation means for the more extensive spread of the Gospel both at home and abroad. Its sittings are open to members of the Connection, subject to the judgment of the president. In addition to the above, a committee of seven persons is chosen at each Conference, by ballot, to transact I the business of the Connection between one Conferenon and another; four of the members are preachers and three are laymen, one year, and vice versa the following year. It is the duty of this committee to see that the resolutions of Conference are carried into effect; to give advice in all matters of dispute and difficulty, and to make provision for such circuits as may through death, new openings, or other causes, need supplies during the ecclesiastical year. A report of its proceedings is prepared by the corresponding member, and annually presented to Conference.

2. District Meetings. — These meetings are composed of all the circuit preachers in the district, with an equal number of laymen (including the representatives to the last Conference), who are elected by the respective quarterly meetings. These meetings are designed to form and carry out plans for the revival of the work of God in the district; to investigate the condition of the societies, chapels, and Sabbath-schools, and to prepare correct returns of the number of members; probationers, Sabbath-school teachers and scholars, etc., for the use of Conference; to ascertain the amount raised in each circuit for the different Connectional funds; to investigate all claims on the yearly collection and chapel fund; to receive applications for the division of circuits; to examine candidates for the ministry; to lay before the district any resolution of the Conference affecting the circuits, and to ascertain whether they have been carried into  full effect. These meetings are designed and calculated to shorten the duration of Conference, to strengthen the executive, to secure more correct information on points of local interest than can be done at a greater distance, and to afford a legitimate channel through which many evils may be altogether prevented or speedily rectified.

3. Quarterly Meetings. — These are held in each circuit, and are composed of the circuit preachers, the circuit stewards, the secretary of the local preachers, and representatives of the people chosen from the local preachers, leaders, trustees (being members), and other experienced persons from the different societies. Each society sends one or more representatives according to the number of its members. Any member of society has free admission to the quarterly meetings, with liberty to give his opinion, but without the power to vote. It is the business of the quarterly meeting to pay the preachers salaries; to determine the amount that each society is to contribute for the support of the ministry; to make by-laws for its own regulation and for the management of the circuit, providing they do not contravene the rules of the Connection; to appoint persons to make the preachers plans for the circuit; to recommend local preachers to be taken into the regular ministry; to determine respecting the qualifications of candidates for the local ministry, and to examine and decide upon the affairs, both temporal and spiritual, of the circuit generally.

4. Leaders Meetings. — These consist of leaders, society stewards, one or more of the circuit preachers, a male representative for each of the female and circuit preachers classes, and a representative from the trustees of the chapel, provided such representative be a member of society. Leaders meetings are held weekly, or once a fortnight, and regulate the affairs of each society and place of worship. It is the province of these meetings to inspect the class-books, and to receive the weekly or other payments; to inquire after the sick or absent members, that they may be visited; to determine on notices for the pulpit; to fix the hours for public worship, and appoint the times for making the collections for its support; to recommend persons to act as exhorters or local preachers; to judge and decide upon the fitness of candidates for Church membership; to ascertain whether any members are walking disorderly; and prayerfully to devise plans for the advancement of the work of God, and for the general improvement of the society.

5. Local Preachers' Meetings. — These are held previously to the circuit quarterly meetings, and are composed, of the circuit and local preachers. Their business is, in addition to mutual counsel and encouragement, to consider the recommendations given by the leaders meetings of persons to be employed as local preachers or exhorters; make suitable inquiries respecting probationers, and any alleged irregularities in the conduct or preaching of any of the brethren; ascertain if any alterations are required in the places or times of preaching, and report thereon to the quarterly meeting through the medium of their secretary.

The religious, social, and society meetings of the New Connection are conducted in the same manner as the like meetings of the Wesleyan body, the parent society.

IV. History. — The incidents of history in the Methodist New Connection are comparatively few, and they relate chiefly to the personal history of the preachers and the steady spread of the movement. At the first Conference the number of adherents was five thousand and thirty-seven. Surrounded by difficulties of more than ordinary urgency and gravity, the society made very slow progress, not so much from want of sympathy on the part of the people as from want of funds and agents to commence new circuits. The new itinerant commenced with seven circuits and seven preachers. In 1798 seven other preachers entered the ministry Messrs. W. Haslam, W. Styan, John Revil, Charles Donald, W. Driver, G. Wall, and John McClure. That fact inspired cheerful hopes of progress, but in five years, only two hundred and forty-three additions were made to the membership. A monthly magazine was commenced in 1798, which has been continued ever since. The first and second conferences were presided over by Mr. William Thom, the secretary being Mr. Kilham The Conference of 1799 was presided over by John Grindell, the secretary being Mr. Robert Hall, of Nottingham, a holy man, and a generous supporter of the cause. In December of the previous year the first heavy blow and discouragement came by the unexpected death of Mr. Kilham; many were disheartened, and some among Mr. Wesley's followers were glad, they viewing the occurrence as a judgment upon him personally. All the surrounding circumstances, calmly considered apart from prejudice, show that Mr. Kilham's death was more the result of earnest overwork and exposure in bad weather. Viewed from any human standpoint, the premature death of that able minister was much to be regretted, and the good work for which he lived and labored was considerably retarded by the occurrence. Exactly  two months after Mr. Kilham's death, the Connection suffered another serious loss by the death of their very liberal and zealous layman, Mr. William Smith, of Hanley, who; expired peacefully Feb. 20,1799. He had been brought up in Mr. Wesley's society, but his sympathies were with Mr. Kilham, whom he visited at Nottingham, Dec. 19,1798. He was born at Walsall, Staffordshire, in December, 1763; was religiously brought up; frequently preached as occasion offered; attended the first Conference of the New Connection; opened his house at Hanley for preaching, and soon afterwards had a chapel erected there, which became the central home of one of the largest and most prosperous societies in the Connection.

The Conference of 1799 recognized a society in Ireland, and the Rev. John McClure commenced a cause at Lisburn. The same year the few preachers then associated agreed to contribute ten shillings and sixpence yearly to found a fund for the support of aged ministers.

The Conference of 1803 commenced what is known as the Paternal Fund. It is sustained by public collections in the chapels and private subscriptions. Allowances are made from it towards the support of the children of the preachers in their early years. The Beneficent Fund was originated at the same Conference by Mr. Samuel Higginbottom of Manchester, who gave fifty pounds as a benefaction, and became the first treasurer of the fund. The resources are obtained from public collections and subscriptions, and its objects are the relief of aged and infirm ministers and their widows. In 1880 the Paternal Fund produced £2698; the Beneficent Fund, £5303.

The year 1804 was made memorable by the celebrated Rev. Richard Watson joining the ranks of the New Connection. He traveled for eight years in that body, and they claim the honor of bringing that extraordinary man out of obscurity. Two of the sermons in his published works were first preached in New Connection chapels. During his itinerancy with them he was a member of the Annual Committee, and three times secretary of the Conference. Dr. Bunting reintroduced him into the Wesleyan body, but he ever held in very high esteem his brethren in the New Connection.

In 1808 the law was made which requires preachers, at the end of their probation, to answer in public questions relating to their religious experience, call to the ministry, their doctrinal views, etc.

It will be instructive to the present race of Methodists to read the financial conditions on which Methodist preachers consented in 1812 to devote  themselves wholly to the ministry. Serious complaints had been made respecting the inadequacy of the income of the preachers to meet their necessities. A committee was appointed by the Conference of 1812 to examine and report thereon. After a candid consideration of the subject, it was resolved that, in addition to the use of a house and furniture at the expense of the circuit, every married preacher in full connection should receive, for himself and wife, £12 per quarter; “not less than £2 per quarter for a servant;” and, in addition to these items, “not less than 14s. per week for board.” The allowance from the Paternal Fund for boys under eight years of age, and for girls under twelve, to be £6 per annum; then they retire from the fund. Charge for medical attendance and traveling expenses are to be paid by the quarterly meeting. Considerable uneasiness and anxiety was felt in many parts of the Connection in the years 1814-i6 with regard to the legal safety of some of the chapels which had belonged to the parent society before the year 1797. Those anxieties were not favorable to the spread of the word of God.

In 1818 a Home Mission was established to introduce Methodism into new localities. The sum of £424 was given by the circuits to aid that mission. In 1824 the mission was relinquished, and Ireland was selected as the place on which to concentrate their efforts, and one of the English preachers was appointed to superintend the work. It has continued with varying success to the present time. In 1880 there were seven stations in Ireland, with a total membership of 715, being only an average of 102 members per station. The home missionary operations were resumed some years afterwards, and in 1880 they occupied eleven stations in England, with a membership of 1249, and for their support the circuits contributed £1158 during the year 1879-80. In 1823 the general rules of the Connection were considered, amended, and published, with the sanction of the Conference.

The same Conference ordered the publication of a monthly magazine for Sunday scholars at the price of 2d. The Conference of 1827 ordered the publication of a Catechism for the use of children, which was prepared by the Rev. Abraham Scott. A larger Catechism for the use of elder children was written by the Rev. William Cooke, D.D., and published about the year 1848. The same minister is preparing a new and enlarged edition of that Catechism to be published in 1881. A Connectional magazine was commenced in January, 1798, at the price of 6d. monthly. It has been continued to the present time. To promote the circulation of these several publications, a book-room and an editor were indispensable. The former  was located at Hanley from 1798 to 1832, when it was removed to Manchester. In 1827 the Rev. W. Shuttleworth was appointed editor and steward, and the business rapidly advanced. In 1827 the capital stock amounted to £1305, and the annual profits to £113. Five years afterwards the capital was £2500, and the yearly profits over £500, while the magazine was greatly improved; the third series was commenced in 1833. In 1844 it was found expedient to remove the book-room to London, where it has since remained, and the Rev. John Bakewell was appointed editor. In 1848 the Rev. William Cooke, the eminent theologian and divine, was the editor of the magazine, and in that capacity and as book-steward he has rendered more valuable service to the Connection than any other minister. The Rev. Charles Dewick Ward, D.D., was appointed editor and book-steward in 1880; the capital stock that year was £2980, and the profits £243.

The Methodist hymn-book had been used in the New Connection from 1797. In the year 1834 a new hymnbook was prepared and published, which was intended more as a source of profit to the Connection than as a superior book to the one, which it supplanted. This also was displaced by another and very much improved collection, including 1024 hymns, compiled chiefly by the Rev. Henry Piggin, and published in May, 1863. It was at that time the best collection in use in any branch of the great Methodist family. Its marked superiority soon led to the preparation of other improved and enlarged collections for the use of “the People called Methodists.”

The years 1836 and 1837 were periods of unrest in many Methodist societies, owing to the trial and expulsion of the Rev. Dr. Warren from the Wesleyan body. At Dudley and Sturbridge large numbers left the Wesleyans and joined the New Connection, adding greatly to their influence and usefulness in those towns. An effort was made to bring all those who had left the parent society into union with the New Connection, but some of the Separatists made such radical changes in the constitution a condition of joining that the New Connection decided not to make such concessions, though many changes were made. Those who did not unite with this body formed themselves into a new branch of the Methodist family, known for some years as the Wesleyan Association. They afterwards relinquished most of those extreme views, which prevented their proposed union.  The year 1841 was a painfully memorable one to the New Connection, owing to the necessary expulsion of two of the ministers, J. Barker and W. Trotter. Joseph Barker had used his position to advocate low socialist and infidel opinions.

Much mischief was done, for twenty-nine societies, including 4348 members, were lost to the Connection. After trying his new doctrines for some years, he found out the delusion into which he had fallen, returned to the Christian faith, and endeavored to the uttermost to undo the mischief he had done. He is said to have joined the Primitive Methodists; wrote and published his autobiography in 1869, in which he recanted all his errors; was reconciled to most of his former brethren in the New Connection; and died in 1879 (or 1880) a penitent Christian. It was not until 1855, fourteen years afterwards, that the number of members in society reached the total at which they stood at the date of Mr. Barker's expulsion. A small work was published in 1841 entitled The Beacon, and also some tracts by the Rev. W. Cooke, D.D., which prevented the breach becoming wider than it otherwise would have been. The Connection suffered greater losses through Mr. Barker's unfaithfulness and treachery than from any other cause in its whole history of over eighty years. The financial difficulties of the Connection became so great and oppressive that in 1842 nearly £900 were collected to lessen them, £840 more in 1843, and the Conference of that year ordered a special collection to be made through the circuit, which secured £5000 more towards the same object.. The Conference of 1837 originated a mission in Canada, which became a great blessing to that country. Mr. William Ridgway one of the leading New Connection laymen, having visited that locality, made such representations of the claims of Canada for the Gospel that the Rev. John Addyman became the pioneer missionary there. He was joined two years afterwards by the Rev. Henry Only Crofts, D.D. Mr. Addyman still survives, having been in the ministry forty-eight years. Dr. Crofts entered into rest in the year 1880. The Canadian mission was a success; but a few years ago, in 1875 it was united to the other branches of Methodism in Canada, in order to make one large undivided Methodist Church in that dominion.

The jubilee of the New Connection was a time of great rejoicing. The Jubilee Conference was held at Manchester, the Rev. Thomas Allin presiding. The sittings commenced June 1, 1846. The first important special business done was the final consideration and adoption of a deed- poll, which provides for the security of the property of the Connection, the preservation of its doctrines, and the continuance of its principles and  discipline. By the deed-poll a legal identity is given to the Connection in the persons of twenty-four guardian representatives-twelve ministers and twelve laymen whose names are inserted in the deed, with provisions for filling up the vacancies that will necessarily occur. The attendance of six of the guardian representatives is requisite to legalize the Conference. After its adoption, the deed-poll was executed by every member of the Conference; and it has since been duly enrolled in the High Court of Chancery. A model trust-deed, and a form of conveyance of freehold land for Connectional chapels, schools, and parsonages, were also decided upon; and a book-room deed also agreed to, each of them adapted to the deed-poll.

At the end of fifty years, the number of members in the Connection was only 20,002, namely in England, 15,610; Ireland, 932; Canada, 3460.

It was resolved to raise a Jubilee Fund of not less than £20,000, but the result was only £7721. Towards that fund there was raised in 1847 £2829; in 1848, £1567; in 1849, £3402. About £5100 was voted to remove chapel debts, £1300 to promote missions; and various sums were given or loaned to the Paternal Fund, the Beneficent Fund for a theological college, for aged ministers, and to lessen other financial burdens which fettered the agencies of the Church. On June 5 a jubilee tea-meeting was held in the Free-Trade Hall, Manchester, which was attended by more than four thousand persons. Several important schemes for the extension of the work, which it was hoped the fund would enable the Connection to undertake, could not be commenced for want of finances. One result, however, was attained, which will be a permanent memorial. The Revs. Thomas Allin, William Cooke, Samuel Hulme, and Philip James Wright conjointly wrote a jubilee volume, which had a reasonable sale, and which chronicles much important and valuable information, both historical and biographical, relating to the Connection during the previous fifty years. From that work many facts in the notices preceding are obtained. Baggaly's Digest and the Minutes of Conferences supply the details which follow.

At the Conference of 1848 arrangements were made for the establishment of home missions in England; but the work grew slowly, and ten years afterwards, in 1857, a plan was adopted for the management of home mission chapels. In 1865 the present Home Missionary Society was  inaugurated. In 1880 there were thirteen mission stations, with 1249 members.

Although the Jubilee Fund had been of much use in relieving the Connection of some financial burdens, yet great embarrassment was felt in many places from inadequate funds in 1849, and at the following Conference a plan was adopted which entirely extinguished the debts of the Connection at that time.

In 1851 the Methodist societies in England were in a very painful state of unrest, owing to the expulsion in 1849 from the Wesleyan Conference of several prominent preachers — the Revs. James Everett, Samuel Dunn, William Griffith, James Bromley, Thomas Rowland, and others. Although in three years more than one hundred thousand members were separated from the parent society, very few of them were attracted to the New Connection. In 1851, 1853, and 1854 this body had to report to each Conference a decrease, which was a source of much anxiety and solicitude, and a special service of humiliation before God was held at the Conference of 1853. In 1851 overtures were made from the Wesleyan delegates — the seceders from the parent society-towards union with the New Connection, but no union took place. In 1854 an effort was made to change the name of New Connection, as it was not then new, and many thought the name was a hindrance to others uniting with them. It was, however, resolved by the Conference of that year not to change the name, as the new deed-poll had only been adopted a few years. The rules of the Connection were revised in 1854.

The Manchester Conference of 1859 was memorable for the establishment of a mission to China. From a conviction that the encouragement of foreign missions would not hinder home work, that step was taken. The Rev. William Cooke was the president, and by his genial advocacy a successful work was commenced in that country, which in 1880 reported 43 chapels, 27 societies, and 902 members, under the superintendence of the Rev. John Innocent, who is the principal of a training institution in China. In 1862 a mission was established in Australia, which has but two societies at present — one at Adelaide and one at Melbourne — with two missionaries and 115 members. At the Conference of 1860 a Trustees Mutual Guarantee Fund was established against losses by fire, to include all Connectional property.  A training institution for the preparation of young men for the ministry was for some years under consideration. The Conference of 1861 resolved upon having one; and owing to the noble generosity of Thomas Firth, of Sheffield, such an institution was erected at Ranmoor, near that town. Its trustees were appointed in 1862, and the college was opened and a tutor selected in 1864. In 1880 there were nine students in residence, who paid £10 per annum. The president of the Conference was the principal and only tutor at that period. The college building cost £8710.

The Conference of 1865 resolved that a copy of Bagster's Bible, the Conference Journal, the deed poll, and the general rules of the society should in future be the insignia of office of the president, to be handed down in succession. The same Conference resolved that all future, conferences of their body should meet on the second Monday in June, instead of Whit-Monday as previously, the latter being a movable date, which was often attended with much inconvenience to both ministers and laymen. Mr. Alderman Blackburn, of Leeds, a wealthy layman, presented to each of the ex-presidents of Conference for fourteen years previously to the year 1863 a copy of Bagster's Bible and the new hymn-book, then first published. A new tune-book, adapted to the hymn-book, was prepared by the Rev. J. Ogden, and published in 1866.

The Conference of 1868 resolved on a new departure from existing usage, and consented to ministerial appointments being continued for five successive years in circuits where two thirds of the quarterly meeting request it. The limit had previously been three years.

A further attempt at union was made at the Conference of 1870, when the terms for a federal union with the Bible Christians were considered, and resolutions recorded thereon. The same Conference resolved that home missionaries of fourteen years standing be allowed to attend the Conference, but not to vote.

The Conference of 1871 approved of the raising of a fund to extinguish the Chapel Fund debt. The sum of £4672 was raised, which accomplished the object desired.

The Conference held at Manchester in 1872 was presided over by the Rev. Joseph H. Robinson, the secretary being the Rev. J. C. Watts. Both these ministers had spent many years in the Canada mission. Methodist union in  Canada was fully considered in 1873, and the union was consummated in 1874.

It was resolved in 1875 to establish a training institution in China for native teachers. The principal is the Rev. John Innocent.

The Conference of 1876 was made memorable by acts of fraternization of considerable interest. The Methodist Church of Canada sent as a deputation to the Conference the venerable and Rev. Egerton Ryerson, D.D., and Mr. David Savage, who presented an address of brotherly fraternization. They were most cordially welcomed. Dr. Ryerson remained some time in England as the guest of various friends of the Connection. His portrait was ordered to be engraved and published in the magazine as a pleasant memorial of his visit. At the same Conference, the Rev. Alexander Clarke, D.D., presented a fraternal message from the General Conference of the Methodist Protestant Church in the United States of America. Fraternal messages were returned to both documents. The same Conference sent its first fraternal message to the Primitive Methodists of England, which greetings were continued and reciprocated for three years, when, in 1879, the New Connection Conference, seeing how kindly their written messages had been received, appointed two of the members of the Conference to visit the ensuing Primitive Methodist Conference, two others to visit the Methodist Free Church Conference, and two others to visit the Wesleyan Conference. Each of the conferences appointed representatives to return these visits of fraternal good-will, and the good work has since been continued with very happy results; and the feeling of surprise now is that such pleasant reunions by representation should have been so long delayed. They serve to facilitate the arrangements for holding the AEcumenical Congress in 1881. At the Conference of 1876, Mr. Mark Firth presented £1000 to the endowment fund of the college, and the home and foreign missionary societies were united under one committee of management.

In 1877 a loan fund was commenced for the purpose of aiding chapel trusts and of encouraging the erection of new chapels.

The Conference of 1880 was remarkable for its record of deaths among the ministers, no less than six of whom, all men of distinction, had died during the year. Their names were Parkinson Thomas Gilton, William Baggaly, Henry Only Crofts, D.D., John Taylor, Charles Mann, and Benjamin B.  Turnock, A.B. The four first named had been presidents of the Conference. As many as six ministers had never before died in one year.

V. Statistics — We exhibit these in a tabular form:

## Methodist Protestant Church[[@Headword:Methodist Protestant Church]]

             is the name assumed by a body of Christians who seceded from the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1830. The primary causes for this step were opposition to the episcopate, and the decided refusal of the Methodist Episcopal ministry to vest any authority in the laity. From the very outset efforts were made by a minority in the Methodist Episcopal Church to secure the representation of the laity in the conferences. SEE KILHAMITES; SEE LAY REPRESENTATION.

In 1824 a so-called Union Society was founded at Baltimore, Md., for the purpose of agitating the question of a change of the Church government, and a periodical was established called The Mutual Rights of the Ministers and Members of the Methodist Episcopal Church. In the spring of 1826 the Baltimore Union Society initiated a movement to inquire into the expediency of making a united petition for a general representation to the General Conference of  1828. The convention was held in November, 1827, and the petition was presented, but received an unfavorable reply. The Union Society, persisting in its efforts, a number of individuals were expelled in Tennessee, North Carolina, and Baltimore. This provoked many friends of the radicals, and caused the secession of considerable numbers. A convention which met at Baltimore, Md., Nov. 12,1828. drew up provisional articles of association; and on Nov. 2, 1830, another convention, composed of an equal number of clerical and lay delegates from various states of the Union, assembled at the same place, and, after a session protracted for three weeks, adopted a Constitution and a Book of Discipline, and formed a new society, under the name of Methodist Protestant Church. The Revelation Francis Waters, DD., of Baltimore, was president of this convention.

The Methodist Protestant Church holds the same doctrinal views as the parent body, and differs from it only in a few points of ecclesiastical government. Following the example of the British Wesleyans, the Episcopal office is abolished, and a president called to rule over each Annual Conference, elected by the ballot of that body. The laity is admitted to an equal participation with the clergy in all Church legislation and government. The General Conference, which at first. met every seventh, but now congregates every fourth year, is composed of an equal number of ministers and laymen, who are elected by the Annual Conferences at the ratio of one delegate of each order from every one thousand communicants. The General Conference has authority, under certain restrictions, to make such rules for the government of the Church as may be necessary to carry into effect the laws of Christ; to fix the compensation and duties of travelling ministers and preachers, etc.; to devise means for raising money, and to regulate the boundaries of Annual Conference districts. The Annual Conference, which consists of all the ordained itinerant ministers of the district, has power to elect to orders, station ministers, preachers, and missionaries; make rules for defraying the expenses of their support, and fix the boundaries of circuits and stations. It elects its own president yearly. The Quarterly Conference is composed of the trustees, ministers, preachers, exhorters, leaders, and stewards in the circuit of which it is the immediate official meeting. It examines the official character of its members, licenses preachers, recommends candidates for ordination to the Annual Conference; etc. There are classes, leaders, and stewards, as in the Methodist Episcopal Church.  The slavery question divided the Methodist Protestant Church into two bodies-the Methodist Protestant Church of the North-western' States, and the Methodist Protestants of the Southern States. The head-quarters of the former were established at Springfield, Ohio; those of the latter at Baltimore, Md. The members of the Methodist Protestant Church were at that time scattered mainly o-er the Border States and certain parts of the West; their principal strength has since developed in Virginia, Maryland, and in some portions of Ohio and Pennsylvania. Of late years a union of all non-Episcopal Methodists having been proposed, the Protestant Methodists North changed their official name to the Methodist Church. Their head-quarters were lately removed from Springfield, Ohio, to Pittsburgh, Pa. Each body has a board of foreign and domestic missions and a Book Concern-the Protestant Church South at Baltimore, Md.; the Methodists at Pittsburgh, Pa. At the beginning the Methodist Protestant Church counted 83 ministers and about 5000 members; and at the seventh General Conference in 1858 there were 2000 stationed ministers, 1200 churches, 90,000 members, and $1,500,000 worth of property. In their present divided form they figure, according to the New York Observer Year-book of 1873 as follows:

(1) The Methodist Church counts 28 conferences, 766 preachers, and about 75,000 members, with a Church property of $1,609,425; and

(2) the Methodist Protestant Church, within 25 conferences employs 423 preachers, and has about 70,000 members.

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

The Methodist Church issues a weekly newspaper, the Methodist Recorder, edited by Alexander Clark, and published by the Book Concern at Pittsburgh, Pa. Also a semi-monthly Sunday-school journal, edited by the same. A new Hymn-book. entitled The Voice of Praise, has just been compiled and published, which compares favorably with that of any other denomination. Among the recent literary productions of the Church are the following works: Pulpit Echoes, by John Scott, DD.; Non.-Episcopal Methodism, by T. H. Colhouer, AM.; Wonders of the East, by J. J. Smith,  DD.; The Impending Conflict, by J. J. Smith, DD.; Recollections of Itinerant Life, by George Brown, DD.; The Lady Preacher, by. the same; The Gospel in the Trees, by Alexander Clark, AM.; Work-day Christianity, by the same; etc. Adrian College, Adrian, Mich., is under their control, and is in a most promising condition. Its president is George B. McElroy, DD. It admits both males and females. The Missionary Board-William Collier, DD., president, and C. H. Williams, corresponding secretary-is devising large plans for the West, and initiating foreign work. The Board of Ministerial Education- J. B. Walker, corresponding secretary-is doing a good work for young men preparing for the ministry. There is a fair prospect that at an early day an organic reunion with the Methodist Protestant Church will be effected. The initiatory steps have already been taken, and will probably lead to a united Methodist Church of nonepiscopal order. The General Conference of the Methodist Church will meet at Pittsburgh, Pa., May 17,1874. See the Discipline of the Methodist Church, and Discipline of the Methodist Protestant Church; also Stevens, Hist. of Methodism, 3:463; Bangs, Hist. Meth. Ch. 3:432 sq.; Sprague, Annals Amer. Pulpit, vol. vii, Introd. p. 18. SEE METHODISM.

## Methodists, Camp[[@Headword:Methodists, Camp]]

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

## Methodists, Dialectic, Or Romish[[@Headword:Methodists, Dialectic, Or Romish]]

             as they have also been called, flourished near the middle of the 17th century. They were priests of ‘the Church of Rome, who attempted, by ingenious sophistry, to refute the arguments employed against them by the Protestant (Huguenot.) party. Mosheim (Ecclesiastes Hist. vol. iii) arranges these “Methodists” under two classes. According to his classification, the one party' in their controversies urged their opponents to adduce direct proof of their doctrines by an appeal to the statements of the Holy Scripture. The other party refused to encounter the Protestants by arguing with them on the various disputed points, but sought to overcome them by adducing certain great principles involving the whole subject. Thus  they insisted that the Church which was chargeable with changing or modifying its doctrines could not have the Holy Spirit for its guide.

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

## Methodists, Free[[@Headword:Methodists, Free]]

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

I. Origin, etc.-The causes for the establishment of this independent body were manifold. Most prominent, however, were a desire for primitive Methodist simplicity, and more faithful adherence to the doctrines and usages of Wesley and his associates. Its' organizers were ministers expelled from the “ parent” body because of their course in opposing what they called innovations or departures from the rules of the Discipline. It was and is claimed by those engaged in the Free Methodist movement that the Methodist Church has declined in spirituality since their early history, and that in the rapid progress made by the Church in adding numbers, acquiring property, etc., sufficient care has not been taken to guard its purity, and preserve its primitive power and spiritual efficiency-the toleration of many worldly practices, and a departure from correct doctrine on several important points. In proof of this it is asserted that widely divergent and contradictory teachings are heard from the pulpit on the doctrine of entire sanctification without official rebuke, some preachers claiming sanctification as a work done concomitantly with justification, others regarding it as a result to be reached by a gradual process of spiritual growth,' and yet others preaching it as a second distinct attainment to be received instantaneously by faith.

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

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

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

\* In adherence to our rule respecting denominational articles, we have permitted our contributor to state his case in his own way. Justice to all parties concerned, however, requires us to add that several of the above statements relative to the origin of the Church in question are made from a partisan point of view, and consequently fail to give a fair representation of the grounds of controversy. This is true, at least, in the following particulars: (1) The original difficulty grew out of a spilt of censoriousness and insubordination exhibited by the parties in question. (2) The expulsion of the ministers from the Annual Conference was in accordance with the regular forms of ecclesiastical discipline; and the private members were dropped, in accordance with an episcopal decision,  after they had really abandoned their former communion. (3) The appeal to the General Conference was dismissed, as being unsustained by adequate reasons. In all these proceedings, the Church from which they were excluded acted in the sovereign right of self-defense, and its legitimate authorities mere the ultimate judges of the necessity and propriety of the course pursued. Those who had incurred the penalty had therefore no just cause to complain of the action taken, however severe it might seem to them.-ED.

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

The articles of faith adopted are the same as those of the Methodist Episcopal Church, with two additions, designed to secure uniformity of belief, and guard against the introduction of errors on the important points to which they relate. The first is on entire sanctification, and the first part is in the words of John Wesley, viz.: “Justified persons, while they do not outwardly commit sin, are nevertheless conscious of sin still remaining in the heart. They feel a natural tendency to evil, a proneness to depart from God, and cleave to the things of earth. Those that are sanctified wholly are saved from all inward sin-from evil thoughts and evil tempers. No wrong temper, none contrary to love remains in the soul. All their thoughts, words, and actions are governed by pure love. Entire sanctification takes  place subsequently to justification, and is the work of God wrought instantaneously upon the consecrated, believing soul. After a soul is cleansed from all sin, it is then fully prepared to grow in grace” (Discipline, “Articles of Religion,” ch. i, § 1, p. 23). This doctrine is regarded as of so much importance that no person is admitted to the full membership of the Church who does not endorse it, and pledge himself definitely to seek diligently the experience thereof. No minister -would be tolerated in the body who could be truthfully regarded as. out of accordance in views or teaching therewith.

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

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

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

III. Present Condition, etc. — The progress of the denomination is rapid, considering the bold stand it makes against many customs and usages quite popular even in the churches, and the nature of the requirements made of those who become members. During the first years of its history it had to  encounter some of the difficulties which beset early Methodism in the form of wild fanaticism and a spirit of insubordination to proper church regulations, and it suffered considerably from the doings and sayings of some who were never members of the Church, but who, taking advantage of the circumstances under which it was formed, and acting somewhat in connection with its movements, promulgated ideas and encouraged practices contrary to pure Gospel; but the young denomination has had power to shake off these parasites, and free itself from these incumbrances, and bids fair to march on its way successfully in the mission of spreading scriptural holiness as understood by Wesley and his immediate coadjutors. The religious services of the Free Methodists are generally characterized by the warmth and fervor so noticeable among early Methodists. Congregational singing is universal.

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

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

The publication of a monthly magazine was commenced by the Revelation B. T. Roberts in the year 1860, entitled The. Earnest Christian, devoted to the advocacy of Bible holiness. It has been from the first well sustained, and, though it is an exponent of the principles taught by Free Methodists, is still conducted as an independent enterprise, and regarded as an unsectarian publication. It has a large circulation outside the Church, which supplies its chief patronage. A weekly paper, entitled The Free Methodist, and edited by the Revelation Levi Wood, was started in the interests of the denomination Nov. 2,1867. This also is a private enterprise, though depending on the patronage of the body for support. It is now published at Chicago, Ill., and its present editor is the Revelation L. Bailey. It has a very large circulation.  At present the labors of the Free Methodist Church are -confined to the poor and comparatively uneducated classes of the community, and its ministers are mostly drawn from them. It can scarcely claim much denominational literature. The Revelation E. Bowen, DD., wrote a history, entitled The Origin of the Free Methodist Church, which is rather a plain, straightforward statement of historical facts than an attempted literary monument. The Revelation B. T. Roberts, who has from its organization been general superintendent of the body, having been thrice re-elected to that position, graduated at Middletown, Conn., and is a writer of considerable power. His editorials, tracts, and essays display argumentative ability, and the faculty of uttering truths concisely.

## Methodists, The[[@Headword:Methodists, The]]

             SEE METHODISM.

## Methodius Of Bohemia[[@Headword:Methodius Of Bohemia]]

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

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

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

## Methodius Of Constantinople[[@Headword:Methodius Of Constantinople]]

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

## Methodius, ST[[@Headword:Methodius, ST]]

             (surnamed also Ebullas and Eubulius), a noted theologian of-the Eastern Church of the 3d century, one of the “fathers” and “martyrs” of the Church, flourished first as bishop of Olympus and Patara, in Lycia (hence also oftentimes surnamed Patarensis), and later presided over the see of Tyre, in Palestine. He is supposed to have died early in the 4th century. According to Suidas, he suffered a martyr's death at Chalcis (Α᾿νατολῆς) during the reign of Decius (249-251) and Valerian. This seems improbable, however, since Valerian reigned after and not contemporary with Decius, and since the chronology of the reign of these emperors is far from accurate. It seems pretty well established now that Methodius was a contemporary of Porphyry; and if he died in a persecution, it was probably, as Cave supposes, in that of AD. 303, or, as Fabricius thinks, in that of AD. 311.

The last-named date is quite generally accepted as the year of Methodius's decease. Epiphanius says that “ he was a very learned man, and a strenuous assertor of the truth.” Jerome has ranked him in his catalogue of Church writers, but Eusebius has not mentioned him; which silence is attributed by some, though merely upon conjecture to Methodiuls's having written very sharply against Origen, who was favored by Eusebius. His principal works are, Περὶ Α᾿ναστάσεως, De Resurrectione, against Origen, divided into two or three parts; fragments of it are to be found in Epiphanius (Panarium), in Photius (Bibliotheca), and in the works of Damascenus:- Περὶ τῶν γενετῶν, De Creatis, in  Photius :- Περὶ Αὐτεξουσίου καὶ πόθεν τὰ κακὰ, ‘De Libero A rbitrio. Leo Allatiusgave the full text, together-with a Latin version, but the worr, as contained in Combdfis's edition of Methodius, is not complete:- Περὶ τῆς ἀγγελομμήτου παρθενεαίς καὶ ἁγνεαίς, De Angelica Virginitate et Castitate, written in the form of a dialogue: it is a curious work, partaking at once of the character of Plato's Banquet and of the Song of Solomon, thoroughly Christian in its doctrines, but very free in its language. Photius claims that it was interpolated, and contains traces of Arianism, these, however, have disappeared from the MSS. at present extant, from which the work was first published by Leo Allatius, under the title S. Methodii, episcopi et martyris, Convivium decent Virginum Leo Allatius hactenus non editumn primsus Greece vulgavit, Latine verit; notas et diatriben e Methodiorsum scriptis adjecit (Rome, 1656, 8vo). About the same time Possinus prepared another edition, which was published at Paris under the' title S. Methodii Convivium Virginum Greece et Latine nuncprimumr editum (1657, 8vo). - It is also to be found in Combefis, Auctuar. Bibl. Patr. (Paris, 1672) — Oratio de Sinteone et Anna, sen In Festun Occursus et Purificationis B. Marica, published by Petris Plantinus (Antwerp, 1598); this has by some been considered as the work of a later Methodius. but this opinion is contradicted by Allatius:- Λόγος περὶ Μαρτύρων, Sermo de Martyribus: — Εἰς τὰ Βαϊvα, In Ramos Palmarum: Photius gives extracts of this oration, but some doubt Methodius being its author:-Libri Adversus Porphyrium, fragments of which are given by Damascenus:- De Pythonissa cozntra Origenem, lost: — Commentarii in Cantica Canticorunb, of which only fragments remain : — Ξένων, lost: etc. Another work, De Revelatione, sometimes attributed to him, is more likely from a later Methodius. The De Libero Arbitrio, De Resurrectione, De Angelica Virginitate et Castitate, two homilies, and the extracts contained in Photius, were published by Combofis in Greek and Latin, with notes (Paris, 1644, fol.), together with the works of Amphilochus and Andreas Cretensis. Galland has collected the preserved works supposed to be the production of Methodius, as well as all fragments, and published them in his Biblioth. Patr. vol. 3:See Photius, Cod. p. 234-237; Mai, Script. vet. nov. coll. 7:1; Cave, Histor. Litt.; Henschenin the Bollandists, Acta Sanctorum, vol. iv; Nath. Lardner, Credibility of the Gospel History, vol. v; Oudin, Comment. de Scriptoribus ecclesvol. i; Andrea Sixt, Dissert. de lMethodio (Altorf, 1787, 4to); Fabricius, Bib. Grceca (edit. of Harless), 7:746 et al.; Donaldson, Hist. Ch. Lit.; Milman, Hist. Lat. Christianity (see Index); Schaff, Ch. Hist. 1:356  sq., 511; Neander, Christ. Dogmas, 1:121, 256; Meth. Qu. Revelation 1871, January, p. 164.

## Methodology[[@Headword:Methodology]]

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

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

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

a. The Life of the Church; that is, Church History.

b. The Thought of the Church; that is, Doctrinal History.

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

a. Apologetics, or the defence of Christianity from attacks from without.

b. Dogmatics, or the scientific statement of doctrines as admitted by the Church.

c. Ethics, or a scientific statement of duty in which man stands to God

d. Polemics, or the vindication of doctrine from he retical attacks from within the Church.

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

a. The Functions of the Church; and

b. The Organization and Government of the Church.

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

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

## Methu[[@Headword:Methu]]

             (מְתוּ, construct-state of מִת, an adult man, used like the old English folk), a frequent prefix in Hebrews proper names, as those here following; so likewise in the old Punic names Metuastartus, Methymatus, etc. (Gesenitus, Monum. Phoan. p. 399, 411).

## Methusael[[@Headword:Methusael]]

             (Hebrews Methushatl', מְתוּשָׁאֵל, man that is from God; Sept. Μαθουσάλα, Vulg. Mathusael), the son of Mehujael and father of Lamech, of the family of Cain (Gen 4:18). BC. cir. 3770. The resemblance of the name to the following, on which (with the coincidence of the name Lamech in the next generation in both lines) some theories have been formed, is apparent rather than real.

## Methuselah[[@Headword:Methuselah]]

             (Ieb. Methushe'lach, מְתוּשֵׁלִח, man of the dart; Sept. and N.T. Μαθουσάλα; Josephus, Μαθουσάλας, Ant. 1:3, 3 and 4; Vulg. Mathusala and Mathusale; Auth. Vers. “Mathusala,” in Luk 3:37), the son of Enoch, and eighth of the Sethite antediluvian patriarchs (Genesis v. 21, 22, 25, 26, 27; 1Ch 1:3). He was born (according to the Hebrews text) BC. 3484. When he had attained the age of 187 years, his son Lamech was born, after which he lived 782 years, and died (BC. 2516) only a few months before the flood, at the extreme age of 969; which, being the greatest term attained by any on record. has caused his name to become a proverb of long life. SEE LONGEVITY.

## Metochita, Georgius[[@Headword:Metochita, Georgius]]

             (Γεώργιος ὁ Μετοχίτης), a Greek theologian, flourished in the latter half of the 13th -century. He was the archdeacon of the Church at Constantinople, the intimate friend and zealous partisan of the emperor Andronicus, and favored a union of the Greek Church with the Latin. Under the reign of Andronicus the Younger he was ostracized on account of his religious opinions, and died in exile. He was the relative, perhaps the father, of Theodorus Metochita, with whom he has often been confounded. He wrote several works of great importance for their bearing on the history of his times; but his literary style, although energetic, is rude and well-nigh barbarous. His Refutation (Α᾿ντίῥῤησις) of the three Chapters of Planude, and his Reply to Manuel Nepos of Crete, were published by Leo Allatius, in the Graecia Orthodoxa, vol. 2 The same publisher has given to the public a fragment of Metochita's Discourse on the Union of the Churches, together with a portion of the fourth book of his treatise On the Procession of the Holy Ghost, bound in one volume with Diatriba contra  Hottingerum. See Fabricius, Bibliotheca Grceca, 10:412; Cave, Hist. Litt. s.v.

## Metochita, Theodorus[[@Headword:Metochita, Theodorus]]

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

## Metonic Cycle[[@Headword:Metonic Cycle]]

             SEE CYCLE

## Metonymy[[@Headword:Metonymy]]

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

(1.) The sign for the thing signified, signum pro signato. Sword for war; θρόνος for power (Luk 1:32; Heb 1:8); ἀνατολή, δυσμή, for east and west (Mat 2:3; Luk 13:29; Psa 46:6); red tape, for the difficulties in obtaining the completion of a work that must pass the inspection of several officers; a pen for literature-” The pen is mightier than the sword.”

(2.) The container for the thing contained, continens pro contento. “The country is jealous of the city.” “The army yielded, but the navy resisted;” ὁ οικος, world, for the human beings contained in the world (Mat 18:7; Joh 1:10; Joh 3:16-17); ὁ κόσμος, the house, for domestics (Joh 4:53; Act 10:2; Act 10:11; Act 10:14; Act 10:16).

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

(4.) A man may be named for his works. Thus we speak of “ Shakespeare,” meaning his writings. “ Blackstone,” meaning his works on law. So the “ Prophets” are referred to (Mar 1:2; Luk 16:29; Luk 24:44; Act 8:28), meaning their writings. This is akin to personification (q.v.).

## Metre[[@Headword:Metre]]

             (Gr. μέτρον) is, in its almost extensive signification, the measure by which any thing is determined with exactness, and due proportion. In its classical sense the word is used for the subdivision of a verse. The Greeks measured some species of verses (the dactylic, choriambic, antispastic, Ionic, etc.) by considering each foot as a metre; in others (the iambic, trochaic, and anapaestic), each dipodia, or two feet, formed' a metre. Thus the dactylic hexameter (the heroic verse) contained six dactyls or spondees; the iambic, almapaestic, and trochaic trimeter, six of those feet respectively. A line is said to be acatalectic when the last syllable of the last foot is wanting; brachicatalectic, when two syllables are cut off in the same way; hypercatalectic, when there is one superfluous syllable.

In religious poetry, as adapted to music, metre denotes the regular consecution in a stanza of lines containing a certain number of syllables of a given kind of verse. The usual number of lines is four, and these may be  alike or different in length. For example, in what is called Long Metre, each line consists of four iambic measures; in Common Metre, the lines contain alternately four and three iambi, or their prosodiac equivalents; and in Short Metre every line has three iambi, except the third, which has four. All other kinds are called “partictlar metres,” as 6 lines of 8 syllables each, 4 lines of 7, 6 lines of 7, 4 lines of 10, 4 of 6 and 2 of 8, 8 of 8 and 7 alternately, etc.

## Metretes[[@Headword:Metretes]]

             See FIRKIN.

## Metrical Psalms And Hymns[[@Headword:Metrical Psalms And Hymns]]

             Several of the Psalms were translated into English metre, during the latter part of the reign of Henry VIII, by Sir Thomas Wyatt, and printed in 1549. This version, however, is supposed to be lost. It has been thought that a reference to some metrical psalms existed in the 7th section of the 1st Act of Uniformity in the reign of Edward VI, 1549, authorizing the use of the Prayer-book, where it was enacted “that it shall be lawful for all men, as well in churches, chapels, oratories, or other places, to use openly any psalm or prayer taken out of the Bible at any due time; not letting or omitting thereby the service, or any part thereof, mentioned in the said book.” But this was several years antecedent to the appearance of any regular version. The metrical Psalms, called the “Old Version,” originated with Sternhold. who was groom of the robes to Henry VIII and Edward VI, and was continued by others until 1641, when the revisers of the Prayer-book declared that “singing of hymns in metre is no part of the liturgy,” and therefore they refused to consider them, as not in their commission. See Proctor, On Common Prayer (see Index); Cardwell, Conferences, s.v.; Bates, Christ. Antiq. s.v.; Staunton, Ecclesiastes Dict. s.v. SEE PSALMS, VERSIONS OF.

## Metrodorus[[@Headword:Metrodorus]]

             a leading Epicurean philosopher, was, according to the best authorities, a native of Lampsacus, although some claim that he was an Athenian. He flourished in the second half of the 3d century BC. From his earliest connection with this school of philosophy until his death, he lived in daily and intimate intercourse with Epicurus, absenting himself only six months during the whole period. He is regarded as the founder of that baser and  more sensual form of Epicurean philosophy which many, who sought for “pleasure as the chief good,” substituted for the intellectual enjoyment adopted by Epicurus as his ideal good. According to Cicero, he made perfect happiness to consist in having a well-constituted body, and knowing that it would always remain so. One of his sayings, as quoted by Athenaeus, was that “the belly is the foundation of all philosophy.” He claimed that all pertaining to a happy life should be tested and measured by this organ. Metrodorus became the favorite disciple of Epicurus, and may justly be ranked second only to him in importance. He died in 277 BC., at the age of fifty-three, seven years before the death of his master, who had intended to make him his successor. He left two children, a son and daughter, whom Epicurus protected while he was living, and for whom he generously provided in his will.

Metrodorus left to the world some of his thoughts in the tangible form of thirteen volumes, as enumerated by Diogenes. All these have disappeared, except some fragments found among the Herculanean Papyri: the most important of which is a portion of his treatise . Περὶ Αἰσθησίαν, contained in the sixth volume of the Neapolitan collection. For many years the Epicureans kept the 20th of each month as a festal day in honor of their master and of Metrodorus, whose name will ever be linked with that of Epicurus. Another philosopher of like name flourished in Chios, in Greece, about 400 BC. He was the author of a Treatise on Nature, which was very celebrated. See Bayle, Hist. and Crit. Dict. s.v.; Fabricius, Biblioth. Grceca, 3:606 Pliny, Hist. Nat. 35:40; Plutarch, Paulus AEmilius, 32. (H.W.T.)

## Metrology[[@Headword:Metrology]]

             the science of determining the relative value of measures, whether these belong to pecuniary standards or to fixed quantities of capacity or extent. Indeed, these three are intimately connected, for coins can only be accurately determined by weight, and the bulk of solids or liquids is ultimately ascertained by linear measurements in cubic dimensions, or by a given weight of a certain substance of uniform density. Specific gravity, therefore, lies at the basis of all quantitative admeasurements. In the present article we are, of course, strictly concerned only with the Biblical, especially Hebrew, weights and measures; but as the value of these has come down to us chiefly in Greek equivalents, it becomes necessary to take the latter also into consideration. “The Roman measures came from  Greece, the Grecian from Phoenicia, the Phoenician from Babylon. Accordingly each system will throw light on the other, and all may be made to contribute something to the elucidation of the Hebrew weights and measures. This method of viewing the subject, and the satisfactory lessons which have been hence deduced, are to be ascribed to Bockh (Metrologischen Untersuchungen, Berlin, 1838), who, availing himself of the results ascertained by English, French, and German scholars, and of the peculiar facilities afforded by a residence in the midst of the profound and varied erudition of the Prussian capital, has succeeded, by the application of his unwearied industry and superior endowments, in showing that the system of weights aid measures of Babylon, Egypt, Palestine. Phoenicia, Greece, Sicily, and Italy, formed one great whole, with the most intimate relationships and connections.” To these researches must be added later investigations and comparisons by different antiquarians as to the value of particular specimens of coins and measures still extant, which sometimes considerably modify the conclusions of Bockh.

I. Coins and Weights.

1. Names of the principal Hebrew Standards.-The following are the regular gradations, beginning with the highest:

(1.) The talent, כַּכָּר, kikkdr, strictly a circle. hence any round object; and thus a circular piece of money. It was of two kinds, the talent of gold (1Ki 9:14) and the talent of silver (2Ki 5:22). SEE TALENT.

(2.) The maneh, מָנֶה, the Greek mina, or μνᾶ, strictly a portion, i.e. a subdivision of the “ talent.”

(3.) The shekel, שֶׁקֶל, Graecized σίκλος, properly a weight, the usual unit of estimation, applied to coins and weights. It likewise was of two kinds, the sacred (Lev 5:15) and the royal (2Sa 14:26).

(4.) The beka, בֶּקִע, strictly a cleft or fraction (Gen 24:22).

(5.) The gerdh, גֵּרָה properly a kernel or bean, like our “ grain,” and the Greek ὄβολος.

2. Values of these as compared with each other.-The relation of the talent to the shekel is determined by the statement in Exo 30:13, that every Israelite above twenty years of age had to pay the poll-tax of half a shekel  as a contribution to the sanctuary. Exo 38:26 tells us that this tax had to be paid by 603,550 men. The sum amounted to 100 talents and 1775 shekels (Exo 38:25), which are, therefore, equal to 603,550 half shekels, or 301,775 full shekels. This gives for the value of the talent in shekels,

(301,775-1775)/100= 3000. The relation of the maneh to the shekel, and consequently to the talent, is not so clear.

In Eze 45:13, it seems to have consisted of 60 shekels (20+25+15); but a comparison of 1Ki 10:17 with 2Ch 9:16 would make it to consist of 100 shekels (3 manehs = 300 shekels). Some explain these discrepancies by supposing that the sacred shekel was double the commercial, or that the talent and maneh of gold were respectively double those of silver. In this uncertainty it is generally agreed to reckon 60 manehs to the talent. and 50 shekels to a maneh. The beka was a half- shekel (Exo 38:26); and the gerah was no the shekel (Exo 30:13; Lev 27:25; Num 3:47; Eze 45:20).

3. Values of the Hebrew Weights as determined by a Comparison with the Greek and Roman. — Josephus states (Ant. 3:6, 7) that the Hebrew talent of gold contained 100 minse (μνᾶς), but whether by this latter he means the Greek or the Hebrew weight corresponding to that term, is not clear. Again he states (Ant. 14:7, 1) that the gold mina (μνᾶ)was equal to two and a half Roman pounds (λίτρας). On the presumption that the same kind of mina is spoken of in both passages, the talent would be equivalent to 250 pounds. On the other hand, Epiphanius (De Pond. et Mens. Heb.) estimates the Hebrew talent at 125 Roman pounds. This difference, being just one half, leads to the suspicion that it is connected with the above variation in the value of the talent, maneh, and shekel; and this, in connection with the nearer correspondence to the Greek measures of similar name, renders the lower estimate the more probable. Taking the Roman pound (presumed to be equivalent to the Greek λίτρα) at 5204 grains (Smith, Dict. of Class. Antiq. s.v. Libra), we have the Hebrew talent equal to 650,500 grains, or 112.79 pounds troy, or 92.9 pounds avoirdupois. Once more, Josephus says the gold shekel was equal to a daric (Ant. 3:8, 10), a Persian coin in Greek circulation, specimens of which have come down to us weighing an average of 128.5 grains (Smith, ibid. s.v. Daricus). This would yield a talent of 385,500 grains; which is much less, yet confirms the above conclusion sufficiently for an  approximate equivalent, as it evidently was meant to be, especially as the darics extant have of course lost considerable weight by time. Moreover, foreign coin usually passes ‘for less than its true value.

4.Absolute Determination of the Value of the Hebrew Weights — This has been attempted by means of the coins that have actually come down to our time. The heavier specimens of silver of the Maccabsean mintage that have been found give an average weight to the shekel of 220 grains. SEE SHEKEL. This affords a talent of 660,000 grains, very nearly agreeing with the above result. The copper coins of the same period that have survived are on the average much heavier, being about double the weight, showing a variation in the standard for that metal similar to that noticed above in the case of gold. Bockh, by averaging the shekels of every kind of metal, arrives at a mean weight of 274 grains; but this is too high for the preceding estimates. SEE MONEY.

“In the New Testament (Mat 17:24) the Templetax is a didrachm; from other sources we know that this ‘tribute' was half a shekel; and in Mat 17:27 the stater is payment of this tax for two persons. Now the stater-a very common silver Attic coin, the tetradrachm -weighed 328.8 Parisian grains: thus considerably surpassing the sacred shekel. Are we, then, to hold the stater of the New Testament for an Attic tetradrachm ? There is reason in the passage of Matthew and in early writers for regarding the two as the same. The Attic tetradrachm sank from its original weight of 328.8 to 308 and 304. This approximation must have gone on increasing, for under the empire a drachm was equal to a Roman denarius, which in the time of Tiberius weighed 69.8 Parisian grains. Four denarii were equal to 279 Parisian grains; so that, if the denarius is regarded as an Attic drachm, the sacred shekel may be correctly termed a tetradrachm. ‘With this Josephus agrees (Ant. 3:8, 2), who says that the shekel (σίκλος), a Hebrew coin, contains four Attic drachms.” SEE DRACHMA.

II. Measures of Dimension or Extent. — These are chiefly taken from some natural standard, such as the various portions of forearm and hand, or the distance of travel, etc.; so, among other nations, the foot, fathom, etc. In the descriptive portion of this and the following section we shall endeavor to bring these disputed questions to something like a practical conclusion.

1. Measures of Length.

(1.) The principal of these were as follows:

(a) The אֶצַבַּע, etsba, or finger-breadth, mentioned only in Jer 52:21.

1 The טֶפִח, tephach, or hand-breadth (Exo 25:25; 1Ki 7:26; 2Ch 4:10), applied metaphorically to a short period of time in Psa 39:5.

(c) The זֶרֶת, zeeoth, or span, the distance between the extremities of the thumb and the little finger in the extended hand (Exo 28:16; 1Sa 17:4; Eze 43:13), applied generally to describe any small measure in Isa 40:12.

(d) The אִמָּה, anmadh, or cubit, the distance from the elbow to the extremity of the middle finger. This occurs very frequently in the Bible in relation to buildings, such as the Ark (Gen 6:15), the Tabernacle (Exodus 26, 27), and the Temple (1Ki 6:2; Ezekiel 40, 41), as well as in relation to man's stature (1Sa 17:4. Mat 6:27), and other objects (Est 5:14; Zec 5:2).

(e) The גֹּמֶד, gomed, lit. a rod, applied to Eglon's dirk (Jdg 3:16). Its length is uncertain, but it probably fell below the cubit, with which it is identified in the A. V. (f) The קָנֶה, kaneh, or reed (comp. our word “cane”), for measuring buildings on a large scale (Eze 40:5-8; Eze 41:8; Eze 42:16-19).

(2.) Little information is furnished by the Bible itself as to the relative or absolute lengths described under the above terms. With the exception of the notice that the reed equals six cubits (Eze 40:5), we have no intimation that the measures were combined in anything like a scale. We should, indeed, infer the reverse from the circumstance that Jeremiah speaks of “ four fingers,” where, according to the scale, he would have said “a hand-breadth;” that in the description of Goliath's height (1Sa 17:4), the expression “ six cubits and a span” is used instead of “six cubits and a half;” and that Ezekiel mentions “span” and “half a cubit” in close juxtaposition (Eze 43:13; Eze 43:17), as though they bore no relation to each other either in the ordinary or the long cubit. That the denominations held a certain ratio to each other, arising out of the proportions of the members in the body, could hardly escape notice; but it does not follow  that they were ever worked up into an artificial scale. But by comparing together Exo 25:10 with Josephus (Ant. 3:6, 5), we find the span equal to half a cubit; for the length which Moses terms two cubits and a half, Josephus designates five spans. The relation of tephach (hand- breadth) and etsba (finger) to ammah (cubit) appears from their several names and their import in other systems. The hand-breadth is four fingers; the span contains three times the breadth of the hand, or twelve fingers. This is the view which the rabbins uniformly take. We find a similar system among the Greeks, who reckoned in the cubit twenty-four fingers, six hand-breadths, and two spans. The same was the case with the Egyptians.

The most important conclusion usually drawn from the Biblical notices is to the effect that the cubit, which may be regarded as the standard measure, was of varying length, and that, in order to secure accuracy, it was necessary to define the kind of cubit intended, the result being that the other denominations, if combined in a scale, would vary in like ratio. Thus in Deu 3:11, the cubit is specified to be “after the cubit of a man;” in 2Ch 3:3, “ after the first,” or, rather, “after the older (רַאשׁוֹנָה) measure;” and in Eze 41:8, “a great cubit,” or, literally, “a cubit to the joint,” which is further defined in Eze 40:5 to be “a cubit and a hand-breadth.” These expressions involve one of the most knotty points of Hebrew archaeology, viz. the number and the respective lengths of the scriptural cubits. A cubit “after the cubit of a man” implies the existence of another cubit, which was either longer or shorter than it, and from analogy it may be taken for granted that this second cubit would be the longer of the two. But what is meant by the “; ammdah of a man ?” Is it the cubitus in the anatomical sense of the term-in other words, the bone of the forearm between the elbow and the wrist? or is it the full cubit in the ordinary sense of the term, from the elbow to the extremity of the middle finger? What, again, are we to understand by Ezekiel's expression, “cubit to the joint?” The term אִצַּרל, atstsil, is explained by Gesenius (Thesaur. p. 144) of the knuckles, and not of the “armholes,” as in the A. V. of Jer 38:12, where our translators have omitted all reference to the word yadeka, which follows it. A- “cubit to the knuckles” would imply the space from the elbow to the knuckles, and as this cubit exceeds by a hand-breadth the ordinary cubit, we should infer that it was contradistinguished from the cubit that reached only to the wrist. The meaning of the word is, however, contested: Hitzig gives it the sense of a connecting wall (Comm. on Jer.). Sturmius (Sciagr. p. 94) understands it  of the edge of the walls, and others in the sense of a wing of a building (Rosenmuller, Schol. in Jer.). Michaelis, on the other hand, understands it of the knuckles (Supplem. p. 119), and so does Saalschtitz (Archaol. 2:165).

The expressions now discussed, taken together, certainly favor the idea that the cubit of the Bible did not come up to the full length of the cubit of other countries. (See below.) A further question remains to be discussed, viz. whether more than two cubits were in vogue among the Hebrews. It is generally conceded that the “former” or “older” measure of 2Ch 3:3 was the Mosaic or legal cubit, and that the modern measure, the existence of which is implied in that designation, was somewhat larger. Further, the cubit “ after the cubit of a man” of Deu 3:11 is held to be a common measure, in contradistinction to the Mosaic one, and to have fallen below this latter in point of length. In this case we should have three cubits-the common. the Mosaic or old measure, and the new measure. We turn to Ezekiel and find a distinction of another character, viz. a long and a short cubit. Now it has been urged by many writers, and we think with good reason, that Ezekiel would not be likely to adopt any other than the old orthodox Mosaic standard for the measurements of his ideal, temple. If so, his long cubit would be identified with the old measure, and his short cubit with the one “after the cubit of a man,” and the new measure of 2Ch 3:3 would represent a still longer cubit than Ezekiel's long one. Other explanations of the prophet's language have, however, been offered: it has been sometimes assumed that, while living in Chaldaea, he and his countrymen had adopted the long Babylonian cubit (Jahn, Archceol. § 113); but in this case his short cubit could not have belonged to the same country, inasmuch as the difference between these two amounted to only three fingers (Herod. 1:178). Again, it has been explained that his short cubit was the ordinary Chaldaean measure, and the long one the Mosaic measure (Rosenmuller, in Eze 40:5): but this is unlikely, on account of the respective lengths of the Babylonian and the Mosaic cubits, to which we shall hereafter refer. Independently of these objections, we think that the passages previously discussed (Deu 3:11; 2Ch 3:3) imply the existence of three cubits.

It remains to be inquired whether from the Bible itself we can extract any information as to the length of the Mosaic or legal cubit. The notices of the height of the altar and of the height of the lavers in the Temple are of importance in this respect. In the former case three cubits is specified  (Exo 27:1), with a direct prohibition against the use of steps (Exo 20:2-6); in the latter, the height of the base on which the laver was placed was three cubits (1Ki 7:27). If we adopt the ordinary length of the cubit (say 20 inches), the height of the altar and the base would be ‘5 feet. But it would be extremely inconvenient, if not impossible, to minister at an altar or to use a laver placed at such a height.' In order to meet this difficulty without any alteration of the length of the cubit, it must be assumed that an inclined plane led up to it, as was the case with the loftier altar of the Temple (Mishna. Middoth, iii, § 1, 3). But such a contrivance is contrary to the spirit of the text; and, even if suited to the altar would be wholly needless for the lavers. Hence Saalschutz offers that the cubit did not exceed a Prussian foot, which is less than an English foot (Archaol. 2:167). The other instances adduced by him are not so much to the point. The molten sea was not designed for the purpose of bathing (though this impression is conveyed by 2Ch 4:6, as given in the AV.), and therefore no conclusion can be drawn from the depth of the water in it. The height of Og, as inferred from the length of his bedstead (9 cubits, Dent. 3:11), and the height of Goliath (6 cubits and a span, 1Sa 17:4), are not inconsistent with the idea of a cubit about 18 inches long, if credit can- be given to other recorded instances of extraordinary stature (Pliny, 7:2, 16; Herod. 1:68; Josephus, Ant. 18:4, 5). At the. same time the rendering of the Sept. in 1Sa 17:4, which is followed by Josephus (Ant. 6:9, 1), and which reduces the number of cubits to four, suggests either an error in the Hebrew text, or a considerable increase in the length of the cubit in later times.

(3.) We now turn to collateral sources of information, which we will follow out, as far as possible, in chronological order. The earliest and most trustworthy testimony as to the length of the cubit is supplied by the existing specimens of old Egyptian measures. Several of these have been discovered in tombs, carrying us back at all events to BC. 1700, while the Nilometer at Elephantine exhibits the length of the cubit in the time of the Roman emperors. No great difference is exhibited in these measures, the longest being estimated at about 21 inches, and the shortest at about 20½, or exactly 20.4729 inches (Wilkinson, Anc. Eg. 2:258). They are divided into 28 digits, and in this respect contrast with the Mosaic cubit, which, according to rabbinical authorities, was divided into 24 digits. There is some difficulty in reconciling this discrepancy with the almost certain fact of the derivation of the cubit from Egypt. It has generally been surmised  that the Egyptian cubit was of more than one length, and that the sepulchral measures exhibit the shorter as well as the' longer by special marks. Wilkinson denies the existence of more than one cubit (Anc. Eg. 2:257-259), apparently on the ground that the total lengths of the measures do not materially vary. It may be conceded that the measures are intended to represent the same length, the variation being simply the result of mechanical inaccuracy; but this does not decide the question of the double cubit, which rather turns on the peculiarities of notation observable on these measures. For a full discussion of this point we must refer the reader to Thenius's essay in the Theologische Studien und Kritiken for 1846, p. 297-342. Our limits will permit only a brief statement of the facts of the case, and of the views expressed in reference to them.

The most perfect of the Egyptian cubit measures are those preserved in the Turin and Louvre museums. These are unequally divided into two parts, the one on the right hand containing 15, and the other 13 digits. In the former part the digits are subdivided into aliquot parts from I to A-, reckoning from right to left. In the latter part the digits are marked on the lower edge in the Turin, and on the upper edge in the Louvre measure. In the Turin measure the three left-hand digits exceed the others in size, and have marks over them indicating either fingers or the numerals 1, 2, 3. The four left-hand digits are also marked off from the rest by a double stroke, and are further distinguished by hieroglyphic marks supposed to indicate that they are digits of the old measure. There are also special marks between the 6th and 7th, and between the 10th and 11th digits of the left-hand portion. In the Louvre cubit two digits are marked off on the lower edge by lines running in a slightly transverse direction, thus producing a greater length than is given on the upper side. It has been found that each of the three above specified digits in the Turin measure= — - of the whole length, less these three digits; or, to put it in another form, the four left-hand digits= - of the 25 right-hand digits: also that each of the two digits in the Louvre measure — of the whole length, less these two digits; and further, that twice the left half of either measure the whole length of the Louvre measure, less the two digits. Most writers on the subject agree in the conclusion that the measures contain a combination of two, if not three, kinds of cubit. Great difference of opinion, however, is manifested as to particulars. Thenius makes the difference between the royal and old cubits to be no more than two digits, the average length of the latter being 484.289 millimnetres, or 19.066 inches, as compared with 523.524 millimetres, or 20.611 inches, and 523 millimetres, or 20.591 inches, the lengths ‘of the Turin and Louvre  Measures respectively. He accounts for the additional two digits as originating in the practice of placing the two fingers crosswise at the end of the arm and hand used in measuring, so as to mark the spot up to which the cloth or other article has been measured. He further finds, in the notation of the Turin measure, indications of a third or ordinary cubit 23 digits in length. Another explanation is that the old cubit consisted of 24 or 25 new digits, and that its length was 462 millimetres, or 18.189 inches, and, again, others put the old cubit at 24 new digits, as marked on the measures. The relative proportions of the two would be, on these two hypotheses, as 28: 26, as 28: 25, and as 28: 24. (See below.)

The use of more than one cubit appears to have also prevailed in-Babylon, for Herodotus states that the “royal” exceeded the “moderate” cubit (πῆχυς μέτριος) by three digits (i 178). The appellation “royal,” if borrowed from the Babylonians, would itself imply the existence of another; but it is by no means certain that this other was the “moderate” cubit mentioned in the text. The majority of critics think that Herodotus is there speaking of the ordinary Greek cubit (Bockh, p. 214), though the opposite view is affirmed by Grote in his notice of Bockh's work (Class. Mus. 1:28). Even if the Greek cubit be understood, a further difficulty arises out of the uncertainty whether Herodotus is speaking of digits as they stood on the Greek or on the Babylonian measure. In the one case the proportions of the two would be as 8:7, in the other case as 9:8. Bockh adopts the Babylonian digits (Without good reason, we think), and estimates the Babylonian royal cubit at 234.2743 Paris lines, or 20.806 inches (p. 219). A greater length would be assigned to it according to the data furnished by M. Oppert, as stated in Rawlinson's Herod. 1:315; for if the cubit and foot stood in the ratio of 5:3, and if the latter contained 15 digits, and had a length of 315 millimetres, then the length of the ordinary cubit would be 525 millimitres, and of the royal cubit, assuming, with Mr. Grote, that the cubits in each case were Babylonian, 588 millimetres, or 23.149 inches.

Reverting to the Hebrew measures, we should be disposed to identify the new measure implied in 2Ch 3:3, with the full Egyptian cubit; the “old” measure and Ezekiel's cubit with the lesser one, either of 26 or 24 digits; and the “cubit of a man” with the third one of which Thenlus speaks. Bickh, however, identifies the Mosaic measure with the full Egyptian cubit, and accounts for the difference in the number of digits on the hypothesis that the Hebrews substituted a division into 24 for that into  28 digits, the size of the digits being of course increased (p. 266, 267). With regard to the Babylonian measure, it seems highly improbable that either the ordinary or the royal cubit could be identified with Ezekiel's short cubit (as Rosenmeiller thinks), seeing that its length on either of the computations above offered exceeded that of the Egyptian cubit.

In the Mishna the Mosaic cubit is defined to be one of six palms (Celim, 17, § 10). It is termed the moderate cubit (א הבינונית), and is distinguished from a lesser cubit of five palms on the one side (Celim, ib.), and on the other side from a larger one, consisting, according to Bartenora (in Cel. 17, § 9), of six palms and a digit. The palm consisted, according to Maimonides (ibid.), of four digits; and the digit, according to Arias Montanus (Ant. p. 113), of four barleycorns. This gives 144 barleycorns as the length of the cubit, which accords with the number assigned to the cubitus justus et mediocris of the Arabians (Bickh, p. 246). The length of the Mosaic cubit, as computed by Thenius (after several trials-with the specified number of barleycorns of middling size, placed side by side), is 214.512 Paris lines, or 19.0515 inches (Stud. u. Krit. p. 110). It seems hardly possible to arrive at any very exact conclusion by this mode of calculation. Eisenschmid estimated 144 barleycorns as equal to 238.35 Paris lines (Bickh, p. 269), perhaps from having used larger grains than the average. The writer of the article on “ Weights and Measures” in the Penny Cyclopcedia (xviii. 198) gives, as the result of his own experience, that 38 average grains make up 5 inches, in which case 144 =18.947 inches; while the length of the Arabian cubit referred to is computed at 213.058 Paris lines (Bockh, p. 247). The Talmudists state that the Mosaic cubit was used for the edifice of the Tabernacle and Temple, and the lesser cubit for the vessels thereof. This was probably a fiction; for the authorities were not agreed ‘among themselves as to the extent to which the lesser cubit was used, some of them restricting it to the golden altar, and parts of the brazen altar (Mishna, Cel. 17, § 10). But this distinction, fictitious as it may have been, shows that the cubits were not regarded in the light of sacred and profane, as stated in works on Hebrew archseology. Another distinction, adopted by the rabbinists in reference to the palm, would tend to show that they did not rigidly adhere to any definite length of cubit; for they recognised two kinds of palms, one wherein the fingers lay loosely open, which they denominated a smiling palm; the other wherein the fingers were closely compressed, and styled the grieving palm (Carpzov, Appar. p. 674, 676).

(4.) Prof. T. O. Paine, the acute and accurate author of Solomon's Temple, etc. (Bost, 1861)' presents some original and ingenious views on the subject, which appear to us to solve most of the above difficulties. He maintains that there was but one cubit in use among the Hebrews, and that essentially the same with the Egyptian cubit. The “hand-breadth” he regards as an addition (a b) to the rod itself (b c), for convenience of holding, as in the annexed figure. This, he thinks, likewise explains the peculiar phraseology in Eze 43:13 : וָטֹפִח אִמָּה אִמָּה. A cubit [i.e. the rule] is a cubit and a hand-breadth long (p. 72). So also by means of the following figure -he shows that only six cubits were counted on the reed (b c), while the hand-breadth (a b) was a handle to hold the reed by. Thus Eze 40:5, “And in the man's hand a measuring-reed six cubits by the [regular] cubit, and a handbreadth” [additional] ;” again, Eze 41:8, “A full reed of six great cubits,” שֵׁשׁ אִמּוֹת אִצַּילָה הִקָּנֶה, literally, as the Masoretic accents require, the reed, six cubits to the joint, i.e.., as Mr. Paine shrewdly interprets the joint of the reed, one of its knots' or sections, as in the subjoined cut (ibid.). All this suggests the surmise that the three larger and separate digits over the cubits described above as extant were actually no part of the measure itself, but only the finger-marks or handle by means of which lit was grasped in use. If these be deducted, the cubit will be reduced to the usual or traditionary reckoning, which is about 18 inches.

We take the liberty of adding some interesting researches from a private communication by the same writer, in which he believes that he has discovered the cubit locked up in the sockets of the Tabernacle walls. Having determined that these were each 1 cubit square and 1 cubit thick, he makes the following curious calculation: The 96 silver sockets of the planks (Exo 26:15-25) would make 4 cubit cubes, i.e., if piled together, a solid mass 2 cubits in each dimension; or, in other terms, 24 sockets made a solid cubit. As each socket weighed a talent (Exo 38:27), we have the formula,

1 cubit (in inches)= (24 talents in silver/1 cub. inch of silver)1/3

As the talent contained 3000 shekels, and as silver weighs 2651 grains per inch, we have, by substitution,

1 cubit = (72,000 shekels silver/2651 grains)1/3  or, assuming the ancient shekel to have weighed (as above) 220 grains,

1 cubit (in inches)=- (15840000/2651)1/3 = (5975)1/3 = 18.14 inches.

This strikingly agrees with the result attained above. Prof. Paine remarks that the cores for the tenons in the sockets may safely be neglected, as the dross would fully counterbalance them. The alloy, if at all used in manufacturing, would not materially raise the value of the cubit in this calculation.

(5.) Land and area were measured either by the cubit (Num 35:4-5; Eze 40:27) or by the reed (Eze 42:20; Eze 43:17; Eze 45:2; Eze 48:20; Rev 21:16). There is no indication in the Bible of the use of a square measure by the. Jews. Whenever they-wished to define the size of a plot, they specified its length and breadth, even if it were a perfect square, as in Eze 48:16. The difficulty of defining an area by these means is experienced in the interpretation of Num 35:4-5, where the suburbs of the Levitical cities are described as reaching outward from the wall of the city 1000 cubits round about, and at the same time 2000 cubits on each side from without the city. We can hardly understand these two measurements otherwise than as applying, the one to the width, the other to the external boundary of the suburb, the measurements being taken respectively perpendicular and parallel to the city walls. But in this case it is necessary to understand the words rendered “from without the city,” in Num 35:5, as meaning to the exclusion of the city, so that the length of the city wall should be added in each case to the 2000 cubits. The result would be that the size of the areas would vary, and that where the city walls were unequal in length, the sides of the suburb would be also unequal. For instance, if the city wall were 500 cubits long, then the side of the suburb would be 2500 cubits; if the city wall were 1000 cubits, then the side of the suburb would be 3000 cubits. Assuming the existence of two towns, 500 and 1000 cubits square, the area of the suburb would in the former case = 6,000,000 square cubits, and would be 24 times the size of the town; while in the latter case the suburb would be 8,000,000 square cubits, and only 8 times the size of the town. This explanation is not wholly satisfactory, on account of the disproportion of the suburbs as compared with the towns; nevertheless any other explanation only exaggerates this disproportion. Keil, in his comment on Jos 14:4, assumes that the city wall was in all cases to be regarded as 1000 cubits long, which with the 1000 cubits outside the wall, and measured in the same direction as the wall, would  make up the 2000 cubits, and would give to the side of the suburb in every case a length of 3000 cubits. The objection to this view is that there is no evidence as to a uniform length of the city walls, and that the suburb might have been more conveniently described as 3000 cubits on each side. All ambiguity would have been avoided if the size of the suburb had been decided either by absolute or relative acreage; in ether words, if it were to consist in all cases of a certain fixed acreage outside the walls, or if it were made to Vary in a certain ratio to the size of the town. As the text stands, neither of these methods can be deduced from it. SEE LEVITICAL CITY.

2. The measures of distance noticed in the Old Testament are the three following:

(a) The צִעִד, tsd'ad, or pace (2Sa 6:13), answering generally to our yard.

(b) The כַּבְרִת הָאָרֶוֹ, kibrath ha-arets, rendered in the A. V. “a little way”' or “a little piece of ground” (Gen 35:16; Gen 48:7; 2Ki 5:19). The expression appears to indicate some definite distance, but we are unable to state with precision what that distance was. The Sept. retains the Hebrew word in the form Χαβραθά, as if it were the name of a place, adding in Gen 48:7 the words κατὰ τὸν ἱππόδρομον, which is thus a second translation of the expression. If a certain distance was intended by this translation, it would be either the ordinary length of a race- course, or such a distance as a horse could travel without being overfatigued-in other words, a stage. But it probably means a locality, either a race-course itself, as in 3 Mace. 4:11, or the space outside the town walls where the racecourse was usually to be found. The Sept. gives it again in Gen 48:7 as the equivalent for Ephrath. The Syriac and Persian versions render kibrath by parac sang, a well-known Persian measure, generally estimated at 30 stades (Herod. 2:6; v. 53), or from 3½ to 4 English miles, but sometimes at a larger amount, even up to 60 stades (Strab. 11:518). The only conclusion to be drawn from the Bible is that the kibrath did not exceed and probably equalled the distance between Bethlehem and Rachel's burial-place, which is traditionally identified with a spot 11 miles north of the town.

(c) The דֶּרֶךְ יוֹם, derek yom, or מִהֲלִךְ יוֹם, mahaldk yom, a day's journey, which was the most usual method of calculating distances in travelling (Gen 30:36; Gen 31:23; Exo 3:18; Exo 5:3; Num 10:33; Num 11:31; Num 33:8; Deu 1:2; 1Ki 19:4; 2Ki 3:9; Jon 3:3; 1 Macc. v. 24, 28; 7:45; Tob 6:1), though but one' instance of it occurs in the New Testament (Luk 2:44). The distance indicated by it was naturally fluctuating, according to the circumstance of the traveller or the country through which he passed. Herodotus variously estimates it at 200 and 150 stades (iv. 101; v. 53); Marinus (ap. Ptol. 1:11) at 150 and 172 stades; Pausanias (x. 33, § 2) at. 150 stades; Strabo (i. 35) at from 250 to 300 stades; and Vegetius (De Re Mil. 1:11) at from 20 to 24 miles for the Roman army. The ordinary day's journey among the Jews -Was thirty miles; but when they travelled in companies, only ten miles. Neapolis formed the first stage out of Jerusalem, according to the former, and Beeroth according to the latter computation (Lightfoot, Exerc. in Luk 2:44). It is impossible to assign any distinct length to the day's journey: Jahn's estimate of 33 miles, 172 yards, and 4 feet, is based upon the false assumption that it bore some fixed ratio to the other measures of length.

In the Apocrypha and New Testament we meet with the following additional measures:

(d) The Sabbath day's journey, σαββάτου ὁδός, a general statement for a very limited distance, such as would naturally be regarded as the immediate vicinity of any locality.

(e) The στάδιον, stadium, or “ furlong,” a Greek measure introduced into Asia subsequently to Alexander's conquest, and hence first mentioned in the Apocrypha (2 Mace. 11:5; 12:9, 17, 29), and subsequently in the New Testament (Luk 24:13; Joh 6:19; Joh 11:18; Rev 14:20; Rev 21:16). Both the name and the length of the stade were borrowed from the foot-race course at Olympia. It equalled 600 Greek feet (Herod. 2:149), or 125 Roman paces (Plin. 2:23), or 6063 feet of our measure. It thus falls below the furlong by 531 feet. The distances between Jerusalem and the places Bethany, Jamnia, and Scythopolis, are given with tolerable exactness at 15 stades (Joh 11:18), 240 stades (2Ma 12:9), and 600 stades (2Ma 12:29). In 2Ma 11:5 there is an evident error, either of the author or of the text, in respect to the position of Bethsura, which is given as only 5 stades from Jerusalem. ‘The Talmudists describe the stade under the term res, and regarded it as equal to 625 feet and 125 paces (Carpzov, Appar. p. 679). (f) The mile, μίλιον, a Roman measure, equalling 1000 Roman paces, 8 stades, and 1618 English yards. See each in its place.  III. Measures of Capacity. —

1. Those for liquids were:

(a) The לֹג, log (Lev 14:10, etc.), originally signifying a “basin.”

(b) The הַין, hui, a name of Egyptian origin, frequently noticed in the Bible (Exo 29:40; Exo 30:24; Num 15:4; Num 15:7; Num 15:9; Eze 4:11; etc.).

(c) בִּת, βάτος, the bath, the name meaning “measured,” the largest of the liquid measures (1Ki 7:26; 1Ki 7:38; 2Ch 2:10; Ezr 7:22; Isa 5:10; Luk 16:16).

With regard to the relative values of these measures we learn nothing from the Bible, but we gather from Josephus (Ant. 3:8, 3) that the bath contained 6 hins (for the bath equalled 72 xestce or 12 chos, and the bin 2 choes), and from the rabbinists that the hin contained 12 logs (Carpzov, Appar. p. 685).

2. The dry measure contained the following denominations:

(a) The קִב, cab, mentioned only in 2Ki 6:25, the name meaning literally hollow or concave.

(b) The עֹמֶר, omer mentioned only in Exo 16:16-36. The same measure is elsewhere termed עַשָּׂרוֹן, issaron, as being the tenth part of an ephah (compare Exo 16:36), whence in the A. V. “tent] deal” (Lev 14:10; Lev 23:13; Num 15:4, etc.). The word omer implies a heap, and secondarily a sheaf.

(c) The סְאָה, seah, or ‘ measure,” this being the etymological meaning of the term, and appropriately applied to it, inasmuch as it was the ordinary measure for household purposes (Gen 18:6; 1Sa 25:18; 2Ki 7:1; 2Ki 7:16). The Greek equivalent, σάτον, occurs in Mat 13:33; Luk 13:21. The seah was otherwise termed שָׁלַישׁshalish, as being the third part of an ephah (Isa 40:12; Psa 80:5).

(d) The אֵיפָה, ephdh, a word of Egyptian origin, and of frequent recurrence in the Bible (Exo 16:36; Lev 5:11; Lev 6:20; Num 5:15; Num 28:5; Jdg 6:19; Rth 2:17; 1Sa 1:24; 1Sa 17:17; Eze 45:11; Eze 45:13-14; Eze 46:5; Eze 46:7; Eze 46:11; Eze 46:14).

(e) The לֶתֶךְ, lethek, ἡμίκορος, or “ half-homer,” literally meaning what is poured out: it occurs only in Hos 3:2.

(f) The הֹמֶר, hdmer, meaning heap (Lev 27:16; Num 11:32; Isa 5:10; Eze 45:13). It is elsewhere termed cor, כֹּר, from the circular vessel in which it was measured (1Ki 4:22; 1Ki 5:11; 2Ch 2:10; 2Ch 27:5; Ezr 7:22; Eze 45:14). The Greek equivalent, copoc, occurs in Luk 16:7.

The relative proportions of the dry measures are to a certain extent expressed in the names issar6n, meaning a tenth, and shalish, a third. In addition, we have the Biblical statement that the omer is the tenth part of the ephah (Exo 16:36), and that the ephah was the tenth part of a homer, and corresponded to the bath in liquid measure (Eze 45:11). The rabbinists supplement this by stating that the ephah contained three seahs, and the seah six cabs (Carpzov, p. 683).

The scale is constructed, it will be observed, on a combination of decimal and duodecimal ratios, the former prevailing in respect to the omer, ephah, and homer, the latter in respect to the cab, seah, and ephah. In the liquid measure the duodecimal ratio alone appears, and hence there is a fair presumption that this was the original, as it was undoubtedly the most general principle on which the scales of antiquity were framed (Bockh, p. 38). Whether the decimal division was introduced from some other system, or whether it was the result of local usage, there is no evidence to show.

3. The absolute values of the liquid and dry measures form the subject of a single inquiry, inasmuch as the two scales have a measure of equal value, viz. the bath and the ephah (Eze 45:11): if either of these can be fixed, the conversion of the other denominations into their respective values readily follows. Unfortunately, the data for determining the value of the bath or ephah are both scanty and conflicting. Attempts have been made to deduce the value of the bath from a comparison of the dimensions and the contents of the molten sea as given in 1Ki 7:23-26. If these particulars had been given with greater accuracy and fulness, they would have furnished a sound basis for a calculation: but, as the matter now stands, uncertainty attends the statement. The diameter is given as 10 cubits, and the circumference as 30 cubits, the diameter being stated to be “from one brim to the other.” Assuming that the vessel was circular, the proportions of the diameter and circumference are not sufficiently exact for  mathematical purposes, nor are we able to decide whether the diameter was measured from the internal or the external edge of the vessel. The difference, however, in either respect, is not sufficiently great to affect the result materially. The shape of the vessel has been variously conceived to be circular and polygonal, cylindrical and hemispherical, with perpendicular and with bulging sides.

The contents are given as 2000 baths in 1Ki 7:26, and 3000 baths in 2Ch 4:5, the latter being probably a corrupt text. The conclusions drawn have been widely different, as might be expected. If it be assumed that the form of the vessel was cylindrical (as the description prima facie seems to imply), that its clear diameter was 10 cubits of the value (often estimated) of 19.0515 English inches each, and that its full contents were 2000 baths, then the value of the bath would be 4.8965 gallons; for the contents of the vessel would equal 2,715,638 cubic inches, or 9793 gallons. If, however, the statement of Josephus (Ant. 8:3, 5), as to the hemispherical form of the vessel, be adopted, then the estimate would be reduced. Saigey, as quoted by Bickh (p. 261), on this hypothesis calculates the value of the bath at 18.086 French litres, or 3.9807 English gallons. If, further, we adopt Saalschitz's view as to the length of the cubit, which he puts at 15 Dresden inches at the highest, the value of the bath will be further reduced, according to his calculation, to 10½ Prussian quarts, or 2.6057 English gallons; while at his lower estimate of the cubit at 12 inches, its value would be. little more than one half of this amount (Archdol. 2:171). On the other hand, if the vessel bulged, and if the diameter and circumference were measured at the neck or narrowest part of it, space might be found for 2000 or even 3000.baths of greater value than any of the above estimates. It is therefore hopeless to arrive at any satisfactory conclusion from this source. Nevertheless, we think the calculations are not without their use as furnishing a certain amount of presumptive evidence. For, setting aside the theory that the vessel bulged considerably, for which the text furnishes no evidence whatever; all the other computations agree in one point, viz. that the bath fell far below the value placed on it by' Josephus, and by modern writers on Hebrew archaeology generally, according to whom the bath measures between 8 and 9 English gallons. SEE BRAZEN SEA.

We turn to the statements of Josephus and other early, writers. The former states that the bath equals 72 xestce (Ant. 8:2, 9); that the hin equals 2 Attic choes (ibid. 3:8, 3; 9, 4); that the seah equals 1½ Italian modii (ibid. 9:4, 5); that the cor equals 10 Attic medimni (ibid. 15:9, 2); and that the  issaron or omer equals 7 Attic cotylk (ibid. 3:6, 6). It may further be implied from Ant. 9:4, 4, as compared with 2Ki 6:25, that he regarded the cab as equal to 4 xestcae Now, in order to reduce these statements to consistency, it must be assumed that in Ant. 15:9, 2, he has confused the medimnus with the metretes, and in Ant. 3:6, 6, the cotyle with the xestes. Such errors throw doubt on his other statements, and tend to the conclusion that Josephus was not really familiar with the Greek measures. This impression is supported by his apparent ignorance of the term metriets, which he should have used not only in the passage above noticed, but also in 8:2, 9, where he would naturally have substituted it for 72 xestfe, assuming that these were Attic xestce. Nevertheless, his testimony must be taken as decisively in favor of the essential identity of the Hebrew bath with the Attic metretes. Jerome (in Mat 13:33) affirms' that the seah equals 1 n modii, and (in Eze 45:11) that the cor equals 30 modii: statements that are glaringly inconsistent, inasmuch as there were 30 seahs in the cor. The statements of Epiphanius, in his treatise De Mensuris, are equally remarkable for inconsistency. He states (ii. 177) that the cor equals 30 modii. On this assumption the bath would equal 51 sextarii, but he gives only 50 (p. 178); the seah would equal 1 nodius, but he gives 1k modii (p. 178), or, according to his estimate of 17 sextarii to the modius, 214 sextarii; though elsewhere he assigns 56 sextarii as its value (p. 182); the omer would be 5 sextarii, but he gives 7, (p. 182), implying 45 zodii to the cor; and, lastly, the ephah is identified with the Egyptian artabe (p. 182), which was either 4 or 3 maodii, according as it was in the old or the new measure, though, according to his estimate of the cor, it would only equal 3 modii. Little reliance can be placed on statements so loosely made, and the question arises whether the identification of the bath with the metretks did not arise out of the circumstance that the two measures held the same relative position in the scales, each being subdivided into 72 parts; and, again, whether the assignment of 30 modii to the cor did not arise out of there being 30 seahs in it. The discrepancies can only be explained on the assumption that a wide margin was allowed for a long measure, amounting to an increase of fifty per cent. This appears to have been the case from the definition of the seah or οαιρον given by Hesychius (μόδιος γέμων, ἤγουν Ÿν ἣμισυ μόδιον Ι᾿ταλικόν), and again by Suidas (μόδιον ὑπερπεπληρωμένον, ὠς εῖναι μόδιον ἕνα καὶ ἣμισυν). Assuming, however, that Josephus was right in identifying the bath with the metretes, its value would be, according to Bickh's estimate of the latter (p. 261, 278), 1993.95 Paris  cubic inches, or 8.7053 English gallons; but, according to the estimate of Bertheau (Gesch. p. 73), 1985.77 Paris cubic inches, or 8.6696 English gallons.

The rabbinists furnish data of a different kind for calculating the value of the Hebrew measures. They estimated the log to be equal to six hen eggs, the cubic contents of which were ascertained by measuring the amount of water they displaced (Maimonides. in Cel. 17, § 10). On this basis, Thenius estimated the log at 14.088 Paris cubic inches, or .06147 English gallon, and the bath at 1014.39 Paris cubic inches, or 4.4286 gallons (St. ur. p. 101, 121). Again, the log of water is said to have weighed 108 Egyptian drachme, each equalling 61 barleycorns (Maimonides, in Peah, 3, § 6, ed. Guisius). Thenius finds that 6588 barleycorns fill about the same space as 6 hen eggs (St. u. Kr. p. 112). Again, a log is said to fill a vessel 4 digits long, 4 broad, and 2i- high (Maimonides, in Pranf. Menachoth). This vessel would contain 21.6 cubic inches, or .07754 gallon. The conclusion arrived at from these data would agree tolerably well with the first estimate formed on the notices of the molten sea.

In the New Testament we have notices of the following foreign measures:

(a) The metretes, μετρητής (Joh 2:6; AV. “firkin”), for liquids

(b) The chcenix, χοῖνιξ (Rev 6:6; AV. “ measure”), for dry things.

(c) The xestes, ξέστης, applied, however, not to the particular measure so named by the Greeks, but to any small vessel, such as a cup (Mar 7:4; Mar 7:8; AV.” “pot”).

(d) The modius, similarly applied to describe any vessel of moderate dimensions (Matthew v. 15; Mar 4:21; Luk 11:33; AV. “bushel”); though properly, meaning a Roman measure, amounting to about a peck.

The value of the Attic metretes has already been stated to be 8.6696 gallons, and consequently the amount of liquid in six stone jars, containing on the average 21/2 metretae each, would exceed 110 gallons (Joh 2:6). Very possibly, however, the Greek term represents the Hebrew bath, and if the bath be taken at the lower estimate assigned to it, the amount would be reduced to about 60 gallons. Even this amount far exceeds the requirements for the purposes of legal purification, the tendency of  Pharisaical refinement being to reduce the amount of water to a minimum, so that a quarter of a log would suffice for a person (Mishna, Yald. 1, § 1). The question is one simply of archaeological interest as illustrating the customs of the Jews, and does not affect the character of the miracle with which it is connected. The chonnix was -g of an Attic medinnus, and contained nearly a quart. It represented the usual amount of corn for a day's food, and hence a chonix for a penny, or denarius, which usually purchased a bushel (Cicero, Verr. 3:81), indicated a great scarcity (Rev 6:6).

With regard to the use of fair measures, various precepts are expressed in the Mosaic law and other parts of the Bible (Lev 19:35-36; Deu 25:14-15; Pro 20:10; Eze 45:10), and in all probability standard measures were kept in the Temple, as was usual in the other civilized countries of antiquity (Bockh, p. 12).

IV. The following are the various Biblical weights and measures of all kinds, in the alphabetical order of the original terms, with their correct and conventional renderings, and the nearest modern representative:

Hebrews or Gr.Name.AV.Equivalent.AdarkonDar“dram”quarter-eagle.ArgurionSilverling“piece of silver,” etchalf-crown.AssarionAssarius“farthing”penny.AmmahCubitcubithalf-yard.BathBath“bath”quarter barrel.BatosBath“measure”quarter barrel.BekaBeka“bekah,” etc.quarter-ounce.ChenixChoenix“measure”quart.DarkemnuDaric“dram”quarter-eagle.DenilrionDenarius“penny”shilling.Derek, etcTravel“journey”[general].DidrchmonDidrachm“tribute”quarter-dollar.DrachmaeDracha“piece of silver”shilling.EphshEphahe“ephah”half-bushel.EtsbaFinger“finger”finger-length.GerahGerah“gerah”half-penny.GomedSpan“cubit”quarter-yard.HinHin“bin”gallon.

HomerHomer“homer”double-barrel.IssaronTenth“tenth deal”halfpeck.KabKab“cab”quart.KanehReed“reed”half-rod.Kesheth, etc.Bow“bow,” etcbow-shot.KesitahKesitapiece of money”ingot.Kibrlath, etcSpace“way,” etc.short distance.KikkarTalent“talent”hundred-weight.KodrantasQuadraansfarthing”farthingKomets,Handful“handful”handful.KorKor“cor”hogshead.KorosKor“measure”hogshead.LeptonScale“mite”mill.LethekLethek“measure”half-hogshead.Lithos, etcStone“stone's throw”stone-throw.LitraPound“ pound”pound.LogLog“lo”half-pint.ManehManeh“maneh”double-pound.MetreteMetretes“firkin”firkin.MilionMile“mile”mile.MinaMina“pound”triple-half-eagle.Modios'Modius“bushel”pec.OmerOmer“omer”half-peck.OrguiaFathom“fathom”fathom.PechusEll“cubit”half-yard.RebaFourth“fourth”half-quarter- ounce..SatonSeah“measure”peck.Seah.Seah,“seah”peck.Shalish.Third“third”peck.ShekelShekel“shekel”half-ounce. half- dollar.Stadios or Stadion}Stade“furlong”furlong.StaterStater“piece of money”half-crown.TalantionTalent“talent”thousand dollars.TephachHand- breadth“hand-breadth”hand-breadth.TsaadePace“pace”pace.XestesSextarius“measure”pint.

ZerethSpan“span”span.V. The following tables exhibit at one view the approximate results of the foregoing investigations:

I. HEBREW WEIGHTS.

Troy WeightGrainsLbsOz.Gerah111/4010Beka110¼202Shekel220½100010050Maueh11,00011160,0006000300060Kikkar660,0001147II. SCRIPTURE MONEYS.

NameNationMetalProp. ValuationCurrent Worth$cts.mills$cts.millLeptonGreekCopper1.9QuadransRoman“3.83.8Assarius““15.415.4Denarius“Silver154.7154.7DrachmaGreek“175.9154.7Didrach““351.9309.4Stater“:Gold703.7618.9Shekel“JewishSilver60MinaGreek“17593.215473.8Talent“Gold10585992843III. HEBREW MEASURES OF LENGTH.

Inches.Finger0.754Palm3.02123Span9.07

2462Cubit18.1414436126Reed108.84IV. HEBREW LIQUID MEASURES.

JOSEPHUS.RABBINSgalsqtsptsgalsqtsptsLog0.990.5612Hin111.8530.72726Bath823.20500.327206010Cor895011.20V. HEBREW DRY MEASURES

JOSEPHUSRABBINSbshpk sqtsptsbs hpksqtsptsCab210.241 4/5Omer21.1263 1/3Seah131.761.4418108Ephah1013.2240.321801003010H o m e r11046111.2VI. Literature. — J. D. Michaelis, Supplem. ad Lex. Hebr. p. 1521; Hussey, Essay on the Ancient Weights, Money, etc. (Oxford, 1836); F. P. Bayer, De Numumuis Hebrceo-Samaritanis (Valentia Edetanorum, 1781: written in reply to Die Unichtheit der Jiid. Miinzen, Butzow, 1779); Hupfeld, Betrachtung dunkler Stellung der A. T. Textgeschichte, in the Studien und Kritiken, 1830 2:247-301; Thenius, ibid. 1846, 1:78 sq.; G. Seyffarth, Beitrage zur Kenntniss der Literatur, Kunst, Mythol. und Geschichte des alten Aegypten; Cumberland, Essay on Weights and Measures; Arbuthnot, Tables of Ancient Coins, etc.; Bockh's Metrologische Untersuchungen; Mommsen's Geschichte des Romischen  Miunzwesens; Don VVazquez Queipo's Essai sur les Systemes Metriques et Monetaires des Anciens Peuples; Miiller, Ueb. d. heil. Maase der HIebrder und Hellenen (Freib. 1859); Hezfeld, Metrologische Voruntersuchungen (Leips. 1863-5); Tuckermanu, Dasjiidische Maas- System (Breslau, 1867).

## Metrophanes[[@Headword:Metrophanes]]

             (Μητροφάνης), a Greek theologian, bishop of Smyrna, flourished in the 9th century. He is particularly known for his opposition to Photius. He was already bishop of Smyrna when his friend, the patriarch Ignatius, was replaced by Photius, and, although he at first recognised the new patriarch, he subsequently opposed him so fiercely as to be himself deposed and cast into prison. When Ignatius was restored by emperor Basil I, Metrophanes regained his see, and in the Council of Constantinople (869) showed himself one of the most ardent of Photius's adversaries. After the death of Ignatius, in 879, Photius became again patriarch, and Metrophanes was again deposed. He nevertheless continued to speak and to write against Photius, and was excommunicated in 880. We have no details concerning his life after that date. He wrote a letter to Manuel concerning the dispute with Photius from 858 to 870, which is preserved both in Greek and Latili in Labbe, Concilia, vol. viii, and in Raderus, Acta Concilii (Ingolstadt, 1604, 4to). See Fabricius, Biblioth. Graca, 11:700; Baronius, Annal. ad ann. 870; Hankius, Scriptores Byzantini, 17:1; 18:66; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Genrcale, 35:220. (J. N. P.)

## Metrophanes, Critopulus[[@Headword:Metrophanes, Critopulus]]

             a Greek theologian of the 17th century, was born in Bercea, and was educated at the convent school at Athos. Afterwards he served in an intimate relation to the celebrated patriarch, Cyril Lucar, who in 1616 sent him to England to be instructed in the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England, and to continue his education at the University of Oxford, even then a very celebrated educational institution. Lucar, in a letter to George Abbott, archbishop of Canterbury, at this time complained bitterly of the progress made by the Jesuits in the Eastern Church, and of the inability of his clergy to successfully resist them for want of sufficient instruction (see that letter in P. Colomesii Clarorum ver. epist. [Lond. 1687], Ep. 46; also in his Opp. ed. Fabric. [Hamb. 1709], p. 557). Metrophanes, on his arrival in England, was well received by archbishop Abbott and king James. In  1620 or 1621 Metrophanes went to Germany, where he visited the Protestant universities of Wittenberg, Tubiugen, Altdorf, Strasburg,. and Helmstadt. In the latter place he made the acquaintance of Conrinsr, Calixtus, and Conrad Hornejus, at whose suggestion he wrote, in 1625, a confession of the tenets of the orthodox Greek Church, with an exposition of its principal customs. This was subsequently published, together with a Latin translation, by John Hornejus, son of Conrad, and anintroduction by Conring (see Conringii Opp. vi, p. 391), at Helmstadt, in 1661. Among his other productions in Germany we find, De vocibus quibusdam Iiturgfcis epist. ed. J. J. Crudelius (Jiiterb. 1737):- Oratio Graeca panegyrica et dogmatica in nativitatem dom7int Latine versa, per M. G. Queccium (Alt. 1626) :-Responsio ad qucestionem de dicto apostolico “ Spiritu ambulate,” Gr. et Lat. ed. a M. Rindero, Emendationoes et aninadversiones in Joh. Meursii Gloss. Graeco-barb(aum ed. Franzius (Stendal, 1787) :-Depronunciatioze literse O, ed. Schwenterus (Norimb. 1625); and letters to'be found in G. Richteri Epistolis, p. 729, and in J. Chr. Wolfii Conspectu supell. epist. p. 26, 66, 129. He next went for some time to Venice as a teacher of Greek, and finally returned to Constantinople, in what year is uncertain. He subsequently became patriarch of Alexandria. The most important of all his works is the above- mentioned confession ( ῾Ομολογία τῆς ἀνατολικῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς, κ. τ. λ.).

It is a rather full, clear exposition of' the doctrines and customs of the Greek Church, more in the form of a theological analysis than of a strictly symbolic work. He shows in it great opposition to the Romish Church, but at the same time avoids all Protestant polemics. The charge that Metrophanes was Lutheran in tendency is unjust, and is ignored by all able theologians. According to Metrophanes, the Greek doctrines can be divided into two parts, forming a “simple” and an “economical” system of theology (Con. page 13, ed. Weissenb.). The first treats of God and of the Trinity, leading naturally to the exposition of the Greek doctrine concerning the Holy Ghost (Confess. page 15 sq.). If we compare the doctrine of the author on the point with the tradition of the Greek fathers, we find ‘the doctrine much more complete, and somewhat similar to that of the Latin Church. Each of the three divine persons stands in a definite relation to the two others, and at the same time constitute one form of the Deity. The first person stands as the father of the second and the sender (προβολεύς), but embraces them both in himself as νοῦς. The second person, or son, possesses a λόγος, the third the πρόβλημα of the first, as πνεῦμα, an identity with both. See  Weissenborn, Prefatio to his Appendix litt. Symbol. Eccles. Orientalis (Jena, 1850); Ditelmaier, De Metrophane Critopule (Altenb. 1769), Neale, Florent. Council, page 168.

## Metropolitan[[@Headword:Metropolitan]]

             (Μητροπολίτης) is the name of an ecclesiastical dignitary an episcopal officer who, by virtue of his residence in the capital of a country or province, exercises not only the authority of a presiding officer in his own diocese, but exerts, in some sense, jurisdiction over the other bishops of the same country or province; and in this respect differs from the archbishop (q.v.), who simply enjoys some additional privileges of honors and respect not common to the plain bishop (comp. Schaff, Ch. Hist. 1:270).

The office originated in the Roman countries, when the chief city of a province was called μητρόπολις. The date of its origin cannot be exactly fixed, but “the third century,” says Coleman (Manual of Prelacy and Ritualism, page 235), “may be regarded as the period in which it was chiefly consolidated and established.” Romanists hold that it can be traced, at least in germ, to the days of the apostles, and that mention is made of the office in the letters of Paul to Timothy and to Titus (comp. Pierre de Marca, Concord. lib. 6, Giorgi, De Antiquo Ital. Metropol.). Several of the Church fathers also mention the fact that the metropolitan office existed in apostolic days (e.g. Chrysostom, 15 Hom. in V. Tim., and Eusebius, Hist. Ecclesiastes 3, c. 4); but it is clear that “the name of metropolitan does not occur until the 4th century” (Coleman, Anc. Christianity Exemplified, page 143). The title was first publicly adopted by the Church at the Council of Nicaea, A.D. 325, and there seems good ground for the belief that, like all other episcopal offices, the metropolitan government “ was not the production of a day, but the result of a gradual modification of the diocesan government, by a further concentration of episcopal power, and the extension of its influence over a wider range of territory” (Coleman, Prel. and Rit. page 242; comp. Schaff, Ch. Hist. 2:270).

The following maybe considered as the rights and privileges of the office. The metropolitan had precedence of all other bishops of his province, a decisive voice in their election, and the power of confirming and ordaining them. He summoned provincial councils, presided in them, and drew up the decrees. He had the oversight of the provincial bishops, and the ecclesiastical superintendence of the whole province. He had the privilege of determining all causes of special importance in provincial council, but in concurrence with the other bishops of the province. In extreme cases, appeal was made to him, when he had the power of controlling a provincial  bishop, without the assistance of other bishops. He could give and receive letters of communion, and publish and carry into effect laws enacted either by emperors or by councils relating to the Church. The bishops of a province elected and ordained their metropolitan. without the concurrence of the metropolitan of any other province.

The ninth canon of the Council of Antioch (341) thus defines the office of the metropolitan: “The bishops of each eparchy (province) should know that upon the bishop of the metropolis (the municipal capital) also devolves a care for the whole eparchy, because in the metropolis all, who have business, gather together from all quarters. Hence it has been found good that he should also have a precedence in honor, and that the other bishops should do nothing without him-according to the old and still binding canon of our fathers — except that which pertains to the supervision and jurisdiction of their parishes (i.e., dioceses in the modern terminology), and the provinces belonging to them; as in fact they ordain presbyters and deacons, and decide all judicial matters. “Otherwise they ought to do nothing without the bishop of the metropolis, and he nothing without the consent of the other bishops.” In the nineteenth canon, this council forbade a bishop being ordained without the presence of the metropolitan, and the presence or concurrence of the majority of the bishops of the province. The writers of the Latin Church use promiscuously the words archbishop and metropolitan, making either name denote a bishop, who, by virtue of his see, presides over or governs several other bishops. Thus in the newly- constituted hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church in England the archbishop of Westminster has the rank of metropolitan. In the Roman Catholic Church of Ireland, the archbishops of Armagh, Dublin, Cashel, and Tuam, all possess the same rank. In the Church of England, also, the real meaning of the term metropolitan seems to have been lost sight of, and the archbishops of Canterbury and York, in England, and in Ireland those of Armagh and Dublin, are called metropolitans. The Greeks, however, use the name only to denote him whose see is really a civil metropolis. See Farrar, Eccles. Dict. s.v.; Hook, Church Dict. s.v.; Walcott, Sacred Archaeology, s.v.; Siegel, Handbuch d. christl.-kirchl. Alterthumer, 3:264 sq.; Planck, Gesch. d. christl.-kirchl. Gesellschaftsverfassung, 1:572 sq.; Ziegler, Versuch d. kirchl. Verfassungsformen, page 61 sq.

## Metropoliti cum[[@Headword:Metropoliti cum]]

             is the name of the archiepiscopal ordinariate and consistory, a sort of ecclesiastical supreme court, or second court of appeals, in the Church of Rome, installed by the metropolitans or archbishops. Occasionally it has the special power conferred which constitutes it also a third court of appeals, but, as a rule, this court hears all appeals in matters of discipline and matrimonial difficulties. As the duties of the archbishop are both to attend to the management of his own diocese and the dioceses of his subaltern bishops, the metropolitan council is divided into two boards or senates, one of which constitutes the court in cases of discipline and matrimonial differences of the archdiocese, the other hearing appeals from the ordinaries and consistories of the assistant bishops. But it is against the nature of archiepiscopal jurisdiction that the metropoliticum can also take the appeals against the sentence of the archiepiscopal vicary and ordinary and decide upon those. An appeal ab eadem ad eundem is not admissible, for it cannot be thought of that the general vicary or the archiepiscopal ordinary represents the archbishop as common bishop in propria dicecesi, the metropoliticum representing him as such, inasmuch as the archbishop is in his own archdiocese as ordinarius. The archbishop certainly cannot fill the offices of two dignitaries; the cognition or decision of appeals from sentences of archiepiscopal general vicaries and metropolitan courts should therefore be sent to other, hence to the metropolitan court of another archbishopric. Appeals from the decisions of the metropolitan courts in second instance are usually presented to the pope himself, securing acquittal at Rome by the Curia Romana, unless his holiness may please to order a judices in partibus, i.e., confer upon the metropoliticum the power of acting as a court of appeal of the third instance. See Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, s.v.

## Mets, Laurent Re[[@Headword:Mets, Laurent Re]]

             a Flemish prelate, was born at Grammont about 1520. He studied theology at Louvain, became a curate at Deinse, almoner and canon of Saint- Gudula's church at Brussels, and shortly after the opening of the year 1562 he was appointed vicar to cardinal de Granvelle, archbishop of Malines, and installed ecclesiastical judge, or official, for the district of Brussels. In 1569, the University of Louvain constituted him the conservator of its privileges and vested rights, which were then hotly contested. Laurent de Mets did not long discharge the intricate functions of this last office, for in  November 1569, he was preferred to the bishopric of Bois-le-Duc. Mets founded a seminary, and published a Ritual for the' use of his clergy. In November 1577, he was constrained to yield to the insurrection of the Calvinists. At first he took refuge in Cologne, and then in Namur, where, in 1578, Gregory XIII invested him with the episcopal see rendered vacant by the death of Anthony Havet. He died at Namur, 1580. He is the author of Statuta Synodi Diocesanae Buscoducensis anno Domini MDLXXI (Bois- le-Duc, 1571, 8vo): — Manuale Pastorum diaecesis Sylvaeducensis, (ibid. 1572, 4to). See Paquot, Memoires pour servire l'histoire litteraire des Pays-Bas, 12:319-27; Valere Andre, Bibliotheca Belgica; Guillaume Gazet, Histoire ecclesiastique des Pays-Bas; Foppens, Bibliotheca Belgica, page 810.

## Metsiah[[@Headword:Metsiah]]

             SEE PRISON REFORM.

## Mettray, Reformatory of[[@Headword:Mettray, Reformatory of]]

             This noted institution for the reformation of juvenile delinquents is the parent of all institutions of this character, and deserves our notice therefor. The object of the Reformatory of Mettray and other like institutions, which have, especially of late, been fast multiplying, is the mild punishment and ultimate restoration to society of juvenile delinquents. The founder of the reformatory — whose labors, like those of the prison reformers of our day, deserve to be cherished forever — was M. Demetz, a French lawyer, a member of the Parisian bar, who, struck with the evils and hardships attending the committal to prison of young persons, and considering the training and habits of scarcely responsible criminals, condemned to languish hopelessly for a time, incapable of producing results other than their emerging worse than when they entered, resolved, in conjunction with the vicomte Bretigneres de Courteilles, to found a school which should have for its object the reformation of this class of offenders. In 1839, accordingly, the Reformatory, or, as it is called, the Colony of Mettray, was set on foot, about five miles from the city of Tours, in France. From that day to this, M. Demetz has, by his assiduous labors and self- devotedness, rendered to France and Europe one of the greatest benefits that could be conferred on society, proving that, by agricultural and other labors of industry, and well-considered rules of organization and discipline, the neglected and criminal may be trained to take their place honestly and  honorably in society; the relapses into crime being in the institution of Mettray only 3.81 per cent. SEE PRISON REFORM. (J.H.W.)

## Metus[[@Headword:Metus]]

             an aged and venerable Christian of Alexandria, who, in the persecution of that city A.D. 249, for refusing to blaspheme his Saviour, was first beaten with clubs, then pierced with sharp reeds, and finally stoned to death. Quinta and Apollonia, two Christian females, and many others whose names are not preserved, were fellow-sufferers. Fox, Book of Martyrs, page 26.

## Metz[[@Headword:Metz]]

             an important fortified city of the province of Lorraine, lately conquered by the Prussians in their contest with France, and situated on the Moselle, at its confluence with the Seille, holds an important position in Church history.

This place, known to the Romans by the name of Divodorum, was the chief town of a people called the Mediomatrici, whose name it took at a later date. In the 5th century the corrupted form Mettis first came into use, whence the modern Metz. It was destroyed \y the Huns in 452. At the death of Clovis it became Line capital of Austrasia, and later the capital of Lorraine. In 985 it became a free imperial town. It was finally secured to France by the peace of Westphalia in 1648, and was held by the French until ceded to the Germans in 1870. It has a population of over 50,000, somewhat diminished of late by the excursions of families unwilling to live under Prussian rule. Its streets are wide and clean, and it contains numerous spacious squares. The cathedral, a Gothic edifice, begun in 1014, and finished in 1546, is remarkable for its boldness, lightness, and elegance, and has a beautiful spire of open work, 373 feet in height. The church of Notre-Dame-de-la-Ronde is a noteworthy structure. Its choir was built in 1130. Metz contains also many other noble edifices and institutions, religious, civil, and military. Its industry is active, the chief employments being lacemaking, tanning, embroidering, and the manufacture of brushes, clothing for the army, flannels, pins, and canes; there are also brass and copper foundries.

Metz figures quite prominently in the history of religious persecutions during the 16th and 17th centuries. The Huguenot war, especially, affected  the peace of the Protestants of this place. The revocation of the Edict of Nantes was put in force at this place only five days after its publication. More than 4000 people left the place. (Comp. La persecution de l'eglise de Metz, d'ecrite par le sieur Olry [2d ed], by O. Cuvier [Paris, 1860]).

## Metz, Christian[[@Headword:Metz, Christian]]

             SEE INSPIRED.

## Metz, Council Of[[@Headword:Metz, Council Of]]

             (Concilium Metense). Church councils were held at Metz as early as A.D. 590. At this time AEgidius, archbishop of Rheims, was deposed and banished for high-treason against king Childebert. Of far greater importance, however, was a council held here in A.D. 835, which revoked the excommunication of Louis le Dboinnaire, who had been unjustly treated by Ebbo, archbishop of Rheims. Another council, in the year following, supplemented the action of 835 by crowning Louis, Ebbo himself receding from his former position. SEE LOUIS LE DEBONNAIRE. See also Landon, Manual of Councils, s.v.

## Metz, Joseph von[[@Headword:Metz, Joseph von]]

             a German Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Ebenhofen, Bavaria, March 9, 1758. He was educated by Meinrad Meichelbeck, prior of the monastery at Reichenau, continued his education at the monastery at Benedictheuren, and graduated in1779 at Augsburg. Afterwards he studied at the seminary at Pfaffenhausen; was ordained at Augsburg in 1785; became in the same year tutor of the children of the count of Stauffenberg, with whom he went to Strasburg, Mentz, and Wurzburg; was then installed as minister at Freighalden, and a few years after as chaplain at Eberstall. In 1801 he was nominated clerical counselor by Carl Theodor of Dalberg, bishop at Constance. In 1802 he got a position as minister to Riszdissen, and in 1804 as deacon at Laupheim; in 1809 poor health forced him to resign both positions, but in 1810, being restored to health, he became clerical counsellor of the government of the bishopric of Constance; in 1812 general counsellor of the vicarage at Elwangen; resigned in 1817, and died January 4, 1819. His manifold duties as pastor prevented the composition of extended literary works. Besides several essays in journals, he published Katechismus, oder Leitfaden zum Christ-katholischen  Religionsunterricht (Const. 1812, 8vo). See Doring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands des 18ten u. 19ten Jahrhunderts, 2, s.v.

## Meucci, Vincenzio[[@Headword:Meucci, Vincenzio]]

             a Florentine artist, born in 1694, was chiefly employed in works of perspective, which he executed at various places in Tuscany, and in the cupola of the royal chapel in S. Lorenzo. Several works of Meucci are dispersed through various churches in Florence, and in a chapel of the Wunziata, where he painted a lovely Madonna, which is allowed to be one of his best works. He died in 1776. See Lanzi's History of Painting, transl. by Roscoe (London, 1847, 3 volumes, 8vo), 1:253.

## Meuillon, Raymond De[[@Headword:Meuillon, Raymond De]]

             a French preacher and theologian, was born about 1235 in Dauphiny. After having declared to adhere to the rules of St. Domninic at the Convent of Sisteran, he was elected in 1264 general preacher of that order, and some time afterwards he was nominated definitor. In 1278 he was commissioned to go to England to suppress the too liberal discourses of some Dominicans, accused of irreverence to the memory of St. Thomas. After having accomplished the mission assigned to him, Raymond gave an account of his journey to the assembled chapels in Paris in May, 1279. The delinquents were condemned, and the priors authorized to punish vigorously whosoever should attempt new excesses. As a reward for his zeal, Raymond was nominated definitor for a second time. Some years after he was introduced to the secular Church in the capacity of a bishop. In 1289 Raymond was promoted archbishop of Embrun. He died June 29, 1294. Raymond de Meuillon's writings may be divided into two distinct categories, viz. his statutes and his dogmatical books. L'Histoire Litteraire analyzes them both. His dogmatical books have been translated into Greek. The only copy of this version, once kept in the Monastery of St. Germain- des-Pres at Paris, is now in the imperial library of St. Petersburg, with a great number of other manuscripts of his. See Le Catalogue des MSS. Bibl. imper. by M. Edouard de Muralt, and the valuable article of M.V. Le Clerc in L'Histoire Litteraire.

## Meunim[[@Headword:Meunim]]

             (Nehum 752). SEE MEHUNIM.

## Meur, Vincent[[@Headword:Meur, Vincent]]

             a noted French divine, the inspirer of French foreign missions, was born at Tonguedec, in the diocese of Frdzuier, France, in 1628. When yet a young man, he obtained the post of almoner to the court of Louis XIV. Tiring, however, of the idleness which frequently intervened in the discharge of his duties, he induced several other ecclesiastics, his friends and colleagues, to unite with him in founding an institution to prepare zealous apostles and effective preachers of the Word, and by this movement originated the French Board of Foreign Missions. In its incipiency, twelve persons assembled for consultation and deliberation in a small house in the Rue de la Harpe. Meur presided at this meeting. The Jesuits, comprehending the advantages which their society would derive from cooperative work with such auxiliaries, in 1652 affiliated with them. Meur, the moving spirit of these Roman Catholic missionaries, advised that work be inaugurated in South-eastern Asia, and, to obtain the approval of pope Alexander VII, in 1657 repaired to Rome. The pontiff warmly approved the project. Meur himself, however, instead of accompanying his associates, returned to Paris, and there engaged in theological discussions. He attacked Jansenius and his followers; in 1664 was appointed superior of the Seminary for Foreign Missions; assumed the priorate of St. Andre, in Brittany; and went on some religious missions to Dijon, Auxerre, and other cities of Burgundy, where he had friends. He had just returned from Brittany, to receive property bequeathed to him by his father and his brother, when he died, at Vieux-Chateaux-en-Brie, in 1668. See Richard et Giraud, Biblioth. Sacrae; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Meurer, Moritz[[@Headword:Meurer, Moritz]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born August 3, 1806, at Pretzsch, on the Elbe. He studied at Leipsic, was in 1833 teacher at the seminary in Weissenfels, in 1834 deacon at Waldenburg, in 1835 archdeacon, and in 1841 pastor. He died at Callenberg, May 10, 1877. He is the author of biographical sketches on Luther, Catharine von Bora, Melanchthon, Bugenhagen, Myconius, etc. Besides, he published, Moses, der Knecht Gottes (Waldenburg, 1836): — Der Tag zu Schmalkalden (Leipsic, 1837); Der Kirchenbau vom Standpunkte und nach dem Brauche der lutherischen Kirche (ibid. 1877). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:876; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Meuschen, Johann Gerhard[[@Headword:Meuschen, Johann Gerhard]]

             a learned German Protestant theologian, was born at Osnabruck, in Westphalia, May 4, 1680, a son of the minister Johann Conrad Meuschen at the St. Catharinenkirche. He commenced his education at the gymnasium of his native town; in 1699 entered the University of Jena, where, in 1702, he secured the title of master of arts. In 1703, being about to take a position as professor at Copenhagen, but detained accidentally at Kiel, he was appointed professor. extraordinary of philosophy at the university of that place. He returned to Osnabriick in 1704, whither he was called by the St. Catharinenkirche as assistant to his father. In 1708 he was called to the Hague as pastor of the Lutheran congregation of that place, and here he labored until 1716, when he went to Hanau as chief court and  city minister, with the character of counsellor of the consistory; in 1720 he was appointed clerical superintendent of the district of Hanau-Lichtenberg. In 1723, after having refused several important offers made to him, he removed to Coburg as ecclesiastical counsellor, superintendent-general, and professor of theology, and died there' December 15,1743. Meuschen was a decided opponent of the papists, and especially of the Jesuits; and had to suffer considerably from their animosity towards him. One of his pamphlets against the machinations of Jesuitism, Nugae venales Rullenses, was even publicly destroyed by fire under the hands of the executioner. The larger part of his works are of an ascetic tendency. The most important of his productions are: Postilla mythica, and Die neu eroffnete Bahn des wahren Christenthums: — Madonna et santa casa di Laretto, oder historische Beschreibung der lieben Frauen und des heiligen Houses zu Loretto (Jena, 1702, 8vo): — Diss. academica de Cynisis philosophis (Kilon. 1703, 4to): — Diss. de praejudicio auctoritatis (ibid. 1704, 4to): — Diss. de antiquo et moderno ritu salutandi sternutantes (ibid. 1704, 4to): — Diss. de fabis Pythagoricis mysticis (ibid. 1704, 4to): — Anweisung zur Verleugnung der Welt und seiner selbst (Osnabrtick, 1706, 12mo): — Das hohe Geheimniss der Geburt Christi in der Seele (Amsterdam, 1709, 8vo): — Die in der ersten Kirche, gebrauchliche apostolische Consecration des heil. Abendmahls, aus den Patribus und Kirchengeschichten erwiesen.

Meuschen was a very superior student in the ancient and Oriental languages, and his contributions to exegetical theology are perhaps among the most valuable productions of his age and country. His best works in the field of Biblical literature are: Diatribe de Nasi principe et directore Synedrii Magni Hebraeorum (Coburg, 1724, 4to): — Novum Testamentum e Talmude illustratum (Leip. 1736, 4to): — Bibliotheca medici sacri, seu recensio scriptorum qui Scripturam Sacram ex medicina et philosophia naturali illustrartunt (The Hague, 1712, 8vo). He also edited Eygas's Chronicon Universale, under the title Herml. Eygantis Ord. minor. flores temporum s. chronicon universale ab anno Christi ad A.D. 1340 et adhinc ad a. 1513 continuatum a M. Eysenhart; editum prazemisse glossario Latinitatis ferreae J.C.G. Meuschenii (Lugd. Batav. 1743, 4to). See Programma funebre in Meuschenium (in the Acta Historico Ecclesiastica [Leipsic, volume 7]); Strieder, Hessische gelehrten geschichte, volume 9; Gotten, Gelehrtes Europa, volumes 2 and 3. (J.H.W.)

## Meusel (Or Mosel), Wolfgang[[@Headword:Meusel (Or Mosel), Wolfgang]]

             (Latin Musculus), a German Protestant theologian and Hebraist, was born at Dieuze, Lorraine (lately in France, but now in Germany), in 1497. At the age of fifteen, through the good offices of the prior, he was entered as a novice in the monastery of the Benedictines near Lixheim. After a course of arduous studies he was ordained a priest, and then devoted himself to preaching. In 1518 the writings of Luther strongly inclined Meusel to embrace the doctrines of the Reformation. Though elected prior of the cloister with which he was connected, he declined that office in order to maintain his independence. About this time he began so openly to preach the dogmas of Protestantism that he became generally known as the “Lutheran monk.” Soon afterwards he quitted the monastery and went to Strasburg, where, in 1527, he married a relative of his former superior in the priory. A series of misfortunes and vicissitudes involved Meusel in obscurity until 1529, when he was appointed vicar at the cathedral at Strasburg. It was then that he diligently applied himself to the pursuit of Hebrew under the tuition of Bucer and Capito. In 1531 the Augsburg Senate invited him to come and labor for the spiritual good of the city. His principles of liberality and toleration so pleased the Senate that they intrusted him with some important missions. In 1536 he was sent to the assembly at Wittemburg, where he executed the formulary of a union designed to bind together the churches of Germany, North and South, in the matter of the Eucharist. In 1540 the Augsburg Senate delegated him to the councils held at Worms by the Protestants and the Catholics, and afterwards to the conferences which took place at Ratisbon. In the following year he drew up the heads of the controversy between Melancthon and Eck. In 1544 he established at Donauwirth the principles of the Reformation, and distinguished himself as a preacher. In 1549 he was installed professor of theology at Bern. He died in that city about 1563. Meusel wrote, Anti-Cochlaeus primus, adverus J. Cochlei de sacerdotio ac sacrificio novae legis libellum (Augsburg, 1644, 4to): — Commentarii in D. Joannis Evangelium (Basle, 1545, fol.): — Commentarii in Matthaeum (ibid. 1548, fol.): — Dialogi IV de Quaestione: Liceat homini Christiano evangeliae doctrinae guaro papisticis superstionibus ac falsis cultibus externa societate communicare? (1549, 8vo): — Commentarii in Psalmos (ibid. 1553, fol.): — In Decalogum Explanatio (ibid. 1553): — Commentarii in Genesis (ibid. 1554, fol.): — Commentarii in Epistolam ad Romanos (ibid. 1555,  fol): — Commentarii in Esaiam prophetam (ibid. 1567, fol.): — Commentari in Epistolas ad Corinthios, ad Galatos, ad Ephesios (ibid. 1559, fol.): — Loci communes Theologiae sacrae (ibid. 1560, fol.): — Commentarii in Epistolas ad Philippenses, Colossenses, Thessalonicenses et in primam ad Timotheum (ibid. 1565, fol.). See Synopsis festalium concionum, auctore Wolf. Musculo Dusano. Ejusdem vita, obitus, erudita carmina. Item clariss. virorum in ipsius obitu epicedia (Basle, 1595, 12mo). See Haag, Le France Protest.; Melch. Adam, Vitae Theologorum; Bayle, Hist. Dictionary, s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Bio. Generale, s.v.

## Mevlevies[[@Headword:Mevlevies]]

             an order of rigid Mohammedan monks. The novice receives his preliminary training in the convent kitchen during the period of a thousand and one days, after which he is received into the order. Their doctrines are chiefly those of the Persian Sufis (q.v.). Contrary to the teachings of the prophet they have introduced music and dancing into their worship. They are the best endowed of all the orders of Moslem monks; yet they use only the coarsest fare. and the plainest raiment, while they distribute much of their revenue in alms to the poor. They are the Dancing Dervishes of Turkey, and consist chiefly of the higher class of Turks. SEE DERVISI; SEE MOHAMMEDANISM.

## Mexican (or Aztec) Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Mexican (or Aztec) Version Of The Scriptures]]

             At a very early period efforts were made to provide the Mexicans with the Word of God in their own vernacular. Didacus de Santa Maria, a Dominican friar, and vicar of the province of Mexico (1579), is said to have translated the epistles and the gospels into Mexican; and Louis Rodriguez, a Franciscan friar, prepared a translation of the Proverbs and other fragments. But of these translations nothing is known at present. In 1829 Mr. Thomson, agent of the British and Foreign Bible Society, caused a translation of the New Test. to be made a movement which the bishop of Puebla not only favored, but also consented to superintend. Three persons were appointed by the bishop to execute the translation, but unhappily the bishop died in 1830, and the only portion of Scripture that has hitherto been printed in Mexican consists of the gospel of Luke, which Dr. Pazos Kanki had translated about the year 1829. From the report of the British and Foreign Bible Society for the year 1870, we see that at the request of Mr. J.W. Butler, a native Mexican has been engaged to revise or retranslate the gospel of Luke. The version was made, and after having been committed to an independent person for examination, was printed. This is the only part of the Mexican Scripture now extant. See Bible of Every Land, page 405. (B.P.)

## Mexican Religious Beliefs And Fables[[@Headword:Mexican Religious Beliefs And Fables]]

             The wondrous country lying between North and South America was long inaccessible, and much told. of it was fabulous, until A. Von Humboldt and some modern travellers lighted up the darkness which hung over the country. The Mexicans accepted four world periods, according thus singularly with the Greeks and the Romans: the first is called Atonatiuh, the period of water; it began with the creation of the world, and its destruction by the flood; the second, Tlaltonatiuh, the period of earth,  closed with an earthquake, which ended the human race, and the sun belonging to this period; the third is called Ehekatonatiuh, the period of air, in which men and the sun perished in a frightful storm; the fourth is called Tletonatiuh, the period of fire, the period in which we live, and which will end by a universal destruction by fire. At the end of each period all men perished except a few pairs; they did not die, but were changed into fish, apes, and, lastly, into birds. The Noah of the Mexicans was called Coxcox, and his wife Xokiquetzal. They saved themselves in a small ship, and landed on the mountain Colhuaan.

Their children learned from wise birds languages so different that they could not understand each other. The protecting goddess of, the human race, Omecihuatl, lived in a splendid city of heaven; she gave birth to many children, and lastly to a stone knife, which the children threw to the earth, whereupon sixteen hundred heroes (demi-gods) sprang from it. These had no human beings about them, for all of the latter had perished by the catastrophe of the third period. They, therefore, sent a herald to their mother in heaven, to give them power to produce children. The mother told them to get a bone of a dead human being from the god of the infernal region, and if they would sprinkle it with their blood men would be produced, but they should beware of the god. Xolotl, one of the demi-gods, received a bone from Mietlanteuetli, and, heeding the warning, fled as fast as he could, pursued by the god. They sprinkled the bone with their blood, and a boy and a girl were formed, who propagated the extinguished race.

However, from this originated the horrible custom of human sacrifices. The sun was still lacking. The heroes collected about a great fire, and said, whoever should jump in first would become a sun. Nanahuatzin sacrificed himself, and soon appeared as the sun. But he said he would not move until all the heroes had been slain. The hero Xolotl then killed them all, and finally himself. Their dress fell to their servants, men, and the Spaniards found in various temples clothes, divinely worshipped, which were said to belong to these demigods. In the same manner the moon originated; because the fire was not so intense it did not receive such splendor. The Mexicans hold the souls of men to be immortal; fallen warriors and mothers dying in childbed come into the house of the sun, where they live in pleasures. The number of deified heroes, kings, and demi-gods soon reached three thousand. They had also a distinct idea of a supreme being, Teotl (god), sprung from himself, the originator of all things. A being opposed to the latter was Tlaatewlolotl, i.e., the sensible owl. The Mexicans believed this daemon appeared to torture men and frighten them. Besides this good and this evil principle there were three  classes of gods; to the first belonged the mother of all gods, the god of providence, the deities of the constellations, of the elements, of war, of hunting, of fishing, of contracts, of punishment, of protection, etc.; to the second class belonged the gods of time; to the third class the family gods. Their idols were placed in their temples, and priests and priestesses placed over them, and sacrifices made. The supreme, or at least the most worshipped of their gods was the blood-thirsty Huitzilopochtli.

## Mexico[[@Headword:Mexico]]

             a federal republic of North America, and by far the most powerful representative of the Spanish American states.

I. General. — Mexico is situated between latitude 150 and 320 north, and longitude 970 and 117° west. The area is estimated by Behm and Wagner (Bevolkerung der Erde, Gotha, 1872) at 776,280 square miles; by other authorities somewhat differently. The population amounted in 1868, according to the calculations of the Mexican statistician, Cubas y Garcia, to 9,173,052. The country was, in 1518, conquered by Cortes for Spain, and from that time to 1821 constituted the vice-kingdom of New Spain. Up to 1843, when Texas separated from Mexico and declared itself independent, the area of Mexico was more than double what it is at present, embracing an area of about 1,500,000 square miles, but soon after the loss of Texas, the entire country north of the Rio Grande had, in consequence of the war of 1846 to 1848, to be ceded to the United States. In 1821 Mexico declared independence from Spain, and constituted itself a republic. The attempt of the Creole, Iturbide, to convert the country into an empire (1822), ended after about one year with his expulsion; and from that time Mexico, though continually torn by civil wars. remained a republic, with the single exception of the interval from 1864 to 1867 when Maximilian I was emperor of Mexico. The Mexican population embraces about 1,140,000 whites (40,000 Europeans, 300,000 Creoles, 800,000 Chapetones, or persons of mixed descent, who claim to be white), 1,500,000 to 2,000,000 Mestizoes of mixed descent, and about 16,0.00 negroes; all the others are Indians. Nearly all of these last are Christianized (fideles), only about 100,000 are still unbaptized (Indios bravos), and inhabit in small tribes the northern regions of the republic. All races have equal rights before the law; slavery was abolished on Sept. 16, 1829, under  president Guerrero. The general language of the country is Spanish; of the Indian dialects, about twenty have maintained themselves to the present day; those most extensively spoken are the Aztec, or Mexican, and the Otonutian. The population in 1883 was 10,447,974.

II. History of the Roman Catholic Church. — The conquest of the country was soon followed by its Christianization. The first missionaries (after 1522) belonged to the Franciscan order, and one of the first Franciscan monks, Peter of Ghent, reported that the missionaries of his order had, during the first six years of their labors, converted 200,000 Indians; and according to a report of the first bishop of Mexico, Zumaraga, in 1531, the number of the converts had risen to 1,000,000. Even the missionaries, however, complain that the conversion in many cases was little more than nominal, and many hid their idols under the cross in order to be able to worship them with impunity. The Franciscans were, in 1526 followed by the Dominicans. who gave to the country most of its bishops, by the Mercedarians (Order of Mercy), and (after 1553) by the Augustinians. When the Jesuits arrived in the country in 1572, the Christianization of the districts settled by the colonists was nearly complete; but the Jesuits established a number of prosperous missions in the territories of Northern Mexico which at that time did not belong to the Spanish dominions. About the year 1600 Mexico abounded in magnificent churches, convents, and charitable institutions. The cruel treatment of the Indians by many Spaniards often called forth the remonstrances of monks and bishops, who prevailed upon king Charles V of Spain to interfere in behalf of the Indians, and upon pope Paul III to declare authoritatively that the Indians were rational beings, and must be treated as such. At the same time the bishops took good care of their own interests, and the Church of Mexico was one of the wealthiest on the globe.

In 1767 the Jesuits were expelled from the country, and about the same time the influence of the liberal and rationalistic tendencies which prevailed in South-western Europe invaded Mexico, and gradually undermined both the Spanish rule and the influence of the Catholic Church. Among the leaders of the war of independence were many liberals. After the establishment of the federative republic, the Church generally sided with the Centralists, or Escosesos (so called after the Scotch rite of Freemasonry), and thereby provoked the bitter hostility of the Federalists, or Yorkinos (so called after the York rite of the Freemasons), who confiscated very large amounts of Church property whenever they were in power. In consequence of the refusal of  the Spanish government to relinquish its historical rights in Mexican Church affairs, nearly all the episcopal sees became gradually vacant, until a convention with Rome for the reorganization of the Mexican Church was concluded and proclaimed, in 1831. as a law of the state. In 1851, under the presidency of Arista, a papal nuncio, Clementi, was appointed for Mexico, but the Chamber of Deputies did not recognise him, and even a portion of the clergy received him with distrust.

In an allocution of December 15, 1856, the pope complained that in the previous year (1855) the ecclesiastical jurisdiction had been abolished, the property of the diocese of Puebla confiscated, and the bishop of that city exiled; that in 1856 the Church had been stripped of all her possessions, the bishop of Guadalajara exiled, the sale of the Church property ordered, and the monks prevailed upon to leave their convents; that liberty of worship, speech, and the press had been introduced, many priests fined, a number of convents destroyed, and others suppressed; and that in general the government of president Santa Anna had shown a bitter hostility to the Church. President Commonfort (elected in 1856) was regarded as a still worse enemy of the Church than Santa Anna. Agood understanding between Church and State was for a short time re-established under president Zuloaga (1858); but after his speedy overthrow (1859) the conflict began anew. Apapal allocution of September 30, 1861, deplored the new persecution of the Church in Mexico, when under the administration of president Juarez the possessions of the Church had been declared as national property, churches plundered, bishops expelled, clergymen, monks, and nuns exposed to many annoyances, and so forth. When Maximilian I was proclaimed. emperor, the entire Church party supported him. Maximilian, before going to Mexico, implored at Rome the papal blessing, conferred many favors upon the Church. and received a new papal nuncio in Mexico; but the negotiations for a new concordat failed from reasons that have not yet. been fully cleared up. After the re-establishment of the republican government under Juarez, the Church again complained of the liberal policy pursued by the government, and these complaints continued when Juarez was succeeded (1872) by president Lerdo de Tejada. The new president, as well as the majority of the Mexican Congress, adhered to the principles of religious toleration. In May, 1873, the Mexican Congress adopted a new law for the regulation of the affairs of the Roman Catholic Church, and the relation between Church and State, which contained the following provisions: Art. 1. Church and State are independent of each other. Congress can issue no laws which. establish or prohibit any religion.  Art. 2. Marriage is a civil contract, which is under the exclusive jurisdiction of the state authorities, and regulated by law. Art. 3. Religious societies can possess no real estate. Art. 4. All inhabitants of the republic are declared free from religious vows. The first article of this law was adopted unanimously, the remainder by overwhelming majorities, the minority in no case consisting of more than seventeen votes.

III. Constitution and Statistics of the Roman Catholic Church. — Soon after the conquest of the country by the Spaniards, the first bishopric was established in Mexico. About 1600 the vice-kingdom was divided into 7 dioceses: Mexico, Chiapa, Michoacan, Oajaca, Puebla, Guadalajara, and Yucatan, forming the ecclesiastical province of Mexico. Subsequently the number of dioceses rose to 11, and the number of parishes, in 1856, amounted to 1235. In 1863 pope Pius IX raised the dioceses of Michoacan and Guadalajara to archbishoprics, and erected 7 new dioceses. Accordingly the country is at present divided into 3 ecclesiastical provinces: Mexico, with the dioceses of Puebla, Chiapa, Oajaca, Yucatan, Vera Cruz, Chilapa, and Tulancingo; Michoacan, with the dioceses of San Luis Potosi, Queretaro, Leon, and Zamora; and Guadalajara, with the dioceses of Durango, Linares, Sonora, and Zacatecas. All the old dioceses have chapters. According to the decrees of the third Provincial Council of Mexico, each cathedral shall have 5 dignitaries (dean, archdeacon, cantor, theologus, thesaurarius), 10 canons, 6 prebendates, 6 half-prebendates, and 6 clerks, “with a good income.” The new dioceses have as yet no chapter. Besides the regular parishes, there are many missionary stations, part of which were supported by six collegios de propaganda fide. Most of the latter were, however, suppressed by a decree of president Santa Anna, and parishes erected in their place. Under the Spanish rule the bishops were appointed by the king. After the establishment of the republic, the president of Mexico claimed the same right, and appointed bishops for every see that became vacant. But the popes refused to recognise the rights claimed by the presidents, and to confirm the appointments. Thus in 1829 all the dioceses, with the exception of one, had become vacant. In 1830 the canon Valdez, as envoy of the Mexican republic, succeeded in concluding a convention with the pope, which regulated the election of Mexican bishops by providing that the chapter were to propose to the government three candidates, among whom the latter would designate one as the future bishop, who thereupon would receive the canonical institution from the pope, The emperor Maximilian again claimed all the rights and privileges  which the Spanish kings had possessed in Mexico, inclusive of the right of appointing the bishops. These, as well as other controverted points, were to be settled by a concordat, for the conclusion of which he was negotiating with the pope; but before an agreement had been arrived at, Maximilian lost his throne and life. The Mexican bishops formerly enjoyed all the rights conferred upon the bishops by the canon law as it prevailed in Spain; but the presidents of the Mexican republic refused to recognise many of these rights, and pope Pius IX, in an allocution of December 15. 1856, complained that president Commonfort had abolished the ecclesiastical jurisdiction altogether. The emperor Maximilian also failed to meet the expectations of Rome in this respect; for a note of the cardinal secretary of state to the Mexican ambassador in Rome, dated March 9,1864, reclaimed from the imperial government “the full freedom of the bishops in the exercise of their pastoral office.” The income of the bishops during the Spanish rule amounted to from 25,000 ducats to 100,000 ducats annually. The republic confiscated the entire property of the Church, and promised to give to the bishops a fixed income from the public revenue; but the bishops protested against this, and declared that they preferred to be supported by the voluntary gifts of the faithful. The number of priests is variously estimated at from 6000 to 10,000; they are partly educated in diocesan seminaries, partly in convents. Nearly all of them are of Indian descent; the native Spanish priests were in 1828 expelled from the country, in common with all the other Spaniards. The parish priests derived their income formerly from the very high fees which had to be paid for the ecclesiastical function. ‘These fees were abolished by a decree of Santa Anna (August 17, 1833), and again by Maximilian (December 27, 1864), and it was provided that they should receive salaries from the state; but the bishops refused to accept this arrangement. Monks and nuns were very numerous in Mexico during the Spanish rule. In 1810 the Franciscans had 6 provinces, the Dominicans 3, the Augustinians 2, the Carmelites and Mercedarians I each. There were in all 1931 monks in 149 monasteries. The female orders in the same year had 57 convents with 1962 nuns. The property of the monasteries amounted to about 10,000,000 pesos, exclusive of the large amount of alms. The female orders had, in 1845, 50 convents, with real estate yielding a net annual income of 500,000 piastres; and had besides a capital of 4,500,000 piastres. The republic abolished the obligatory character of the monastic vows, and suppressed several convents; yet the number of convents did not begin to show any marked decrease until about 1860, when the Franciscans had 30 houses, the  Dominicans 25, the Augustinians 10, the Carmelites 10, the Jesuits 1, the Oratorians 3, the Benedictines 1, the Brothers of Charity 2, The female orders were all suppressed by a decree issued in 1863, except the Sisters of Charity. The public educational institutions are under the exclusive control of the state authorities. They embrace one university in the city of Mexico, founded in 1551, 2 lyceums in Potosi and Guanajuato, and colleges in most of the large cities. Elementary instruction has severely suffered from the constant civil wars; but, according to recent accounts (Annual American Cyclopedia, 1872), “in most of the states each municipality has primary schools for both sexes, the teachers being paid out of municipal funds. The Lancasterian Society of the city of Mexico furnishes examined teachers for the elementary branches of those schools, and by its untiring efforts for the advancement of the cause of education generally, is establishing a firm basis for the future welfare of the country.” There is, however, also a large number of schools established by the Church, and under her exclusive control, and their number has of late considerably increased. Besides the religious societies found in all Catholic countries, Mexico has some peculiar confradias and hermandados, the members of which engage to pay monthly contributions for defraying the extraordinary pomp at the festivals of the patron saints of the churches. Some of these confraternities are very wealthy. One of these secular brotherhoods is called the “Brotherhood of the Coachmen of our Lord.” It was founded in 1758, and the members engage to act as coachmen for the priests who carry the Eucharist to sick persons. The confiscation of the immense Church property was begun by the Spanish government soon after the expulsion of the Jesuits. During the War of Independence, the government of Mexico drew largely upon the possessions of the Church in order to get the money needed for carrying on the war. The value of the tithe, which in 1810 yielded about 2,000,000 pesos, had decreased in 1826 to about one half, and decreased still more when the Mexican Congress in 1833 abolished the cooperation of the secular arm in the collection of the tithe, leaving the payment of it wholly to the individual piety of the citizens. President Commonfort, in 1855, confiscated all the property of the Church of Puebla. Under president Juarez, in 1859, the entire possessions of the clergy were declared to be a national domain, and their sale ordered. The income from this property was estimated at about 20,000,000 pesos. The regency which was appointed after the French invasion did not dare to stop the progress of the sale, and was therefore excommunicated by the bishops. After the establishment of the empire, the clerical party demanded the restoration of all the property  that had belonged to the Church, and which was estimated at one third of the entire real estate of the republic. As a considerable portion of the sold property had already changed hands, the emperor found it impossible to concede the demand, and by decree of December 27, 1864, ordered the secularization of the Church property to be proceeded with. Commissioners were subsequently sent to Rome, to come, if possible, to an understanding with the pope; but they were unsuccessful. Four provincial synods were held by the Mexican bishops — the first three in 1555, 1565, 1585; the fourth by archbishop Lorenzana (1766-1771).

IV. Protestant Missions. — The history of the Protestant missions in Mexico began in 1860, when the government proclaimed religious freedom. Until then, Protestant Christianity in any form had been prohibited. But previously to that year Miss Rankin had (in 1852) opened at Brownsville, in Texas, just opposite the Mexican town of Matamoras, a school for the children of the large Mexican population. She sent a considerable number, of Spanish Bibles, which were supplied by the American Bible Society, into Mexico, and in 1854 established a Protestant seminary for Mexican girls likewise at Brownsville. In 1856 the American Foreign and Christian Union took charge of the Mexican mission. After all obstructions to the establishment of Protestant worship had been removed in 1860, the Reverend Mr. Thompson, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, went (in November 1860) as agent of the American Bible Society into Mexico as far as Monterey. He was cordially received, the authorities giving him leave to plant Protestant missions and to circulate the Bible; but when the outbreak of the civil war in the United States interrupted the communication with New York, he had to suspend his labors, and to return to Texas. When the communication with New York had been re- established by the opening of a port on the Mexican side of the Rio Grande, the Reverend Hickey, a colportor of the American Bible Society, who, being a Union man, had to flee the South, went to Matamoras, and accepted in 1863 an agency of the Bible Society for Mexico. He subsequently went to Monterey, collected a congregation, and after a little time administered baptism to a dozen Mexicans. When his duties compelled him to leave Monterey, he selected a suitable man from the converts to continue religious services. In 1865 Miss Rankin went to Monterey, where she erected a missionhouse, suited for chapel, school, and residence of the missionary. The building was completed in 1868, and several of the converts were sent out as colportors and Bible-readers. Two  of these men went to the state of Zacatecas, in company with two of the Bible Society's agents. Their labors resulted in the conversion of thirty persons, among whom were two highly educated men, who took up the work after the departure of the colportors, and carried it forward with great success. An evangelical paper, the Antorcha Evangelical, was published, which proved a very efficient aid to Protestant preaching. In 1871 the number of converts amounted to more than one hundred. In 1872 the mission of Zacatecas was transferred by the American and Foreign Christian Union to the Board of the Presbyterian Church, which in the same year also stationed missionaries at San Luis Potosi and in the city of Mexico. In 1873 there were in all from ten to fifteen little congregations connected with the missions of the Presbyterian boards. Two schools, one for each sex, had been formed in the capital, and two also at Cos, a small town of 4000 inhabitants in the state of Zacatecas. The mission at Monterey, at the beginning of 1873, numbered six regularly organized churches, the number of members in these ranging from twelve to sixty. As the American and foreign Christian Union in 1873 suspended operations in foreign lands, Miss Rankin offered the Monterey mission to the American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions, which, in September 1872, had sent from California the first missionaries into Mexico. During the decline and ruin of the empire of Maximilian, the foreign committee of the Board of Missions of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States sent out an agent to collect information in regard to the prospects of an effort for the establishment of a congregation. under the jutrisdiction of the Protestant Episcopal Church. It was found that there was a widespread preparation for a reformation of the National Church, and that a large number of priests sympathized with the movement. Though the government of Maximilian strongly favored the Roman Catholic Church, the foundation of a Reformed Catholic Church, called “the Church of Jesus,” was laid. After the re-establishment of the republic, the movement soon assumed large dimensions. The government sold to the Reformers some of the most beautiful churches in the capital. During the greater portion of this time the Reverend Dr. Riley, a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, who had been born and educated in one of the Spanish republics of South America, had been the constant adviser and friend of the Reformers. He had brought with him from New York to Mexico a printing-press, and used it for the dissemination of the principles of the Reformed Church. He had prepared a Liturgy in Spanish, conformed in all essential respects to that of the Protestant Episcopal Church. He had  purchased one church in the capital and one half of another, and presented them to a board of trustees, to be held in trust for the benefit of the movement. As the foreign committee of the Protestant Episcopal Church was restricted by its constitution to the support of missions of its own Church, and on that account could not comprise an independent Church like that of the Church of Jesus, the American Church Missionary Society in 1873 took the movement under its charge. The Methodist Episcopal Church established a mission in Mexico in 1872. In November of that year the Reverend Dr. William Butler was appointed superintendent of the mission. He accepted, and arrived in the city of Mexico in February 1873. He reported the statistics of the work of the Church at the close of its first quarter as; follows: four Mexican congregations — two in the city of Mexico, 75 persons; one in Pachuca, capital of the state of Hidalgo, 45 persons; one in Rio del Monte, five miles beyond, 10 persons; total, 130 souls; two English congregations — in the city of Mexico, 60 attendants, and Pachuca, 45; being an aggregate of 235 persons in six congregations; 12 scholars in day-schools, and 42, with 9 teachers and officers, in two Sunday-schools. The mission had two classmeetings, about 14 Mexicans and 16 English and Americans attending. A missionary property has been purchased in Puebla. The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, also resolved in 1872 to take up Mexico as a missionary field. Bishop Keener proceeded to Mexico and purchased a chapel for the mission, and in 1873 the first missionary was stationed there. The progress of these Protestant missionary labors produced a great excitement among the strict adherents of the Roman Catholic Church. In a number of places mobs insulted the Protestants, as well as the members of the Reformed Church of Jesus. At Chapulhuac three persons were killed and several wounded. The Methodist and Presbyterian missionaries in the city of Mexico, with the representatives of the British Bible Society, solicited through the United States minister, the Hon. Thomas H. Nelson, an interview with the president of Mexico, in order to seek from him an assurance of his disposition to protect Protestants in Mexico in: the enjoyment of their religious rights under the constitution. The interview took place on April 25, 1873, when president Lerdo de Tejada assured the missionaries that the opinion of all the enlightened classes of society favored religious toleration, and that he, the president, would answer for the conduct of all the authorities depending directly upon the federal government.  See Lorenzana, Concilio (Mexic.) primero y segundo (Mexico, 1769); Lorenzana, Histor. de Nueva Espana escrito por su esclarecido conguistador H. Cortez, aumentada con otros documentos y notas (Mexico, 1770); Prescott, Hist. of the Conquest of Mexico; Baluffi, L'America un tempo Spagnuolu, riguardata sotto l'aspetto religioso dall' epoca del suo discuoprimento sino al 1843 (Ancona, 1844); Brasseur du Bourbourg, Hist. des nations civilisees du Mexique (Paris, 1858-60,4 tom.); Muhlenpfordt, Schilderung der Republic Mexico (Hanover, 1844); Richthofen (Prussian ambassador in Mexico), Die aussern u. innern polit. Zustinde der Republic Mexico (Berlin, 1859); Neher, Kirchl. Statistik, 3:337, sq.; Kalkar, Gesch. der rim-kathol. Mission (Germ. transl. [Erlangen, 1867]). (A.J.S.)

## Meyboom, Ludwig Tuson Petrus[[@Headword:Meyboom, Ludwig Tuson Petrus]]

             a Dutch theologian, was born at Emden, April 2, 1817. He studied at Groningen, where he also took his degree as doctor of theology. In 1854 he was called to Amsterdam, in spite of the protest of the orthodox party, and died November 13, 1874. Meyboom belonged to the so-called Groningen school, which believes in a personal God, the historic Christ, the immortality of the soul, and the incessant energy of the Holy Spirit in the Church. He published, De Ideis et Rebus in Facto Positis, in re Christiana apte Conjunctis (Groningen, 1840): — De Francisci Hemsterhusii Meritis  (ibid. eod.): — History of the Kingdom of God (1852-54, 3 volumes): — Life of Jesus (1854 sq.): — Pinciples of the Neo-Christian Tendency (2d ed. 1874). See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v.; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:877. (B.P.)

## Meyer, Christian Gottlob[[@Headword:Meyer, Christian Gottlob]]

             a Lutheran minister of Germany, was a convert from Judaism. From the preface of Prof. Semler, given to the German translation of Levita's Massoreth ha-Massoreth, we learn that Meyer, who was a native of Posen, was admitted into the Church by the Reverend Dr. Schultze of Halle. After his baptism Meyer studied theology at Halle, and here it was that he translated Levita's work, at the instance of Semler. After having completed his studies Meyer was admitted into the ministry, and in 1783 was called to the pastorate at Dassensee, in the duchy of Grubenhagen. Besides Levita's work, he also published Sententiae Rabbinorum deu Successione ab Intestato et Testamentaria (Halle, 1775). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:370; Levita, Massoreth ha-Massoreth (Germ. transl. 1772). (B.P.)

## Meyer, Gottlob Wilhelm[[@Headword:Meyer, Gottlob Wilhelm]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Lubeck, November 29, 1768. In 1801 he was university preacher at Gottingen, in 1804 professor and preacher at Altdorf, and in 1813 doctor and professor of theology at Erlangen. He died May 19, 1816, leaving, De Notione Orci apud Hebraeos (Lubeck, 1793): — De Foedere cum Jehova (Gottingen, 1797): — Versuch einer Hermeneutik des Alten Testaments (Libeck, 1800): — Grundriss einer Hermeneutik des Alten und Neuen Testaments (Gottingen, 1801): — Geschichte der Schrifterklarung seit der Wiederherstellung der Wissenschaften (1802-1808, 5 volumes): — Apologie der geschichtlichen Auffassung der historischen Buicher (Sulzbach, 1811). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:371; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:104, 106-111, 294-335, 588; 2:96, 177. (B.P.)

## Meyer, Heinrich August Wilhelm[[@Headword:Meyer, Heinrich August Wilhelm]]

             a famous German exegete, was born at Gotha, January 10, 1800. He studied at Jena, passed his candidate's examination in 1821, and in 1823 was installed pastor at Osthausen. In 1829 appeared the first part of his work on the New Test., including the Greek text and a German translation. In 1830 followed his Libri Symbolici Ecclesiae Lutheranae. In the same  year, having previously obtained citizenship in the kingdom of Hanover, Meyer was appointed pastor at Harste, near Gottingen. In 1832 appeared the second part of his work on the New Test., containing the commentary on the synoptic gospel's. The original design was to embrace the whole commentary in two large volumes, but this he soon found to be impracticable; besides, he discovered that his own strength and time would not be sufficient to complete the work without assistance; accordingly he secured the services of Drs. Lunemann, Huther, and Dusterdieck. In 1837 he was called as superintendent to Hoya, where he remained only four years. In 1841 he was called to Hanover, where he spent the rest of his life as member of consistory, superintendent, and head pastor of St. John's Church. In 1845 Meyer received the degree of doctor of theology from the faculty of the University of Gottingen. In 1848 he gave up his pastorate, retaining only his position in the consistory. In 1861 he was made member of the superior consistory, but in 1865 he retired from public life on a pension, which he received from the government. He died June 21, 1873.

Meyer's reputation beyond Hanover rests upon his commentaries on the New Test., and the excellence of his work was acknowledged not only in his own land, but in England and America, through Clark's translation. Meyer lived to see many editions of his work appear, and continued, down to the time of his death, to work diligently, making improvements. He grew with his work, and in each stage of his growth he expressed himself in his commentaries just as he felt. His study of the New Test. produced in him a more perfect experience of the saving grace and truth of the Gospel. As is the case with most scholars, Meyer became somewhat more dogmatical in his old age. The student who compares the last editions of the commentary with the first will find wide differences. Meyer was constantly correcting himself, and with relentless honesty removing from his work what he had come to regard as defects. Since his death, the continuation. of Meyer's commentary in new editions has been intrusted to Prof. Weiss in Berlin, who has associated himself with such scholars as Wendt, Henrici, Sieffert, and others. See a biographical sketch of Meyer by his son, in the fourth edition of the Commentary on the Philippians; Dusterdieck in Plitt- Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v.; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:879. (B.P.)

## Meyer, Hermanus, D.D[[@Headword:Meyer, Hermanus, D.D]]

             a noted Dutch Reformed minister, was born in Bremen, Lower Saxony, July 27, 1733. He was educated at the Latin school and gymnasium of that Saxon city, and subsequently at the theological academy in Groningen, where in 1758 he became a candidate for the ministry. Having received a call to the Dutch Church of Kingston, New York, he was ordained March 31, 1763, and sailed from London for New York, where he arrived in October of that year, and immediately assumed the duties of his pastoral charge. He found the Church sadly divided on the old quarrel of the Coetus and Conference parties as to ordination in this country or in Holland. He sympathized with the former, which was the liberal side, in favor of a ministry trained in America; but his efforts to keep the peace were vain. His pungent, practical preaching also made him many foes among the formal and worldly people. Thus, after preaching on regeneration, one of his Church officers said to him, “Flesh and blood cannot endure such preaching.” “Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God,” was his quick reply. The ecclesiastical difficulties alluded to above culminated in his suspension from the active duties of the ministry by an exparte and illegal body of Conference ministers in 1766. For nearly seven years afterwards, although this discipline was declared illegal, he remained in Kingston, preaching to his adherents in private houses. In 1772 he removed to New Jersey, as pastor of the united churches of Pimpton and Totowa (now Paterson). Brighter days had dawned. He was a member of the convention of 1771, which reunited the long-sundered churches. The General Synod elected him to two professorships in their theological institution-Hebrew (1784) and lector in divinity (1786), both of which he  held during life; and in 1789 he was made a doctor of divinity by Queen's College. He died October 27, 1791, lamented as “one of the pillars of the Church.” Dr. Meyer was a truly learned divine. In Latin, Greek, and Hebrew he was a critical scholar, and had made considerable attainment in the Syriac. He had long meditated a new translation of the Old Testament, but the ecclesiastical troubles of his life prevented its completion. He left “the, beginning of that work in a full translation of the Psalms of David, in Latin interlineations between the text, with copious commentaries and emendations in the finest German writing upon a broad margin.” His person was small, his features fine and benevolent, his voice and manner in the pulpit good, and his delivery very animated. In theological sentiment he was thoroughly evangelical. His faithful preaching made him pre-eminent among the godly ministers of his day. Amiable and kind-hearted, punctual and exact, faithful as a pastor, and humble in his private and official walk, his severe trials chastened and exalted his sterling piety, and his last days were crowned with honor. His death was pre-eminently peaceful and happy. See Magazine of Ref. Dutch Church, 2:300; Sprague, Annals, volume 9; Corwin's Manual of Ref. Church, s.v. (W.J.R.T.)

## Meyer, Johann Andreas Georg[[@Headword:Meyer, Johann Andreas Georg]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Hildesheim in 1768, and died March 29, 1841, doctor of theology. He wrote, Ueber das Verdienst des Christenthums (Erfurt, 1793): — De charismate τῶν γλωσσῶν, (Hanover, 1797): — Versuch einer Vertheidigung und Erlduteruny der Geschichte Jesu (1805): — Natur-Analogien, etc. (Hamburg, 1839). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:396, 399, 550; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:879. (B.P.)

## Meyer, Johann Friederich von[[@Headword:Meyer, Johann Friederich von]]

             an eminent German theologian and jurist, was born at Frankfort-on the- Main, September 12, 1772. In 1789 he entered the University of Gittingen, where he applied himself with great zeal to jurisprudence, not however neglecting his favorite study, Greek. In 1790 he published his Commentatio de diis ac deabus Graecorum et Romanorum δᾳδούχοις cum vi tabulis aereis, which attracted great attention. In 1793 he went to Leipsic, where he turned his attention mainly to the study of philosophyv After holding various official positions, which he successively lost in consequence of the French invasion, he was, in 1807, appointed counsellor to the municipal court of Frankfort; became member of the senate in 1816; judge in 1821, and finally, in 1837, president of the criminal court and of the court of appeals. At the same time he was a member of the diet, and thrice, in 1825, 1839, and 1843, filled the office of burgomaster. He died January 27, 1849. In the early part of his life Meyer inclined to rationalism — this still appears in his poem of Tobias, in seven cantos, published in 1800; but he was subsequently converted, and thenceforth became very active as a theologian. In 1806 and 1807 he translated Cicero's works on the nature of the gods, divination, and fate; in 1813, Xenophon's Cyropaedia (2d ed. 1823). In 1812 he published his Bibeldeutungen, in which he found full  play for his acquirements in philology, jurisprudence, etc. He next turned his attention to a new translation of the Bible, as he wished to correct the philological errors contained in Luther's translation. It assumed the form of a revision of Luther's translation, with annotations, and was published in 1819 (2d ed. without the notes, 1823; latest ed. Frankf. 1855). The value of this work was recognised by the University of Eriangen, and he was honored with the doctorate in divinity, and in 1816 was made president of the Bible Society of Frankfort. On emerging from rationalism, Meyer took a leaning towards mysticism, in the better sense of the word. This is apparent in such works as his Blatter fur hohere Wahrheit (Frankf. 1820- 32); Wahrnehmungen einer Seherin (Frankf. 1827). Aside from the above- named works, he wrote, Der Rosenkrenzer, die Fama u. d. Confession (Frankf. 1828): — Kritische Kranze (Berl. 1830): — Das Buch Jezira, hebraisch v. deutsch (Leips. 1830): — Inbegriff d. christlichen Glaubenslehre (Kempt. 1832): — Hesperiden, (Kempt. 1836): — Prosodisches Hulfsbuch (1836): — Zur Aegyptol. (1840). See Doring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschl. s.v. (J.H.W.)

## Meyer, Johann Hermann[[@Headword:Meyer, Johann Hermann]]

             a German Protestant theologian, was born at Hamburg October 6, 1737, and was educated at the University of Helmstadt. He was appointed minister at Hamburg in 1766, in 1778 at Rendsburg. He was elected deacon in 1771 by the parishioners of the Nicolai Kirche at Kiel. and made, in 1778, archdeacon, and in 1786 pastor of that church. He died August 26, 1795. Meyer was very much beloved for his strict sense of honesty, morality friendship, and love. He was very devoted to his vocation as minister, and found but little time for the publication of books. The following dissertations are the most important works he gave to the public: Hamburgische Abschiedsrede-und Rendsburgische Antrittspredigt. (Hamburg, 1768, 4to); Gedenkverse mit dem Inhalt Predigten vom J. 1774 (Kiel, 1774, 8vo); Der Verlust der Gnade, in einer Wahlpredigt (Hamburg, 1775, 8vo); Das Andenken voriger Zeiten (Kiel, 1776, 8vo).

## Meyer, Johann Matthias von[[@Headword:Meyer, Johann Matthias von]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Ansbach in 1814. In 1839 he was vicar, in 1843 director of the teacher's seminary at Schwabach, in 1844 preacher at Nordlingen, in 1849 at Munich, and in 1855 dean there. In 1872 he was made member of the superior consistory, and became its president at the death of Harless (q.v.). Meyer died September 15, 1882, doctor of theology, and member of the council of the Bavarian empire. He published a few sermons, for which see Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:880. (B.P.)

## Meyer, John[[@Headword:Meyer, John]]

             a noted Dutch theologian and Hebraist, was born about the middle of the 17th century. He flourished as professor of theology at the University of Haderwyk, and died in 1725. His works are of great value to the exegete. Those most worthy of notice are his Uxor Christiana, sive de conjugio  inter duos, deque incestu et divortiis, dissertationes tres (Amst. 1688, 4to); Tractatus de temporibus et fasti diebus Hebraeorum (Amst. 1724); and his edition of Seder Olam, a Hebrew chronicle of great esteem among the Jews, usually attributed to rabbi Jose ben-Chilpeta.

## Meyer, John H[[@Headword:Meyer, John H]]

             son of Dr. Herman Meyer (q.v.), another distinguished minister of the Reformed Church, was born at Pequinet, N.J., October 19, 1774; graduated at Columbia College in 1795; studied theology under Dr. Livingston, and was licensed to preach in 1798; settled as pastor of the Dutch churches at New Paltz and New Hurley, N.Y., from 1799 to 1803, and at Schenectady from 1803 to 1806. He was an accomplished scholar, and preached with great elegance and ease in the Dutch and English languages. He was remarkable for unction and popularity as a preacher.

## Meyer, Louis Georg Frederic[[@Headword:Meyer, Louis Georg Frederic]]

             a Lutheran minister of France, was born at Montbeliard, January 1, 1809. He studied at Strasburg, was in 1829 teacher in Switzerland, in 1831 professor of French at Leipsic, and in 1833 he accompanied two young men to Paris, and took up his abode in the house of John Monod. In 1837 he succeeded Mr. Boissart as pastor of the Lutheran Church at Paris, was in 1857 president of consistory and ecclesiastical inspector, and died October 11, 1867. Meyer advanced the cause of home missions within his church, and originated many institutions. After his death were published Sermzons, Lettres et Friagsments. See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Meyerbeer, Giacomo[[@Headword:Meyerbeer, Giacomo]]

             a very noted German composer of music, was born in Berlin September 5, 1794, and was of Jewish descent. At the age of nine years he was regarded as a masterly pianist in a city full of cultivated musicians, and at ten he commenced his career as a composer, producing many songs and pieces for the piano-forte, which excited the wonder and admiration of his friends by their spirit and originality. At fifteen he was placed under the tuition of abbe Vogler, who had established a celebrated school of composition in the city of Darmstadt. Here, under the abbe's instruction, young Meyerbeer composed a quantity of classic and elaborate sacred music in the severest scholastic style of his master, all of which, however, is lost to the world, as the composer, when his ideas became more matured, did not care to preserve it. One of these compositions, however, brought him into notoriety: it was an oratorio bearing the title God and Nature, and was performed in the presence of the grand-duke of Darmstadt, gaining for its author the distinction of being appointed composer to the court. When Meyerbeer was eighteen, his first dramatic piece, Jephthah's Daughter, was performed at Munich. Though intended for the stage, it was more of an oratorio than an opera; but on account of its severe style, and the evident inattention to the minor attractions of melody, it was not received in a flattering manner by the Bavarian public. After a series of professional disappointments, his first success was achieved at Padua in 1818, in the performance of Romilde Costanza, which, together with Semiramide,  produced at Turin in 1819, and Emnma di Resburgo, at Venice in 1820, firmly established the composer's reputation. In 1831 he gave to the public Robert the Devil. His subsequent works are operatic. He died May 2, 1864. See L. de Lomenie, M. Meyerbeer, par un Homme de Rien (1849); De Bury, Meyerbeer et son temps (1865); Mentel, Meyerbeer, s. Leben u. Werke (1868).

## Meyere, Lievin De[[@Headword:Meyere, Lievin De]]

             a Belgian Jesuit, was born at Gand in 1655. In 1700 he became a member of the Society of Jesus. He subsequently taught philology, philosophy, and theology, and was made rector of a college at Louvain. He bitterly opposed the tenets of the Jansenists. His numerous writings, nearly all poetical, are replete with animadversions against them. Meyere died at Louvain in 1730. The following work, said to have been written by Theod. Eleutherius, was edited by Meyere: Historia Controversiarum de divinae gratiae auxiliis sub pontif. Sixto V, Clemente VIII, et Paulo V, lib. 6 (Antwerp, 1705, fol.). See Moreri, Grand Dict. Hist. s.v.; Goethals, Lectures relatives a l'hist. des sciences et des lettres en Belgique, volume 1.

## Meyfart (Or Mayfart), Johann Mattheus[[@Headword:Meyfart (Or Mayfart), Johann Mattheus]]

             a Lutheran theologian of considerable note, son of a Protestant divine, was born at Jena in 1590. He received an excellent philological and philosophical education a Gotha, and afterwards entered the University of Wittenberg, where he devoted himself to the study of logic, physics, ethics, and the classics. In 1611, having secured the degree of A.M., he began the study of theology. In 1616 Meyfart was called to a professorship a the newly-founded University of Coburg. He published his first theological essays in 1617. In 1624 he was created doctor of theology by the University of Jena. In the same year he began the preparation of large dogmatic work entitled De theologia, de philosophiae sobrio usu, de S.S., et de symbolis; but he never completed this work. In 1627, however, he went before the public with quite large and valuable works: Anti-Becanus sive manualis controversiarum theol., a Becano collecti, confutatino (L'eipsic, 1627, 2 volumes); Nodu. Gordius Sophistarum solutus, i.e. de ratione solvend argumenta sophistica, etc., libri 4 (Coburg, 1627, 8vo) Meyfart is one of the most remarkable characters of the 17th century, and can justly be called the forerunner of Spener (q.v.). With an intense longing  for the highest ideals, which undoubtedly had been fostered by his classical studies, he united a true, living faith in Christ and desired to leave this earth to be with his Saviour. At the same time he was quick to perceive the many errors and the moral decay of the Church, and, with an earnestness seldom surpassed, he raised his voice against the manifold sins and imperfections of the Church of his day and country. In 1626 he issued his Tuba novissima, i.e., of the four last things, viz. death, judgment, eternal life, and condemnation. These were originally four sermons preached by him at Coburg; but they created such an impression that he had not only to publish them in book form, but was also urged to publish more sermons and admonitions on these and similar subjects. Thus he published six more volumes on The Heavenly Jerusalem, Eternal Damnnation, and the Final Judgment. Some of these books passed through five and more editions. Henke, in just appreciation of his merits, calls Meyfart “a German Dante, full of poetry and knowledge.” During his later life Meyfart published several books and essays which were written in the spirit of the Reformation. One of his essays contains an earnest address to the clergy how to live and how to pray; another is directed against the vice of nepotism and simony; and in another, De concilianda pace inter ecclesias per Germaniam evangelicas, he enumerates seventeen characteristic reasons why theologians are so ill adapted to peace, e.g. insufficientia mtorum et eruditionis, metus odii et invidiae, intuitus humanae auctoritatis, etc. After the capture of Erfurt by Gustavus Adolphus, Meyfart was called as professor of theology to the newly-reorganized Lutheran University of Erfurt, and in 1635 he was elected rector of the university, and senior of the theological department. He died January 26, 1642.

## Meyger, Karl Ludwig Friedrich[[@Headword:Meyger, Karl Ludwig Friedrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Schonndorf, March 18, 1810. In 1845 he was professor at the seminary in Schionthal, and died October 16, 1885, doctor of theology. He is the author of, Liber Ruth ex Hebraico in Latinum Versus Perpetuque Interpretatione Illustratus (Tubingen, 1856): — Hulfsbuch Zum Verstandniss der Bibel (1879). (B.P.)

## Meyr, Melchior[[@Headword:Meyr, Melchior]]

             a philosophical writer of Germany, was born June 28, 1810, at Ehringen, near Nordlingen. He studied at Munich and Heidelberg, and died at Munich, April 22, 1871. Of his many writings we mention, Die Religion des Geistes (Leipsic, 1871): — Gott und Sein Reich (Stuttgart, 1860): — Drei Gespriche uber Wahrheit, Gute und Schonheit (1863): — Die Forttdauer nach dem Tode (2d ed. Leipsic, 1875): — Die Religion und  ihre jetzt gebotene Fortbildung (1871). After his death Bothmer and Carriere published from his manuscripts Gedanken uber Kunst, Religion und Philosophie (Leipsic, 1874). (B.P.)

## Mezahab[[@Headword:Mezahab]]

             (Heb. Mey-Zahab', מֵי זָהָב, water of gold, i.e., of a golden luster; Sept. Μαιζοώβ, but omits in Chronicles; Vulg. Mezaab), the father of Matred and maternal grandfather of Mehetabel, which last was wife of Hadar, or Hadad, the last mentioned of the early Edomitish kings (Gen 36:39; 1Ch 1:50), B.C. considerably ante 1619. “His name has given rise to much speculation. Jarchi renders it, ‘What is gold?' and explains it, ‘He was a rich man, and gold was not valued in his eyes at all.' Abarbanel says he was ‘rich and great, so that on this account he was called Mezahab, for the gold was in his house as water.' ‘Haggaon' (writes Aben-Ezra)  ‘said he was a refiner of gold, but others said that it pointed to those who made gold from brass.' The Jerusalem Targum of course could not resist the temptation of punning upon the name, and combined the explanations given by Jarchi and Haggaon. The latter part of Gen 36:39 is thus rendered: ‘The name of his wife is Mehetabel, daughter of Matred, the daughter of a refiner of gold, who was wearied with labor ( מִטְרְדָאmatreda) all the days of his life; after he had eaten and was filled he turned and said, What is gold? and what is silver?' A somewhat similar paraphrase is given in the Targum of the Pseudo-Jonathan, except that it is there referred to Matred, and not to Mezahab. The Arabic version translates the name ‘water of gold,' which must have been from the Hebrew, while in the Targum of Onkelos it is rendered ‘refiner of gold,' as in the Quaestiones Hebraicae in Paralip., attributed to Jerome, and the traditions given above; which seems to indicate that originally there was something in the Hebrew text. now wanting, which gave rise to this rendering, and of which the present reading, מֵי, mey, is an abbreviation.”

## Mezuzah[[@Headword:Mezuzah]]

             (מְזוּזָה) or Mezuzoth (מְזוּזֹת)the sing. and plur. forms of a “door-post,” the place on which the Mosaic law is interpreted by the Jews as enjoining the Israelites to write passages of Scripture (Deu 6:9; Deu 11:20). In the following account we especially treat of the Rabbinical regulations.

1. Signification of the Word, and Design of the Injunction. — The word מזוזה(from זוז, to push about, to move) denotes either that which is most prominent, hence the post of a door, or that on which the door moves, or on which the hinges turn — hence a door-post. This is the sense in which it occurs in the Hebrew Scriptures. From the fact, however, that on it were written passages of the law, the term Mezuzah came afterwards synedochically to denote the writing itself, or the passages of Scripture affixed to the door-post, and this is the sense in which the word is used in the Chaldee paraphrases, and in the Jewish writings generally. As books were exceedingly rare and expensive in ancient times, and could only be possessed by very few, the practice obtained among the nations of antiquity, and still prevails in the East, of writing, engraving, or painting such sacred mottoes or sage maxims over the doors of dwellings as the parents were especially anxious to record or to impart to their children.  Thus the ancient Egyptians had brief hieroglyphical legends over their doorways (Wilkinson, Manners and Customs of Ancient Egypt, 2:102; Wathen, page 101); the Greeks and Romans had inscriptions over their doors (Virgil, Georg. 3:26 sq.). Other nations had their laws written upon their gates (Huetius, Demonstratio Evangelica, page 58); and the Moslems to the present day, “never set up a gate, cover a fountain, build a bridge, or erect a house, without writing on it choice sentences from the Koran, or from their best poets”' (Thomson, The Land and the Book, page 98). Now Moses in this instance, as in many other cases, availed himself of a prevalent custom, in order to keep the divine precepts ever before the eyes of the people, and to enable them to instruct their children in the law of God. Hence Maimonides beautifully remarks: “The commandment about the Mezuzah is binding on every one. For whenever an Israelite comes into the house, or goes out, he, seeing on it the name of the Holy One, blessed be he, will thereby be reminded of his love; and when he awakens from his sleep, and from his thoughts about the vanities of time, he will thereby be led to remember that there is nothing which endures forever and throughout all eternity except the knowledge of the everlasting Rock, and he will reflect and walk in the paths of righteousness” (Jad Hachezaka, Ililchoth Tephillin, 6:13).

2. The Manner in which this Injunction has been and still is observed. — That the Jews of old literally observed this injunction is not only evident from the above-mentioned prevailing custom of antiquity, but also from Josephus, who distinctly says that the Jews “inscribe the greatest blessings of God upon their doors” (Ant. 4:8, 13); from the Chaldee paraphrase of Onkelos, who translates Deu 6:9; Deu 11:20, “And thou shalt write them upon scrolls, and affix them on the door-posts of thy houses and thy gates;” from the Jerusalem Targum, Jonathan ben-Uziel, Jerusalem Talmud (Pesach, 1:1), Babylonian Talmud (Erubin, 96 b; Aboda Sara, 11 a), etc. These authorities, moreover, show that the Hebrews, at least after the Babylonian captivity, and at the time of Christ, wrote the passages containing this injunction on a piece of parchment, and affixed it to the door-posts; and that this Mezuzah, as it is called, is substantially the same as the Jews now have it, which is made in the following manner: On the inside of a piece of square parchment, prepared by a Jew especially for this purpose, are written Deu 6:4-9; Deu 11:13-21, while on the outside are written the divine name שדי the Almighty, on the place where the first passage ends, and the words כוזו כוזו במוכסז, Kuzu Bemuksaz  Kuzu, to the left at the bottom. Thus written, the schedule is then rolled up in such a manner that the divine name שדי is outside, and is put into a reed, or hollow cylinder made of lead, brass, or silver, varying in costliness according to the circumstances of the people. In this tube there is a little hole, just large enough to show the divine name, which is protected by a piece of glass, forming, as it were, a little window, through which שדי is seen. Such a Mezuzah must be affixed to the right-hand doorpost of every door in the house by a nail at each end.

The fixing of it is accompanied by the following prayer: “Behold I prepare my hands to perform the commandment which my Creator has given me about the Mezuzah. In the name of the one, holy, most blessed God and his Shechinah, who is concealed, mysterious, and incorporated in the name of all Israel. Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, king of the universe, who hast sanctified us by thy commandments. and hast enjoined us to affix the Mezuzah.” Like the Greeks and Romans, who attached amulets to the jambs of the doors, and ascribed to them magic power, the Jews from a very early period believed that the 2Mezuzah guarded the house against the entrance of diseases and evil spirits, as may be seen from the remarks in the Talmud (Jerusalem Pesach, 1:1; and Babylonian Aboda Sara, 11 a; Menachoth, 33 b), and the Chaldee paraphrase of the Song of Solomon (8:3), which is, “I have affixed the Mezuzah to the right side of my door, in the third part thereof, towards the inside,. so that the evil spirits may have no power to hurt me.” Hence the divine name שדי is made to denote the Guardian of the dwellings of Israel, the ש standing for שומר, the ד for דירת, and the יfor ישראל, according to the exegetical rule called נוטויקון (=notaricum, from notarius, a short-hand writer, one who writes with abbreviations), which regards every letter of a word as an initial or abbreviation of a word; while the words כוזו במוכסז כוזו, supposed to be the name of the guardian angel, or of God himself, are made to stand for יהוה יהוה אלהינו, Jehovah our God is Jehovah, by another exegetical rule, which exchanges each letter of a word with its immediate predecessor in the alphabet; e.g. the כ in כוזו is exchanged for י, the ו for ה, the ז for ו, and the ו for ה, .thus yielding יהוה. Every pious Jew, as often as he passes the Mezuzah, in leaving the house or in entering it touches the divine name with the finger of his right hand, puts it to his mouth, and kisses it, saying in Hebrew, “The Lord shall preserve thy going out and thy coming in, from this time forth, and for evermore” (Psa 121:8); and when leaving on a business  expedition, he says, after touching it, כוזו במוכסז כוזו אל ִואצליח בשמ,ִ “in thy name, Kuzu Bemuksaz Kuzu (= God), I go out and shall prosper.”

III. Literature. — Maimonides, Jad Ha-Chezaka Hilchoth Tephillin U- Mezuzah Ve-Sepher Torah,5, 6; Jork Dea, § 285-295; the Jewish ritual entitled Derek Ha-Chajim, containing a summary of all the laws connected with the Jewish observances (Vienna, 1859), page 31 sq.; Buxtorf, Synag. Jud. pages 482-487; Leo Modena, Rites and Customs, part 1, chapter 2:§ 3; Allen's Modern Judaism, page 327-329. SEE DOOR-POST.

## Mezzachulians[[@Headword:Mezzachulians]]

             a Mohammedan sect who believe that those who have any knowledge of God's glory and essence in this world may be saved, and are to be reckoned among the faithful.

## Mezzofanti, Joseph Caspar[[@Headword:Mezzofanti, Joseph Caspar]]

             a Roman Catholic prelate, celebrated as the greatest linguist the world has ever seen, was born at Bologna September 17, 1774. His father, Francis Mezzofanti, was a carpenter; and he himself, being destined for the same humble career, was placed at one of the free schools of the Oratory in his native city. Father Respighi; a priest of that congregation, observed the remarkable talents of the boy, and saved him for literature. He was removed to a higher school — one of the so-called “Scuole Pie” of Bologna — and eventually to the archiepiscopal seminary, where, after completing the usual course of letters, philosophy, divinity, and canon law in the university, he was admitted to priest's orders in September 1797. Of the details of his progress in the study of languages during these early years no accurate record is preserved; but it is known that, like most eminent linguists, he was gifted, even in childhood, with a very wonderful memory, and that, partly under the various professors in the university, partly by the aid of foreign residents in the city, partly by his own unassisted studies, he had acquired, before the completion of his university career, the Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Arabic, Spanish, French, German, and Swedish languages.

In 1797, at the early age of twenty-two, he was appointed professor of Arabic in the university; but on the annexation of Bologna, as one of the papal legations, to the newly-established Cisalpine republic, he, refusing to take the oaths of the new constitution, was set aside from the professorship. After the conclusion of the concordat between Pius VII and the first consul, the ancient constitution of the university was restored. In 1803 Mezzofanti was named to the higher professorship of Oriental languages, and in the same year became assistant librarian of the public library of the city. In 1808 the professorship was discontinued, and Mezzofanti was reduced to great distress. He made a scanty living by  private tuition; but, nothing daunted, steadily followed in private what had become his engrossing pursuit — the study of languages. A letter of his, dated in 1804, to the celebrated Orientalist, John Bernard de Rossi, whose personal acquaintance he subsequently formed during a short visit to Modena in 1805, enclosed a composition in twelve languages, which he submitted to the judgment of his correspondent; and by 1812 Mezzofanti's reputation as a linguist was thoroughly established. The well-known Pietro Giordani, in several of his letters to his friends, calls him “the divine Mezzofanti,” and declares that his skill in living and dead languages entitles him to be regarded as “ a man of all ages and all nations.” The war of which Northern Italy was so long the theatre afforded Mezzofanti many opportunities of extending his stock of languages. In the hospital of Bologna, to which he was attached as volunteer chaplain, were to be met — among the invalids of the Austrian, Russian, and French armies — Germans, Hungarians, Bohemians, Wallachians, Servians, Russians, Poles, and Croats. Partly in the desire to offer these sufferers the consolations of religion, partly from his love of the study itself. Mezzofanti labored assiduously to turn these and all similar opportunities to account; and several instances are recorded in which, without the assistance of a grammar or dictionary, he contrived to establish a mode of communication with a stranger who was utterly ignorant of every language except his own, and eventually to master that language sufficiently for all the purposes of conversation. He has left an account of his mode of study during these years, which is not a little curious and interesting. “The hotel-keepers,” he says, “were in the habit of notifying me of the arrival of all strangers at Bologna; and I never hesitated, when anything was to be learned thereby, to call upon them, to interrogate them, to make notes of their communications, and to take lessons in the pronunciation of their several languages.

There were a few learned Jesuits too, and several Spaniards, Portuguese, and Mexicans residing in Bologna, from whom I received valuable assistance, both in their own and in the learned languages. I made it a rule to learn every strange grammar, and to apply myself to every new dictionary that came within my reach. I was constantly filling my head with new words. Whenever a stranger, whether of high or low degree, passed through Bologna, I tried to turn the visit to account, either for the purpose of perfecting my pronunciation, or of learning the familiar words and turns of expression. Nor did all this cost me so much trouble; for, in addition to an excellent memory, God had gifted me with remarkable flexibility of the organs of speech.” In the year 1812 Mezzofanti was appointed assistant  librarian of the university; in 1814 he was reinstated in his professorship; and in 1815 he became chief librarian. From this period, especially after the restoration of peace, his reputation rapidly extended. Every visitor of Bologna related fresh marvels regarding his prodigious attainments. Tourists from every nation, whether of Europe or of the East, united in representing him as perfect, each one in his own language.

Lord Byron, about 1820, pronounced him “a walking polyglot, a monster of languages, and a Briareus of parts of speech.” M. Molbech, a Danish traveller of the year 1820, reports the number of his languages at “more than thirty,” and testifies to his speaking Danish “ with almost entire correctness.” French, German, Spanish, Polish, Russian, Greek, and Turkish travellers concur in the same report, not only with regard to their own, but also to many other languages. During all these years — except a short visit to Pisa, Leghorn, Florence, and Rome — he had resided altogether at Bologna, though invited, with many flattering offers, to transfer his residence to Paris, to Vienna, to Florence, and to Rome. At length, having gone to Rome as a member of the deputation sent by the Bolognese to offer their submission to pope Gregory XVI, after the revolution in 1831, he was induced by the pontiff to settle permanently in Rome, and to accept a prebend in the Church of St. Mary Major, which was soon after exchanged for a canonry in St. Peter's, and, on the promotion of the celebrated Angelo Mai, then keeper of the Vatican Library, to the secretaryship of the Propaganda, Mezzofanti was appointed to succeed him in the important charge of the Vatican. He held this office till 1838, in which year, conjointly with Mai, he was elevated to the cardinalate. His residence in a great center of languages, such as Rome, and especially the facilities of intercourse with the various races represented in the College of the Propaganda, gave a new impulse to Mezzofanti's linguistic studies.

The reports of his visitors at Rome are still more marvellous than those of the Bolognese period. An eminent German scholar, Herr Gorres, who had much intercourse with him in the year 1841, writes thus: “He is familiar with all the European languages; and by this I mean not only the ancient classical tongues and the modern ones of the first class — such as the Greek and Latin, or the Italian, French, German, ‘Spanish, Portuguese, and English — his knowledge extends: also to the languages of the second class, viz., the Dutch, Danish, and Swedish; to the whole Sclavonic family — Russian, Polish, Bohemian, or Czechish; to the Servian, the Hungarian, the Turkish;, and even those of the third and fourth classes — the Irish, the Welsh, the Wallachian, the Albanian, the Bulgarian, and the Illyrian. The Romani of  the Alps and the Lettish are not unknown to him; nay, he has made himself acquainted with Lappish. He is master of the languages which fall within the Indo-Germanic family — the Sanscrit and Persian, the Kurdish, the Georgian, the Armenian; he is familiar with all the members of the Shemitic family — the Hebrew, the Arabic, the Syriac, the Samaritan, the Chaldee, the Sabaic — nay, even with the Chinese, which he not only reads, but speaks. Among the Hamitic languages, he knows Coptic, Ethiopic, Abyssinian, Amharic, and Angolese.” What is especially notable in this marvellous gift possessed by Mezzofanti is that his knowledge of each among this vast variety of languages was almost as perfect as though his attention had been devoted to such language exclusively. The reports of all the great students of language concur in describing him as speaking even their own tongues always with the precision and, in most cases, with the fluency of a native. His pronunciation, his idiom, his vocabulary, were alike unexceptionable.

Even the familiar words of everyday life, and the delicate turns of conversational language, were at his command; and in each language he was master of the leading dialects, and of the provincial peculiarities of idiom, of pronunciation, or of expression. In French, he was equally at home in the pure Parisian of the Falubourg St. Germain or in the Provincial of Toulouse. He could accommodate himself in German to the rude jargon of the Black Forest or to the classic vocabulary of Hanover; and he often amused his English visitors with specimens of the provincialisms of Yorkshire, Lancashire, or Somersetshire. With the literature of those various countries, too, he was well acquainted. He loved to talk with his visitors of the great authors in their respective languages; and his remarks are described as invariably sound and judicious, and exhibiting careful and various reading, often extending to departments with which it would never be supposed that a foreigner could be familiar. ADutch traveller, for instance, Dr. Wap, was surprised to find him acquainted with his own national poets, Vondel and Cato.; a Dane, with the philological works of Rask; a Swede, with the poetry of Ochsentsjerna. To a Sicilian he would repeat whole pages of the poetry of Meli; and an English gentleman was astounded to hear him discuss and criticise Hudibras, of all English writers the least attractive, as well as the least intelligible to a foreigner. He was in the habit, too, of amusing himself by metrical compositions in the various languages which he cultivated, and often wrote for his visitors a couplet or two in their native language, as a little memento of their interview. Dr. Wap, the Dutch traveller just referred to, speaks in high praise of some extempore lines in Dutch by which  Mezzofanti replied to a sonnet which Dr. Wap had addressed to him; and the well-known Orientalist, Dr. Tholuck; having asked Mezzofanti for some memorial of his visit, received from him a Persian couplet, after the manner of Hafiz, which he composed (although not without some delay) during .Dr. Tholuck's visit. After his removal to Rome, although he had already passed his fiftieth year, he added largely to his stock of languages. His most notable acquisition during this period was Chinese, which he acquired (partly at the Chinese college in Naples, partly among the Chinese students of the Propaganda) in such perfection as to be able not only to write and converse freely in it, but even to preach to the young Chinese ecclesiastics. During the same period he acquired the Abyssinian, the Californian, some of the North American Indian languages, and even the “impossible” Basque. It was in Rome, and especially in the Propaganda, that he displayed in its greatest perfection his singular power of instantaneously passing in conversation from one language to another, without the slightest mixture or confusion, whether of words or of pronunciation.

Mezzofanti, by virtue of his position as cardinal, was member of many ecclesiastical congregations in Rome, but he never held any office of state. He died on the 15th of March, 1849, and was buried in the Church of St. Onofrio, beside the grave of Torquato Tasso. His personal character was gentle, humble, modest, humane, and he was a sincere and devout man.

It is difficult to determine with accuracy the number of languages known by Mezzofanti, and still more so to ascertain how many of these he spoke, and with what degree of fluency in each. During his lifetime, as we have seen, report varied considerably at different times; nor was he himself believed to have made any very precise statement on the subject. To a Russian traveller, who visited him before the year 1846, and who begged of him a list of all the languages and dialects in which he was able to express himself, he sent a paper in his own hand containing the name of God in fifty-six languages. The author of a memoir which appeared soon after the cardinal's death in a Roman journal, the Civila Catolica (now known to be by father Bresciani, a Roman Jesuit), states that in the year 1846 Mezzofanti himself informed him that he was able to express himself in seventy-eight languages. Marvellous as these statements may appear, they seem fully borne out by inquiries (with a view to the preparation of a biography) which have been made since the death of the cardinal. Reports have been received from a vast number of individuals, natives of different  countries, whose collective testimony, founded on their own personal knowledge of Mezzofanti, places beyond all question the fact of his having spoken fluently considerably more than fifty different languages. There are others among the languages ascribed to him, regarding which it is difficult to institute any direct inquiry; but, judging from analogy, and relying on the well-known modesty and truthfulness of Mezzofanti, we need not hesitate to accept his own statement as reported by F. Bresciani; the more so as among his papers now in the possession of his family is a list, drawn up from memoranda contained therein, of no less than a hundred and twenty languages with which he possessed some acquaintance, unaccompanied, however, by any note specifying those among the number which he spoke, or the degree of his knowledge of each. His English biographer, Russell, comes to the following results, which are, in brief (for details see that work):

1. Languages frequently tested, and spoken by the cardinal with rare excellence-thirty.

2. Stated to have been spoken fluently, but hardly sufficiently tested- nine.

3. Spoken rarely and less perfectly — eleven.

4. Spoken imperfectly; a few sentences and conversational form — eight.

5. Studied from books, but not known to have been spoken — fourteen.

6. Dialects spoken, or their peculiarities understood thirty-nine dialects of ten languages, many of which might justly be described as different languages.

This list adds up one hundred and eleven, exceeding by all comparison everything related in history. Jonadab Almanor and Sir William Jones are not claimed to have gone beyond twenty-eight; while Mithridates and Pico of Mirandola have been made famous by twenty-two.

In general learning Mezzofanti's attainments were highly respectable. He was a well-informed theologian and canonist, and an impressive though not eloquent preacher. M. Libri, the historian of mathematical science in Italy, found him well acquainted with algebra, and reports an interesting  conversation which he had with him on the Bija Gannita (the algebra of the Hindus), as well as on the general subject of Indian history and antiquities. Other writers describe him as entering freely into the history as well as the literature of their several countries. But as an author he is almost unknown. He occasionally read papers at various literary and scientific societies in Bologna and Rome; but his only known publication is a short memoir of his friend and brother professor, father Emanuel da Ponte, which was printed at Bologna in 1820; and he leaves no monument for posterity beyond the tradition that he was incomparably the greatest linguist the world has ever seen. See G. Stolz, Biographia del Cardinal Giuseppe Mezzofanti, in the Journal de Rome of February 5, 1850; A. Manavit, Esquisse historique sur le Cardinal Mezzofanti (Paris, 1854, 8vo); Russell, Life of the Cardinal Mezzofanti, etc. (Lond. 1857, 8vo); L'Ami de la Religion (1849); Revue Catholique de Louvain, September 1853; Engl. Cyclop. s.v.; Bibliotheca Sacra, 1849, page 407; English Review, January 1855; Princeton Review, 1858, page 645 sq.; Catholic World, March, 1870, page 857.

## Miako[[@Headword:Miako]]

             one of the largest cities of Japan, was, until the recent abolishment of the ecclesiastical emperor, the seat of the mikado, or spiritual prince. The city, containing nearly one million of inhabitants, is situated in the south-west of the island of Nipon, in the midst of an extensive plain, and about thirty miles from Osaca. Miako is also noted as the great stronghold of Sintuism (q.v.) — the ancient religion of Japan — of temple-worship, priests, monks, ceremonies, and ritualism. Some of the temples are of great size and splendor. Don Rodrigo de Vivero, the Spanish governor of Manilla, who visited Miako in 1608, was told that it then contained 5000 temples. He describes one in which was, an immense bronze image of Buddha. the construction of which was begun by the tycoon in 1602. He says, “I ordered one of my people to measure the thumb of the right hand; but, although he was a person of the ordinary size, he could not quite encircle it with both arms, But the size of the statue is not its only merit: the feet, hands, mouth, eyes, forehead, and other features are as perfect and as expressive as the most accomplished painter could make a portrait. When I first visited this temple it was unfinished; more than 10,000 men were daily employed upon it.

The devil could not suggest to the emperor a surer expedient to get rid of his immense wealth.” This colossus was injured by an earthquake in 1662, after which it was melted down and a substitute  prepared of wood gilded. Kampfer, who was at Miako in 1691, describes the temple which contained this image as enclosed by a high wall of freestone, some of the blocks of which were twelve feet square. “Astone staircase of eight steps led up to the gateway, on either side of which stood a gigantic image twenty-four feet high, with the face of a lion, but otherwise well proportioned, black, and almost naked, and placed on a pedestal six feet high. Within the gateway were sixteen stone pillars on each side for lamps, and on the inside of the enclosing wall was a spacious gallery covered with a roof supported by two rows of pillars eighteen feet high and twelve feet distant from each other. Opposite the gateway, in the middle of the court, stood the temple, much the loftiest structure which Kampfer had seen in Japan, with a double roof supported by ninety-four immense wooden pillars, nine feet in diameter. The floor of the temple was paved with square flags of marble. There was nothing inside but the great image of Buddha sitting on a terete, or lotus flower, supported by another flower of which the leaves were turned upwards, the two being raised about twelve feet from the floor. The idol was gilded all over, had long ears, curled hair, and a crown on the head which appeared through the window over the first roof of the temple. The shoulders were so broad as to reach from one pillar to another, a distance of thirty feet. In front of this temple is an edifice containing a bell, which is described in the Japanese guide-books as seventeen feet two and a half inches high, and weighing 1,700,000. Japanese catties, equal to 2,066,000 English pounds, a weight five times greater than that of the famous bell at Moscow. Kampfer, however, who had seen the great bell at Moscow, describes this Japanese bell as inferior in size to that, and as being rough, ill cast, and ill shaped. It was sounded by striking it on the outside with a large wooden mallet. Another temple, dedicated to Quanwon, was very long in proportion to its breadth. In the centre was a gigantic image of Quanwon, with thirty-six arms. Sixteen black images larger than life stood round it, and on each side two rows of gilt idols, with twenty arms each. On either side of the temple, running from end to end, were ten platforms rising like steps one behind the other, on each of which stood fifty images of Quanwon as large as life — 1000 in all. each on its separate pedestal, so arranged as to stand in rows of five, one behind the other, and all visible at the same time, each with its twenty hands. On the heads and hands of all these are placed smaller idols, to the number of forty or more. The whole number of images is stated by the Japanese to be 33,000” (New American Cyclopaedia, volume 11, s.v.). Miako is also the head-quarters of literature, science, and  art. The imperial palace, on the northern side of the city, is, together with its ward, a town of itself. SEE JAPAN; SEE MIKADO.

## Miall, Edward[[@Headword:Miall, Edward]]

             an English Independent minister and journalist, was born at Portsmouth in 1809. He was educated at the Dissenters' College at Wymondley, Herts, and served for three years an Independent congregation at Ware, and afterwards one at Leicester. In 1841 he went to London, and established the Nonconformist, a paper in the interests of religious equality, becoming proprietor and editor, a position which he continued to occupy until his death, April 30, 1881. He was several times a representative in Parliament, and wrote numerous works on political and ecclesiastical subjects.

## Miamin[[@Headword:Miamin]]

             (Heb. Miyamin', מַיָּמַ,ִ a contracted form of the name Miniamin), the name of three persons after the exile.

1. (Sept. Μεϊαμείν v.r. Μεϊαμίν, Vulg. Maiman, Auth. Vers. “Mijamin.”) The head of the sixth division of the sacerdotal order as distributed by David (1Ch 24:9). B.C. 1014.

2. (Sept. Μεαμείν v.r. Μιαμίν,Vulg. viamiin.) One of the chief priests who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Neh 12:5). B.C. 536. He must have attained a great, age if identical with the priest who subscribed the religious covenant with Nehemiah (Neh 10:7, where the name is Anglicized “Mijamin”). B.C. cir. 410. . He is probably the same person called MINIAMIN in Neh 12:17, but his son's name appears there to have accidentally escaped from the text. SEE MOADIAH.

3. (Sept. Μεαμίν v.r. Μεαμίμ,Vulg. Miamin.) One of the Israelites, a “son” (i.e., inhabitant) of Parosh, who divorced his Gentile wife after the captivity (Ezr 10:25). B.C. 459.

## Miautse[[@Headword:Miautse]]

             the hill-tribes of China, are generally supposed to be the aborigines of that country. From the dawn of Chinese history, we find the people of the plains contending against those of the high lands, and to the present day the hardy mountaineers have maintained their independence. The Miautse consist of forty-one tribes, occupying large portions of Kwang-se, Kweichow, Yun-nan, Sze-chuen, and adjacent provinces. Some of them own Chinese sway; other tribes are absolutely independent. They are smaller in size and stature, and have shorter necks, and their features are somewhat more angular, than the Chinese. Their dialects are various, and wholly different from the Chinese; their affinity is most likely with the Laos and other tribes between Burmah, Siam, and China. Dr. Macgowan, a well- known ethnologist, describes them as skillful in manufacturing. He holds to an identity of the Miautse of Western China and the hill-tribes of Burmah. SEE KARENS. The degree of civilization they have attained to is much  below .that of the Chinese. Both sexes wear their hair braided in a tuft on the top of the head, but never shaven and twisted as the Chinese; they dress in loose garments of cotton and linen; ear-rings are in universal use among them. They live in huts constructed upon the branches of trees, and in mud hovels. Their agriculture is rude, and their garments are usually obtained by barter from other people. Their religious observances are of the same peculiar nature as those of the other Asiatic tribes uninfluenced by Christian civilization. Their marriage and funeral usages are particularly striking. In one tribe it is the custom for the father of the new-born child, as soon as the mother has become strong enough to leave her couch, to get into bed himself, and there receive the congratulations of his acquaintances as he exhibits his offspring. See Chinese Repository, 1:29; 14:105 sq.; Williams, The Middle Kingdom, I, 37, 147 sq.

## Mibhar[[@Headword:Mibhar]]

             (Heb. Mibchar', מַבְחָר, choice, as in Isa 22:7, etc.; Sept. Μαβάρ v.r. Μεβαάλ), a Hagarene (“son of Haggeri”), one of David's famous warriors (1Ch 11:38); apparently the same called in the parallel passage (2Sa 23:36) BANI the Gadite. B.C. 1046. SEE DAVID. “It is easy to see, if the latter be the true reading, how בָּנַי הִגָּדַי, Bani hag-gadi, could be corrupted into בֶּןאּהִגְּרַי, ben-hag-geri; and הגדי is actually the reading of three of Kennicott's MSS. in 1 Chronicles, as well as of the Syriac and Arabic versions, and the Targum of R. Joseph. But that ‘Mibhar' is a corruption of מַצֹּבָה (or מצבא, ace. to some MSS.), mitstsobah, ‘of Zobah,' as Kennicott (Dissert. p. 215) and Cappellus (Crit. Sacr. i,c. 5) conclude, is not so clear, though not absolutely impossible. It would seem from the Sept. of 2 Samuel, where instead of Zobah we find πολυδυνάμεως, that both readings originally co-existed, and were read by the Sept. מַבְחִר הִצָּבָא, -mibchar hats-tsaba, ‘choice of the host.' If this were the case, the verse in .1 Chronicles would stand thus: ‘Igal the brother of Nathan, flower of the host; Bani the Gadite.'”

## Mibsam[[@Headword:Mibsam]]

             (Heb. Mibsam', מַבְשָׂם, fragrance), the name of two men.

1. (Sept. Μασσάμ.v.r. in Chronicles Μαβσάν.) The fourth named of the twelve sons of Ishmael, and head of an Arabian tribe bearing his name (Gen 15:13; .1Ch 1:29). B.C. post 2061. “ The  signification of his name has led some to propose an identification of the tribe sprung from him with some one of the Abrahamic tribes settled in Arabia aromatifera, and a connection with the balsam of Arabia is suggested (Bunsel, Bibelwerk; Kalisch, Genesis, page 483). The situation of Mekkeh is well adapted for his settlements, surrounded as it is by traces of other Ishmaelitish tribes; nevertheless the identification seems fanciful and farfetched.” SEE ARABIA.

2. Sept. Μαβασαν v.r. Μαβασάμ.) The son of Shallurm and father of Michma, apparently the grandson of Shaul, a son of Simeon (1Ch 4:25). B.C. ante 1658.

## Mibzar[[@Headword:Mibzar]]

             (Heb. Mibtsar', מַבְצָר, fortress, as often; Sept. in Chronicles Μαβσάρ v.r. Βαβσάρ, in Genesis Μαζάρ). The ninth named of the petty Edomitish chieftains descended from Esau contemporary with the Horite kings (Gen 36:42; 1Ch 1:53). B.C. long post 1905. “These phylarchs are said to be enumerated ‘according to their settlements in the land of their possession;' and Knobel (Genesis), understanding Mibzar as the name of a place, has attempted to identify it with the rocky fastness of Petra,' the strong city' (עַיר מַבְצָר, ‘ir mibstar, Psa 108:11; comp. Psa 60:11). ‘ the cliff,' the chasms of which were the chief stronghold of the Edomites (Jer 49:16; Oba 1:3).” SEE EDOM.

## Mic-Mac Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Mic-Mac Version Of The Scriptures]]

             The Mic-Macs, or Souriquois of French writers, are a North American Indian tribe, inhabiting the peninsula of Nova Scotia, Prince Edward's Island, and the eastern portion of New Brunswick. A version of the Bible into that language is of recent origin. The gospels of Matthew and John were the first portions issued in 1854, by the British and Foreign Bible Society. In 1856 the book of Genesis and the gospel of Luke were also published, the translations being made by the Reverend S.T. Rand, who continued the work. Several portions of the Old Test., and the entire New Test. are at present published. The language has been treated by Maillard, Grammar of the Mic-Mac Language (1864). (B.P.).

## Micah[[@Headword:Micah]]

             (Heb. Mikah', מַיכָה [in Jdg 17:1; Jdg 17:4, the prolonged form Mika'yehu, מַיכָיְהוּ, is used], a contracted form of the name Micaiah; Sept. Μιχά, but Μιχαία in 2 Chronicles [18:14, where the name is for that of “Micaiah,” and is so rendered in the Auth. Vers.] 34:20; and Μιχαίας in Jer 26:18; Mic 1:1), the name of several men. SEE MICAIAH; SEE MICHAH; SEE MICHAIAH.

1. An Ephraimite, apparently contemporary with the elders who outlived Joshua. B.C. cir. 1590-1580. He secretly appropriated 1100 shekels of silver which his mother had saved; but being alarmed at her imprecations on the author of her loss, he confessed the matter to her, and restored the money. She then forgave him, and returned him the silver, to be applied to the use for which it had been accumulated. Two hundred' shekels of the  amount were given to the founder, as the cost or material of two teraphim, the one molten and the other graven; and the rest of the money served to cover the other expenses of the semi-idolatrous establishment formed in the house of Micah, of which a wandering Levite, named Jonathan, became the priest, at a yearly stipend (Judges 17). Subsequently the Danite army, on their journey to settle northward in Laish, took away both the establishment and the priest, which they afterwards maintained in their new settlement (Judges 17). SEE DAN; SEE JONATHAN.

The establishments of this kind, of which there are other instances — as that of Gideon at Ophrah — were, although most mistakenly, formed in honor of Jehovah, whom they thus sought to serve by means of a local worship, in imitation of that at Shiloh (see Kitto's Daily Bible Illustra. ad loc.). This was in direct contravention of the law, which allowed but one place of sacrifice and ceremonial service; and was something of the same kind, although different in extent and degree, as the service of the golden calves, which Jeroboam set up, and his successors maintained, in Dan and Bethel. The previous existence of Micah's establishment in the former city no doubt pointed it out to Jeroboam as a suitable place for one of his golden calves. — Kitto. SEE JEROBOAM. The preservation of the story here would seem to be owing to Micah's accidental connection with the colony of Danites who left the original seat of their tribe to conquer and found a new Dan at Laish-a most happy accident, for it has been the means of furnishing us with a picture of the “interior” of a private Israelitish family of the rural districts, which in many respects stands quite alone in the sacred records, and has probably no parallel in any literature of equal age. But apart from this the narrative has several points of special interest to students of Biblical history in the information which it affords as to the condition of the nation, of the members of which Micah was probably an average specimen.

(1.) We see how completely some of the most solemn and characteristic enactments of the law had become a dead letter. Micah was evidently a devout believer in Jehovah. While the Danites in their communications use the general term Elohim, “God” (“ask counsel of God,” Jdg 18:5; “God hath given it into your hands,” Jdg 18:10), with Micah and his household the case is quite different. His one anxiety is to enjoy the favor of Jehovah (Jdg 17:13); the formula of blessing used by his mother and his priest invokes the same awful name (Jdg 17:2; Jdg 18:6); and yet so completely ignorant is he of the law of Jehovah that the mode which he  adopts of honoring him is to make a molten and a graven image, teraphim or images of domestic gods, and to set up an unauthorized priesthood, first in his own family (Jdg 17:5), and then in the person of a Levite not of the priestly line (Jdg 17:12) — thus disobeying in the most flagrant manner the second of the Ten Commandments, and the provisions for the priesthood-laws both of which lay in a peculiar manner at the root of the religious existence of the nation. Gideon (Jdg 8:27) had established an ephod; but here was a whole chapel of idols, “a house of gods” (Jdg 17:5), and all dedicated to Jehovah.

(2.) The story also throws a light on the condition of the Levites. They were indeed “divided in Jacob and scattered in Israel” in a more literal sense than that prediction is usually taken to contain. Here we have a Levite belonging to Bethlehem-judah, a town not allotted to the Levites, and with which they had, as far as we know, no connection; next wandering forth, with the world before him, to take up his abode wherever he could find a residence; then undertaking, without hesitation, and for a mere pittance, the charge of Micah's idol-chapel; and, lastly, carrying off the property of his master and benefactor, and becoming the first priest to another system of false worship, one, too, in which Jehovah had no part, and which ultimately bore an important share in the disruption of the two kingdoms. It does not seem at all clear that the words “molten image” and “graven image” accurately express the original words Pesel and Massekah. SEE IDOL. As the Hebrew text now stands, the “graven image” only was carried off to Laish, and the “molten” one remained behind with Micah (Jdg 18:20; Jdg 18:30; comp. 18). True the Sept. adds the molten image in Jdg 18:20, but in Jdg 18:30 it agrees with the Hebrew text.

(3.) But the transaction becomes still more remarkable when we consider that this was no obscure or ordinary Levite. He belonged to the chief family in the tribe; nay, we may say to the chief family of the nation, for, though not himself a priest, he was closely allied to the priestly house, and was the grandson of no less a person than the great Moses himself. For the “Manasseh” in 18:30 is nothing less than an alteration of “Moses,” to shield that venerable name from the discredit which such a descendant would cast upon it. SEE MANASSEH, 3. In this fact we possibly have the explanation of the much-debated passage, Jdg 18:3 : “They knew the voice of the young man the Levite.” The grandson of the Lawgiver was not unlikely to be personally known to the Danites; when they heard his voice (whether in casual speech or in loud devotion we are not told) they  recognized it, and their inquiries as to who brought him hither, what he did there, and what he had there, were in this case the eager questions of old acquaintances long separated.

(4.) The narrative gives us a most vivid idea of the terrible anarchy in which the country was placed when “there was no king in Israel, and every man did what was right in his own eyes,” and shows how urgently necessary a central authority had become. A body of six hundred men completely armed, besides the train of their families and cattle, traverses the length and breadth of the land, not on any mission for the ruler or the nation, as on later occasions (2Sa 2:12, etc.; 2Sa 20:7; 2Sa 20:14), but simply for their private ends. Entirely disregarding the rights of private property, they burst in wherever they please along their route, and, plundering the valuables and carrying off persons, reply to all remonstrances by taunts and threats. The Turkish rule, to which the same district has now the misfortune to be subjected, can hardly be worse.

At the same time it is startling to our Western minds — accustomed to associate the blessings of order with religion — to observe how religious were these lawless freebooters: “Do ye know that in these houses there is an ephod, and teraphim, and a graven image, and a molten image? Now therefore -consider what ye have to do” (Jdg 18:14). “Hold thy peace and go with us, and be to us a father and a priest” (Jdg 18:19). —

(5.) As to the date of these interesting events, the narrative gives us no direct information beyond the fact that it was before the beginning of the monarchy; but we may at least infer that it was also before the time of Samson, because in this narrative (Jdg 17:12) we meet with the origin of the name of Mahaneh-dan, a place which already bore that name in Samson's childhood (Jdg 13:25, where it is translated in the Auth. Vers. “the camp of Dan”). That the Danites had opponents to their establishment in their proper territory before the Philistines entered the field is evident from Jdg 1:34. Josephus entirely omits the story of Micah, but he places the narrative of the Levite and his concubine, and the destruction of Gibeah (chapters 19:20, 21) — a document generally recognised as part of the same (see Bertheau, Kommentar, page 192) with the story of Micah, and that document by a different hand from the previous portions of the book at the very beginning of his account of the period of the judges, before Deborah or even Ehud (Ant. 5:2, 8-12). This is supported by the mention of Phinehas, the grandson of Aaron, in Jdg 20:28. An argument against the date being before the time of Deborah is drawn by Bertheau (page 197) from the fact that at that time the north of Palestine was in the possession of the Canaanites — “Jabin, king of Canaan, who reigned in Hazor,” in the immediate neighborhood of Laish. The records of the southern Dan are too scanty to permit our fixing the date from the statement that the Danites had not yet entered on their all of men that is to say, the allotment specified in Jos 19:40-48. But that statement strengthens the conclusion arrived at from other passages, that these lists in Joshua contain the towns allotted, but not therefore necessarily possessed by the various tribes. “ Divide the land first, in confidence, and then possess it afterwards,” seems to be the principle implied in such passages as Jos 13:7 (comp. 1); 19:49, 51 (Sept. “So they went to take possession of the land”).

The date of the insertion of the record may perhaps be more nearly arrived at. That, on the one hand, it was after the beginning of the monarchy is evident from the references to the ante-monarchical times (Jdg 18:1; Jdg 19:1; Jdg 21:25); and, on the other hand, we may perhaps infer from the name of Bethlehem being given as “Bethlehem-judah,” that it was before the fame of David had conferred on it a notoriety which would render any such affix unnecessary. The reference to the establishment of the house of God in Shiloh (Jdg 18:31) seems also to point to the early part of Saul's reign, before the incursions of the Philistines had made it necessary to remove the tabernacle and ephod to: Nob, in the vicinity of Gibeah, Saul's head- quarters. Some, like Le Clerc, argue for a later date, from the phrase, “until the day of the captivity of the land,” in Jdg 18:30, as if it necessarily referred to the Assyrian invasion. The reading is doubtful. Studer and Hitzig take the 30th verse as a later interpolation; Kimchi, Havernick, Hengstenberg, and Bleek refer the phrase to the captivity of the ark in the time of Eli, but on no good ground, unless the reading הָאָרֶוֹbe changed, as some prefer, into הָאָרוֹן. Stahelin and Ewald, regarding the verse as a later addition, place the composition about the period of Asa or Jehoshaphat; Stiahelin insisting, too, that the diction does not belong to the purer period of the language. Jdg 18:30; indeed, does not quite agree with 31, which seems to limit the duration of the Danite idolatry to the period of the station of the-ark at Shiloh; and the phrase, “until the day of the captivity,” as Keil remarks (Commentary, ad loc.), may refer to some unknown invasion on the part of the neighboring Syrians. Besides, it can scarcely be supposed that this idolatrous cultus, so directly and openly  opposed to the spirit and letter of the Mosaic law, would have been allowed to stand in the zealous days of Samuel and David. See Stanley's Lectures on the Jewish Church, pages 296, 297. SEE JUDGES, BOOK OF.

2. The son of Mephibosheth, or Meribbaal (son of Jonathan and grandson of king Saul), and the father of several sons (1Ch 8:34-35; 1Ch 9:40-41). B.C. post 1037. In 2Sa 9:2, he is called MICHA.

3. The first in rank of the priests of the Kohathite family of Uzziel, under the sacerdotal arrangement by David (1Ch 23:20). B.C. 1014. He had a son named Shamir, and a brother Isshiah (1Ch 24:24-25; Auth. Vers. “Michah”).

4. The son of Shimei and father of Reaia, of the descendants of Reuben (1Ch 5:5). B.C. ante 782.

5. A prophet, apparently of the kingdom of Judah, and contemporary with Isaiah (Mic 1:1). B.C. cir. 750. He is styled “the Morasthite,” as being a native of Moresheth of Gath (Mic 1:14-15), so called to distinguish it from another town of the same name in the tribe of Judah (Jos 15:44; 2Ch 14:9-10). Micah is thus likewise distinguished from a former prophet of the same name; called also Micaiah, mentioned in 1Ki 22:8. The above place of Micah's birth “Jerome and Eusebius call Morasthi, and identify ‘with a small village called Eleutheropolis, to the east, where formerly the prophet's tomb was shown, but which in the days of Jerome had been succeeded by a church (Epit. Paulle, c. 6). As little is known of the circumstances of Micah's life as of many of the other prophets. Pseudo Epiphanius (Opp. 2:245) makes him, contrary to all probability, of the tribe of Ephraim; and besides confounding him with Micaiah the son of Imlah, who lived more than a century before, he betrays additional ignorance in describing Ahab as king of Judah. For rebuking this monarch's son and successor Jehoram for his impieties, Micah, according to the same authority, was thrown from a precipice, and buried at Morathi in his own country, hard by the cemetery of Enakim' (Ε᾿νακείμ, a place which apparently exists only in the Sept. of Mic 1:10), where his sepulchre was still to be seen. The Chronicon Paschale (page 148 c) tells the same tale. Another ecclesiastical tradition relates that the remains of Habakkuk and Micah were revealed in a vision to Zebennus, bishop of Eleutheropolis, in the reign of Theodosius the Great, near a place called Berathsatia, which is apparently a corruption of Morasthi (Sozomen. H.E.  7:29; Nicephorus, H.E. 12:48). The prophet's tomb was called by the inhabitants Nephsameemana, which Sozomen renders μνῆμαπιστόν.”

## Micah, Book Of[[@Headword:Micah, Book Of]]

             the sixth of the minor prophets in the usual arrangement, but the third in the Sept. (after Hosea and Amos). In the following account of it we treat in special detail those points that have created controversies in modern times.

I. The Name. — This, which the prophet bears in common with the other persons above and below, is found with considerable variation in the Heb. and A.V. The full form is מַיכָיָּהוּ, Mikaya'hu, “who is like Jehovah,” which is found in 2Ch 13:2; 2Ch 17:7. This is abbreviated to מַיכָיְהוּ, Mikayehu, in Jdg 17:1; Jdg 17:4; still further to מַכָיְהוּ, Mika'yehu (Jer 36:11), מַיכָיָה, Mikayah' (1Ki 22:13); and finally to, מַיכָה, Mikah', or מַיכָא, Mika' (2Sa 9:12).

II. Date. — The period during which Micah exercised the prophetical office is stated, in the superscription to his Proverbs 6 phecies, to have extended over the reigns of Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah, giving thus a maximum limit of 59 years (B.C. 756-697), from the accession of Jotham to the death of Hezekiah, and a minimum limit of 16 years (B.C. 742-726), from the death of Jotham to the accession of Hezekiah. In either case he would be contemporary with Hosea and Amos during part of their ministry in Israel, and with Isaiah in Judah. According to rabbinical tradition, he transmitted to the prophets Joel, Nahum, and Habakkuk, and to Seraiah the priest the mysteries of the Kabbala, which he had received from Isaiah (R. David Ganz. Tsemach David), and by Syncellas (Chronogr. page 199 c) he is enumerated in the reign of Jotham as contemporary with Hosea, Joel, Isaiah, and. Oded. The date of the book itself may be fixed at about B.C. 725. His prediction with impunity of the desolation of Jerusalem (Mic 3:12) is expressly alluded to in Jeremiah (Jer 26:18, where the text has מַיכָיֹה, Micaiah), as having been uttered during the reign of Hezekiah. The allusions to idolatry (Mic 7:13) and to Babylon (Mic 4:10) have induced Berthold (Einleitung, § 411) to refer the prophecy of Micah to the time of the captivity; but De Wette truly observes that this supposition is unnecessary, as idolatry existed under Hezekiah (2 Kings 23), and Babylon equally belonged to the kingdom of Assyria. Hartmann's attempt to regard the passage respecting Babylon as  an interpolation (see Micha neu ubersetzt), De Wette regards as even still more venturesome; nor had this writer the slightest authority for supposing that some only of the prophecies are Micah's, and that the work was compiled during the exile. The time assigned to the prophecies by the only direct evidence which we possess agrees so well with their contents that it may fairly be accepted as correct.

Why any discrepancy should be perceived between the statement in Jeremiah, that “Micah the Morasthite prophesied in the days of Hezekiah king of Judah,” and the title of his book, which tells us that the word of the Lord came to him “in the days of Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah,” it is difficult to imagine. The former does not limit the period of Micah's prophecy, and at most applies only to the passage to which direct allusion is made. Aconfusion appears to have existed in the minds of those who see in the prophecy in its present form a connected whole, between the actual delivery of the several portions of it, and their collection and transcription into one book. In the case of Jeremiah, we know that he dictated to Baruch the prophecies which he had delivered in the interval between the 13th year of Josiah and the 4th of Jehoiakim, and that when thus committed to writing they were read before the people on the fast day (Jer 36:2; Jer 36:4; Jer 36:6). There is reason to believe that a similar process took place with the prophecies of Amos. It is, therefore, conceivable, to say the least, that certain portions of Micah's prophecy may have been uttered in the reigns of Jotham and Ahaz, and for the probability of this there is strong internal evidence, while they were collected as a whole in the reign of Hezekiah and committed to writing. Caspari (Micha, page 78) suggests that the book thus written .may have been read in the presence of the king and the whole people on, some great fast or festival day, and that this circumstance may have been in-the minds of the elders of the land in the time of Jehoiakim, when they appealed to the. impunity which Micah enjoyed under Hezekiah. Knobel (Prophetismus, 2:§,20) imagines that the prophecies which remain belong to the time of Hezekiah, and that those delivered-under Jotham and Ahaz have perished. It is evident from Mic 1:6 that the section of the prophecy in which that verse occurs must have been delivered before the destruction of Samaria by Shalmaneser, which took place in the 6th year of Hezekiah (cir. B.C. 722), and connecting the “high-places” mentioned in Mic 1:5 with those which existed in Judah in the reigns of Ahaz (2Ki 16:4; 2Ch 28:4; 2Ch 28:25) and Jotham (2Ki 15:35), we may be justified in assigning chap. 1 to the time of one of these monarchs,  probably the latter; although, if chap. ii be considered as part of the section to which chapter 1 belongs, the utter corruption and demoralization of the people there depicted agree better with what history tells us of the times of Ahaz. Caspari maintains that of the two parallel passages, Mic 4:1-5, Isa 2:2-5, the former is the original, and the latter belongs to the times of Uzziah and Jotham, and this view is maintained by Hengstenberg (Christology, 1:480), and accepted by Pusey (Minor Prophets, page 289). But the evidence on the point is not at all conclusive: Mic 4:1-4 may possibly, as Ewald and others have suggested, be a portion of an older prophecy current at the time, which was adopted by both Micah and Isaiah (Isa 2:2-4). The denunciation of the horses and chariots of Judah (5:10) is appropriate to the state of the country under Jotham, after the long and prosperous reign of Uzziah, by whom the military strength of the people had been greatly developed (2Ch 26:11-15; 2Ch 27:4-6). Compare Isa 2:7, which belongs to the same period. Again, the forms in which idolatry manifested itself in the reign of Ahaz correspond with those which are threatened with destruction in Mic 5:12-14; and the allusions in 6:16 to the “statutes of Omri,” and the “works of the house of Ahab,” seem directly pointed at the king, of whom it is expressly said that “he walked in the way of the kings of Israel” (2Ki 16:3). It is impossible in dealing with internal evidence to assert positively that the inferences deduced from it are correct; but in the present instance they at least establish a probability that, in placing the period of Micah's prophetical activity between the times of Jotham and Hezekiah, the superscription is correct. In the first years of Hezekiah's reign the idolatry which prevailed in the time of Ahaz was not eradicated, and in assigning the date of Micah's prophecy to this period there is no anachronism in the allusions to idolatrous practices. Maurer contends that chap. 1 was written not long before the taking of Samaria; but the third and following chapters he places in the interval between the destruction of Samaria and the, time that Jerusalem was menaced by the army of Sennacherib in the 14th year of Hezekiah. The passages, however, which he quotes in support of his conclusion: (Mic 3:12; Mic 4:9, etc.; Mic 5:5, etc.; Mic 6:9, etc.; Mic 7:4; Mic 7:12, etc.) do not appear to be more suitable to that period than to the first years of Hezekiah, while the context, in many cases, requires a still earlier date. In the arrangement adopted by Wells (pref. to Micah, § 4-6), chapter 1 was delivered in the contemporary reigns of Jotham king of Judah and of Pekah king of Israel; Mic 2:1 to Mic 4:8 in  those of Ahaz, Pekah, and Hosea; Mic 3:12 being assigned to the last year of Ahaz, and the remainder of the book to the reign of Hezekiah.

It is remarkable that the prophecies commence with the last words recorded of the prophet's namesake, Micaiah the son of Imlah, “Hearken, O people, every one of you” (1Ki 22:28). From this, Bleek (Einleitung, page 539) concludes that the author of the history, like the ecclesiastical historians, confounded Micah the Morasthite with Micaiah; while Hengstenberg (Christology, 1:409, Eng. tr.) infers that the coincidence was intentional on the part of the later prophet, and that “by this very circumstance he gives intimation of what may be expected from him, and shows that his activity is to be considered as a continuation of that of his predecessor, who was so jealous for God, and that he had more in common with him than the mere name.” Either conclusion rests on the extremely slight foundation of the occurrence of a formula which was at once the most simple and most natural commencement of a prophetic discourse.

III. Contents. — But, at whatever time the several prophecies were first delivered, they appear in their present form as an organic whole, marked by a certain regularity of development. Three sections, omitting the superscription, are introduced by the same phrase, שַׁמְעוּ, “Hear ye,” and represent three natural divisions of the prophecy — 1-2, 3-5, 6-7 — each commencing with rebukes and threatenings, and closing with a promise.

1. The first section opens with a magnificent description of the coming of Jehovah to judgment for the sins and idolatries of Israel and Judah (Mic 1:2-4), and the sentence pronounced upon Samaria (Mic 1:5-9) by the Judge himself. The prophet, whose sympathies are strong with Judah, and especially with the lowlands which gave him birth, sees the danger that threatens his country, and traces in imagination the devastating march of the Assyrian conquerors from Samaria onward to Jerusalem and the south (Mic 1:8-16). The impending punishment suggests its cause, and the prophet denounces a woe upon the people generally for the corruption and violence which were rife among them, and upon the false prophets who led them astray by pandering to their appetites and luxury (Mic 2:1-11). The sentence of captivity is passed upon them (Mic 2:10), but is followed instantly by a promise of restoration and triumphant return (Mic 2:12-13).  2. The second section is addressed especially to the princes and heads of the people; their avarice and rapacity are rebuked in strong terms; and as they have been deaf to the cry of the suppliants for justice, they too “shall cry unto Jehovah, but he will not hear them” (Mic 3:1-4). The false prophets who had deceived others should themselves be deceived; “the sun shall go down over the prophets, and the day shall be dark over them” (Mic 3:6). For this perversion of justice and right, and the covetousness of the heads of the people who judged for reward, of the priests who taught for hire, and of the prophets who divined for money, Zion should “be ploughed as a field,” and the mountain of the temple become like the uncultivated woodland heights (Mic 3:9-12). But the threatening is again succeeded by a promise of restoration, and in the glories of the Messianic kingdom the prophet loses sight of the desolation which should befall his country. Instead of the temple mountain covered with the wild growth of the forest, he sees the mountain of the house of Jehovah established on the top of the mountains, and nations flowing like rivers unto it. The reign of peace is inaugurated by the recall from captivity, and Jehovah sits as king in Zion, having destroyed the nations who had rejoiced in her overthrow. The predictions at the close of this section form the climax of the book, and Ewald arranges them in four strophes, consisting of seven or eight verses each (Mic 4:1-8; Mic 5:3-15), with the exception of the last, which is shorter, and in which the prophet reverts to the point whence he started: all objects of politic and idolatrous confidence must be removed before the grand consummation.

3. In the last section (6, 7) Jehovah, by a bold poetical figure, is represented as holding a controversy with his people, pleading with them in justification of his conduct towards them and the reasonableness of his requirements. The dialogue form in which chapter 6 is cast renders the picture very dramatic and striking. In Mic 6:3-5 Jehovah speaks; the inquiry of the people follows in Mic 6:6, indicating their entire ignorance of what was required of them; their inquiry is met by the almost impatient rejoinder, “Will Jehovah be pleased with thousands of rams, with myriads of torrents of oil?” The still greater sacrifice suggested by the people, “Shall I give my first-born for my transgressions?” calls forth the definition of their true duty, “to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with their God.” How far they had fallen short of this requirement is shown in what follows (Mic 6:9-12), and judgment is pronounced upon them  (Mic 6:13-16). The prophet acknowledges and bewails the justice of the sentence (Mic 7:1-6), the people in repentance patiently look to God, confident that their prayer will be heard (Mic 7:7-10), and are reassured by the promise of deliverance announced as following their punishment (Mic 7:11-13) by the prophet, who in his turn presents his petition to Jehovah for the restoration of his people (Mic 7:14-15). The whole concludes with a triumphal song of joy at the great deliverance, like that from Egypt, which Jehovah will achieve, and a full acknowledgment of his mercy and faithfulness to his promises (Mic 7:16-20). The last verse is reproduced in the song of Zacharias (Luk 1:72-73).

The predictions uttered by Micah relate to the invasions of Shalmaneser (Mic 1:6-8; 2Ki 17:4; 2Ki 17:6) and Sennacherib (1:9-16; 2Ki 18:13), the destruction of Jerusalem (Mic 3:12; Mic 7:13), the captivity in Babylon (Mic 4:10), the return (Mic 4:1-8; Mic 7:11), the establishment of a theocratic kingdom in Jerusalem (Mic 4:8), and the Ruler who should spring from Bethlehem (Mic 5:2). The destruction of Assyria and Babylon is supposed to be referred to in Mic 5:5-6; Mic 7:8; Mic 7:10. According to many, Mic 4:13 refers to the heroic deeds of the Maccabees, and their victories over the Syrians or Syro-Macedonians, called Assyrians in Micah 5, as well as in Zec 10:11.

There is no prophecy in Micah so interesting to the Christian as that in which the native place of the Messiah is announced (Mic 5:2), which is cited by the evangelist (Mat 2:6) with slight verbal variations, but substantially the same import (see Kuinil, Comment. ad loc. Mat.). In Micah emphasis is laid on the actual smallness of Bethlehem to enjoy such an honor; in Matthew the prominent idea is the honor itself, and its ideal grandeur — the converse side of the statement. Pocock cuts the knot by adopting rabbi Tanchum's odd opinion that the term צָעַיר means both little and great, the prophet selecting the one sense and the evangelist the,other. It is evident that the Jews in the time of Jesus interpreted this passage of the birthplace of the Messiah (Mat 2:5; Joh 7:41-42). The Targum gives the reference formally to the Messiah. The later rabbinical writers, however, such as Kimchi, Aben-Ezra, Abrabanel, etc., have maintained that it had only an indirect reference to the birthplace of the Messiah, who was to be a descendant of David, a Bethlehemite, but not of necessity himself born in Bethlehem. Others, however, as David Ganz (B. Zemach David), expressly mention Bethlehem as the birthplace of the Messiah.

The interpretation which considered this prophecy as intimating  only that the Messiah was to be a descendant of David, was that current among the Jews in the time of Theodoret, Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Euthymius Zigabenus, from whom we learn that it was maintained to have been fulfilled in Zerubbabel, the leader of the Jews on their return from Babylon, of which, and not of Bethlehem, he was a native. (See Sozomen, 7:729; Carpzov, Introd. 3:374 sq.; Jerome, Ep. ad Eustach. 1:704.) This interpretation was held among Christians by the celebrated Theodore of Mopsuestia (as we learn from his condemnation by the council at Rome under pope Vigilius), and afterwards by Grotius (Comment.), who, however, regarded Zerubbabel as a type of Christ, and considered Christ's birthplace at Bethlehem as an outward representation of his descent from the family of David. Many of the moderns have been attached to this interpretation of the prophecy, referring it to the general idea of the Messiah rather than to Zerubbabel, while some among them have, after the example of some Jews, ventured to assert that the account of the birth of Christ at Bethlehem was not to be depended on. Some have asserted, after Jerome (Comm. in Micah), that the citation in Mat 2:6 is that of the Sanhedrim only, not of the evangelist (Hengstenberg's Christology). Jahn (Append. Hermeneut.) observes that it is evident that the Jews in the time of Christ expected the Messiah's birth to take place at Bethlehem; and although he admits that the prophecy may be understood tropically in the sense applied to it by Grotius, he contends that the context will not admit of its applicability either to Hezekiah or any other monarch than the Messiah; nor is it possible to apply the prophecy fully and literally to any but him who was not only of the house and lineage of David, but was actually born at Bethlehem, according to the direct testimony of both Matthew's and Luke's gospels. The plain meaning is that the Messiah, as David's son, should be born in David's town (Hofmann, Weiss. u. Erf. page 249). Tertullian also presses the argument that the Messiah has come, for Bethlehem was deserted — “Neminem de genere Israel in civitate Bethlehem remansisse” (Adv. Judeos, volume 13; Opera, 2:734, ed. Oehler). To give the vague sense of Davidic extraction, and yet to deny that the words point out the place of birth, was thus a necessary but feeble Jewish subterfuge. Ronan admits the usual interpretation of the prophecy, though he affirms that Jesus was really not of the family of David, and was born at Nazareth (Vie de Jesus, chapter 2). (See generally, Eichhorn, Einleit. 4:369 sq.; Bertheau, Einl. 4:1633 sq.; Knobel, Prophet. 3:199 sq.) SEE MESSIAH.

IV. The genuineness of the book has not. been called in question. Only Ewald, in his Jahrb. 11:29, is disposed to maintain that the two concluding chapters are the work of a different author. His objections, however, have no force against the universal opinion. The language of Micah is quoted in Mat 2:5-6, and his prophecies are alluded to in Mat 10:35-36; Mar 13:12; Luk 12:53; Joh 7:42.

V. The style of Micah is rich, full, and musical — as nervous, vehement, and bold, in many sections, as Hosea, and as abrupt, too, in transitions from menace to mercy. He presents, at the same time, no little resemblance to Isaiah in grandeur of thought, in richness and variety of imagery, and in roundness and cadence of parallelism. The similarity of their subjects may account for many resemblances in language with the latter prophet, which were almost unavoidable (comp. Mic 1:2 with Isa 1:2 : Mic 2:2 with Isa 5:8 ; Mic 2:6; Mic 2:11 with Isa 30:10; Mic 2:12 with Isa 10:20-22; Mic 1:6-8 with Isa 1:11-17). The diction of Micah is vigorous and forcible, sometimes obscure from the abruptness of its transitions, but varied and rich in figures derived from the pastoral (Mic 1:8; Mic 2:12; Mic 5:4-5; Mic 5:7-8; Mic 7:14) and rural life of the lowland country (Mic 1:6; Mic 3:12; Mic 4:3; Mic 4:12-13; Mic 6:15), whose vines, and olives, and figtrees were celebrated (1Ch 27:27-28), and supply the prophet with so many striking allusions (Mic 1:6; Mic 4:3-4; Mic 6:15; Mic 7:1; Mic 7:4) as to suggest that, like Amos, he may have been either a herdsman or a vine-dresser who had heard the howling of the jackals (Mic 1:8; A.Vers. “dragons”) as he watched his flocks or his vines by night, and had seen the lions slaughtering the sheep (Mic 5:8). The sudden changes are frequently hidden from the English reader, because our version interprets as well as translates; the simple connective 1 being often rendered by some logical term, as “therefore” (Mic 1:6), “then” (Mic 3:7), “but” (Mic 4:1), “notwithstanding” (Mic 7:13), etc. Concise and pointed questions are put suddenly; persons are changed rapidly; the people are spoken of, and then in a moment spoken to; the nation is addressed now as a unit, and now edged appeals are directed to individuals. The language is quite pure and classical-intercourse with northern countries had not yet debased it. An under-tone of deep earnestness pervades the book; everywhere are discerned the workings of an intensely honorable and patriotic soul. Micah is successful in the use of the dialogue, and his prophecies are penetrated by the purest spirit of morality and piety (see especially 6:6-8; and 7:1-10).  One peculiarity which Micah has in common with Isaiah is the frequent use of paronomasia; in Mic 1:10-15 there is a succession of instances of this figure in the plays upon words suggested by the various places enumerated (comp. also Mic 2:4), which it is impossible to transfer to English, though Ewald has attempted to render them into German (Propheten des A. B. 1:329, 330).

In these verses there is also vivid grouping, as place after place is challenged along the line of the conqueror's march. Each town is seen to carry its doom in its very name. That doom is told in many ways either to them or of them; either in the prophet's name or as a divine burden; either as an event about to come or as a judgment which will certainly overtake them. Perhaps in Mic 7:18 there is an allusion to the meaning of the prophet's own name. The divine name which appears with greatest frequency is, as is usual with the prophets, Jehovah; but we also meet with Adonai and Adonai Jehovah (Mic 1:2), also “the Lord of the whole earth” (Mic 2:13), and “Jehovah of hosts” (Mic 4:4). Elohim is used distinctively of the divine as opposed to the human in Mic 3:7. Allusions to the past history of the people are found in many places. There are also several expressions which are found in the Mosaic writings, though it might be rash to say that Micah takes them directly from the Pentateuch. Nor would we endorse all the instances in which, as Caspari affirms, later prophets, as Jeremiah and Ezekiel, Habakkuk and Zephaniah, have adopted the language of Micah (Micha, page 449, etc.). The poetic vigor of the opening scene, and of the dramatic dialogue sustained throughout the last two chapters, has already been noticed.

VI. Commentaries. — The following are the especial exegetical helps on the whole book alone, to a few of the most important of which we prefix an asterisk: Ephrem Syrus, Explanatio (in Opp. 5:272): Theophylact, Commentarius (in Opp. volume 4) ; Luther, Commentarius (ed. Theodore, Vitemb. 1542, 8vo; also in his Works, both Germ. and Lat.); Brentz, Conmnentaria (in Opp. volume 4): Gerlach, Commentarius (Aug. Vind. 1524, 8vo); Bibliander, Commentarius (Tigur. 1534, 8vo); Phrygio, Commentarius (Argent. 1538, 8vo); Gilby, Commentary (Lond. 1551, 1591, 8vo); Chytraeus, Explicatio [includ. Nehemiah] (Vitemb. 1565, 8vo); Draconis, Explicatio [includ. Joel and Zechariah] (Vitemb. 1565, 8vo); Graxar, Comnzentarius (Salmant. 1570, 8vo); Selnecker, Anmersckunqen (Leips. 1578, 4to); Bang, Fontium trias [includ. Jonah and Ruth] (Hafn. 1631, 8vo); Graver, Expositio (Jen. 1619, 1664, 4to);  \*Pocock, Commentary (Oxf. 1677, fol.; also in Works); Van Toll, Vitleyginge (Utrecht, 1709; 4to); Schnurrer, Animadversiones (Tibing. 1783, 4to); Buer, Aninadversiones [on chapter 1, 2] (Altorf, 1790,4to); Grosschopff Uebersetzung (Jena, 1798, 8vo); \*Justi, Erlauterung (Leips. 1799, 8vo); \*Hartmann, Erlauterung (Lemgo, 1800,8vo); Wolf, טְהוֹרָה מַנְחָה(Dessau, 1805, 8vo); Gliemann, Illustratio (Hall. 1842, 4to); \*Caspari, Micha der Morasthiter (Marb. 1852, 8vo); Roorda, Commentarius (Leyd. 1869, 8vo). SEE PROPHETS, MINOR.

6. The father of Abdon (2Ch 34:20); elsewhere called MICHAIAH, the father of Achbor (2Ki 22:12).

7. A Levite of the descendants of Asaph (1Ch 9:15); elsewhere properly called MICHA(Neh 11:17; Neh 11:22).

## Micaiah[[@Headword:Micaiah]]

             the prevailing form of the name of several persons (one a Levite, 2Ch 13:2), written with considerable diversity in the original and in the ancient translations, as well as the Auth. Vers. (properly, for Heb. Mikayah', מַיכָיָה, who is like Jehovah? 2Ki 22:12; Sept. Μιχαίας, Vulg. Micha, Auth. Vers. “Michaiah,” Neh 12:35, Μιχαία, Michaja, “Michaiah ;” Neh 12:41, Μιχαίας, Michaea, “Michaiah;” Jer 26:18, Μιχαίας, Michaeas, “Micah;” paragogically, Heb. Mikah'yehu, מַיכָיְהוּ; Jdg 17:1; Jdg 17:4, Μιχά, Michas, “Micah;” 1Ki 22:8-9; 1Ki 22:13-15; 1Ki 22:24-26; 1Ki 22:28, Μιχαίας, Micheas, “Micaiah;” 2Ch 18:7-8; 2Ch 18:12-13; 2Ch 18:23-25; 2Ch 18:27, Μιχαίας, Michaeas, “Micaiah;” Jer 36:11; Jer 36:13, Μιχαίας, Michaeas, “Michaiah;” fully, Heb. Mikaya'hut 2Ch 13:2, Μααχά, Michaja, “Michaiah “ 2Ch 17:7, Μιχαίας, Micheas, “Michaiah;” contracted, Heb. Mikah', מַיכָה; Jdg 17:5; Jdg 17:8-10; Jdg 17:12-13; Jdg 18:2-4; Jdg 18:13; Jdg 18:15; Jdg 18:18; Jdg 18:22-23; Jdg 18:26-27; Jdg 18:31, Μιχά, Michas, “Micah;” 1Ch 5:5; 1Ch 8:34-35; 1Ch 9:40-41; 1Ch 23:20, Μιχά, Michas, “Micah;” 1Ch 24:24-25, Μιχά, Micha, “Michah;” 2Ch 18:14, Μιχαίας, Michaeas, “Micaiah;” 2Ch 34:20, Μιχαία, Micha, “Micah;” Jer 26:11 Μιχαίας v.r. Μιχέας and Μηχαίας, Michtas, “Micah” Mic 1:1, Μιχαίας, Michaeas, “Micah;” by Chaldaism, Mika', מַיכָא; 2Sa 9:12, and Neh 10:11; Neh 11:17, Μιχά, Μιχά, “Micha;” 1Ch 9:15, Μιχά, Micha,  “Micah;” Neh 11:22, Μιχά, Michas, “Micha”). The only person invariably thus called was the son of Imla, and a prophet of Samaria (1Ki 22:13; 2 Chronicles 18). B.C. 895.

The following abstract of the narrative concerning him is sufficiently copious on certain disputed points. Three years after the great battle with Benhadad, king of Syria, in which the extraordinary number of 100,000 Syrian soldiers is said to have been slain, without reckoning the 27,000 who, it is asserted, were killed by the falling of the wall at Aphek, Ahab proposed to Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, that they should jointly go up to battle against Ramoth-Gilead: which Benhadad was, apparently, bound by treaty to restore to Ahab. Jehoshaphat, whose son Jehoram had married Athaliah, Ahab's daughter, assented in cordial words to the proposal; but suggested that they should first “inquire at the word of Jehovah.” Accordingly, Ahab assembled 400 prophets, while, in an open space at the gate of the city of Samaria, he and Jehoshaphat sat in royal robes to meet and consult them. “That these were, however, no true prophets of Jehovah, is evident from their being afterwards emphatically designated Ahab's prophets, in contradistinction to the Lord's (2Ch 18:22-23). It is evident also from the suspicion created in the mind of Jehoshaphat respecting their character by their manner and appearance; for, after they had all spoken, and as having yet to learn the real purpose of heaven, Jehoshaphat asked whether there was not yet a prophet of Jehovah. In consequence of this request Micaiah was mentioned by Ahab, but with the notification that he hated him, ‘for he doth not prophesy good concerning me, but evil' (2Ch 18:8); which, in the circumstances, cannot be regarded otherwise than as a further proof of the essential difference between the actual position of this man and the others who assumed the name of prophets of the Lord.”

The prophets unanimously gave a favorable response; and among them, Zedekiah, the son of Chenaanah, made horns of iron as a symbol, and announced, from Jehovah. that with those horns Ahab would push the Syrians till he consumed them. For some reason which is unexplained, and can now only be conjectured, Jehoshaphat was dissatisfied with the answer, and asked if there was no other prophet of Jehovah at Samaria? Ahab replied that there was yet one, Micaiah, the son of Imla; but, in words which obviously call to mind a passage in the Iliad (1:106), he added, “I hate him, for he does not prophesy good concerning me, but evil.” Micaiah was, nevertheless, sent. for; and after an attempt had in vain been made to tamper with him, he first expressed an ironical concurrence with the 400 prophets, and then openly foretold the defeat of Ahab's army and the death of Ahab himself.  In opposition to the other prophets, he said that he had seen Jehovah sitting on his throne, and all the host of heaven standing by him, on his right hand and on his left: that Jehovah said, Who shall persuade Ahab to go up and fall at Ramoth-Gilead; that a spirit (the Heb. has the art. the spirit, as if some special emissary of evil) came forth and said that he would do so; and on being asked, Wherewith? he answered, that he would go forth and be a lying spirit in the mouth of all the prophets. Irritated by the account of this vision, Zedekiah struck Micaiah on the cheek, and Ahab ordered Micaiah to be taken to prison, and fed on bread and water, till his return to Samaria. Ahab then went up with his army to Ramoth-Gilead; and in the battle which ensued, Benhadad, who could not have failed to become acquainted with Micaiah's prophecy, uttered so publicly, which had even led to an act of public personal violence on the part of Zedekiah, gave special orders to direct the attack against Ahab, individually. Ahab, on the other hand, requested Jehoshaphat to wear his royal robes, which we know that the king of Judah had brought with him to Samaria (1Ki 22:10); and then he put himself into disguise for the battle; hoping thus, probably, to baffle the designs of Benhadad and the prediction of Micaiah; but he was, nevertheless, struck and mortally wounded in the combat by a random arrow. We hear nothing further of the prophet. Josephus dwells emphatically on the death of Ahab. as showing the utility of prophecy, and the impossibility of escaping destiny, even when it is revealed beforehand (Ant. 8:15, 6). He says that it steals on human souls, flattering them with cheerful hopes, till it leads them round to the point whence it will gain the mastery over them. This was a theme familiar to the Greeks in many tragic tales, and Josephus uses words in unison with their ideas. (See Euripides, Hippolyt. 1256, and compare Herodot. 7:17; 8:77; 1:91).

From his interest in the story, Josephus relates several details not contained in the Bible, some of which are probable, while others are very unlikely; but for none of which does he give any authority. Thus. he says, Micaiah was already in prison when sent for to prophesy before Ahah and Jehoshaphat, and that it was Micaiah who had predicted death by a lion to the son of a prophet, under the circumstances mentioned in 1Ki 20:35-36; and had rebuked Ahab after his brilliant victory over the Syrians for not putting Benhadad to death. There is no doubt that these facts would be not only consistent with the narrative in the Bible, but would throw additional light upon it; for the rebuke of Ahab in his hour of triumph, on account of his forbearance, was calculated to excite in him the intensest feeling of displeasure and mortification; and it would at once explain Ahab's hatred  of Micaiah, if Micaiah was the prophet by whom the rebuke was given. Nor is it unlikely that Ahab, in his resentment, might have caused Micaiah to be thrown into prison, just as the princes of Judah, about 300 years later, maltreated Jeremiah in the same way (Jer 37:15). But some other statements of Josephus ‘cannot so readily be regarded as probable. Thus he relates that, when Ahab disguised himself, he gave his own royal robes to be worn by Jehoshaphat in the battle of Ramoth-Gilead, an act which would have been so unreasonable and cowardly in Ahab, and would have shown such singular complaisance in Jehoshaphat, that, although supported by the translation in the Septuagint, it cannot be received as true. The fact that some of. the Syrian captains mistook Jehoshaphat for Ahab is fully explained by Jehoshaphat's being the only person in the army of Israel who wore royal robes. Again, Josephus informs us that Zedekiah alleged, as a reason for disregarding Micaiah's prediction, that it was directly at variance with the prophecy of Elijah, that dogs should lick the blood of Ahab, where dogs had licked the blood of Naboth, in the city of Samaria: inasmuch as Ramoth-Gilead, where, according to Micaiah, Ahab was to meet his doom, was distant from Samaria a journey of three days. It is unlikely, however, that Zedekiah would have founded an argument on Elijah's insulting prophecy, even to the meekest of kings who might have been the subject of it; but that, in order to prove himself in the right as against Micaiah, he should have ventured on such an allusion to a person of Ahab's character, is absolutely incredible. SEE AHAB.

It only remains to add, that the history of Micaiah offers several points of interest, among which the two following may be specified:

1. Micaiah's vision presents what may be regarded as transitional ideas of one origin of evil actions. In Exodus, Jehovah himself is represented as directly hardening Pharaoh's heart (Exo 7:3; Exo 7:13; Exo 14:4; Exo 14:17; Exo 10:20; Exo 10:27). In the Book of Job, the name of Satan is mentiolled; but he is admitted without rebuke, among the sons of God, into the presence of Jehovah (Job 1:6-12). After the captivity, the idea of Satan, as an independent principle of evil, in direct opposition to goodness, becomes fully established (1Ch 21:1; and compare Wis 2:24). SEE SATAN. Now the ideas presented in the vision of Micaiah are different from each of these three, and occupy a place of their own. They do not go so far as the Book of Job much less so far as the ideas current after the captivity; but they go farther than Exodus.. See Ewald, Poet. Biicher, 3:65.  2. The history of Micaiah is an exemplification in practice of contradictory predictions being made by different prophets. Other striking instances occur in the time of Jeremiah (Jer 14:13-14; Jer 28:15-16; Jer 23:16; Jer 23:25; Jer 23:2-6). The only rule bearing on the judgment to be formed under such circumstances seems to have. been a negative one, which would be mainly useful after the event. It is laid down in Deu 18:21-22, where the question is asked, how the children of Israel were to know the word which Jehovah had not spoken? The solution is, that “if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which Jehovah has not spoken.” SEE PROPHET.

## Mice[[@Headword:Mice]]

             SEE MOUSE.

## Micha[[@Headword:Micha]]

             (for the Heb., etc., see MICAIAH), the name of three men.

1. Ason of Mephibosheth (2Sa 9:12); elsewhere (1Ch 8:34-35) called MICAH SEE MICAH (q.v.).

2. The son of Zabdi and father of Mattaniah, a Levite of the family of Asaph (Neh 11:17; Neh 11:22); probably the same that-joined in the sacred covenant after the captivity (Neh 10:11). B.C. cir. 410. In 1Ch 9:15 his name is incorrectly Anglicized “Micah.” He must not be confounded with the Michaiah of Neh 12:35.

3. “A Simeonite, father of Ozias, one of the three governors of the city of Bethulia in the time of Judith (Jdt 6:15). His name is remarkable as being connected with one of the few specific allusions to the ten tribes after the captivity.”

## Michael[[@Headword:Michael]]

             (Heb. Mikael', מַיכָאֵל, who is like God? Sept. and N.T. Μιχαήλ), the name of an archangel and of several men.

1. The title given in the angelology of the Jews adopted during the exile, to one of the chief angels, who, in Dan 10:13-21; Dan 12:1, is described as having special charge of the Israelites as a nation, and in Jud 1:9 as disputing with Satan about the body of Moses, in which dispute, instead of bringing against the archenemy any railing accusation, he only said, “The Lord rebuke thee, O Satan!” Again, in Rev 12:7-9, Michael and his angels are represented as warring with Satan and his angels in the upper regions, from which the latter are cast down upon the earth. “This representation served not only to give that vividness to man's faith in God's supernatural agents, which was so much needed at a time of captivity, during the abeyance of his local manifestations and regular agencies, but also to mark the finite and ministerial nature of the angels, lest they should be worshipped in themselves. Accordingly, as Gabriel represents the ministration of the angels towards man, so Michael is the type and leader of their strife, in God's name and his strength, against the power of Satan. In the O.T. therefore he is the guardian of the Jewish people in their antagonism to godless power and heathenism. In the N.T. (see Rev 12:7) he fights in heaven against the dragon that old serpent called the Devil and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world: and so takes part in that struggle which is the work of the Church on earth. The nature and method of his war against Satan are not explained, because the knowledge would be unnecessary and perhaps impossible to us: the fact itself is revealed rarely, and with that mysterious vagueness which hangs over all angelic ministrations, but yet with plainness and certainty.” On the authority of the first of these texts the Jews have named Michael not only one of the “seven” archangels, but the chief of them (comp. the Targum on Son 8:9); and on the authority of all three the Christian Church has been disposed to concur in this impression (see J.D. Haberlin, Selecta de Mich. ejusque apparitionibus, gestis et cultu, Helmst. 1758).

The Jews regard the archangels as being such, not simply as a class by themselves, but as respectively the chiefs of the several classes into which they suppose the angels to be divided; and of these classes Michael is the head of the first, and therefore chief of all the archangels (Sepher Othioth, fol. 16). “The rabbinical traditions constantly oppose him to Sammael, the accuser and enemy of Israel, as disputing for the soul of Moses: as bringing the ram the substitute for Isaac, which Sammael sought to keep back, etc.: they give him the title of the ‘great high-priest in heaven,' as well as that of the ‘great prince and conqueror;' and finally lay it down that ‘wherever Michael is said to have appeared, there the glory of the Shechinah is  intended.' It is clear that the sounder among them, in making such use of the name, intended to personify the divine power, and typify the Messiah (see Schottgen, Hor. Hebr. 1:1079, 1119; 2:8,15, ed. Dresd. 1742).” Hengstenberg maintains at length (both in his Christology and his Commentary on the Apocalypse) that Michael is no other than the Lord Jesus Christ himself; but this is hardly in accordance with the mention of the other archangel, Gabriel, nor with the other theophanies of the O.T., in which the Logos appears only as the Angel [of] Jehovah, or the Angel of the Covenant. The passages in Daniel and Revelations must be taken as symbolical, and in that view offer little difficulty. In the former, one of the guardian angels of the Jews (probably Gabriel, Dan 9:21) exhibits himself as a protector, and as struggling with the prince of Persia for the liberation of the Jewish exiles. In the discharge of this duty, Michael, the chief guardian of the same people, comes to help him. The first angel promises to return (from his visit to Daniel) to renew the contest, and indicates his success by declaring that “the prince of Greece will come,” i.e., to overthrow the Persian empire. Here also Michael, in particular, is designated as the prince of the Jews. So in Zec 1:8; Zec 1:14, the guardian angel of the Jews exhibits his solicitude for them and his care over them. The same thling is again exhibited in Zec 3:1-2, where the angel of the Lord rebukes Satan on account of his malignant intentions towards the high-priest Joshua. So again in Rev 12:7; Rev 12:9, Michael and his angels are represented as waging war with Satan and his angels.

This passage stands connected with Rev 12:5 of the context, which represents the Man-Child (Jesus) as caught up to the throne of God. The war waged would seem to have arisen from the efforts of Satan to annoy the ascending Saviour. Such appears to be the symbolic representation (see Stuart's Comment. ad loc.). The allusion in Jud 1:9 is more difficult to understand, unless, with Vitringa, Lardner, Macknight, and others, we regard it also as symbolical; in which case the dispute referred to is that indicated in Zec 3:1; and “the body of Moses” as a symbolical phrase for the Mosaical law and institutions, see JUDE, in accordance with the usual mode of speaking among Christians, who called the Church “the body of Christ” (Col 1:18; Col 1:24; Rom 12:5). Acomparison of Jud 1:9 with Zec 1:8-14 gives much force and probability to this conjecture (see F.U. Wolter, De Michaeli cuns diabolo litigante [Rinteln, 1727-9]). According to others, “the body of Moses” here means his proper and literal body, which the Lord secretly buried (Deu 34:5-6), and which Satan wished to present to the Jews  as an object of idolatry (comp. 2Ki 18:4). “The allusion seems to be to a Jewish legend attached to Deu 34:6. The Targum of Jonathan attributes the burial of Moses to the hands of the angels of God, and particularly of the archangel. Michael, as the guardian of Israel. Later traditions (see OEcumen. in Jud. cap. 1) set forth how Satan disputed the burial, claiming for himself the dead body because of the blood of the Egyptian (Exo 2:13) which was on Moses's hands” (see Quistorp, Num Michaelis de corpore Mosis disceptatio fabula sit? [Gryph. 1770]).

Michael as a Saint in the Church of Rome. — This archangel is canonized in the Roman calendar, and his festival, called Michaelmas (q.v.), is ‘celebrated on the 29th of September., The legends preserved by Roman Catholics relate that Michael appeared to the Virgin Mary to announce to her the time of her death, and that he received her soul and bore it to Jesus. And again, that during the 6th century, when a fearful pestilence was raging in Rome, St. Gregory advised that a procession should be made, which should pass through the streets singing the service which since then has been called the Great Litanies. This was done for three days, and on the last day, when they came opposite to the tomb of Hadrian, Gregory beheld the archangel Michael hovering over the city; and he alighted on the top of the mausoleum and sheathed his word, which was dripping with blood. Then the plague was stayed, and the tomb of Hadrian has been called the Castle of Sant' Angelo from that day, and a chapel was there consecrated, the name of which was Ecclesia Sancti Angeli usque ad Ccelos. Michael is also said to have appeared to command the building of two churches (see Mrs. Clement, Legendary and Mytholog. Art, page 229). The first was on the eastern coast of Italy, and was called the church of Monte Galgano, which became a resort for numerous pilgrims. Again, in the reign of Childebert II, Michael appeared to Aubert, bishop of Avranches, and commanded that a church should be built on the summit of a rock in the Gulf of Avranches, in Normandy; and Mont-Saint-Michel became one of the most celebrated places of pilgrimage, as it is one of the most picturesque in scenery. From this time Michael was greatly venerated in the Church of Rome, especially in France. He was selected as patron saint of the country and of the order which Louis instituted in his honor.

Representations of the Archangel as a Saint. — “Michael is always represented as young and beautiful.

As patron of the Church Militant, he is ‘the winged saint,' with no attribute save the shield and lance. As conqueror of Satan, he stands in armor, with his foot upon the Evil One, who is half human or like a dragon in shape. The angel is about to chain him, or to transfix him with the lance. But the treatment of this subject is varied in many ways, all, however, easily recognized. As lord of souls, St. Michael is unarmed; he holds a balance, and in each scale a little naked figure representing the souls; the beato usually joins the hands as in thankfulness, while the rejected one expresses horror in look and attitude. Frequently a daemon is seizing the falling scale with a Plutonic hook, or with his talons. In these pictures the saint is rarely without wings. When introduced in pictures of the Madonna and Child he presents the balance to Christ, who seems to welcome the happy soul. Whether with or without the balance, he is always the lord of souls in pictures of the death, assumption, or glorification of the Virgin Mary, for tradition teaches that he received her spirit, and cared for it until it was reunited to her body and ascended to her Son. The old English coin called an angel was so named because it bore the image of this archangel.”

On the subject generally, see Surenhusius, Bibl. Katall. page 701; Fabricius, Pseudepigr. 1:839 sq.; Wetstein, 1:649; 2:735; Hartmann, Verbind. p. 83; Eisenmenger, Judenth. 1:806 sq.; Thilo, Apocryph. 1:691; Trigland, Dissert. theol. page 198 sq.; Laurmann. Collectan. in ep. Jud. page 71 sq.; Seeland, in the Brem. u. Verdensch. Bibloth. 3:89 sq.; Braunl, De Michale (Altorf, 1726); — Hurenius, De Michaele (Vitemb. 1593), SEE ANGEL; SEE MOSES.

2. The father of Sethur, which latter was the Asherite commissioner to explore the land of Canaan (Num 13:13). B.C. ante 1657.

3. One of the four sons of Izrahiah, the great-grandson of Issachar (1Ch 7:3). B.C. prob. post 1618. Possibly the same with No. 8.

4. One of the “sons” of Beriah, a son of Elpaal, of the tribe of Benjamin (1Ch 8:16). B.C. post 1612.

5. Achief Gadite resident in Bashan (1Ch 5:13), B.C. apparently post 1093. He was perhaps identical with the son of Jehishai and father of Gilead, some of the posterity of whose descendant Abihail are  mentioned as dwelling in the same region (1Ch 5:14). B.C. long ante 782.

6. One of the Manassite chiliarchs who joined David when he returned to Ziklag (1Ch 12:20). B.C. 1053.

7. The son of Baaseiah and father of Shimea, among the ancestors of the Levite Asaph (1Ch 6:40). B.i. considerably ante 1014.

8. The “father” of Omri, which latter was the phylarch of the tribe of Issachar under David and Solomon (1Ch 27:18). B.C. ante 1014.

9. One of the sons of king Jehoshaphat, whom he portioned before the settlement of the succession upon Jehoram, but whom the latter, nevertheless, out of jealousy, caused to be slain upon his own accession (2Ch 21:2). B.C. 887.

10. A “son” (prob. descendant) of Shephatiah, whose son Zebadiah returned with eighty males from Babylon (Ezr 8:8). B.C. ante 459.

## Michael Alexandrinus[[@Headword:Michael Alexandrinus]]

             a noted patriarch of Alexandria, flourished near the middle of the 9th century. He was very active in behalf of a union of the Eastern and Western churches, and wrote, about A.D. 869, De Unitate Ecclesii  (printed in Labbe's Concil. volume 8, and in Hardouin, Concil. volume 5) See Cave, Hist. Lit. ad an. 869; Fabricius, Bibl. Graca, 11:188.

## Michael Anchilus[[@Headword:Michael Anchilus]]

             another distinguished Eastern ecclesiastic, patriarch of Constantinople from 1167 to 1185, was a decided opponent to the attempt at union of the Eastern and Western churches. He was also noted as an eminent disciple of Aristotelian philosophy. His extant works are five synodal decrees, published in Greek and Latin in .the Jus Gr. Rom. (3:227), and a dialogue with the emperor Manuel Comnenlus concerning the claims of the Roman pontiff. Of the latter work only some extracts have been published by Leo Allatius.

## Michael Angelo Buonar(r)ot(t)I[[@Headword:Michael Angelo Buonar(r)ot(t)I]]

             an Italian artist, who, in an age when Christian art had reached its zenith, stood unrivalled as a painter, sculptor, poet, and architect, was born March 6, 1474, at the Castle of Caprese in Tuscany. He was of noble origin, having descended on his mother's side from the ancient family of Canossa, in Tuscany, while the Buonarotti had long been associated with places of trust in the Florentine republic. Michael Angelo was very early afforded the advantages of association with first-class artists, and this gave rise to the saying that “he sucked in sculpture with his milk.” About 1488 he was admitted as a student into the seminary which was established by Lorenzo the Magnificent for the study of ancient art in connection with the collections of statuary in the Medicean Gardens, and there he attracted the notice of Lorenzo by his artistic skill, and was invited by that generous Florentine prince to take up his residence at the palace of the Medici. As an inmate of the palace, he enjoyed the society of eminent literary men, one of whom, Angelo Poliziano (Politian), became his intimate friend. Among his earliest works was a marble bas-relief, the subject of which was The Battle of Hercules with the Centaurs. This work, which was approved by his own mature judgment, is preserved in Florence. Lorenzo's death in 1492, and the temporary reverses which befell the Medici family in consequence of the incapacity of Lorenzo's successor, Pietro, led Michael Angelo to quit Florence for Bologna. There, however, he remained only about a year, and gladly enough turned his face towards Florence again. Michael now found a patron in the person of Pietro Soderini, the gonfaloniere (chief ruler) of Florence. About 1497 he produced an admirable marble group called a  “Pieth,” representing “The Virgin weeping over the Dead Body of her Son.” “In none of his works,” says Ernest Breton, “has he displayed more perfect knowledge of design and anatomy, or more profound truth of expression” (Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.).

This Mater Dolorosanow adorns a chapel in the Church of St. Peter at Rome. After this he executed a gigantic marble statue of the psalmist David, which stands in front of the Palazzo Vecchio, in Florence. He received 400 ducats for this work, on which he spent about eighteen months, and which he finished in 1504. Next in order of time, and, according to some of his contemporaries, first in merit, ranks his great cartoon for the ducal palace at Florence, which, together with the pendant executed by Leonardo da Vinci, has long since perished. This work, which represented a scene in the wars with Pisa, when a number of young Florentines, while bathing in the Arno, are surprised by an attack of the Pisans, showed so marvellous a knowledge of the anatomical development of the human figure, and such extraordinary facility in the powers of execution, that it became a study for artists of every land, creating actually a new era in art. “Such was the excellence of this work,” says Vasari, “that some thought it absolute perfection.” Another production which belongs to this period, and which is of special interest to the student of Christian art, is an oil-painting of the Holy Family (about 1504). Shortly after his accession to the pontificate, Julius II called Michael Angelo to Rome, and commissioned him to make the pope's monument, which was to be erected within St. Peter's. Although this work was never completed on the colossal scale on which it had been designed, and was ultimately erected in the Church of St. Pietro ad Vincolo, it is a magnificent composition, and is memorable for having given occasion to the reconstruction of St. Peter's on its present sublime plan, in order the better to adapt it to the colossal dimensions of the proposed monument. In 1506 Michael Angelo, incensed by the indifference of the pontiff towards him, quitted Rome;. but after a short time the repeated and urgent entreaties of Julius led him to return, and at the pope's request he now painted with his own hand the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel, and, although unwillingly, he began in 1508, and completed within less than two years his colossal task, which proved one of the most marvelous of his works. The subjects of these cartoons are taken from the book of Genesis, but between these and the representations of the persons of the Savior's genealogy are colossal figures of prophets and sibyls.

Julius II died in 1513, and was succeeded by Leo X, who, together with successive popes, is censured for illiberal conduct towards Michael Angelo. Leo ordered him to build the fa9ade of the Church of San Lorenzo, at Florence, and compelled him, against his will, to spend several years in procuring marble for that purpose. “It is a mortifying reflection,” says Duppa, “that the talents of this great man should have been buried and his time consumed, during the whole reign of Leo X, in little else than in raising stone out of a quarry and making a road to convey it to the sea” (Life of M. Angelo). Under the patronage of Clement VII (1523), Michael Angelo devoted himself to the library and sacristy of San Lorenzo, at Florence, and in 1528 or 1529 he spent his time at Florence in the erection of fortifications to resist the attempts of the expelled Medici to recover possession. He also fought in the defence of that city against the papal troops. On the surrender of Florence he returned to Rome, and after the accession of pope Paul III, in 1534, was permitted to resume the monument of Julius II, which he completed on a smaller scale than he had first designed. It consists of seven statues, one of which represents Moses, and was placed in the Church of San Pietro ad Vincolo. This statue of Moses is called one of his masterpieces. Another great production of this period is his great picture of the Last Judgment, painted' for the altar of the Sistine Chapel. This colossal fresco, nearly 70 feet in height, which was completed in 1541, after some eight years of close confinement, was regarded by contemporary critics as having surpassed all his other works for the unparalleled powers of invention and the consummate knowledge of the human figure which it displayed. On a comparison with Raphael it loses, however, much of its value, for, as has been truly said, “one will seek in vain for that celestial light and divine inspiration which appears in the Transfiguration.”

After its completion, Michael Aigelo devoted himself to the perfecting of St. Peter's, which by the touch of his genius was converted from a mere Saracenic hall into the most superb model of a Christian church. He refused all remuneration for this labor, which he regarded as a service to the glory of God. He never married; and upon his death in 1563, at Rome, his remains were removed to Florence, and laid within the Church of Santa Croce. His piety, benevolence, and liberality made him generally beloved; and in the history of art no name shines with a more unsullied lustre than that of Michael Angelo. “He was the bright luminary,” says Sir Joshua Reynolds, “from whom painting has borrowed a new lustre, under whose hands it assumed a new appearance and became another and superior art, and from whom al his contemporaries and  successors have derived whatever they have possessed of the dignified and majestic” (Discourses on Painting, volume 2). Always a student, always dissatisfied with what he had done, many of his works were left unfinished; but his fragments have educated eminent men. In disposition he was proud and passionate, but highminded; not greedy of gold, but princely in his generosity. His mind was full of great conceptions, for which he was ready to sacrifice and forego physical comforts. Of his, merits as an artist, it is enough to say that Raphael thanked God that he was born in the time of Michael Angelo Buonarotti. Comparing him with Raphael, Quatremere de Quincy marks Michael Angelo as “the greatest of draughtsmen.” “In painting,” says Duppa, “the great work on which Michael Angelo's fame depends, and, taking it for all in all, the greatest work of his whole life, is the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel... His sibyls and prophets exhibit with variety and energy the colossal powers of his mind... In his great works, his superior abilities are shown in the sublimity of his conceptions, and the power and facility with which they are executed.” See Condivi, Vita di Michael Angelo Buonarotti (Rome, 1553; new ed. Pisa, 1823); Vignali, Vita di Michael Angelo (1753) ; Richard Duppa, Life of Michael Angelo (London, 1806); Hauchecorne, Vie de Michel-Ange; Quatremere de Quincy, Vie de Michel Ange (1835); J.S. Harford Life of Michael Angelo (1856-7, 2 volumes, 8vo); Hermann Grimm, Michael Angelo's Leben, and English version of the same (London, 1865, 2 volumes,); Vasari, Lives of Painters and Sculptors; Lanzi, Storia della Pittura; Winckelmann, Neues Maler-Lexikon, s.v.; Nagler, Kiinstler-Lexikon, s.v.; Marie Henri Bavle, Histoire de la Peinture en Italie, Pater, Studies in the History of the Renaissance (Lond. and N.Y., Macmillan & Co., 1873, 8vo), chapter 5, contains an interesting essay on the poetry of Michael Angelo.

## Michael Apostolius[[@Headword:Michael Apostolius]]

             an eminent Greek scholar, who contributed largely to the revival of learning in Italy, flourished in the 15th century. He was an intimate friend of Gemistus Pletho, and an adherent of the Platonic philosophy, two circumstances which, together with his own merits, caused him to be well received by cardinal Bessarion in Italy, where he settled about 1440. Later in life Michael retired to Candia, where he got a livelihood by teaching children and copying manuscripts. There he died, some time after 1457, for in that year he wrote a panegyric on the emperor Frederick III. His principal works are, a defence of Plato against Theodore Gaza, extant in MS. in the Vienna library: — Menexenus, a dialogue on the Holy Trinity,  investigating whether the Mohammedans and Jews are right in believing a Mono-Deus; or the Christians, in believing a Deus Trinunus; extant in MS., ibid. — Oratio consultoria ad Socerum sibi irascendum cum, ad secundas transiret nuptias, extant in the Bodleian: Appellatio ad Constantinum Palaeologum ultitum Imperatorum: Oratio ad loannem Argyropulum: — Epistolae XLV; these letters are extremely important for the history of the writer's time, as Lambecius asserts, who perused all or most of them, and it is to be regretted that nope of them are printed. The first is addressed to Gemistus, the others to Manuel Chrvsolaras, Chalcocondylas, Argyropulus, Bessarion, and other celebrated men of the time. They are extant in MS. in the Bodleian; some of them are also to be found in the Vatican and at Munich: — Oratio Panegyrica ad Fredericum III, written about or perhaps in 1457; it was published in Greek and Latin by Freherus in the second volume of his Rerum German. Script.: — Oratio Funebris in Laudem Bessarionis, does credit to the heart of Michael for it seems that the cardinal had not behaved very generously towards the poor scholar. Still it is very questionable whether our Michael is the author of it; Bessarion died in 1472, and as Michael, previously to leaving Constantinople, in or before 1440, had enjoyed, during many years, the friendship of Gemistus, whose name became conspicuous in the very beginning of the 15th century, and who was a very old man in 1441, he must have attained a very great age if he survived Bessarion: — Disceptatio adversus eos qui Occidentales Orientalibus superiorses se contendebant, extant in MS. in the Bodleian: — De Figuris Grammaticis, which Leo Allatius esteemed so highly that he intended to publish it, but was unfortunately prevented: — An Etymological Dictionary; doubtful whether still extant; a work of great importance: — Ι᾿ωνία, Violets, a pleasing title given to a collection of sentences of celebrated persons. Arsenims. of Malvasia, made an extract of it (Α᾿ποφθέγματ Rome, 8vo), which he dedicated to pope Leo X, who reigned from 1513 to 1522: — Συναγωγὴ Παροιμιῶν, containing 2027 Greek proverbs, a very remarkable little work, which soon attracted the notice of the lovers of Greek literature; it was dedicated by the author to Casparus Uxama, or Osmi, a Spanish prelate, whom Michael met at Rome. Editions: the Greek text by Hervagius (Basle, 1558, 8vo); the text, with a Latin version and valuable notes, by P. Pantinus and A. Scholl, (Leyd. 1619, 4to); also cum Clavi Homerica, by George Perkins. See Cave, Hist. Lit. ad an. 1440; Fabricius, Bibl. Graec. 11:189; Smith, Dict. Greek and Rom. Biog. aid Mythol. s.v.

## Michael Balsamon[[@Headword:Michael Balsamon]]

             a noted Eastern ecclesiastic flourished in the latter half of the 15th century. He is supposed to have been a native of Constantinople, where he always lived. He was one of the Greek deputies sent in 1438 to the Council of Florence, discovered the secret intrigues of the Latins, and prognosticated the ultimate fate of the union of the two churches, to which he subscribed reluctantly. He wrote and addressed to the emperor Joannes Palaeologus Anaphora Cleri Constantinopolitani, of which Leo Allatius gives a few fragments in his work De Consensu utriusque Ecclesiae. See Cave, Hist. Lit. ad an. 1440; Fabricius, Bibl. Grcea, 10:373, note.

## Michael Bradacius[[@Headword:Michael Bradacius]]

             the first Moravian bishop, flourished originally as a Hussite priest at Zamberg, in the eastern part of Bohemia, about the middle of the 15th century. In 1467, when the Moravian Brethren (q.v.) separated from the National Church, and instituted a ministry of their own, Michael, who had in the mean time joined the Moravian Brethren, was sent, together with two other priests, to a Waldensian colony on the frontiers of Bohemia and Austria, in order to secure the episjcopacy. These Waldenses were on friendly terms with the Calixtines, and openly fraternized with them at the mass. John Rokyzan, the Calixtine leader, who had ambitious projects with regard to the archiepiscopal chair at Prague, which had long been vacant, hoped to win the support of the Waldenses. Hence, when their ministry had become extinct, he induced bishop Philibert, who had come to Prague as a delegate of the Council of Basle, to ordain two members of the Waldensian colony, Frederick Nemez and John Wlach, as priests, on the 14th of September, 1433. In the summer of the following year (1434) — when the Taborites had been defeated by the Calixtines; when the utmost confusion prevailed throughout Bohemia in Church and State; when an open feud was raging between the council and the pope; when, however, the former did everything in its power to conciliate the Bohemians — these two Waldensian priests were consecrated bishops at Basle by bishops of the Roman Catholic Church. This act was meant as an example and encouragement for the Bohemians, that they might be the more ready to accept the compactata of the council. Nemez and Wlach consecrated other bishops, of whom two were living in 1467, the name of the senior being Stephen. He and his associate consecrated Michael Bradacius and his two companions, who thus became the first bishops of the Bohemian Brethren.  AChurch council was organized, of which Michael Bradacius was constituted the president. After a time he resigned the presidency in favor of Matthias of Kunwalde (q.v.), but remained in the council. He died at Reichenau in 1501. Zezschwitz in his article Lukas v. Prag, in Herzog's Real-Encykl. volume 20 calls in question the authenticity of the above narrative, but fails to make good his doubts. He is misled by preconceived notions against the Moravian episcopacy, as his article plainly shows. The transfer of the Waldensian episcopate to the Brethren is established by a number of documents, whose dates range from 1476 to 1600, in the “Lissa Folios,” at Herrnhut, see MORAVIAN BRETHREN, THE ANCIENT; by the official report (1478) of Wenzel Koranda, the administrator of the Utraquist Consistory at Prague (Palacky's Geschichte v. Bohmen, 1:191, 192); and by the earliest histories of Blahoslaw, Lasitius, Regenvolscius, and Comenius; while the origin of the Waldensian episcopacy is set forth in the official answers with which the Brethren met the attacks of the learned Jesuit, Wenzel Sturm, in the reign of Maximilian I. These answers were written by the assistant bishop Jaffet, and are preserved in the archives at Herrlhut. The validity of the episcopate of the Brethren was not doubted either by the Roman Catholic or by the National Church, and the fact that they had secretly secured it from the Waldenses brought about a severe persecution immediately after the truth became known (1468). Compare Benham's Origin and Episcopate of the Boh. Breth. (Lond. 1867); Schweinitz's Moravian Episcopate (Bethlehem, 1865); Palacky's Geschichte v. Bohmen, 7:492; Gindely's Geschichte d. B.B. 1:37; Czerwenka's Persekutionsbuchlein (Gutersloh, 1869), c. 20, n. 31; Croger's Gesch. d. Alten Bruderkirae (Gnadan, 1865), volume 1. (E. de S.)

## Michael Cerularius[[@Headword:Michael Cerularius]]

             a noted Eastern ecclesiastic, flourished as patriarch of Constantinople near the middle of the 11th century. He gained great notoriety mainly by his violent attacks upon the Latin Church. He caused so much scandal that pope Leo IX sent cardinals Humbert and Frederick, with Peter, archbishop of Amalfi, to Constantinople in order to persuade Cerularius to a more moderate conduct. Their efforts were not only unsuccessful, but they were treated with such abuse that Humbert excommunicated the virulent patriarch. Cerularius in his turn excommunicated the three legates, and he caused the name of pope Leo IX to be erased from the diptychs. In 1057 he prevailed upon the emperor Michael Stratioticus to yield to his  successful rival, Isaac Comnenus, whose interest he took care of for some time. Differences however, soon broke out between them; and when he was once quarrelling with Isaac about the respective authority of the Church and the State, he impudently cried out, “I have given you the crown, and I know how to take it from you again.” Banishment was his due reward, and Isaac was about to remove him from his see when death removed him from the earth (1058). Cerularius wrote: Decisio Synodica de Nuptiis in Septino Gradu: — De Matrimonio prohibito (the former printed, Greek and Latin, in the third book, and fragments of the latter in the fourth book of Leunclavius, Jus Graeco-Roman.): — Epistole II ad Petrum Antiochenunm (Greek and Latin, in the second vol. of Cotelerius, Eccles. Graec. Monument.): — De Sacerdotis Uxore Adulterio polluta (in Cotelerius, Patres Apostol.): — Σημείωμα, s. Edictum Synodale adversus Latinos de Pittacia, seu De Excommunicatione a Latinis Legatis in ipsum ab ipso in Legatos vibrata, anno 1054, die septimo Juniifactum (Graece et Latine, in Leo Allatius, De Libr. Eccles. Gracis): — Homilia (ed. Graece et Latine, by Montfaucon, under the title Epistola Synodi Nicaeanae ad Sanctam Alexandrica Ecclesiam [Paris, 1715, fol.]). There are, farther, extant in MS. fragments of several letters, as Contra Rebelles Abbates, Contra Armenios. De Homicidio facto in Ecclesia, De Episcoporum Judiciis, etc. See Cave, Hist Lit. ad an. 1043; Fabricius, Bibl. Graec. 11:195, 196.

## Michael Glycas[[@Headword:Michael Glycas]]

             a noted ecclesiastical historian of the Greek Church of the 12th century (some place him as late as the 15th), was a native of Sicily, and flourished about A.D. 1120. His most important production, the Annales Quadripartiti, is a work not only historical, but also philosophical and theological. Part I describes the creation of the world in six days; Part II extends from the creation to the birth of Christ; Part III to Constantine the Great; and Part IV to the death of Alexius Comnenus, A.D. 1118. It was published in Gr. and Lat., with notes, by Labbe (Paris, 1660, fol.). Glycas also wrote Disputationculae II, and likewise many epistles, of which fragments are preserved.

## Michael Monachus[[@Headword:Michael Monachus]]

             a theologian of the Church of the East, flourished as presbyter at Constantinople probably towards the close of the 9th century. He is noted  as the author of Encomium Ignatii Patriarchae (who died in 877), edited, Greek and Latin, in a very mutilated form, by Raderus in his Acta Concilii (Ingolstadt, 1604, 4to), also in the eighth volume of the Concilia: — Encomium in Angelicorum — Ordinum Ductores, Michaelem et Gabrielem: — Encomium in glorisum Christi Apostolum Philippum: — Perhaps Vita et Miracula S'ti Nicolai: — Vita Theodori Studite, of which Baronius gives some fragments in his Annales ad an. 795 and 826. The complete text, with a Latin translation, was published by Jacobus de la Baune in the fifth volume of Opera Sirmondi (Paris, 1696, fol.). The life of Theodore Studita, as well as one or two of the other productions, was perhaps written by another Michael Monachus, a contemporary and survivor of Studita, who died as early as 826. The author of this life was a very incompetent writer. Cave, Hist. Lit; ad an. 876; Fabricius, Biblioth. Graec. 9:505.

## Michael Psellus, Jr[[@Headword:Michael Psellus, Jr]]

             a noted Greek philosopher and teacher, flourished at Constantinople from 1026 to 1105, as teacher of theology and philosophy. He is noted as the writer of Διδασκαλία παντοδαπή in Fabricius, Biblioth. Graeca (volume 10): — Περὶ δυνάμεων τῆςψυχῆς, edited by Tarin (Par. 1618 sq.): — a Paraphrase of Aristotle's Περὶ ἑρμενεαίς (Ven. 1503): — Synopsis of Aristotle's Organon, edited by Ehlinger (Augsb. 1597): — Commentary on Aristotle's Natural Philosophy, in Lat. by Camotius (Ven. 1554): — Περὶ τῶν πέντε φωνῶν of Porphyrius (Basle, 1542): — Πεπὶ ἐνεργείας δαιμόνων,. edited by Gaulinenus (Paris, 1615). See Leo Allatius, De Psellis eorumque scriptis (Rome, 1634); Ueberweg, Hist. Philos. 1:404; Enfield, Hist. Philos. page 474.

## Michael Scotus[[@Headword:Michael Scotus]]

             a learned author of the 13th century, was born at Durham, England; or, as some assert, at Balweary, Scotland. He attended lectures at Oxford, and afterwards at Paris, and devoted himself to the study of mathematics and Oriental languages. Emperor Frederick II, who reigned at that time in Germany, was the most prominent protector of art and sciences, and Michael went to his court, studying medicine and chemistry. After a stay of several years in Germany, he returned to England, where he became a great favorite of king Edward II. He died in 1291, at a very advanced age. Michael Scotus was celebrated on account of his knowledge in secret arts  and magic (comp. Dante, Inferno, 20:115-118). It is said that his books on magic were buried with him. He was also actively engaged in the translation of Aristotle, which was made by command of emperor Frederick II, and was afterwards printed at Venice in 1496: Aristotelis opera Latine versa, partime Graeco, partime Arabico, per vios lectos et in utriusque linguae prolatione peritos, jussu imperatoris Fridirici II. He probably translated the natural philosophy of Aristotle from the Arabic version of Avicenna. Michael is the author of De secretis naturae, sive de procreatione hominis et physiognomia, and of the Quaestio curiosa de natura solis et lunae,” i.e., of gold and silver. He has also been considered the author of Mensa philosophica seu enchiridion, in quo de quaestionibus mensalibus et variis ac jucundis hominum congressibus agitur, which has been printed several times. This latter work, however, has been attributed, by some at least, to Theobald Anguilbertus, a learned Irishman, who lived about the year 1500 as doctor of medicine and philosophy at Paris. See Tennemann, Manual list. Philos. page 223; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, s.v.

## Michael VIII[[@Headword:Michael VIII]]

             surnamed PALAEOLOGUS (ό Παλαιολόγος), emperor of Nicaea, and afterwards of Constantinople, from A.D. 1260 to 1282, the restorer of the Greek empire, and the laborer for the “unity of the Church,” was born of noble parentage in 1234. At an early age he rose to eminence, which he owed more to his uncommon talents than to his illustrious birth. He was in great favor with the emperor Theodore (II) Lascaris. This sovereign died in August 1259, leaving a son, John III, who was only nine years old, and over whom he had placed the patriarch Arsenius, and the magnus domesticus Muzalon, as guardians. Michael, the friend of the soldiers, was determined to secure for himself the place of Muzalon, who was despatched by the imperial guard, and Michael Palaeologus, whom Theodore shortly before his decease had appointed magnus dux, was chosen as guardian instead, and soon afterwards received or gave himself the title and power of despot. Next he made himself master of the imperial treasury, bribed or gained the Varangian guard and the clergy, and secured his proclamation as emperor at Magnesia. Michael and the boy John were crowned together at Nicaea, on the 1st of January, 1260.

While the event was hailed with satisfaction at home, it failed to secure friends abroad. The Latins, especially, were dissatisfied; assumed a haughty tone towards Michael, and demanded the cession of those parts of Thrace and  Macedonia which belonged to Nicaea, as a condition of acknowledging him as emperor. But Michael treated the Latin ambassadors with ridicule, and, in answer, took prompt measures for driving the Latins out of Constantinople; and, before the end of the year 1260, Baldwin II was shut up within his capital. Michael, however, was not strong enough to reduce the city, and was obliged to convert the siege into a blockade; until one day, one Curtrizacus, the commander of a body of volunteer auxiliaries, was informed of the existence of a subterranean passage leading from a place outside the walls into the cellar of a house within them, and which seemed not to be generally known. Upon the strength of this information, a plan was formed for the surprise of the garrison by means of the passage, and, after concerting measures with the commander-in-chief, he ventured with fifty men through the passage into the city. His plan succeeded completely. No sooner was he within than he took possession of the nearest gate, disarmed the post, opened it, and the main body of the Greeks rushed in. The stratagem was executed in the dead of night. The inhabitants, roused from their slumber, soon learned the cause of the noise, and kept quiet within their houses, or joined their daring countrymen. The Latins, dispersed in various quarters, were seized with a panic, and fled in all directions, while the emperor Baldwin had scarcely time to leave his palace and escape on board of a Venetian galley, which carried him immediately to Italy. On the morning of the 25th of July, 1261, Constantinople was in the undisputed possession of the Greeks, after it had borne the yoke of the Latins during fifty-seven years, three months, and thirteen days.

Michael, informed of the success of his arms, lost no time in repairing to Constantinople; and on the 14th of August held his triumphal entrance, saluted by the people with demonstrations of the sincerest joy. Constantinople, however, was no more what it had been. During the reign of the Latins plunder, rapine, and devastation had spoiled it of its former splendor; trade had deserted its harbor, and thousands of opulent families had abandoned the palaces or mansions of their forefathers in order to avoid contact with the hated foreigners. To restore, repeople. and readorn Constantinople was now Michael's principal task; and, in order to accomplish his purpose the better, he confirmed the extensive privileges which the Venetian, the Genoese, and the Pisan merchants had received from the Latin emperors. Although the Nicaean emperors considered themselves the legitimate successors of Constantine the Great, the  possession of Constantinople was an event of such magnitude as to suggest to Michael the idea of a new coronation, which was accordingly solemnized in the cathedral of St. Sophia. But Michael was crowned alone, without John — an evil omen for the friends of the young emperor, whose fears were but too soon realized, for on Christmas-day of the same year, 1261, John was deprived of sight and sent into exile to a distant fortress. This hateful crime caused a general indignation among the people, and might have proved the ruin of Michael had he been a man of a less energetic turn of mind. The patriarch Arsenius, coguardian to John, was irreconcilable; he fearlessly pronounced excommunication upon the imiperial criminal, and years of trouble and commotion elapsed before Michael was readmitted into the communion of the faithful by the second successor of Arsenius, the patriarch Joseph.

The loss of Constantinople pope Urban IV regarded as robbing him of the hope of effecting a union between the Latin and the Greek churches, and he therefore urged the European princes to undertake a crusade against the Greek schismatics; but Michael avoided the danger by promising the pope to do his utmost in order to effect himself a mediation between the belligerents, and, as both the parties were tired of bloodshed, peace was soon restored (1263). In 1265 Arsenius was deposed, because he would not revoke the excommunication he had pronounced against the emperor; whereupon the prelate's adherents, the Arsenites, caused a schism which lasted till 1312. SEE ARSENIUS.

In this skilful manner he also avoided troubles which threatened him in 1269, when Charles, king of Sicily, took up arms on pretence of restoring the fugitive Baldwin to the throne, and forthwith marching upon Constantinople, placed the capital in jeopardy. Michael, afraid that these hostilities were only the forerunners of a general crusade of all the Latin princes against him, made prompt proposals for a union of the Greek Church with that of Rome. The learned Veccus, accompanied by several of the most distinguished among the Greek clergy, were sent to the council which was called to assemble at Lyons in 1274; and there the union was effected by the Greeks giving way in the much disputed doctrine of the procession of the Holy Ghost, and submitting to the supremacy of the pope. SEE LYONS, II. The union, however, was desired only by a minority of the Greeks, and the orthodox majority accordingly did their utmost to prevent the measure from being carried out. Michael, in his turn, supported his policy with force. The patriarch Joseph was deposed, and Veccus appointed ill his stead; cruel punishment was  inflicted upon all those who opposed the union; and Greece was shaken by a religious commotion which forms a remarkable event in the ecclesiastical history of the East. As space forbids us to dwell here longer upon these important transactions, we can only remark that the union was never effectually carried out, and was entirely abandoned upon the death 6f Michael. SEE FILIOQUE; SEE GREEK CHURCH.

The manifest duplicity and the cruelty with which the emperor behaved finally made him odious to his own subjects and contemptible to his Latin friends, and the latter part of his reign was an uninterrupted series of domestic troubles and foreign wars. His dearly-bought friendship with the Latin, and especially the Italian powers, was brought to a very speedy end. Upon the decease of the ex-emperor Baldwin, his son Philip assumed the imperial title, and formed an alliance between pope Martin IV, Charles of Anjou, king of Sicily, and the Venetians, with a view of reconquering Constantinople and dividing the Greek empire. But the invaders failed, and Michael, not satisfied with the glory of his arms and the material benefit he derived from his victory, resolved to take terrible revenge: he paid twenty thousand ounces of gold towards equipping a Catalan fleet, with which king Peter of Aragon was to attack Sicily; and the “Sicilian Vespers,” in which eight thousand Frenchmen were massacred, and in consequence of which Sicily was wrested from Charles of Anjou and united with Aragon, were in some degree the work of Michael's fury. In the autumn of 1282 he fell ill, and died December 11, 1282, leaving the renown of a successful but treacherous tyrant. See Niceph. Gregor. lib. 4-5; Acropol. c. 76, etc.; Phranz. lib. 1; Pachymeres, Histaria Rerum a Michaele Palkeologa gestarum (1666); Neale, Hist, of the East. Ch. 2:311 sq.; Hase, Ch. Hist. pages 269, 354 sq.; Schrockh, Kirchengeschichte, 28:315 sq.; Gieseler, Eccles. Hist. 3:232, 413; Ffoulkes, Divisions in Christendom, volume 1; Neander, Ch. Hist. 8:264; Hardwick, Ch. Hist. of the Middle Ages, pages 279-282; Hefele, Conciliengeschichte, volume 4; Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biogr. s.v.

## Michael, St., and all Angels, Feast of[[@Headword:Michael, St., and all Angels, Feast of]]

             This festival of the Latin and Greek churches, commemorating the ministry of the holy angels to the heirs of salvation, originated in some provincial festivals which were introduced between the 3d and 5th centuries, and which were then combined into one common celebration on the 29th of September by pope Felix III in 480 (Mansi, 14:73). Its observance was not enjoined upon the Greek Church before the 12th century (Guericke, Kirchen-Gesch. page 194 sq.). The Collect is taken from the Missal: “Deus, qui miro ordine angelorum ministeria hominumque dispensas; concede propitius ut a quibus tibi ministrantibus in coelo Semper assistitur, ab his in terra vita nostra muniatur. Per dominum” (Missal Sar. “In festo sancti Michaelis Archangeli,” fol. 206). See Procter, Hist. Book of Common Prayer, page 301.

## Michaelensi, Jean[[@Headword:Michaelensi, Jean]]

             a Swiss theologian of the 12th century, the date of whose birth and death are unknown, figured as a bishop of Lausanne in 1166. We know so little of his life that we cannot say whether this same Michaelensi was the one that assisted at the Council of Troyes in 1128, and who was commissioned to draw up a body of rules for the Temple order. These rules have often  been reprinted, but appeared for the first time in the Chronique de Citeaux, by Aubert Lemire. They have also been attributed to Saint Bernard, but without foundation. See, for the scanty information accessible, Fleury, Hist. Eccles. liv. 67, n. 55; Mabillon, Op. S. Bernarde, 1:571; Hist. Litter. de la France, 11:66; Ruchat, Abrgey de l'Histoire Eccles. du pays de Vaud. page 75.

Michaelis is the name of a German family distinguished in the Protestant theological world. The following are the most eminent members of this family:

1. CHRISTIAN BENEDIKT was born at Elrich, in Hohnstein, January 26, 1680. He was educated at Halle, and in 1713 was made a professor extraordinary of philosophy, and in 1731 ordinary professor of theology at his alma mater. In 1738 he was transferred to the departments of Greek and Oriental literature. He died February 22, 1764. He was not a very prolific writer, but his few productions display unusual talent and ripe scholarship. He was a thorough master of the Biblical languages, particularly the Hebrew. His principal works are,

(1.) On Hebrew Grammar and Philology: — Dissertatio, qua solcecismus casuum ab Ebraismo S. Codicis depellitur (Halle, 1729): — Dissert. qua solcecismus generis a Syntaxi S. Codicis Ebraici depellitur (Halle, 1739): a treatise against the etymological hypothesis, defended by Hermann Hardt and others, that Hebrew and the cognate tongues were derived from Greek (Halle, 1726): — a treatise on the Hebrew points, in which he took the side of Capellus (Halle, 1739): — a dissertation on Scripture Paronomasia (Halle, 1737): — a disputation on Hebrew Ellipses (Halle, 1724).

(2.) On Biblical Exegesis: De Herba Borith (Halle, 1728): — De Idumaea et ejus Antiq. Historia (Halle, 1733): — Philologemata Medica (in which he discusses certain points of the ars medica of the Bible): — Observationes philologiae de nominibus propriis Ebrceis, a work which was a worthy predecessor of Simon's Onomasticon V.T.: — Dissertatio philologica de antiquitatibus inconomice patriarchalis (reprinted in Ugolino, Thesaur. 24:323). In the year 1749 he published Tractatus criticus de variis lectionibus N.T. caute colligendis et dijudicandis, an elaborate treatise on the various readings of the Greek Testament, exhibiting proofs of an accurate critical judgment. It gives some account of the MSS. known in his day, both Greek and Latin; of the ancient versions, and of the patristic quotations. We must not omit to mention his  cooperation with his uncle, Johann Heinrich Michaelis (q.v.), in the valuable commentary on the Hagiographa. Our author contributed the annotations on the Proverbs, Lamentations, and Dafiel. He was also associated with J.H. Michaelis in a commentary on the first two of the greater prophets. Simultaneously with the work of the latter on Isaiah, noticed above, appeared C.B. Michaelis's treatise, De Jeremia et de Vaticinio ejus (Halle, 1712). In the year 1736 he published a short work, De vaticinio Amosiprophetae. See Kitto, Cyclop. Bibl. Lit. s.v.; Herzog, Real-Encyklopdaie, s.v.

2. JOHANN DAVID, one of the ablest of Germany's theologians, and son of the preceding, was born at Halle February 27, 1717. After receiving instruction for some time from private tutors, Michaelis spent four years in the Orphan School at Halle, where his attention was particularly directed to languages and philosophy. In 1733 he began to attend the lectures at the university, and it was here that he obtained from the chancellor Ludwig's lectures on German history the foundation of that knowledge of general law and of the constitution of society which was afterwards displayed in his Mosaisches Recht. (See below.) In 1740 he visited England, where he made the acquaintance of several eminent scholars both in London and in Oxford. During part of his residence in England he preached in the German chapel at St. James's Palace. On his return to Germany, he devoted himself to the study of history, Oriental languages, and Biblical criticism. Upon the death of the chancellor Ludwig, Michaelis was commissioned to arrange and catalogue his immense library. The catalogue was published in 1745, and is considered a model for such works. Michaelis published his first book in 1739. It was a Dissertatio de Punctuorum Hebr. Antiquitate, and was quite ultra-orthodox, written in the Buxtorfian manner. But later he appears to have joined the school of Schultens, if we may judge by the Hebrew Grammar he published in 1745. The pietistic air of Halle finally led him to accept the proffered position at Gottingen, and he removed to that place in 1746, and there he spent the rest of his life, although he was invited by Frederick the Great in 1763 to return to Prussia. To the University of Gottingen Michaelis rendered the most important services as professor of theology ‘and Oriental literature from 1745 to 1791; as secretary and director of the Royal Society of Sciences, from 1751 to 1770, when he left it on account of some differences with the members; as editor of the journal entitled Gelehrte Anzeigen, from 1753 to 1770; and as librarian and director of the philological seminary, which would have been  abandoned after the death of Gesner in 1761 if Michaelis had not consented to direct it gratuitously.

In order to throw new light upon Biblical science, Michaelis planned the expedition to Arabia and India which was conducted by Carsten Niebuhr. The first project of this enterprise was submitted in the year 1756 to baron Von Bernstorff, then minister of Frederick V, king of Denmark. The course of the travellers was directed mainly by Michaelis, who drew up a series of questions for their guidance. These questions discuss the most interesting points of Biblical science — sacred geography, Oriental habits and customs, natural productions mentioned in the Bible, and diseases which still affect men in the East as they did of old. “The perspicuity, and precision, and learning with which our author proposes the questions, and the information in answer, to them obtained by Niebuhr and Forskal (as embodied in the Voyage en Arabie and Description de l'Arabie of the former, and in the Descriptiones Animalium, etc., of the latter), strikingly illustrate the sagacity of Michaelis; and the literary results of the expedition, though short of the exaggerated expectations of the time, have, in the shape of five quarto volumes, been permanently beneficial to Biblical science. In 1775 Michaelis was made a knight of the Polar Star by the king of Sweden; in 1786 he was appointed an Aulic counsellor of Hanover, and in 1789 he was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society of London. He was also a member of the Academy of Inscriptions, Paris. He died August 22, 1791.

The works of Michaelis are very numerous; the following are some of the most important. In Oriental literature, grammars of Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, and Arabic, and treatises on various subjects connected with these languages: Orientalische und Exegetische Bibliothek (a valuable periodical commenced by Michaelis in 1771, and of which he conducted 24 vols.): — Supplementa in Lexica Hebraica (6 parts in 2 volumes, 4to — useful, not more for the language illustrated, than for the information afforded on Biblical geography, archaeology, and natural history. In philosophy: an essay On the Influence of Opinions on Language, and of Language on Opinions, which obtained a prize from the Prussian Academy of Sciences in 1759; a treatise on moral philosophy, and other works. In history, geography, and chronology: Spicilegium Geographiae Hebraeorum exterae post Bochartum (Gotting. 1769, 1780); other treatises on geography and chronology; several separate dissertations on the laws and antiquities of the Jews, the substance (f most of which is embodied in his  Mosaisches Recht, in 6 volumes, 1770-75; a second edition of the first 5 volumes of this work was published in the years 1775-80. This work, which is considered the masterpiece of Michaelis, was translated into English by Dr. Alexander Smith, under the title of Commentaries on the Laws of Moses (1814, 4 volumes, 8vo). “The great object of Michaelis in this work is to investigate and illustrate the philosophy of the Mosaic laws, to show their wonderful adaptation in every respect to the very peculiar circumstances in which the people to whom they were given had been placed by Providence; and, while he takes every opportunity of establishing the claims of Moses to the character of an ambassador from heaven, to inculcate upon human legislators the important lesson of studying those particulars: respecting the nature and political situation, the ideas and prejudices, the manners and customs of their countrymen, by attention to which alone they can ever hope to make them virtuous, prosperous, and happy” (Dr. Smith's Preface, page 17). In Biblical criticism, Michaelis's Introduction to the New Testament is well known in England by the translation of the late bishop Marsh; he also published part of an Introduction to the Old Testament; a Translation of the Bible, with Notes, for the Unlearned; a monograph on the three chief Messianic psalms (viz. 10:40, 110), in which he ably defended their prophetic character (comp. cardinal Wiseman, Lectures, page 378); a commentary on the Book of Maccabees (1778); on Ecclesiastes (1762). He also wrote an able vindication of the sacred narrative on the Burial and Resurrection of Christ according to the Four Evangelists (Halle, 1783; English transl. 1827); and published learned notes on an edition of bishop Lowth's Sacra Poesis Hebrceorum (reprinted in the Oxford edition. with further annotations by E.F.C. Rosenmuller, 1821).

Johann David Michaelis has been in many respects more influential as a Biblical writer than any other of the numerous savants whom Germany has produced within the last 150 years. He exhibited an indomitable energy in the prosecution of his studies, and, hurried forward by an inquiring spirit, he could not fail to produce valuable writings. Unfortunately, however, he was inconsistent as a writer. Anxious to adhere to the established system of Lutheranism, he displayed outwardly great respect for the Christian religion, while he was really too light-minded, as he himself acknowledges, to adopt their tone of pious feeling. It is true, however, that his early pietistic training nevertheless sustained in him a certain conviction of the truth of Christianity. He endeavored constantly, by new and singularly  ingenious theories, to remove objections to Christianity; and, much to the surprise of his younger contemporaries, whose rationalistic views were ripening apace, he held to the last many parts of the older system, which they had either modified or thrown aside. The melancholy consequences, however, of this merely natural persuasion are abundantly manifest. Destitute of that conviction which alone can give a comprehensive insight into the real character of revelation, and the harmonious relation of its several parts, he had no guide to enable him to perceive what might be safely admitted without detriment to the system itself; he consequently, according to the usual custom of persons taking only a partial view of subjects, frequently opposed the objection, instead of the principle on which the objection was founded; endeavored to remove it by theories in conformity with mere human systems, and strengthened it equally by his concessions and by his own inadequate and arbitrary defences.. Possessed of no settled principles, every minute difficulty, presented itself with intrinsic force and perplexity to his mind; his belief was a reed ready to be shaken by every fresh breeze; all that he had previously gained seemed again staked on the issue of each petty skirmish; and, in the very descriptive comparison of Lessing, he was like the timid soldier who loses his life before an outpost, without once seeing the country of which he would gain possession. The theological opinions of this celebrated man are never to be trusted; and, indeed, the serious student cannot but be disgusted with the levity which too frequently appears in his writings, and the gross obscenity which frequently defiles them. After all drawbacks, however, the discriminating and careful student will seldom consult Michaelis without benefiting by his erudition and clearness of illustration; and often will he find objections on Scripture refuted with much force and felicitous originality. Dr. Tholuck describes Michaelis as one of the chief pioneers of neology, though not because he indulged in bold neological assumptions, but because he was devoid of religious life, retaining only the external form of orthodoxy, but abandoning its essence and spirit (comp. Tholuck, Vernmischte Schriften, 2:130). See Lebensbeschreibung von ihm selbst abgefasst (Leipsic and Rinteln, 1793); C.G. Heyne, Elogium J.D. Michaelis (1791); Kitto, Cyclop. Bibl. Lit. s.v.; English Cyclop. s.v.; Doring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands, volume 2, s.v.; Hagenbach, Ch. Hist. of the 18th and 19th Centuries, 1:157 sq.; Kahnis, Hist. of German Protestantism, page 120.

3. JOHANN FRIEDRICH, another writer of this family, a pupil of Danzius, is the author of a philological dissertation on the derivation and meaning of the sacred name אֶלֹהַים (reprinted in Ugolino, Thesaur. 24:105-138). With this treatise it is worth while to compare J.D. Michaelis's remarks, Supplement. ad Lex. Hebraic. pages 85-87; and Gesenius, Thesaur. pages 95-99.

4. JOHANN GEORG, who flourished as divinity professor at Halie, was born at Zerbst May 22, 1690; was educated at the University of Franeker; in 1715 entered the ministry; in 1717 accepted a position in the gymnasium at Frankfort-on-the-Oder; and in 1730 was promoted to a professorship in the university then at that place. In 1735 he was called to Halle, and died there July 16,1.758. He is the author of several learned works; one, on the famous Catechetical School of Alexandria, was first published in 1739; another work is entitled De progressu et incremento doctrines salutaris inde a protevangelio usque ad Noachum (1752); he is, however, better known for his Observationes Sacrae, a volume of great and varied erudition, comprising certain disputations which he had held at the University of Frankfort. This volume was published at Utrecht in 1738; we add the titles of such as claim mention in this work: De incisura propter mortuos: — De Elisaeo, a propro puerorun Bethlehensium justo Dei judicio vindicato: — De cane, symbolo prophetae: — De Spiritu Sancto, sub externo linguarum ignearum symbolo Apostolis communicato: — De crustulis quotidianis pontificis maximi: — De Sacerdote, ex ministerio sufftus non divite. In Ugolino, Thesaur. 11:727-748, there occurs a valuable dissertation, De Thuribulo Adyti, in which our author fully considers the high-priest's sacrificial duties on the great day of atonement, and takes occasion to illustrate, in an interesting manner, the priesthood of Christ in some of its features as indicated in the Epistle to the Hebrews (9:7-15). See Doring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands, 2:516 sq.; Kitto, Cyclop. Bibl. Lit. s.v. (J.H.W.)

5. JOHANN HEINRICH, upon the whole, the most accurately learned of all the accomplished members of his family, was born at Klettenberg, in Hohnstein, July 26, 1668. He studied Oriental literature for some years at Frankfort-on-the-Oder, where he had the celebrated Ludolf for his instructor in Ethiopic. He next studied for a time at Leipsic, and then removed to Halle, the head-quarters of Spener's influence, and became librarian to the university, later professor of the Oriental languages, and eventually of divinity. Halle was at that time the most renowned of the  German universities; its professors were eminent men, and its schools crowded with sager students, and J. Heinrich Michaelis was the soul of the place. In connection with A.H. Franke, he instituted the Collegium Orientale Theologicum, a seminary for instruction in the Biblical languages. Fifty years before Kennicott's publication, J.H. Michaelis, after some thirty years' conscientious labor, led the way in Old-Testament textual criticism by issuing from the press a carefully-edited Hebrew Bible (Halle, 1720, 2 volumes, 4to). Kennicott, who was impetuous in judgment, spoke slightingly of this work, as if the author, from favor of the Masoretic text, had improperly used his manuscripts (see Kennicott's Annual Account of Hebrew Collections, page 146). He afterwards modified his opinion in the following statement, which we extract, as giving a good description of Michaelis's labors: “This edition was the first which contained any various readings collected from Hebrew MSS. by a Christian editor. The text is taken from Jablonski's edition, with some few emendations... There were collated for this Bible most of the best printed editions, and also five Hebrew MSS. belonging to the library at Erfurt; two of which contain the verses in Joshua excluded by the Masora. The propriety of selecting various readings from Hebrew MSS. and ancient versions is set forth in the preface” (Hist. of Hebr. Text. Dissert. 2:487, Teller's ed. page 465). Three quarto volumes of exegesis, in the shape of a commentary on the Hagiographa, entitled Annotationes Philologico-Exegeticae in Hagiographis (Halle, 1720), accompanied the critical text. This is a work of still acknowledged value. J.H. Michaelis was the general editor of the whole work; but he. received assistance from his nephew, and from Rambach in portions of it. The annotations on the Psalms, Job, Canticles, Ezra, and the Chronicles were contributed by him (on the critical merit of our author, see Wiseman, Connection between Science, etc. 2d ed. page 349). Other works of his, worthy of mention here, are, a dissertation, De Paradiso: — a tract, De peculiaribus Hebraeorum loquendi modis (Halle, 1702): — De Iesaia propheta ejusque vaticinio (Halle, 1710): — and on the N.T., De textu N.T. Graeco (Halle, 1707: — Introductio in Jacobi epistolam (Halle, 1722, 4to). Johann Heinrich Michaelis died in 1738. See Doring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands, volume 2, s.v.; Herzog, Real- Encyklopadie, 9:522 sq.

## Michaelis, Sebastien[[@Headword:Michaelis, Sebastien]]

             a French Dominican, was born in 1543, at Saint-Zacharie, Provence. He introduced reforms into many houses of his order, for which, with the  consent of the court of Rome, he raised a particular congregation. Michaelis was the first vicar-general of this body, and, after having refused in 1579 the bishopric of Frejus, became prior of the new convent of the Friar Preachers at Paris in 1613. He may be regarded as the restorer of the Order of St. Dominicin France, a work with which in our days Lacordaire's name has figured prominently. Besides some religious works, he wrote L'Histoire veritable de ce qui s'est passe sous l'exorcisme de trois filles possedees au pays de Flandre, avec un Traite des Sorciers et des Magiciens (Paris, 1623, 2 volumes, 8vo); and edited Le Fevre, Calendrier historique et chronologique de l'Eglise de Paris. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Michaelius, Jonas[[@Headword:Michaelius, Jonas]]

             a Reformed (Dutch) minister, the first minister of the Reformed Church in America, was born in 1577; was educated at Leyden University; settled in Holland in 1612-16, in St. Salvador in 162425, in Guinea in 1626-27, and then migrated to this country, and arrived at Manhattan (now New York) in 1628. He organized a consistory, administered the sacraments, and performed all the functions of a minister of the Gospel. In 1633 he was succeeded by the Rev. Everardus Bogardus, who was accompanied by Adam Roelandsen, the first schoolmaster. After a few years of service he returned to Holland, and “the Classis of Amsterdam wished to send him back to New York in 1637, but he did not return. At his first communion here he had fifty communicants. He paints a sad picture of the low condition of the natives, and proposes to let the parents go and try to educate the children. His letter breathes a spirit of deep piety, and of submission to the divine will in all his bereavements.” His wife died in 1628, only seven weeks after their arrival in this country, leaving him with three small children. This letter, and other particulars respecting this pioneer of the Dutch churches in this country, are found in Colonial Hist. of New York, 2:759-770. See also Corwin's Manual Ref. Church, page 164. (W.J.R.T.)

## Michaelmas[[@Headword:Michaelmas]]

             a day which, according to the Church of Rome, was set apart to express her thankfulness to God for the many benefits she had received by the ministry of holy angels; and called Michaelmas because St. Michael is alluded to in Scripture as an angel of great power and dignity, and as  presiding and watching over the Church of God with particular vigilance and application, and as triumphant over the devil. It originated in some provincial festivities which were introduced between the 3d and 9th centuries, and which were then combined into one common celebration on the 29th of September, the day on which St. Michael's Church on Mount Garganus was dedicated, as mentioned in the Saxon Chronicle in 1011, and in Ethelred's laws in 1014. There is a tradition that this feast was instituted by Alexander, bishop of Alexandria. It was generally observed in the 8th century; in the 12th century by the Council of Mayence, and indeed by the whole Greek Church, in accordance with an injunction of the emperor Manuel Comnenus. The apparition of St. Michael, “the prince seraphim, leader of the angelic hosts, prefect of Paradise, and conductor of souls to the place of repose,” to whom cemetery chapels and churches on hills were in consequence dedicated, was observed on the 8th of May. In the 10th century there was a curious superstition that on every Monday morning St. Michael held high mass in the churches.

The Greek and other Eastern churches, the Church of England, as well as several other evangelical churches, continue to observe the Feast of St. Michael, according to Wheatly, in order “ that the people may know what benefits Christians receive by the ministry of angels” (On the Common Prayer, page 190).

The Romish Church, besides observing St. Michaelmas, also celebrates three appearances of St. Michael, which have happened (we are told) in these later years. The first is the appearance of this archangel at Colossus, in Phrygia; but at what time the Romanists do not know themselves. They observe September 6 as the day. The second is that of Mount Garganus, in the kingdom of Naples, about the end of the 5th century. May 8 is set apart as the day to commemorate the event. The third is his reputed appearance to Aubert, bishop of Avranches, upon a rock called the Tomb, where now stands the abbey of St. Michael. This was about 706. October 16 is observed in memory of this event. See Broughton, Biblioth. Hist. Sacra, 2:93; Procter, On the Book of Common Prayer, page 301; Wheatly, On the Common Prayer, page 253; Butler, Lives of Fathers, Martyrs, and Saints, 2:94; 3:177; Michaelis, Denkwiirdigkeiten a.d. christl. Archdol. 3:28 sq.

## Michah[[@Headword:Michah]]

             (Heb. as in MICAIAH), a son of Uzziel and a Kohathite priest (1Ch 24:24-25); elsewhere (1Ch 23:20) more correctly Anglicized MICAH SEE MICAH (q.v.).

## Michaiah[[@Headword:Michaiah]]

             (for the Heb., etc., see MICAIAH), the name of several men and one woman.

1. The queen-mother of king Abijah (2Ch 13:2); elsewhere (2Ch 11:20) called MAACHAH SEE MAACHAH (q.v.).

2. One of the national chieftains to whom Jehoshaphat gave orders to instruct the people of the various cities of Judah in the sacred law (2Ch 17:7). B.C. 910.

3. The father of Achbor, which latter was one of the courtiers (perhaps a Levite) sent by Josiah to inquire of the prophetess Huldah concerning the newly-discovered copy of the Pentateuch (2Ki 22:12). B.C. ante 623. In the parallel passage (2Ch 34:20) he is called MICAH, and his father's name is written Abdon.

4. The son of Gemariah and grandson of Shaphan; after having heard Baruch read the terrible predictions of Jeremiah in his father's hall, he went, apparently with good intentions, to report to the king's officers what he had heard (Jer 36:11-13). B.C. 605. “Michaiah was the third in descent of a princely family, whose names are recorded in connection with important religious transactions. His grandfather Shaphan was the scribe, or secretary, of king Josiah, to whom Hilkiah the high-priest first delivered the book of the law which he said he had found in the House of Jehoivah — Shaphan first perusing the book himself, and then reading it aloud to the youthful-king (2Ki 22:10). It was from his father Gemariah's chamber in the Temple that Baruch read the prophecies of Jeremiah in the ears of all the people. Moreover, Gemariah was one of the three who made intercession to king Zedekiah, although in vain. that he would not burn the roll containing Jeremiah's prophecies.” SEE JEREMIAH.

5. The son of Zaccur and father of Mattaniah, Levites (“priests' sons”) of the line of Asaph ((Neh 12:35). B.C. considerably ante 446.  6. One of the priests who celebrated with trumpets the completion of the walls of Jerusalem after the exile (Neh 12:41). B.C. 446.

## Micheeas[[@Headword:Micheeas]]

             (Vulg. id.), an erroneous form (2Es 1:39) of the name of the prophet MICAH.

## Michel Angelo[[@Headword:Michel Angelo]]

             SEE CARAVAGGIO; SEE MICHAEL ANGELO.

## Michel, Augustin[[@Headword:Michel, Augustin]]

             a German Roman Catholic theologian, was born in 1661, at Unterstorff, Bavaria, and was educated at the University of Dillingen. He studied both theology and law, and secured the doctorate in divinity and also in law. After finishing his studies, he returned as teacher to the convent-school of his native place, where he, had prepared for the university. He was afterwards appointed ecclesiastical counsellor by the prince elector of Cologne, the prince bishop of Freising, and the prince abbot of Kempten. He died in 1751. Some of his most important works, besides many dissertations and contributions to periodicals, are, Expositiones in Psalmos, in Cantica, Cenciones dominicales, etc. (never published): — Theologia canonico-moralis (1707, fol.): — De juro etjustitia, juridiae et theologiae tractata contra L.B.'de Schmid (Rome, 1699, 8vo): — Discussio theologica de contritione et attritione (ibid. 1710, 4to): — Confutatio infamis libri cui Litalis Expostulatio contra damnationem Quesnellii, etc. (Landeshuti, 1719, 4to).

## Michel, Francois[[@Headword:Michel, Francois]]

             a French visionary, was born at Salon, in Provence, in 1661. To this name is attached the memory of an extraordinary adventure, which, towards the close of the summer of 1699, created a great sensation in France. Michel practiced at Salon the trade of a farrier. When thirty-eight years of age, the father of a family, and well known in his vicinity, he claimed to have the following vision: “One evening, in the field, returning home, he saw at the foot of a tree, and surrounded by a great light, a beautiful fair woman, clothed in white, with a mantle arranged in court-fashion, who, calling Michel by his name, told him that she was the late queen, Marie Therese, who had been married to the king. After having confided to him some things of great importance, she ordered him, under pain of death, to go and  reveal them to the king, adding that if at first he could not obtain an audience with the king, he should demand to see a minister of state, but that he should reserve certain secrets for the king alone. This apparition was renewed three times. Yielding finally to these injunctions, the farrier repaired to Aix, to the intendant of Provence, who, surprised at ;the good sense and firmness of this man, gave him letters to the ministers, and paid his way. This marvellous story spread in all directions. Michel had scarcely arrived at Marseilles, when he sought M. de Brissac, major of the body- guard, and, without permitting himself to be disheartened, insisted on having access to the king. Louis XIV, informed of the singular obstinacy of Michel, finally consented to receive the farrier, and had with him two interviews; but to this day the conversation between the king and his subject remains a mystery. To his friends the king pronounced Michel a man of great good sense. Michel returned to his province, furnished with a sum of money, and provided for during the remainder of his life.” This singular case was much commented upon. While some admitted the reality of a providential mission, others saw in it only a tissue of bold trickery, of which Michel, in his simplicity, was the first dupe. We are told to place all this story to the account of a Madame Arnoul, a romantic and intriguing woman, widow of the intendant of marine at Marseilles, and who preserved a secret and intimate friendship for a long time with Madame de Maintenon. Michel, fatigued with the curiosity of which he was the object, retired to Landon,- a- village near Aix, where he died, December 10, 1726. Saint-Simon, Memoires, 11:16 sq. (edit. Cheruel); Proyart, Vie du Dauphin pere de Louis XVI. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Michel, Georg Adam[[@Headword:Michel, Georg Adam]]

             a German theologian, was born September 23, 1708, at Walpheim; was educated at the school of his native place, and studied theology at the University of Jena. Afterwards he assisted his father in his ecclesiastical functions for seven years, was then appointed inspector of the orphan asylum at Oettingen, with the title Counsellor of the Consistory; and died March 21, 1780. Michel combined with a great knowledge in theology a thorough acquaintance with history. He contributed largely to the Oettingische Bibliothek (Oettingen, 1758, 8vo), and to the Oettingische politische kirchliche und gelehrten Geschichte (ibid. 177279, 3 volumes, 8vo).

## Michel, Jean[[@Headword:Michel, Jean]]

             a French ecclesiastic, was born at Beauvais about the close of the 14th century. He was at first counsellor to Louis II, king of Sicily; then canon of Rouin, of Aix, and of Angiers. He was appointed bishop of Angiers by the state, February 28, 1439; archdeacon Guillaume d'Estouteville, of the same diocese, however, obtained edicts from the pope for the bishopric. Fortified with these bulls, he presented himself to the chapter, and demanded the deposition of Michel; but, instead, the supplicant himself was removed. Guillaume persisted notwithstanding, and seated himself as bishop of Angiers in the Council of Florence, while Jean Michel was seated with the same title in the Council of Basle. Stormy dissensions ensued, which the pope Eugenius endeavored to terminate by appointing Guillaume successively bishop of Digne and cardinal. But a man of so great an origin, and so powerful in his alliances, was not to be satisfied with these transactions. His intrigues continued to involve the bishopric in constant agitation. The plebeian Jean Michel had, however, resolute partisans. Few prelates have left in the Church of Anglers such honorable memories. The kings of France have several times demanded, though in vain, his canonization by the Church of Rome. Michel died September 11, 1447. See Gallia Christiana, volume 14, col. 580; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Michele, Parrasic[[@Headword:Michele, Parrasic]]

             a Venetian painter, flourished about 1590. He was a pupil of Paul Veronese. He executed several works for the churches, especially a Pieta, in a chapel of the church of San Giuseppe, into which he introduced a portrait of himself. See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts (N.Y. 1865, 2 volumes, 8vo).

## Michelians[[@Headword:Michelians]]

             SEE HAHN, MICHEL; SEE KORNTHAL, SOCIETY OF.

## Michelini, Gio. Battista[[@Headword:Michelini, Gio. Battista]]

             a painter of religious subjects, who flourished about 1650, was a native of Foligno. He was a pupil of Guido Reni, and wrought in the churches of the Romagna. Lanzi says there are several of his works at Gubbio, and mentions particularly a Dead Christ. But little is known of him. See Lanzi's  Hist. of Painting, transl. by Roscoe (Lond. 1847, 3 volumes, 8vo), 1:460; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts (N.Y. 1865, 2 volumes, 8vo).

## Michelozzi (Or Michelozzo)[[@Headword:Michelozzi (Or Michelozzo)]]

             a celebrated Florentine sculptor and architect, was born in 1396. He was a pupil of Donatello, and the greater part of the sepulchral monument erected for pope Giovanni Coscia, in the church of San Giovanni at Florence, by Donatello, is in reality the work of Michelozzi. In the same church is a beautiful statue of Faith, which was executed by Michelozzi as a companion to the two statues of Hope and Charity by his master. Over the sacristy and the rooms of the superintendents, which are opposite to San Giovanni, Michelozzi executed a full relief of San Giovanni, which was afterwards removed, and is now in the Florentine Gallery, in the corridor of bronzes. As an architect, Michelozzi had deservedly a high reputation. He built, among many other fine buildings, the library of the monastery of San Giorgio Maggiore, a house of the Black Monks of Santa Giustina. In 1437 he commenced the construction of the convent of San Marco, which was finished, at a cost of 36,000 ducats, in 1452. Michelozzi also constructed for Cosmo de' Medici the noviciate of Santa Croce, which, for beauty of form and decoration, will compare favorably with any work of this master. The convent of the Barefooted Monks of St. Francis, the church and convent of the monks of San Girolamo, and many other works of purely secular character, are by this distinguished man. He died in 1470, and was buried in his own tomb, in the church of Sali Marco, in Florence. See Vasari, Lives of the Painters, transl. by Mrs. Foster (Lond. 1850, 5 volumes, 8vo), 1:494; Quatremere de Quincy, Vies des Architectes illustres.

## Michl, Anton[[@Headword:Michl, Anton]]

             a German Roman Catholic theologian, was born in 1753 at Ebersberg, Bavaria; was educated at Freysing, and ordained in 1776. He afterwards studied law and ecclesiastical history, and was in 1799 appointed professor of ecclesiastical law and history at Landshut. He was a faithful adherent of the government party, at that time, as in our own day, decidedly anti- Romanistic in feeling and tendency, and Michl thereby made many friends even among the Protestants, who looked upon him as a friend of liberty and of light. He died at Landshut in 1813. Besides several dissertations, he published Kirchenrecht fur Katholiken. und Protestanten, mit Hinsicht auf  den Code Napoleon und die bayerischen Landesgesetze (Munchen, 1809); and Kirchengeschichte (ibid. 1807-11, 2 volumes, 8vo). See C.A. Baaders, Lexikon verstorbener bayer. Schriftsteller (Augsburg and Leipsic, 1824); Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, s.v.

## Michmas[[@Headword:Michmas]]

             (Heb. Mlikmas', מַכְמָס, something hidden; Ezr 2:27, Sept. Μαχμάς v.r. Χαμμάς; Neh 7:31, Μαχεμάς), or MICHMASH (Heb. Mikmash', מַכְמָשׁ, id. Neh 11:31, Sept. Μαχαμάς, in pause מַכְמָשׁ, 1Sa 13:2; 1Sa 13:5; 1Sa 13:11; 1Sa 13:16; 1Sa 13:23; 1Sa 14:5; 1Sa 14:31; Isa 10:28; Sept. Μαχμάς, and so in 1Ma 9:13; Josephus, Μαχμά [Ant. 13:1, 6]), a town of Benjamin (Ezr 2:27; Neh 11:31; comp. 7:31), east of Bethel or Beth-aven (1Sa 13:5), and south from Migron, on the road to Jerusalem (Isa 10:28). “If the name be, as some scholars assert (First, Handwb. page 600b, 732b), compounded from that of Chemosh, the Moabitish deity, it is not improbably a relic of some incursion or invasion of the Moabites, just as Chephar-haammonai, in this very neighborhood, is of the Ammonites. But though in the heart of Benjamin, it is not named in the list of the towns of that. tribe (comp. Joshua 17).” The words of 1Sa 13:2; 1Sa 14:4; and Isa 10:29, show that at Michmas was a pass where the progress, of a military body might be impeded or opposed, since it was held by the Philistines while Saul and the Israelites were at Gibeah; it was also on the line of march of an invading army from the north, and the Assyrians are represented as depositing their baggage there on their way to Jerusalem, just before reaching Gibeah (Isa 10:28). It was perhaps for this reason that Jonathan Maccabseus fixed his abode at Michmas (1Ma 9:73); and it is from the chivalrous exploit of another hero of the same name, the son of Saul, that the place is chiefly celebrated (1 Samuel 13; 1Sa 14:4-16). “Saul was occupying the range of heights above mentioned, one end of his line resting on Bethel, the other at Michmas (1Sa 13:2). In Geba, close to him, but separated by the wide and intricate valley, the Philistines had a garrison with a chief officer.

The taking of the garrison or the killing of the officer by Saul's son Jonathan was the first move. The next was for the Philistines to swarm up from their, sea-side plain in such numbers that no alternative was left for Saul but to retire down the wady to Gilgal, near Jericho, that from that ancient sanctuary he might collect and reassure the Israelites. Michmas was then occupied by the Philistines, and was their  furthest post to the east. But it was destined to witness their sudden overthrow. While he was in Geba, and his father in Michmas, Jonathan must have crossed the intervening valley too often not to know it thoroughly; and the intricate paths which render it impossible for a stranger to find his way through the mounds and hummocks that crowd the bottom of the ravine — with these he was so familiar — the passages here, the sharp rocks there-as to be able to traverse them even in the dark. It was just as the day dawned (Joseph. Ant. 6:6, 2) that the watchers in the garrison at Michmas descried the two Hebrews clambering up the steeps beneath. We learn from the details furnished by Josephus, who must have had an opportunity of examining the spot when he passed it with Titus on their way to the siege of Jerusalem (see War, 5:2, 1), that the part of Michmas in which the Philistines had established themselves consisted of three summits, surrounded by a line of rocks like a natural entrenchment, and ending in a long and sharp precipice, believed to be impregnable. Finding himself observed from above, and taking the invitation as an omen in his favor, Jonathan turned from the course which he was at first pursuing, and crept up in the direction of the point reputed impregnable. It was there, according to Josephus, that he and his armor-bearer made their entrance to the camp (Josephus, Ant. 6:6, 2)” (Smith). SEE GIBEAH; SEE JONATHAN.

It was inhabited, after the return from Babylon (Neh 11:31), by 122 returned colonists (Ezr 2:27; Neh 7:31). Eusebius describes Michmas as a large village nine Roman miles from Jerusalem, on the road to Ramah (Onomast. s.v. Μαχμά). Travellers have usually identified it with Bir or el-Bireh (see Maundrell, March 25; and the details in Quaresmius, Elucidato, 2:786, 787); but Dr. Robinson (Researches, 2:117) recognizes it in a place still bearing the name of Mukhmas, at a distance and position which correspond well with these intimations. It is small, and almost desolate, but bears marks of having once been a place of strength and importance. There are many foundations of hewn stones, and some columns lie among them. The steep and precipitous Wady es-Suweinit, a valley into which the two ravines on the low ridge between which the village is situated run, is probably the “passage of Michmash” mentioned in Scripture (1Sa 13:23; Isa 10:29). “In it,” says Dr. Robinson, “just at the left of where we crossed, are two hills of a conical, or rather spherical form, having steep rocky sides, with small wadys running up between each so as almost to isolate them. One of them is on the side towards Jeba (Gibeal), and the other towards Mukhmas. These would seem to be the two rocks mentioned in connection  with Jonathan's adventure (1Sa 14:4-5). SEE BOZEZ; SEE SENEH.

They are not, indeed, so sharp as the language of Scripture would seem to imply; but they are the only rocks of the kind in this vicinity. The northern one is connected towards the west with an eminence still more distinctly isolated” (Bib. Researches, 2:116; comp. new ed. 3:289; see Thenius, in the Sachs. exeget. Stud. 2:147 sq.). “Immediately facing Mukhmas, on the opposite side of the ravine, is the modern representative of Geba; and behind this again are Ramah and Gibeah-all memorable names in the long struggle which has immortalized Michmas. Bethel is about four miles to the north of Michmas, and the interval is filled up by the heights of Burka, Deir Diwan, Tell el-Hajar, etc., which appear to have constituted the Mount Bethel of the narrative (13:2).” In the Talmud (Menachoth, 8:1; comp. Schwarz, Palest. page 131) the soil of Michmas is celebrated for its fertility (Reland, Palaest. page 897). “There is a good deal of cultivation in and among groves of old olives in the broad, shallow wady which slopes down to the north and east of the village; but Mukhmas itself is a very poor place, and the country close to it has truly a most forbidding aspect. Huge gray rocks raise up their bald crowns, completely hiding every patch of soil, and the gray huts of the village, and the gray ruins that encompass them, can hardly be distinguished from the rocks themselves. There are considerable remains of massive foundations, columns, cisterns, etc., testifying to former prosperity greater than that of either Anathoth or Geba” (Porter, Handbk. pages 215, 216).

## Michmash[[@Headword:Michmash]]

             (1Sa 13:2-23; 1Sa 14:5; 1Sa 14:31; Neh 11:31; Isa 10:28). SEE MICHMAS.

## Michmash (2)[[@Headword:Michmash (2)]]

             On this interesting locality, Lieut. Consider remarks as follows (Tent Work, 2:112 sq.):

"The site of the Philistine camp at Michmash, which Jonathan and his armor-bearer attacked, is very minutely described by Josephus. It was, he says, a precipice with three tops, ending in a long, sharp tongue, and protected by surrounding cliffs. Exactly such a natural fortress exists immediately east of the village of Michmash, and it is still called "the fort" by the peasantry. It is a ridge rising in three rounded knolls above a perpendicular crag, ending in a narrow tongue to the east, with cliffs below, and having an open valley behind it, and a saddle towards the west on which Michmash itself is situate. Opposite this fortress, on the south, there is a crag of equal height and seemingly impassable; thus the description of the Old Test. is fully borne out — 'a sharp rock on one side, and a sharp rock on the other' (1Sa 14:4).

"The southern cliff, as we have noticed above, was called Seneh, or 'the acacia,' and the same name still applies to the modern valley, due to the acacia-trees which dot its course. The northern cliff was named Bozez, or ‘shining,' and the true explanation of the name only presents itself on the spot. The great valley runs nearly due east, and thus the southern cliff is almost entirely in shade during the day. The contrast is surprising and picturesque, between the dark, cool color of the south side and the ruddy or tawny tints of the northern cliff, crowned with the gleaming white of the upper chalky strata. The picture is unchanged since the days when Jonathan looked over to the white camping-ground of the Philistines, and Bozez must then have shone as brightly as it does now, in the full light of an Eastern sun." (See illustration on following page.)

## Michmethah[[@Headword:Michmethah]]

             (Heb. Mikmethath', מַכְמְתָת, perh. hiding-place; Sept. Μαχθώθ, Vulg. Machmethath), a town on the northern border of Ephraim (and the southern of Manasseh), situated eastward of Shechem and southward from Asher, in the direction of Tappuah (Jos 17:7), also not very far west of Jordan, but beyond Taanath-Shiloh (Jos 16:6; where part of the verse appears to have become transposed from its proper location at the beginning of Jos 16:8; see Keil's Comment. ad loc.). These notices appear to fix it not far from Wady Bidan, north-east of Salem. SEE TRIBE. This position corresponds to the location assigned to the associated places by  Eusebius (Schwarz, Palest. page 147); and M. de Saulcy found a little village in this vicinity, called el-Makhna, which he thinks may be a vestige of the Biblical locality (Narrative, 1:93); but Dr. Robinson, who passed through this region during his last visit, speaks only of “several villages” visible in this vicinity (Researches, new ed. 3:298), and applies the name el- Makhna to a large fertile valley south of Nablus (ibid. page 132, etc.); which, however, according to Van de Velde's Map, runs into Wady Bidan.

## Michon, Jean Hippolyte[[@Headword:Michon, Jean Hippolyte]]

             a French abbot and religious writer, was born at La Roche-Fressange in 1806. He pursued his theological studies at the seminary of St. Sulpice in Paris, accompanied De Saulcy to the East in 1850 and 1860, and was honorary canon of AngoulAme and Bordeaux. He died in 1881, leaving, La Femme et la Famille dans le Catholicisme (1845): — Apologie Chretienne au Dix-Neuvieme Siecle (1863): — Vie de Jesus (1865, 2 volumes): — Solution Nouvelle de la Question des Lieux Saints (1852): — Voyage Religieux en Orient (1854, 2 volumes). See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Michri[[@Headword:Michri]]

             (Heb. Mikrai', מַכֻרי, salable; Sept. Μοχορέ v.r. Μαχίρ), the father of Uzzi and grandfather of Elah, which last was one of the principal Benjamites resident in Jerusalem after the exile (1Ch 9:8). B.C. considerably ante 440.

## Michtam[[@Headword:Michtam]]

             (Heb. miktam', מַכְתָּם, prob. for מַכְתָּבwritten; Sept. στηλογραφία, Vulg. tituli inscriptio), a term found in the titles of several psalms (16, 56, 57, 58, 60), and signifying a writing, i.e., a poem or song (see Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 724), like מַכְתָּב(miktab', “writing,” in Isa 38:9). Others (as Luther, after Aben-Ezra, Kimchi, and others) unaptly translate it golden, i.e., precious, distinguished, as if from כֶּתֶם gold. Still others (as Hezel, Ewald) refer to an Arabic root meaning to conceal, as if written from retirement, or in a plaintive strain; and some (after the rabbins) make it a compound of מָךְ וְתָם, i.q. humble and perfect, referring to David. SEE PSALMS.

## Micislaus[[@Headword:Micislaus]]

             duke of Poland in the 10th century, is noted in ecclesiastical history as the promulgator of Christianity among the Poles, A.D. 965. His own conversion was brought about by his wife, Dambrowka, daughter of a Bohemian prince. John XIII was at that time the Roman pontiff, and he despatched AEgidius, bishop of Tusculum, to the aid of the duke and his wife. SEE POLAND.

## Micqueau, Jean-Louis[[@Headword:Micqueau, Jean-Louis]]

             a French Protestant theologian, was born at Rheims about 1530. He took part in the Reformation; established a school at Orleans in 1557, and taught  the humanities in the college of the same city. Allied by friendship with Gentien Hervet, a canon of Rheims and native of Orleans, the difference in their religions brought on a polemical correspondence., He died near the close of the 16th century. Micqueau wrote, Lycampaei castri obsidio et excidium (1554): — De constituenda apud Aurelios juventutis disciplina Oratio (1558): — Aureliae urbis memorabilis ab Anglis obsidio, anno 1428, et Joannae Virginis Lotharingae res gestae (1560): — Response au discours de Gentien Hervet, sus ce que les pilleurs, voleurs et branleurs de l'eglises disent qu'ils ne veulent qu'aux prieres (1564): — Deuxieme Response de Jean-Louis Micqueau, maistre d'ecole a Orleans, aux folies reveries, execrables blasphemes, erreurs et mensonges de G. Hervet (1564). See Revue historique et litteraire de la Champagne, No. 11, 15 (November, 1854), page 74; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Micraelius, Johann[[@Headword:Micraelius, Johann]]

             a German Lutheran professor, was born at Cosslin, in Pomerania, September 1, 1597. He began his studies at the college of his own town, and in 1614 removed to Stettin, where he studied theology under professor Aamer. In 1616 he maintained a dispute, “De Dea uno et trino,” which secured him much reputation. A year after he disputed at the University of Konigsberg, “De veritate transcendentali.” He received in 1621 the degree of master of philosophy at the University of Greifswald, after having maintained a thesis, “De meteoris.” He finished his studies at Leipsic. He was made professor of rhetoric in the royal college at Stettin in 1624, rector of the Senate School in 1627, and rector of the royal college and professor of theology in 1649. He had a famous dispute with John Bergius, first preacher at the court of the elector of Brandenburg, upon the differences between the Lutherans and Calvinists. On a visit to Sweden, in 1653, he had the honor to pay his respects to queen Christina, who received him with very marked attention. She defrayed the charges of his doctor's degree. He died December 3, 1658. Micrelius' wrote, Lexicon Philologicum: — Lexicon Philosophicum: — Syntagma Historiae Mundi: Syntagma Historiae Ecclesiasticae: — Ethnophronius contra Gentiles de Principiis Religionis Christianae: — he afterwards added a continuation, Contra Judeas Depravationes: — Tabellae Historicae, ad Millen. et Rerumpublic. Tempora dijudicanda Necessarice: — Tractatus de copia Rerum et Verborum, cum Praxi continua Praeceptorum Rhetor: — Archerologia, Arithmetica, usus Globorum et Tabular. Geographicar.: — Orthodoxia Lutherana contra Bergium; and numerous theses,  disputations, orations, etc. See Allgemeines Historisches Lexikon (Leips. 1731, 5 volumes, fol.), 3:560 sq.; Witte, Memor. theol. page 282 sq.; Bayle, Hist. Dict. s.v. (J.H.W.)

## Micronesia[[@Headword:Micronesia]]

             (from Greek μικρός, small, and νῆσος, island, signifying a region of small islands or islets) is a term of recent application, and is applied to a portion of the Central Archipelago, Pacific Ocean, including the Kingsmill group. Micronesia proper extends from the westernmost island of the Sandwich group to near Japan and the Philippines, and reaches south of the equator, including the Ladrone Islands, the Carolinas, and the Pellew Islands. The Kingsmill group lies on both sides of the equator, and consists of fifteen principal islands, all coral, and densely covered with cocoa-nut groves.

Customs. — The population of these islands amounts to about 50,000 souls. They are governed by independent chiefs or kings, and mostly lead a life of indolence. They are divided into three classes — chiefs, landholders, and slaves. They live in small communities, regarding the eldest of their number as a kind of patriarch. Polygamy is common. They are hospitable, and ready to share the last morsel with the needy. In each town is a “stranger's house,” where travelers find a temporary home. The cocoa-nut, which everywhere abounds, supplies the few wants of the natives with little labor. Their chief employment is the manufacture of coconut oil. Almost everything which the natives eat, drink, wear, live in, or use in any way, is obtained from the cocoa-nut tree.

Religion. — There exists hardly any well-developed form of worship or religion. They have no idols and no priests. A loose system of spirit worship, or, better said, of veneration for the spirits of the dead, used to prevail among these people, but is gradually dying out. When a Micronesian dies, the body is placed upon mats, in the center of the house, and rubbed with coconut oil till the flesh is gone; then the bones are placed in a loft or thrown into the sea. A stone is placed near the house as a resting-place for the spirit, and offerings are made to it twice a year. There are but few traditions, and the people cannot be said to be very superstitious.

Missions. — Prosperous missions have been established in these groups by agents of the American Board of Foreign Missions; several of the workers have been selected from among their converts in Honolulu. As the result of  the mission to Micronesia, during the nineteen years since its commencement, it would appear that a wonderful change has been produced in the social and moral condition of the once wild and savage inhabitants. A number of the natives have been converted to Christianity, and, according to the last report, 668 converts are united in Church fellowship. See The Missionary World (N.Y. 1873, 12mo), page 457 and 1123; Grundemann, Miss. Atlas, s.v.; Newcomb, Cyclop. of Missions, page 539 sq. SEE SANDWICH ISLANDS.

## Micronius, Martin[[@Headword:Micronius, Martin]]

             a very distinguished Dutch divine, was born about 1523 at Ghent, of a noble Dutch family. We know little of Micronius's early years. He was at first a physician, and is said to be the author of several medical books and essays. In 1550, when the Protestant Church was bitterly persecuted by the Spaniards, Micronius, with many others of his countrymen, fled to England, and there proved himself a very efficient helpmate to John a Lasko (q.v.) in the establishment and organization of the foreign Protestant congregation in London. He translated John Lasko's system of Church order and liturgical formulars into Dutch, and introduced them into the congregation of Dutch refugees in London. The death of the king wrought an entire change in the prospects of the exiles, and on the accession of queen Mary they prepared to leave for other parts. Micronius accompanied them to Denmark and East Friesland, and finally became pastor at Norden. He died towards the close of the 16th century. In his disputations and writings Micronius opposed Simon Menno (q.v.) and David George; and when Westphal (q.v.), a Lutheran divine, had called his fellow-pilgrims “martyrs of the devil,” on account of Lasko's views of the sacraments, Micronius sought to convince, or at least silence him, but failed. In Norden he edited his larger and smaller Catechism, 1592: De cleyne catechismus of kinderbere der Duitschen Ghemeynte van London, etc., weekenu hier ende daer verstrogt is. Ghemaect door Martin Micron. Ghedruckt bey Gellium Itematium anno 1555. These catechisms were consulted in the composition of the Heidelberg Catechism (q.v.). Micronius also wrote an apology of the foreign Protestant congregation, defending them against the accusation of high-treason, which had furnished a pretext for their expulsion from England. See Kocher, Katech. Gesch. der reform. Kirche; Bartel's Johannes a Lasko.

## Mid-day[[@Headword:Mid-day]]

             (צָהַרִיַם, double light,. 1Ki 18:29, i.e., noon, as elsewhere rendered; מִחֲצַית הִיּוֹם, half of, the day, Neh 8:3; ἡμέρα μέση, middle day, Act 26:13). SEE DAY.

## Middeldorpf, Heinrich[[@Headword:Middeldorpf, Heinrich]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born at Hamburg, August 2, 1788. He commenced his academical career at Frankfort-on-the Oder, was in 1811 professor of theology at Breslau, in 1814 member of consistory, and died in 1837, doctor of theology. He published, Nahum ubersetzt mit Anmerkungen (Hamburg, 1808): — Symbola Exegetico-Critica ad Librum Ecclesiast. (Frankfort, 1811): — Commentatio de Institutis Literariis in Hispania (Gottingen, 1812):Curce Hexaplaris in Jobunm (Breslau, 1817): — Comm. de Prudentio et Theologia Prudentiana (1823, 1826): — Codex Syriaco-Hexaplaris (1835). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:56, 213, 228, 911; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:377. (B.P.)

## Middin[[@Headword:Middin]]

             (Heb. Middin', מַדַּין, distaznce; Sept. Μαδδίν v.r. Μαδών), a town in the desert of Judah, mentioned between Beth-arabah and Secacah (Jos 15:61); and probably situated not far from the Dead Sea, about opposite its middle, or possibly at the ruins near a well marked on Van de Velde's Map as Khan Mardeh, near the north end of the Dead Sea. “By Van de Velde (Memoir, page 256, and Map) mention is made of a valley on the south-western side of the Dead Sea, below Masada, called Urn el- Bedun, which may contain a trace of the ancient name.”

## Middin (2)[[@Headword:Middin (2)]]

             For this site Tristram suggests (Bible Places, page 87) Khurbet Mird, two miles north-east of Mar Saba, the Mons Mardes of the Middle Ages, a ruin on a strong hill, with an aqueduct, wells, and arches (Memoirs to the Ordnance Survey, 3:212).

## Middle Ages[[@Headword:Middle Ages]]

             The barbarism of this period may be said to have begun about A.D. 510, when the barbarians had made an eruption into the West very prejudicial to the interests of literature. Learning was preserved in the bishops' schools and monasteries: the works of ancient authors were kept in the libraries of the monasteries, but the libraries of monks and churchmen were composed chiefly of ecclesiastical and ascetic works. Greek literature was generally neglected, Latin but poorly cultivated; rhetoric was turned into bombast, the liberal arts comprised within a few rules, and the study of philosophy abandoned and decried. This barbarism almost extinguished the light (hence the name “Dark Ages”) and life of Christianity, as the influence of the Church in the course of its previous corruption had already suppressed ancient literature. See Riddle's Eccl. Chronicles; Eden, Theol. Dict.; Farrar, Eccles. Dict.

## Middle Wall[[@Headword:Middle Wall]]

             (μεσότοιχον), spoken of the chel or sacred fence (“partition”) between the Court of the Gentiles and the interior sanctum of the Temple (Eph 2:14). SEE TEMPLE.

## Middlekauff, Solomon[[@Headword:Middlekauff, Solomon]]

             a German Reformed minister, was born near Hagerstown, Maryland, in 1818; was educated at Marshall College, Mercersburg, Pennsylvania, (class of 1839); studied theology in the theological seminary of the German Reformed Church located in the same place; was ordained in 1842, and became pastor of the Lincolnton charge in North Carolina. He died at the mineral springs, Catawba County, N.C., May 21, 1845. His ministry was brief but blessed. Energetic, mild and peaceful in spirit, well educated and zealous, his influence was widely felt, and his memory is faithfully cherished.

## Middleton, Conyers[[@Headword:Middleton, Conyers]]

             a celebrated divine and scholar of the Church of England, was born December 27,1683, at Richmond, in Yorkshire. His father, the Reverend William Middleton, rector of Hinderwell, gave him a liberal education. At the age of seventeen he was sent to Trinity College, Cambridge, of which college he was two years afterwards chosen a scholar. He took his degree of B.A. in 1702, and was shortly after ordained deacon. In 1706 he was elected a fellow of Trinity' College; and in 1708 joined with other fellows of his college in a petition to the bishop of Ely, as the visitor of the college, against Bentley (q.v.), the master. Middleton, who was then a young man, did not take a prominent part in this proceeding; but the feelings of hostility to the master originated by these disputes sank deep into his mind, and made him subsequently the most determined and dangerous of Bentley's enemies. Soon after this petition, he withdrew himself from Bentley's jurisdiction by marrying a lady of ample fortune. He subsequently resided for a short time in the Isle of Ely, on a small living in the gift of his wife, but the unhealthiness of the situation induced him to return to Cambridge at the end of a year. In October, 1717, when George I visited the University of Cambridge, Middleton, with several others, was created doctor of divinity by mandate; but Bentley, who was regius professor of divinity, refused to confer the degree unless a fee of four guineas was given to him in addition to the so-called “broadpiece,” which had by ancient custom been allowed as a present on this occasion.

This demand was resisted by Middleton, who, however, at last consented to pay it under protest. An appeal to court proved unfavorable to Bentley, but still he kept the money. Middleton thereupon sued Bentley for it in the vice- chancellor's court; and Bentley, refusing to pay the money or to  acknowledge the jurisdiction of the court, was deprived of his degrees. Bentley petitioned the king for relief from that sentence, and, as he was a firm supporter of the Whig ministry then in power, it was feared that a commission might be issued by the crown to inquire into the state of the university. Middleton, to justify himself and his friends, published A full and impartial Account of all the late Proceedings in the University of Cambridge against Dr. Bentley; which, says Dr. Monk, “was the first published specimen of a style which, for elegance, purity, and ease, yields to none in the whole compass of the English language. The acrimonious and resentful feeling which prompted every line, is in some measure disguised by the pleasing language, the harmony of the periods, and the vein of scholarship which enliven the whole tract” (Monk, Life of Bentley, page 388). A few months afterwards Middleton published A Second Part of the full and impartial Account of all the late Proceedings, and also A true Account of the present State of Trinity College, in Cambridge, under the oppressive Government of their Master, R. Bentley, late D.D. These books seem to have been written in order to destroy the suspicion which many then had, viz. that the proceedings of the university against Dr. Bentley did not flow so much from any real demerit in the man, as from a certain spirit of opposition to the court, the great promoter of whose interest he was thought to be. Middleton, in one of his pamphlets, had very imprudently declared “that the fellows of Trinity College had not been able to find any proper court in England which would receive their complaints;” and Bentley, perceiving that his adversary had been guilty of an expression which might be considered as a libel upon the administration of justice in the whole kingdom, brought an action against him, in which the jury returned a verdict of guilty. The court, however, was unwilling to pronounce sentence, and the matter was eventually settled by Middleton's begging pardon of Bentley, and consenting to pay all the expenses of the action.

But Middleton had not done with Bentley yet. The latter, in 1720, published proposals for a new edition of the Greek Testament, with a specimen of the intended work. The former, in 1721, published Remarks, Paragraph by Paragraph, upon the Proposals lately published by R. Bentley for a new Edition of the Greek Testament.

Although Middleton professed, in the commencement of the pamphlet, that “his remarks were not drawn from him by personal spleen or envy to the author of the Proposals, but by a serious conviction that he had neither  talents nor materials proper for the work he had undertaken. and that religion was much more likely to receive detriment than service from it,” the whole tenor and style of the pamphlet showed that it was the result of the most virulent personal animosity. He followed up his attack on Bentley by Some further Remarks; and it must be conceded that these two books against Bentley are written with great acuteness and learning, and, though Bentley affected to despise them, they destroyed the credit of his Proposals so effectually that his intended publication of the New Testament came to nothing.

Upon the great enlargement of the public library at Cambridge, a new office of principal librarian was established, to which Middleton was elected, notwithstanding a violent opposition. He afterwards travelled through France and Italy, and spent some months in Rome in 1724. After his return, Middleton published his celebrated Letter from Rome (1729), in which he attempted to show that “the religion of the present Romans was derived from that of their heathen ancestors;” and that, in particular, the rites, ceremonies, dress of the priests, etc., in the Roman Catholic Church, were taken from the pagan religion. This work was received with great favor by the learned, and went through four editions in the author's lifetime. The free manner, however, in which he attacked the miracles of the Roman Catholic Church gave offence to many Anglican divines, and they charged Middleton with entertaining as little respect for the miracles of the apostles as for those of the Roman Catholic saints.

Hitherto Dr. Middleton stood well with mankind; for notwithstanding the offence he had given to some bigots by certain passages in the above- mentioned pamphlet, yet the reasonable part of Christians were well pleased with his writings, believing that he had done great service to Protestantism by his expose of the absurdities of popery. He was, in fact, a general favorite with the public, when, by the publication of a new work, Christianity as old as Creation (1731), he not only gave great offence to the clergy, but also ruined all his hopes for preferment. This letter, which was first published anonymously, was soon known to be written by Middleton. Pearce (q.v.), bishop of Rochester, replied to it, treating the author as an infidel; and so strong was the feeling against Middleton that he was in danger of losing his degree and office of librarian. Promising, however, to publish a satisfactory vindication of his course, the authorities withheld their intended degradation, and in 1732 Middleton gave to the world Sonu Remarks on Dr. Pearce's second Reply; wherein the author's  sentiments, as to all the principal points in dispute, are fully, clearly, and satisfactorily explained. In this manifesto, Middleton strongly asserted his belief in Christianity, and disavowed any intention to cast doubt upon its evidences; and thereby saved himself from degradation, but not from strong suspicion of hypocrisy — a charge which has ever since attached to his name. Middleton regarded Christianity in scarcely any other light than as a republication of the law of nature, and endeavored to reduce, as far as possible, everything supernatural in the Bible to mere natural phenomena. He expressly maintained that there were contradictions in the four evangelists which could not be reconciled (Reflections on the Variations found in the Four Evangelists); he accused Matthew “of wilfully suppressing or negligently omitting three successive descents from father to son in the first chapter of his Gospel” (see volume 2:24); he asserted that the apostles were sometimes mistaken in their applications of prophecies relating to Christ (2:59); he considered “ the story of the fall of man as a fable or allegory” (2:131), and, with respect to the prophecy given at the fall, he did not hesitate to declare (3:183) “that men who inquire into things will meet with many absurdities which reason must wink at, and many incredibilities which faith must digest, before they can admit the authority of this prophecy upon the evidence, of this historical narration.” Such being the opinions of Middleton, it cannot excite surprise, notwithstanding his assertions to the contrary, that he should have been looked upon as a disbeliever in the fundamental doctrines of Christianity.

While these discussions were going on, Middleton was appointed to the professorship of natural history, which appointment he resigned in 1734. In the following year he published A Dissertation concerning the Origin of Printing in England, showing that it was first introduced and practiced by an Englishman, William Caxton, at Westminster, and not, as commonly supposed, by a foreign printer at Oxford. In 1741 he published by subscription his most celebrated work, The History of the Life of M. Tullius Cicero (Lond. 2 volumes, 4to). There were three thousand subscribers to this work, and the profits arising from its sale were so considerable as to enable Middleton to purchase a small estate at Hildersham, six miles from Cambridge, where he chiefly resided during the remainder of his life. Two years afterwards Middleton published a translation of Cicero's letters to Brutus, and of Brutus's to Cicero, with the Latin text, and a prefatory dissertation, in which he defended the authenticity of the Epistles. In 1745 he published Germana quaedam  Antiquitatis eruditae Monumenta, etc., in which he gave an account of the various specimens of ancient art which he had collected during his residence at Rome. Two years afterwards he published his Treatise on the Roman Senate, in which he maintained that all vacancies in the senate were filled up by the people. But the work which has a peculiar interest for us he published shortly after, under the title An Introductory Discourse to a larger Work, designed hereafter to be published, concerning the Miraculous Powers which are supposed to have subsisted in the Christian Church from the earliest Ages, through several successive Centuries; by which it is shown that we have no sufficient Reason to believe, upon the Authority of the primitive Fathers, that any such Powers were continued to the Church after the Days of the Apostles (1748). The Introductory Discourse to the work, and the Free Inquiry itself, elicited numerous controversial tracts. Middleton was attacked by Stebbing and Chapman, the former of whom endeavored chiefly to show that Middleton's scheme was inseparably connected with the fall of Christianity, while the latter labored to support the authority of the fathers. These attacks Middleton repelled by Some Remarks on Two Pamphlets (by Drs. Stebbing and Chapman) published against the Introduction. “The discourse,” remarks Mr. Orme (Bibl. Bib. s.v.), referring to the whole controversy, “is worthy of attention, for, though the combatants on both sides carried matters too far, considerable information may be collected from them — on the character and testimony of the fathers, the nature of miracles, and on other points closely connected with the Christian revelation.”

The controversy began to grow very hot. Besides Stebbing and Chapman, Parker, Brook. Johnson, Dodwell, Church, and others attacked him, while he was defended by Yates, Jenkins, Toll, etc. A full list of the principal publications on the subject are enumerated by Kippis in a note to the 6th part of Doddridge's Course of Lectures (see. also Orme's Bibl. Bib.; Strong's Cat. of Engl. Theol. 1830, No. 9441 sq.; Lord Brougham, Men of Letters of the Times of George III, page 384). It was declared by Middleton's opponents that the tendency of his inquiry was to destroy the evidence of miraculous interpositions; but Middleton explicitly disavowed such intentions, and should have the benefit of the doubt. This much, however, must be admitted, that he seems never to have been so much pleased as when, by broaching some startling point of disputation, he succeeded in horrifying the minds of his orthodox brethren. Accordingly, before the theological world had recovered from the surprise and indignation into which they had been thrown by the Free Inquiry, its  fearless author put forth upon the world an attack upon bishop Sherlock, entitled An Examination of the Lord Bishop of London's Discourses concerning the Use and Intent of Prophecy; with some cursory Anismadversions on his late Appendix, or additional Dissertation. containing a further Inquiry into the Mosaic Account of the Fall (1750). In this work he attempted to refute Sherlock's (q.v.) theory of a chain of prophecy running through the different portions of the Old Testament. He was refuted by Dr. Rutherforth, divinity professor at Cambridge; but Middleton, whose end seems to have been answered, which was to abuse the bishop a little, pursued the argument no further. The obstinate controversialist died with the armor on his back and the lance in his hands. He was meditating a general answer to all the objections made against the Free Inquiry; but, being seized with illness, and imagining he might not be able to go through it, he singled out Church and Dodwell, as the two most considerable of his adversaries. and employed himself in preparing a particular answer to them.

This, however, he did not live to finish, but died July 28, 1750, at Hildersham, in Cambridgeshire. A little before his death, he thought it prudent to accept a small living from Sir John Frederick. A few months after his death was published his Vindication of the Free Inquiry into the Miraculous Powers, etc., from the Objections of Dr. Dodwell and Dr. Church. The piece is unfinished, but very able as far as it goes. In 1752 all the before-mentioned works, except The Life of Cicero, were collected and printed in four volumes, 4to, under the title of Miscellaneous Works; among which were inserted the following pieces, never before published, viz., A Preface to an intended Answer to all the Objections made against the Free Inquiry; — Some cursory Reflections on the Dispute, or Dissension, which happened at Antioch, between the Apostles Peter and Paul; — Reflections on the Variations, or, Inconsistencies, which are found among the Four Evangelists in their different Accounts of the same Facts; — An Essay on the Gift of Tongues, tending to explain the proper Notion and Nature of it, as it is described and delivered to us in the sacred Scriptures, and as it appears also to have been understood by the learned both of ancient and modern times; Some short Remarks on a Story told by the Ancients concerning St. John the Evangelist and Cerinthus the Heretic; and on the Use which is made of it by the Moderns, to enforce the Duty of shunning Heretics; — An Essay on the allegorical and literal Interpretation of the Creation and Fall of Man; — De Latinatrum literarum pronunciatione dissertatio; — Some Letters of Dr. Middleton to his Friends. A second edition of these Miscellaneous  Works was published in five volumes, 8vo, in 1755. “Dr. Middleton,” says Parr, in his preface Bellendenus, “was a man of no common attainments: his learning was elegant and profound, his judgment was acute and polished, his taste was fine and correct; his style was so pure and harmonious, so vigorously flowing without being inflated, that, Addison alone excepted, he seems to me without a rival.” See Leckey. Hist. of Rationalism (see Index in volume 2); Jortin, Eccles. Remarks, 1:298; Disraeli, Miscell. of Literature, Quarrels of Authors, page 313; Nichols, Lit. Anec. page 414 sq.; Knox, Essays, 2:56; N. Amer. Review, 35:440; Chancellor Kent, Course of Engl. Reading; Macaulay, Crit. and Hist. Essays, 2:132; Orme, Bibl. Bib. s.v.; Biogr. Brit. s.v.; Chalmers's Biogr. Dict. s.v.; General Biogr. Dict. s.v.; English Cyclop. s.v.; Hook, Eccles. Biogr. s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibl. 1:2057; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, 2:1273 sq.; Blackwood's Magazine, 14:257; 15:461; 28:440 sq.; 32:607; Bickersteth, Christ. Student, page 298.

## Middleton, Erasmus[[@Headword:Middleton, Erasmus]]

             a noted English divine, was born about 1740. He received his education at St. Edmund's Hall, Oxford, but was expelled from that university, together with five other youths, on account of his sympathy with the Methodists. This circumstance gave rise to MacGowan's satire of The Shaver. Middleton then entered King's College, Cambridge, and, after his graduation, became pastor of an Episcopal congregation at Dalkeith,' Scotland, and curate successively to Romaine and Cadogan, and at St. Margaret's, Westminster. He was presented to the rectory of Turvey, Bedfordshire, in 1764, and was thus a predecessor of Leigh Richmond (q.v.). He died April 25. 1805. Dr. Middleton was a man of warm piety, and of a Catholic spirit. He is the well-known author of Biographia Evangelica, or an historical Account of the Lives and Deaths of the most eminent evangelical Authors or Preachers, both British and Foreign, in the several Denominations of Protestants (1779, 4 volumes, 8vo). This great biographical work is a collection of invaluable materials, and must immortalize his memory, while doing immense good. Of his other works we mention: Archbishop Leighton's whole Works, with Life (1805,4 volumes): — Versions and Initiations of the Psalms of David (1806): — Luther's Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, with his Life (1807). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, 2:1275; Cooper, Biog. Dict. of Eminent Persons, page 865.

## Middleton, Thomas Fanshawe, D.D[[@Headword:Middleton, Thomas Fanshawe, D.D]]

             the first English bishop of Calcutta, largely identified with the Anglican Church missionary work in India, only son of the Reverend T. Middleton, rector of Kedleston, Derbyshire, was born at that village January 26,1769. His early training he received under his father. In 1779 he was admitted into Christ's Hospital, London, and thence proceeded to Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, where he took his degree of B.A., with honors, in January, 1792. Shortly after he received ordination, and entered upon the curacy of Gainsborough, in Lincolnshire. Here he edited a periodical work entitled the Country Spectator, which continued to appear for about seven months, Middleton sustaining the paper mainly by his own compositions. This connection brought him to the notice of Dr. John Pretyman, archdeacon of Lincoln, who in 1794 appointed him tutor to his two sons. Middleton in consequence removed first to Lincoln, and afterwards to Norwich, where he became curate of St. Peter's Mancroft in 1799, having previously (in 1795) been presented by Dr. Pretyman to the rectory of Tansor, in Northamptonshire. In 1802 he was presented with the rectory of Bytham, in Lincolnshire. About this time he wrote his chief work, The Doctrine of the Greek Article applied to the Criticism and Illustration of the New Testament, which he published in 1808, with a dedication to Dr. Pretyman. The object of this work — is first, to establish the rules which govern the use of the article, and then to apply these rules to the interpretation of various passages in the New Testament, many of which are of such a nature that they furnish arguments for or against the divinity of Christ, according to the different views which are taken of the force of the article. Owing to this circumstance, the doctrine of the Greek article has become the subject of warm discussion among theologians; and some Unitarian divines have strongly opposed the views of Middleton.

His chief rules have, however, been received as sound by the great majority of Biblical critics. (A second and improved edition was published by Prof. Scholefield in 1828; and a third by the Reverend Hugh James Rose in 1833. An abstract of the work is prefixed to Valpy's edition of the Greek Testament.) In the same year in which he published this work he took his degree of D.D. at Cambridge, and removed to his living at Tansor, where he discharged his duties in such a manner as to gain the affection and esteem of his people. In 1809 he was appointed by bishop Pretyman to a stall in the cathedral of Lincoln, .and in 1812 to the archdeaconry of Huntingdon. In 1811 he resigned his two livings for the vicarage of St. Pancras, Middlesex, and the  rectory of Rottenham, in Hertfordshire. He fixed his residence at St. Pancras, and made the acquaintance of several dignitaries of the Church and other distinguished individuals. He was in sympathy with the object of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and was earnest and untiring in advancing its interests, as well as those of other societies in connection with the Church. The knowledge thus acquired of their plans, resources, and activities greatly aided him in his subsequent career in India, and the discernment and good judgment which he brought to their meetings contributed materially to their efficiency. About this time the Anglican Church established a bishopric in India, constituting Calcutta as the episcopal residence. For this distinguished position Dr. Middleton was selected; and he was accordingly consecrated the first colonial bishop ever set apart by the Anglican Church by the archbishop of Canterbury, May 8, 1814. A short time prior to his departure for Calcutta, bishop Middleton was made a fellow of the Royal Society.

He arrived in Calcutta November 28, 1814 a little more than a year from the time of the death of Henry Martyn, that valued worker in this field. During the voyage Middleton had diligently employed himself in increasing his qualifications for his office, especially by the study of Hebrew and Persian. As bishop of Calcutta he made every effort to promote the interests of Christianity, and to aid the cause of education. He made three visitations of his immense diocese, in two of which he directed his particular attention to the state of the Syrian Christians in the neighborhood of Cochin, on the coast of Malabar. By his efforts the Bishop's College at Calcutta was established for the education of clergymen and missionaries for the British possessions in Asia; and he laid the first stone of its buildings December 15, 1820. He instituted a consistory court at Calcutta, and would have done the same at Madras but for the opinion of the advocate-general of Madras that he regarded such a measure as illegal. These extended labors and extraordinary exertions, embarrassed by daily annoyances from the civil authorities in their application of regulations applicable only to the home clergy, could not result otherwise than in depressing him and diminishing his vigor, especially in India's unhealthy climate, and greatly hastened the end of his days. He died July 8, 1822, abidlutely worn out by toil and fatigue. His successor in the work was the sainted Reginald Heber (q.v.). Bishop Middleton was large and dignified in form, animated in manner, and generous and kind in disposition. As a preacher he was very impressive, his voice clear and pleasing, his style simple and manly, generally argumentative, and strongly imbued with the doctrines of the Church of England. In accordance with  his last desires, bishop Middleton's papers were destroyed, and we have, therefore, none of his greater works excepting the one he had published in his earlier years on “the Greek Article,” the periodical publication mentioned above, and some sermons, charges, and tracts, which have been collected into a volume, to which a memoir of bishop Middleton is prefixed, by H.K. Bonney, D.D., archdeacon of Bedford (London, 1824). See Charles Webb Le Bas, Life of the Right Rev. Thomas Fanshawe Middleton (London, 1831, 2 volumes, 8vo); Miss Yonge, Pioneers and Founders, chapter 7; Monthly Review, 1810 (May); Kaye, Christianity in India. (J.H.W.)

## Middoth[[@Headword:Middoth]]

             SEE TALMUD.

## Midgard[[@Headword:Midgard]]

             in Norse mythology, is the earth, the habitation of men, as Asgard is the dwelling of the Asas.

## Midgards Serpent[[@Headword:Midgards Serpent]]

             or the World-Serpent (Jormungand), is, in the mythology of the Norsemen, the great serpent which surrounds the world. As the offspring of Loki (q.v.), the principle of evil, the other gods feared the new-born, and determined to get early possession of, it and Fenrir, another of Loki's offspring, and, when secured, Midgard's Serpent was cast into the ocean, where it grew till it encircled the world, biting its own tail. At the end of the world, the world-serpent will fight among the enemies of the gods and be slain by Thor, who, however, will die immediately afterwards from the effect of its venom. The myth of the world-serpent is supposed to signify the deep or main ocean, which, excited by Loki (subterranean fire or earthquake), is thrown upon the land, thus proving scarcely less fatal to the works of man than the direct action of volcanic fire, represented under the form of Fenrir. For further particulars, see Thorpe's Northern Mythology, 1:80 sq., 161 sq.; Mallet's Northern Antiquities, volume 2, Fables 16:25, 26, 27; Keyser's Religion of the Northmen; Petersen's Nordisk Mythologi.

## Midian[[@Headword:Midian]]

             (Heb. Midyan', מַדְיָן, strife, as in Pro 18:18; Pro 19:13; Sept. Μαδιάν v.r. Μαδιάμ; N.T; Μαδίαμ, Act 7:29, where the Auth.Vers. has “Madian;” the Heb. often stands collectively for the “Midianites” also, as it is frequently rendered in all the versions), the fourth son of Abraham by Keturah,-and the progenitor of the Midianites (Gen 35:2; 1Ch 1:32). B.C. post 2024. His five sons are  enumerated in Gen 25:4; 1Ch 1:33. Of his personal history nothing further is known. SEE MIDIANITE.

## Midianite[[@Headword:Midianite]]

             (Heb. Midyani', מַדְיָנַי, Num 10:29, used collectively, and so rendered “Midianites,” which is the usual translation for Midian itself; Sept. Μαδιανίτης; but the plur. מַדְיָנַיםalso occurs, Gen 37:28, and the fem. מַדְיָנַית, Num 25:15; SEE MADIAN), a tribe of people descended from Abraham's son Midian (q.v.), a branch of the Arabians dwelling principally in the desert north of the peninsula of Arabia. Southwards they extended along the eastern shore of the Gulf of Aileh; and northwards they stretched along the eastern frontier of Palestine; while the oases in the peninsula of Sinai seem to have afforded them pasturegrounds, and caused it to be included in the “land of Midian.”. The notion that there were two peoples called Midian, founded on the supposed shortness of the interval for any considerable multiplication from Abraham to Moses, and on the mention of Moses's Cushite wife, seems to be untenable. Even conceding the former objection, which is unnecessary, one tribe has often become merged into another and older one, and only the name of the latter retained. See Burton, Goldmines of Midian and Ruined Midianitish Cities (Lond. 1878, 8vo).

I. History. — Midian, though not the oldest, was the most celebrated son of Keturah. What Judah became among the tribes of Israel. Midian became among the tribes of Arabia. It is true we find the other branches of the Keturites spoken of a few times in sacred history, and mentioned in such a way as to prove that as tribes they never lost their individuality; yet the Midianites were the dominant people, and Midian is the great name which always comes out prominently before the historian. Not only so, but the Midianites appear to have been for a lengthened period the virtual rulers of Arabia, combining into a grand confederacy, and then guiding or controlling, as circumstances required, all the Arabian branches of the Hebrew race. This fact comes out incidentally in many parts of Scripture; and we require to keep it carefully in view in order to understand the sacred narrative.

1. Midian had five sons, who, doubtless, in accordance with Arab custom, became heads of distinct tribes (Gen 25:4; comp. Num 31:8). We are told that while “Abraham gave all that he had to Isaac,” that  is, made him his heir — head of his house and patrimony — “to the sons of the concubines Abraham gave gifts, and sent them away from Isaac his son while he yet lived, eastward, to the land in the east” (Num 31:5-6). This is the first indication of the country occupied by the Midianites and other descendants of Keturah. The expression is not very definite. Abraham's principal place of residence was Southern Palestine — Mamre and Beersheba. The “country of the east” appears to have included the whole region on the east side of the Arabah or great valley which reaches from the fountains of the Jordan to the AElanitic Gulf. All Arabia, in fact, and even Mesopotamia were included in the “country of the East” (Gen 29:1; Num 23:7, etc.). SEE BENE-KEDEM.

Another incidental notice in Gen 36:35 points more clearly to the exact territory of Midian. Hadad, one of the early kings of Edom, is said to have “smitten Midian in the field of Moab.” We may conclude from this that the Midianites were at that time settled on the eastern borders of Moab and Edom. They were, like all Arabians, a nomad or semi-nomad people; having some settlements around fountains and in fertile valleys, but forced to wander in their tents from place to place to secure sufficient pasture for their flocks. The Midianites were an enterprising people. They were not satisfied with the dull routine of pastoral and agricultural life. From the first they appear to have engaged in commercial pursuits. Some districts of Arabia, Eastern Palestine, and Lebanon, yielded valuable spices and perfumes which were in great demand in Egypt, not merely for the luxuries of the living, but for the embalming of the dead. In this profitable trade the Midianites engaged. It was to one of their caravans passing through Palestine from Gilead to Egypt that Joseph was sold by his brethren (Gen 37:25 sq.). Slaves at that time found as ready a market in Egypt as they do now. It will be observed that the traders are called by the historian both Ishmaelites and Midianites, the two names being used as synonymous. The reason probably is that these were the dominant tribes in Arabia, and carried on the trade jointly; hence they were known among strangers by both names. It would seem, however, that the merchants in this caravan were true Midianites. though they may have been accompanied by Ishmaelites (Gen 37:28; Gen 37:36; but comp. 25, 27). In Gen 37:36 the Hebrew is

הִמְּדָנַים, the Medanites, which is the regular plural of Medan (מדן), the third son of Keturah (Gen 25:2); while in Gen 25:28 the word is מדינים, the regular plural of מדין. There can be little doubt that the Midianites are referred to in both passages, as represented in the Septuagint, Vulgate, Targums, and other ancient versions. SEE MEDAN.  By a similar latitude of expression, the Midianites sometimes appear to be reckoned among the Ishmaelites (Jdg 7:12; Jdg 8:22; Jdg 8:24); elsewhere they are distinguished from them (Gen 25:2; Gen 25:4; Gen 25:12; Gen 25:16). This probably arose from their being nomadic in their habits, so that bands of them often moved from place to place. But the difficulty may be avoided by supposing that the terms “Midianite” and “Ishmaelite” are used as a synonyme of travelling merchant, such as they became in later times. SEE ISHMAELITE.

2. The next notice of Midian is in connection with the eventful history of Moses — “Moses fled from the face of Pharaoh, and dwelt in the land of Midian” (Exo 2:15). Reuel or Jethro, the priest of Midian, became his master and father-in-law. Moses kept his flock. The subsequent incidents of this strange narrative show clearly the region then inhabited by Jethro, and called “the land of Msidian.” It was the peninsula of Sinai, and it was while watching his flock there on the side of Horeb that Moses saw the glory of the Lord in the burning bush, and received the commission to return to Egypt for the deliverance of Israel (Exo 3:1 sq.). It would appear, from a comparison of the several incidental notices of Jethro given in the Pentateuch, that the peninsula of Sinai was not his settled place of abode. When Israel was encamped at Horeb, Jethro brought thither Moses's wife and his two sons; and, after a brief stay, we are told that “he went his way into his own land” (Exo 18:1-3; Exo 18:27; comp. Num 10:29-30). The Midianites were nomads roaming over a very wide region, but, like most Arab tribes, having one permanent nucleus. This nucleus was specially their home: it was the “land of their kindred;” yet they also claimed the whole region in which they pastured their flocks as their own. The nucleus of the Midianites was somewhere on the eastern border of Edom, but their pasture grounds probably extended as far as Gilead and Bashan on the north, while on the south they embraced an extensive territory along both shores of the Atlanitic Gulf. Hence Horeb was said to be in the land of Midian (Exo 2:15 with 3:1), while the chief seat of Jethro's tribe was on the east of Edom. The Midianites were thus accustomed to lead their flocks and herds over the whole of that region which the Israelites afterwards traversed the choice pastures, the fountains, and the wells in the desert were all known to them. This fact throws light on Moses's urgent request to his father-in-law, “Leave us not, I pray thee: forasmuch as thou knowest how we are to encamp in the wilderness, and thou mayest be to us instead of eyes” (Num 10:31).

It should, however, be remembered that the name of Midian (and hence the “land of Midian”) was perhaps often applied, as that of the most powerful of the northern Arab tribes, to the northern Arabs generally, i.e., those of Abrahamic descent (comp. Gen 37:28, but see respecting this passage above; and Jdg 8:24); just as BENE-KEDEM embraced all those peoples, and, with a wider signification, other Eastern tribes. If this reading of the name be correct, “Midian” would correspond very nearly with our modern word “Arab;” limiting, however, the modern word to the Arabs of the northern and Egyptian deserts: all the Ishmaelitish tribes of those deserts would thus be Midianites, as we call them Arabs, the desert being their “land.” At least it cannot be doubted that the descendants of Hagar and Keturah intermarried; and thus the Midianites are apparently called Ishmaelites in Jdg 8:24, being connected, both by blood and national customs, with the father of the Arabs. The wandering habits of nomadic tribes must also preclude our arguing from the fact of Moses's leading his father's flock to Horeb, that Sinai was necessarily more than a station of Midian: those tribes annually traverse a great extent of country in search of pasturage, and have their established summer and winter pastures. The Midianites were mostly (not always) dwellers in tents, not towns; and Sinai has not sufficient pasture to support more than a small, or a moving people. But it must be remembered that perhaps (or we may say probably) the peninsula of Sinai has considerably changed in its physical character since the time of Moses; even the adjacent isthmus has been thought, since that period, to have risen many feet, so that “the tongue of the Egyptian Sea” has “dried up;” and this supposition would much diminish the difficulty of accounting for the means of subsistence found by the Israelites in their wanderings in the wilderness, when not miraculously supplied. Apart from this consideration, we know that the Egyptians afterwards worked mines at Sarabet el-Khddim, and a small mining population may have found sufficient sustenance, at least in some seasons of the year, in the few watered valleys, and wherever ground could be reclaimed: rock-inscriptions (though of later date) testify to the number of at least passers-by; and the remains of villages of a mining population have recently been discovered. Whatever may have been the position of Midian in the Sinaitic peninsula, if we may believe the Arabian historians and geographers, backed as their testimony is by the Greek geographers (see below), the city of Midian was situate on the opposite or Arabian shore of the Arabian Gulf; and thence northwards, and spreading east and west, we have the true country of the wandering Midianites. SEE SINAI.

3. The next occurrence of the name of this people in the sacred history marks their northern settlements on the border of the Promised Land, “on this side Jordan [by] Jericho,” in the plains of Moab (Num 22:1-4). The Midianites were a wise and a wily people. So long as the Israelites only traversed their outlying pasturegrounds on the west of the Arabah, they were content to cultivate their friendship; but when, in the latter part of their journey, having passed round the southern end of Edom, they entered the proper territory of Midian, the Midianites tried every plan and used every effort to work their destruction. They consulted with their neighbors, the chiefs of Moab, and resolved to bring the prophet Balaam to curse the powerful strangers (Num 33:4-7). Balaam came, and the Lord turned the intended curse into a blessing. The prophet, however, adopted a more effectual mode of injuring the Israelites than by the agency of enchantments. He persuaded the women of Midian and Moab to work upon the passions of the Israelites, and entice them to the licentious festivals of their idols, and thus bring upon them the curse of heaven (Num 31:16). This infamous scheme proved only too successful (ch. 25), and, had it not been checked by the almost complete annihilation of the Midianites, it would have brought destruction upon the whole host of Israel (Num 25:17; Num 31:2). The vengeance then executed upon Midian was terrible. Their cities and castles were burned; the entire males that fell into the hands of the conquerors were put to death, including the five kings of Midian — Evi, Rekem, Zur, Hur, and Reba, together with Balaam and with them all the married females; and the young women and children were reduced to slavery. It has been affirmed that these acts of vengeance are so cruel, so barbarous in their character, that they could never have been prompted by a God of love, and that, therefore, the narrative cannot be considered as of divine authority. Those who bring such an accusation against the Scriptures must surely overlook the leading circumstances of the case-they must forget that the God of love is also the God of justice. The whole Midianitish nation, male and female, had deliberately combined and conspired, by wile and stratagem, to wean the Israelites from their allegiance to the God of heaven, and not only so, but wantonly to allure them to the commission of the most foul and degrading crimes. Was it inconsistent with justice for the moral Governor of the universe to punish such guilt? Could any punishment less sweeping have freed the earth from crime so deep-rooted and so dangerous? The influence of the Midianites on the Israelites was clearly most evil, and directly tended to lead them from the injunctions of Moses. Much of the dangerous  character of their influence may probably be ascribed to the common descent from Abraham. While the Canaanitish tribes were abhorred, Midian might claim consanguinity, and more readily seduce Israel from its allegiance.

The details of this war given by Moses afford us some little insight into the nature of the country of Midian, and the occupations of the people. The Midianite: were not pure nomads; they had cities and goodly casties (Num 31:10). Their principal wealth consisted, however, in flocks and herds, for the Israelites capture( 675,000 sheep, 72,000 beeves, and 61,000 asses. It is singular that camels are not mentioned; but it is probable that, as the Israelites were all footmen, the camel escaped to the desert. Recent investigations have shown that the whole desert east of Edom and Moab it thickly studded with the ruins of ancient cities and castles (Wallin, in Journal of R.G.S. 24:115 sq.; Porter Damascus, 2:188; Wetstein, Reisebericht iiber Hauran etc.; Graham, in Journal of R.G. S for 1859). These were doubtless the habitations of the Midianites. The whole region around their cities, extending from the mountains of Hauran to the AElanitic Gulf, though no dreary and desolate, is not barren. In spring and early summer it is covered with vegetation, and it has many rich valleys, a few patches of which are still here and there cultivated by the Arab tribes. Everywhere there are evidences of partial cultivation in former days, and there are also traces of a comparatively dense population (see Porter, Hand-book, pages 501, 508, 523, etc.).

Some time previous to the exodus it appears that the Midianites had allied themselves closely to the Moabites. Sihon, king of the Amorites, made war upon Moab and Ammon, conquered a large part of their territory, and retained possession of it (Jdg 11:13-23). At the same time he made Midian, the ally of Moab, tributary; and hence the five princes of Midian are called by Joshua vassals (נְסַיכַם; Keil on Jos 13:21) or “dukes” of Sihon. The defeat of Sihon by the Israelites secured the freedom of the Midianites; and then they, fearing lest they should in like manner be subdued by Moses, conspired to destroy Israel, and thus brought destruction upon themselves. The government of Midian was doubtless similar to that of all the nations of Arabia-patriarchal. The nation was divided into a number of tribes, each of which was independent, and led by its own sheik or chief. In time of common danger or of war, the sheiks of the various tribes formed a council, but always acknowledged the presidency of the head of one leading family, who was (and still is) styled  the “prince” (emir) of the nation. Five of the sheiks of Midian are mentioned in Judges as subjects of Sihon. In Num 31:8 they are called “kings” (מלכים); while in Num 22:4 Moab is said to have consulted with the “elders” (זקנים) of Midian. The great Arab tribes have two classes of chiefs: one class is composed of the rulers of the leading divisions of the tribe, the other of the rulers of subdivisions. The former are hereditary, the latter are simply influential or warlike men who, by their talents, have gathered around them a number of families. It would seem to be the former class-the hereditary rulers of Midian-who are called “kings ;” while the others, the influential leaders or senators of the tribe, are termed “elders.” In the transaction with Balaam, the elders of Midian went with. those of Moab, “with the rewards of divination in their hand” (Num 22:7); but in the remarkable words of Balaam; the Midianites are not mentioned. This might be explained by the supposition that Midian was a wandering tribe, whose pasture-lands reached wherever, in the Arabian desert and frontier of Palestine, pasture was to. be found, and who would not feel, in the same degree. as Moab, Amalek, or the other more settled and agricultural inhabitants of the land allotted to the tribes of Israel, the arrival of the latter. But the spoil taken in the war that soon followed, and more especially the mention of the dwellings of Midian, render this suggestion very doubtful, and point rather to a considerable pastoral settlement of Midian in the trans-Jordanic country. ‘Such settlements of Arabs have, however, been very common. In this case the Midianites were evidently tributary to the Amorites, being “dukes of Sihon, dwelling in the country” (ישְׁבֵי הָאָרֶוֹ): this inferior position; explains their omission from Balaam's prophecy. The rank of the Midianitish woman Cozbi, that of a daughter of Zur, who was “head over a people, of a chief house in Midian,” throws a strange light over the obscure page of that people's history. The vices of the Canaanites, idolatry and licentiousness, had infected the descendants of Abraham, doubtless connected by successive intermarriages with those tribes; and the prostitution of this chief's daughter, caught as it was from the customs of the Canaanites, is evidence of the ethnological type of the latter tribes. Some African nations have a similar custom: they offer their unmarried daughters to show hospitality to their guests.

4. There is no further mention of the Midianites in history for two hundred and fifty years. During that period the nation had completely recovered its ancient influence and power, probably by the arrival of fresh colonists from the desert tracts over which their tribes wandered; and they again turned  their arms against their old enemies, the Israelites. For seven years they oppressed them so grievously that the people were forced to flee from the open country, and to seek an asylum in mountain fastnesses, in caves, and in fortified cities (Jdg 6:1-2). Midian was now at the head of a great confederacy, comprising the Amalekites and the leading tribes of Arabia, called by the sacred historian Beni Kedem (“children of the East,” Jdg 6:3). In early spring the confederates assembled their vast flocks and herds, descended through the defiles of Gilead, crossed the Jordan, and overran the rich plains of Central Palestine, plundering and destroying all before them — “sheep, oxen, asses,” property, the young corn, and the luxuriant pastures: “For they came up with their cattle, and their tents, and they came as grasshoppers for multitude; for both they and their camels were without ‘number; and they entered into the land to destroy it” (Jdg 6:5). In their distress the Israelites cried unto the Lord, and he sent a deliverer in the person of Gideon (Jdg 6:8-13). The invaders were concentrated on Esdraelon-their flocks covering the whole of that splendid plain, and their encampment lying along the base of “the hill of Moreh,” now called Little Hermon (Jdg 6:33; Jdg 7:1; Jdg 7:12). Gideon assembled his band of warriors ‘at the well of Harod, or fountain of Jezreel, situated at the foot of Gilboa, and famed in after-days as the scene of Saul's defeat and death (Jdg 7:1). SEE HAROD.

The romantic incidents in this memorable campaign have been treated of elsewhere, SEE GIDEON, but the Midianitish side of the story is pregnant with interest. The scene over that fertile plain, dotted with the enemies of Israel, “the Midianites, and the Amalekites, and all the Bene-Kedem, [who] lay along (נֹפְלַים, fell, i.e., pitched their tents) in the valley like locusts for multitude, and their camels were without number, as the sand by the sea-side for multitude” (Jdg 7:12), has been picturesquely painted by Prof. Stanley (Sinai and Palestine, page 333).

The descent of Gideon and his servant into the camp, and the conversation of the Midianitish watch, forms a vivid picture of Arab life. It does more:: it proves that as Gideon, or Phurah, his servant, or both, understood the language of Midian, the Shemitic languages-differed much less in the 14th century B.C. than they did in after-times, see ARABIA; and we besides obtain a remarkable proof of the consanguinity of the Midianites, and learn that, though the name was probably applied to all or most of the northern Abrahamic Arabs, it was not applied to the Canaanites, who certainly did not then speak a Shemitic language that Gideon could understand. The stratagem of Gideon-receives an illustration from modern Oriental life.  Until lately, the police in Cairo were accustomed to go their rounds with a lighted torch thrust into a pitcher, and the pitcher was suddenly withdrawn when. light was required (Lane's Mod. Eg. 5th edit. page 120) — a custom affording an exact parallel to the ancient expedient adopted by Gideon. The consequent panic of the great multitude in the valley, if it have no parallels in modern European history, is consistent with Oriental character. Of all peoples, the nations of the East are most liable to sudden and violent emotions; and a panic in one of their heterogeneous, undisciplined, and excitable hosts has always proved disastrous. In the case of Gideon, however, the result of his attack was directed by God, the divine hand being especially shown in the small number of Israel, 300 men, against 135,000 of the enemy. At the sight of the 300 torches, suddenly blazing round about the camp, in the beginning of the middle-watch (which the Midianites had newly set), with the confused din of the trumpets, “ for the three companies blew the trumpets, and brake the pitchers, and held the lamps in their left hands, and the trumpets in their right hands to blow [withal], and they cried, [The sword] of the Lord and of Gideon” (7:20), “all the host ran, and cried, and fled” (Jdg 7:21). The panic-stricken multitude knew not enemy from friend, for “the Lord set every man's sword against his fellow even throughout all the host” (Jdg 7:22). The rout was complete, the first places made for being Beth-shittah (“the house of the acacia”) in Zererath, and the “border” (שָׂפָה) of Abel-meholah, “the meadow of the dance,” both being probably down the Jordan valley, unto Tabbath, shaping their flight to the ford of Beth-barah, where probably they had crossed the river as invaders.

The flight of so great a host, encumbered with slow-moving camels, baggage, and cattle, was calamitous.. All the men of Israel, out of Naphtali, and Asher, and Manasseh, joined in the pursuit; and Gideon roused the men of Mount Ephraim to “take before” the Midianites “the waters unto Beth-barah and Jordan” (Jdg 7:23-24). Thus cut off; two princes, Oreb and Zeeb (the “raven,” or, more correctly “crow,” and the “wolf”), fell into the hands of Ephraim, and Oreb they slew at the rock Oreb, and Zeeb they slew at the wine-press of Zeeb (Jdg 7:25; comp. Isa 10:26, where the “slaughter of Midian at the rock Oreb” is referred to). It is added, in the same verse, that they pursued Midian, and brought the heads of the princes to Gideon “on the other side Jordan.” This anticipates the account of his crossing Jordan (Jdg 8:4), but such transpositions are frequent, and the Hebrew may be read “On this side Jordan.” But though we have seen that many joined in a desultory pursuit of the rabble of the Midianites, only  the 300 men who had blown the trumpets in the valley of Jezreel crossed Jordan with Gideon, “faint yet pursuing” (Jdg 8:4). With this force it remained for the liberator to attack the enemy on his own ground, for Midian had dwelt on the other side Jordan since the days of Moses. Fifteen thousand men, under the “kings” of Midian, Zebah and Zalmunna, were at Karkor, the sole remains of 135,000, “for there fell a hundred and twenty thousand men that drew sword” (Jdg 8:10). The assurance of God's help encouraged the weary three hundred, and they ascended from the plain (or ghdr) to the higher country by a ravine or torrentbed in the hills, “by the way of them that dwelt in tents [that is, the pastoral or wandering people as distinguished from towns-people], on the east of Nobah and Jogbehah, and smote the host, for the host was secure” (Jdg 8:11) secure in that wild country, on their own ground, and away from the frequent haunts of man. A sharp pursuit seems to have followed this fresh victory, ending in the capture of the kings and the final discomfiture of the Midianites. The overthrow of Midian in its encampment, when it was “secure,” by the exhausted companies of Gideon (they were “faint,” and had been refused bread both at Succoth and at Penuel, 8:5-9), set the seal to God's manifest hand in the deliverance of his people from the oppression of Midian. Zebah and Zalmunna were slain, and with them the name itself of Midian almost disappears from' sacred history. That people never afterwards took up arms against Israel, though they may have been allied with the nameless hordes who, under the common designation of “the people of the East,” Bene-Kedem, harassed the eastern border of Palestine.

To this victory there are subsequent allusions in the sacred writings (Psa 83:10; Psa 83:12; Isa 9:4; Isa 10:6); but the Midianites do not again appear in sacred or profane history. The name, indeed, occurs after the exile in Jdt 2:16, but it seems to be there confounded with the Arabians. Josephus, however, asserts (Ant. 4:7,1) that Petra, the capital of Arabia (i.e., Idumea), was called by the natives Areceme, from the Midianitish king Rekem slain by Moses (Num 31:8). Eusebius and Jerome also mention a city lladian, so named after the son of Abraham by Keturah, situated beyond Arabia (Idumsea) to the south, by the Red Sea, from which the district was called; and another city of the same name near the Arnon and Areopolis, the ruins of which only existed in their days (Onomast. s.v.; comp. Jerome, Comment. ad Jes. 60, and Ezech. 25). These. were doubtless traditionary recollections of the different branches of  the Midianitish stock, showing their prevalence throughout Idumsea and the Sinaitic peninsula as a migratory tribe.

II. Geographical Identification. — From all the above notices, we may gather with considerable certainty that there were at least two main branches of the Midianites. It seems to have been that portion of the tribe dwelling about the eastern arm of the Red Sea, among whom Moses found refuge when he fled from Egypt, and whose priest or sheik was Jethro, who became the father-in-law of the future lawgiver (Exo 3:1;. Num 10:29). SEE KENITE.

These in like manner are usually reckoned along with the Ethiopians of Cushite origin. It is certain that some Cushite tribes did settle in and on the outskirts of Arabia, which was therefore called Gush, in common with other districts occupied by Cushite tribes; and, under this view, it is observable that the wife of Moses is called a Cushite (Num 12:1), and that, in Hab 3:7, the Midianites are named with the Cushites; for these are undoubtedly the Midianites who trembled for fear when they heard that the Israelites, had passed through the Red Sea. We do not again meet with these Midianites in the Jewish history, but they appear to have remained for a long time settled in the same quarter, where indeed is the seat of the only Midianites known to Oriental authors. The Arabian geographers of the middle age (Edrisi, Clim. 3:5, page 3; Ibn el-Wardi, and Abulfeda, Arab. descr. page 77; comp. Seetzen, 20:311) speak of the ruins of an ancient town called Jiadian, on the eastern side of the Red Sea, where was still to be seen the well at which Moses watered the flocks of Shoaib or Jethro. This was doubtless the same as Modiana, a town in the same district, mentioned by Ptolemy (Geog. 5:19); and Niebuhr conjectures that the site is now occupied by Moilah, a small town or village on the Red Sea, on the Haj road from Egypt (Descript. Arab. page 377); but, as Rosenmuller remarks (Bibl. Geog. 3:224), this place is too far south to be identified with the Midian of Jethro. The Madian of Abulfeda is doubtless that mentioned by Josephus (Ant. 12:11, 1) as Madiene (Μαδυηνή), situated at the Red Sea, ‘properly identified by Reland (Paleest. pages 98, 100) with the modern Miidyan, situated about half-way down the eastern coast of the AElanitic Gulf (Forster's Geogr. of Arabia, 2:116, and Index, s.v.). To the same effect are the notices of the city Madian in Eusebius and Jerome above.

Another branch of the Midianites occupied the country east and south-east of the Moabites, who were seated on the east of the Dead Sea; or rather, perhaps, we should say that, as they appear to have been a seminomad  people, they pastured their flocks in the unsettled country beyond the Moabites, with whom, as a kindred, although more settled tribe, they seem to have been on the most friendly terms, and on whose borders were situated those “cities and goodly castles which they possessed” (Num 31:10). It is to these Midianites that we must refer the brief statements of a collision with Hadad, one of the early Edomitish kings (Gen 36:35). These Midianites, like the other tribes and nations who had a common origin with them, were highly hostile to the Israelites.

Midian is named authentically only in the Bible. It has no history elsewhere. The names of places and tribes occasionally throw a feeble light on its past dwellings; but the stories of Arabian writers, borrowed, in the case of the northern Arabs, too frequently from late and untrustworthy Jewish writers, cannot be seriously treated. For trustworthy facts we must rest on the Biblical narrative. The city of “Medyen [say the Arabs] is the city of the people of Shu'eib, and is opposite Tabuk, on the shore of Bahr el-Kulzum [the Red Sea]: between these is six days' journey. It [Medyen] is larger than Tabuk; and in it is the well from which Moses watered the flock of Shu'eib” (Mardsid, s.v.). El-Makrfzi (in his Khitat) enters into considerable detail respecting this city and people. The substance of his account, which is full of incredible fables, is as follows: Medyen are the people of Shu'eib, and are the offspring of Medyan [Midian], son of Abraham, and their mother was Kanturan, the daughter of Yuktan [Joktan] the Canaanite: she bare him eight children, from whom descended peoples. He here quotes the passage above cited from the Marasid almost verbatim, and adds that the Arabs dispute whether the name be foreign or Arabic,. and whether Medyen spoke Arabic, so called. Some say that they had a number of kings, who were respectively named Abjad, Hawez, Hutti, Kelemen, Saafas, and Karashet.

This absurd enumeration forms a sentence common in Arabic grammars, which gives the order of the Hebrew and ancient Arabic alphabets, and the numerical order of the letters. It is only curious as possibly containing some vague reference to the language of Midian, and it is therefore inserted here. These kings are said to have ruled at Mekkeh, Western Nejd, the Yemen, Medyen, and Egypt, etc., contemporaneously. That Midian penetrated into the Yemen is, it must be observed, extremely improbable, notwithstanding the hints of Arab authors to the contrary: Yakut, in the Moajam (cited in the Journal of the Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesellschaft), saying that a southern Arabian dialect is of Midian; and El-Mes'udl (ap. Schultens, page 158) inserting a Midianitish king  among the rulers of the Yemen; the latter being, however, more possible than the former, as an accidental and individual, not a national occurrence. The story of Shu'eib is found in the Kuran. He was sent as a prophet to warn the people of Midian, and being rejected by them, they were destroyed by a storm from heaven (Sale's Kurdn, 7 and 11). He is generally supposed to be the same as Jethro, the father-in-law of Moses; but some, as Sale informs us, deny this; and one of these says that “ he was first called Buyun, and afterwards Shu'eib; that he was a comely person, but spare and lean, and of few words.” The whole Arab story of Medyen and Shu'eib, even if it contain any truth, is encumbered by a mass of late rabbinical myths. El-Makrizi tells us that in the land of Midian were many cities, of which the people had disappeared, and the cities themselves had fallen to ruin; that when he wrote (in the year 825 of the Hegira) forty cities remained, the names of some being known, and of others lost. Of the former, he says there were, between the Hijaz and Palestine and Egypt, sixteen cities; and ten of these in the direction of Palestine. They were El- Khalasah, El-Sanitah. El-Medereh, El-Minyeh, El-Aawaj, El-Khuwevrak, ElBirein, El-May-eyn, El-Seba, and El-Mu'allak. The most important of these cities were El-Khalasah and El-Sanitah; the stones of many of them had been removed to El-Ghazzah (Gaza) to build with them. This list, however, must be taken with caution.

III. Condition and Customs. — Much of this has already been incidentally mentioned. The whole account of the doings of the Midianites with Israel- and it is only thus that they find a place in the sacred writings plainly marks them as characteristically Arab. We have already stated our opinion that they had intermarried with Ishmael's descendants, and become nationally one people, so that they are apparently called Ishmaelites; and that, conversely, it is most probable their power and numbers, with such intermarriages, had caused the name of Midian to be applied to the northern Abrahamic Arabs generally. They are described as true Arabs — now Bedawin, or “people of the desert;” anon pastoral or settled Arabs — the “flock” of Jethro; the cattle and flocks of Midian, in the later days of Moses; their camels without number, as the sand of the sea-side for multitude when they oppressed Israel in the days of the Judges — all agree with such a description. Like Arabs, who are predominantly a nomadic people, they seem to have partially settled in the land of Moab, under the rule of Sihon the Amorite, and to have adapted themselves readily to the “cities” (עָרַים) and forts (A.V. “goodly castles,” טַירֹת), which they did  not build, but occupied, retaining even then their flocks and herds (Num 31:9-10), but not their camels, which are not common among settled Arabs, because they are not required, and are never, in that state, healthy. Israel seems to have devastated that settlement, and when next Midian appears in history it is as a desert horde, pouring into Palestine with innumerable camels; and, when routed and broken by Gideon, fleeing “by the way of them that dwelt in tents” to the east of Jordan. The character of Midian we think is thus unmistakably marked. The only glimpse of their habits is found in the vigorous picture of the camp in the valley of Jezreel, when the men talked together in the camp, and one told how he had dreamed that “a cake of barleybread tumbled into the host of Midian, and came into a tent, and smote it that it fell, and overturned it, that the tent lay along” (Jdg 7:13).

The spoil taken in both the war of Moses and that of Gideon is remarkable. On the former occasion, the spoil of 675,000 sheep, 72,000 beeves, and 61,000 asses, seems to confirm the other indications of the then pastoral character of the Midianites; the omission of any mention of camels has already been explained. But the gold, silver, brass, iron, tin, and lead (Num 31:22), the jewels of gold, chains, and bracelets, rings, earrings, and tablets” (Num 31:50) — the offering to the Lord being 16,750 shekels (Num 31:52) — taken by Moses, is especially noteworthy; and it is confirmed by the booty taken by Gideon; for when he slew Zebah and Zalmunna he “took away the ornaments that [were] on their camels' necks” (Jdg 8:21), and (Jdg 8:24-26) he asked of every man the ear-rings of his prey, “for they had golden ear-rings, because they [were] Ishmaelites.” “And the weight of the golden ear-rings that he requested was a thousand and seven hundred [shekels] of gold; besides ornaments and collars, and purple raiment that [was] on the kings of Midian, and besides the chains that [were] about their camels' necks.” (The rendering of the A.V. is sufficiently accurate for our purpose hero, and any examination into the form or character of these ornaments, tempting though it is, belongs more properly to other articles.) We have here a wealthy Arab nation, living by plunder, delighting in finery (especially their women, for we may here read “nose-ring”), and, where forays were impossible, carrying on the traffic southwards into Arabia, the land of gold- if not naturally, by trade-and across to Chaldsea, or into the rich plains of Egypt. SEE ARABIA.

## Midlent Sunday[[@Headword:Midlent Sunday]]

             (or Mothering Sunday), imperfectly explained in the Antiquitates Vulgares; is founded on the Roman Hilaria (q.v.), or feast in honor of Cybele, the mother of the gods, who, the legend tells us, was converted by Christianity into the mother Church, whence, in the second step, the Antiquitates Vulgares deduces the origin of Midleit. See Broughton, Bibl. Historico- Sacra, 1:194; Fosbrook, British Monachism, page 61.

## Midnight[[@Headword:Midnight]]

             (לִיַל, night, νύξ, in connection with חֲצַי חָצוֹת, or תָּוֶךְ, μέσος, middle; μεσονύκτιον simply. SEE NIGHT.

## Midraish[[@Headword:Midraish]]

             (Heb. מַדְרָשׁ) is a word applied to the oldest Jewish exposition of the Scriptures-a peculiar, somewhat wild mode of interpretation, which appeals more to the feelings than to the reason.

I. Title and its Signification, etc. — The term מדרש, which is strangely rendered in the text of the A.V. by story (2Ch 13:22; 2Ch 24:27), is derived from the root דרש, to search into, to examine, to -investigate, to explain, and primarily denotes the study, the exposition of Holy Scripture, in the abstract and general sense. Thus it is said, “Not the study of it (המדרש), but the doing of the law is the chief thing” (Aboth, 1:17). The study or exposition of Holy Writ (מדרש) was effected in earlier times through public discourses, delivered on Sabbaths, festivals, and days of assembly, by the priests, Levites, elders of Israel, and prophets. During the period of the second Temple, when the canonical books and the written discourses ‘of the older prophets became unintelligible to the mass of the' people, who spoke Hebraized Aramaic, these public expositions became more formal, and were delivered on a large scale by the lawyers, or Scribes (סופרים), as they are called in the N.T., the directors of schools (רברנן), graduated rabbins (רבות, only with suff. רבותינו), or learned men in general and members of societies (הברים).

II. Design and Classification. — The design of the Midrash or exposition varied according to circumstances. Sometimes the lecturer (דורש דרשן)  confined himself to giving a running paraphrase (מתורגמן) into the vulgar Aramaic, or the other dialects of the country, of the lessons from the Law and Prophets which were read in Hebrew, see HAPHTARAH, thus gradually giving rise to the Chaldee, Syriac, and Greek versions, so that these Targumim may be regarded as being the result, or forming part of the Midrash. The chief design of the Midrash, however, was to propound the Scriptures either logically or homiletically. Hence obtained that twofold mode of expression called the legal or Halachic exegesis, and the homiletic or Hagadic exegesis, and their respective literatures.

1. The Legal or Halachic Exegesis. — The object of this branch of exposition is to ascertain, by analogy, combination, or otherwise, the meaning of the law respecting exceptional cases about which there is no direct enactment in the Mosaic code, as it was the only rule of practice in the political and religious government of the Jews under all vicissitudes of the commonwealth, and as the motto of the expositors and administrators of it was “ Turn it (i.e. the inspired code) over and over again, for everything is in it, and will be discovered therein” (Aboth, 5:22). The laws thus obtained, either by deduction from the text or introduction into it, are called Halachoth (הלכות, sing. הלכה, from הל,ִ to go), the rule by which to go, the binding precept, the authoritative law, being equivalent to the Hebrew word משפטים(comp. Chaldee Paraphrase on Exo 21:9), and this mode of exposition, which is chiefly confined to the Pentateuch as the legal part of the O.T., is termed Halachic exegesis. These Halachoth (הלכות), some, of which are coeval with the enactments in the Pentateuch itself (Deu 17:11), while some are the labors of the Great Synagogue or the Sopherim = Scribes — beginning with Ezra, and terminating with Simon the Just — were for centuries transmitted orally, and hence are also called Shematha (שמעתא),i.e., that which was heard, or that which was- received by members of the chain of tradition. Those prohibitory laws or fences (גדר סיג, later גזרה) which the Sopherim were obliged to make on their own account in consequence of the new wants of the times, without being indicated in the Pentateuch, and which are called Sopheric precepts (דברי סופרים), and in the N.T. Tradition of the Elders (παράδοσις τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, Mat 15:2; Mar 7:3), are distinguished from the traditional laws which are deduced from the Bible. The latter are designated Deductions from the Laig (דאורייתא עקר), and are of equal authority with the Biblical  precepts. The few learned men who during the period of the Sopherim (B.C. 450-300) wrote down some of these laws, or indicated them by certain signs (סמנים) or hints (רמזים) in their scrolls of the Pentateuch, only did so to assist their memory, and the documents are called Secret Scrolls (מגלות סתרים). These marginal glosses in the MSS. of the Law became the basis of the Masorah (q.v.). Gradually, however, these Halachoth were fully written down, and are embodied in the following works.

(1.) It was not till the period of the Tanaim (an honorable appellation given to those doctors who transmitted the oral law), B.C. 220-A.D. 220, that the fixing, collecting, and final redaction of the Halachah — this mass of juridico-political and religious practice, or doctrine of human and divine law (humani et divinijuris) — took place. The first attempt at a compilation' and rubrification of it was made by Hillel I (B.C. 75-A.D. 8), who classified and arranged the diverse laws under six sedarim (סדרים) or orders. In this he was followed by Akiba (A.D. 20-120), and Simon III b.-Gamaliel II, who was the president of the Sanhedrim A.D. 140-163, and whose son R. Jehudah I the Holy, called Rabbi κατ᾿ ἐξοχήν (died A.D. cir. 193), completed the final redaction of the code called Mishna (q.v.).

(2.) The Mishna, however, like the Pentateuch, soon became the subject of discussion or study, as many of its expositions and enactments are not only couched in obscure language, but are derived from antagonistic sources. Hence. like the divine code of the law, which it both supplements and expounds, the Mishna itself was expounded during the period of the Amoraim. or expositors; an appellation given to the public expositors of the oral law (הלכות), recorded by the Tanaim, A.D. 220-540, both in Jerusalem and Babylon. The result of these expositions is the two Talmuds, or more properly Gemaras, viz. the Jerusalem and the Babylon. SEE TALMUD.

(3.) Prior in point of age to the compilation of the Mishna is the commentary on Exodus, called Mechilta. which is composed of nine Tractates (מסיכתות), subdivided into sections (פרשיות), and treating on select sections of Exodus in the following order: The first tract treats on Exo 12:1 to Exo 13:6, in eighteen sections; the second is on Exo 13:7 to Exo 14:31, in six sections; the third is on Exo 15:1-21, in ten sections; the fourth is on Exo 15:22 to Exo 17:7, in seven sections; the fifth  is on Exo 17:8 to Exo 18:27, in four sections; the sixth is on Exo 19:1 to Exo 20:22, in eleven sections; the seventh is on Exo 21:1 to Exo 22:22, in eight sections; the eighth is on Exo 22:23 to Exo 23:19, in two sections; and the ninth tract is on Exo 29:12-17; Exo 35:1-3, in two sections. The first compilation of the Mechilta was most probably made under the influence of R. Ishmael b.-Elisa, A.D. cir. 90, see ISHMAEL SEE ELISA, which accounts for the many maxims contained in it, and not to be found elsewhere. It was re-edited afterwards, and greatly altered (comp. Geiger, Urschrift, p. 434 sq.). It was printed at Constantinople in 1515; then again at Venice in 1545; then, with a commentary and revised text by M. Frankfurter (Amst.), in 1712; but the best edition is that by Landau (Vilna), in 1844. A Latin translation of it by Ugolino is given in his Thesaursus Antiquitatum Sacrum, volume 14 (Venice, 1752).

(4.) Commentary on Leviticus, called Siphraa, Sifra (ספרא), the Book; also Siphra D'be Rab (רב ספרא דבי), Siphra of the school of Rab, because Rab=Abba Areka, the first of the Amosraim, and founder of the celebrated school at Sora, of which he was president twenty-eight years (A.D. 219-247), is its author; and by some it is denominated Borsaitha shel Torath Cohanim ‘(בריתא של תורת כהנים), because the book of Leviticus which it expounds is called by the Jews the Code of the Priests (תורת כהנים, Jebamoth, 72 b; Rashi, on Lev 9:23). The Siphra is divided into treatises (דיבורים), which are subdvided into sections (פרשות), and these again into chapters (פרקים). The first edition of it appeared, together with the Mechilta and Siphri, at Constantinople in 1515; then at Venice in 1545; and, with a very extensive commentary by Ibn Chajim, at Venice in 1609-11; with the commentary Ha-Tora Veha- Mitzva, by M.L. Malbim, at Bucharest in 1860. The best edition, however, is that by Schlossberg, with the commentary of Abraham b.-David, and the Massoreth Ha-Talmud of Weiss (Vienna, 1862). A Latin translation of it by Ugolino is given in his Thesaurus ‘Antiquitatum Sacrumn (Venice, 1752), volume 14.

(5.) Commentary on Numbers and Deuteronomy, called Siphrae or Siphri (ספרי), the Books, also Siphre D'be Rab (ספרי דבי רב), because Rab, the author of the preceding work, is also the author of this commentary, and Vishallechu (וישלחו), because it begins with Numbers v, 2, where this word occurs. The commentary on Numbers is divided into one hundred  and sixty-one chapters, and that on Deuteronomy into three hundred and fifty-seven. The Siphre first appeared with the Mechilta and Siphra at Constantinople in 1515; at Venice in 1545. The best edition of it is in two volumes, with the extensive commentary by Lichtstein (volume 1, Dyrhenfort, 1810; volume 2, Radvill, 1819). A Latin translation of it by Ugolino is given in his Thesaurus Antiquitatum Sacrum (Venice, 1753), volume 15.

2. The Homiletic or Hagadic Exegesis. — The design of this branch of the Midrash or exposition is to edify the people of Israel in their most holy faith, to encourage them to obedience, to commend to them the paths of virtue and morality, to stimulate them to all good works, and to comfort them in tribulation by setting before them the marvellous dealings of Providence with the children of man, the illustrious examples of the holy patriarchs, and the signal punishment of evil-doers from by-gone history — investing each character, and every event, with the halo or contumely, the poetry or the legend, which the fertile genius of the Hebrew nation and the creative power of tradition had called into existence in the course of-time. This branch of exposition extends over the whole Hebrew Scriptures, while the Halachic interpretation, as we have seen, is chiefly confined to the Pentateuch, which is the civil and legal portion of the Bible. It is also called Hagadah (הגדה; Chaldee אגדה, from נגד, to say), said, reported, on it, without its having any binding authority, in contradistinction to the Halachah, which is authoritative law. When it is stated that this department of Biblical exegesis is interspersed with homiletics, the beautiful maxims and ethical sayings of illustrious men, attractive mystical expositions about angels and demons, paradise and hell, Messiah and the Prince of Darkness; poetical allegories, symbolical interpretations of all the feasts and fasts, charming parables, witty epithalamiums, touching funeral orations, amazing legends, biographical and characteristic sketches of Biblical persons and national heroes; popular narratives, and historical notices of men, women, and events of by-gone days; philosophical disquisitions, satirical assaults on the heathen and their rites, able defences of Judaism, etc., etc., it will be readily understood why the Jewish nation gradually transferred to this storehouse” of Biblical arid national lore the name Midrash the exposition, κατ᾿ ἐξοχήν. This branch of public and popular exposition, in which the public at large naturally felt far more interest than in the dry disquisitions about legal enactments, being thus called by them The Midrash, the collection of works which contain this  sacred and national lore obtained the name Midrashim (מדרשים), Commentaries, in the sense of Caesar's Commentaries. Hence the term Midrashic or Hagadic exegesis, so commonly used in Jewish writings, by which is meant an interpretation effected in the spirit of those national and traditional views. The following are the principal Mlidrashim, or commentaries, in the more restricted sense of the word, which contain the ancient Hagadic expositions. (It must here be remarked that as this branch of the Midrash embraces the whole cycle of ethics. metaphysics, history, theosophy, etc., as well as Biblical exposition, it has been divided into-1, General Hagadah or Hagadah Midrash, in its wider sense, treating almost exclusively on morals, history, etc.; and, 2, into Special Hagadah or Hagadah Midrash,-in its narrower, and Midrash in its narrowed sense, occupying itself almost entirely with Biblical exposition, and making the elements of the general Hagada subservient to its purpose. It would be foreign to the design of this article were we to discuss anything more than the Midrash in its narrowest sense.)

(1.) Midra-sh Rabboth (מדרש רבות), or simply Rabboth (רבות), which is ascribed to Oshaja b.-Nachmani (fl. A.D. 278), and derives its name from the fact that this collection begins with a Hagadah of Oshaja Rabba, contains ten Midrashim, which bears the respective names of —

1. Bereshith Rabba (בראשית רבא), abbreviated from Bereshith d'Rabbi Oshaja Rabba (דבי אושעיא רבא בראשית), on Genesis, divided into a hundred sections (פרשות).

2. Shemoth Rabbah (יבה שמות), on Exodus, in fifty-two sections.

3. Va-jikra Rabbah (ויקרא רבה), on Leviticus, in thirty-seven sections.

4. Ba-midbar Rabbah (במדבר רבה), on Numbers, in twenty-three sections.

5. Debarim Rabbah (דברים רבה), on Deuteronomy, in eleven sections.

6. Shir Ha-Shirimn Rabbah (שיר השירים רבה), also called Agadath Chasith (אגדת חזית), because the text begins with the word Chasith, on the Song of Solomon

7. Midrash Ruth Rabbah (מדרש רות רבה), on Ruth.

8. Midrash Eichah Rabbathi (איכה רבתי), on Lamentations.

9. Midrash Coheleth (מדרש קהלת), on Ecclesiastes.

10. Midrash Megillath Esther (אסתר מדרש מגילת, also called Hagadath Megillah (הגדת מגלה), on Esther.

This entire collection, which was first published at Venice in 1545, has been reprinted many times since (best edition by Schrentzel, with the different commentaries, Stettin, 1863, 2 volumes). Excerpts of the Midrash on Ruth, Esther, and Lamentations have been published in Latin by Schnell (Altdorf, 1650). The age of the compilation of the separate Midrashim constituting this collection is critically and elaborately discussed by Zunz, Die Gottesdienstlichen Vortrage der Juden, pages 174-184, 263 sq...

(2.) Pesikta (פסיקתא), compiled by Cahana or Kahana ben-Tachlifa, who was born about A.D. 330, and died in 411. This Midrash, which comprises a complete cycle of lectures on the Pericopes of the feasts and fasts, see HAPHTARAH, and which was lost for several centuries, has been restored by an anonymous writer about the year A.D. 846, and edited under the name Pesita Rabbathi (פסיקתא רבתי), intermixing it, however, with portions from the Midrash Jelammedenu. In this new form the Pesikta was first published by Isaac ben-Chajim Ha-Cohen (Prague, 1655). An excellent edition, entitled פסקתא רבתי עם הגדות ופרוש, with divisions into paragraphs, an emended text, extensive references, and a critical commentary and indices by Seeb (Wolf) ben-Israel Isser, was published in Breslau in 1831. The nature and date of this Midrash are discussed in a most masterly manner by Zunz, Die Gottesdienstlichen Vortraige, pages 185-226, 239-251: Rapaport, Erech Millin, page 171.

(3.) Midrash Tanchuma (מדרש תנחומא), i.e., the Midrash compiled by Tanchuma ben-Abba (flourished cir. A.D. 440), also called Midrash Jelammedenu (ילמדנו מדרש), from the fact that eighty-two sections begin with the formula ילמדנו, it will teach us. This Midrash extends over the whole Pentateuch, and consists of 140 sections. It contains extracts from the Mechilta, Siphre, Va-Ikra Rabba, Pesikta, and Boraitha de Rabbi Eliezer. and was first published after a redaction of the first Geonim period, when a great deal of it was lost, altered, and interpolated by Joseph ben-  Shoshan. (Constantinople, 1520; also Venice, 1545; Mantua, 1563; Salonica, 1578; with corrections after two MSS. and additions, Verona, 1595; and at different other places); the best edition is that with the twofold commentary by Chan. Sandel ben-Joseph (Vilna, 1833). For a thorough analysis of this Midrash we must refer to Zunz, Die Gottesdienstlichen Vortrage, pages 226-238.

(4.) Pirke Rabbi Eliezer ( פרקי רבי אליעזר), also called Boraitha or Agada de Rabbi Eliezer (ברייתא דרבי אליעזר אגדא או), because Eliezer ben-Hyrcanus (flourished cir. A.D. 70) is its reputed author. This Midrash, which discusses the principal events recorded in the Pentateuch, consists of fifty-four sections, treating respectively on the following important subjects: the life of R. Eliezer (sections 1 and 2); the creation (6); new moon (7); intercalary year (8); the fifth day's creation (9); the flight of Jonah, and his abode in the fish (10); the sixth day's creation (11); Adam, paradise, and the creation of the plants (12); the fall (13); the curse (14); paradise and hell (15); Isaac and Rebecca (16); the offices to be performed to bridal pairs and mourners (17);,the creation (18); the ten things created on the eve of the sixth creation day (19); the expulsion from paradise (20); Adam, Eve, Cain, and Abel (21); the degeneracy of Cain's descendants and the flood (22);the ark and its occupants (23); the descendants of Noah, the tower of Babel (24); Sodom, Lot, and his wife (25); the ten temptations of Abraham (26); his rescuing Lot (27); God's covenant with Abraham (28); his circumcision (29); the sending away of Hagar and Ishmael, the condition of the Jews in the days of Messiah (30); Abraham about to sacrifice Isaac (31); Isaac bestowing the blessing on Jacob (32); the resurrection (33); future state (34); Jacob's dream (35); his sojourn with Laban (36); his wrestling with the angel (37); the selling of Joseph (38); Jacob's sojourn in Egypt (39); God's manifestation in the bush (40): the giving of the law (41); the exodus (42); the power of repentance (43); the conflict of Moses with Amalek (44); the golden calf. (45); the tables of stone and the atonement (46); the exploit of Phineas (47); the birth of Moses and the redemption from Egypt (48); Samuel, Saul, Agag,. Haman, Mordecai, Titus, Nebuchadnezzar. Ahasuerus, Vashti, and Esther (49, 50); the new creation (51); the seven wonders of the world (52); the punishment of calumny, Absalom and David (53); and the leprosy of Miriam (54). This Midrash, which is chiefly written in pure and easy Hebrew, was first published at Constantinople in 1514, and has since been reprinted numerous times; but the best edition is with the critical  commentary called the Great Edifice (בית הגדול), emended text and references to Talmud and Midrashim by Broda (Vilna, 1838; a more convenient edition of it, Lemberg, 1858). A Latin translation by Vorst was published under the title Capitula R. Eliezeris continentia imprimis succinctam historiae sacrae recensionens, etc., cum vett. Rabb. Commentariis (Leyden, 1644). The composition and age of this Midrash are discussed by Zunz, Die Gottesdienstlichen Vortrage, pages 271-278.

(5.) Midrash on Samuel, called (רבתא מדרש שמואל]) Midrash Shemuel [Rabbatha], divided into thirty-two sections (פרשות), twenty-four of which are devoted to 1 Samuel and eight to 2 Samuel It is chiefly made up of excerpts from older works, and the compiler is supposed to have lived about the beginning of the 11th century. Rashi is the first who quotes this Midrash (Comment. on Chronicles 10:13). It was first published at Constantinople in 1517, and has since been frequently reprinted with the Midrash described below. The best editions of it are the one with the twofold commentary Ez Joseph and Anaph Joseph, references to the parallel passages in the Talmud and Midrashim, etc., by Schrentzel (Stettin, 1860); and the other published together with the Midrash on Proverbs and the commentary of Isaac Cohen (Lemberg, 1861).

(6.) Midrash on the Psalms, called (רבתא מדרש תלים) Midrash Tillim [Rabbatha], Hagadath Tillim (הגדת תלים), or Shochar Tob (שחר טוב), after the words with which it commences. With the exceptions of seven psalms — viz. 42, 96, 97, 98, 115, 123, and 131 — this Midrash extends over the whole Psalter. As it contains extracts from the Babylonian Talmud, the Pesikta, Boraitha of R. Eliezer, Tanchuma, and Pesikta Rabbathi, it must have been compiled about the end of the 10th century, most probably in Italy. It was first published at Constantinople in 1512. The portion on Psalms 119, which extends to the first verses of the letter ק, is called Midrash Alpha Betha (מדרש אלפא ביתא), from the fact that this is an alphabetic psalm; it has been published separately (Salonica, 1515). The Midrash on the Psalms has frequently been published together with the Midrash on Samuel, under the title Midrash Shochar Tob (טוב שוחר), which properly belongs only to that on the Psalms.

(7.) Midrash on Proverbs, called (רבתא מדרש משלי]) Midrash Mishle [Rabbatha], consists of a compilation of those maxims and expositions  from former works which are best calculated to illustrate and explain the import of the book of Proverbs. The compiler, who lived about the middle of the 11th century, omits all the references to the original sources, discards the form of lectures, and assumes that of a commentary. The first edition of this Midrash appeared at Constantinople in 1512-17, with the commentary Sera Abraham (Vilna, 1834), and the commentary of Isaac Cohen (Stettin, 1861).

(8.) Midrash Jalkut (מדרש ילקוט), or Jalkut Shimoni (ילקוט שמעוני), i.e., the collection or compilation of Simeon, who flourished in the 11th century. This Midrash, which extends over the whole Hebrew Scriptures, is described in the article CARA SEE CARA in this Cyclopaedia.

III. Method and Plan of the Midrash. — In discussing its method and plan; it must be borne in mind that the Midrash first developed itself in public lectures and homilies; that the ancient fragments of these discourses became afterwards literary commodities, serving frequently as the groundwork of literary productions; and that the Midrashic writers or compilers mixed up other matters and pieces of their own composition with the remnants of expository lectures. The ancient relics, however, are easily discernible by their dialect, diction, etc., and by the authority to whom they are ascribed. That there was a method in them has been shown by the erudite and indefatigable Jellinek, than whom there is no greater authority on the subject. He points out the following plan as gathered from the ancient fragments:

1. The lecturer first set forth the theme of his discourse in a passage of Scripture enunciating the particular truth which he wished to unfold, and then illustrated it by a parable, and enforced it by a saying which was popular in the mouth of the people. This rule is given in the Midrash itself (comp. מקרא ויש להם משל ויש להם מליצה יש להן וכולהון, Midrash on the Song of Solomon , 1 a).

2. The attention of the audience was roused and the discourse was enlivened by the lecturer using a foreign word instead of a well-known expression, or by employing a Greek, Latin, Aramaic, or Persian term in addition to the Hebrew (comp. Aruch, s.v. אדודקי). This accounts for the striking fact that so many foreign words occur in the Midrash to express things for which the Hebrew has expressions, and that both Hebrew and foreign words, expressing the same idea, stand side by side (comp.  מחדר לחדר ומקיטון לקיטוןMidrash Rabbah on Genesis, c. 7; בת טובים ובת גינוסין, Midrash on the Song of Solomon , 1 a).

3. The lecturer increased the beauty of his discourse by trying to discover analogies between numbers and persons related to each other — e.g. between David and Solomon. Comp. Midrash on the Song of Songs, ibid.

4. The lecture was also rendered more attractive by being interspersed with plays upon words, which were not intended to explain or corroborate a statement, but were simply meant to create a pleasant feeling in the audience. Hence, to judge of the frequent plays upon words by the rules of hermeneutics is to misunderstand the esthetics of the Hagadah.

5. It was considered as ornamenting the discourse, and pleasing to the audience, when single words were reduced to their numerical value in order to put a certain point of the lecture in a clearer light. Thus, e.g., the lecturer speaking of Eliezer, Abraham's faithful servant, and being desirous to show that he alone was worth a host of servants, remarked that Eliezer (אליעזר, 1+30+10+70+7+200=318) is exactly as much as the three hundred and eighteen young men mentioned in Gen 14:14. Comp. Midrash Rabboth on Genesis, chapter 42. When it is remembered that the Hebrew letters were commonly used as numbers, it will be easily understood how the audience would be rejoiced to see a word converted so dexterously into figures.

6. To relieve the discourse of its monotony, the lecturer resolved a long word into several little words, or formed new words by taking away a letter or two from the preceding and following words in the same sentence.

“If the Midrash is read with the guidance of these nesthetical canons,” continues Dr. Jellinek, “we shall find in it less arbitrariness and more order. We shall, moreover, understand its method and plan, and often be put in a position to distinguish the original discourse from the literary element of a later date, as well as from interpolations. For the confirmation of our aesthetical canons, let the reader compare and analyze chapters 2, 3, and 5 of Midrash Rabboth on Genesis” (Ben Chanamja, 4:383 sq.).

IV. Halachic and Hagadic Rules of Interpretation. — The preceding exposition of the method and plan of the Midrash has prepared us to enter upon the Halachic wand Hagadic rules of interpretation which were collected and systematized by Elieser ben-Jose the Galilaean (הגלילי  יוסי), one of the principal interpreters of the Pentateuch in the 2d century of the Christian era. According to this celebrated doctor, whose sayings are so, frequently recorded in the Talmud and the Siphri, there are thirty-two rules (שלשים ושתים מדות) whereby the Bible is to be interpreted, which are as follows:

1. By the superfluous use of the three particles גם את, and א, the Scriptures indicate in a threefold manner, that something more is included in the text than the apparent declaration would seem to imply. Thus, e.g., when it is said, Gen 21:1, “And the Lord visited (שרה את) Sarah; the superfluous את, which sometimes denotes with, is used to indicate that with Sarah the Lord also visited other barren women. The second, גם, is used superfluously in the passage “take also your herds, and also (גם) your flocks” (Exo 12:32), to indicate that Pharaoh also gave the Israelites sheep and oxen, in order to corroborate the declaration made in Exo 10:25; while the superfluous א, 2Ki 2:14, “He also (א) had smitten the waters,” indicates that more wonders were shown to Elisha at the Jordan than to Elijah, as it is declared in 2Ki 2:9. This rule is called ריבוי, inclusion, more being meant than said.

2. By the superfluous use of the three particles רק א,ִ and מן, the Scriptures point out something which is to be excluded. Thus, e.g., א Gen 7:23, “And Noah only (א)ִ remained,” shows that even Noah was near death, thus indicating exclusion. The superfluous רק in “Only (רק) the fear of God is not in this place” (Gen 20:11), shows that the inhabitants were not altogether godless; while מן in Exo 18:13, “And the people stood by Moses from (מן) the morning unto the evening,” indicates that it did not last all day, but only six hours (Sabbath, 10a). This rule is called מיעוט, diminution, exclusion.

3. If words denoting inclusion follow each other, several things are included. Thus in 1Sa 17:36, “Thy servant slew also (גם את) the lion, also (גם) the bear,” three superfluous expressions follow each other, to show that he slew three other animals besides the two expressly mentioned in the text. This rule is called אחר ריבוי ריבוי, inclusion after inclusion.

4. If words denoting exclusion follow each other, several things are excluded. Thus in Num 12:2, “Hath the Lord indeed only spoken to Moses? hath he not also spoken to us?” the superfluous expressions רק and א  which follow each other denote that the Lord spoke to Aaron and Miriam before he spoke to Moses, thus not only without the lawgiver being present to it, but before God spoke to him, and not only did he speak to Aaron, but also to Miriam, so that there is here a twofold exclusion. If two or more inclusive words follow each other, and do not admit of being explained as indicative of inclusion, they denote exclusion. Thus, e.g., if the first word include the whole, while the second only includes a part, the first inclusion is modified and diminished by the second. If, on the contrary, two or more exclusive words follow each other, and do not admit of being explained as indicative of exclusion, they denote inclusion. Thus, e.g., if the first exclude four, while the second only excludes two, two only remain included, so that the second exclusive expression serves to include or increase. This rule is called מיעוט מיעוט אחר, exclusion after exclusion, and the two exceptions are respectively denominated ריבוי אלא למעט אין ייבוי אחר, inclusion after inclusion effecting diminution, and מיעוט אחר מיעוט אלא לרבות אין. exclusion after exclusion effecting increase (comp. Pessachimn, 23a; Joma, 43a; Megilla, 23b; Kiddushin, 21b; Baba-Kama, 45b; Sanhedrin, 15a; with Menachoth, 34a).

5. Expressed inference from the minor to the major, called קל וחומר מפורש. An example of this rule is to be found in Jer 12:5, “If thou hast run with the footmen, and they have wearied thee, [inference] then how canst thou contend with horses?”

6. Implied inference fromn the minor to the major, calledקל וחומר סתום. This is found in Psa 15:4 : “He sweareth to his own hurt, and changeth not,” hence how much less if he swear to his advantage (comp. Maccoth, 24a).

7. Inference from analogy or parallels, called שוה גזרה. Thus it is said of Samuel, that “ there shall no razor come upon his head” (1Sa 1:11), and the same language is used with respect to Samson — “No razor shall come on his head” (Jdg 13:5); whereupon is based the  deduction from analogy, that just as Samson was a Nazarite, so also Samuel (Nasir, 66a).

8. Building of the father (בנין אב) is the property of any subject which is made the starting-point, and to constitute a rule (אב, a father) for all similar subjects. Thus, e.g.; in Exo 3:4, it is stated, “God called unto him out of the midst of the bush, and said, Moses, Moses;” hence it concludes that whenever God spoke to Moses, he addressed him in the same manner. SEE HILLEL and SEE ISMAEL BEN-ELISA.

9. Brachylogy (דר ִקגרה). The Scriptures sometimes express themselves briefly, and words must be supplied. Thus, e.g. ותכל דוד, where it ought to be ותכל נפש דוד, and David's soul was consumed, נפשbeing omitted; again, 1Ch 17:5, where מאוהל אל אוהל ומֹמשכן ואהוה ought to be מאוהל אל אוהל וממשכן למשכן ואהיה מתהל,ִ “And I went from tent to tent, and from tabernacle to tabernacle,” the words מתהל and למשכן being omitted.

10. Repetition (דבר שהוא שנוי). The Scriptures repeat a thing in order to indicate thereby something special. Thus it is said in Jer 7:4, “Trust ye not in lying words, saying, The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord;” the last phrase is repeated three times, to indicate that though his people Israel celebrate feasts in the temple three times in the year, the Lord will not regard it because they do not amend their ways.

11. The separation and order of the verses (שנחלק סדור) are designed to convey some explanation. Thus Jer 7:18-19 of 2 Chronicles 30 ought to be differently placed (comp. Rashi, ad loc.).

12. A subject often explains itself while it imparts information on other subjects (למד דבר שבא ללמד ונמצא). Thus, “Its cry, it shall arise like that of a serpent” (Jer 46:22), indicates that the serpent must have raised a tremendous cry after the curse which the Lord pronounced against it, since we are nowhere else told that there was any occasion on which it cried; and that Egypt raises an equally loud cry — thus serving to give information upon another subject, and at the same time explaining itself (comp. Sofa, 9b).

13. A general statement is made first, and is followed by a single remark, which is simply to particularize the general. This rule is called אלא פרטו של ראשון בלל שאחריו מעשה ואינו, and is illustrated by Gen 1:27, where the creation of man is recorded in general terms “Male and female created he them;” while Gen 2:7, which describes the creation of Adam, and Gen 2:21, which speaks of the creation of Eve, are simply the particulars of Gen 1:27, and not another record or contradiction.

14. A great and incomprehensible thing is represented by something small to render it intelligible. This rule is called שהיא שומעת דבר גדול שנתלה בקטן להשכיע האוזן כדר,ִ and is illustrated by Deu 32:2 “My doctrine shall drop as the rain;” where the great doctrines of revelation are compared with the less significant rain, in order to make them comprehensible to man; and by Amo 3:8 — “When the lion roareth, who doth not fear? the Lord speaketh,” etc.; where the lion is compared with the Deity, to give man an intelligible idea of the power of God.

15. When two Scriptures seem to contradict each other, a third Scripture will reconcile them את את זה עד שיבא הכתוב השלישי שני כתובים ויכריַע ביניהים המכחישים. Thus it is said in 2Sa 24:9, “There were in Israel eight hundred thousand valiant men,” in contradiction to 1Ch 21:5, where “a thousand thousand and a hundred thousand men that drew sword” — three hundred: thousand more are said to have been among all Israel. The apparent contradiction is reconciled by 27:1, where it is said, “The children of Israel after their number; to wit, the chief fathers and captains of thousands and hundreds, and their officers who served the king in all matters of the courses, who came in and went out, was, month by month, through all the months of the year, twenty-four thousand in each course.” From this it is evident that the number of these servants for twelve months amounted to two hundred and eighty-eight thousand, and as the chief fathers of Israel consisted of twelve .thousand, we obtain the three hundred thousand who were noted in the registers of the king, and therefore are not mentioned in 2Sa 24:9. Thus the two apparently contradictory Scriptures are reconciled by a third Scripture. It deserves to be noticed that this ancient interpretation is now generally followed, and that it is espoused by Dr. Davidson, Sacred Hermeneutics (Edinb. 1843), page 546, etc.

16. An expression used for the first time is explained by the passage in which it occurs (דבר מיוחד במקומו). Thus, e.g., Hanuah is the first who in her prayer addresses God as “Lord of Hosts; whence it is concluded that the superfluous expression hosts indicates that she must have argued to this effect — “Lord of the universe, thou hast erected two worlds (צבאות); if I belong to the nether world I ought to be fruitful, and if to the upper I ought to live forever.” Hence the expression is designed for this passage (Berachoth, 31b).,

17. A circumstance is not fully described in the passage in which it first occurs, but is explained elsewhere (דבר שאינו מתפרש במקומו ומתפרש במקום אחר). Thus it is stated in Gen 2:8, where the garden. of Eden is first mentioned, that there were in it all manner of fruit; but it is not to be gathered from this passage that there was anything else in the garden; while from Eze 28:13, where this passage is further explained, it is evident that there were also precious stones in Paradise.

18. Athing is named in part, but comprises the whole (דבר שנאמר במקצת והוא נוהג בכל). Thus in Exo 22:30 it is forbidden to eat flesh “torn of beasts in the field;” and in Lev 22:8, it is said, “That which is torn he shall not eat,” here also forbidding that which is torn in the city. The use of the expression field in the first passage is owing to the fact that beasts are far more frequently torn in it than in the city; and the Scriptures mention the common and not the uncommon occurrences. Hence in the expression field everything is comprised — city, country, forest, mountain, valley, etc.

19. The respective predicates of two subjects in the same passages may refer to both alike (וה ה לחבירו דבר שנאמר בזה). Thus, “Light is sown for the righteous, and gladness for the upright in heart” (Psa 97:11), does not imply that the former is without gladness and the latter without light, but what is predicated of one also belongs to the other (comp. Taanith, 15a).

20. The predicate of a subject may not refer to it at all, but to the one next to it (ענין לו והוא ענין לחבירו דבר שנאמר בזה ואינו). Thus there mark, “This to Judah” (Deu 33:7), does not refer to Judah, since it is said further on, “And he said, Hear, Lord, the voice of Judah,” but to Simeon, whom Moses hereby blesses after Reuben.

21. When a subject is compared with two things, it is to receive the best attributes of both (מדות ואתה נותן לו כח היפה שבשתיהן דבר שהוקש לשתי). Thus, “The righteous shall flourish like the palm-tree; he shall grow up like a cedar in Lebanon” (Psa 92:12) the comparison is with the best qualities of both (comp Taanith, 25a).

22. The first clause explains by its parallelism the second, to which it refers (דבר שחירו מויח עלּיו). Thus, “A gift in secret pacifieth anger,” in the first hemistich signifying the anger of God, shows that “and a reward in the bosom strong wrath” (Pro 21:14), in the second hemistich, refers to the strong wrath of God (comp. Baba Bathra, 9b).

23. The second clause in parallelism explains the first hemistich, to which it refers (חבירו דבר שהוא מוכיח). Thus, “The voice of the Lord shaketh the wilderness; the Lord shaketh the wilderness of Kadesh” (Psa 29:8). Here Kadesh, though comprised in the expression wilderness of the first clause, is used in the second clause to heighten the strength of the first hemistich, by showing that the wilderness must have been shaken exceedingly, since Kadesh, the great wilderness, was shaken (comp. Deu 1:16).

24. A subject included in a general description is excepted from it to convey a special lesson (בכלל ויצא מן הכלל ללמד על עצמו יצא דבר שהיה). Thus, “Joshua, the son of Nun, sent out of Shittim two men to spy secretly, saying, Go, view the land, and Jericho” (Jos 2:1). Here Jericho is superfluous; since it is comprised in the general term land, but it is especially mentioned to indicate that Jericho by itself was equal in power and strength to the whole country. Hence that which is excepted teaches something special about itself.

25. A. subject included in a general description is excepted from it to teach something special about another subject (חבירו דבר שהיה בכלל ויצא מן הכלל ללמד על). Thus the command, “Ye shall take no redemption-price for the life of a murderer who is guilty of death” (Num 35:31), is entirely superfluous, since it is included in the declaration already made “As he hath done, so shall it be done to him” (Lev 24:19). It is, however, mentioned especially to be a guide for other punishments, since it is concluded from it that it is only for murderers that no redemption-price is to be taken, but that satisfaction may be taken  in case of one knocking out his neighbor's tooth or eye (comp. Kethuboth, 37b, 38a).

26. Parable (משל). Thus, “The trees went forth on a time to anoint a king over them, and they said unto the olive-tree, Reign thou over us” (Jdg 9:8), where it is the Israelites and not the trees who said to Othniel, son of Kenaz, Deborah and Gideon reign over us. So also the remark, “And they shall spread the cloth before the elders of the city” (Deu 22:17), is parabolic, meaning that they should make their testimony as clear as the cloth (comp. Kethuboth, 46a).

27. The preceding often explains what follows (ממעל בהגדה מנין שדורשין). Thus, “And the Lord said unto Jehu, Because thou hast done well, executing that which is right in mine eyes... thy children of the fourth generation shall sit on the throne of Israel” (2Ki 10:30), is to be explained by what precede, Because Jehu destroyed four generations of the house of Ahab-viz. Omri, Ahab, Joram, and his sons, as is stated (comp. 2Ki 10:13) — therefore shall four generations of his house remain on the throne.

28. Antithetic sentences often explain each other by their parallelism (מנין שדורשין טנגר בהגדה). Thus in Isa 30:16, “But ye said, No; for we will flee upon horses; therefore shall ye flee, and ride upon rapid runners; therefore shall your pursuers run;” the words wherewith they have sinned are put in parallelism with the words of punishment, couched in the same language and in similar expressions.

29. Explanations are. obtained by reducing the letters of a word to their numerical value (גמטריא בהגדה מנין שדורשים), and substituting for it another word or phrase of the same value, or by transposing the letters (חלו אותיות). For an instance of the first we must refer to the reduction of אליעזרto 318, given in the preceding section. The second part of this rule is illustrated by examples which show that several modes of transposing the letters were resorted to. Thus שש,ִ Sheshach, is explained by בבל, Babel (Jer 25:26; Jer 51:41), and לב קמיby כשדים(ibid. 51:1), by taking the letters of the alphabet in their inverse order; א, the first letter, is expressed by ת, the last letter of the alphabet; ב, the second letter, by ש, the last but one; גby ר; דby ק; הby צ, and so on. This principle of  commutation is called Atbash (את בש), from the first two specimen pairs of letters which indicate the interchange. Or the commutation is effected by bending the alphabet exactly in the middle, and putting one-half over the other, and the interchange is אfor ל, בfor מ, גfor נ. This mode is termed Albam (אל ב ם), from the first two specimen pairs of letters which indicate the interchange (comp. Nedarim, 32a; Sanhedrin, 22a).

30. An explanation is to be obtained by either dividing a word into several words, or into syllables, and transposing these syllables, or into letters, and taking each letter as an initial or abbreviation of a word. This rule is termed מנין שדורשין נוטריקון בהגדה, and is illustrated by the word אברהםbeing divided into המון גוים אב, the father of many nations; by כרמלbeing divided into מלand כר, and the latter transposed into ר,ִ viz. soft and grindable; and by every letter of נמרצת(1Ki 2:8) being taken as standing for a word, viz.: נוא נ, adulterer; מואבי מ, Moabite; רוצח ר, murderer; צורר צ, apostate; and תועבה ת, abhorred (comp. Sabbath, 105a).

31. Words and sentences are sometimes transposed (שהוא מאוחר בענין מוקדם). Thus 1Sa 3:3, “And ere the lamp of God went out, and Samuel was lying in the temple of the Lord,” the words בהיכל יהוה, in the temple of the Lord, which are placed later in the sentence, evidently belong to יכבה, went out, since no one was allowed to sit down in the Temple except the kings of the house of David, much less to lie down. So also in Psalms 34 where Psa 34:18 must be taken up to Psa 34:16 (comp. Kiddushin, 78 b; Baba Kama, 106).

32. Whole sentences are sometimes transposed (מאוחר שהוא בפרשות מוקדם). Thus, e.g. the record, “And he said unto him, Take me a heifer of three years old,” etc. (Gen 15:9, etc.), ought properly to precede ch. 14, inasmuch as it is anterior in point of time. This reversed order is owing to the fact that the Scriptures for some reason put certain events which occurred earlier in time after later occurrences (comp. Berachoth, 7b, with Pessachim, 6 b).

Besides these thirty-two rules, the following laws of interpretations must be mentioned:  i. Deduction from Juxtaposition. — When two laws immediately follow each other, it is inferred that they are similar in consequences. Thus it is said in Exo 22:18-19, “Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live. Whosoever lieth with a beast shall surely be put to death;” whence it is inferred that these two enactments are placed close to each other to indicate the manner of death a witch is to suffer, which the Scriptures nowhere define. Now, as he who cohabits with an animal is, according to the Halachah based upon Leviticus 20 to be stoned to death, hence it is concluded that a witch is to die in the same manner.

ii. All repetitions of words, as well as the construction of the finite verb with the infinite, e.g. תשיב העבט תעביטנו השב, have a peculiar signification, and must be explained. Some, however, maintain that the Bible, being written in human language, employs these repetitions (דיברה תורה כלשון בני אדם) in accordance with the usus loquendi (Mishna Baba Mezia, 2:9; 12:3; Gemara, ibid. 31; Jerusalem Nedarin, 1:1; Kethuboth, 77b; Berachoth, 31b).

iii. Letters are to be taken from one word andjoined to another, orformed into new words. Thus, e.g. את נחלתו לשארו ונתתמ, “Then ye shall give his inheritance unto his kinsman” (Num 27:11), is explained by ונתתם את נחלת שאר לו, “And ye shall give the inheritance of his wife to him,” i.e., the husband, by taking away the ו from נחלתו and the ל from לשארו, thus obtaining the word לו; and it is deduced therefrom that a man inherits the property of his (שאר) wife (comp. Baba Bathra, 3:6; Menachoth, 74a). This rule is called גורעין ומוסיפין ודורשין.

iv. A word is to be explained both with the preceding and following words. Thus, ילדה לו ולה שפחה מצרית ושמה הגר ושרי אשת אברם לא, “And Sarai, Abraham's wife, bare him no children; and she had a handmaid, an Egyptian, whose name was Hagar” (Gen 16:1), is explained, “And Sarai, Abraham's wife, bare no children to him and to herself” (לו ולה); and then again, to him (i.e., Abraham) and to her (i.e., Sarai) there was a handmaid (לו ולה שפכה). This rule is called מקרא נדרש לפניי ולאחריו, and is not admitted by some (comp. Sabbath, 32 b; Menachoth, 19a).  v. The letters of a word are sometimes transposed. Thus עמלנו, “our labor” (Deu 25:7), is made to mean our children, עלמנו, by transposing the מand the ל.

vi. Letters resembling each other in sound or appearance, or belonging to the same organ of speech, are interchanged. Thus יעקב תורה צוה לנו משה מורשה קהלת, “Moses commanded us the law, an inheritance of the congregation of Jacob” (Deu 33:4), is explained, “The law which Moses has given us, is the BETROTHED or WIFE (מְאֹרָשָׂה) of the congregation of Jacob,” by changing the וin מורשה for א, and שׁ for שׂ.

The alteration produced by rules 5 and 6 and which are in the Talmudic and post-Talmudic period generally introduced by the remark אל תקרי כ ִאלא כ,ִ Read not so and so, but so and so, must not be taken for emendations of the text of various readings, but are simply another mode of obtaining an additional meaning of the text. It was argued that as the literal and limited sense of the Bible, read in the stereotyped order, could not yield sufficiently the divine and inexhaustible mind couched in those letters, every transposition, commutation, etc., ought to be resorted to in order to obtain as much as possible of the infinite idea; especially as every such effort yielded that sense and meaning thoroughly in harmony with what might justly be expected from Holy Scripture. It was therefore regarded as probable that the Bible designed to indicate it in addition to what the regular order and reading of the words conveyed. It must also be remembered that some of these rules, especially those which involved an alteration of the text and a departure from the literal meaning, were not used in Halachic exegesis, and that the Hagadic exegesis employs many more than those we have specified. In fact, anything and everything is resorted to which can make the text speak comfort and consolation in every time of need, or connect the legends about Scriptural characters with the Biblical record. The puerility and extravagance of many of the rules are obvious, while others are of acknowledged value. SEE CABALA.

V. Importance of the Halachic and Blagadic Exegesis. — When it is borne in mind that the annotators and punctuators of the Hebrew text, and the translators of the ancient versions, were Jews impregnated with the theological opinions of the nation, and prosecuted their Biblical labors in harmony with these opinions, and the above-named exegetical rules, the  importance of the Halachic and Hagadic exegesis to the criticism of the Hebrew text, and to a right understanding of the Greek, Chaldee, Syriac, and other versions, as well as of the quotations of the O.T. in the N.T., can hardly be overrated. If it be true and few will question the fact that every successive English version, either preceding or following the Reformation, reflects the peculiar notions about theology, Church government, and politics of each period and of every dominant party; and that even the most literal translation of modern days is, in a certain sense, a commentary of the translator; we ought to regard it as natural that the Jews, without intending to deceive, or wilfully to alter the text, should by the process of the Midrash introduce or indicate, in their Biblical labors, the various opinions to which shifting circumstances gave rise. Let a few specimens from the Hebrew text, and the ancient versions, suffice to illustrate the Midrashic process, and its paramount importance to Biblical criticism.

1. The Hebrew Text and the Masorah. — The influence of the Halachic and Hagadic exegesis on the formation of the Hebrew text and the Masorah is far greater than has hitherto been imagined, though the limits of this article only admit of a few examples. Thus, e.g., the question put by Isaiah to Hezekiah, “The shadow has gone forward (הָלִךְ) ten degrees; shall it go back ten degrees?” (2Ki 20:9) as the Hebrew text has it, is not only grammatically incorrect, inasmuch as the repetition of the ten degrees a second time requires the article, but is at variance with the king's reply given in 2Ki 20:10, from which it is evident that the prophet asked him whether the shadow should go forwards OR backwards ten degrees, that Hezekiah chose the latter because it was more difficult and wonderful, and that the original reading was הֲיֵלֵךְ, instead of הָלִךְ; and, indeed, this reading is still preserved by the Chaldee, the Syriac, the Vulgate, etc.; is followed by Luther and the Zurich version, whence it found its way into Coverdale, the Bishop's Bible, and has finally got into the A.V. The mystery about the origin of the present textual reading is solved when we bear in mind the Hagadic explanation of the parallel passage in Isa 38:8. Now, tradition based upon this passage tells us that the shadow or the sun had gone ten degrees forwards at the death of Ahaz, and the day was thus shortened to two hours (אותו היום שמת בו אחז שתי שעות היה, Sanhedrin, 96a), in order that his burial might be hasty and without royal honors, and that now these ten degrees went backwards. Hence the present reading, which was effected by the trifling alteration of היל into הל,ִ i.e., “the shadow,” the prophet is made to say to the king, “Has once gone forward ten degrees” (i.e., at the death of Ahaz); “shall it now go backward ten degrees?” Thus the Midrashic exposition of Isa 38:8, it may be supposed, gave rise to the textual reading of 2Ki 20:9. For the influence of the Halachic and Hagadic exegesis on the Masorah and the various readings, we must refer to Krochmal, More Neboche Ha-Jeman (Lemberg, 1851), page 169 sq. SEE KERI AND KETHIB; SEE NETHINIM.

2. The Greek Versions. — That the Septuagint is pervaded by the Halachic and Hagadic exegesis may almost be seen on every page of this version. A few examples must suffice. Thus, e.g., the Septuagint rendering of חיהby ζωογονοῦντων, in Lev 11:47, is only to be explained when it is borne in mind that, according to the Halachah, the prohibition respecting טרפה(Exo 22:30, etc.) does not simply refer to animals torn by wild beasts, but to every animal which is sickly and maimed, though belonging to the clean animals allowed to be eaten in Leviticus 11; and that one of the sure tests whether an animal is healthy, and hence eatable, is when it bears young ones; barrenness is an infallible sign of its sickly condition (comp. Chulin, 24 with 58; Salomon ben-Adereth, Respons. 108; Torath Cohanim, 124) hence the Septuagint rendering, “Between those which bear young ones and [for this reason] may be eaten, and those which bear young ones and may not be eaten,” because they belong to the animals proscribed. Again, the rendering of Jos 13:22, הרגו בחרב ואת בלעם, by καὶ τὸν Βαλαὰμ... ἀπέκτειναν... ἐν ῥοπῇ, which has caused such perplexity to commentators and given rise to diverse emendations (e.g. προνομῇ, Oxf.; ἐν ῥομφαια ἐν τροπῇ, Ald. and Complut.), is at once explicable when reference is made to the Hagadah, which is quoted in Jonathan ben-Uzziel's Chaldee Paraphrase of Num 31:6, and is as follows: “Balaam flew into the air by his magic arts, and Phinehas threw him down;” so that ἐν ῥοπῇ means in the fall (comp. also Rashi on Num 31:6).

Symmachus, too, cannot be understood in many of his translations without reference to the Halachic and Hagadic exegesis. Thus the apparently strange rendering of לא תבשׁל גדי בחלב אמו by οὐ σκευάσεις ἔριφον διὰ γάλακτος μητρὸς αὐτοῦ (Exo 23:19) becomes intelligible when it is remembered that the Halachah not only prohibits the cooking, but the mixing and eating of animal meat and milk in any form  (comp. Mechilta, ad loc.; Cholin, 115). Hence the rendering of תבשׁל by σκευάσεις. The rendering of ויואל משׁה by ὥρκισε δὲ Μωϋσήν (Exo 1:21), which has been thought very extraordinary and inexplicable, becomes perfectly plain when the Hagadah on this passage is consulted, which tells us that Jethro demanded of Moses to swear that he would devote to idolatry his first-begotten son by Zipporah, and that Moses consented to it; and remarks further, Then said Jethro, Swear, and Moses swore to him, as it is written, ויואל משׁה. Now אלהdenotes to swear, as in 1Sa 14:24, and 2Ki 5:23 (comp. Mechilta, sec. Jethro, beginning quoted in Jalkut, ad loc.; Nedarim, 65a).

These few specimens must suffice, for, greatly important as the subject is, the limits of this article prevent us from giving illustrations of the influence which the Halachic and Hagadic exegesis exercised upon the other Greek versions, as well as upon the Chaldee paraphrases, the Syriac version, the Vulgate, the Arabic, and the expositions of the early fathers.

VI. Literature. — Zunz, Die gottesdienstlichen Vortrage der Juden (Berlin, 1832), page 35 sq.; Hirschfeld, Halachische Exegese (Berlin, 1840); by the same author, Die hagadische Exegese (Berlin, 1847); Sachs, Die religiose Poesie der Juden in Spanien (Berlin,. 1845), page 141 sq.; Rapaport, Erech Millin (Prague, 1852), art. Agada, page 6 sq.; Frankel, Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta (Leipsic, 1841), page 179 sq.; by the same author, Ueber den Einfluss der palastinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik (Leipsic, 1851); and Programm zur Eroffnung des judisch-theologischen Seminars zu Breslau (Breslau, 1854); Luzzatto, Oheb. Ger. (Vienna, 1831); Pinner, Vorstudien zum Talmud (Berlin, 1831); Geiger, Urschrift und Uebersetzung der Bibel (Breslau, 1857); Steinschneider, Jewish Literature (London, 1857), page 5 sq.; Deutsch, in Lond. Quarterly Review, April 1867 sq., art. on Talmud; Ginsburg, Historical and Critical Commentary on Ecclesiastes (London, 1861), page 30 sq., 455 sq.; and the literature there referred to.

## Midrash[[@Headword:Midrash]]

             By way of supplement, we add here the following works, belonging to the Midrashic literature:

I. Exegetical.

1. Agadath Bereshith, on Genesis, in eighty-three sections (Venice, 1618). See Zunz, Gottesdienstliche Vortrage, page 256; Steinschneider, Catalogus Librorum Hebr. in Bibl. Bodl. 3727-3729.

2. Moses had Darshan of Narbonne, of the 11th century, wrote annotations on some books of the Bible. Ravmund Martini often quotes him in the Pugio Fidei. See Zunz, u.s. 287-293; Pusey, in Introduction to 53rd Chapter of Isaiah, according to the Jewish Interpreters, volume 2 (Oxford, 1877); Neubauer, The Book of Tobit (ibid. 1878), page 7-9, 20- 24.

3. Midrash Hashkem, on the Pentateuch, probably of the 10th century (Zunz, page 281). The part pertaining to Exodus was edited after a Munich MS. by Freimann, also with the Latin title, Vehishir, Opus Continens Midrashim et Halachoth, etc. (Leipsic, 1873).

4. Midrash Jonah, published at Prague in 1595. See Zunz, pages 270, 271.

II. Halaciic Midrash, viz. Sheeltoth (i.e., questions) of Rabbi Acha of Shabcha (about 750), on laws and usages, as contained in the Pentateuch. Best edition is that published at Dyhrerrnfurth in 1786, with the commentary of Jesaiah Berlin or Pik (q.v.). See Zunz, pages 56, 96, 343; Steinschneider, page 4330.

III. Historical Haggadoth, viz. 1. Seder Olam (q.v.). 2. Megillath Taanith, a calendar containing the non-festive days of the 2d century. Comp. Schmilg, Ueber Entstehung und historischen Werth des. Siegeskalenders Megillath Taanith (Leipsic, 1874). See Braun, Entstehupng und Werth der Megillath Taanith, in Gratz, Monatsschrift. 1876, pages 375-384, 410-418. 445-460; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 1:68 sq., 384 sq., 2:1375 s.v. 3:1195 sq. 4:1024; Zunz, pages 127, 128; Ewald, Gesch. d. Volkes Israel, 4:497 sq., 7:402 sq.; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 3:415-428; Fiirst, Bibl. Jud 1:9; Derenbourg, Historie de la Palestine, pages 439-446, giving the text and a French translation.

3. Josippon (q.v.). 4. Sepher ha-Jashar, a history from Adam to the Judges, written, perhaps, in the 12th century (Venice, 1625). See Zunz, pages 154-156; Steinschneider, pages 3581-3586.

5. Midrash Vayissu, wars of the sons of Jacob with the Canaanites and Esau, printed in Beth ham-Midrash (ed. Jellinek), 3. See Zunz, page 145.

6. Pesach-hagada, for the Easter festival. See Zunz, page 126; Steinschneider, page 2671.

7. Midrash Petirath Aaron, and 8. Midrash Petiraths Moshe, on the last days of Moses and Aaron. See Zunz, page 146; Steinschneider, pages 3996-4000; Beth ham-Midrash, 1:6.

9. Kethib Eldad had-Dani (i.e., the Book of Eldad the Danite), towards the end of the 9th century, and containing the fable of the Jews bevond the river Sambation. See Beth ham-Midrash, 2, 3, 4; Steiinschneider, page 4934; Zunz, page 139.

10. Sepher Zerubbabel (q.v.). 11. Abba Gorion treats of the narrative as contained in the Book of Esther, printed in Beth ham-Midrash, 1. See Zunz, page 279.

12. Megillath Antiochos, on the Wars of the Asmontans. See Zunz, page 134. The Hebrew was often printed, see Steinschneider, pages 1382-1388. The Aramaic text was first published by Filipowski at the end of his Choice of Pearls (London, 1851); then by Sluzki (Warsaw,1863), and by Jellinekin Beth-ham-Midrash, 6. A new edition is in the course of preparation by Charles H. H. Wright, The Megillath Antiochos, a Jewish Apocryphon with the Chaldee Text, etc.

13. Midrash Ele Ezkerah, so called from the first words, "These will I remember," Psa 42:5 (Hebrew text), describes the martyrdom of ten eminent teachers. See Zunz, page 142 a; Steinschneider, pages 3730-3732; Beth ham-Midrash, 2:6.

IV. Of a purely legendary character are:

1. Midrash Vayosha, the tradition about Armilus (the Roman antichrist). See Zunz, page 282; Steinschneider, pages 3734-3739; Beth ham-Midrash, 1.

2. Midrash Esreh had-debaroth, on the Ten Commandments. See Zunz, page 142 d; Steinschneider, pages 3751, 4986 s; Beth kam-Midrash, 1.

3. Chibbur Maasioth (i.e., story-books). See Zunz, page 130 b; Steinschneider, page 3869 sq.; on the numerous Hebrew and Judaeo- German story-books, see ibid. pages 3869-3942.

V. Ethical Midrashim, viz.

1. The Alphabet of BenSira. SEE SIRA.

2. Derech Eretz and Derech Eretz Sutta. SEE TALMUD (volume 1, page 184).

3. Thanna de Be-Elijahu, a melange from the Bible, Talmud, and Prayer- books, thrown into the form of instructions by the prophet Elijah. See Zunz, pages 112-117; Steinschneider, pages 4111, 4112.

4. Midrash Themura. See Zunz, page 118; Steinschneider, page 3793; Bethham-Midrashi.

VI. Cabalistic, Mystic, Metaphysical, etc., Midrashim, viz.

1. The Book Jezirah. SEE JEZIRAH.

2. Alphabeth of Rabbi Akiba. See Zunz, page 168; Steinschneider, pages 3395-3401; Beth ham-Midrash, 3; Lat. transl. by Kircher in his OEdipus AEg. (Rome, 1652), 2:225; Bartolocci, Bibl. Rabbinica, 4:27; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:28 sq.

3. The Great and Small Halachoth. See Zunz, pages 166, 167; Steinschneider, pages 3457-3459.

4. Midrash Konen, a kind of romantic cosmology. See Zunz, page 169; Steinschneider, pages 3743-3745; Beth ham-Midrash, 2.

5. Sepher Raziel (which must be distinguished from a later "Sepher Raziel hag-gadol," a kind of commentary on the book Jezirah). See Zunz, page 187; Steinschneider, page 4042.

Collections of Mia'ashim. — Ad. Jellinek, Beth-ham Midrash (volumes 1- 4, Leipsic, 1853-57; 5:6, Vienna, 1873, 1877); Horowitz, Sammlung Kleiner Midraschim (part 1, Frankfort and Berlin, 1881).

Translations of Midrashim. — In Latin many are found in Ugolino's Thesaurus Antiquitatum Sacrarum; in German, Wunsche's Bibliotheca Rabbinica comprises the Midrash Rabboth (on the Pentateuch and five  Megilloth, i.e., Esther, Song of Solomon, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Ruth), Proverbs, and Pesikta de Rab Kahanah (Leipsic, 1880 sq.). See Plitt-Herzog, Real Encyklop. s.v. (B.P.)

## Midwife[[@Headword:Midwife]]

             (מְילֶּדֶת, part. in Piel of יָלד, “to bring forth;” Sept. Gala, Vulg. obstetrix; Gen 35:17; Gen 38:28). It must be remarked that חָיוֹת, Exo 1:19, “lively,” is also in rabbinical Hebrew “midwives,” an explanation which appears to have been had in view by the Vulg., which interprets chayoth by  “ipsae obstetricandi habent scientiam.” It is also rendered “living creatures,” implying that the Hebrew women were, like animals, quick in parturition. Gesenius renders “vividie, robustae” (Thes. page 468). In any case the general sense of the passage Exo 1:19 is the same, viz. that the Hebrew women stood in little or no need of the midwives' assistance. Parturition in the East is usually easy. SEE WOMAN.

The office of a midwife is thus, in many Eastern countries, in little use, but is performed, when necessary, by relatives (Chardin, Voy. 7:23; Harmer, Obs. 4:425). SEE CHILD.

It may be for this reason that the number of persons employed for this purpose among the Hebrews was so small, as the passage Exo 1:19 seems to show; unless, as Knobel and others suggest, the two named were the principal persons of their class. In the description of the transaction mentioned in Exodus 1, one expression, “Upon the stools,” receives remarkable illustration from ancient as well as modern usage. On the walls of the palace of Luxor, in Upper Egypt, there is a grand painting, which is faithfully copied in Lepsius's Denknzaler, representing the birth of the eldest son of Thothmes IV, and very possibly the “first-born” of the Pharaoh who was drowned in the Red Sea. Queen Mautmes is represented as receiving a message through the god Thoth, that she is to give birth to a child. The mother is placed upon a stool, while two midwives chafe her hands, and the babe is held up by a third (Sharpe's History of Egypt, 1:65). Gesenius doubts the existence of any custom such as the direct meaning of the passage implies, and suggests a wooden or stone trough for washing the new-born child. But the modern Egyptian practice, as described by Mr. Lane, exactly answers to that indicated in the book of Exodus. “Two or three days before the expected time of delivery, the Layeh (midwife) conveys to the house the kursi elwiladeh, a chair of a peculiar form, upon which the patient is to be seated during the birth” (Lane, Mod. Egypt. 3:142). SEE STOOL. The moral question arising from the conduct of the midwives does not fall within the scope of the present article. The reader, however, may refer to St. Augustine, Contr. mendacium, 15:32, and Quaest. in Hept. 2:1; also Com. a Lap. Com. on Exodus 1. When it is said, “God dealt well with the midwives, and built them houses,” we are probably to understand that their families were blessed either in point of numbers or of substance. Other explanations of inferior value have been offered by Kimchi, Calvin, and others (Calmet, Com. on Exodus 1; Patrick; Corn. a Lap.; Knobel; Schleusner, L.V.T. oirctia; Gesenius, Thesaur. page 193; Crit. Sacr.). It is worth while to notice only to refute on its own ground the Jewish tradition which identified Siphrah and Puah  with Jochebed and Miriam, and interpreted the “houses” built for them as the so-called royal and sacerdotal families of Caleb and Moses (Josephus, Ant. 3:2, 4; Corn. a Lap. and Crit. Sacr. 1.c.; Schottgen, Hor. Hebr. 2:450; De Mess. c. 4). SEE BIRTH.

## Mieczyslaw And The Christian Church In Poland[[@Headword:Mieczyslaw And The Christian Church In Poland]]

             SEE POLAND, ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY OF.

## Mieg, Johann Casimir[[@Headword:Mieg, Johann Casimir]]

             a German theologian and philologist, was born at Heidelberg October 6,1712. His father was a professor of theology and minister at the Heiligengeistkirche of that place. He entered the university of his native place when fourteen years of age; continued his studies at Zurich, Basle, and Berne; returned to Heidelberg in 1732, and finished his education at Marburg and Halle. He was appointed a professor of philosophy at Herborn in 1733, and in 1743 professor of divinity and philology at Lingen. This position he resigned in 1757, and returned to Herborn as professor of theology and preacher. He died September 28, 1764. Some of his most celebrated works are, Diss. עבדים חדבות, hoc est Constitutiones servorum tam in genere, quam in Hebraeorum specie (Herbornae Nassoviarum, 1734, 4to): — חלכית עבדי עבר, hoc est: Constitutio res servi Hebraei e Scriptura et Rabbinorum monumentis collectae nec non cum ceterarum gentium consuetudinibus huic inde collate (ibid. 1735, 8vo): — Commentatio theologico-practica, de virtute in praecordiis objecto εὐαρεσίας divinae ad Psalms 2 (Lemgoviae, 1749, 8vo).

## Mieg, Ludwig Christian[[@Headword:Mieg, Ludwig Christian]]

             a German Reformed theologian, was born August 20, 1668, at Heidelberg, and received his education at his native place and at Basle, where he defended his dissertation “De regulis communicationis motus.” In 1689, during the French war, when Heidelberg was destroyed, he was vicar of the French congregation at Manheim. Later he made a voyage through the Netherlands, and returned in 1691 to Heidelberg, and was appointed professor of Greek, and minister of the Reformed congregation at Rinteln. In 1694 he was made professor of ecclesiastical history at Marburg, and in 1697 professor of theology. He returned in 1706 to Heidelberg as ecclesiastical counsellor, professor of divinity, and first minister of the church of the Holy Ghost; resigned his, place in 1730, and died January 19, 1740. His most noted works are, Diss. de regulis communicationis motus (Basle, 1685, 4to): — Theses historico-practicos ex historia et vita Abrahami desumtae (Marburg, 1696, 4to): — Diss. historica, qua A.  Pagii sententia de occasione Apologiarum a veteris ecclesiae doctoribus conscriptarum examinatur (ibid. 1696, 4to): — Diss. theologica de terrore Dei (ibid. 1699, 4to): — Disquisitio theologica de perspicuitate et universalitate institutionis naturalis. ad Psa 19:4-5 (ibid. 1699, 4to): — Diss. theologico-philologica I et II de cura pauperum apud Hebraeos (ibid. 1700, 4to): — Theses theologicae de traditionibus (ibid. 1700, 4to): — Diss. de propheta promisso, Deu 18:15, contral D. Hugueminum (ibid. 1704, 4to): — Oratio de providentia divina circa nascentem Univers. Heidelberg. cum elencho Professor. Heidelberg. (ibid. 1770, 4to). See Doring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands, s.v.

## Miel, Jan[[@Headword:Miel, Jan]]

             a distinguished Flemish painter, was born in a small village near Antwerp in 1599. Lanzi says he was a pupil of Vandyck. He resided some time at Rome, where he studied under Andrea Sacchi, to whom he gave such proofs of genius that he was employed to assist him in his works at the Palazzo Barberini. Miel, whose disposition led him to the grotesque, introduced something ludicrous into the work, which was deemed unworthy the dignity of the subject, and he was dismissed. He then visited Lombardy to study the works of Correggio, and also passed some time in Parma and Bologna. On his return to Rome he was employed by pope Alexander VII to paint a picture of Moses striking the Rock for the gallery of Monte Cavallo. He also painted a Baptism of St. Cyrillio for the church of S. Martino de' Monti, and the Annunciation, and some frescos of the life of St. Lamberti, in S. Maria dell' Anima. Subsequently he was invited to Turin by Charles Emanuel, duke of Savoy, who appointed him court painter, and in whose service he was retained the residue of his life. After his engagement by the duke he painted no more religious works. He was elected a member of the Academy of St. Luke in 1648, and thereafter devoted himself almost entirely to hunting scenes and battle pieces. He died at Turin in 1664. Many of Miel's best works are in the Imperial Gallery at Vienna. See Lanzi, History of Painting, transl. by Roscoe (Lond. 1847, 3 volumes, 8vo), 3:307; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the fine Arts (N.Y. 1865, 2 volumes, 8vo).

## Mielk, Johann Bertram[[@Headword:Mielk, Johann Bertram]]

             a German theologian, was born at Kiel March 24, 1736, where he was also educated. In 1758 the dignity of master of arts was conferred upon him as  a reward for the defense of his dissertation “De divisione in infinitum.” In 1768 he was appointed deacon at Neustadt, in Holstein: in 1771, second minister at the Fleckenkirche at Preetz, and in 1784 chief minister at Oldenslohe, where he died June 14, 1801. He was very much renowned as editor of Beitrage zur Beforderung der hauslichen Andacht it Predigten (1777-83). He deserves also much credit for his translation of Millot's Universal History.

## Mieris, Frans, Jr[[@Headword:Mieris, Frans, Jr]]

             a Dutch artist and writer of note, deserves a place here as the author of a work on History and Ecclesiastical Antiquities of the Seven United Provinces (1726). He was born at Leyden in 1689, and died in 1763.

## Mies, Jacob Von[[@Headword:Mies, Jacob Von]]

             SEE JACOB.

## Migas, Joseph, Ben-Meir lbn-Ial-Levi[[@Headword:Migas, Joseph, Ben-Meir lbn-Ial-Levi]]

             (also called Haramn [הרא8 8ם], from the initials of הרב אבן מיגש, Rabbi Ibn-Migas), one of the greatest Talmudical scholars of his time, was born at Granada in 1077. When twelve years of age he went to Cordova to attend the lectures of Isaac ben-Jacob Alfasi (q.v.), with whom he stayed for fourteen years. The master who gave him the ordination (סמיכה) was very proud of this scholar, of whom he used to say, that even in the age of Moses none could be found like him, and he appointed him as his successor in the presidency of the College of Cordova, which post he held for thirty- eight years (1103-41), until his death. His renown. attracted many students, even from Egypt. From all parts his Talmudical decisions were sought for. and the greatest ornament of his school was the celebrated Moses Maimonides (q.v.),. He wrote novellas and decisions, which are enumerated by Furst. See Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 6:116 sq.; Braunschweiger, Gesch. d. Juden in den romanischen Staaten, page 61 (Wurzburg, 1865); De' Rossi, Dizionario Storico Degli Autori Ebrei (Germ. transl. by Hamburger), s.v.; Lindo, History of the Jews in Spain and Portugal, page 55; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:378. (B.P.)

## Migdal-Edar[[@Headword:Migdal-Edar]]

             (“tower of the flock”), a place on the route of Jacob (Gen 35:21), probably about two miles south of Jerusalem, hear the Bethlehem road, where the cluster of ruins called Kirbet Um-Moghdala is now situated (Tobler, Dritte Wanderung, page 81). SEE EDAR.

## Migdal-Sannah[[@Headword:Migdal-Sannah]]

             a large village located by Jerome (Ononmast. s.v. Senna, “Magdal-senna, quod interpretatur Turris Senna;” but perhaps he has merely misread Eusebius, μεγάλη Σεννά) at seven (Euseb. eight) Roman miles north of Jericho, on the border of Judea. Dr. Robinson (Bib. Res. 3:295) inclines to identify it with the Mejdel in the central mountains of Palestine, near the edge of the Ghor, at the upper end of the Wady Fasail, and not far from Daumeh, the ancient Edumia (Van de Velde, Syr. and Pal. 2:307).

## Migdal-el[[@Headword:Migdal-el]]

             (Heb. Migdal'-El, מַגְדִּלאּאֵל, tower of God; Sept. Μαγδαλιήλ v.r. Μαγδαλιηωράμ or Μεγαλααρίμ), a fortified city of the tribe of Naphtali (Jos 19:38), “named between Iron and Horem, possibly deriving its name from some ancient tower the tower, of El, or God.” By Eusebius (Onomasticon, Μαγδιήλ) it is spoken of as a large village lying between Dora (Tantura) and Ptolemais (Akka), at nine miles from the former, that is, just about Athlit, the ancient ‘Castellum peregrinorum.' No doubt the Castellum was anciently a migdol or tower; but it is impossible to locate a town of Naphtali below Carmel, and at least twenty-five miles from the boundaries of the tribe. It may, however, have been the Magdalum named by Herodotus (2:159) as the site of Pharaoh Necho's victory over Josiah (see Rawlinson's Herod. 2:246, note). But this was not the only Migdol along this coast. If the modern Hurah is Horem and Yarun Iron, there is a possibility in finding Migdal-el in Mujeidel, at no great distance from them, namely, on the left bank of the Wady Kerkerah, eight miles due east of the  Ras en-Nakurah, six miles west of Hurah and eight of Yarun (see Van de Velde's Map, 1858).” The enumeration of the towns in the above passage of Joshua, however, favors the connection of this name with the preceding as one, i.e., Migdal- el-Horem, as in the Sept. In any case the present Migdal is probably the MAGDALA SEE MAGDALA (q.v.) of the New Test. (Mat 15:39), which lay within the limits of Naphtali (q.v.).

## Migdal-el (2)[[@Headword:Migdal-el (2)]]

             Mujeidel, with which Tristram (Bible Places, page 274) and Conder (Tent Work, 2:338) identify this place, lies three and three quarter miles north- west of Tibnin, and is a considerable village, with ancient wine-presses, sarcophagi, cisterns, etc. (Memoirs to the Ordnance Survey, 1:137).

## Migdal-gad[[@Headword:Migdal-gad]]

             (Heb. Migdal'-Gad, מַגְדִּלאּגָּד, tower of fortune; Sept. Μαγδαλγδά), a town in the plain of Judah, mentioned between Hadashah ‘and Dilean (Jos 15:37); probably the el-Mejdel a short distance northeast of Ascalon (Schwarz, Palest. page 103; Van de Velde, Memoir, page 334). It is a prosperous village, encircled by luxuriant orchards and olive groves, and fields unsurpassed in fertility. Among the houses are many traces of antiquity-large hewn stones and broken columns. Some three miles south- east of Mejdel is the village of Jenin, which may perhaps be the Zenan noted by Joshua. in the group with Migdal-gad; and ten miles distant in the same direction are the ruins of Lachish and Eglon (Porter, Hand-book, page 261, 272).

## Migdal-gad (2)[[@Headword:Migdal-gad (2)]]

             The supposed modern representative of this site, el-lejdel, three miles north-east of Ascalon, is an important place of 1500 inhabitants, but without signs of antiquity (Memoirs to the Ordnance Survey, 2:410).

## Migdol[[@Headword:Migdol]]

             (Heb. Migdol', מַגְדּוֹל, a tower; Sept. Μάγδωλον or Μαγδωλόν), a town in Lower Egypt (Jer 44:1; Jer 46:14), the northern limit of the country (opposite Syene, Eze 29:10; Eze 30:6). It is apparently the Magdolum of the Antonine Itinerary (p. 171), situated twelve Roman miles from Pelusium; and, as it is doubtless also the place mentioned (Exo 14:2; Num 33:7) in the description of the passage of the Red Sea by the Israelites (see Gesenius, Thesaur. page 268; Ewald, Isr. Gesch. 2:55), a difficulty has been experienced from the statements of those texts that this  occurred “between Migdol and the sea,” and “before Migdol,” arising from the much greater distance of this locality from Pelusium, which the explanation of Hengstenberg (Mos. u. Aeg. page 58 sq.), that these expressions simply refer to the general region within which the Israelites were hemmed, scarcely meets. It is therefore better to regard the distance given in the Itinerary as somewhat vague, so that Migdol may have been situated sufficiently near to be said to be opposite the scene of the miracle. SEE EXODE.

The name has been traced in the Coptic Meshtol, which signifies many hills (Champollion, L'Egypte sous les Pharaons, 2:79), and has been referred (see Niebuhr, Descr. Arabice, page 409) to the Meshtul of Arabian geographers, in the province of Sharkje, in Lower Egypt, on the island Myeephor (Rosenmuller, Alterth. 3:260); but it is better (with Forster, Ep. ad Michael. page 29) to consider it as alluding to a mountainous situation (suitable for a watch-tower on the frontier), and we may then (with Tischendorf, De Israel. per mare rubrum transitu, page 25 sq.; Kutscheit, Lepsius u. der Sinai, page 6 sq.; and other earlier travellers) identify it with Jebel Ataka (see Olin's Travels in the East, 1:350). The only objection to this identification that remains, worthy of consideration, is that, according to some travellers, a gentle slope, some two or three miles wide, intervenes between this range of hills and the sea-shore, containing many camel-paths, and offering an easy escape for the Israelites hemmed in by the Egyptians that came down upon them, through Wady Tuwarik (Aiton's Lands of the Messiah, page 120); but it is doubtful whether so extensive a shore existed here anciently (see ib. page 106), and even if this margin were not at that time covered by the waves, it may easily have been preoccupied by a detachment of the Egyptian troops sent round by way of the isthmus to cut off the retreat of the Israelites. Herodotus (2:159) doubtless alludes to this place under the name of Magdolum, which he describes as a frontier town towards Palestine, where Josiah was slain by Necho; evidently confounding it with Megiddo. SEE RED SEA, PASSAGE OF.

## Miget, St[[@Headword:Miget, St]]

             a prelate of the French Church, was born about the beginning of the 7th century. His life was written in the 10th century by an anonymous hagiographer, and published by the Bollandists, June 6. Another chronicler of the same century, Adson, in his Legende de Saint Waldebert, abbe de Luxueil, says that St. Miget presided at the obsequies of this abbot, who was his dearest friend. St. Miget is spoken of as a reformer within the  Church. It appears that he introduced great changes in the liturgy of his diocese, and instituted first in the church of Besanon five archdeacons, to whom he gave important privileges. He died about the year 670. His name is found in the Martyrologe Galliean of the date of August 7. — Dunod de Charnage, Hist. de l'Eglise de Besanon; J.-Jacques -lifflet, Vesuntio, part 2; Vie des Saints de Franche Comte by the professors of the college of St. Francis Xavier, 1:236. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Miglionico, Andrea[[@Headword:Miglionico, Andrea]]

             a Neapolitan painter, was a pupil of Luca Giordano. According to Dominici, he acquired considerable reputation, and executed many works for the churches at Naples, among which the Descent of the Holy Ghost, in the church of S. S. Nunziata, is highly commended. He died about 1710. — Lanzi's History of Painting, transl. by Roscoe (Lond. 1847, 3 volumes, 8vo), 2:59; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts (N.Y. 1865, 2 volumes, 8vo).

## Mignard, Pierre (1)[[@Headword:Mignard, Pierre (1)]]

             (called the Roman), an eminent French painter, was born at Troyes in 1610. After receiving some instruction at home, his father placed him in the school of Jean Boucher at Bruges; subsequently under Vouet. In 1636 he went to Rome, to study after Raphael and Michael Angelo; there he remained twenty-two years, painting a number of fine Madonnas, and the portraits of popes Urban VIII and Alexander VII. One of the finest frescos in France, the cupola of the Val de Grace, was executed by Mignard. He also adorned the great hall at St. Cloud with mythological subjects. He died in 1695, after having received many distinctions and honors. — Lanzi's History of Painting (Lond. 1847, 3 volumes, 8vo), 1:476.

## Mignard, Pierre (2)[[@Headword:Mignard, Pierre (2)]]

             a French architect, and nephew of the preceding, was born at Avignon in 1640. After a series of extensive journeys throughout France and Italy, during which he devoted himself to the study of architecture, he settled in Paris. He built the Abbey de Montmajour, near Aries, which gained him great reputation; and he was intrusted with many important works. Among these may be mentioned the facade of the church of St. Nicholas and the Porte St. Martin. Subsequently the Abbey de Montmajour was destroyed by fire, but was rebuilt precisely according to the designs of Mignard. He  was one of the six architects who, in 1671, founded the French Academy of Architecture, of which he was appointed professor. He died in 1725. See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts (N.Y. 1865, 2 volumes, 8vo), 2:564.

## Migne, Jacques Paul[[@Headword:Migne, Jacques Paul]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian, was born at St. Flour, Cantal, France, October 25, 1800. He was educated at the theological seminary in Orleans, acted for some time as professor at Chateaudun, and after his ordination served as curate. in the diocese of Orleans. In consequence of a controversy with his bishop respecting his (Migne's) book upon the "Liberty of the Priests," he went to Paris, and started L'Univers Religieux, later called simply L'Univers. — In 1833 he sold his interest in the paper, and went to Petit Montrouge, near Paris, where he soon built up an enormous printing establishment, to which he gave the name "Imprimerie Catholique." From this proceeded the famous Patrologiae Cursus Completus sive Bibliotheca Universalis, Integra, Uniformis, Conimoda, OEconomica Omnium SS. Patrum, Doctorum Scriptorumque Ecclesiasticorum qui ab evo Apostolico ad Usque Innocentii II Tempora Floruerunt (Latin series, 221 volumes, 1844 sq.; 2d ed. 1878 sq.; 1st Greek series, 104 volumes; 2d ed. 58 volumes, both since 1857): — Collection des Orateurs Sacres (100 volumes, 1846-48), etc. In 1868 this immense establishment was burned to the ground. Migrie died October 25, 1875, at Paris. See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v.; Vapereau, Dictionnaire des Contemporains, ed. 1880, page 1290. (B.P.)

## Migron[[@Headword:Migron]]

             (Heb. Migron', מַגְרוֹן, precipice; Sept. in 1 Samuel Μαγδών, in Isaiah Μαγδών v.r. Μαγγεδώ, apparently reading ד for ר; Vulg. Magron), a town of Benjamin, which, from the historical indications, must have been between Ai and Michmas, on the route of the invading Assyrian army southward (Isa 10:28). From Michmas a narrow valley extends northward out of and at right angles with that which has been identified as the passage of Michmas (q.v.). The town of Migron seems to have been upon and to have commanded the pass through this valley, somewhere between the modern Deir Diwan and Mukhmus (Robinson's Researches, 2:149). Saul was stationed at the further side of Gibeah (? Geba), “under a pomegranate tree which is by Migron” (1Sa 14:2), when Jonathan performed his great exploit at Michmas; and this is to be explained (see Rosenmuller, Alterth. II, 2:170 sq.; Bachiene, II, 2:145) on the supposition that Migron was on the border (perhaps extending considerably north-west of Michmas) of the district to which Gibeah gave its name. Migron, therefore, was in all probability situated on, or close to, the ravine now called Wady Suweinit. It was a commanding position (Josephus, Ant. 6:6, 2. where it is said to be “a high hill”), for Saul was able to see from it the commotion which followed the attack of Jonathan on the Philistine camp. The ravine is not quite half a mile in breadth from brow to brow. According to Schwarz (Palest. page 130), there are extant some ruins about half a mile south of the site of Bethel, which the Arabs still call Burj (fort) Magrun; but no map exhibits here more than a ruined church, and the position is too far north. Keil thinks the Migron of 1 Samuel was a different place from that of Isaiah (Comment. on Samuel ad loc.), but this is an unnecessary supposition. The only locality that seems to combine the scriptural requirements is the eminence just north-west of Mukhmus, which separates Wady Suweinit from its branch running up directly north to Deir Diwan; and some ancient town appears to be indicated by the sepulchres in the latter valley.

## Mih-Teih, Or Me-Teih[[@Headword:Mih-Teih, Or Me-Teih]]

             an eminent Chinese philosopher, who flourished about 400 B.C., says Dr. Legge “was an original thinker, and exercised a bolder judgment on things than Confucius. or any of his followers He taught that all the evils in society arise from the want of mutual universal love. For example, a prince loves only his own state, and does not love the neigh boring state. Therefore he makes war against it.” “If princes,” he asked, “regarded other states as their own, who would begin a war? If every one regarded his neighbor's person as his own, who would be found to rob? If universal love prevailed, all enmities, usurpations, and miseries would disappear. Princes, loving one another, would have no battle-fields; the chiefs of families, loving one another, would attempt no usurpation; men, loving one another, would commit no robberies.” See Dr. Legge, Chinese Classics, volume 2, chapter 3; Thomas, Dict. of Biog. and Mythol. s v.

## Mihill, Norris[[@Headword:Mihill, Norris]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Sheffield, C.W., about 1823. He was converted at eighteen, while resident at Wilmington, N.Y.; but continued in his trade until 1861, when he was placed in charge of West Peru Circuit, which he served with marked ability for two years. At the end of this time he joined the Troy Conference on trial, and was sent to Beekmantown, where he was serving for the third year with great efficiency at the time of his death, October 3, 1868. Mihill was earnestly devoted to the interests of his Master, and was beloved by his associates and parishioners. See Minutes of Conference, 1869, page 117.

## Mijamin[[@Headword:Mijamin]]

             (a, 1Ch 24:9; b, Neh 10:7). SEE MIAMIN.

## Mikels, William S., D.D[[@Headword:Mikels, William S., D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born in Orange County, N.Y., May 18, 1820. He graduated at Madison University in 1843, and from the theological department of the same institution in 1845; soon after became pastor in Rondout, N.Y., remaining there four years; then at Sing Sing six years; next at the Sixteenth Street Church, New York city, and had a successful ministry for seventeen years; and finally of the East Church, in the seventh ward of the same city, where he died, June 20, 1883. See Cathcart, Baptist Encyclop. s.v. (J.C.S.)

## Mikkelsen, Hans[[@Headword:Mikkelsen, Hans]]

             a noted Danish Biblical student, author of the first Danish version of the New Testament, was originally mayor of Malmoe, in Scaiaa, and subsequently secretary to Christian II of Denmark. When the king was, in 1523, obliged to flee from his dominions and take refuge in Holland, Mikkelsen accompanied him, and it was while there that, at the suggestion of his sovereign, he set himself to the work of translating the New Testament. Driven by the bigoted jealousy of the papal party in the  Netherlands from his place beside the king, he retired to Harderwick, in Guelderland, where he died about the year 1532. His translation, which was published in 1524 (small 4to), professes to be made from the Latin, but this applies only to the four Gospels, in translating which he seems to have followed the version of Erasmus; for the other books he has closely followed the German version of Luther. See Henderson, Dissertation on Hans Mikkelsen's Translation (Copenhagen, 1813); W.L. Alexander, in Kitto, Cyclop. Bibl. Lit. s.v.

## Mikloth[[@Headword:Mikloth]]

             (Heb. Mikloth', מַקְלוֹת, prob. i.q. מִקְּלוֹתstaves, as in Gen 30:37, etc.; Sept. Μακαλώθ, Μακελώθ, and Μακελλώθ, the name of two men.

1. The principal officer of, the second contingent of troops under Dodo, during the reign of David and Solomon (1Ch 27:4). B.C. 1014.

2. A descendant of Benjamin resident at Jerusalem, and father of Shimeah or Shimean; of the family of king Saul, but in what degree of relationship is not clear (1Ch 8:32; 1Ch 9:37-38). B.C. perhaps cir. 536.

## Mikneiah[[@Headword:Mikneiah]]

             (Heb. Mikneya'hu, מַקְנֵיָהוּ, possessions of Jehovah; Sept. Μακενία or Μακενιας), a Levitical door-keeper of the Temple and harper in the time of David (1Ch 15:18; 1Ch 15:21). B.C. 1014.

## Mikron[[@Headword:Mikron]]

             SEE MICRONIUS.

## Mikvaoth[[@Headword:Mikvaoth]]

             SEE TALMUD.

## Milalai[[@Headword:Milalai]]

             (Heb. Milalay', מַלֲלִי, eloquent; Sept. omits; Vulg. Malalai), one of the Levitical musicians who made the circuit of the newly-completed walls of Jerusalem after the exile (Neh 12:36). B.C. 446.

## Milan[[@Headword:Milan]]

             one of the large cities of Italy, capital of Lombardy, situated on the River Olona, contains a population of 295,543. It is a very ancient city, and is noted in ecclesiastical history as the seat of several important Church councils. Milan (Lat. Mediolanum) was originally a town or village of the Insubrian Gauls. It was conquered by the Romans 222 B.C., received the Latin franchise about 89 B.C., and the full Roman franchise 49 B.C. Under the Romans it became a conspicuous centre of wealth and civic influence; its inhabitants were noted for their refined manners and literary taste and the public buildings for their beauty and elegance. In the beginning of the 4th century it was selected as the residence of the imperial court by Maximian. Milan was sacked by the Huns (under Attila) in 452; by the Goths (under the brother of Vitiges) in 539; and passed to the Longobards and Franks previous to its subjection by the German Empire. After 961, it was long governed by dukes in the name of the emperors. The feuds of the Guelphs and Ghibellines distracted Milan, like all the other Italian cities. Supreme power became eventually vested in the Ghibelline Visconti, by whom the ascendency of Milan was extended over the whole of Lombardy. From 1545 to 1714, Milan submitted to the successive predominance of France and Austria. Under Bonaparte, it was declared the capital of the Cisalpine republic, of the Italian republic, and, finally, of the kingdom of Italy. In 1815, Milan was restored to Austria, and continued the capital of the Austro-Italian kingdom until the annexation of Lombardy to Piedmont, in 1859, by the peace of Villafranca.

## Milan, Archbishopric Of[[@Headword:Milan, Archbishopric Of]]

             We have no trustworthy information as to its early history. There is a vague tradition that Barnabas (q.v.), the colaborer of the apostle Paul, established the Christian Church at Milan, and was the first bishop. This account lacks support, and scarcely deserves notice. But though of no historical value, the legend is significant in regard to the position which the archbishopric of Milan held in the controversies between the Oriental and Occidental churches. It has been aptly remarked by Reuchlin that, “just as Barnabas was the connecting link between Paul and the other apostles, so the Church of Milan attempted to reconcile the Greek and Roman opinions.” The first bishop of Milan, of whom we have any historical knowledge, is Auxentius (q.v.), A.D. 355-374. He was the leader of the Arians in the Western churches. When the orthodox bishops, at a  provincial synod held at Rome in 369, condemned Arianism, they did not dare to pronounce the anathema against Auxentius, because they knew him to be protected by the emperor Valentinian I. Although they were at last prevailed upon by Athanasius to pronounce against Auxentius in their synodal epistle to the Illyrians, Auxentius maintained himself in his see until his death. But the divisions thus created in the Church by the Arian heresy (q.v.) rendered the election of a successor to Auxentius no easy matter. The contest was carried on between Catholics and Arians with such violence that Ambrose, who was the consular prefect of Liguria and AEmilia, was obliged to proceed himself to the church to exhort the people to order. At the close of his speech the whole assembly, Catholics and Arians, with one voice demanded him for their bishop, and he was constrained to accept the proffered honor.

Ambrose devoted himself to his work with great zeal, and soon acquired great influence both with the people and the emperor Valentinian. He opposed the Arians from the very beginning of his episcopacy, and in 382 presided at an episcopal synod at Aquileia, at which the Arian bishops Palladius and Secundianus were deposed. Ambrose died at Milan, April 4, 397. All succeeding archbishops and bishops were in like manner elected by the people, the Church of Milan not being subject to the Roman bishop until the days of Gregory the Great (q.v.). After the overthrow of the Gothic kingdom, the archbishops of Milan, owing to the religious differences and the feeling of enmity which existed between the people and their conquerors, the Lombards (q.v.), resided at Geneva. But when, in 653, Aribert, the son of duke Garduald, was chosen king of the Lombards, matters changed. “Rex Heribertus,” says Dollinger, “pius et catholicus. Arianorum abolevit haeresem et Christianam fidem fecit crescere.” The Lombards now became enthusiastic churchmen, and the archbishop returned to Milan. But although the archbishop of Milan was henceforth considered the first bishop of the kingdom, crowning the kings with the so called iron crown, and obtaining increasing power, he nevertheless remained subject to the king, and the inferior clergy to the subordinate judges — in short, the Church was subject to the State. After the downfall of the Longobard kingdom, the archbishops of Milan at first lost much of their power; but during the fights and quarrels of the 9th, 10th, and 11th centuries, they not only regained their former influence, but became even more independent than ever before. Owing. to the then prevailing German policy, large feudal estates were bestowed upon the bishops of Milan, and, during the reign of the Ottos (q.v.), the archbishops  of Milan were considered the most influential allies of the German emperors.

Eriberto di Argago, who filled the archiepiscopal chair of Milan from 1019 to 1045. was one of the most powerful princes, and though unsuccessful in the revolt which he organized in 1034 against emperor Conrad the Salic, his influence was scarcely diminished after his return from the expulsion to which his rebellion had subjected him. At the time of his death, Milan ‘was passing through one of its accustomed civil dissensions, and the election of Eriberto's successor caused great excitement. Erlembaldo, the popular chief (dominus populi), called the citizens together to nominate candidates, and induced them to select four. These four were sent to the emperor Henry III (q.v.), for him to make the appointment; but the faction of the nobles despatched a rival in the person of Guido di Valate, who had recommended himself to the emperor by his zealous services, and who was given the coveted dignity, to the great disgust of the popular nominees. Their expostulations were unavailing with the emperor, and both parties returned Guido to assume an office harassed by the opposition of the people on whom he had been forced, and the disappointed candidates to brood over the wrongs they had experienced. We shall presently see how thoroughly these men avenged themselves on Guido, with whom the independence of the Milanese archbishopric came to an end.

It is historically evident, then, that Milan was at one time completely independent of the papacy. Rome was not even thought of in creating the archbishop, whose spiritual and temporal power were granted by the imperial investiture. But when, soon after, the German popes had rescued the pontificate from the contempt into which it had fallen, its domination over Milan became a necessary step in its progress to universal supremacy.

Marriage, at that time, was a universal privilege of the Milanese clergy. Pope Leo IX (q.v.) and his successors attacked the Milanese on this account, and, in a council held at Rheims by Leo IX in 1049, many laws were enacted against clerical matrimony. Archbishop Guido defended the position of the Milanese clergy, not only by Scripture texts, but also by a decision which he affirmed was rendered by St. Ambrose, to whom the question of the permissibility of sacerdotal marriage had been referred by the pope and bishops. The popes by their emissaries excited great tumults in Milan, inflaming the popular passion against, what they called, the irregularities of the clergy. Guido in vain endeavored to repress the  agitation thus produced, and argued in favor of the married clergy. Armed resistance was offered to the papal faction, the result of which was incessant fights and increasing bloodshed. Nicholas II (q.v.), who then occupied the papal chair, sent Hildebrand and Anselm on a mission to Milan, with instructions to allay the passions which led to such deplorable civil strifes. The milder Anselm might perhaps have succeeded in this errand of reconciliation, but the unbending Hildebrand refused to listen to aught but unconditional subjection to Rome. The quarrel, therefore, waxed fiercer and deadlier (see Arnulf, Gest. Archiep. Mediolan. lib. 3, c. 9; Landulf, Sen. lib. 3, c. 9).

In 1059 another papal legation was sent, with full authority to force the recalcitrant archbishop and clergy to submission. An assembly was held, where the legates asserted the papal pre-eminence by taking the place of honor, to the general indignation of the Milanese, who did not relish the degradation of their archbishop before the representatives: of a foreign prelate. The authority of Rome, which at first was stoutly denied by the archbishop, was finally acknowledged, the archbishop and the clergy signing a paper in which they expressed their contrition in the most humiliating terms (see Damiani, Opusc. 42, c. 1).

The pride of the Milanese, however, was deeply wounded by such a subjection to Rome, unknown for many generations, and ill endured by men who gloried in the ancient dignity of the Ambrosian Church. When, therefore, in 1061, after Nicholas's death, their townsman, Anselm, was elevated from the episcopate of Lucca to that of the holy see, under the name of Alexander II, the Milanese Church attempted to regain its former independence. A council of German and Lombard bishops convened at Basle, and unanimously elected as pontiff Cadalus, bishop of Parma, under the title of Honorius II. By the assistance of the German emperors, the Lombard bishops, with Guido, the archbishop of Milan, at their head, assembled a considerable army in 1062, with which they conducted their new pope to Rome, while the popular party in Milan and Northern Italy assumed a formidable aspect in its alliance to the Lombard bishops. At this juncture Alexander II was rescued from probable defeat by the occurrence of a most unexpected event — the German bishops, under the influence of Hanno, archbishop of Cologne, sided with Alexander, and in 1064 the Synod of Mantua pronounced the deposition of Honorius. The archbishop of Milan, being unable to support the pretensions of the rival pope Without German aid, of which there was no prospect, yielded, and was  excommunicated by the pope in 1066. Guido, however, disregarding this excommunication, resolved to officiate in the solemn services of Pentecost (June 4, 1066), and, braving all opposition, appeared at the altar.

Excited to fury at this unexpected contumacy, the papal party attacked him in the church; his followers rallied in his defence, but, after a stubborn fight, were forced to leave him in the hands of his enemies, by whom he was nearly beaten to death. Some few months later archbishop Guido succeeded in reorganizing his party, and the war was for several years carried on with varying fortune. At last, in 1069, Hildebrand proposed that both the Milanese clergy and laity should take an oath that in future their archbishops should apply to the pope, and not to the emperor, for confirmation. Guido sought to anticipate this movement, and, old and wearied with the endless strife and contention, resigned his archbishopric to the subdeacon Gotefrido, who had long been his principal adviser. The latter procured his confirmation from Henry IV (q.v.), but the Milanese, defrauded of their electoral privileges, refused to acknowledge him. The papal party, taking advantage of this popular feeling, excited a tumult, and Gotefrido was glad to escape at night from the rebellious city.

Meanwhile Azzo, the papal aspirant, fared no better than his rival. The people rushed in to his inaugural banquet, unearthed him from the corner where he had hidden himself, dragged him by the heels in the street, and, placing him in a pulpit, forced him to swear that he would make no further pretensions to the see, and Azzo quitted the city, content to have saved his life.

The city remained thus without an archbishop, and in 1074 Hildebrand, who in April, 1073, had succeeded to Alexander, launched an interdict against Milan. The Milanese were disposed to disregard the interdict, and applied to Henry IV, requesting the appointment of another archbishop. To this the emperor responded by nominating Tedaldo, who was duly consecrated. Tedaldo was the leader of the disaffected bishops, who at the Synod of Pavia, in 1076, excommunicated pope Gregory himself; and though, after the interview at Canossa in 1077, the Milanese, disgusted with Henry's voluntary humiliation before that papal power which they had learned to despise, abandoned the imperial party for a time, yet Tedaldo kept his seat until his death in 1085, notwithstanding the repeated excommunications launched against him by Gregory (see Arnulf, lib. 4; 5, c. 2, 5, 9;. Landulf, Sen. lib. 3, c. 29; 4:2; Muratori, Annales, ann. 1085). With his death the independence of the Milan archbishopric ceased.  At present the clergy of Milan seem to be inclined to follow the lead of the Old Catholic party. Their programme, which contains the following reforms: election of the priests by the parish, the use of the vernacular at all Church-services, reform of Mariolatry and adoration of saints, marriage of the priests, etc., shows a healthy reaction against papal abuses. E. Serra Gropelli may be pointed out as the leader of the Milanese reform party.

See Hefele, Conciliengeschichte, 4:297 sq.; Riddle, Hist. of the Papacy, 2:119 sq.; Dupin, Eccles. Hist. 9, chapter 8; Mosheim, Church Hist. 3:11, part 2; Lea, Hist. of Sacerdotal Celibacy, chapter 13; Schrockh, Kirchengesch. 22:523 sq.; Bohringer, Kirche Christi, 1:90; 3:92 sq.; Milman, Hist. of Lat. Christianity, 3:240 sq.; Reichel, Roman See in the Middle Ages, pages 189, 191 sq.; Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, 5:318 sq.; Herzog, Real Encyklop. 20:72 sq.

## Milan, Council Of[[@Headword:Milan, Council Of]]

             There is no historical proof extant to warrant the assertion that any Church councils or synods were held at Milan before 355 A.D. We have no reliable information concerning the synod which is said to have been held at Milan in 344 (see Hardouin, Acta Conciliorum et Epistolce decretales ac Constitutiones, etc. [Paris, 1715], 1:627 sq.), and very little is known of the synod of 346 (or 347). In that year a council of Western bishops was summoned at Milan, when the so-called Long Creed (μακρόστιχος, to be found in Socrates, Hist. Ecc 2:18), which had been drawn up by the Arian Council of Antioch (A.D. 345), was rejected. The council also required the deputies who brought it to sign a condemnation of Arianism. Of course they left the council in wrath (see J. Dominic, Mansi Sacrorum conciliorum nova et. amplissima collectio, etc. [Florent. 1759], 2:1370). After the death of Constance (A.D. 350), and the victory over Magnentius (A.D. 353), Constantius endeavored to establish Arianism by force in the West. In the synods of Arles (A.D. 354) and of Milan (A.D. 358), he compelled the assembled bishops to sign the condemnation of Athanasius, though most of them were, it is thought, orthodox. Constantius was now sole master of the Roman world, and by bribes, by threats, and by force, the condemnation of Athanasius was extorted from the assembled bishops. Even Liberius (q.v.), the successor of Julius I, rejected Athanasius, from fear of Constantius, but soon afterwards threw off his timidity, and refused to subscribe to his condemnation (see Mansi, 3:233 sq.; Hefele, 1:631).  The next council was held A.D. 390, St. Ambrose presiding. It is commonly supposed that in this council the sentence of the Gallic bishops against Ithacius Ursacius (who had caused the death of the Priscillianists by their fiery zeal against their errors) was confirmed by the bishops of Italy. Baronius (as well as the collection of councils) states that this same council condemned Jovinian, the author of a new heresy, which decried the merit of virginity. St. Jerome reduces his doctrine to the four following heads:

1. That virgins, widows, and married women, being baptized, have the same degree of merit, if there be no. difference between them in other respects.

2. That they who have been regenerated in baptism cannot be overcome by the devil.

3. That there is no difference in point of merit, between those who abstain from meat and those who partake of it with thanksgiving.

4. That all those who have kept their baptismal state shall have the same glory in heaven.

From these principles other errors were deduced, viz. that there is no difference of degree in sin; that fasting is not requisite; that there will be no distinction of merits in heaven. The fathers of the council condemned the opinions of Jovinian- and his followers, and they were driven out of the city. See Mansi, 1.c. 690; Gieseler, 1:333.; Hefele, 2:48.

Another council was held at Milan in 451, convoked by Eusebius, bishop of Milan, at the request of St. Leo the Great. All the suffragans of Milan were present, in. all twenty bishops, among whom were Crispinus of Pavia, Maximus of Turin, Abundius of Como, Optatianus of Brescia. The letter of the pope to Eusebius was read; the legates then made a report of what was passing in the East, and especially of the miseries existing from the acts of the Latrocinium at Ephesus; afterwards the celebrated letter of St. Leo to Flavianus was read, and the council unanimously declared that it contained the true doctrine of the Catholic Church upon the subject of the Incarnation (q.v.), and that it was built upon the teachings of the prophets, evangelists, and apostles. At the same time they decreed that all who should oppose this doctrine should be anathematized. Finally, a synodal letter was addressed to the pope filled with expressions of esteem and respect (Mansi, 2:78 sq.; Hefele, Conciliengeschichte, 2:374 sq.). In A.D. 679 pope Agatho summoned a council at Milan to condemn anew the  heresy of Monothelism (q.v.) (Mansi, 11:174; Hefele, 3:228). The provincial synods of A.D. 842, 860, 880, and 1009 have no bearing upon the general history of the Church, but those interested in these are referred to Mansi, 14:790; 15:590; 17:535, and 19:310; Hefele, 4:99, 217, 770. September 12, 1287, a synod was held by Otto, the archbishop, assisted by eight of his suffragans, and the deputies of all the chapters of the province. Ten canons were published, in which they ordered the observation of the papal constitutions, and the laws of the emperor Frederick II against heretics. Abbots and abbesses, monks and nuns, were ordered to observe the rule of St. Benedict or that of St. Augustine, and monks were forbidden to enter nunneries. The power of building churches and oratories was declared to be solely in the hands of the bishop (Mansi, 24:868 sq.; Hefele, 6:225; Muratori, Rev. Ital. volume 4). From 1565 to 1582 six provincial councils were held at Milan. For information concerning-their enactments, see Concil. 15:242, 337, 365 sq., 408, 556, 706; Jo. Harduini Acta, 10:633, 1140; Christ. Wilhelm Franz Walch, Entwurf einer vollstandigen Historie der Kirchenversammlungen (Leipsic, 1759).

## Milanese Liturgy[[@Headword:Milanese Liturgy]]

             The Liturgy of Milan, commonly attributed to Ambrose, is substantially the same as that of Rome until the time of Gregory the Great, and appears to have been derived from the same origin. “In the time of Gregory, the Church of Milan did not adopt the chief alteration made by him. From that time, if not previously, the Liturgy of Milan began to be considered a peculiar rite; and as the Romans gave their sacramentaries the names of Gelasius and Gregory, so the Milanese gave theirs the name of Ambrose; who, in fact, may have composed some parts of it. After the time of Gregory, the Milan Liturgy doubtless received several additions. The earliest ecclesiastical writer who has been cited as speaking of the Ambrosian rite is. Walofred Strabo, who died A.D. 849” (Riddle, Christian Antiquities, page 417). SEE LITURGY.

## Milani, Aureliano[[@Headword:Milani, Aureliano]]

             nephew of the following, was born at Bologna, Italy, in 1675. He painted in the style of Caracci, and, next to Carlo Cignani, no one did more to maintain the dignity and credit of the Bolognese school. Lanzi says he was not so excellent in his coloring. His principal works in Bologna are the Resurrection, in the church of La Purita; the Stoning of St. Stephen, in St.  Mascarella; and St. Jerome, in Sta. Maria della Vita. He afterwards went to Rome, where his finest work is the Beheading of St. John the Baptist, in the church of the Bergamaschi. He died in 1749. See Lanzi, History of Painting, transl. by Roscoe (London, 1847, 3 volumes, 8vo), 3:152.

## Milani, Giulio Cesare[[@Headword:Milani, Giulio Cesare]]

             a Bolognese painter, who was born in 1621, executed many works for the churches in Bologna and the adjacent cities. His finest productions are the Marriage of the Virgin, in the church of St. Giuseppe; St. Antonio di Padova, in St. Maria del Costello; and a Holy Family, at the Lervi. According to Lanzi, “he was the most eminent of Torre's disciples, and was rather admired in the churches of Bologna, and extolled in many adjacent states.” He died in 1678. See Lanzi, History of Painting, transl. by Roscoe (Lond. 1847, 3 volumes, 8vo), 3:107; Spooner, Biog. History of the Fine Arts (N.Y. 1865, 2 volumes, 8vo).

## Milbourne, Luke[[@Headword:Milbourne, Luke]]

             an English divine, was born at Wroxhali, Warwickshire. He was educated at Pembroke Hall, Cambridge; after which he became rector of St. Ethelburga; London, and lecturer of Shoreditch in 1704. He died April 13, 1720. He published thirty-one single sermons between 1692 and 1720; several theological treatises, poems, etc.; and the following work, by which he is best known: Notes on Dryden's Virgil (Lond. 1698). Among Milbourne's theological works, we regard as the most important his Legacy to the Church of England (new ed. 1726,2 vols. 8vo), in which he vindicates her orders from the objections of Papists and Dissenters. This work. it is stated, was undertaken by the special command of archbishop Sancroft and Dr. Lloyd, bishop of Norwich. See Cooper, Biograph. Dict. page 806; Ellis, Hist. of Shoreditch; Malone's Dryden, 2:214; 4:633, 645; Johnson, Lives of the Poets, ed. Cunningham, 1:371 sq.; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 2:1277.

## Milcah[[@Headword:Milcah]]

             (Heb. Milkah', מַלְכָּה, advice; Sept. Μελχά), the name of two women.

1. The daughter of Haran, and sister of Lot and Iscah (or Sarah); she married Nahor (Gen 11:29), by whom she had eight sons (Gen 19:20; Gen 19:23), one of whom was Bethuel, the father of Rebekah  (Gen 24:15; Gen 24:24; Gen 24:47). She was thus Abraham's sister-in-law, and the grandmother of Isaac's wife. B.C. cir. 2047.

2. The fourth named of the five daughters of Zelophehad, of the tribe of Manasseh (Num 26:33), who became heiresses for the want of brothers (Num 27:1), and, having married members of the same tribe (Num 36:11), were assigned portions in Gilead (Jos 17:3). B.C. 1619-1612.

## Milcom[[@Headword:Milcom]]

             (Heb. Milkom', מַלְכֹּם, their king, 1Ki 11:5; Sept. Μελχώμ and Μελχόμ, Vulg. Moloch; 2Ki 23:13, Μολόχ, Melchom; also MALCHAM, Heb. Malkam', מִלְכָּם, id., Jer 49:1; Jer 49:3, Sept. Μελχόλ,Vulg. Melchom, “their king;” but this last is the proper rendering in Amo 1:15; Zep 1:5, in which latter passage the Auth. Vers. has “Malcham”), the principal deity of the Ammonites (Jer 49:1; Jer 49:3), for whose worship Solomon erected altars on the Mount of Olives, hence called the Hill of Offence (2Ki 23:13). Milcom is usually regarded as the same as Molech or Moloch, although the latter was worshipped in a different place and manner, namely, by the offering of children in the flames of the valley of Hinnom (see Keil, Comment. ad loc. Kings; Movers, Phon. page 324 sq.; Ewald, Isr. Gesch. 3:100). SEE MOLOCH.

## Mildew[[@Headword:Mildew]]

             (יֵרָקוֹן, yerakon', greenness, i.e., pallor, as the “paleness” by affright, Jer 30:6) is properly a species of fungus or parasitic plant generated by moisture, and corrosive of the surface to which it adheres. In Scripture it is applied to grain, and refers to the pale green or yellowish color indicative of fading or withering of plants (Deu 28:22; 1Ki 8:37; 2Ch 6:28; Amo 4:9; Hag 2:17; in all which passages it is connected with “blasting”). The Arabic applies the word yerakon to human beings as well as to corn, and thus describes the disease called in Europe yellow jaundice. Forskal was informed in Arabia by a Jew that it was the general opinion there that it is a mild breeze, dangerous to the corn, by which the ears are turned yellow. SEE LEPROSY.

## Mile[[@Headword:Mile]]

             (μίλιον, the Greek form of the Latin milliarium, from mille, a thousand, Mat 5:41), a Roman measure of 1000 geometrical paces (passus) of five feet each, and therefore equal to 5000 Roman feet (see Smith's Dict. of Greek and Roman Antiq. s.v. Milliare). Taking the Roman foot at 11.6496 English inches, the Roman mile would be 1618 English yards, or 142 yards less than the English statute mile (see Penny Cyclopaedia, s.v.). By another calculation, in which the foot is taken at 11.62 inches, the mile would be little more than 1614 yards. The number of Roman miles in a degree of a large circle of the earth is little more than 75 (see Ukert, Geogr. d. Griech. I, 2:75). The most common Latin term for the mile is mille passuum, or only the initials M.P.; sometimes the word passuum is omitted. The Roman mile contained eight Greek stadia (Pliny, 2:21). Hence it is usual with the earlier writers on Biblical geography to translate the Greek “stade” into the English “furlong” in stating the measurements of Eusebius and Jerome, who, like the early itineraries, always reckon by Roman miles. SEE FURLONG.

The Talmudists also employed this measure (which they call מַיל, Otho, Lex. Rabb. page 421), but estimate it at 7½ stadia (Baba Mezia, 33:1), as also the Roman historians frequently reckon it, without geographical or mathematical accuracy (Forbiger, Handbuch d. alt. Geogr. 1:555). Mile-stones were set up along the roads constructed by the Romans in Palestine (Reland, Pulaest. page 401 sq.), and to this day they may be seen, here and there, in that country (Robinson, Bib. Res. 2:161, note; 2:306). The mile of the Jews is said to have been of two kinds, long or short, dependent on the length of the pace, which varied in different parts, the long pace being double the length of the short one (Carpzov, Apparat. page 679). SEE METROLOGY.

## Miles, Henry G[[@Headword:Miles, Henry G]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Amsterdam, N.Y., about the year 1811. He was educated in Hudson, Ohio, studied theology in the Union Theological Seminary, New York; was licensed by the New York Third Presbytery, and ordained by the Rochester Presbytery in 1851. He received and accepted a call to the Church at Dover, Ohio, and subsequently preached at Hublinsbury, Pa., and Parma Centre and Woodhull, N.Y., where he died, July 21, 1860. Mr. Miles had to struggle with many difficulties, but in all his duties he was conscientious and zealous. As a  preacher he was clear and practical. See Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1862, page 189. (J.L.S.)

## Miles, Henry, D.D[[@Headword:Miles, Henry, D.D]]

             an English Presbyterian clergyman, was born in 1699, and entered the ministry in early life. He was the minister of a church at Tooting, Surrey, for many years; a learned and ingenious man of considerable ability, and an eminent Christian. His skill in natural science led to his being elected a fellow of the Royal Society. In 1737 he was chosen assistant minister at the Old Jewry Church, where he preached once on the Lord's Day for seven  years, but resigned in 1744, and confined himself to Tooting, where he died, much regretted, February 10, 1763. See Wilson, Dissenting Churches, 2:384.

## Miles, James Browning, D.D[[@Headword:Miles, James Browning, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Rutland, Mass., Aug. 18,1822. He graduated from Yale College in 1849, and from Yale Divinity School in 1854, having one year (1852) attended the Theological Seminary at Andover; also, from 1852 to 1854, acting as tutor in Yale College. He was ordained pastor of the First Church, Charlestown, Massachusetts, January 2, 1855, from which he was dismissed in October 1871, to become secretary of the American Peace Society. About the same time he became secretary of the International Code Society. He died at Worcester, November 13, 1875. See Cong. Quarterly, 1876, page 431.

## Miletum[[@Headword:Miletum]]

             (2Ti 4:20). SEE MILETUS.

## Miletus[[@Headword:Miletus]]

             (Μίλητος, from the name of a fabled son of Apollo, who is said to have founded the city, Apollod. 3:1, 2), a city and seaport of Ionia, in Asia Minor, about thirty-six miles south of Ephesus (Cramer's Asia Minor, 2:385 sq.). The apostle Paul touched at this port on his voyage from Greece to Syria, and delivered to the elders of Ephesus, who had come to meet him there, a remarkable and affecting address (Act 20:15-38). “In the context we have the geographical relations of the latter city brought out distinctly, as if it were Luke's purpose to state them. In the first place, it lay on the coast to the south of Ephesus. Next, it was a day's sail from Trogyllium (Act 20:15). Moreover, to those who are sailing from the north, it is in the direct line for Cos. We should also notice that it was near enough to Ephesus by land communication for the message to be sent and the presbyters to come within a very narrow space of time. All these details correspond with the geographical facts of the case. As to the last point, Ephesus was by land only about twenty or thirty miles distant from Miletus. There is a further and more minute topographical coincidence, which may be seen in the phrase, ‘They accompanied him to the ship,' implying as it does that the vessel lay at some distance from the town. The site of Miletus has now receded tell miles from the coast, and even in the apostle's time it must have lost its strictly maritime position (Hackett, Comm. on the Acts , 2 d ed. page 344; comp. Act 21:5).

In each case we have a low, flat shore, as a marked and definite feature of the scene.” Miletus was a place of considerable note, and the ancient capital of Ionia and Caria (Herod. i, 142; Pliny, 5:31). It was the birthplace of several men of renown — Thales, Timotheus, Anaximander, Anaximenes, Democritus (Pomp. Mela, 1:17; Diog. Laertius, Vit. Philosoph. pages 15, 88, 89, 650). Ptolemy (Geogr. 5:2, 9) places Miletus in Caria by the sea, and it is stated to have had four havens, one of which was capable of holding a fleet. (See J.E. Rambach, De Mileto ejusque coloniis [Hal. 1790]; Soldan, Rer. Miles. Comment. [Darmst. 1829]; Schroeder, Comment. de rebus Miles. [ Strals.  1827].) “In early times it was the most flourishing city of the Ionian Greeks. The ships which sailed from it were celebrated for their distant voyages. Miletus suffered in the progress of the Lydian kingdom and became tributary to Croesus. In the natural order of events, it was absorbed in the Persian empire; and, revolting, it was stormed and sacked. After a brief period of spirited independence, it received a blow from which it never recovered, in the siege conducted by Alexander when on his Eastern campaign. But still it held, even through the Roman period, the rank of a second-rate trading town, and Strabo mentions its four harbors. At this time it was politically in the province of Asia, though Caria was the old ethnological name of the district in which it was situated. Its preeminence on this coast had now long been yielded up to Ephesus. These changes can be vividly traced by comparing the whole series of coins of the two places. In the case of Miletus, those of the autonomous period are numerous and beautiful, those of the imperial period very scanty. Still Miletus was for some time an episcopal city of Western Asia. Its final decay was doubtless promoted by the silting up of the Meander.” It was noted for a famous temple of Apollo, the oracle of which is known to have been consulted so late as the 4th century (Apollodorus, De Orig. Deor. 3:130). There was, however, a Christian church in the place; and in the 5th, 7th, and 8th centuries we read of bishops of Miletus, who were present at several councils (Magdeburg, Hist. Eccles. 2:1-2; 4:86; 5:3; 7:254; 8:4). The city fell to decay after its conquest by the Saracens, and is now in ruins, not far from the spot where the Meander falls into the sea. (See Biisching, Erdbeschr. XI; 1:100; Tzschucke, ad Mel. III, 1:481.) The exact site, however, is somewhat a matter of uncertainty (Rosenmuller, Bibl. Geogr. I, 2:187), owing to the altered character of the coast in modern times; but it appears to be in part covered by the remains now called Palatia, i.e. the palace (Leake, Asia Minor, page 240).

It lies in a triangular plot of ground, bounded by two branches of the river Mendere — the ancient Meander. These unite a little to the north of the ruins, and the stream thus formed disembogues through marshy ground into the sea about two miles distant. The harbor is filled up by the alluvial soil brought down by the river, which has already created a delta of no insignificant dimensions. The ruins of the ancient Miletus are even at the present time striking and picturesque, especially those of the theatre, one of the largest in Asia Minor. Seen from the south-west, it makes still a splendid object; to the south is a mosque, and farther still, in the same direction, a line of ruined arches, once forming an aqueduct. The fragments of a church  remain, in which the current tradition of the place asserts that St. John preached the Gospel; but it is unquestionably of a date far later than that of the evangelist. In the plain, between the theatre and the aqueduct, are a few pillars, indicating the site of a temple, probably dedicated to Diana. See Texier, Asie Mineure, page 316 sq.

Some take the Miletus where Paul left Trophimus sick (2Ti 4:20; Auth. Vers. “Miletum”) to have been in Crete, and therefore different from the above; but there seems to be no need for this conclusion. “This passage presents a very serious difficulty to the theory that there was only one Roman imprisonment. When Paul visited the place on the occasion just described, Trophimus was indeed with him (Act 20:4); but he certainly did not ‘leave him sick at Miletus,' for at the conclusion of the voyage we find him with the apostle at Jerusalem (Act 21:29). Nor is it possible that he could have been so left on the voyage from Caesarea to Rome, for in the first place there is no reason to believe that Trophimus was with the apostle then at all; and in the second place the ship was never to the north of Cnidus (Act 27:7). But on the hypothesis that Paul was liberated from Rome and revisited the neighborhood of Ephesus, all becomes easy, and consistent with the other notices of his movements in the pastoral epistles. (See Conybeare and Howson, Life and Epistles of St. Paul, chapter 27; Birks, Horae Apostolicae.) See further in Schmidt, Res Milesiance (Gott. 1855); Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Geogr. s.v.; Conybeare and Howson, St. Paul, 2:214 sq.; Tschihatscheff, L'Asie Mineure (Par. 1853), 1:252 sq.; Rawlinson, Herod. 1:218 sq.

## Mileum[[@Headword:Mileum]]

             a city of Numidia, in the northern part of Africa, is celebrated in Church history as a place where, at the beginning of the 5th century, two synods were held. The first of them, which is of little importance, convened Aug. 27, 402. Aurelius of Carthage presided. The canons of Hippo and Carthage were confirmed, and five canons of discipline published, which are contained in the African Code (comp. Codex Canon. Eccl. Afric. pages 85- 90). It was decided that the younger bishops should give place to those of older standing, excepting the primates of Numidia and Mauritania, who always took precedence of all other primates of whatever standing (Conc.  2:1323). The second synod, which was held towards the autumn of A.D. 416, is known as the Concilium Milevitanum. This was a provincial council of Numidia, and was attended by sixty-one bishops of the province. It was chiefly owing to Augustine's (q.v.) influence, and to the happy issue of the synod at Diospolis (q.v.), that the African bishops assembled in a synodical meeting. Having learned the proceedings of the Council of Carthage of the same year, they wrote a synodal letter to pope Innocent I (q.v.), in which, after enlarging upon the enormity of the Pelagian heresy, which denied the necessity of prayer in adults and of baptism for children, and after showing how worthy it was of the notice and censure of the Church, they entreated him, since the salvation of Pelagius (q.v.) and Ccelestius (q.v.) could not be secured, that he would at least provide for that of others by condemning their heresies. They did not ask the excommunication of Pelagius and Celestius, as has sometimes been stated, but that they should be commanded to renounce their heresies, and that only the heresies themselves should be condemned. “Hoc gestum,” they concluded, “Domino frater, sanctae caritati tuae intimandum ducimus, ut statutis nostrae mediocritatis etiam apostolicae sedis adhibeatur auctoritas.” Among the names attached to this letter are those of Silvanus, primate of the province of Numidia, Alypius, St. Augustine, Severus of Mileum, Fortunatus of Citha, and Possidius. Another and more confidential letter was addressed to Innocent by five North African bishops, of whom Augustine was one (see Mansi, 4:321 sq.). Pelagius also sent him a letter and a confession of faith, which, however, were not received in due time. Innocent understood both the controversy and the interests of the Roman see. In his reply, which is to be found in August. Epist. page 182, he commended the Africans for having addressed themselves to the Church of St. Peter, before which it was seemly that all the affairs of Christendom should be brought. He praised the zeal and pastoral care of the African bishops, briefly established the true doctrine of grace, and condemned Pelagius and Coelestius, with their followers, declaring them to be separated from the Catholic Church. “Non solum enim,” he says, “qui faciunt sed etiam qui consentiunt facientibus, digni sunt morto; quia non multum interesse arbitror inter committentis animum et consentientis favorem.” He refrained, however, from giving judgment respecting the Synod of Diospolis. He also replied to the letters which Augustine and the four bishops — Aurelius, Alypins, Evodius, and Possidius — had addressed to him. These letters of Innocent were written in a council held at Rome upon the subject in January, 417, and are to be found in Mansi  (3:1071 sq.). See Schillstraten, Antiq. Eccles. Afric. Diss. volume 3; Norris, Hist. Pelag. 1:10; Hefele, Conciliengeschichte, 2:100; Gieseler, Eccles. Hist. 1:330 sq.; Schaff, Church Hist. 3:797; Milman, Hist. of Christianity, pages 389, 414 sq.

## Milicz Von Kremsier (Kromesize), John[[@Headword:Milicz Von Kremsier (Kromesize), John]]

             was one of the most eminent precursors of the Bohemian Reformation. Of his early years little is known. The fact that in his mature years he first engaged in the study of the German language, would indicate that his education must have been acquired elsewhere than in a German university; possibly in Italy or at Paris, or in his own country, Moravia. Commencing his public career as a priest about the year 1350, he soon attracted the notice of the emperor Charles IV, who was also king of Bohemia, and became his secretary. At the same time, as canon of the cathedral at Prague, and archdeacon, he occupied a conspicuous ecclesiastical position. Resigning, however, all his prospects of promotion, notwithstanding the entreaties of the bishop, he chose a lot of poverty and hardship, that he might more fully imitate the example of Christ. For six months he preached to the people at Bishop-teinitz; but fearing lest his position there was too tempting, in a worldly point of view, he returned to Prague, first officiating in the church of St. Nicholas, in the Kleine Seito, and afterwards in that of St. AEgidius, in the old city. At first his hearers were few. Perhaps his Moravian dialect was not attractive. His reproof of sin, and his earnest words, however, soon attracted notice. Multitudes thronged to hear him. He preached daily, and often three, and sometimes five sermons. To be more extensively useful, he applied himself to the study of German, that he might address himself to the Germans of Prague. The evils and corruptions of the times doubtless led him to select his themes of discourse largely from the Apocalypse, and the prophets of the Old Testament, and ere long the coming of Antichrist became the burden of his pulpit discourses. He fixed the date of his coming at A.D. 1365-67, nor did he fear to expose the iniquities which, to his view, seemed to herald it. Priests, bishops, and magistrates, and even the emperor himself, were not spared. It is to the credit of his reputation for sincerity that, notwithstanding the hostility which he provoked in some quarters, he was sustained and befriended by the highest powers in Church and State.

In 1367, on the report that the pope was about to return from Avignon to Rome, Milicz resolved to visit and confer with him. The pope's arrival was  delayed; and Milicz, obedient to what he regarded as the voice of the Spirit within him, nailed upon the doors of St. Peter's the sentence which had so long occupied his thoughts — “The Antichrist has come.” He zealously warned the people and the clergy to withdraw themselves from iniquity. The inquisitor, encouraged by reports of Milicz's course in Bohemia, ordered his arrest and imprisonment. From his prison he was summoned to preach to an assembly of the clergy, but his full release did not take place till the pope's arrival in Rome in 1368. In free conference with the pope and some of the cardinals who befriended him, he moderated, if he did not modify his views. On his return to Prague, where he succeeded Conrad Waldhauser in the Tein Church, his enthusiastic zeal assumed a new phase. He devoted himself earnestly to the reform of the vicious and abandoned. Scores of prostitutes were recalled to repentance and virtue. The quarters they had occupied, heretofore the scandal of the city, were transformed. Achapel to St. Mary Magdalene was erected there, and buildings were provided for the residence and support of the hundreds, if not thousands, that were recovered to the paths of virtue. Milicz's course made him many enemies. Of the clergy, some were jealous of him, and others hated him for his rebukes. Charges were drawn up against him, and forwarded to the pope at Avignon. It is quite significant that these articles, twelve in number, are almost silent as to any doctrinal errors. The pope, however, was prejudiced against Milicz, and summoned him to his court, to answer in person. Milicz, promptly responded to the summons. He met a kindly reception, and succeeded in vindicating his innocence. But his career was drawing to a close. He was taken sick at Avignon, and died June 29, 1374. At Prague his decease gave occasion for public and general lamentation.

Of the Christian character and devotion of Milicz, Matthias of Janow speaks in terms that might seem extravagant if the actual results of Milicz's labors did not go so far to justify them. Notwithstanding the envy which was felt towards him by some of the clergy, and the hostility which he provoked by his sharp rebuke of prevailing iniquity, he does not seem to have laid himself open to the charge of departing seriously from the accepted doctrines and usages of the Church. Indeed, his zeal took more of a practical than a speculative direction, and in this respect only can he be considered as a precursor who prepared the way for Huss.

Of Milicz's writings, some are still extant in manuscript, and some have been preserved by his friend and admirer, Matthias von Janow (q.v.). His Latin works were, Libellus de Antichristo; Gratia Dei, or sermons on the  occasion of Church festivals throughout the year; and Sermones Quadrigesimales. Of his Bohemian works, consisting of sermons and postils, one only has been printed, and, though it found a place in the Prohibitory Index, not a copy of it is now known to exist.

A somewhat detailed account of Milicz is given by Neander in his History of the Church (volume 5). To the other sources of information — besides Balbinus (Miscell. 1, lib. 4:34) and the writings of Matthias of Janow — to which Neander had access, must be added P. Jordan's Die Vorlaufer des Hussitenthums in Bohmen, which presents a concise sketch of Conrad of Waldhausen, Milicz, and Matthias of Janow. This sketch, really drawn up by F. Palacky, the historian of Bohemia, was published at first in Germany, with the name of P. Jordan affixed, since at the time it was doubtful whether the laws of the press in Austria would permit its publication in any of its states. It was republished, however, in 1868, under the name of its real author, F. Palacky; and doubtless furnishes the most trustworthy account extant of the subject of this article. See also Gillett, Life of Huss (see Index in volume 2); Hardwick, Ch. Hist. pages 397, 399; Gieseler, Eccles. Hist. 3:184 sq.; Riddle, Hist. of the Papacy, 2:363; Czerwonka, Gesch. der evagel. Kirche in Bohmnen (Bibf. 1869), volume 1. (E.H.G.)

## Militant, Church[[@Headword:Militant, Church]]

             a term applied to the whole congregation of faithful men on earth (in distinction from the Church triumphant in heaven), as engaged “to fight manfully” under Christ's banner against sin, the world, and the devil; and to continue his faithful soldiers (milites) and servants unto their life's end.

## Military Orders[[@Headword:Military Orders]]

             is a term applied to three celebrated fraternities which sprang up in the period of the Crusades (q.v.). They were religious associations which arose from a mixture of the religious enthusiasm and the chivalrous love of arms which almost equally formed the characteristics of mediaeval society. The first origin of such associations may be traced to the necessities of the Christian residents of the Holy Land, in which the monks, whose first duty had been to serve the pilgrims in the hospital at Jerusalem, were compelled, by the necessity of self-defense, to assume the character of soldiers as well as of monks. These were termed Knights of St. John. SEE HOSPITALLERS.

The second, the order of the Templars (q.v.), and the third, the Teutonic Knights, were the outgrowth of the days of the  Crusades. SEE KNIGHTHOOD.

These military orders professed to unite religious vows with the duties and discipline of a warrior. The chief objects they claimed to have in view were to defend and support Christianity, by force of arms, against the Mohammedans; to keep the public roads of Palestine from being infested with robbers; and to assist the poor, and minister to the sick, among those who were prompted by the spirit of the times to visit, as pilgrims, the various places reputed to be scenes of our Lord's earthly career.

The inferior orders of Alcantara and Calatrava, in Spain, having for their immediate object the defence of their country against the Moors, as well as those of Avis, in Portugal, claimed to have been instituted for like reasons as those above mentioned. They followed the Cistercian rule, and all three differed from the Templars and the Knights of St. John in being permitted by their institute to marry once. The same privilege was enjoyed in the Savoyard order of Knights of St. Maurice and the Flemish order of St. Hubert. On the contrary, the Teutonic Knights, who had their origin in the Crusades, see TEUTONIC KNIGHTS, were bound by an absolute vow of chastity.

With the varying conditions of society, these religious associations have at various times been abolished or fallen into disuse; but most of them still subsist in the form of orders of knighthood, and, in some of them, attempts have recently been made to revive, with certain modifications, the monastic character which they originally possessed. See Lea, Hist. of Sacerdotal Celibacy, chapter 22; Giustinani, Ordini Militari, s.v.

## Militz [[@Headword:Militz ]]

             SEE MILICZ.

## Milk[[@Headword:Milk]]

             is designated by two Hebrew words of distinct signification.

1. חָלָב(chalab', fat, i.e., rich; Gr. γάλα) denotes new or sweet milk. This, in its fresh state, appears to have been used very largely among the Hebrews, as is customary among people who have many cattle; and yet make but sparing use of their flesh for food (see Job 21:24; Jdg 4:19). It is not a mere adjunct in cookery, or restricted to the use of the young, although it is naturally the characteristic food of childhood, both  from its simple and nutritive qualities (1Pe 2:2), and particularly as contrasted with meat (1Co 3:2; Heb 5:12); but beyond this it is regarded as substantial food adapted alike to all ages and classes. Hence it is enumerated among “the principal things for the whole use of a man's life” (Sir 39:26). It frequently occurs in connection with honey, as a delicacy (Exo 3:8; Exo 13:5; Jos 5:6; Jer 11:5; comp. Dio Chrvs. 35:p. 434; Strabo, 15, page 715). In reading of milk in Scripture, the milk of cows naturally presents itself to the mind of the European reader; but in Western Asia, and especially among the pastoral and semi-pastoral people, not only cows, but goats, sheep, and camels are made to give their milk for the sustenance of man. That this was also the case among the Hebrews maybe clearly inferred even from the slight intimations which the Scriptures afford. Thus we read of “butter of kine, and milk of sheep” (Deu 32:14); and in Pro 27:27, the emphatic intimation, “Thou shalt have goats' milk for food,” seems to imply that this was considered the best for use in the simple state (comp. Pliny, 28:33; see Russell's Aleppo, 2:12; Sonnini, Trav. 1:329 sq.; Bochart, Hieroz. 1:717 sq.). “Thirty milk camels” were among the cattle which Jacob presented to his brother Esau (Gen 32:15). implying the use of camels' milk.

The most striking scriptural allusion to milk is that which forbids a kid to be seethed in its mother's milk, and its importance is attested by its being thrice repeated (Exo 23:19; Exo 34:26; Deu 14:21). The following are the most remarkable views respecting it:

(1.) That it prohibits the eating of the foetus of the goat as a delicacy: but there is not the least evidence that the Jews were ever attached to this disgusting luxury.

(2.) That it prevents the kid being killed till it is eight days old, when, it is said, it might subsist without the milk of its mother.

(3.) This ground is admitted by those who deduce a further reason from the fact that a kid was not, until the eighth day, fit for sacrifice. But there appears no good reason why a kid should be described as “in its mother's milk,” in those days, more than in any other days of the period during which it is suckled.

(4.) Others, therefore, maintain that the eating of a sucking kid is altogether and absolutely prohibited. But a goat suckles its kid for three  months, and it is not likely that the Jews were so long forbidden the use of it for food. No food is forbidden but as unclean, and a kid ceased to be unclean on the eighth day, when it was fit for sacrifice; and what was fit for sacrifice could not be unfit for food.

(5.) That the prohibition was meant to prevent the dam and kid from being slain at the same time. But this is forbidden with reference to the goat and other animals in express terms, and there seems to be no reason why it should be repeated in this remarkable form with reference to the goat only.

(6.) Others understand it literally, as a precept designed to encourage humane feelings. But, as Michaelis asks, how came the Israelites to hit upon the strange whim of boiling a kid in milk, and just in the milk of its own mother?

(7.) Still, understanding the text literally, it is possible that this was not a common act of cookery, but an idolatrous or magical rite. Maimonides, in his More Nebochim, urges this opinion, and adduces the fact that in two of the above passages the practice is spoken of in immediate connection with the three great annual feasts (Exo 23:17; Exo 23:19; Exo 34:23; Exo 34:26), although he admits that he “had not yet been able to find it in the Zabian books.” This opinion is confirmed by an extract which Cudworth (Discourses concerning the True Notion of the Lord's Supper, page 30) gives from an ancient Karaite commentary on the Pentateuch; it has been supported by Spencer (De Legibus Heb 2:9, § 2), and has been advocated by Le Clerc, Dathe, and other able writers; it is also corroborated by the addition in the Samaritan copy, and in some degree by the Targum.

(8.) Michaelis, however, advances a quite new opinion of his own. He takes it for granted that בָּשִׁל, rendered “seethe,” may signify to roast as well as to boil, which is hardly disputable; that the kid's mother is not here limited to the real mother, but applies to any goat that has kidded; that חָלָבhere denotes not milk, but butter; and that the precept is not restricted to kids, but extends not only to lambs (which is generally granted), but to all other not forbidden animals. Having erected these props, Michaelis builds upon them the conjecture that the motive of the precept was to endear to the Israelites the land of Canaan, which abounded in oil, and to make them forget their Egyptian butter. Moses, therefore, to prevent their having any longing desire to return to that country, enjoins them to use oil in cooking their victuals, as well as in seasoning their  sacrifices (Mosaisches Recht, part 4, page 210). This is ingenious, but it is open to objection. The postulates cannot readily be granted, and, if granted, the conclusion deduced from them is scarcely just, seeing that, as Geddes remarks, “there was no need nor temptation for the Israelites to return to Egypt on account of its butter, when they possessed a country that flowed with milk and honey” (Critical Remarks, page 257). SEE KID.

In its figurative use, milk occurs sometimes simply as the sign of abundance (Gen 49:12; Eze 25:4; Joe 3:18, etc.); but more frequently in combination with honey “milk and honey” being a phrase which occurs about twenty times in Scripture. Thus a rich and fertile soil is described as a “land flowing with milk and honey;” which, although usually said of Palestine, is also applied to other fruitful countries, as Egypt (Num 16:13). This figure is by no means peculiar to the Hebrews, but is frequently met with in classical writers. A beautiful example occurs in Euripides (Bacch. 142). Hence its use to denote the food of children. Milk is also constantly employed as a symbol of the elementary parts or rudiments of doctrine (1Co 3:2; Heb 5:12-13); and, from its purity and simplicity, it is also made to symbolize the unadulterated Word of God (1Pe 2:2; comp. Isa 55:1).

The term rendered “milk out” in Isa 66:11, is מָצִוֹ, matsats', which occurs only in that passage, and apparently signifies to suck or draw out something sweet with relish, as milk from the breast; it is put as a symbol of abundant satisfaction.

2. חֶמְאָה, chemah', from חָמָה, to coagulate),is always translated “butter” in the Authorized Version. It seems to mean both butter and curdled milk, but most generally the latter; and the context will. in most cases, suggest the distinction, which has been neglected by our translators. It was this curdled milk, highly esteemed as a refreshment in the East (where it is called lebben, see Russell's Aleppo, 1:150; Burckhardt, Trav. 2:697, 727; Robinson, 2:405; 3:574), that Abraham set before the angels (Gen 18:8); and it was the same that Jael gave to Sisera, instead of the water which he asked (Jdg 5:25), as Josephus particularly notes (γάλα διαφθορὸς ἤδη, Ant. 5:5, 4); it was produced from one of the goat-skin bottles which are still used for the purpose by the Bedouins (Jdg 4:19; comp. Burckhardt's Notes, 1:45). As it would keep for a considerable time, it was particularly adapted to the use of travellers (2  Samuel 17:29). In this state milk acquires a slightly inebriating power, if kept long enough. Isa 7:22 is the only text in which the word is coupled with “honey,” and there it is a sign of scarcity, not of plenty, as when honey is coupled with fresh milk. It means that there being no fruit or grain, the remnant would have to live on milk and honey; and, perhaps, that milk itself would be so scarce that it would be needful to use it with economy, and hence to curdle it, as fresh milk cannot be preserved for chary use. Although, however, this word properly denotes curdled milk, it seems also to be sometimes used for milk in general (Deu 32:14; Job 20:15; Isa 7:15). SEE BUTTER; SEE CHEESE.

Lebben is still extensively used in the East: at certain seasons of the year the poor almost live upon it, while the upper classes eat it with salad or meat (Russell, 1:118). It is still offered in hospitality to the passing stranger (Robinson, Bib. Res. 1:571; 2:70, 211) — so freely, indeed, that in some parts of Arabia it would be regarded as a scandal if money were received in return (Burckhardt's Arabia, 1:120; 2:106). The method now pursued in its preparation is to boil the milk over a slow fire, adding to it a small piece of old lebben or some other acid in order to make it coagulate (Russell, Aleppo, 1:118, 370; Burckhardt, Arabia, 1:60). See Foo).

## Milk And Honey[[@Headword:Milk And Honey]]

             used at Baptism. — The practice of tasting milk and honey at baptism appears to have been founded upon the promises made to the Israelites (Exo 3:8; Exo 3:17; Exo 33:3). They were probably regarded as appropriate emblems at the administration of that sacrament by which we are introduced into that new land “flowing with milk and honey,” the spiritual kingdom of God under the Gospel. The tasting of milk may be supposed to refer especially to the words of St. Peter, “As new-born babes, desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby” (1Pe 2:2); a passage which was applied to baptism. As milk denoted the spiritual nourishment afforded by God's Word, so honey denoted its pleasantness or agreeableness to the mind and heart of a renewed person (Psa 19:11; Psa 119:103; Rev 10:9-10). And the use of honey at baptism may have served to remind believers of the superiority of the Christian dispensation over the Jewish, since under the latter there was a law against the use of honey at sacrifices, on account of its liability to corrupt. SEE HONEY.

The emblems of milk and honey were in use as early as the third and fourth centuries. Salmasius and some others suppose that they were  given to the communicant instead of the Eucharist. This, however, is a mistake, for the Eucharist was administered at the same time (Salmasius, ap. Suicer. Thesaur. part 2, page 236). Tertullian says it was a sign of new birth, and that the communicants became as children adopted into God's family — “Inde suscepti lacti et mellis concordiam praegustamus” (Tertull. De cor. Mil. c. 3). St. Jerome says this was done in allusion to those passages of the apostle, “I have fed you with milk, and not with strong meat;” and to St. Peter's saying above; for milk denotes the innocency of children (Comment. in Es. Leviticus , 1). Clemens Alexandrinus also takes notice of this custom, saying, “As soon as we are born, we are nourished with milk, which is the nutriment of the Lord; and when we are born again, we are honored with the hope of rest by the promise of Jerusalem which is above, where it is said to rain milk and honey: for by these material things we are assured of that sacred food” (Clem. Alexandr. 1:6, 103). We learn further, from the third Council of Carthage, that the milk and honey had a peculiar consecration distinct from that of the Eucharist (Cod. Eccles. Afric. can. 37, ap. Justellun) — “Nothing else should be offered in the sacraments of the body and blood of the Lord but what the Lord commanded, that is, bread and wine mingled with water. But the first- fruits, and honey and milk, which are offered on one most solemn day for the mystery of infants, though they be offered at the altar, shall have their own peculiar benediction, that they may be distinguished from the sacrament of the body and blood of the Lord.” Here we see that milk and honey were only to be offered on one solemn day, that is, on the great Sabbath, or Saturday before Easter, which was the most solemn time of baptism; and only for the mystery of infants, that is, persons newly baptized, who were commonly called infants, in a mystical sense, from their new birth, in the African Church. In the time of the Council of Trullo the offering of milk and honey at the altar was forbidden (comp. Conc. Trull. can. 57). See Riddle, Christian Antiquities, page 520; Ayer, Treasury of Bible Knowledge, page 591; Coleman, Ancient Christianity, page 402; Bingham, Antiquities of the Latin Church, 1:500 sq.; 2:755 sq.; Eadie, Eccles. Dict.; Augusti, Christl. Archceology, 2:446 sq.

## Mill[[@Headword:Mill]]

             (רֵחִיַם, recha'yim, the two millstones, from רָחָה, to bruise, Exo 11:5; “mills,” Num 10:8; “millstones,” Isa 47:2; Jer 25:10; “nether” millstone, Deu 24:6; μύλων, Mat 24:21. Each millstone was called פֶּלָח, pe'lach, a slice or piece, as of fruit, in Son 4:3; 1Sa 30:12; always “piece” of a millstone, Jdg 9:53; 2Sa 11:21; Job 41:24; Gr. μύλος, Mat 18:6; Luk 17:2; Rev 18:21-22). The mill (properly טִהֲנָה, tachanah', a “grinding,” Ecc 12:4; טְחוֹן, techon', “to grind,” Lam 5:13; Gr. μύλη) for grinding grain had not wholly superseded the mortar for pounding it in the time of Moses (Num 11:8). SEE MORTAR.

But fine meal-that is, meal ground or pounded fine — is mentioned so early as the time of Abraham (Gen 18:6): hence mills and mortars must have been previously known. SEE GRITS.

The mill common among the Hebrews differed little from that which is in use to this day throughout Western Asia and Northern Africa. It consisted of two circular stones, two feet in diameter and half a foot thick. The lower is called the “nether millstone” (Job 41:16 [24]), and the upper the “rider” (Jdg 9:53; 2Sa 11:21). The former was usually fixed to the floor, and had a slight elevation in the center, or, in other words, was slightly convex in the upper surface. The upper stone had a concavity in its under surface fitting to, or receiving, the convexity of the lower stone. There was a hole in the top, through which the grain was introduced by handfuls at a time. The upper stone had an upright stick fixed in it as a handle, which which it was made to turn upon the lower stone, and by this action the grain was ground, and came out at the edges. As there were neither public mills nor bakers, except the king's (Gen 40:2; Hos 7:4-8), each family possessed a mill;, and, as it was in daily use, it was made an infringement of the law for a person to take another's mill or millstone in pledge (Deu 24:6). SEE MILLSTONE.

On the second day, in warm climates, bread becomes dry and insipid; hence the necessity of baking every day, and hence also the daily grinding at the mills early in the morning. SEE BREAD.

It is worked by women, sometimes singly and sometimes two together, who are usually seated on the bare ground (Isa 47:1-2) facing each other; both have hold of the handle by which the upper is turned round on the ‘nether' millstone. The one whose right hand is disengaged throws in the grain as occasion requires through the hole in the upper stone. It is not correct to say that one pushes it half round, and then the other seizes the handle.  This would be slow work, and would give a spasmodic motion to the stone. Both retain their hold, and pull to, or push from, as men do with the whip or cross-cut saw. The proverb of our Savior (Mat 24:41) is true to life, for women only grind. I cannot recall an instance in which men were at the mill” (Thomson, Land and Book, 2:295). The labor is very hard, and the task of grinding is in consequence performed only by the lowest servants (Exo 11:5; comp. Plaut. Merc. 2:3) and captives (Jdg 16:21; Job 31:10; Isa 47:1-2; Lam 5:13; comp. Homer, Od. 7:103; Suetonius, Tib. c. 51). Grinding is reckoned in the Mishna (Shabbath, 7:2) among the chief household duties, to be performed by the wife unless she brought with her one servant (Cethuboth, 5:5); in which case she was relieved from grinding, baking, and washing, but was still obliged to suckle her child, make her husband's bed, and work in wool. Among the Fellahs of the Hauran, one of the chief articles of furniture described by Burckhardt (Syria, page 292) is the “hand-mill, which is used in summer when there is no water in the wadies to drive the mills.” The operation occasions considerable noise, and its simultaneous performance in a great number of houses or tents forms one of the sounds as indicative of an active population in the East as the sound of wheel- carriages in the West.

Hence the sound of the mill is the indication of peaceful household life, and the absence of it is a sign of desolation and abandonment: “When the sound of the mill is low” (Ecc 12:4). No more affecting picture of utter desolation could be imagined than that conveyed in the threat denounced against Judah by the mouth of the prophet Jer 25:10 : “I will take from them the voice of mirth, and the voice of gladness, the voice of the bridegroom and the voice of the bride, the sound of the millstones, and the light of the candle” (comp. Rev 18:22). The song of the women grinding is supposed by some to be alluded to in the above passage of Ecclesiastes, and it was evidently so understood by the Sept.; but Dr. Robinson says (1:485), “We heard no song as an accompaniment to the work,” and Dr. Hackett (Bibl. Illust. page 49) describes it rather as shrieking than singing. It is alluded to in Homer (Od. 20:105-119); and Athenaeus (14, page 619a) refers to a peculiar chant which was sung by women winnowing corn, and mentioned by Aristophanes in the Thesmophoriazusae.  The hand-mills of the ancient Egyptians appear to have been of the same character as those of their descendants, and like them were worked by women (Wilkinson, Anc. Eg. 2:118, etc.). “They had also a large mill on a very similar principle, but the stones were of far greater power and dimensions; and this could only have been turned by cattle or asses, like those of the ancient Romans and of the modern Cairenes.” It was the millstone of a mill of this kind, driven by an ass, which is alluded to in Mat 18:6 (μύλος ὀνικός), to distinguish it, says Lightfoot (Hor. Hebr. ad loc.), from those small mills which were used to grind spices for the wound of circumcision, or for the delights of the Sabbath, and to which both Kimchi and: Jarchi find a reference in Jer 25:10. Of a married man with slender means it is said in the Talmud (Kiddushin, page 29b), “With a millstone on his neck he studies the law,” and the expression is still proverbial (Tendlau, Sprichworter, page 181). The ordinary mill of the Romans, however, was essentially like the conical hand-mill of the East, as specimens preserved among the ruins of bake-houses in Pompeii show (see Smith's Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Antiq. s.v. Mola).

It was the movable upper millstone of the hand-mill with which the woman of Thebez broke Abimelech's skull (Jdg 9:53). It is now generally made, according to Dr. Thomson, of a porous lava brought from the Hauran, both stones being of the same material; but, says the same traveller, “I have seen the nether made of a compact sandstone, and quite thick, while the upper was of this lava, probably because from its lightness it is the more easily driven round with the hand” (Land and Book, 2:296). The porous lava to which he refers is probably the same as the black tufa mentioned by Burckhardt (Syria, page 57), the blocks of which are brought from the Lejah, and are fashioned into millstones by the inhabitants of Ezra, a village in the Hauran. “They vary in price according to their size, from fifteen to sixty piastres, and are preferred to all others on account of the hardness of the stone.”

One passage (Lamenations 5:13) is deserving of notice, which Hoheisel (De Molis Manual. Vet. in Ugolini, volume 29) explains in a manner which gives it a point that is lost in our Auth. Vers. It may be rendered, “The choice (men) bore the mill (טְחוֹן, techen), and the youths stumbled beneath the wood;” the wood being the woodwork or shaft of the mill, which the captives were compelled to carry. There are, moreover, allusions  to other apparatus connected with the operation of grinding — the sieve, or bolter (נָפָה, naphah', Isa 30:28; or כְּבָרָה, kgbarah', Amo 9:9), and the hopper, though the latter is only found in the Mishna (Zabim, 4:3), and was a late invention. We also find in the Mishna (Demai, 3:4) that mention is made of a miller (טוֹחֵן, tochen), indicating that grinding grain was recognised as a distinct occupation. Wind-mills and water-mills are of more recent date.

## Mill, David, D.D[[@Headword:Mill, David, D.D]]

             a noted German Orientalist. was born at Konigsberg, Prussia, April 13, 1692. Called to Holland, he accepted a professorship in the University of Utrecht. He died May 22, 1755. His ablest work is, Dissertationes Selectae Varia S. Litt. et Antiquitatis Orientalis Capita exponentes et illustrantes, curis secundis (Lugd. Bat. 1743).

## Mill, James[[@Headword:Mill, James]]

             an eminent British metaphysician and political economist, was born of humble parentage in the neighborhood of Montrose, Scotland, April 6, 1773. After having received a thorough education in the house of Sir John Stuart, M.P., he was sent to the University of Edinburgh, where he was educated for the Church. He entered into holy orders in 1798, but, instead of devoting himself to his sacred calling, he went to London in 1800; became editor of the Literary Journal, and wrote for various periodicals, including the Eclectic and the Edinburgh Review. In 1806 he commenced a History of British India, which he completed and published in 1818. The impression produced by this masterly history on the Indian authorities was such that in 1819 Mill was appointed assistant-examiner of Indian correspondence. He continued in this office till 1832, when he was appointed head of the examiner's office, where he had the control of all the departments of Indian administration. Shortly after his appointment to the India House, he contributed the articles on Government, Education, Jurisprudence, Law of Nations, Liberty of the Press, Colonies, and Prison Discipline to the Encyclopaedia Britannica. These essays were reprinted in a separate form and became widely known. The powers of analysis, of clear statement, and thorough application of principles exhibited in these articles had probably never before been brought to bear on this class of subjects. In 18211822 he published his Elements of Political Economy, a  work prepared primarily with a view to the education of his eldest son, John Stuart Mill (q.v.).

In 1829 Mr. Mill came before the public with his Analysis of the Phenomena of the Human Mind, a work on which he bestowed more of the labor of thought than on any other of his productions, and on a subject of special interest to the theologian and the philosopher. In this work Mill has attempted to resolve all the powers of the human mind into a very small number of simple elements. From an examination of a number of the more complicated cases of consciousness, he arrives at the conclusion that they all resolve themselves into three simple elements — sensations, ideas, and the train of ideas. He thus explains what he means by the terms sensations and ideas: “We have two classes of feeling: one, that which exists when the object of sense is present; another, that which exists after the object of sense has ceased to be present. The one class of feelings I call sensations, the other class of feelings I call ideas” (1:41). He begins with the simpler phenomena, and thence proceeds to the exposition of the more complex ones. “ The feelings,” he says, “which we have through the external senses are the most simple, at least the most familiar, of the mental phenomena. Hence the propriety of commencing with this class of our feelings” (Analysis, 1:1).

Accordingly he begins with sensation, under which head he ranges the feelings which we have by the five senses — smell, taste, hearing, touch, and sight; the muscular sensations, and the sensations in the alimentary canal. He next treats of ideas, or, as he calls them, the images of sensation. He then comments on ideas put together or associated in trains, and of the order of their association and the causes of that order. He then treats of consciousness and conception, which philosophers, he says, have erroneously created into what they called powers of the mind; whereas, he says, consciousness is merely a name applied to sensations, and to ideas whether simple or complex — to all the feelings of our sentient nature: and conception a name applied only to ideas, and to ideas only in a state of combination. “Imagination,” he says, “is the name of a train of ideas. I am said to have an imagination when I have a train of ideas. There is a great diversity of trains. Not only has the same individual an endless variety of trains, but a different character belongs to the whole series of trains which pass through the minds of different individuals or classes of individuals. The different pursuits in which the several classes of men are engaged render particular trains of ideas more common to them than other trains. One man is a merchant, and  trains respecting the goods in which he buys and those in which he sells are habitual in his mind.

Another man is a lawyer, and ideas of clients and fees, and judges and witnesses, and legal instruments and points of contestation, and the practice of his court, are habitually passing in his mind. Ideas of another kind occupy the mind of the physician; of another kind still the mind of the warrior. The statesman is occupied with a train different from that of any of the classes that have been mentioned, and one statesman with a very different train from another, according as his mind is running upon expedients Which may serve the purpose of the day, or arrangement which may secure the happiness of the population from generation to generation. A peculiar character belongs to the train which habitually occupies the mind of the mathematician. The mind of the metaphysician is also occupied by a train distinguished from that of other classes. And there is one man yet to be mentioned, the poet, the peculiarity of whose trains has been a subject of particular observation. To such a degree, indeed, have the trains of the poet been singled out for distinction, that the word imagination, in a more restricted sense, is appropriated to them. We do not call the trains of the lawyer, or the trains of the merchant, imagination. We do not speak of them as imagining, when they are revolving each the ideas which belong to his peculiar occupation; it is only to the poet that the epithet of imagination is applied. His train, or trahis analogous to his are those which receive the name of imagination” (1:179).

In some parts of his philosophy Mill has, we think, been led into error, by carrying his notion of association, as an explanation of these phenomena, too far. Thus, in the chapter on classification, after very ably showing how long men had been led away by mere jargon from the real nature and object of classification, he says: “Man first becomes acquainted with individuals. He first names individuals. But individuals are innumerable, and he cannot have innumerable names. He must make one name serve for many individuals.” Then, after alluding to the case of “synchronous sensations so concreted by constant conjunction as to appear, though numerous, only one, of which the ideas of sensible objects — a rose, a plough, a house, a ship — are examples,” he thus proceeds: “It is easy to see wherein the present case agrees with and wherein it differs from those familiar cases. The word man, we shall say is first applied to an individual; it is first associated with the idea of that individual, and acquires the power of calling up the idea of him; it is next applied to another individual, and acquires the power of calling up the idea of him; so of another, and  another, till it has become associated with an indefinite number, and has acquired the power of calling up an indefinite number of those ideas indifferently. What happens? It does call up an indefinite number of the ideas of individuals as often as it occurs; and calling them up in close connection, it forms them into a species of complex idea” (1:204). From this simple basis he builds up with remarkable dexterity a comprehensive system, all the errors or defects of which lie at the very threshold. His conclusions are inevitable, if his premises, his representation of the facts of consciousness, be accepted. Sensation, ideation, association, and naming are the elementary processes in his analysis, by which he accounts for all the complex phenomena of the mind — for abstraction, memory, judgment, ratiocination, belief, and the power of motives. He devotes the latter half of the second volume of his Analysis to the phenomena in which the sensations and ideas are to be considered as not merely existing, but also as exciting to action. He treats of pleasurable and painful sensations, and of the causes of the pleasurable and painful sensations; then of ideas of the pleasurable and painful sensations, and of the causes of them. He treats of wealth, power, and dignity, and their contraries; of our fellow-creatures, and of the objects called sublime and beautiful, and their contraries, contemplated as causes of our pleasures and pains. Chapter 22 is devoted to the subject of motives, and chapter 24 to that of the will; chapter 25 (the last) to intention. Mr. Mill's exposition of all these phenomena is mainly grounded on the law of association, by which he means simply the fact that the order of occurrence among our ideas is the order of occurrence among our former sensations, of which those ideas are the copies.

The last publication of Mill was a fragment containing a severe criticism on James Macintosh's dissertation on the progress of ethical philosophy. Mill, who had always exercised a particular championship for the doctrines of Thomas Hobbes (q.v.), was not at all pleased with the unceremonious manner in which his favorite was handled by Sir James. If Hobbes and Mill are right, then many great names are liable to the charge of error. Mill took a leading part in the founding of University College, London, and gave a powerful intellectual stimulus to a number of young men, some of whom (including his own son, and Grote. the Greek historian) have risen to eminence. Hedien at Kensington June 23, 1836. See Engl. Cyclop. s.v.; Amer. Cyclop. 11:501 sq.; Chambers, Cyclop. s.v.; Lewis, Biog. Hist. of Philosophers, 2:507; Westminst. Rev. 13:265; Blackwood's Magazine, 46:671; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, 2:1279 sq.

## Mill, John Stuart[[@Headword:Mill, John Stuart]]

             the British philosopher whose writings have done much to shape the thinking of this generation, was the son of James Mill (q.v.), and was born  in London May 20, 1806. His intellectual training was conducted by his learned father, who, holding that all men are born with equal faculties, and that character is the result solely of association and circumstance, preferred, it would seem, the sole control of the boy in order to test upon him the theories he had espoused and preached. At an age when children are usually weaned, John Stuart began the study of Greek, followed shortly after by arithmetic, with Latin at eight, and logic in his twelfth year, and before he had completed his fourteenth year, as he tells us himself, he had gone over the whole range of ancient literature and philosophy, as well as the most noted of modern historians, civil and ecclesiastical, besides having himself composed volumes of history. Such an education, conducted by a person of his father's ability, could not fail of remarkable results. By it he also gained lasting, habits of application, and a wonderful power of sustained and accurate thinking; and by the constant use of his pen he early became master of a style whose point and lucidity are unrivalled among logical and metaphysical writers. But with these advantages there came also a most serious drawback. The training intentionally left one side of his nature untouched. It ignored all culture of the imagination, the emotions, or the sympathies. Of the tender associations, the sweet charities that cluster about the thought of home, this young philosopher knew nothing. He cannot bring himself to say that he loved his father, and of his mother he makes no mention whatever. Nor was the solitude of his early life broken by the cheerful intercourse of school. Indeed, he was carefully kept apart from all his contemporaries lest he should be corrupted by their prejudices or their example, insomuch that he was not himself aware that his own education and acquirements were not those of any other boy of his age. As this education, especially with respect to religion, has an important bearing on the life and work of this so justly celebrated man, we quote here at length from his Autobiography:

“I was brought up from the first without any religious belief, in the ordinary acceptation of the term. My father, educated in the creed of Scotch Presbyterianism, had by his own studies and reflections been early led to reject not only the belief in revelation, but also the foundations of what is commonly called Natural Religion... Finding no halting-place in deism, he remained in a state of perplexity until, doubtless after many struggles, he yielded to the conviction that concerning the origin of things nothing whatever can be known. This is the only correct statement of his opinion, for dogmatic  atheism he looked upon as absurd; as most of those whom the world has considered atheists have always done. These particulars are important, because they show that my father's rejection of all that is called religious belief was not, as many might suppose, primarily a matter of logic and evidence: the grounds of it were moral still more than intellectual. He found it impossible to believe that a world so full of evil was the work of an Author combining infinite power with perfect wisdom and righteousness . . .

His aversion to religion, in the sense usually attached to the term, was of the same kind with that of Lucretius he regarded it with the feelings due not to a mere mental decision, but to a great moral evil. He looked upon it as the greatest enemy of morality: first, by setting up fictitious excellences, belief in creeds, devotional feelings, and ceremonies, not connected with the good of the human race-and causing them to be accepted as substitutes for genuine virtues; but, above all, by radically vitiating the standard of morals, making it consist in doing the will of a being on whom it lavishes all the phrases on adulation, but whom in sober truth it depicts as eminently hateful. I have a hundred times heard him say that all ages and nations have represented their gods as wicked in a constantly increasing progression; that mankind have gone on adding trait after trait till they reached the most perfect conception of wickedness which the human mind cant devise, and have called this God, and prostrated themselves before it. This ne plus ultra of wickedness he considered to be embodied in what is commonly presented to mankind as the creed of Christianity. Think (he used to say) of a being who would make a hell who would create the human race with the infallible fore knowledge, and therefore with the intention, that the great majority of them were to be consigned to horrible and everlasting torment!”

It does not seem to have occurred to James Mill to inquire whether what was presented as the creed of Christianity by the Kirk and its divines really was the only lesson to be learned from the religion of the Gospel and the idea of God. But, holding this entirely negative belief, essentially and directly, as was well said by Browne before the Christian Evidence Society, because he did not admit the freedom of the will, he based the education of his son upon it. Hence we are not astonished when a little after the passage quoted above we find John Stuart Mill writing: duty to allow me to acquire impressions contrary to his convictions and feelings respecting religion; and he impressed upon me from the first that the manner in which the world came into existence was a subject on which nothing was known; that the question, ‘Who made me?' cannot be answered, because we have no experience or authentic information from which to answer it; and that any answer only throws the difficulty a step further back, since the question immediately presents itself, ‘Who made God?”'

That is to say, because he could not solve the problem of the origin of evil, he took refuge in a cheerless nescience, and denied the possibility of knowing anything relative to the origin or the destiny of mankind, denied the authority of conscience, and substituted the principle of utility for any intuitive standard of right and wrong. In his own life this dismal philosophy had already borne its bitter fruit, and his son writes that

“He deemed very few pleasures worth the price paid for them; he thought human life a poor thing after the freshness of youth and of unsatisfied curiosity had gone by. He would sometimes say that if life were made what it night be by good government and good education, it would be worth having; but he never spoke with any enthusiasm even of that possibility. He used to say he had never known a happy old man, except those who were able to live over again .in the pleasures of the young.”

At first young Mill accepted without hesitation the leading ideas of his father, and of the circle of his father's friends, among whom were chief the philosopher Bentham (q.v.) and the political economist Ricardo. They had many projects on foot for the improvement of mankind, and the youthful and inexperienced Mill entered into their plans with the zeal becoming his age and wisdom; indeed, he believed he had a call “to be a reformer of mankind,” and felt as if all his earthly happiness hung upon this design. His studies were directed to this end, and he began when only sixteen to employ his pen in the work. The enthusiasm lasted until his twentieth year. He was in the midst of eager discussion, he had already made himself a reputation in the new Westminster Review, and was hard at work upon his edition of Judicial Evidence, when he stopped to ask himself this question, “Suppose that all your objects in life were realized, that all the changes in institutions and opinions which you are looking forward to could be happiness to you?” He got the inevitable answer, “No.” In an hour the light faded out of all his visions. His labor had lost its motive and its charm. He had nothing, he thought, to live for; and he sank into a dull and dreary melancholy. He had heretofore made happiness the end of existence, and the test of all right action; but he now found it impossible, in his own experience, to realize that end or apply that test, because he was forced to. confess that no action, however apparently successful, was competent to bring him happiness. His philosophy of life had broken down under him. It was evidently necessary to reconstruct it; and as the six months' melancholy wore away he elaborated his new theory. He still considered happiness the end of life, but “thought this end only to be attained by not making it the direct end. Ask yourself whether you are happy, and you cease to be so, The only chance is to treat, not happiness, but some end external to it, as the purpose of life.” These utilitarian doctrines became the life of his theory of morals, and the principles in his expansion of the Benthamite formulas. They are, it must be confessed, “the least earthy forms of this earthy philosophy,” and yet how very far from the Christian doctrine of duty and of right is any such theory of morals as this! Still, had he but followed the free and uncontrollable bent of his philosophical growth from this point in his life, or had he fallen into hands other than those which subsequently enchained him, we think that he might have arrived at far higher and more sound results in moral and metaphysical science than he ever attained to. For it may be here remarked that one of the distinctive peculiarities of Mill was what, for want of a simpler term, must be called his receptivity. Seldom has so powerful a thinker been so subject to the unconscious influence of others; but in him sympathy was more powerful than individuality — he had more of the feminine principle that receives than the masculine power which imparts an impression. Hence through life, whenever his sympathies and affections were excited, his opinions followed.

In 1820 John was first suffered to pass beyond the narrow limit of his father's study, and he was sent for a year to France, where he studied some of the sciences and the higher mathematics. On his return he continued his philosophical studies, and in the winter of 1822-23 had the pleasure of starting a “Utilitarian Society,” where he enjoyed discussions upon some of the heaviest metaphysical topics that occupied the British mind. and he himself tells us that he always dated from them his own “real inauguration  as an original and independent thinker.” He also obtained valuable instructions from the “Co-operative Society,” composed of the disciples of Owen, the Communist, with ‘whom Mill and a few other political economists, sworn enemies of Communism, had discussions in order to “settle” the question whether the Owenites had any right to exist. The result was the formation of a “Speculative Society,” composed of a body of young men who became almost as famous as Mill — Macaulay, Thirlwall, Wilberforce, and the Bulwers, among others, were of that circle. In May 1823, his father procured for him employment in the East India Company, which he himself was serving, and John was thus afforded the necessary competency for the continuation of his literary labors, besides enjoying that training in accurate and perspicuous writing for which he afterwards became noted. There can be no doubt that his work in the India House was of great value to him. It considerably enlarged his knowledge of social and political subjects, and in a more direct and human way than by the study of books. He was led to study mind in the concrete. His despatches had to pass the scrutiny of the directors; then they were to be read and acted on by men living on the other side of the world — both of which facts led him to choose not only the strongest arguments, but the strongest way of putting them. Mr. W.T. Thornton, his colleague, thus describes the vast amount of his work in that relation:

“In 1828 he was promoted to be assistant examiner, ind in 1856 he succeeded to the post of chief examiner, after which his duty consisted rather in supervising what his assistants had written than in writing himself; but for the three-and-twenty years preceding he had had immediate charge of the political department, and had written almost every ‘political' despatch of any importance that conveyed the instructions of the merchant princes of Leadenhall Street to their pro-consuls in Asia. Of the quality of these documents it is sufficient to say that they were John Mill's; but in respect to their quantity, it may be worth mentioning that a descriptive catalogue of them completely fills a small quarto volume of between 300 and 400 pages, in their author's handwriting, which now lies before me; also that the share of the Court of Directors in the correspondence between themselves and the Indian government used to average annually about ten huge vellum-bound volumes, foolscap size, and five or six inches thick, and that of these volumes, two a year, for more than twenty years  running, were exclusively of Mill's composition: this, too, at times when he was engaged upon such voluntary work in addition as his Logic and Political Economy” (Memorial, page 31).

Mill remained with the East India Company until its extinction in 1858. In 1865 he was elected to Parliament, and acted with the advanced liberals, but lost his seat in 1868. In 1867 he was chosen rector of St. Andrew's University, Edinburgh. In 1869 his wife, whom he adored, died, and in order to be ever near her grave he removed to Avignon, France, and there spent the remainder of his life. He died May 9, 1873.

While yet a youth we have seen Mill a writer of various essays. They were of such a bold and thoughtful character as to secure him even then a prominent place in the Edinburgh and Westminster Reviews, and from 1834 to 1840 he was editor in chief of the latter. In 1827 he was intrusted with the editorship of Bentham's Rationale of Judicial Evidence. But his great production he brought out when he was thirty-eight years old, and at once secured by the System of Logic, Ratiocinative and Inductive (Lond. 1843, 2 volumes, 8vo; republished, N.Y., Harpers, 1864, from the 8th ed.), a worldwide reputation. It is a perfect exhibit of his philosophy, notwithstanding his claim that he seeks simply to discover and expound the proper method of investigating truth, without pledging himself to any system of speculative philosophy. “There are so many points of a speculative nature touched upon, all in the spirit of the Analysis, that he must necessarily be regarded as a partisan of the modern Lockian school of metaphysics” (Morell, page 252). Mill has developed in his Logic the deductive principle and its application to logic as a science, and thus has lent special value to his work. The last hundred pages are taken up with what the author calls “the logic of the moral sciences.” Here, as he tells us, he makes “an attempt to contribute towards the solution of a question which the decay of old opinions, and the agitation which disturbs European society to its inmost depths, render as important in the present day to the practical interests of human life as it must at all times be to the completeness of our speculative knowledge, viz. whether moral and social phenomena are really exceptions to the general certainty and uniformity of the course of nature, and how far the methods by which so many of the laws of the physical world have been numbered among truths irrevocably acquired and universally assented to can be made instrumental to the formation of a similar body of received doctrine in moral and political science.” The Logic, together with an Examination of Sir William  Hamilton's Philosophy (1865), and his editorial corrections and comments on his father's Analysis of the Human Mind, constitute John Stuart Mill's philosophical works. From these it is apparent that, as Dr. Porter says (in Ueberweg's Hist. of Philos. 2:427-429),

“The physiological foundation on which he builds is the system of James Mill, modified by that of Dr. Thomas Brown. He carefully insists, however, that he neither accepts nor inculcates any system of metaphysics. But the system of metaphysics which he usually applies is substantially that of Hobbes, Hume, and Comte. He does not rigidly adhere, however, either to the psychology or to the philosophy which characterizes or controls his conclusions. He differs from his father in holding the act of belief to be something more than an inseparable association of one object with another (compare James Mill's Analysis, 2d edition, chapter 11 note); that causation is a term which it is indispensable we should use in our analysis of the conceptions of matter and mind; and that certain axioms are the necessary foundations of mathematical and physical sciences, but are themselves the products of induction (comp. Logic, passim). After a long and laborious analysis, he reaches the conclusion that matter must be defined as ‘a permanent possibility of sensation,' and that ‘mind is resolved into a series of feelings, with a background of possibilities of feeling.' He concedes that in adhering to this definition ‘we are reduced to the alternative of believing that the mind, or ego, is something different from any series of feelings or possibilities of them, or else of accepting the paradox that something which, ex hypothesi, is but a series of feelings can be aware of itself as am series.' In respect to the belief in the real existence of the external world, he concedes that it cannot be proved philosophically, and can only be justified by the consideration that ‘the world of possible sensations, succeeding one another according to laws, is as much in other beings as it is in me; it has therefore an existence outside me; it is an external world' (comp. Exam. of Sir W. Hamilton's Philosophy, chapter 11:12, 13).” Mill's posthumous publications — Three Essays on Religion; Nature; The Utility of Religion (Lond. and N.Y. 1874, 8vo) — teach more clearly, however, than the preceding works that he believed very positively in matter and very hesitatingly in spirit; very strongly in man and very feebly in God; very earnestly in human government and social organization, and not at all in divine providence. Indeed, “the perfectibility of man through an enlightened self-interest — by means of popular government and universal education, especially in the elements of political economy and  the Malthusian doctrines of population — was the chief article of his philosophical creed” (Dr. Porter, in Internat. Rev. N.Y. 1874, May-June, part 6). For further particulars, we refer our readers to Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, 2:1280; see also Edinb. Rev. July 1866, art. 4; January 1874, art. 4; January 1875, art. 1; Brit. Qut. Rev. July 1868, art. 1; January 1874, art. 9; New-Englander, October 1874, art. 1; Westminster Rev. January 1875, art. 1; Christian Qu. April 1874, art. 1; Masson, Recent Brit. Philos. (N.Y. 1866, 12mo), especially pages 245-335; Porter, Human Intellect (see Index) John Stuart Mill, his Life and Works (1873), twelve sketches by J.R. Fox Bourne, W.T. Thornton, Herbert Spencer, and others (reprinted in Popular Science Monthly, July 1873, art. 12; and the Autobiography (Lond. and N.Y. 1873, 8vo).

## Mill, John, D.D[[@Headword:Mill, John, D.D]]

             a very learned English divine and Biblical critic, was born at Shapp, Westmoreland, in 1645. In 1661 he became a servitor in Queen's College, Oxford, where he secured the master of arts in 1669. He was afterwards elected a fellow, and became eminent as a tutor. Having entered into orders, he was greatly admired for his pulpit eloquence. In 1676 he became chaplain to the bishop of Oxford. In 1680 he received from his college the living of Bletchingdon, in Oxfordshire, and in the year following received the degree of D.D., and became chaplain in ordinary to Charles II. In 1685 he was elected principal of St. Edmund's Hall, Oxford, and in 1704 was appointed prebendary of Canterbury. He died in 1708. He is famous for having devoted the labor of thirty years to the preparation of a new edition of the Greek Testament, finishing it only fourteen days before his death. It appeared under the title of ῾Η Καινὴ Διαθήκη, Novum Testamentum Graecum, cum Lectionibus Variantibus MSS. Exemplarium, Versionum, Editionum, SS. Patrum et Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum, et in easdem notis; Studio et labore Joannis Millii, S.T.P. Oxonii, e Theatre Sheldoniano (1707, fol.). The various readings are reckoned at about 30,000, the text being that of Robert Stephens's edition of 1550. The collection of such a mass of various readings, instead of supplying arms for infidelity, as some seem to have feared, has served to place the uncorrupted integrity of the Scriptures in a stronger light than ever. Dr. Whitby (q.v.) attacked the work in his Examen variantum lectionum Joh. Millii (1710), but Dr. Bentley (q.v.), under the signature of Phileleutheros Lipsiensis, ably vindicated the labors of Mill; and Michaelis, Marsh, Harewood, and critical scholars generally, attest the great value of his edition. It has been aptly remarked that “the infancy of criticism ends with the edition of Gregory, and the age of manhood commences with that of Mill.” Mill's edition ranks next to that of Wetstein in importance and utility, its prolegomena being beyond price. See Marsh, Divinity Lectures, 7:9, 10, 13; Wood, Athen. Oxon.; Jones, Christ. Biography, s.v. ; Brit. and For. Rev. 1871, February, art. 8; Lond. Qu. Rev. July 1871; Blackwood's Mag. 28:443; Chambers, Cyclop. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, 2:1279 sq.; Home, Bibl. Bib. (1839), page 16; Orme, Bibl. Bib. s.v. SEE CRITICISM.

## Mill, William Hodge, D.D[[@Headword:Mill, William Hodge, D.D]]

             an eminent English divine, was born at Cambridge in 1791. He was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, and was ordained deacon in l1817, and priest in 1820. Immediately after his ordination he was appointed principal of Bishop's College, Calcutta, which position he held till 1838, when he was obliged to return to England in consequence of impaired health. In the year following he was appointed domestic and examining chaplain to archbishop Howley, and in 1840 was elected Christian advocate in the University of Cambridge. In 1843 he was presented to the living of Brasted, Kent, and in 1848 was chosen regius professor of Hebrew at Cambridge, and canon of Ely. His profound learning in mathematics, languages, and other branches of intellectual research, gained him a deservedly high reputation at home and abroad. His great work, Christii Sangita, or the Sacred History of Jesus, in Sanskrit, rendered him famous as a thorough Oriental philologist. He died December 25, 1853. Dr. Mill was a prolific author, and of his numerous works we mention only the most important: Observations on the attempted Application of Pantheistic Principles to the Theory and Historic Criticism of the Gospel (Camb. 1840-44; 5 div. 8vo; 2d ed. 1855, 8vo): — Prelectio theologica (1843): — On the Temptation of Christ (1844): — On the Nature of Christianity (1848): — Lectures on the Catechism, ed. by the Reverend B. Webb (1856). See Cooper, Biog. Dict. page 866; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, 2:1281.

## Millan, Saint[[@Headword:Millan, Saint]]

             SEE EMILIAUS.

## Milledoler, Philip, D.D[[@Headword:Milledoler, Philip, D.D]]

             a noted American divine, was born at Rhinebeck, N.Y., September 22, 1775. His parents were Swiss Germans, who emigrated to America from the canton of Berne about the middle of the last century. Philip was converted in very early youth; was educated at Columbia College; and at nineteen years of age was licensed to preach the Gospel, and became pastor of the German Reformed Church in Nassau Street, New York, succeeding the Reverend Dr. Gross, his pastor and theological professor. He preached there in both German and English from 1795 to 1800. His reputation for unction and eloquence drew large audiences; he became generally known, and in 1800 was called to the Third Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia. He accepted the offer, and, removing to the city of brotherly love. labored there for five years with great success, large additions being made to the communion of the Church. In 1805 he accepted a unanimous call as first pastor of the Rutgers Street Presbyterian Church, New York, and remained there until 1813, when he transferred his relation to the Reformed Church, and became one of the pastors of the Collegiate Church of that city. In 1825 he was elected professor of didactic and polemic theology by the General Synod of the Reformed Church, to succeed the venerable Dr. John H. Livingston. At the same time he was appointed president of Rutgers College, and professor of moral philosophy. These offices he accepted and held until 1841, when he resigned, and retired to private life at New Brunswick. He died, full of years, labors, and honors, September 22, 1852.

His wife died the next day, and both were buried in the same grave, with a common funeral service. Dr. Milledoler's professional career was marked by diligent and faithful services, by great dignity of character and kind demeanor towards his students, and by a saintly piety which shone through all his life. His gentleness of heart perhaps diminished his ability as a disciplinarian, and unfitted him to cope successfully with the difficulties of his double office. His forte was in the pulpit. His whole ministry in New York was remarkable for the constant divine blessing that followed his labors. In prayer he seemed almost like a man inspired. His use of scriptural language at the throne of grace was most wonderful, and it was woven together with a skill and power that were only to be accounted for by the influence of the Holy Spirit upon his suppliant soul. This fervor and unction in prayer characterized him till the very close of life. His preaching partook of much of the same elevated and tender spirit. His sermons were clear, earnest, solemn, and impressive. His  sentences were short, often highly rhetorical in structure and always pregnant with Gospel truth. As a pastor and in the sick-room, he was not surpassed. But in nothing did he so soar heavenward, and seem so full of divine power, as in public prayer. A number of powerful revivals of religion occurred under his ministry. Dr. Milledoler declined several pressing offers of high positions in the Church. In 1823, with Dr. Gardner Spring, he visited, as commissioner of the General Assembly, the missions among the Tuscarora, Seneca, and Cattaraugus Indians. In the great benevolent movements of his time he was an earnest actor. He was moderator of the Presbyterian General Assembly in 1808, and president of the General Synod of the Reformed Church in 1823, and was one of the members of the convention that formed the American Bible Society in 1816. He helped to organize and was the first president of the Society for Evangelizing the Jews, and an active original member and corresponding secretary of the United Foreign Missionary Society formed in 1817. He published a number of sermons, public addresses, and other pamphlets. ‘In his old age Dr. Milledoler was most venerable in appearance; elegant in manners, and saintlike in spirit. His snow-white hair, and almost ruddy complexion, and scrupulous neatness in dress, his unfailing courtesy and radiant goodness, stamped him not merely as a Christian gentleman of the old school, but as one who lived for two worlds, blessing this one and waiting for the glory of the next. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, volume 9; Corwin's Manual of the Ref. Church, s.v. (W.J.R.T.)

## Millenarians (or Chiliasts)[[@Headword:Millenarians (or Chiliasts)]]

             a name given to those who believe that the saints will reign on earth with Christ a thousand years. SEE MILLENNIUM.

## Millenary Petition[[@Headword:Millenary Petition]]

             is the name of the paper which was presented to king James VI of Scotland (James I of England), as he passed through England on his way to London, by the Puritans. It contained a petition signed by nearly a thousand ministers, and hence the name Millenarian. It prayed for such changes or alterations in ceremonial as the Puritans had generally contended for. An answer to it was published by the University of Oxford, and the divines of Cambridge thanked their Oxonian brethren. The conference at Hampton Court, however, was the result of the famous petition. See Fisher, Hist. of  the Reformation, page 434; Neale, Hist. of the Puritans (Harper's edition), 1:228; Fuller, Church History, book 10, page 21. SEE PURITANS.

## Millennial Association, American [[@Headword:Millennial Association, American ]]

             SEE ADVENTISTS, EVANGELICAL.

## Millennium[[@Headword:Millennium]]

             This term signifies a period of a thousand years, and in its religious use is applied to the prophetic era mentioned in Rev 20:1-7. The Millenarians or Chiliasts, in ancient and modern times, are characterized by their tenet respecting the second advent of Jesus, which they believe will be accompanied by the resurrection of the martyrs and saints, who will reign with him on earth, in a state of blessedness and rest, for a thousand years, when the resurrection of the wicked will occur, together with the final judgment and its eternal awards. They have differed somewhat among themselves concerning the character of this millennial kingdom, some viewing it as more and some as less spiritual in its nature, employments, and joys. They have also differed in other minor particulars; but in the main opinion relative to the advent, the first resurrection, and the temporal reign of Christ, the various classes of Millenarians are agreed. This doctrine is generally attributed to a Jewish origin. Josephus (Ant. 18:1, 3) says of the Pharisees that they hold to the confinement of the souls of the wicked in an everlasting prison, but that the righteous “have power to revive and live again.” In a second passage (War, 2:8, 14) he describes the Pharisaic doctrine in a similar manner, for it is not probable that, in this last place, he intends to ascribe to the Pharisees a doctrine of transmigration. In the Book of Daniel (Dan 12:2) it is declared that both the righteous and wicked will be raised from the grave, although it is no certain whether the sacred writer at the moment has in mind the whole human race or only Israel. The New Testament teaches us that both the righteous and the wicked will be raised from the dead (Joh 5:28-29; Act 24:15; Rev 20:11-15). The passages on this topic in the writings of Paul pertain chiefly to the consequences of redemption, and hence relate to the resurrection of believers. The idea of a resurrection of the saints, and of their participation in a temporal, millennial reign of Christ, was early adopted, especially by Jewish Christians. In the Epistle of Barnabas (cir. 100) we find the rest of the seventh day (Gen 2:2-3) symbolically interpreted, with the aid of Psa 90:4, and made to prefigure a rest of Christ and his saints, to continue for a thousand years (chapter 15).

The millennial theory was embraced in a sensuous form by Cerinthus (Eusebius, Hist. Ecl. 3:28; 7:25). It is found in apocryphal books by Jews and Jewish Christians in the first age of the Gospel — in the Book of Enoch, in the  Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, and in the Sibylline Books. It penetrated into the Gentile branch of the Church, and spread extensively. Papias, who is supposed to have been a contemporary of John the Apostle, is mentioned by Irenaeus and Eusebius as an adherent of this doctrine. The colossal grapes which Papias supposed that the millennial days would provide suggest the idea which he entertained of this happy period. It is true that the Chiliastic doctrine wears a Judaic stamp, and arose, in some degree, from Judaic influences; but, as Dorner has observed, there is one marked distinction between the millenarian views of Christians and all Jewish theories of the Messianic kingdom. Christian millenarians unanimously considered the earthly kingdom as limited in its duration, and as introductory to a spiritual and eternal state of being. The triumph of the Gospel through the agency of a present Redeemer was to be attended with the renovation of the earth, and to be succeeded by the everlasting, heavenly blessedness of the righteous, the proper sequel of the last judgment. Tracing down the history of the doctrine, we find that Justin Martyr (cir. 150) received it. In the dialogue with Trypho (c. 80), he says that he himself and many others” hold that Jerusalem will be built again as a residence for Christ, with the patriarchs and saints. He says that there are “many of a pure and devout Christian mind who are not of the same opinion;” but he adds, “I, and all other Christians whose belief is in every respect correct, know that there will be both a resurrection of the flesh and a thousand years in Jerusalem, which will then be rebuilt, adorned, and enlarged, as the prophets Ezekiel, Isaiah, and others declare.” Justin quotes in support of his opinion Isa 65:17 sq.; Gen 2:2, in connection with Psa 90:3; Rev 20:4-6, and other passages. Ireneus is likewise a millenarian. He speaks (Adv. Haer. V, 33:2) of “the times of the kingdom,” when the “righteous shall bear rule upon their rising from the dead; when also the creation, having been renovated and set free, shall fructify with an abundance of all kinds of food, from the dew of heaven and from the fertility of the earth.” Here follows the citation from Papias in regard to the colossal fruit of the vine. Tertullian advocated the same doctrine. Notwithstanding the extensive spreading of the millenarian tenet, it would be a rash inference to assume that it was universal, or accepted as the creed of the Church. On this point Neander has good observations (Ch. Hist., Torrey's transl., 1:651).

The first decided opponent of whom we have a knowledge was Caius, the Roman presbyter, about the year 200. The crass form in which Chiliasm entered into the heresy of Montanism contributed materially to the strengthening of the antagonism to millenarian  views. The Alexandrian school opposed them with energy, particularly Origen, with whose peculiar opinions it was inconsistent. Nepos, an Egyptian bishop, about the middle of the 3d century wrote, in defence of the doctrine, a work entitled A Confutation of the Alegorists, by which name were designated such as explained allegorically the passages on which the opinion of a millennium rested. This work, which acquired much reputation, was refuted with equal zeal and candor by Dionysius of Alexandria. It was still common, however, in the time of Jerome, who himself was one of its opponents. But gradually the tenet which had so widely prevailed became obnoxious and proscribed. One great reason of this remarkable change of sentiment is to be found in the altered condition and prospects of the Church. Christians at first yearned for the reappearance of the Lord. Moreover, it was impossible for them to raise their faith and hopes so high as to expect the conquest of the Roman empire by the moral power of the cross, independently of the personal and supernatural interposition of Christ. But as the Gospel made progress, the possibility and probability of a peaceful victory of the Christian cause over all its adversaries, by the might of truth and of the Spirit, gained a lodgment in the convictions of good men. It is believed that Origen (b. 180, d. 254) is the first of the ancient ecclesiastical writers to affirm the practicableness of such a triumph of the Gospel through its own inherent efficacy. The Judaic and Judaizing associations of the millenarian opinion were not without a strong influence in rendering it suspected and unpopular. Augustine's treatment of the subject marks an epoch. He says (De Civitate Dei, 20:7) that he had once held to a millenarian Sabbath; nor does he consider the doctrine objectionable, provided the joys of the righteous are figured as spiritual. But, proceeding to discuss the subject, he advocates the proposition that the earthly kingdom of Christ is the Church, which was even then in the millennial era, and on the road to a glorious ascendency over all its enemies. It would seem that this modified interpretation of prophecy, sustained as it was by the authority of the principal Latin father, gave color to the mediaeval speculations on this subject. As the year of our Lord 1000 approached, it was a natural corollary that the judgment and the end of the world would then occur. Hence there was a widespread excitement throughout Western Europe, from the apprehension that the “dies irae” was at hand. There were not wanting in the Middle Ages “apocalyptic parties” — enthusiasts, whether individuals or in bands — who looked for the miraculous advent of Jesus as the indispensable means of purifying and extending the Church.  At the Reformation, the traditional method of interpreting the Book of Revelation was abandoned. The papacy was extensively regarded as Antichrist, and Luther and other leading Reformers frequently supposed themselves authorized by the signs of the times to expect the speedy coming of the Lord. A fanatical form of millenarianism was espoused by the Anabaptists of Germany, who took possession of the city of Meunster, and set up the reign of the saints.

The millenarian doctrine, in its essential characteristics, has had adherents among some of the sober-minded theologians of the Lutheran Church in later times. Of these, one of the most distinguished is John Albert Bengel, the author of the Gnomon, who defended his opinion in his commentary on the Apocalypse, published in 1740. He was followed by other divines of repute; and the doctrine has not been without prominent supporters among the Lutherans down to the present time. One of the latest of their number who has discussed this question is the Reverend A. Koch (Das tausendjahrige Reich, Basle, 1872). This writer endeavors, in particular, to refute the arguments adduced against the doctrine of a millennium by the German commentators Hengstenberg, Keil, and Kliefoth.

In all the other various orthodox Protestant bodies there are many who believe in the personal advent of Christ for the purpose of establishing a millennial kingdom. Now, as in former ages, the literal restoration of the Jews to Palestine, and their conversion to Christianity, is frequently a part of this creed. The coming of Christ in visible glory is to be signalized, it is held, by this among other wonderful events. The Chiliastic tenet forms one of the distinguishing features of the “Catholic Apostolic Church,” or the religious denomination commonly known as Irvingites. ( SEE CATHOLIC APOSTOLIC CHURCH, and SEE IRVING, EDWARD, in this Cyclopedia.) Christ is to come and gather his elect together; the Jews are to be brought back to their ancient land; the Gospel is to be extended by their instrumentality, and by the new agencies connected with the personal presence of the Lord, over the earth. Then is to follow the judgment and the end of the world. Such are the main points of the millenarian view, as cherished by the followers of Mr. Irving.

In the course of the history of the Church many sects have arisen by whom the speedy coming of Christ to set up a visible empire has been proclaimed. One of these is the class designated as “Millerites” (q.v.), the disciples of William Miller (q.v.). He was born in Pittsfield, Mass., in i781, and died in  1849. With slender resources of learning, he began, about the year 1833, to preach on the subject of the second advent, which he declared, on the ground of his interpretation of the prophecies, to be near at hand. The Millerites at length went so far as to fix a certain day in the year 1843 when the Lord was to appear in the clouds of heaven. Some gave up their ordinary occupations, and prepared robes in which to ascend and meet Christ. Subsequently the members of this sect — if sect it is to be called — ceased to define the precise time of the miraculous advent, but continued to wait for it as near. SEE ADVENTISTS. The Millerites, in common with many other Chiliasts, have supposed themselves to be furnished by the prophecies with the means of calculating with mathematical accuracy the time of the Saviour's glorious advent.

When we leave the history of the doctrine, and look at the exegetical arguments of the several parties, it becomes plain that they are guided by diverse principles of interpretation. With respect to certain passages, millenarians adopt a second sense, or a figurative, tropical interpretation. This is the character of their view of the sabbatical rest, as predicted in Gen 2:2-3, and Psa 90:4. On the contrary, to the passages in Isaiah and other prophets which describe Jerusalem as the centre and resort of worshippers of all nations, promise Canaan as an everlasting possession to the Jews, and depict their splendid restoration to power and plenty, they give a literal interpretation. The same course is pursued by them with regard to Revelation 20 and with regard to all that is said of the first and the second resurrection. They attach often a literal sense to the declaration of Jesus (Mat 26:29; Mar 14:25) in which he speaks of drinking new wine in his Father's kingdom. They consider their general view to be favored by Luk 14:14 (“the resurrection of the just”); Luk 20:35 (“they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection of the dead”); by Joh 6:39; Joh 6:44 (which speaks of the resurrection of believers, without any mention of others). The promise of Christ that the disciples at “the regeneration” — or the restitution of all things, and the deliverance of all things from corruption — shall sit on thrones, judging the tribes of Israel (Mat 19:28), is confidently referred to as proving the millenarian hypothesis. So the statements of John and Paul with respect to Antichrist, and the sins and perils to immediately precede the advent — corroborated, as they suppose, by the Savior's own predictions in Matthew 24, 25, and the parallel passages are brought forward in defence of their position.  The opponents of the millenarians rely principally upon the passages in which the resurrection of the good and evil is spoken of as if it were simultaneous, or without any considerable interval of time interposed. They appeal also to the passages in the Gospels and Epistles in which the general judgment is connected immediately with the second advent. Their conception of the prospects and destiny of the kingdom of Christ are derived from passages like the parables of the leaven, of the mustard-seed, and of the husbandman. That it was expedient for Christ to go away from his disciples in order that his visible presence might give way to his invisible presence and influence everywhere, and to the dispensation of the Spirit, is considered an argument against the general philosophy on which the millenarian tenet rests. It is thought to be more consonant with the genius of Christianity, as contrasted with the Jewish economy, to look for a triumph of the Gospel in the earth by moral forces and by the agency of the Holy Spirit within the souls of men, than to expect the stupendous miracle of Christ's reappearance as a Ruler on this globe, for the spiritual subjugation of unbelievers and enemies. Hence those who reject Chiliasm give a figurative rendering to the prophetic passages in the Apocalypse which are the most plausible argument for that theory. The tendency of the millenarian theory to chill the hopes, and thus repress the missionary activity of Christians, by exhibiting the world as in a process of deterioration, and by representing the efforts of Christians to convert mankind as fruitless, until the coming of Christ, constitutes not the least serious objection to such opinions.

There is in England at the present time an energetic propaganda of millenarian notions, called the “Prophecy Investigation Society,” which consists of fifty members, some of them prominent Churchmen, and which has published a series of volumes on prophetic subjects, adding largely to apocalyptic literature. There are also numerous journals published in England to support these views. The most important is the Quarterly Journal of Prophecy, edited by Dr. Bonar, of the Free Church of Scotland, which has been established fourteen years, and has a large circulation. The Rainbow is a monthly periodical; the Christian Observer, the monthly journal of the evangelicals, often displays millenarian tendencies. There are, besides, numerous weeklies of small circulation, the chief being the Revivalist, originally established to promote revivals in personal religion, but now devoted to the spread of millenarian views. Nor is the interest in this subject confined to Dissenters in England or Scotland; a certain class  of minds in the Established Church seem to be just as strongly contaminated. For many successive years, during Lent, courses of lectures have been delivered in St. George's Church, Bloomsbury, on the subject of the second advent, by clergymen of the Church of England. The course for the year 1849 was printed, under the title of The Priest upon his Throne, being lectures by twelve clergymen of the Church of England, with a Preface by the Reverend James Haldane Stewart, M.A., rector of Limpsfield (Lond. 1849). This is, next to Dr. Brown's Second Coming of our Lord, the ablest book against the millenarian doctrine. One of the latest productions in English is The End of all Things, or the Coming of Christ, by an anonymous author, a clergyman of the Church of England. It is an argument against millenarianism, and is interesting for its sketch of the rise of the doctrine with the well-meaning but weak-minded Papias, and its progress through all the sects and shades of belief, until “more than half of the evangelical clergy of the Church of England are at this moment millenarians.”

Among the most important writings on the millennium are Corrodi, Krit. Gesch. d. Chiliasmus (Frankfort, 1871); Dorner, Gesch. d. Person Christi, vol. i; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. art. Chiliasmus. See also the exegetical criticism in Rothe's Dognzatik, part 2, section 2. Most of the recent treatises on doctrinal theology — for example, that of Gass, Dogmengeschichte, 2:477 sq.; and the able work by Dr. Hodge — contain discussions of this subject. Among the special writers on the subject may be consulted, on the millenarian side, Mede, Abbadie, Beverley, Burnet, Hartley, Price, Frere, Irving, Birks, Bickersteth, Brooks, the duke of Manchester, Begg, Burgh, Greswell, Gilfillan, Bonar, Elliot, Homes, Burchell, Wood, Tyso, Molyneux, etc.; and on the other side, bishop Hall, R. Baxter, Gipps, Dr. David Brown. Waldegrave, Fairbairn, Urwick, Bush, and many others. Floerke (evangelical pastor in Libz), Die Lehre von tausendjahrigen Reiche. Ein theologischer Versuch. (Marburg, 1859, 8vo); Volck, Der Chiliasmus seiner neuesten Bekampfung gegenuber, eine historisch-exegetische Studie (Dorpat, 1869, 8vo); Carson, The Personal Reign of Christ during the Millennium proved to be impossible (1873,12mo); Second Adventism in the Light of Jewish History, by the Reverend T.M. Hopkins, edited by Joseph R. Boyd, D.D. (N.Y. 1873, 12mo). The following periadicals may be consulted to advantage: Church of England Rev. 1854, October page 443; Lond. Rev. No. 10, art. 9; Meth. Qu. Rev. 1845; January art. 5 and 7; 1850, July, page 485; 1851, April,  page 325; 1868, October page 615; Kitto, Journal of Sacred Literature, 1854, July, page 505; October page 19 sq.; 1856, January page 467; Amer. Presb. Rev. 1861, April, page 403; 1864, April, page 177 sq.; July, page 411; 1865, April, page 195; Princet. Rev. 1867, January page 160; Evangel. Qu. Rev. 1861, January, art. 2; 1868, July, p. 337; Theological. Medium (Cumberland Presb. Church), 1873, April, art. 9; Bibliotheca Sacra, 1873, January art. 4; Qu. Rev. Evang. Luth. Church, 1873, Jan. art. 2. (G.P.F.)

## Miller, Armistead[[@Headword:Miller, Armistead]]

             a Presbyterian missionary of African parentage, was born in North Carolina about 1830. as a slave, but was liberated and went to Africa when a boy; was educated in the Alexander High School, Liberia, and afterwards returned to America, and received a theological training in the Ashmun Institute, Oxford, Pa. In 1859 he was licensed and ordained by New Castle Presbytery, and soon afterwards went to Africa, and became pastor of Mount Coffee Church, Liberia, where he died, January 15, 1865. — Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, page 131.

## Miller, Charles W[[@Headword:Miller, Charles W]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Wayne County, Ind., in 1820. He entered the ministry in 1840, and, continued faithful in the prosecution and studies of the work. When failing health obliged him to seek the climate of the Rocky Mountains, he went to Colorado as a laborer for the Church of which he was a member, and acceptedly applied himself to his task. He died in Colorado City, Colorado, April 8, 1872, universally deplored, and long to be remembered for his great activity. Three thousand persons are said to have been converted under his preaching. See F.H. Sutherland, in the Central Christian Advocate (M.E. Ch., South), May 1, 1872.

## Miller, Charles W., D.D[[@Headword:Miller, Charles W., D.D]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Mercer County, Kentucky, June 22, 1837. In 1857 he entered the Kentucky Conference, in which, with the exception of a short time as chaplain in the Southern army, he continued to preach efficiently until attacked by disease, in 1882. He died January 10, 1885. See Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M.E. Church South, 1885, page 14.

## Miller, Christian Gottfried[[@Headword:Miller, Christian Gottfried]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born December 28, 1747, at Zoblitz near Marieubnrg. In 1780 he was rector at Schleitz, in 1786 at Naumburg, in 1788 at Zeitz, and died August 10, 1819, leaving, De Usu Versionis Vulgate (Schleitz, 1782-85): — Formula Augustanae Confess. (Leipsic, 1808): — Reformation geschichte der Stadt Zeitz (1817): — Observatt. in 5 Loca Cypriani (Gera, 1777). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:109, 320, 802, 906; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:405. (B.P.)

## Miller, Daniel[[@Headword:Miller, Daniel]]

             a German religious enthusiast of low origin and condition of life, was born in Nassau in 1716, the time of the Pietist movements, when various indications of an inward religious life made their appearance in Germany, and many opposing circumstances excited a longing for a new development of the Church. At first he attached himself to the secondary effects of pietism, and busied himself with Jacob Bohme and other Mystics. For a long time also he was engaged in historical studies, and his mysticism became connected with a historical scepticism. At this juncture also there was the commencement of a rationalistic reaction, especially hastened on by the appearance of the Wolfenbiittel Fragments. But neither of the two parties — neither the Church nor the rationalistic — suited him. He wished to maintain the authority of the Bible against the new scepticism, and to insist on its inspiration in the most unqualified sense. But, on the other hand, he was not satisfied with orthodoxy; he was led to a peculiar religious idealism, by which he wished to establish a harmony of all religions. An original revelation was at the basis of all of them, the symbols of which had been misunderstood.

Everything in the Old Testament and the New was to be understood symbolically; it was the garb of God's inner revelation, and of the eternal revelation of the divine Logos. Everything  historical, as such, is untrue; it is only the clothing of ideal truth. In this view of the life of Christ, although proceeding on quite different principles, he was the forerunner of the modern mythic school, and combated the belief in the historical miracles of Christ on grounds very similar to those brought forward by Strauss. If such miracles, he says, as feeding the five thousand had actually happened, all the Jews would have received Christ, and would not have crucified him. Indeed, Miller went so far as to give any religion the authority for man's ultimate conversion to the state of eternal bliss, and Adam and Christ were to him simply the same human formation of the all-pervading Deity, the same divinity pervading the sacred writings of all nations. Later in life Muller himself claimed to be an Elias, called to redeem the world from the yoke of the letter. He travelled through the whole northern part of Germany to announce that the external Church was about to be subverted; and although he died in 1782, under an impression that God had deceived him, he had yet made such an impression on his fellows that even now there are followers of his in Germany. They reject the historical Christ, look upon infidels as their brethren, and are expecting Muller's return to set up a universal kingdom. See Keller, Daniel Muller, Religilse Schwarmer des Achtzehnten Jahrh. (Leipsic, 1834); Zeitschr. fur Histor. Theologie (1834); Neander's Hist. Christian Dogmas, pages 634, 635; Hase, Ch. Hist. page 508.

## Miller, David[[@Headword:Miller, David]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at New Hartford, Connecticut, November 24, 1792. He entered the ministry in 1816 as a member of the New York Conference. For several years he was chaplain at the State Prison at Wethersfield. In 1855 he was appointed presiding elder of the Hartford District. He died at Bristol, Connecticut, December 26, 1855. David Miller was a man of good judgment and a practical mind,  which aided him in his own affairs and also in giving counsel to others. As a preacher, he was plain and earnest, relying upon the truth which he endeavored always to proclaim in the spirit of one determined not to know anything among men save Jesus Christ and him crucified.

## Miller, Ebenezer, D.D[[@Headword:Miller, Ebenezer, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, graduated from Harvard College in 1722; obtained ordination in England in 1727; became a missionary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and as such was made rector of the Church in Braintree, Massachusetts, December 25, 1727. He died February 11, 1763. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 5:110.

## Miller, Friedrich Theodosius[[@Headword:Miller, Friedrich Theodosius]]

             a German theologian, born at Ilmenau, September 10, 1716; was educated at the gymnasium at Zittau, and entered the University of Jena in 1735, where he studied theology, philosophy, and ancient languages. He was appointed in 1742 deacon of the Stadt Kirche at Jena; in 1745, assistant of the philosophic faculty; in 1754, assessor of the consistory; in 1761, professor of theology; and in 1765, archdeacon of the Stadt Kirche at Jena, where he died in 1766. He published in 1745 a new theory of the Hebrew accents, in Latin. His most important works are, Diss. de memorice amplitudine et diversitate (Jene, 1735, 4to): — Diss. Specimen sapientice divince ex neglecta in Scriptura. S. methodo demonstrativa (ibid. 1739, 4to): — Diss. Particulas Hebreaorum esse nomina (ibid. 1740, 4to): — Diss. Theoria accentuum apud Hebraeos nova, qui legati, vicarii et barones appellari consueverunt (ibid. 1745, 4to): — Progr. Anima hominis substantia in completa argumentum pro resurrectione carnis expectanda (ibid. 1761, 4to).

## Miller, George Benjamin, D.D[[@Headword:Miller, George Benjamin, D.D]]

             an eminent divine of the Lutheran Church, was born of Moravian parentage at Emmons, Lehigh County, Pennsylvania, June 10, 1795. His father, the Reverend George G. Miller, connected with the classical and theological school at Nazareth, and descended from a long line of Moravian clergymen, furnished him with special facilities for intellectual and moral culture. He entered Nazareth Hall as a pupil when only eight years of age, and there he continued his studies for eight years. He then left for Philadelphia, and commenced his career as a teacher in a private school. Subsequently he turned his attention to mercantile pursuits, but he soon discovered that the work was not adapted to his natural tastes and inclinations. In less than a year he resumed his former employment, and became associated with the Reverend Dr. Hazelius as an instructor in an academy at New Germantown, N.J., and at the same time continued his theological studies, which had been commenced at Nazareth. In the autumn of 1818 he entered upon the work of the ministry at Canajoharie, N.Y., having been previously licensed to preach by the New York Ministerium,  then under the presidency of the Reverend Dr. Quitman. In connection with his pastoral labors he established a classical school, and gave regular instruction. In this position he faithfully labored till 1827, when he accepted a professorship in Hartwick Seminary, N.Y., and again became the colleague of Dr. Hazelius, whom he succeeded as principal of the institution in 1830. With the exception of five years spent in the work of teaching and preaching elsewhere, he continued connected with this seminary, either as principal or professor of theology, until his death, devoting all his energies to the preparation of young men for college or of candidates for the holy ministry.

His name will always be as closely identified with the history of the institution as that of its benevolent founder. He died with the harness on, April 5, 1869. Dr. Miller was married to Delia B. Snyder in 1816, and in 1866 commemorated his “golden wedding” with a large number of relatives and friends, who had gathered from different parts of the country to present their congratulations and good wishes, the whole family, twenty-three in number, on the evening preceding the wedding festivities, uniting in the celebration of the Lord's Supper, and the reverend patriarch, surrounded by three generations, administering the sacred ordinance. Dr. Miller was a man of quick, acute, and discriminating intellect. He was distinguished for his accurate and ripe scholarship. As a man of learning, he had few superiors in the country. He had a perfect command of his own vernacular, and spoke and wrote German and French with wonderful facility. He was familiar with the exact sciences, his acquaintance with history was very extensive, and his knowledge of the ancient classics critical and complete. He was also a Profound Hebraist, and thoroughly versed in the Scriptures, so that he never found it necessary to use a concordance, but could turn with almost unfailing intuition to the required passage of the sacred page. Dr. Miller was noted as a man of original thought and independent research. As a writer, he was universally commended as clear, accurate, and instructive. The productions of his pen show his power of analysis, of generalization, and great condensation in the method of statement. His extensive erudition and enlarged experience were only surpassed by the loveliness of his Christian character; and his earnest, simple-hearted, active piety made a deep impression upon all who came within the range of his influence. His elevated type of Christian excellence, his high culture, his unpretending, modest character, his life unsullied by a single stain, attracted towards him by the strongest sympathies all men. He was a bright and shining light in the Church, and his name will ever be cherished with the most affectionate  interest. All his acquisitions were made subordinate to that which most deeply interested his active mind — the study of divine truth. All his treasures were laid at the Master's feet, and devoted entirely to his service. When, in 1836, he received the distinction of D.D. from Union College, he meekly submitted, remarking to a friend that the letters would serve as a good Scriptural motto, Deo Duce. The Lutheran Church owes to him as much as to any other laborer in this country. The only works published by Dr. Miller are a volume of Sermons on some of the Fundamental Principles of the Gospel, and a text-book on German Grammar, which never reached an extensive circulation. For a more detailed account, see Evangel. Qu. Rev. 1870, January page 25 sq.; Memorial Volume of Hartwick Seminary. (M.L.S.)

## Miller, George W[[@Headword:Miller, George W]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born near Westminster, Md., in 1826. He was converted at sixteen; entered the ministry of the United Brethren Church in his twenty-fifth year, and travelled for seven consecutive years. He then joined the ministry of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in which he labored until his death, at Pioneer, Ohio, August 10,1872. He was an earnest and successful minister, a faithful and beloved pastor.

## Miller, George, D.D[[@Headword:Miller, George, D.D]]

             an Irish divine, distinguished for his eminence in theology, history, and literature, was born at Dublin October 22, 1764. He was educated at Trinity College in his native city, and, after receiving holy orders, soon rose to prominence. In 1801 he was appointed vicar-general of Armagh, and lecturer of modern history at his alma mater. His lectures attracted universal attention, and were published in 1816, under the title of Lectures on the Philosophy of Modern History from the Fall of the Roman Empire to the French Revolution (Dublin, 1816, 8 volumes; 1852, 4 volumes, 8vo). This work of Dr. Miller “possesses unity of subject, harmony of proportion, and connection of parts; theory constituting one of the best of modern histories in English, and affording a systematic view of the progress of civilization” (For. Qu. Rev.). “Dr. Miller assumes, as the basis of his system, that all the events of this world have an intrinsic connection, which gives them the coherence and the unity of a moral drama. A single event or period, taken by itself, is a grain of dust in this mighty balance” (Edinb. Rev. 1:287 sq.). “Dr. Miller,” says a prominent critic in the Dublin University Magazine (13:572), “advances and establishes his great principle, that God reigneth in the affairs of men, and that the end of the divine government is man's improvement.” In the winter of 1817 Dr. Miller was induced to apply for the head-mastership of the Royal School of Armagh, which was immediately conferred upon him. In conjunction with many able champions of Protestantism, he made a noble stand against the fatal policy of English statesmen, by which Roman Catholic were admitted to political power. While Dr. Miller, in 1793, had hailed with pleasure the commencement of political concessions to the Romish Church, and had even lent a helping hand to these reforms, he now, with deeper philosophy and wider statesmanship, opposed the growing political power of the Romanists. His Letter to Mr. Plunkett: on the Policy of the Roman Catholic Question (Lond. 1826) is a fair index to his opinions. In the same year he showed himself the champion of the true faith by attacking the modern Arian opinions in his Observations on the Doctrines of Christianity and on the Athanasian Creed; and when the Pusey (q.v.) discussions were at their height, he published A Letter to Dr. Pusey in  reference to his Letter to the Lord Bishop of Oxford (1840, 8vo). A Second Letter to Dr. Pusey was published in the winter of 1841, and it suffices to say that Dr. Miller was thereafter considered one of the most formidable opponents of Puseyism. In his position as head-master of the Royal School of Armagh he showed himself uncompromising in his defence of Scriptural education in Ireland. Dr. Miller, being firmly persuaded that “most of our relations to our fellowmen, for which education is to prepare us, grow out of our relations to God,” advocated Scriptural education as the only true system. Christian influence must pervade the whole educational institution, he asserted, and all our knowledge must be derived from the holy Scriptures. His Case of the Church Education Society of Ireland argued in Reply to Dr. Elrington (Lond. 1847), and his Supplement to the Case of the Church Education Society (Dublin, 1847), are most important statements of what true education ought to accomplish. Blessed with a mind peculiarly cheerful, contented and happy in his disposition, devout in his religion, truly philosophic in his learning, Dr. Miller was beloved and esteemed by all who came into official or private connection with him. He died October 6, 1848. See Memoir of Dr. Miller in Bohn's edition of Miller's History, 4:5 sq.; Dublin University Mag. 17:674 sq.; Edinburgh Review, 1:287 sq.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, 2:1282.

## Miller, Hugh[[@Headword:Miller, Hugh]]

             one of the most noted characters among the English-speaking nations of our century, the champion of the Free Church of Scotland, and the defender of revelation from “scientists,” falsely so called, was born of very humble parentage at Cromarty, in Scotland, October 10, 1805. He received his first education at the parish school, where he was distinguished for his fondness for poetry and poetical composition. At that early age he was an extensive reader, and placed under contribution the libraries of the parish. In this way he laid the foundation of an extended knowledge of literature, which availed him in after-life. But the most important part of his education consisted in the natural history instruction he received from an uncle who had acquired a taste for the observation of natural phenomena. His poverty proved an obstacle to a collegiate education, and he was obliged to learn a trade in order to secure a livelihood. He determined fortunately, as his later history proved, to become a stone-mason. This occupation unexpectedly fostered the taste he had acquired for the study of natural history; and  while hewing blocks of stone in the quarry, he was diligently studying the traces they exhibited of their past history. It was in this way that he prepared himself to become the historian of the old red sandstone, among the rocks of which he principally worked. “It was the necessity which made me a quarrier that taught me to be a geologist,” he himself wrote in after- life. He labored as a quarryman and stone-mason for about fifteen years, constantly improving himself in his leisure hours by reading and study.

The publication of a volume of poems which he wrote during that time attracted the attention of some persons, who, by procuring him a situation in a bank of his native village, enabled him to devote more time to his studies. He now commenced contributing to several newspapers. The Church of Scotland was at that time a prey to internal dissensions, which ultimately led to a division. The Independents, who wished to throw off the yoke of the higher clergy, received great support from the people; Miller rendered them great service when the contest came to a close by the decision of the House of Lords in the Auchterarder case, in 1839, by his pamphlet, entitled A Letter from One of the Scottish People to the Right Honorable Lord Brougham and Vaux on the Opinions expressed by his Lordship in the Autchterarder Case. This remarkable letter drew towards him the attention of the evangelical party, and he was selected as the most competent person to conduct the newly-started Witness newspaper. the principal metropolitan organ of the Free Church. This paper owed its success to his able contributions — political, ecclesiastical, and geological. His articles on geology he contributed to the first congress of the British Association, held at Glasgow in 1840. They were highly praised by Charles Lyell, Murchison, Buckland, and Agassiz, and the name of Miller was by them associated with the wonderful fossil, the Pterichthys Milleri, which he had discovered in the red sandstone, and which had previously been thought to contain scarcely any fossils. Miller published these articles in book form, under the title The Old Red Sandstone, or New Walks in an Old Field (Edinburgh, 1841, 8vo; often reprinted, both in England and America).

In 1847 appeared his First Impressions of England and its People (3d ed. 1853, 8vo), the result of a tour made during the previous year. Some parts of this book, especially the account of the pilgrimages to Stratford-on-Avon, and the Leasowes, and Olney, and other places, memorable for their literary associations, are among the very finest pieces of descriptive English. A magic style characterized all his works, whether those of a more popular kind or his scientific treatises, such as the Footprints of the Creator (1849), a work suggested by the Vestiges of  Creation, and subversive of the fallacies of that superficial and plausible book. “There was nothing in Miller's works,” says the Edinburgh Review for July, 1858, “which so much surprised the reader as their mere literary merit. Where could this Cromarty mason have acquired his style?” Not one of the authors of our day has approached Hugh Miller as a master of English composition, for the equal of which we must go back to the times of Addison, Hume, and Goldsmith. During the later part of his life he suffered severely from disease of the brain, and he finally shot himself while in a fit of somnambulism, December 24, 1856. His death caused a most painful excitement. Few men have occupied a higher position in the estimation of his countrymen. He was a noble example of what self- education can do for a man; and, whether regarded as the fearless and independent writer, or the man of literature and science, his character must claim the respect and admiration of posterity. The personal appearance of Mr. Miller, or “Old Red,” as he was familiarly named by his scientific friends, is thus described by one who had the good fortune to see him: “A head of great massiveness, magnified by an abundant profusion of sub- Celtic hair, was set on a body of muscular compactness, but which in later years felt the undermining influence of a life of unusual physical and mental toil. Generally wrapped in a bulky plaid, and with a garb ready for any work, he had the appearance of a shepherd from the Rossshire hills rather than an author and a man of science.

In conversation or in lecturing the man of original genius and cultivated mind at once shone out, and his abundant information and philosophical acuteness were only less remarkable than his amiable disposition, his generous spirit, and his consistent, humble piety” (Literary Gazette). His other works are, The Geology of the Bass (1848, 8vo): — On certain Peculiarities of Structure in some ancient Ganoids (fishes) (1850): — On the Fossil Flora of Scotland (1855): — My School and Schoolmasters, a very interesting autobiography, in which he relates his early history, and his struggles in pursuit of science (1855): — The Testimony of the Rocks (Lond. 1858), in which he discusses the Biblical bearings of geology, published after his death. “Hugh Miller,” says the writer in the Edinburgh Review whom we have already had occasion to quote, “must undoubtedly be regarded as one of the most remarkable men whom Scotland has produced... The interest of his narrative, the purity of his style, his inexhaustible faculty of happy and ingenious illustration, his high imaginative power, and that light of genius which it is so difficult to define yet so impossible to mistake, all promise to secure for the author of the Old Red Sandstone the lasting admiration of  his countrymen.” The different scientific works of Hugh Miller mark an important epoch in the progress of the study of geology. He was one of the first to popularize the subject. “Besides adding much to our knowledge, and placing things previously known in a clear and pleasing light, Mr. Miller's performance will be very acceptable also to geologists both of the old and young school” (Lond. Athen. 1842, page 523). “But what is in a great degree peculiar to our author is the successful combination of Christian doctrines with pure scientific truth” (Agassiz, Introd. to Amer. ed. of Footprints of the Creator). See Labor and Triumph: the Life and Times of Hugh Miller, by Thomas N. Brown, D.D. (Glasgow and N.Y. 1858, 12mo); Lond. Gentleman's Magazine, 1857, part 1, page 244 sq.; Lond. Athen. 1856, page 1609; Edinb. Rev. July, 1858, art. Hugh Miller (reprinted in the Living Age, August 21, 1858); North Brit. Rev. August 1854; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; — Men of the Time, s.v.; Engl. Cyclop. s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generate, 35:524; New- Englander, 8:237; North Amer. Rev. 73:448; Eclectic Revelation 4 th series, 27:685; 15:690; Brit. Qu. Rev. 1871, July, page 40; Meth. Qu. Rev. 1859, October page 513; Westminster Rev. 1871, April, page 269.

## Miller, Jacob (1), D.D[[@Headword:Miller, Jacob (1), D.D]]

             was born December 11, 1788, at Goshenhoppen, Pennsylvania, and was reared under religious influences in accordance with the views and practices of the Lutheran Church. He was engaged in the prosecution of his literary and theological studies for five years, under the direction of the Reverend Dr. Geissenhainen, and completed them under the instruction of Drs. Helmuth and Schmidt, who at that time had charge of a private seminary in Philadelphia for the education of candidates for the ministry. His first field of labor was the Goshenhoppen District, among the people in whose midst he had lived all his life. Here he labored twentyone years, “not only with acceptance,” says the record, “but with profit.” In 1829 he removed to Reading, Pennsylvania, where he continued to labor till his death, just twenty-one years. He died May 16, 1850. Dr. Miller was a man of marked ability. His natural endowments were of a superior order, and they had been brought under the influence of careful culture. He wielded an immense influence. In whatever position he was placed his power was felt. In 1838 he was honored with the doctorate of divinity by the University of Pennsylvania, but he never recognised or used the degree. (M.L.S.)

## Miller, Jacob (2)[[@Headword:Miller, Jacob (2)]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, a native of Germany, came to this country when but seventeen years of age (1832); was converted while a resident of Quincy, Illinois, and connected with the German Lutheran Church. Himself the product of a revival, he labored earnestly for the renewing of God's love in the hearts of his lukewarm Lutheran brethren, but the minister of the Church with which he was connected opposed him, and Miller was finally obliged to leave that body. With thirty others, like-minded, he joined the Methodist Episcopal Church. In 1848 he was admitted into the Illinois Conference, and labored with great success until, by reason of failing health, he was obliged to ask for a superannuated relation. In 1860 he was again placed on the active list, and sent to Alton, Illinois, where he labored successfully. In 1866 he was sent to Petersburg Circuit, Illinois; thence to Bushnell, where he died, March 7, 1871. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1871, page 188.

## Miller, James[[@Headword:Miller, James]]

             a Presbyterian minister. was born near New Milns, Ayrshire, Scotland, February 4, 1803. He was educated at Glasgow College, Scotland; studied divinity in the theological seminary at Glasgow, and was licensed by Kilmarnock Presbytery of the United Secession Church. Soon after he came to the United States; was ordained in 1841 by the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church of Ohio as pastor over the Church in Perrysburg and Scotch Ridge, Wood County, Ohio; subsequently removed to Iowa, preaching as opportunity offered, and died January 26, 1867. Mr. Miller was a successful and useful minister, and did much to advance the cause of truth. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1868, page 274.

## Miller, Johann Christian Friedrich Wilhelm von[[@Headword:Miller, Johann Christian Friedrich Wilhelm von]]

             a noted German engraver of sacred subjects, was born at Stuttgard in 1782. He was carefully educated by his father, Johann Gotthard (see  below), in all those branches of the arts which, by his own experience, he knew to be requisite to constitute an excellent engraver; and in 1802 went to complete his studies at Paris, where at that time the majority of the finest works of art in Europe were collected together in the Louvre. Here, in 1808, Miiller engraved the St. John about to write his Revelation, after Domenichillo, in which the eagle brings him his pen; and Adam and Eve under the Tree of Life, after Raphael. He was commissioned shortly afterwards by Rittner, a printseller of Dresden, to engrave his last and greatest work, the Madonna di San Sisto of Raphael, in the Dresden Gallery. He was wholly occupied for the remainder of his short life on this plate, which he just lived to complete, but he never saw a finished print from it. He removed to Dresden in 1814. and was appointed professor of engraving in the academy there. His existence seems almost to have been wrapped up in the execution of this plate: he was occupied with it day and night, and, always of a sickly constitution, the infallible result of such constant application and excitement soon made its appearance. He was, however, in vain advised to desist for a while from his work. He completed the plate and sent it to Paris to be printed; but with his plate the artificial excitement which supported him departed also; he had just strength enough left to admit of his being carried to the Sonnenstein, near Pirna, where he died in 1816, only a few days before the proof of his plate arrived from Paris. It was suspended over the head of his bier as he lay dead, thus reminding one of the similar untimely fate of the great master of the original, above whose head, as he lay in state, was hung also his last work, The Transfiguration. Muller engraved only eighteen plates, but the Madonna di San Sisto is in itself a host, and exhibits him at least the equal of Raphael Morghen, to whose Transfiguration it serves as a good pendant. There are several lithographic copies of it. An index of his plates and those of his father was published by Andresen at Leipsic in 1865. At Harvard College there are nineteen fine copies of his plates in the "Gray Collection." See Nagler, Allgenmeines Kunstler-Lexikon, s.v.; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

## Miller, Johann Peter[[@Headword:Miller, Johann Peter]]

             a German Protestant theologian, was born at Leipheim April 26,1725; was educated at the university at Helmstadt; in 1747 went: to Gottingen, and in 1750 became rector of the Latin school at Helmstadt. In 1756 he accepted a similar position at the Lutheran Gymnasium at Halle, but returned in 1766 to Gottingen, as professor of theology, and there died, May 29, 1789. Miller wrote and published a continuation of Mosheim's Sittenlehre. His productions of value are, Das Reich der Natur und Sitten (Halle, 1757- 1762): — Diss. in locum ad Roman. S. 28 (Helmstadt, 1747): — Diss. locus antologicus de Eodem et Diverso (Gotting. 1748, 4to): — Diss. de  notabili et maximo versionis Italae ad verba Christi Mat 20:28 additamento (ibid. 1749,4to); — J.L. Mosheimii Commentationes et orationes varii generis (Hamburg, 1751, 8vo): — Vollstandiger Auszug aus allen neuen Theilen der Mosheimischen Sittenlehre der heiligen Schrift (Halle, 1765, 8vo; 2d auflage, ibid. 1777, 8vo): — Die Hoffnung besserer Zeiten fur Schulen (ibid. 1765, 4to): — Progr. quo probatur, cum theopneustea Apostolorum nec omniscientiam quasi aliquam, nec anamartesiam fuisse conjunctam (Gotting. 1789, 4to).

## Miller, John E[[@Headword:Miller, John E]]

             a minister of the Reformed (Dutch) Church, was born at Albany in 1792; graduated at Union College in 1812; was licensed in 1817; served the Church as missionary in the South and West in 1817 and 1818; was pastor at Chester, N.J., Presbyterian Church from 1818 to 1823; and then of the Reformed Church, Tompkinsville, Staten Island, until he died, in 1847, in the midst of a powerful revival of religion in his Church. Miller was also chaplain in the Marine Hospital and at the Seaman's Retreat. In this place he exhibited the highest degree of moral courage and religious faith and zeal in times of appalling pestilence, and among sufferers of all kinds. Contagious diseases had no fears for him. He was a simple-hearted, bold, tender, and faithful preacher of the Gospel; a guileless, outspoken, honest soul; a hater of strife; and a brave, calm, earnest, uncompromising lover and defender of the faith once delivered to the saints. His memoir is to be found in a goodly volume, called An Old Disciple and his Descendants, by Reverend F.M. Kip, D.D., which contains brief biographies of his patriarchal father (Christian Miller, Esq., of Albany) and several of his family, who were noted for unusual gifts of mind, character, and piety. Among these was a grandson, Isaac Livingston Kip Miller, a youth of unusually brilliant and powerful intellect, and of great promise, who died in 1846, while studying for the ministry. He was the elder brother of Dr. W.A. Miller (q.v.). (W.J.R.T.)

## Miller, John Peter[[@Headword:Miller, John Peter]]

             a talented but eccentric American minister, was born in the Palatinate, Germany, about the year 1715; was thoroughly educated in his native land; came to this country in 1730; was licensed and ordained by the Philadelphia Synod of the Presbyterian Church; and in 1731 became pastor of the German Reformed Church in Tulpehocken, Berks County,  Pennsylvania, where he labored successfully for about four years. In 1735 he fell in with an enthusiast by the name of Beissel, by whom he was immersed, and so became identified with the Seventh-day Baptists. Flying from the society of the world, he entered upon a solitary or monastic life at the base of a mountain, near a “limpid spring.” He afterwards, urged by the force of his trials, entered the cloister of the Seventh-day Baptists at Ephrata, Pennsylvania. “Here, under the name of Jabez, he lived a quiet life as a Protestant monk, using a board for his bed at night, and devoting himself by day to what he imagined to be the service of God in severe self- castigation.” See Harbaugh, Fathers of the Ref. Church, 1:301-311. (D.Y.H.)

## Miller, John Wesley[[@Headword:Miller, John Wesley]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born at Charleston, South Carolina, October 27, 1829. He enjoyed a collegiate education, and entered the ministry in 1850; was, as licentiate, deacon, and elder, on circuits, stations, missions, and in the Southern army as chaplain of hospitals, always a faithful, devoted servant of Christ. He died in the village of Darlington, South Carolina, June 29, 1866. See Minutes of the M. E. Church, South, 1866.

## Miller, Josiah[[@Headword:Miller, Josiah]]

             an English minister, who died December 22, 1880, at London, where he had for a long time been secretary to the London City Mission, is best known for his writings on hymnology. His first volume in this branch of religious literature, Our Hymns, their Authors and Origin, appeared in 1866; three years later a second edition was published, under the altered title of Singers and Songs of the Church (Lond. 1869), which has also been reprinted in New York. (B.P.)

## Miller, Karl Ottfried[[@Headword:Miller, Karl Ottfried]]

             one of the most distinguished classical scholars of recent times, is noted for his labors in the department of comparative religion, having furnished works very valuable on Grecian mythology and religion. He was born August 28, 1797, at Brieg, in Silesia, and received a careful education. He devoted himself, at the universities of Breslau and Berlin to philological  and archaeological studies, and the first fruit of his learning was the publication of the AEgineticorum Liber (Berlin, 1817). Shortly after he received an appointment to the Magdalenum in Breslau, where his leisure hours were devoted to a grand attempt to analyze the whole circle of Greek myths. In 1819 he obtained an archaeological chair in Gottingen; and to thoroughly prepare himself for it, visited the collections in Germany, France, and England. His great design was to embrace the whole life of ancient Greece, its art, politics, industry, religion, in one warm and vivid conception — in a word, to cover the skeletons of antiquity with flesh, and to make the dry bones live. With this view he lectured and wrote with a fine, earnest animation, until the political troubles in Hanover made his position uncomfortable. He obtained permission to travel, and made tours in Greece and Italy, but unfortunately died of an intermittent fever at Athens, Aug. 1, 1840. Miller's literary and scholarly activity stretched over the whole field of Greek antiquity, furnishing many' new and striking elucidations of the geography and topography, literature, grammar, mythology, manners and customs of the ancients. The work of special interest to us is his Prolegomena zu einer wissenschaftlichen Mythologie (Gottingen, 1825, 8vo; Engl. by Leitch, Lond. 1844, 8vo). His work on the Dorians is also valuable to the student of comparative religion, as well as his work on the Etruscans. "Miller," says a contemporary, "was a man of the most extensive and varied acquirements, and of a keen and penetrating judgment. lie acquired a European reputation at a comparatively early age. His numerous works, however, are not all of equal merit, and the two faults more particularly to be noticed are his great haste in the composition of his works and a tendency to theorize and generalize on insufficient grounds. But in extent of knowledge and reading there scarcely ever was a scholar who surpassed him." See Neuer Nekrolog der Deutschenfiir 1841; Lucke, Erinnerungen an Karl Ottfried Miiller (Getting. 1841, 8vo), which contains an admirable delineation of Muller's personal character.

## Miller, Lovis Pilketon[[@Headword:Miller, Lovis Pilketon]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Union County, Pennsylvania, January 8, 1809. He joined the Church in his sixteenth year. He was soon after impressed by a strong conviction that it was his duty to preach the Gospel to others. He worked in his father's fields by moonlight, that he might procure religious books to qualify himself for this station in life. In 1828 he entered the academy at Milton, Pennsylvania, and in 1830 he was admitted into the Ohio Conference. He was successively stationed at Athens, Norwich, Georgetown, Madisonville, South Charleston, Wilmington, Franklin, White Oak, Madisonville, Amelia, Williamsburg, Lockland, West White Oak, Amelia, Milford, New Carlisle, Raysville, Batavia, Madisonville, Miami, Jamestown, and Moscow. In 1864 he entered the army as chaplain, and served until peace was restored. He died in 1872. Mr. Miller was a man of great humility and piety, and his ministry was a glorious success.

## Miller, Nathan W[[@Headword:Miller, Nathan W]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Washington, Me., December 24, 1831; was converted and united with the Church in June 1842. In 1853 he was licensed as a local preacher, and in 1859 was employed by the presiding elder of the Rockland District to preach at Benton and vicinity, where he labored successfully. He entered the itinerancy in 1862 as a member of the East Maine Conference, and was appointed to North Searsport; in 1864 and 1865, to Bear Hill, Charleston, and Garland; in 1866, to Garland; in 1867, to Abbott and Greenville; in 1868, to Danforth, Weston, and Topsfield. In 1869 he was granted a superannuated relation; and in June following he moved to Benton, where he could be near his family friends. Here he assisted in the public service as long as his strength would permit. He died February 22, 1870. “Brother Miller, as a Christian minister, had clear perceptions; a high sense of honor, combined with a deep sense of obligation; as a citizen, he was kind and obliging; as a friend, true, trusty, and confiding; as a companion and father, affectionate, kind, and faithful.” See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1870.

## Miller, Samuel (1), D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Miller, Samuel (1), D.D., LL.D]]

             an eminent Presbyterian divine, whose name is cherished as that of one who materially assisted in laying the foundations of the Presbyterian Church in this country, was born October 31, 1769, at Dover, Delaware. He received his early literary training under the direction of his father, the Reverend John Miller, a native of Boston, who early settled as a Presbyterian pastor in Delaware. Samuel was educated at the University of Pennsylvania (class of 1789), and graduated with the highest honor in his class; commenced the study of theology under his father, and finished his theological course under the Reverend Dr. Nesbit, at Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pennsylvania; in 1791 was licensed to preach, and in 1793 was installed as colleague pastor with Drs. McKnight and Rodgers over the First Presbyterian Church in New York City, and, after the dissolution, was pastor of the Wall Street Church until 1813. He was instrumental in the establishment of Princeton Seminary, and subsequently was appointed to the chair of ecclesiastical history and Church government, which he held for more than thirty-six years. He died January 7, 1850. Dr. Miller was an extensive author, and published, Sermon on Psa 2:11 (February 1799): — A Pastoral Discourse (1800): — A Brief Retrospect of the 18th Century  (1803, 2 volumes, 8vo): — Letters on the Constitution and Order of the Christian Ministry (1807,12mo): — Discourse designed to Commemorate the Discovery of New York (1809): — Memoir of Rev. John Rogers, D.D. (1813, 8vo): — Letters on Unitarianism (1821, 8vo): — On the Eternal Sonship of Christ (1823): — Lectures at the Seminary (1827): — Letters on Clerical Manners and Habits (1827, 12mo): — Lectures at the Seminary (1830): — Essay on the Utility and Importance of Creeds and Confessions: — On the Office of Ruling Elder (1831, 12mo): — On Baptism: — Letters on the Observance of the Monthly Concert in Prayer: — Memoir of the Rev. Charles Nesbit, D.D. (1840): — The Primitive and Apostolical Order of the Church of Christ vindicated (1840, 12mo): — Letters from a Father to his Son in College (1843): — Thoughts on Public Prayer (1848): — On Christian Education of Children. Dr. Miller also contributed a Life of Jonathan Edwards to Sparks's “American Biography.” Dr. Miller possessed admirable natural qualities that constituted the foundation of his eminently attractive character. His countenance, full of generosity and manliness, was indicative of great purity and nobility of character; his manners were uncommonly dignified and polished; his conversation brilliant and attractive. He was pre- eminently a man of system and method. His intellect was naturally clear, comprehensive, and symmetrical. As a minister, he was singularly adapted to profit theological students — his preaching clear, direct, and full of evangelical truth. As a professor, he was eminently qualified; his lectures were luminous exhibitions of his subject, full of welldigested thought, and arranged with graceful naturalness. As an author, he was at home in almost every field, whether literary or theological. His taste was beyond criticism, insomuch that, in reading his works, one rarely meets with an expression that admits of being essentially improved. His style is marked by an elegant simplicity-generally easy and flowing, but occasionally rising to the more artificial, condensed, and elevated strain. See Life of Samuel Miller, D.D., LL.D., by Samuel Miller (1869); The Biblical Rep. and Princeton Rev. January 1870, page 33; Amer. Presb. Rev. July 1869, page 619; Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1863, page 52; N. Amer. Rev. 28:505-531; Sketches of the Lit. of the United States; London Athen. 1835, page 716; Dr. J.W. Francis's Old New York (2d. ed. 1858), page 57; Life of Archibald Alexander, D.D., by his son, page 380.

## Miller, Samuel (2)[[@Headword:Miller, Samuel (2)]]

             a minister of the German Reformed Church, was born in Union County, Pennsylvania, March 23, 1815. He was licensed in 1842, and ordained the following year. He first labored in Dauphin, and then in Butler County, Pennsylvania. In 1852 he removed to Chambersburg, Pennsylvania, where he stood in connection with the publication office of the Reformed Church as associate editor of the Messenger and Kirchenzeitung. After laboring in this capacity about six years, he returned to the pastoral work. residing for several years in Lebanon, and afterwards in Pottsville, Pennsylvania. His health failing, he removed to Philadelphia, where he died, October 11, 1873. Mr. Miller was a man of decided talent, genial spirit, and indomitable energy, patience, and perseverance. He is the author of a work of some merit, entitled Mercersburg and Modern Theology compared, and of quite a number of articles in the Mercersburg Review. See Ref. Church Messenger. November 5, 1873. (D.Y.H.)

## Miller, Samuel J[[@Headword:Miller, Samuel J]]

             an American divine of some note, figured first as missionary to Africa, and later as agent of the Colonization Society. He died in 1818. He was the editor of the celebrated Report of the Presbyterian Church: The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania vs. Ashbel Green and Others (Phila. 8vo; new ed. 1855. 8vo, page 596).

## Miller, Samuel, D.D[[@Headword:Miller, Samuel, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Princeton, N.J., January 23, 1816, being the son of professor Samuel Miller of Princeton College. He graduated from the college there in 1833, and the theological seminary in 1844, having been tutor in the college for several years in the meantime. He studied law, and while engaged in its practice prepared a full report of the great suit between the Old and New School branches of the Presbyterian Church at the time of the disruption. He was ordained in 1844, and after serving as stated supply at the Presbyterian Church at Mount Holly, N.J., for many years, became pastor in 1850. He also established a classical school of a high order, which continued there from 1845 to 1857. From 1858 he was stated supply at Columbus for twenty years, and for four years of the churches of Zuckerton and Bass River. He was relieved from the charge of Mount Holly Church in 1873, but continued to supply various pulpits. In 1880 he was installed pastor of the Church of Oceanic, where he labored until failing health obliged him to resign. He died. at Mount Holly, October 12, 1883. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sent. 1884, page 32. (W.P.S.).

## Miller, Thomas[[@Headword:Miller, Thomas]]

             one of the pioneer preachers of American Methodism, largely identified with the spread of Methodist doctrine in Maryland, was born about the year 1770, of Irish parentage, and was reared in the Presbyterian Church. About 1800 he joined the Methodist Episcopal Church, and soon became an official member; in 1808 he was licensed to exhort and preach. His itinerant life commenced in 1809, under the elder Dr. Chandler, and continued till 1848, nearly forty years. In his early ministry he was healthy and strong, and never spared his strength; in fact, his health and strength served him well through all his ministerial course. He was stationed for twelve years at different times in Philadelphia, and held other important charges. His early education was limited, but constant reading and close application, added to great natural, abilities, made him an able minister of the New Testament. He was known by the title of Old Father Miller” far and wide, and he was loved and honored by all who knew him, both in and  out of the Church. He was a good friend to the young, and took great interest in the Sabbath-school. He took many a young man by the hand, and helped him into the ministry. He died in 1848.

## Miller, Tobias Ham[[@Headword:Miller, Tobias Ham]]

             a Universalist minister and journalist, was born about 1802. In early life he was settled in Maine as an orthodox clergyman, but later he became a firm Universalist. He was the original “Uncle Toby” of the Boston Carpet Bag; was on the Chronicle (Portsmouth) eighteen years, and the Portsmouth Journal twenty years. He died in Portsmouth, New Elampshire, March 30, 1870.

## Miller, William[[@Headword:Miller, William]]

             the founder of the Millerites (q.v.), was born at Pittsfield, Massachusetts, in 1781. He enjoyed but slender educational advantages. During the war of 1812 he served as a volunteer with the rank of captain. About 1833, while a resident of Low Hampton, N.Y., he began his career as an apostle of the new doctrine, which taught that the world was coming to an end in 1843. The main argument on which his belief rested was that relative to the termination of the 2300 days in Dan 8:14, which he regarded as years. Then considering the seventy weeks in Dan 9:24, as the key to the date of the 2300 days of the preceding chapter, and dating the periods B.C. 457, when Artaxerxes, king of Persia, sent up Ezra from his captivity, to restore the Jewish polity at Jerusalem (Ezra 7), and ending the seventy weeks, as commentators generally do, in A.D. 33, with the crucifixion of Christ, he found the remainder of the 2300 days, which was 1810, would end in 1843. For ten years he held forth to this purport, and succeeded in gathering a large number of followers, which is said to have reached fifty thousand, who awaited, with credulous expectation, the appointed day. The result, however, turning out contrary to the teaching of their apostle, the Adventists, as they are sometimes termed, gradually forsook Miller. He died at Low Hampton, Washington County, N.Y., December 20, 1849. His followers esteemed him as a man of more than ordinary mental power, as a cool, sagacious, and honest reasoner, a humble and devoted Christian, a kind and affectionate friend, and a man of great moral and social worth. SEE MILLERITES.

## Miller, William A., D.D[[@Headword:Miller, William A., D.D]]

             a minister of the Reformed (Dutch) Church; was born at Albany, N.Y., in 1824; graduated at Union College in 1842, and at the theological seminary of the Reformed Church at New Brunswick in 1845. He was a grandson of the “Old Disciple,” and nephew of Reverend John E. Miller, whom we notice above, and inherited the robust intellect, strong character, and religious peculiarities of his remarkable family. After a brief settlement as pastor of the Reformed Church of Glenham, N.Y. (1846-49). he became professor of languages, and subsequently principal of the Albany Academy, a celebrated classical and mathematical school (1849-56). From 1856 to 1859 he was the useful pastor of the Reformed Church of Rhinebeck when his health failed from pulmonary disease, of which he died in 1863. Dr. Miller was a highly-gifted man, a thoroughly accurate and critical scholar, an enthusiastic and competent instructor, a logical, practical, and profitable preacher, and a man who always devoted himself completely to his professional duties. He dealt much in careful expository preaching, for which his turn of mind, classical culture, and love of the truth admirably fitted him. Had his life been spared, he would doubtless have risen to higher positions in the Church which he so greatly adorned by his scholarship and services. He was “chosen in the furnace of affliction,” and his graces were beautifully developed by the protracted trials of bereavement, disease, and suffering, and especially by being obliged to desist from all labor for Christ, just when he felt most anxious and best qualified for it. His Christian experiences during his last years and in death were delightful and impressive exhibitions of the triumphs of grace. (W.J.R.T.)

## Millerites, Or Adventists[[@Headword:Millerites, Or Adventists]]

             as they are sometimes called, are those millenarians, SEE MILLENNIUM who adhere to the doctrines as expounded by William Miller (q.v.). When in 1833 he first began to proclaim millennial doctrines, the earnestness of his manner, his evident familiarity with the Scriptures and with history, and the bold confidence with which he proclaimed his views, made so deep and wide an impression that he everywhere left in his wake large numbers examining the evidences for themselves. Among his most ardent followers was Joshua V. Himes, a minister of the Christian connection, who, having become a believer, commenced, in 1840, without subscribers or funds, the publication of a semi-monthly journal entitled Signs of, the Times and  Exposition of Prophecy; and, meeting with success, two years later issued a weekly, under the title of the Advent Herald, which largely aided in disseminating the doctrines of the Adventists, who now comprise many thousands, in the United States, British America, and Great Britain. This journal (still published in Boston, Massachusetts), together with the labors of Mr. Miller, who gave his time, his energies, and his property to the. extension of his views, and the efforts of numerous proselytes that everywhere rose up, soon established great numbers in a belief in the general correctness of Mr. Miller's interpretation of the prophecies, and the personal appearing of the Lord was eagerly looked for by some 50,000 followers. Though disappointed at the time set, and frequently from time to time since, there are still many adherents to Miller's views. Their aggregate number is quite respectable, and their efforts for the dissemination of their convictions generous and unfaltering.. While as a body they make little or no pretension to influence, as individuals they are necessarily close Bible students; are liberal, according to their means, to the poor and for the support of the Gospel; and noticeable in the main for the modesty and uprightness of their walk, and their careful conformity to virtue and to law. As a body they accept the great leading doctrines of the evangelical Church, and are distinguished only for their peculiar belief in the personal coming of Christ, and his bodily reign with his saints on the earth. They have no creed nor form of discipline other than the Word of God, which they regard as a sufficient rule of faith and duty. They hold conferences, composed of lay and clergy, as often as it is deemed necessary for the discussion of such subjects and measures as the interests of the cause may demand; but these are purely voluntary and advisory, and claim to exercise no authority over the conscience of any.

In round numbers the Millerites are supposed to comprise in this country from fifteen to twenty thousand, scattered over all the states of the Union, in which estimate those in the different churches, who are numerous, are not included.

General Doctrines of Belief. They cannot see, if, according to Isa 7:14, Christ was foretold to be born of a virgin, and it came to pass (Mat 1:18-25); if, as foretold (Mic 5:2), Christ was literally born in Bethlehem (Mat 2:1); if, as foretold (Dan 9:26), Messiah came at the expiration of seven weeks and sixty-two weeks. (Mar 1:15), and if after the sixty-two weeks Messiah was literally cut off; if, as foretold (Isa 53:8-9), he was cut off out of the land of the  living for the transgression of his people, and made his grave with the wicked and with the rich in his death; if (Psa 16:10) Christ's soul was not left in hell, nor did his flesh see corruption; if (Psa 110:1) Christ did sit on the right hand of God, and is to sit there till his enemies be made his footstool-if all these predictions have literally come to pass, and they think they have, then they cannot see ground for doubting that the same rule will be observed in the fulfilment of all other predictions relating to Christ.

2. Prophecy (Gen 22:18) foretells Christ as the seed of Abraham, in whom all the families of the earth shall be blessed. It also promises to the seed of Abraham all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession, in connection with Abraham himself (Gen 17:8); hence the land is called Emanuel's land (Isa 8:8). But, when Christ was on earth, he had not where to lay his head. Therefore he must return personally to inherit it.

3. Christ is the predicted Son of David. who is to sit forever on David's throne; he is the Son of David according to the flesh (Psa 132:11). But, while on earth, he never sat on David's throne. He went to Jerusalem, as foretold, on an ass's colt; claimed his rights, and was proclaimed king by the children, but rejected by the rulers (Matthew 21). Hence he must return to enjoy his kingdom and reign over the house of Jacob forever (Luk 1:32-33).

4. Christ has the promise of the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession (Psa 2:8), but he never yet had it. Therefore he must come back to earth to possess it.

5. Prophecy (Dan 7:13-14) points out the coming of Christ to receive his kingdom and dominion over all nations, to be in the “clouds of heaven.” But he has never yet come thus. He must, therefore, fulfil the prediction in futurity, at his second advent. He cannot have universal dominion till he does.

6. Christ rose from the dead in the identical body in which he was crucified and buried, and was so identified (Joh 20:24-31). Those who thus identified his person; of flesh and bones, saw him go from earth up into heaven, and a cloud received him out of their sight. They were told by divine messengers that this same Jesus, whom they saw go into heaven, “shall so come back again in like manner” (Act 1:2-11).

7. That the second advent will be pre-millennial. First, because the millennial reign is placed after the first resurrection (Rev 20:1-6), which cannot be till the second advent of Christ. Those who have part in the first resurrection are saints, and will live forever. The second death has no power on them. But they that are Christ's are to be raised at his coming; and that is the order of the resurrection to follow Christ's resurrection (1Co 15:23). Christ's coming, and the resurrection of the just, must therefore precede the millennial reign.] Second, because the millennial period follows the casting the beast and the false prophet into the lake of fire, and the shutting up of the devil in the bottomless pit (Rev 19:20; Rev 20:1-3). Third, because thus, before the millennium, all the great anti-Christian powers are to be put down. The man of sin, however, the son of perdition, is only to be destroyed by the brightness of Christ's coming (2Th 2:8). The coming of Christ, for his destruction, must therefore be pre-millennial.

8. That there will be two resurrections, a thousand years apart, viz. the “first resurrection,” “the resurrection of life,” “the resurrection of the just;” and the “resurrection of the rest of the dead,” the “resurrection of damnation,” the “resurrection of the unjust.”

9. That the general view that the millennium will be a thousand years of peace, and be introduced by the conversion of the world to Christ, and consist in his universal spiritual reign; and the millenarian view that though Christ will come and reign personally on earth during the millennium, yet that that period will be one of probation, in which the heathen who had never heard of Christ, and the Jews who have been cut off during the Christian dispensation, will have the Gospel preached to them and be converted, are both unscriptural and not to be received, -because both the general and specific teachings of the Bible are against it. Thus the dream of Nebuchadnezzar (Daniel 2) foretells four universal empires which are to fill up the period from then till the everlasting kingdom of God comes and destroys them, and fills the whole earth. But there can be no everlasting kingdom without immortality, which cannot be till the resurrection at the second advent of Christ. The seventh chapter of Daniel presents, in vision, the same four empires, with the divisions and successions of the fourth empire, which only end (Dan 2:13-14) when the Son of Man comes in the clouds of heaven to receive his everlasting dominion, which is also universal. Till the judgment. the little blasphemous horn wears out the saints, and prevails against them. So, also, in the twenty-fourth of  Matthew, the course of events from the time of Christ to his second coming and the end of the world is given. There were to be wars, famines, pestilences, persecutions of the saints, false prophets, false Christs, abominations, great tribulations, mournings by all the tribes of the earth, the preaching of his Gospel to all the. we rid for a witness to all nations, and then the end should come, and they see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. There is no peace in the prediction till he comes. Therefore he will come personally to judge the world and reign, and not spiritually to convert and save the world. The tares and wheat, too (the righteous and wicked), are to grow together till the end of the world or age, and then they are to be cast off and punished, and the other glorified in the kingdom of God (Mat 13:24-43). For these and many other reasons, they cannot believe in the conversion of the world before the second advent of the Saviour.

10. That the thousand years will be one of judgment rather than probation. For they read in the second Psalm that when the heathen are given to Christ for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession, that he is to break or rule them (Rev 12:5; Rev 2:27) with a rod of iron, and dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel, which they consider to be anything else besides conversion. They also read in Psalms 149 that all the saints will “bind their kings with chains, and their nobles with fetters of iron, and execute upon them the judgments written.” From Isaiah 60 and Zechariah 14 they likewise learn that the worship and service of the heathen will be compulsory service.

11. That final and eternal retribution will be awarded to all nations when the Son of Man comes in his glory (Matthew 25 and Luke 13).

12. That the promises made to Israel of a yet future and final gathering to the land of Canaan will be literally accomplished, and Israel forever dwell there in peace. But that this cannot be fulfilled before the resurrection of the just, when the believing remnant of Israel, of every generation, including Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, will be raised from the dead, and restored to their own land. This Ezekiel 37 declares will be the way the whole house of Israel will be restored: “I will open your graves, and bring.you up out of your graves, and bring you into your ownland.” The resurrection, according to Paul is “the hope of Israel.” But if the resurrected and glorified Israel are to have the land and dwell there forever, the Jews in flesh and blood, as a nation, cannot have it forever. All the  promises, however, of a future return, promise an everlasting possession of the land. But mortal Jews cannot possess it forever — glorified and immortal ones can. Therefore they are the heirs of promise.

13. That the coming of the Lord is at the door for the following reasons, viz.: First, the four great empires are to be succeeded by the kingdom of God; and it is very manifest that the last — the Roman government — has passed its predicted divisions, and must soon end. Second, the waning of the Ottoman or Mohammedan power is another index pointing to the speedy coming of the kingdom of Christ. Third, the universal movements and agitations, the famines, pestilences, and earthquakes, the wars and rumors of wars, together with the signs in the sun, moon, and stars, etc., are conclusive evidence of his speedy approach. Fourth, the Gospel, which was to be preached in all the world, for a witness to all nations, is now completing its work.

14. That the advent doctrine, embracing, as it does, the resurrection of the body, the personal and visible appearance and reign of Christ on earth, the restitution of the heavens and earth to their paradisical state, as the eternal inheritance of the saints, etc., is the only view which will explain and harmonize the Word of God.

The intelligent reader will perceive, however, that most of the above arguments are merely precarious inferences from passages of Scripture whose meaning is greatly disputed. SEE MILLENNIUM. (J.H.W.)

## Milles, Jeremiah, D.D[[@Headword:Milles, Jeremiah, D.D]]

             a celebrated English divine and antiquary, was born in 1714, and received his preparatory education at Eton. He studied at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and took the degree of M.A. in 1735, and that of D.D. in 1747. His uncle, Dr. Thomas Milles, bishop of Waterford and Lismore, collated him to a prebend in the cathedral of Waterford, and presented him to a living near that city. In 1762 Dr. Milles was nominated to the deanery of Exeter, and in 1767 he was chosen president of the Society of Antiquaries. He died February 13, 1784. In the “Archaeologia” are several communications by him, particularly one entitled Observations on the Wardrobe Account of the Year 1483, wherein are contained the deliveries made for the coronation of king Richard III; and another (Archaol. 4:331 sq.) in which he denies the genuineness of the Apamseanmedal. In connection with Pococke (q.v.), he edited Inscriptiones Antiuce (1752).  He also published some of his sermons. Dr. Milles is, however, best known in the literary world by his edition in defence of the antiquity of the “Poems of Rowlay.” See Chambers, Cyclopaedia, s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, 2:1288.

## Millet[[@Headword:Millet]]

             (דֹּחִן, do'chan, so called from the dark-green or smoky color of the leaf; Sept. κέγχρος,Vulg. nzilium) occurs in Scripture only in Eze 4:9, where the prophet is directed to take unto him wheat, and barley, and beans, and lentiles, and millet, and fitches, and to put them into one vessel, and to make bread thereof for himself. All the grains enumerated in this verse continue to form the chief articles of diet in the East at the present day, as they appear to have done in ancient times. The Hebrew word dochan is identical with the Arabic dukhun, which is applied in the present day by the Arabs to a small grain cultivated from the middle of Europe to the most southern part of India. This is the common millet, Panicum miliaceum of botanists, which is sometimes cultivated in England on account of the seeds being used for feeding birds and poultry. But the grain is usually imported from the Mediterranean. In India it is cultivated in the cold weather, that is, in the same season with wheat and barley, and is an article of diet with the inhabitants.

The culms are erect, from two to four feet high, the whole plant being very hairy; leaves large, with long sheaths, which involve most part of the culm; panicle oblong, much branched, bending down with the weight of the grain: glumes cuspidate; corol three- valved, adventitious valve emarginate; seed oval and smooth, colored longitudinally with five streaks. The name, miliaceua, is said to have been applied to this plant from its producing such a quantity of grain, as if one stalk bore a thousand seeds. Tournefort says (Voyage, 2:95) that in the isle of Samos the inhabitants, in preparing their bread, knead together one half wheat and the other half barley and millet mixed together. It is also an article of diet both in Persia and India. Forskal applies the name dukhun to another corn-grass, which he first found in a garden at Rosetta, cultivated on account of its seed being given as food to birds. Afterwards he found it commonly cultivated in Arabia. It grows to a great size, being about five cubits in height, with seeds of the size of rice. To it he has given the name of Holcus dochna, but the plant is as yet unknown to botanists. The Biblical “millet” is confounded by many writers with the broom-corn  varieties, which belong to the genus Sorghum, a species of which is the modern Egyptian durra. It is possible that the Heb. dochan includes the common species, Sorhum vuggare. There is, however, little doubt that the true dukhun of Arab authors is the above-described Panicum miliaceum. This is so universally cultivated in the East as one of their smaller corn- grasses that it is most likely to be the kind chiefly alluded to in the passage of Ezekiel. Two cultivated species of Panicunz are named as occurring in Palestine, viz. P. miliaceum and P. italicum (Strand's Flor. Palest. Nos. 35, 37). The genera Sorghumn and Panicum belong to the natural order Graminee, perhaps the most important order in the vegetable kingdom. See Celsii Hierobot. 1:453 sq.; Oedmann, Verm. Sanml. 5:92 sq.; Niebuhr, Arabia, page 295; Trav. 1:158; Forskal, Flora AEgypt. page 174; Wellsted, Tray. 1:295; Gesenius, Thes. Heb. page 333; Penny Cyclopaedia, s.v. Panicum.

## Millet, Simon-Germain[[@Headword:Millet, Simon-Germain]]

             a French Benedictine, was born at Venisy, near Sens, in 1575. He died near Paris, June 28, 1647. But little, is known of his life's history. The following are his works: Les Dialogues de Saint-Gregoire (translated into French; Paris, 1624, 1644, 8vo): — Le Tresor sacre, ou inventaire des saintes reliques etau tres precieux joyaux de l'eglise et du tresor de Saint-Denys (Paris, 1638,12mo): — Vindicata Ecclesiae Gallicanae de suo Areopagita Dionysio Gloria (Paris, 1638, 8vo): — Ad Dissertationem nuper evulgatam de Duobus Dionysiis Reponsio, against the canon of Launoy (Paris, 1642, 8vo). — Hist. Litter. de la Congregation de Saint-Maur, page 28. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Genesis s.v.

## Milletiere[[@Headword:Milletiere]]

             SEE LAMILETIERE.

## Milligan, James, D.D[[@Headword:Milligan, James, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian divine. was born in Dalmellington, Ayrshire, Scotland, August 7, 1785. At the age of fourteen he united with the Established Church of Scotland. His early education was obtained while out upon the moor watching the sheep, reciting two or three times a week to a teacher in a neighboring village. In 1801, dissatisfied with the government of  Scotland, he emigrated to America, and came to Westmoreland County, Pennsylvania. After engaging in mercantile life for some months, he entered Jefferson College, Pennsylvania. His funds becoming exhausted, he was obliged to leave, and went to Greensburg, Pennsylvania; instituted an academy, taught eighteen months, realized a sum sufficient to complete his collegiate course, and graduated with honors. He next accepted a call as teacher of languages in the Philadelphia University. While there he pursued his theological studies in the Reformed Presbyterian Seminary. He was licensed by the Northern Presbytery in 1811, and in 1812 was ordained pastor of Coldenham Congregation, Orange County, N.Y.; in 1818 he accepted a call to the Scotch Covenanter Congregation at Ryegate, Caledonia County, Vermont; thence he went to New Alexandria, Pennyslvania, in 1839; and in 1848 to Eden, Illinois, — where he continued to preach until 1855. He died about the year 1861. Dr. Milligan was a warm friend of the Scotch Covenanters. He was instrumental in inaugurating the first temperance reform movement in the State of Vermont; and was first also to introduce the scriptural office of deacon in the American Reformed Presbyterian Church. His publications are, A Narratice of the Secession Controversy in Vermont: — Sermon on Free Agency: — Sermon on the Prospects of a True Christian in a Sinful World: — A Defence of Infant Baptism See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1863, page 388.

## Millington, William, D.D[[@Headword:Millington, William, D.D]]

             an eminent Anglican divine of the Reformatory period, And one of the most learned men of his day, was a native of Pocklington, Yorkshire. He was ordained priest March 8, 1420. He took his doctor's degree at Cambridge, and is said to have been a member of Clare Hall, in that university; but however that may be, certain it is that in 1443 he was appointed the provost of King's College. This important position, however, he voluntarily resigned in 1446, on a point of conscience. The oft-repeated statement that he was deprived of the provostship for unduly favoring natives of Yorkshire is without foundation. It is said that on leaving King's he retired to Clare Hall. He died in May 1466, and was buried in St. Edward's Church, Cambridge. An interesting memoir of Dr. Millington, by George Williams, B.D., was communicated to the Cambridge Antiquarian Society in 1858.

## Million[[@Headword:Million]]

             (רְבָבָה, rebabah', Genesis 21:60), ten thousand, as elsewhere rendered.

## Millo[[@Headword:Millo]]

             (Heb. always with the art. ham millo', המַּלּוֹאthe fulness; Sept. [Alex.] in 1 Kings 9 only ἡ Μελιο; Vulg. Mello), properly a mound or rampart, as being filled in with stones and earth; hence a fortress or castle; applied to two structures or fortifications:

(a) According to Gesenius (Thes. Heb. page 789), a part of the citadel of Jerusalem, probably the rampart or intrenchment; or, as Winer thinks (Worterb. s.v.), the tower afterwards called Hippicus (2Sa 5:9; 1Ki 9:15; 1Ki 9:24; 1Ki 11:27; 1Ch 11:8; 2Ch 32:5). In the last of these texts, where David is said to have restored or fortified the Millo “of” (not “in”) the city of David, the Sept. has τὸ ἀνάλῃμμα τῆς πόλεως, “the fortification of the city of David;” in the other passages it has simply ἄκρα, the mound or tower. The Targum merely Chaldaizes the Heb. term (מְלֵיתָא מִלְיְתָא, vallum) “Both name and thing seem to have been already in existence when the city was taken from the Jebusites by David. His first occupation, after getting possession, was to build around about, from the Millo and to the house' (A.V. ‘inward.' 2Sa 5:9); or, as the parallel passage has it, ‘he built the city round about, and from the Millo round about' (1Ch 11:8). Its repair or restoration was one of the great works for which Solomon raised his ‘levy' (1Ki 9:15; 1Ki 9:24; 1Ki 11:27); and it formed a prominent part of the fortifications by which Hezekiah prepared for the approach of the Assyrians (2Ch 32:5).” The same place is probably meant by the “house of Millo,” where Joash was killed (2Ki 12:21). Others are of the opinion that Millo was the name of a valley in Jerusalem, which separated ancient Jebus from the city of David, but which was afterwards filled up by David and Solomon (Barclay, City of the Great King, page 113). Schwarz (Pcrlest. page 241) holds that it was on the eastern declivity towards the spring of Siloam (reading Shiloah for Silla). The most natural impression from the notices is that it was some region or space adjacent to Mount Zion, perhaps that portion of the Tyropoeon enclosed by the first wall, the bridge, and the Temple. (See Lightfoot, Works, 2:189; — Hamelsveld, Bibl. Geogr. 2:46 sq.; Ewald, Jsr. Gesch. 3:70; Strong's  Harm. and Expos. of the Gospels, Append. 2, page 24; Schulz, Jerusalem, page 80.) SEE JERUSALEM.

(b) The fortress or citadel of Shechem, all the occupants or garrison of which joined in proclaiming Abimelech their king (Jdg 9:6; Jdg 9:20). SEE BETH-MILLO; SEE SILLA.

## Mills, Abraham, LL.D[[@Headword:Mills, Abraham, LL.D]]

             a prominent American author, was born in Dutchess County, N.Y., in 1796. After having received a thorough academic education, he opened a classical school in New York City. He had not been long engaged in this school when he was appointed professor of mathematics and philosophy in the Baptist Literary and Theological Institute, then established in New York. Three years after, when the institute was transferred to Hamilton, N.Y., Mills severed his connection, and flourished as a highly-esteemed teacher of and lecturer on rhetoric and belles-lettres. He died July 8, 1867. Mills issued text-books on the topics on which he gave instruction. The honorary degree of LL.D. was conferred on him by Madison University. He deserves a place here on account of his Compendium of the History of the Ancient Hebrews (1856). See Drake, Dict. of Amer. Biogr. s.v.; Appleton's Annual Cyclop. 1867, page 511.

## Mills, Cyrus Taggart, D.D[[@Headword:Mills, Cyrus Taggart, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Paris, N.Y., May 4, 1819. He graduated from Williams College in 1844, and from Union Theological Seminary in 1847; was ordained in 1848, and in 1849 went out as a missionary to Ceylon, having charge of the Battacotta Seminary. In 1855 failure of health obliged him to return. From 1856 to 1858 he was stated supply at Berkshire, N.Y., and in 1860 was chosen president of the Oahu College, in the Sandwich Islands, where he remained four years, and then resided for a year at Ware, Mass. In 1865 he went as agent of the Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions to California, where he established in Brooklyn a female seminary. He died in California in 1884.

## Mills, Henry, D.D[[@Headword:Mills, Henry, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian divine, was born at Morristown, N.J., March 12, 1786; pursued his preparatory studies in his native town; graduated at Princeton College in 1802; for a considerable time taught in the academy at Morristown, and also at Elizabethtown, N.J.; was tutor for two years at Princeton College; studied theology with the Reverend Dr. James Richards; was licensed by the Presbytery of New Jersey, and in 1816 was ordained pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Woodbridge, N.J. In 1821 he was called to the professorship of Biblical criticism in the theological seminary at Auburn, N.Y., where he continued to perform his duties with eminent ability until 1854, when he resigned, and was made professor emeritus. He died June 10, 1867. Dr. Mills was a man of marked characteristics — impressive in personal appearance, instructive in conversation, sharp in intellect. As a preacher, his style was simple, chaste, and direct. As a scholar, he was most eminent — thoroughly versed in Hebrew and master of the German language. He published in 1845 Horae Germaniae, a  Version of German Hymns. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1868, page 218.

## Mills, Nathaniel B[[@Headword:Mills, Nathaniel B]]

             an early and eminent minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church. He was born in Newcastle County, Delaware, February 23, 1766; was converted in 1783; entered the Baltimore Conference in 1787; in 1790 was stationed at Hartford, Connecticut; in 1804 at Baltimore; filled various important circuits, etc., until 1835, when he became superannuated.' He died in Carroll County, Maryland, February 20, 1845. He preached with great zeal and success for nearly sixty years. — Minutes of Conferences, 3:594; Stevens, Memorials of Methodism.

## Mills, Samuel[[@Headword:Mills, Samuel]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Northampton County, N.C., in 1780; was converted in 1800; entered the itinerancy in 1804; was stationed at Columbia in 1806, at Charleston in 1809, at Milledgeville in 1810, and at Camden in 1811, where he died, June 8, 1811. He was a plain, earnest preacher, possessed of good abilities, and “a witness of sanctification, which he frequently pressed on his hearers.” See Minutes of Conferences, 1:206.

## Mills, Samuel John (1)[[@Headword:Mills, Samuel John (1)]]

             a Congregational minister, was born May 16, 1743, in Kent, Conn. He graduated at Yale College in 1764, and was ordained June 29, 1769, in Torringford, Conn., where he resided until his death, May 11, 1833. He published a few occasional sermons, and two sermons on the religious sentiments of Christ, in a volume entitled Sermons Collected (1797). See Sprague, Annals of the American Pulpit, 1:672.

## Mills, Samuel John (2)[[@Headword:Mills, Samuel John (2)]]

             popularly called the “Father of Foreign Mission Work in Christian America,” an efficient minister of the Congregational Church, was the son of the minister of Torrington, Conn., and was born April 21, 1783. He was educated at Williams College (class of 1809). He next entered the theological seminary, having decided to preach the Gospel, and while at school in Andover his mind was deeply impressed with the importance of foreign missions, and he endeavored to awaken a similar feeling in the  hearts of his fellow-students. He united with Judson, Newell, Nott, and Hall in a resolution to undertake a foreign mission.

In 1812 and 1813 he and J.F. Schermerhorn made a missionary tour in the Western States. He was ordained, with other missionaries, at Newburyport, June 21,1815. He ascertained in March, 1815, that not a Bible could be found for sale or to be given away in New Orleans; he thereupon distributed many Bibles in French and English, and visited the sick soldiers. Finding that seventy or eighty thousand families at the South and West were destitute of a Bible, he suggested at the close of his report the formation of a national society like the British. His efforts contributed to the establishment of the American Bible Society, May 8, 1816. The plan of the United Foreign Mission Society, which, however, accomplished but little, originated with him while residing with Dr. Griffin at Newark, N.J., as did also the African school, which existed a few years at Parsippany, near Newark. He attended the first meeting of the Colonization Society, January 1, 1817, which was established by his and Dr. Finley's exertions, and Mills was at that time appointed, together with Dr. Burgess, to visit England, and explore the coast of Africa for the society. He sailed in November 1817, and in a wonderful manner escaped shipwreck on the coast of France. He sailed from England for Africa February 2, 1818, and arrived on the coast March 12. After a laborious inspection of more than two months, he embarked on his return in the brig Success, May 22, 1818. A severe cold, which he took early in June, was succeeded by a fever, and he died at sea, June 16, 1818. He was buried in the depths of the ocean. See Spring, Memoirs of John Samuel Mills (N.Y. 1820, 8vo); Sprague, Annals Amer. Pulpit, 2:566; Cyclop. Missions, page 263 sq.; Anderson, Hist. Missions of A. B. For. M. in India (1874).

## Mills, Thornton A., D.D[[@Headword:Mills, Thornton A., D.D]]

             a Presbyterian divine, was born in Paris, Kentucky, September 1810. He early enjoyed excellent educational advantages; graduated at Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, in 1830; studied theology for a short time in Lane Theological Seminary. and afterwards privately, and was licensed in 1833. He labored for some time in Frankfort, Kentucky, and in 1836 was installed pastor of the Third Presbyterian Church, Cincinnati. In 1848 he purchased The Watchman of the Valley, and continued to edit that paper, first under the name of Central Watchman, and later of Central Christian. Herald, until January, 1853, when it was bought by the synods of Ohio, Indiana, Cincinnati, and Wabash. During 1853 he was secretary and  general agent for the Church Erection Committee; in 1854 accepted a call to the Second Church, in Indianapolis; in 1856 was chosen as general secretary of the Permanent Committee of the General Assembly on Education for the Ministry, to which work he devoted the remainder of his life. He died June 21, 1867. Dr. Mills was a man of firm grasp of mind, clear and positive views of truth, and indomitable energy and perseverance. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1868, page 220; Meth. Qu. Rev. January 1872, page 27. (J.L.S.)

## Mills, William[[@Headword:Mills, William]]

             an early minister of the Methodist Church, was born in Monmouth County, N.J., August 26, 1747; entered the United States army in 1776; suffered various vicissitudes during the war until he was carried a prisoner to Europe, whence he returned after the war; was converted through Methodist instrumentality in 1792; entered the itinerancy at Philadelphia in 1799, and died at Long Branch, N.J., December 5, 1813. He was a most amiable and excellent man, and a very successful preacher. Several extensive revivals resulted from his labors. See Minutes of Conferences, 1:239.

## Mills, William Robert[[@Headword:Mills, William Robert]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Alexandria, Virginia, July 5, 1816. He enjoyed the advantages of a liberal academical training, and was for some time a student at William and Mary College. At an early age he was converted, and shortly after became fully persuaded of a divine call to the ministry; was licensed to preach, and was admitted into the Baltimore Conference in the spring of 1840. He labored successively on Berwick Circuit; in 1841 on Huntington Circuit; 1842, Northumberland; 1843, Lycoming; 1844, Lock Haven; 1845-46, Penn's Valley; 1847, Northumberland; 1848-49, Warrior's Mark; 1850-51, Huntingdon; 1852- 53, Lewistown Circuit; 1854-55, Newport; 1856, Mercersburg; 1857-58, Liberty, Maryland; 1859-60, East Baltimore Station; 1861-62, North Baltimore \*Station; 1863-65, Altoona; 1866-67, Lewisburg; 1868, Carlisle; 1869, York. In the last-named place he died, December 18, 1869. Mills was a faithful pastor and an eloquent preacher. His sermons evinced deep research, were argumentative, and logically arranged, and enlivened with illustrative incidents. See Minutes of Conferences, 1870, page 54.

## Millstone[[@Headword:Millstone]]

             (רֶכֶב, re'keb, usually a chariot, hence the “upper millstone” or rider, Deu 24:6; more fully. כֶּלִח רֶכֶב, Jdg 9:53; 2Sa 11:21; in Job 41:24 there is no Hebrew word corresponding; in Isa 47:2; Jer 25:10, רֵחִיַם; elsewhere rendered “ mill;” Gr. μύλος). SEE MILL.

## Milman, Henry Hart, D.D[[@Headword:Milman, Henry Hart, D.D]]

             one of the leaders of the Broad Church party in the Anglican communion of our day, an ecclesiastic of distinction also, both as a historian and a poet, was the youngest son of Sir Francis Milman, physician to George III, and was born in London February 10, 1791. He was educated at Eton, and afterwards at Brasenose College, Oxford, where he took the degrees of B.A. and M.A., and of which he was elected a fellow. He wrote several poems, and secured much distinction by his efforts. In 1817 he took holy orders, and was appointed vicar of St. Mary's, Reading. In 1820 Mr. Milman published The Fall of Jerusalem, a dramatic poem, founded on Josephus's narrative of the siege of the sacred city. This, in some respects his most beautiful poetical production, established his reputation. In 1821 he was elected professor of poetry in the University of Oxford. He now published three other dramatic poems: The Martyr of Antioch, Belshazzar, and Anne Boleyn. In 1827 he published his sermons, delivered as the Bampton Lecture, and entitled The Character and Conduct of the Apostles considered as the Evidence of Christianity (8vo), and in 1829, without his name, The History of the Jews (Lond. and N.Y. 3 volumes, 18mo). This work was written in so liberal a spirit that orthodox ecclesiastics could hardly fail to be offended. Its weak point was a want of adequate learning, especially in the department of Biblical criticism. Anew edition, greatly improved, and more critical, yet still far from being very accurate, or built on solid foundations, prefaced by an interesting introduction, was published in 1863 (Lond. and N.Y. 3 volumes, 12mo). In this new form the work has had a large circulation both among Jews and Gentiles. It is to this day the only worthy record of the “chosen people of God” in the English tongue. In 1840 he came again before the public as a historian; this time with a History of Christianity from the Birth of Christ to the Abolition of Paganism in the Roman Empire (Lond. 3 volumes, 8vo; N.Y., Harpers, 1 volume, 8vo). In this work he professes to view Christianity as a historian,  in its moral, social, and political influences, referring to its doctrines no further than is necessary for explaining the general effect of the system. It is a far better effort than his previous work, and marks the advance of an accomplished and liberal-minded student. His scholarly attainments received the acknowledgment of the Church by various appointments. In 1849, after having been honored successively with the rectory of St. Margaret's, Westminster, and the canonship of Westminster, he was promoted to the deanery of St. Paul's. This position he held until his death, September 24, 1868.

The works already mentioned will secure for dean Milman an honorable place in the literary history of England, but they are by no means his ablest productions. His greatest work, and one of the most valuable productions in the English language, is his History of Latin Christianity, including that of the Popes to the Pontificate ‘of Nicholas V (Lond. and N.Y. 1854, 8 volumes, 8vo); a continuation of the author's History of Christianity, and yet in itself a complete work. To give it that completeness, dean Milman has gone over the history of Christianity in Rome during the first four centuries. It brings the history down to the close of the pontificate of Nicholas V, that is, to 1455. It is a work of great learning, liberality, and chastened eloquence; it displays a broad grasp of human nature in its religious workings; something of the philosopher, and still-more of the poet, is seen in the strong and vivid spirit of sympathy with which he deals. with men of the most different opinions. The work has secured for its author a position in the first rank of English historians. “No such work,” says the Qu. Rev. of London, “has appeared in English ecclesiastical literature-none which combines such breadth of view with such depth of research, such high literary and artistic eminence with such patient and elaborate investigation.” Perhaps we should add the estimate of one of our own historical writers, than whom no greater or more competent critic could be heard; we refer to William H. Prescott (Philip II, 2:500, n. 69), who says of it: “One of the most remarkable works of the present age, in- which the author reviews, with curious erudition and in a profoundly philosophical spirit, the various changes that have taken place in the Roman hierarchy; and, while he fully exposes the manifold errors and corruptions of the system, he shows throughout that enlightened charity which is the most precious of Christian graces, as, unhappily, the rarest.” Dean Milman also earned the gratitude of the Christian world by an edition of Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, which presented the  great historian with more ample illustration than he had before received, and set at rest many exceptions taken by Gibbon against Christianity. The notes were further elucidated and verified by Dr. W. Smith, and Gibbon's works are now sought for only in this amended form. Other works of Milman are a Life of Keats, and Hebrew Prophecy, a sermon, published in 1865. He also edited an illustrated review of Horace, with a Life of the poet; translations from the Agamemnon of Eschylus, Bacchanals of Euripides, etc. He was a frequent contributor to the [London] Quarterly Review. A collected edition of his “Poetical Works,” including Fazio, a tragedy, which has frequently been on the stage, was published in 1840, and, besides the works above mentioned and his smaller poems, contains the Noala and Damayanti, translated from the Sanscrit. Since his death Annals of St. Paul's Cathedral (1868), and Savonarola, Erasmus, and other Essays (1870), have been published.

Dean Milman was also an important contributor to English hymnology. Some of his productions are familiar to every English-speaking Christian; in the Anglican Church he is a particular favorite, and as the author of “When our heads are bowed with woe,” “Bound upon the accursed tree,” “Ride on, ride on in majesty,” and the more subjective composition, “Brother, thou art gone before us” (from the Martyr of Antioch), has established a household name, and has secured popular love. As he occupied for years the pulpit of one of the largest and most influential of English churches, we append the following portrayal of dean Milman from the Saturday Rev. (October 1868): “He was no speaker; he had not the very least of platform tricks; with a superb scorn, he disdained the arts which win fame at public meetings; and in a certain sense he was not a good preacher. He was too refined, too much habituated to limitations, too sensitive, and too careful, to be able to fling out those broad statements which must be hazarded by the popular preacher. But in a certain sort of preaching he was first-rate. His eulogium on the duke of Wellington — we doubt whether it is published — struck us, as we were fortunate enough to hear it, as equal to the best of the French models of pulpit eloquence.” See Vapereau, Dict. des Contemnporains, s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; English Cyclop. s.v.; Men of the Times, s.v. 1, Hagenbach, Hist. Doctrines, 2:423 sq.; Schaff, Christ in Song, pages 206- 209; Lecky, Hist. of European Morals from Augustus to Charlemagne (Preface) (1869) ; Edinb. Rev. January 1858; January 1864; and January 1869; Lond. Qu. Rev. April 1816; July 1818; May 1820, and April 1869;  Blackwood's Mag. March and July 1822; December 1868; North Brit. Rev. Nov. 1854; March, 1869: Fraser's Mag. October 1854; Christian Remenbrancer, 1854, October page 266; Kitto, Journ. of Sac. Lit. 1854, October; Westminst. Rev. 1870, October page 219; Princeton Rev. 1842, page 238; Pen Pictures of popular English Preachers (Lond. 1852), pages 175-178.

## Milne, Colin[[@Headword:Milne, Colin]]

             a Scottish divine, noted for his attainments in natural science, was born at Aberdeen, Scotland, about 1744. He was educated at Marischal College under the supervision of his uncle, Dr. Campbell, who was both principal and divinity professor at the college. After completing his studies there, Milne entered the University of Edinburgh. He joined the Church of England, and by the aid of the duke of Northumberland obtained the rectory of North Chapel, in Sussex. His pulpit eloquence soon made him widely known, and he received the appointment of preacher to the London Hospital, and also the lectureship of Deptford, a position which he held for many years. He died in 1815. His sermon preached at the anniversary meeting of the Roval Humane Society was published in 1779 (8vo). A volume of his sermons was published in 1780 (8vo). His other publications were in a line foreign to our work.

## Milner, Isaac (1), D.D[[@Headword:Milner, Isaac (1), D.D]]

             an Anglican divine of note, eminent for his piety as well as for his great attainments in divinity and the sciences, was born of humble parentage near Leeds, Yorkshire, in 1751. As a boy of six he entered the grammar school of his native place, but the straitened circumstances of his family obliged the removal of Isaac, and he was transferred from the schoolroom to the factory. Though apprenticed to a weaver, he continued to devote his leisure hours to study, and gradually acquired sound learning. His brother, the noted Joseph Milner (q.v.), who had enjoyed many educational advantages, was in 1767 appointed head-master of the grammar school at Hull. By him Isaac was relieved of his obligation at the factory, and afforded opportunity to continue his studies in the position of assistant to Joseph. In 1770 Isaac was admitted a student at Queen's College, Cambridge, and there received his degree in 1774, and was appointed tutor. He received among his pupils Mr. Pitt and Mr. Wilberforce, with whom he travelled abroad, and became the honored instrument in the  conversion of the latter. SEE WILBERFORCE.

In 1775 Isaac Mihber was elected fellow of Queen's College. In 1783, returning to. the university, he was chosen professor of natural philosophy, and master of his college in 1788, when he proceeded doctor in divinity. In 1791 he was appointed to the deanery of Carlisle. He was elected vice-chancellor of the university in 1792, and six years afterwards became Lucasian professor of mathematics. He died at the house of Wilberforce, at Kensington Gore, April 1,1820. Dean Milner wrote, besides several papers in the Philosophical Transactions, and the continuation of his brother's Church History, the following works: Animadversions on Dr. Haweis's Impartial History of the Church of Christ (1800, 8vo): — Strictures on some of the Publications of the Rev. Herbert Marsh, intended as a Reply to some of his Objections against the Bible Society (1813, 8vo): — Essays on Human Liberty; Sermons (2 volumes, 8vo); besides works of a mathematical kind. “ Dean Milner was possessed of very extensive and accurate learning, which he always had at his command. He had great talents for conversation, and a dignified simplicity of manner. His religious and political principles agreed pretty closely with his brother's.” See Meth. Qu. Rev. 1840 (July), page 407; Jones, Christ. Biog. s.v.; English Cyclop. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Mary Milne, Life of Isaac Milner (1842).

## Milner, Isaac (2)[[@Headword:Milner, Isaac (2)]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Yorkshire, England, April 2, 1818. His parents were of the old English Wesleyan stock, and young Milner was educated with great piety and care. In his seventeenth year he was converted, and, believing: himself called of God to preach the Gospel, he hesitatingly prepared to enter the ministry. While human reasoning held him back, divine love impelled him forward. He began his elementary studies alone and after the midnight hour, and in this way gained his education. Being of a studious habit, he soon acquired a storehouse of knowledge, and was numbered among the promising youths of the ministry. Seized with a desire to visit America, he came to New Orleans in 1848. Many and severe trials awaited him in his new home. He was taken sick of typhoid fever, and for three months he lay hovering between life and death. After his recovery he was for a time a member of the Memphis Conference. He afterwards joined the Tennessee Conference, and remained a member of it till his death, which occurred near Columbia, Tennessee, June 16, 1872. Isaac Milner was one of the most popular  Methodist preachers. He knew no failure; if he ever did, his audience knew nothing about it. In every department he proved himself to be a man of great ability and usefulness. His mind was naturally vigorous and receptive; his memory tenacious; his well-balanced mind, like a rich, productive field, yielded a wealth of thought, independent of the production of other men. His fancy was vigorous, his figures original and bold always pleasing often overwhelming. Milner served his Church in various ways, but in every department he proved himself not only a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, but a workman of great ability, usefulness, and popularity. See Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the M.E. Church, South, 1872, page 715 sq.

## Milner, John (1)[[@Headword:Milner, John (1)]]

             an English nonjuring divine of note, was born near Halifax in 1627 or 1628. He was educated at Christ's College, Cambridge, and after his graduation took orders. He was, however, obliged to live retired till the Restoration, when he obtained the curacy of Beeston, and in 1673 was appointed vicar of Leeds. In 1681 he was chosen prebendary of Ripon; but, on refusing the oaths at the Revolution, he quitted his preferments and went to St. John's College, Cambridge, where he died, February 16, 1702. Dr. Milner was a prolific writer, and published several controversial theological tracts and critical dissertations upon various portions of the Scriptures. Of his numerous works we mention the following: Church History of Palestine from the Birth of Christ to Diocletian (1688, 4to): — Conjectanea in Isa 9:1 : — De Nethinin sive Nethinceis: — Defence of Archbishop Usher against Drs. Cary and Vossius: — Account of Mr. Locke's Religion: — Animadversions on Le Clerc's Reflections upon our Saviour and his Apostles. See Watson, Halifax; Thoresby, Vicaria Leodensis, page 114 sq.; Wilford, Memorials; Cooper, Biog. Dict. Page 869; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, 2:1293.

## Milner, John (2), D.D[[@Headword:Milner, John (2), D.D]]

             more properly named MILLER, an eminent Romish theologian and antiquary, was born in London, October 14, 1752. He was educated at the schools of Sedgley Park and Edgbaston, and then went to study theology at Douai. Having taken orders, he was in 1779 attached to Winchester Chapel. Although a zealous Roman Catholic, he refused to join in the efforts made by his Church in England in 1788 and in 1791 to obtain from  Parliament the repeal of the ancient laws against Roman Catholics. In after- times he was engaged in numerous controversies, both with Protestant theologians and with members of the Roman Catholic committee, who accused him of too great vivacity in his discussions. He declared against the right of the king of vetoing the appointment of bishops, and, together with the Irish Roman Catholic clergy, obstinately refused to yield the point to the solicitations of his own party. In 1814 he even took a journey to Rome, to consult with the pope on this point. The esteem in which he was held in the midst of these difficulties is evinced by the appointment he received in 1803 as apostolic vicar of the midland district, under the title of bishop of Castabala in partibus. Dr. Milner settled at Wolverhampton, where he died, April 19, 1826. He was quite distinguished as an archaeologist, belonged to the Antiquarian Society, and contributed many learned papers to the Archceologia. He wrote The History, Civil and Ecclesiastical, and Survey of the Antiquities of Winchester (1798, 2 volumes, 4to; 2d ed., corrected and enlarged, 1809, 2 volumes, 4to): — The End of Religious Controversy, addressed to Dr. Burgess, Bishop of St. David's, in answer to his Protestant Catechism (1818; 2d ed., revised, 1819, 8vo; transl. into French under the title Excellence de la Religion Catholique, Paris, 1823, 2 volumes, 8vo): — A Vindication of the End of Religious Controversy from the Exceptions of Bishop Burgess and the Rev. R. Grier (Lond. 1822, 8vo): — Letters to a Prebendary, being an Answer to Reflections on Popery by the Rev. John Sturges, LL.D. (Winchester, 1800, 4to): — A short Description of the Hospital of St. Cross, near Winchester (21st ed. Winchester; no date): — An Historical and Critical Inquiry into the Existence and Character of St. George, Patron of England (1795, 8vo): — A Treatise on the Ecclesiastical History of England during the Middle Ages (1811, royal 8vo): — Letter to the Author of a Book called A candid and impartial Sketch of the Government of Pope Clement XIV (Lond. 1785, 8vo): — Divine Right of the Episcopacy (1791, 8vo): — The Case of Conscience solved, or the Catholic Claims proved to be compatible with the Coronation Oath (1802, 8vo): — Inquiry into certain Opinions concerning the Catholic Inhabitants and the Antiquities of Ireland (1808, 8vo). Of all the advocates of the papal Church, no one has displayed more learning and acuteness than Milner, though not unmixed with partisan gall and misrepresentation. See Lond. Qu. Rev. 1810 (May), 1811 (October); Rose, New Biog. Dict. s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. 2:2771; Hoefer, Nouv.  Biog. Generale, 35:554; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Dr. Husenbeth, Life of Dr. Milner (Dublin, 1862, 8vo).

## Milner, Joseph[[@Headword:Milner, Joseph]]

             an eminent Anglican divine and ecclesiastical historian, the elder brother of Isaac, was born near Leeds, Yorkshire, January 2, 1744. He was sent to the grammar school at Leeds, where, by his industry and talents, among which a memory of most extraordinary power was conspicuous, he gained the warm regard of his master. Milner's father had always been in very narrow circumstances; his death only made the task greater; but, by the assistance of some gentlemen in Leeds, whose children Milner had lately engaged in teaching, and by the offer of the office of chapel-clerk at Catharine Hall, Cambridge, he was enabled to enter that hall at the age of eighteen. In the year 1766 he took his degree of B.A., and gained the chancellor's second gold medal for classical knowledge. He was made assistant in the school, and afterwards the curate of the Reverend Mr. Atkinson, of Thorp Arch, near Tadcaster. While in this place he undertook the completion of an epic poem, entitled Davideis, which he had commenced at Cambridge. It was submitted to Dr. (afterwards bishop) Hurd, who highly complimented the author on the talent it displayed, but advised him to defer its publication. On entering into deacon's orders, Mihier was elected head-master of the grammar school, and afternoon lecturer of the principal church of Hull. In this position he succeeded beyond the most ardent expectations of his dearest friends, especially in the capacity of an instructor, and the school. increased under his care. About the year 1770 Joseph Milner embraced the sentiments of the evangelical party in the Church of England. This change in his religious views brought upon him neglect, and in some cases open opposition from many among the upper classes who had once been his admirers and friends; but his church was soon crowded with others, chiefly from the lower orders of the people, in whose sentiments and manners his preaching produced a striking change; and at length he not only recovered the esteem of his fellow- townsmen, but lived to see his own religious sentiments become so popular in the town that many of the pulpits of the churches were filled by his friends and pupils, and he himself was chosen vicar of Hull by the mayor and corporation. Mr. Milner had been appointed vicar of North Ferriby, near Hull;. subsequently he had been appointed to the vicarship of the Holy Trinity, Cambridge. His election as vicar of Hull occurred only a few weeks before his death, which took place on the 15th of November, 1797.  A monument, executed by Bacon. was erected to his memory in the high church of Hull by several of his friends and former pupils. The excellences of Mr. Milner's personal character were of the highest order. He was deeply pious, upright in all his conduct, singularly open and sincere, and kind, cheerful, and amusing in social life. In his political principles he was strongly attached to the established order of things in Church and State.

His principal works are Gibbon's Account of Christianity considered (1781, 8vo), in which he not only exposes the sophistry of that infidel theologian, but gives the true character of the religion which he had attempted to undermine: — Some Passages in the Life of Wm. Howard (1785, 8vo): — Essays on the Influence of the Holy Spirit (1789, 12mo): — Practical Sermons (1801, 2 volumes, 8vo; 2d edit. revised, corrected, and enlarged by Reverend Isaac Milner, D.D., dean of Carlisle, 1801-23, 3 volumes, 8vo): — The Way of Salvation, or the Christian Doctrine of Justification explained (Lond. 1814, 24mo); and, lastly, a History of the Church of Christ — a work by which Dr. Joseph Milner is principally known. He lived to complete only four volumes; but the task was taken up by his brother Isaac, who completed it by the addition of another volume, in which he was largely aided by the MS. left at his command. The work extends from the rise of Christianity to the Reformation. The first edition appeared in 5 volumes, 8vo, 1794 to 1812, and a second edition in 1810. The latest edition was published at London in 1847, 8vo. It was also translated into French (1836-8, 3 volumes, 12mo) and German (1804). At it omits nearly all discussion of ecclesiastical controversies, as well as of rites, ceremonies, and forms of Church government in fact, whatever did not agree with the writer's own opinions — Milner's work cannot be well termed a Church history, but its value as a contribution to ecclesiastical history is very considerable; only it should be read with much caution, and constant reference to Dr. Maitland's Strictures on Milner's Church History, and his Notes on Milner's History, etc. Dr. Milner's historical work certainly surpasses most other Church histories previously produced in the use made of the writings of the fathers, though the reverence which the author professes for those venerable men has led him to trust them too much. Most modern critics speak only in derogatory terms of this work. and an English writer of recent times thus comments upon it: “The principles on which the History of the Church of Christ is written are of the narrowest kind; the scholarship is poor, the literary merit still poorer, and the critical insight poorest of all. It deserves mention only for the  estimation in which it was formerly held.” The author of the Natural History of Enthusiasm, in commenting upon the characteristic defects of Mosheim and Milner as historians of Christianity, observes that “Mosheim gives us the mere husk of history, and Milner nothing but some separated particles of pure farina.” A collection of Dr. Joseph Milner's works was published by his brother Isaac (Lond. 1810, 8 volumes, 8vo). See Isaac Milner, Life of Joseph Milner, prefixed to his “Sermons;” Perry, Ecclesiastical History (see Index in volume 4); Bibliotheca Sacra, January 1850, page 65; North Brit. Rev. November 1858, page 186; Bickersteth, Christian Student, page 320; English Cyclop. s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. 2:2771; Hook, Eccles. Biog. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Milnor, James, D.D[[@Headword:Milnor, James, D.D]]

             a distinguished divine of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born at Philadelphia June 20, 1773. He studied for a while at the University of Pennsylvania, but about 1789 turned his attention to jurisprudence. His first settlement as a legal practitioner was at Norristown, but about 1797 he returned to Philadelphia, where he married. Until then he had lived, as he had been educated a Quaker; but as he had not been trained to any great strictness in the customs of the Friends, and as his wife belonged to an Episcopal family, it cost him little sacrifice to change his denomination. In consequence of his marriage, he had, moreover, been in due form “read out of meeting.” In 1805 Mr. Milnor was elected a member of the select council of Philadelphia for two years. In 1807 he was elected for three years to the same body; and in 1808 was raised to the presidency of the council for one year. In 1810 he was elected to the Congress of the United States, as a member of the House of Representatives, from the city and county of Philadelphia: his term there closed March 4, 1813. He was for a long time a man of. the world, though in the better sense of that expression; but about the year 1800 he began to turn his attention to religion. At first he inclined to Universalism, but finally, in 1812, became a communicant in the Episcopal Church. Soon after the expiration of his term in Congress he removed to Norristown, where, while preparing himself to enter the ministry, he acted as lay-reader in St. John's Church by permission of bishop White. He was ordained deacon in St. James's Church, Philadelphia, August 14, 1814, and was admitted to the order of Presbyters in the same place August 27, 1815. On October 21 following he was unanimously elected by the vestry a minister of the United Churches in  Philadelphia. He finally received a call from St. George's Church, in New York, which he accepted after much hesitation, and was installed by bishop Hobart September 30, 1816. He was made D.D. by the University of Pennsylvania in 1819. In 1830 he was sent to the British and Foreign Bible Society as a delegate of the American Bible Society, and of various other religious and benevolent institutions. On his return he resumed his charge at St. George's, and continued there until his death, April 8, 1844. Dr. Milnor was distinguished for his dignity and wisdom, and especially for his benevolence and piety. He ardently labored for the advancement of the kingdom of Christ, and his life is full of incident and instruction, “alike attractive to the ardent youth, the man of business, the humble Christian, and the mature theologian.” Dr. Milnor published an Oration on Masonry (Phila. 1811): a Thanksgiving Sermon (New York, 1817): A Sermon on the Death of his Excellency De Witt Clinton (New York, 1828): — Two Sermons in: the National Preacher (1836): — A Charitable Judgment of the Opinions and Conduct of Others (New York, 1845). See the Rev. John S. Stone, D.D. Memoir of the Rev. James Milnor, D.D. (New York, 1848, 12mo); Prot. Epis. Qu. Rev. and Ch. Register, April 1855, page 311; N.Y. Ch. Rev. 2:31; New-Englander, 7:122 sq.; Princeton Rev. 21:236; Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 5:562; Meth, Qu. Rev. July 1849, page 407; Drake, Dict. of Amer. Biog. s.v.

## Milo Of Rheims[[@Headword:Milo Of Rheims]]

             a noted character in the ecclesiastical history of the 8th century, flourished as archbishop of Rheims and Treves. In his early life he was decidedly irreligious; dedicated himself to a soldier's profession, and gained much notoriety as one of Charles Martel's warriors. When the Carlovingian was involved in a quarrel with St. Rigobert. the archbishop of Rheims, he ended the dispute by deposing Rigobert, and bestowed the primatical see upon Milo, who soon after succeeded in obtaining possession also of the equally important archiepiscopate of Treves. He is described as being a clerk in tonsure, but in every other respect an irreligious laic; yet when pope Boniface interfered and sought his removal, the holy father, with all the aid of his royal patrons, was unable to oust Milo from his inappropriate dignities; and in 752, ten years after the beginning of his reforms, we find pope Zachary, in response to an appeal for advice, counselling to leave Milo to the divine vengeance (Epist. 142). Nothing more is known of Milo's personal history. See Lea, Hist. of Sacerdotal Celibacy, page 132.

## Milon (1)[[@Headword:Milon (1)]]

             a French monastic, was born about the beginning of the 9th century. In his youth he submitted to the monastic rules of the abbey of Saint Imand. Some critics have reckoned him among the abbots of that house, but this is an erroneous opinion. Milon was superintendent of the schools attached to Saint Amand, when Charles the Bald confided to him the education of his two sons, Pepin and Drogon. He died June 20, 872. A great number of the poems of Milon have been preserved. His Vie de Saint Amand, in heroic verse, is preserved in the collection of Bollandus of February 5th. It is to be regretted that we cannot find in this collection a supplement in prose to the Vie de Saint Amand by the monk Baudemond. Henschenius pretends, it is true, that this supplement is not the work of Milon; but the manuscripts, the epitaph of Milon, and the authority of Mabillon condemn the assertion of Henschenius. This supplement can be found in Surius of February 6th. Mabillon and Bollandus have, besides, published two sermons of Milon on Saint Amand, which are also found in the works of Philip, abbot of Bonne- Esperance. To the writings already mentioned we may add a Homelie sur Saint Principe, edited by Surius; a little poem, Sur le Printemps et l'Hiver, published by Casimir Oudin, in his Supplenmentun de Scriptoribus ecclesiasticis a Bellarmino omissis; an epitaph on the princes Drogon and Pepin, in the collection of Bollandus, June 16th, ascribed to Milon by Mabillon; two pieces in hexameter verse, Sur la. Croix, which are still unedited; also a poem, Sur la Sobrietfe, published by Martene, Anecd. 1:44. See Trithemius, De Script. eccles. c. 283; Mabillon, Annal. 1:427; Hist. Litt. de la France, 5:409; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Milon (2)[[@Headword:Milon (2)]]

             a French prelate, was born about the beginning of the 11th century. He joined the Benedictine order in the monastery of Saint-Aubin, at Angers. Milon was sent to Rome by his abbot to pope Urban II, and was by him presented with the cardinal's hat, and made bishop of Palestine. He was finally ordered to return to France, and preach against simony. Milon assisted in 1095 at the Council of Clermont. After the death of Urban II, Milon was appointed by Pascal II papal legate. Milon died about the year 1112. Marbode wrote a eulogy upon him, which Mabillon has published in the fifth volume of his Annales. Martene has published, in his Voyage Litteraire, 2:244, some verses of a certain Milon which are believed to be  written by the chief bishop of Palestine. See Hist. Litt. de la France, 10:20; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Milon (3)[[@Headword:Milon (3)]]

             a French prelate, was born in the latter part of the 11th century. In his youth he lived in strict seclusion, but later embraced the rules of the canons of Prdmontre; in 1121 was made abbot of the monastery of Dompmartin; and finally, in 1131, was elected and confirmed bishop of Terouanne. The first act of his episcopate appears to have been the consecration of Simon, abbot of Saint-Bertin. Milon was a strict disciplinarian. In 1148 he assisted in the Council of Rheims, at the trial of Gilbert de la Porree. In 1150 he was engaged in a debate with Thierry, count of Flanders. In 1157, delegated by the sovereign pontiff, he adjusted a dispute which arose between the bishop of Amiens and the abbot of Corbie. Baronius has praised the religious character and wisdom of Milon; others have greatly extolled his humility. Claude la Saussaye has given him a place in his martyrology; and Luc, abbot of Saint-Corneille, has dedicated to him his Commentaires sur le Cantique des Cantiques. Thus Milon, who lived in an age fruitful in illustrious prelates, was one of the glories of his province. No one has to this day made a rigorous distinction between his authentic writings and the more numerous works which appear to have been improperly attributed to him. He died July 16, 1158. See Gallia Christ. 10, col. 1347, 1546; Hist. Litt. de la France, 13:286; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog.

## Milon (4)[[@Headword:Milon (4)]]

             a French prelate, was born in England, of French descent, about the latter part of the 11th century. Milon, bishop of Terouanne, having died in 1158, Milon was appointed his successor, having formerly been archdeacon of that church. A letter written to pope Alexander III, in favor of Thomas a Becket, has been attributed to him. A friend of John of Salisbury, bishop of Chartres has addressed two of his epistles to him. He died at Terouanne, September 14, 1169.. See Gallia Christ. 10, col. 1548; Hist. Litt. de la France, 13:287; Hoefer, Vouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Milon (5)[[@Headword:Milon (5)]]

             a French ecclesiastic, was born about the beginning of the 12th century. He was sent by Innocent III to preach a crusade against the Albigenses. Subsequently he led the crusaders, marched under the walls of Beziers, and  besieged and burned that place, after having slaughtered the inhabitants. Milon is mentioned for the last time as being present at the council held at Avignomn, September 6, 1209. In the collection of the letters of Innocent III published by Baluze are two letters from his legate. They also attribute to this fanatic a prayer to the Virgin, which has been inserted by P. Benoit in his Histoire des Albigeois, 1:279. See Hist. Litt. de la France, 17:26; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Milon, Johann Nicolaus[[@Headword:Milon, Johann Nicolaus]]

             a German theologian, was born at Hamburg November 2, 1738; was educated at the Johanneum, and later at the gymnasium of his native city. In 1760 he entered the University of Gittingen, where he studied ancient languages and Church history. He returned in 1764 to Hamburg, and was appointed in 1765 professor of philosophy at Kiel; in 1769 he was appointed minister at Luneburg, and in 1770 at Wandsbeck, where he died, June 10,1795. Some of his important works are, Diss. de scribarum erroribus in textu Hebraico V.T. impresso (Kilouii, 1764, 4to): — Observationes criticae in aliquot Veteris Foederis loca (ibid. 1765, 4to): —Kritische Anmerkungen ber einige Stellen des Alten Testaments (Kiel, 1768, 8vo): — Etwas uber 1 Mos. xlix, 10 und Mat 5:31-32 (Hamburg, 1788, 8vo).

## Miltiades[[@Headword:Miltiades]]

             also called Melchiades or Melciades, a bishop of Rome, was born about the middle of the 3d century. He early occupied as a priest a very conspicuous place by his arduous efforts to protect the rights and interests of the Roman Church against the many wrongs enacted by pope  Maxentius, and was, besides, prominent in the protection of Christians during the persecutions. He succeeded Eusebius on the pontifical throne in 310, and, in 313, was ordered by the emperor Constantine the Great, who was opposed to the Donatists, to bring the Donatist difficulties to a close. In council with twenty Gallican and Italian bishops, he reinstated Csecilian as bishop of Carthage. For his zeal and exertion in trying to bring back the Donatists into the union of the Church he was slandered, but Augustine (Epiist. 162) speaks of him as “vir optimus, filius Christianae pacis et pater Christianoa plebis.” The Manichaeans also, who worked secretly at Rome, found in him a watchful guardian against their doctrines. He was the first pope to live in a royal palace, which was presented to him by the emperor Constantine the Great with other rich endowments. Miltiades issued two well-known edicts the one interdicting fasting on Sundays and Thursdays, because the heathens celebrated these days “quasi sacrum jejunium;” and he also enacted, “Ut oblationes consecrate per ecclesias ex consecratu episcopi dirigerentur, quod declaratur fermentum.” The true meaning of the latter edict has often been a matter of dispute. Miltiades died in 314: it is erroneously reported of him that he died a martyr. St. Bernard, who, described the life of this pope, makes no mention of the manner of his death. His remains were interred in the Calixtine Chapel, but by pope Paul I they were removed “in capite” to the Church of St. Sylvester. See Bower, Hist. of the Popes (see Index in volume 7); D'Artaud, Life and Times of the Roman Pontiffs (N.Y. 1865, 2 volumes, roy. 8vo), 1:67; Herzog, Real- Encyklop. 9:300; Wetzer.u.Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, volume 6, s.v.

## Miltiaides[[@Headword:Miltiaides]]

             an early ecclesiastical writer, noted for his able defence of the orthodox Church against the Montanists, is supposed to have flourished towards the close of the 2d century. Eusebius and Jerome mention his writings, but there is now no trace of these supposed valuable productions. He is said to have lived under Marcus Aurelius (161-180), and under his son and successor Commodus (180-192). Miltiades was an able polemic, and waged war successfully, not only against the Montanists, but also combated Judaism and heathenism in its various phases. See Eusebius, Hist. Ecc 5:17.

## Miltitz, Karl Von[[@Headword:Miltitz, Karl Von]]

             a Roman ecclesiastic, celebrated as the papal chamberlain and legate to the Reformers, was the son of a Saxon nobleman, and was born about 1490. He flourished first as canon at Mayence, Treves, and Missonia. In 1515 he removed to Rome and became papal notary. In 1518, when cardinal Cajetan had so signally failed in bringing “little brother Martin” to submission, Leo X became aware of the greatness of the schism likely to occur in the German Church. The strife against the Latin system had assumed gigantic proportions. Around Luther were now gathered the great, and the strong, and the learned of the Teutonic race. Frederick, the electoral prince of Saxony, was Luther's staunch friend and protector, and Leo X, knowing the influence and power of this prince, felt loth to incur his ill-will by harsh measures against Luther. Miltitz was therefore despatched to the electoral court with a valuable present — the  consecrated golden rose. This was to give the electoral prince assurance of the good intentions of pope Leo towards Saxony, and of his special friendship for Frederick; at the same time he was instructed to conciliate Luther, and, if possible, to make an end of the whole Lutheran controversy. In December, 1518, Miltitz arrived in Saxony, but, being careful to find out first how matters stood, he did not take the consecrated rose with him on his first call. This was a mistake on Miltitz's part, for, when the rose afterwards arrived, the prince acted very coolly, and, instead of accepting the present in person, commissioned three of his noblemen to receive the pope's gift, and Luther aptly remarked that “its odor had been lost on the long journey” (see Luther's Briefe, edited by De Wette, 1:108, 109). Miltitz's special instructions were to conciliate Luther, and we must acknowledge that he acted with much policy and skill. He carefully abstained from visiting cardinal Cajetan, who, by his imperious and arrogant treatment of Luther, had lost all influence with the electoral prince. When among friends, or even while staying in public houses, he did not hesitate to denounce the indulgence traffic, and assured his hearers that the — shameful trade was carried on without the pope's consent. It was therefore perfectly natural that the electoral prince and Luther should have put confidence in Miltitz, and that his mission of conciliation seemed in a fair way to succeed (comp. however, Fisher, Ref. page 97, note 2).

On January 3, 1519, Miltitz had a conference with Luther at Altenburg. The papal legate received the Reformer kindly, embraced and kissed him, and then addressed him as follows: “Dear brother Maftin, how much I have been mistaken! I always imagined you an old doctor, sitting behind the stove, and full of whims and chimerical notions. But now I see that you are in the very height of manly strength. Not with five thousand armed men would I dare to take you to Rome. All my investigations have shown me that, wherever one person is for the pope, three are against him and for you.” He then in the kindest manner remonstrated against Luther's violence, showing him how much harm the Church had to suffer in consequence. He failed, however, to procure any recantation, and succeeded simply in obtaining from Luther an expression of submissiveness. Silence was imposed on him, as well as on his opponents, and it was agreed to transfer the whole matter to the judgment of the archbishop of Treves. In consequence of this agreement, Luther wrote to the pope a letter full of courtesy and humility, and went even so far as to declare publicly “that separation from a Church for which St. Paul and St. Peter, and one hundred thousand martyrs, had shed their blood, was not  permissible, and that on no account must we resist her teachings and commands” (see Walch, 15:812). This attitude of the great Reformer has often been stigmatized by the Romanists as an act of hypocrisy and simulation (see Wetzer u. Weite, Kirchen-Lex. 7:148 Pallavicini, Gesch. d. Conc. v. Trient); but Luther's design, it must be borne in mind, was not to array himself against the Church, but to vindicate her against what he believed to be an abuse of her sacred name. Luther's movements were so completely churchly that even archbishop Manning (Unity of the Church, page 328 sq.) is obliged to acknowledge it. At this critical moment (February 1519) Dr. Eck, one of Luther's most prominent opponents, who in 1518 had challenged Carlstadt to a public disputation, published an outline of his Theses, which clearly proved to Luther that the main object of his attack was not Carlstadt, but himself. Luther considered this a breach of the agreement which he had concluded with Miltitz, and, as his adversaries did not hold themselves bound thereby, he, of course, felt relieved from his promise, and he so declared to the elector Frederick on the 13th of March. Luther's position at these disputations widened the breach with Rome, SEE LUTHER; and the reformatory writings, To the Christian Nobles of the German Nation, of the Bettering of the Christian State (August 1520), and Of the Babylonish Captivity of the Church (October 1520), tended to fix the fact that reconciliation with the Church of Rome was no longer possible. Yet Miltitz would not despair of it.

October 12, 1520, he had another conference with Luther at Lichtenberg, and then and there Luther expressed himself willing once more to test the question. It was too late, however, for in September 1520. Eck had appeared in Germany with the papal bull, condemning as heresies forty-one propositions extracted from Luther's writings, and summoning him, on pain of excommunication, to retract his errors within sixty days. This ended Miltitz's mission as far as Luther was concerned. But as Miltitz's instructions extended not only against Luther, but also against Tetzel, whose behavior in the traffic in indulgences had been marked with peculiar impudence and indecency, he now repaired to Leipsic (December 1519), sent for Tetzel, and subjected him to a most searching examination, which is given in a letter written by Miltitz to Pfeffinger (see Lescher, Reformationsacten, 3:20 [Leipsic, 1729]): “I know enough of Tetzel's scandalous and lying life and actions. I convicted him of his crimes by well- attested testimony. I showed him the receipts of Fugger's commissioners, which proved beyond doubt that he received one hundred and thirty florins per month for his trouble, besides all expenses paid; a carriage with three  horses, and ten florins per month extra for his servant. Thus did Tetzel, who, moreover, has two illegitimate children in the employ of the Church. No one can estimate how much he may have stolen. I shall report all these things to Rome, and expect a papal judgment.” Tetzel, in consequence of his fear and anxiety, was taken dangerously sick, and died soon after. All efforts of reconciliation having failed, Miltitz returned to Rome, but, after a short stay; he returned to Germany, and died there in 1529 — some say while on his homeward journey. See Seidemann, Carl v. Miltitz (Dresden, 1844, 8vo); id. Die Leipziger Disputation im Jahre 1519 (Dresden, 1843, 8vo); Luther's Briefe (edited by De Wette), 1:108, 109, and 115; Ranke, Hist. of the Reformation, 1:386 sq.; Hagenbach, Kirchengesch. 3:83 sq.; Krauth, Conservat. Reformation; Fisher, Hist. of the Reformation, page 97; Waddington, Hist. of the Reformation, volume 1, chapter 3; Gieseler, Eccles. Hist. volume 4; Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 8:326, 577; 3:629; 15:579.

## Milton, John[[@Headword:Milton, John]]

             among the brightest glories of the rich and varied literature of England, one of the four master-singers of the English Helicon, has taken rank with Homer and Virgil and Dante. Dryden's eulogy was well-merited, though too epigrammatic. In splendor of conception and in majesty of language, he is without a peer. Gray recognizes in him no inferiority to Shakespeare. John Wilson, a graceful poet himself and an appreciative critic, concludes that England had produced but one perfect poem, and that that poem Milton's Paradise Lost. Poetry, however, was not the exclusive occupation of Milton's life. He was also a laborious and prolific writer of prose, and was long-engaged in religious polemics and political controversy His wreath of immortality was woven of poetic flowers but his distinction in his own day was more largely due to his writings as a publicist and theological disputant Milton is even more remarkable in the phases and circumstances of his life than in the brilliancy of his genius.

His mature years coincided with that turbulent period when civil dudgeon first grew high, and passed into the turmoil and strife which constitute at once the shame and the glory of English history. The evening glories of the Elizabethan age lingered along the horizon at the commencement of his career; the serener but fainter radiance of the aera of queen Anne was prognosticated before his death. In the wide interval, one name of eminent renown in literature  stretches its single and unbroken line of light across the darkened heavens. That name is the name of John Milton. His birth was amid the glories that had ennobled the reign of the maiden queen; he gathered strength for the stern and shifting duties of life throughout the reign of James; he illustrated the early rule of Charles I by strains that seemed echoes from the fairy land behind he dignified the times of civil warfare and theological contention by prose compositions which occasionally united the grand cathedral harmonies of Hooker with the yet unanticipated magnificence of Burke. In poverty and depression, and blindness and age, he sought consolation from his music on that sacred harp, whose melting and piercing melodies no hand could ever awaken but his own. In character, and in the vicissitudes of his career, he was the true representative of the struggle which fills the seventeenth century. He bridges over the vast abyss between Shakespeare and Dryden, and marks the changing phases of the revolution in Church and State. Hence the consideration of his works can scarcely be severed from the notice of his life, which divides itself into four sharply-defined and well-contrasted periods.

I. Period 1608-1629. — Infancy, and education till he attains his majority, from the fifth year of James I to the fifth year of Charles I.

II. Period 1629-1639. — Completion of education at the university, in retirement and by foreign travel. From his majority to his return from the Continent.

III. Period 1639-1660. — Participation in the turmoil of the times. Active and public life.

IV. Period 1660-1674. — Milton's age, and blindness and seclusion. Production of his great poems.

Milton's Life and Works.

I. Period 1608-1629. — John Milton, the illustrious son of obscure but reputable parents, was born at the sign of “the Spread Eagle,” in Bread Street, in the parish of All-hallows, London, on the 9th of December, 1608. His father, of the same name, was a scrivener, who had been disinherited by his Roman Catholic parents for adopting the Protestant faith. His exertions in pursuit of a livelihood had secured comfort, if not wealth, and had not repressed his tastes for literature and art. Thus may be explained the conjunction of Puritan principles, of romantic fancies, of chivalrous  sentiments, of literary and artistic sensibilities, so strangely, and not always congruously, exhibited in the poetry of his son.

That son received the tenderest care and the most sedulous instruction from his hopeful and appreciative sire. He was of frail constitution, and was, in consequence, educated at first at home. From his instructor — the eminent scholar and zealous Puritan, Thomas Young — he imbibed his taste for poetry, as he gratefully acknowledged. At the age of thirteen he was sent to St. Paul's School, London, and after two years was transferred to Christ Church, Cambridge, where he remained, with some interruptions, over eight years. He carried with him to college great proficiency in the classic tongues, and had added to them an acquaintance with Hebrew, French, and Italian, and some skill in music and fencing. These liberal pursuits he continued to prosecute at the university with unusual diligence and with admirable results. Indications of his progress are supplied by his Latin and English poems, by notices in his polemical writings, and by his college exercises, which Mr. Masson has reclaimed from oblivion. From these sources we learn that he was exceedingly handsome, though of slight frame and moderate stature, and was skilled in all manly exercises. He is said to have been called “the lady of his college,” not less for the purity of his character than for his delicate beauty.

Along with his extensive acquirements, Milton bore with him to Cambridge the germs of all his future tastes, the beginnings of all his future accomplishments. In his boyhood he had been “smit with the love of sacred song.” Aubrey states that he was a poet at ten years of age. The love of the Muse grew strong with his growth. His devotion to his native tongue was early displayed. He soon aspired to the production of a poem which “future ages would not willingly let die.” He was already consecrating himself to his high vocation, and disciplining his young genius with patient diligence. In this calm and industrious tenor of life, Milton ripened to his majority.

II. Period 1629-1639. — On the 8th of December, 1629, Milton was twenty-one years of age. On the Christmasday ensuing he produced that magnificent choral song, The Ode on the Nativity. Admirable and exquisite as it is in itself, it is amazing as the composition of a young man who had just assumed the toga virilis, and was in the midst of his college career. Its remarkable merit may be best appreciated by comparing it with the nearly contemporaneous poems of George Herbert, Ben Jonson, and Vaughan on the same subject. The ode is equally remarkable for its startling indication  at so early a period of the characteristics of his grandest works. The lyric movement of thought and expression, the intricate melody and skill of the metre, the strength and propriety of the epithets, the concentration and point of the language, the harmonies of sound, the dexterous accumulation of suggested names, the solemnity and reverential awe of the whole utterance, are anticipations of his final glories. Grand as is this choral hymn, Milton felt that his powers of song were not sufficiently matured to sustain the yet vague splendor of his conceptions. The Ode on the Passion — the companion-piece to the Ode on the Nativity — was never completed. “This subject the author finding to be above the years he had when he wrote it, and nothing satisfied with what was begun, left it unfinished.” These two odes are the first outlines of the Paradise Lost and Paradise Regained. The self-censure, patience, diligence, and humility of Milton are as notable as his lordly tone and conscious power. Three years later, just before leaving Cambridge, he laments that “my late spring no bud nor blossom shew'th;” but adds,

“It shall be still in strictest measure even

To that same lot, however mean or high

To which Time leads me, and the will of Heaven.”

Milton was designed for the Church, and had been trained in all secular and theological learning for that holy office. The depression of the Puritans under the stern domination of Laud closed the prospect to the young candidate. He waited long and patiently, in doubt and hope; but in 1632 withdrew from Cambridge, having taken both his degrees. He left the university with credit and honor, and retired to the grateful seclusion of his father's villa at Horton — not far from Eton and Windsor. Here he remained for five years, spending the sunny summer-time of his life in multifarious study. He plunged into the mysteries of Hebrew lore, familiarized himself with the best lessons of history and carefully perused the whole series of the Greek and Latin authors, from Homer to Ducas and Phranza.

It was during the earlier half of his residence at Horton that Milton produced his L'Allegro and II Penseroso, and his two masques, the Arcades and Comus. These poems were not composed for the noisy public, but as relaxations from study, which embodied the shifting lights and shadows of his life at Horton. They are photographs of the scenery that surrounded his retreat, lighted up by the bright glow of his changing moods. They reveal also the character and ingredients of the ambrosia on  which his mind had feasted from boyhood, and betray the flowers from which the honey was distilled. The subjects, the contrasts, the metre, and many of the thoughts, phrases, and rhymes, are imitated from the poetical “Abstract of Melancholy” prefixed by Burton to his quaint Anatomy of Melancholy. Other obligations are due to the exquisite “Song on Melancholy” in Beaumont and Fletcher's Nice Valar. The same royal seizure, which ennobles what it appropriates, and which is declared by Longinus to be no theft, signalizes all of Milton's compositions. It is his manner. It is his genius. He claims the spoils of learning as his own. He made the triumphs of others the stepping-stones of his fame. To the year 1634 we probably owe the Arcades; to it we certainly owe the more splendid Comus. Both were written under circumstances which are curiously illustrative. of the social, political, and theological condition of the times, and of the great controversy in respect to dramatic performances. The Arcades is a much slenderer performance than the Comus, but possesses the same general characteristics: purity, grace, fancy, melody, learning, and gorgeous expression. The Comus is an almost perfect gem. It is as distinctly unique in its charms as Shakespeare's Midsummer Night's Dream. Its authorship was not avowed. It was published by Henry Lawes, in 1637, to escape the constant importunities for copies of the manuscript. In this year the plague raged with great violence, and many notable deaths occurred. On the 3d of April Milton's mother died; on the 6th of August Ben Jonson expired; on the 10th Edward King, of Christ Church, was lost at sea on his way to Ireland.

The death of Mrs. Milton broke up the family retreat at Horton, and Milton made preparations for foreign travel. He was meditating a great poem — an epic on the Round Table, or on the story of the Trojan Brutus. “Do you ask what I am meditating?” says he, in a letter to Deodati. “By the help of Heaven, an immortality of fame! But what am I doing? I am letting my wings grow, and preparing to fly, but my Pegasus has not yet feathers enough to soar aloft in the fields of air.”

One more poem — the last song of his young and fresh life-preceded his going abroad. The admirers of “Rare Ben” honored his memory by a volume of epicedia, or funeral eulogies, entitled Jonson Virbius. The scholars of Cambridge proposed a similar tribute to the ghost of Edward King. To this collection Milton contributed that finest of elegies, the Lycidas. It is the echo of the pastoral music of the ancient Greeks, and  recalls the plaintive strains of Bion, while adopting the metrical forms of the Italian canzoni.

Not long after this Milton set out on his Continental tour. Northern Europe was closed against him by the Thirty-Years' War, which was ravaging the whole of Germany. France was writhing beneath the tyranny of Richelieu, who was consolidating the monarchy at home, and strangling the supremacy of the House of Austria abroad. Milton crossed over to Paris, where he formed the acquaintance of Grotius; proceeded to Lyons, and, descending the Rhone, reached Marseilles. Thence he followed the littorale to Nice. From Nice he went to Genoa, and to Florence, in which city, the centre of Italian culture, he was welcomed with the highest distinction, and was elected a member of the Florentine academies. While at Florence he visited “the starry Galileo,” now seventy-five years of age, at his pleasant villa of Arcetri, in the neighborhood. Continuing his journey he reached Rome, spending two months there “in viewing the antiquities,” and listening to Leonora Baroni, the Jenny Lind of those days — who seems to have touched his heart, and to whom he addressed three Latin epigrams. He next proceeded to Naples, where he was hospitably entertained by Manso, marquis di Villa, the friend of Tasso. Everywhere he was received with honor, admiration, and the interchange of complimentary verses.

Milton had proposed to extend his travels to Sicily and Greece, but was not permitted to anticipate lord Byron in a poetic pilgrimage to the land of Helicon and Parnassus, and of the Vale of Tempe. He was recalled from Naples by the political agitations at home, and the dull murmurs of approaching civil war. On his homeward journey he was met by intelligence of the death of his friend, Charles Deodati, whereupon he wrote the Epitaphium Damonii — the Latin counterpart of the Lycidas. From this it is evident that he was still revolving an epic on the Brut d'Angleterre or the Morte d'Arthur. But he deserted the fountains of Hippocrene, and for twenty-one years devoted himself to polemics, politics, and prose.

III. Period 1649-1660. — Milton as a Polemic, Theologian, Politician, and Prose-write. — On his return to England, Milton undertook the education of his two nephews, John and Edward Phillips, He was induced to receive other boys also, and accordingly took a large house in Aldersgate Street, and opened a school. Out of his academical employments sprung his Tractate on Education, his Accidence commenced  Grammar, and his posthumous work On Christian Doctrine, which lay unknown till 1825. (It was edited by the present incumbent of the episcopal chair of Winchester [bishop Sumer]; a translation has also been published.) The first expounded his views on education, which resembled those of Roger Ascham and of John Lyly. The second was a practical exemplification of his method for the use of his school. The third was an expansion and systematization of the religious instructions given by him to his pupils. It has a much higher significance. It presents Milton's peculiar and utterly heterodox theology which is thoroughly Arian, and in a great measure materialistic. It was the theological preparation for the Paradise Lost and Paradise Regained, and is their best commentary. Indeed, it is impossible to understand the esoteric meaning of those great poems, to estimate their spirit, or to appreciate many of their details, without the continuous illustration afforded by this long-lost treatise in prose. “His active imagination and impetuous spirit,” it has been well said, “mingle too strongly with his theology, and in several particulars corrupt it; but though, like Locke, he sometimes mistakes the sense of Scripture, no man had a higher opinion of its supreme authority, or held more firmly its most vital truths. His name cannot be classed with modern Unitarians.”

In 1641 Milton reappeared as a writer before the public with his first prose work, Of Reformation in England, “to prove that the Church of England still stood in need of reformation.” He continued the subject in four other works, replying to bishop Hall and archbishop Usher in a short essay, Of Prelatical Episcopacy, and in a more elaborate response, entitled The Reason of Church Government urged against Prelaty. It is in this latter work that Milton commences the remarkable series of autobiographical sketches whence so much of our information in regard to his tastes, studies, habits, sentiments, principles, and occupations is gathered. Bishop Hall and archbishop Usher had aroused other assailants. Chief among such attacks in that pamphleteering day was a pamphlet designated Smnectymnuus, from the initials of its five authors — Stephen Marshal, Edmund Calamy, Thomas Young, Matthew Newcomen, and William Spurston. To this attack bishop Hall replied in a Defence of the Remonstrance. Milton, who had assailed the original Remonstrance, and was the grateful pupil of Thomas Young, now brought out Animtadversions on the Remonstrants' Defence. A rejoinder from bishop Hall's son followed, to which Milton responded in 1642 by his celebrated Apology for Smectymnuus. These productions thus all hang together. Their  object and interdependence are pointed out in the author's Second Defence for the People of England. In 1643, during the brief superiority of the Cavaliers, Milton, now in his thirty-fifth year, hastily married Mary Powell, a gay, thoughtless, pretty girl of seventeen “the daughter of Richard Powell, Esq., of Forrest Hill, near Shotover, Oxfordshire, an active royalist.” The match was a singular and ill-assorted union. It was unhappy. It could scarcely have been otherwise.

The fair malignant, in her young beauty, could not endure the gloomy yoke of her sedate Puritan husband. After the honeymoon was over, she visited her father, and remained all summer, heedless of the entreaties, remonstrances, and commands of her grim lord. He turned to his books, and to the examination of nice points of theological ethics. He studied the nature and obligations of marriage, and soon arrived at the foregone conclusion to divorce his recalcitrant bride. The result of his eager inquiries was The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce, restored to the Good of both Sexes — published anonymously in 1644. Another fruit of his studies and experiences was his undisguised contempt for women. Before concluding his inquiries, he proceeded to the practice of his theory by paying his addresses to another fascinating young lady. Mrs. Milton, after a year's absence, sought a reconciliation entreated forgiveness on her knees, was pardoned, and returned to her repellent, home. She died in 1653, leaving three daughters, the only children of the poet, who grew up without culture or companionship. The husband, who took back the wife, did not put away his scandalous doctrine, which was earnestly denounced. He enforced it in three other works: The Judgment of Martin Bucer concerning Divorce; Tetrachordon; a consideration of his four chief texts of Scripture on the subject; and Colasterion, a bitter castigation of an illiterate and anonymous opponent. The Colasterion is Milton's solitary attempt at humor — and very questionable humor it is, except as ill-humor. In the same year with The Doctrine of Divorce appeared the Tractate on Education, addressed to “Master Samuel Hartlib,' and the noble Areopagitica, or Speech for the Liberty of unlicensed Printing. The Areopagitica is the finest of Milton's prose compositions in subject, treatment, spirit, and expression. It is the earliest of the grand English arguments for the liberty of the press. Written with the forms of Greek oratory, and in imitation of the orations of Isocrates, its stiff, stately, and sonorous periods roll on with involved Hellenistic phrase, but are distinguished by fervor of feeling, breadth and truth of conception, and radiant utterance. Leckey (Rationalism in Europe, 2:80) says, “The  Paradise Lost is, indeed, scarcely a more glorious monument of the genius of Milton than the Areopagitica.”

Milton's prose style is not in general either good or attractive. It is not merely intricate and cumbrous, but it. is prolix, vagabond, and wearisome.. Its high reputation has been derived from the Areopagitica, and from rare bursts of rhetorical brilliancy in other writings. Only a small part of the prose works merits the eulogies bestowed upon the glorious “purple patches;” and even these are more worthy of admiration than of unrestricted praise.

On March 15, 1649 — six weeks after the execution of Charles I — Milton was appointed secretary for foreign tongues to the Council of State. He had probably gained the favor of the Republican authorities by his Tenure of Kings and Observations on the Articles of Peace in Ireland. He held the position till a short time before the Restoration; but the salary was reduced by nearly one half after 1655; and after 1652, when he became blind, the duties were discharged, first, by Philip Meadowes, and afterwards by Andrew Marvell. The appointment called him away from his preparations for his Arthurian epic, which was published towards the close of his life as a Historie of Britanie.

His first task under his political taskmasters was Eikonoclastes, in answer to the Icon Basilike the political testament ascribed to Charles I, and bequeathed by him on the scaffold to his people. Milton's reply is bold, defiant; breathing all the. exhilarating airs of sanguine freedom, but coarse, vituperative, passionate, and ungenerous. It was a suitable prelude for the Latin “Apologies for the People of England” (Defensio pro Populo Anglicano, Prima et Secunda), composed in 1651 and 1654 as a refutation of the celebrated scholar Salmasins. In his various “Letters of State” — extending from August 10, 1649, to May 15, 1659 — including the “Manifesto of the Lord Protector” in 1655, there are many lofty sentiments and sounding periods; but it would be scarcely fair to transfer to the secretary the praise for sagacious or audacious policy, which may belong exclusively to the Republican councillors, or to the great Republican sovereign. Cromwell was not a man to borrow his policy from a subordinate, and from a subordinate awed into unscrupulous homage by his resolute character.

In the composition of the Defence for the People of England Milton's sight gave way. As early as 1644 it had been seriously impaired by much  study, frequent vigils, and constant writing. He became totally blind in 1652. He was warned by his physicians to abstain from literary labor. He refused to spare his eyes by the renunciation of what he conceived to be a high patriotic duty. He studied and wrote for his party and country till “the drop serene” totally darkened his vision. The assertion of his lofty resolve is imbedded in his Second Defence for the People of England, and a touching account of the advancing stages of his blindness is given in a letter to a Greek friend, which is much less known than his pathetic allusions to his great privation in the Paradise Lost, the Samson Agonistes, and two of his sonnets.

Shut out from the light of day, cut off from the direct pursuit of his official duties, denied personal communion with his books, the companions of his solitary hours, Milton's thoughts were turned inwards, employed on poetic visions, and fed with the treasures of his vast memory. During the long years of darkness and enforced leisure, he gradually conceived and moulded and commenced his Paradise Lost. When Cromwell died, confusion and anarchy returned, and the hope or fear of the restoration of the Stuart line occupied the public expectation. The blind seer then resumed his political labors, endeavored to preserve or to improve the recent order in the Church, and to uphold the late scheme of government, in several small publications. His ideas of religious and civil freedom tolerated only views consonant in spirit With his own; and would have sought to perpetuate English freedom and republicanism by rendering the remnant of the Long Parliament a close, permanent, and self-renewing oligarchy.' His urgent clamors awoke no echo. His voice was too faint, too wild, too foreign to the necessities of the country and the time, and to the wisdom of sober statesmanship, to meet with any acceptance. Fairfax and Monk insured Charles II's return to his ancestral throne. Milton's political life was ended. All his hopes, all his dreams; all his cherished plans, were turned to dust and ashes. Poor, forlorn, outlawed, helpless, but not wholly dejected, he entered an the last period of his life in difficulty and danger and distress.

IV. Period 1660-1674. — The closing years of Milton's life offer little biographical detail. He was blind, in want, helpless; shunning the world, and shunned by it. Vane and other leaders of the lately dominant faction perished on the scaffold; others were outlawed or exiled. Milton was threatened with the like fate in consequence of his prompt and virulent denunciation of his slaughtered monarch. He was spared, tradition says,  through the intercession of Sir William Davenant. He was compelled to remain in hiding. His second wife, nee Woodcock, had died in 1659, within a year of her marriage. He took a third in 1665, Elizabeth Marshal, daughter of Sir Edward Marshal, of Cheshire. She must have been a young bride, as she survived her husband more than fifty years. Of his second and third wives, of his daughters in their young womanhood, of his domestic life, of his intercourse with his still remaining friends, scarcely anything is heard at this period. Andrew Marvell and a few other intimates still consoled his loneliness and obscurity with their fervent attachment. Dryden, in the flush of his young and garish reputation, did reverence to him; but the desolate poet disappears from public gaze, and communes with his thoughts, his memories, and his God. “Forgetting the world, and of the world forgot,” he worked out his immortal fame. Content with “audience fit, though few,” he created those wondrous poems, which were the sublimated essence of his life and learning and labors-his own undying glory, and the pride of the English tongue.

When Milton retired from the plague in London, in 1665, to the house which Elwood, the Quaker, had presented to him, at Chalfont, in Buckinghamshire, he exhibited to his friends the MS. of Paradise Lost. It may have been unfinished. It was sold, April 27,1667, to Samuel Simmons, of London, for £5 down, and £5 on each of three future contingencies. Only two payments were made, whence it is inferred that less than 2800 copies were disposed of in the seven years preceding his death. This poem- was the crowning labor of the poet's life. It had engaged his thoughts as early as 1654, and had occupied his solitary meditations during the ensuing years. It had been completed amid the boisterous license, and obscene dissonance, and reckless debauchery of the Restoration. He had poured into it all the wealth of learning and reflection and observation, and experience gathered in a studious, thoughtful, and full life crystallizing into radiant gems the rich materials he employed. Like his own Pandemonium,

“Out of the earth a fahric huge Rose like an exhalation,

with the sound Of dulcet symphonies, and voices sweet.”

From his college days he had contemplated the production of a great poem. In penury and wretchedness and scorn he achieved his ideal, after the lapse of a whole stormy generation. The currents of his life changed the course of his fancies. He renounced the charms of old romance to sing the songs of heaven, and “tell of things invisible to mortal sight.”  Milton selected for his subject the fall of man — a subject of universal interest — of special interest to all believers in the redemption — of more peculiar interest to the religious enthusiasts and reformers of the 17th century; and pre-eminently attractive to Milton from his peculiar idiosyncrasies. It was no new theme. In whole or in part it had been treated by Avitus in the 5th century; by Caedmon in the 6th; by Proba Falconia in the 10th; by Fra Giacomo, of Verona, in the 12th; by the mediaeval writers of miracle plays between the 11th and 16th; by Andreini in the 17th, and by other writers. To most of these predecessors Milton was indebted, without sacrificing his own essential originality, which stamps every page with the seal of his own majesty. He hesitated long before settling the form of the poem. His genius was distinctly lyrical, but the Ode on the Nativity had exhausted the compass of the lyric strain, and demonstrated its insufficiency. He tried a dramatic cast, and commenced the play with Satan's invocation to the sun in the fourth book. His own temperament, the personages, the scene, the action, the incidents, were all unsuited to the drama. He finally adopted the epic mould, without creating a true epic, for the lyric spirit and strong predominance of his own personality still remain. If Satan is his hero, Satan is a glorified though fallen image of Milton himself. The poem is singular, alone, unapproached, a work sui generis. As Wordsworth said of the poet's soul, the poem

“Was like a star, and dwelt apart,

It had a voice whose sound was like the sea,

Pure as the naked heavens, majestic, free.”

There is neither need nor room here for any criticism of this noble masterpiece. It is nearly perfect in subject, plan, impersonations, sentiments, moral aim, language, decoration, episodes, and rhythm. It is unequalled in grandeur, sublimity, verisimilitude of invention, and pathos. The blemishes indicated by Addison and other censors are less failures of the poet than .weaknesses of the theologian, as may be seen from his treatise De Doctrina Christiana. Even the blank verse, which was adopted by him on an erroneous theory, and would have failed utterly in feebler hands, becomes with him “the Dorian mood of flutes and soft recorders.” All the lavish rhetoric of praise of Macaulay, in the sparkling essay which his matured judgment disapproved throughout, may be bestowed on the Paradise Lost.

Four years after the completion of this signal work, Milton brought forth his Paradise Regained and Samson Agonistes. The former was preferred  by the poet to its greater predecessor, was its natural counterpart, and probably was designed in its opening lines. The author's partiality for this smaller work doubtless rested on theological caprices; but, as a work of art, it has striking excellences of its own. It is more quiet, more smooth, more uniform, and more symmetrical. Its radiance has a gentler glow than the fierce splendor of the more imposing poem. Its habitual depreciation may be due to the same cause which secured the parental preference — the mistake in determining the supreme moment of the Savior's life, as the subject of the tale. The temptation was more significant to Milton than the crucifixion. By the temptation Christ's divinity was earned; it was scarcely attested by the crucifixion, according to his views. The Sanson Agonistes is Greek in form and expression; Hebrew in conception and spirit; English and personal in aim. It is a martyr's death-song the agonizing wail of Milton's crushed, mangled, writhing, but triumphant soul; expostulating, like Job, with the Almighty and the Omniscient, who

“Now hath cast me off as never known. And to those cruel enemies, Whom I by his appointment had provoked, Left me, with the irreparable loss Of sight, reserved alive to be repeated The subject of their cruelty and scorn. Nor am I in the list of them that hope; Hopeless are all my evils, all remediless; This one prayer yet remains, might I be heard, No long petition: speedy death, The close of all my miseries, and the balm.”

The death invoked came soon. He sank rapidly under attacks of gout, which became both more frequent and more violent; yet in his paroxysms “he would be very cheerful, and sing.” He expired placidly in his own house on Sunday, November 8, 1674, and the seer of things celestial was buried near his father, who had so sanguinely cherished his young genius. It would be presumptuous to close this concise notice of John Milton with any summary estimate of ours upon his character and genius. He may be admired by all he can be judged only by his peers. “It may be doubted,” says Walter S. Landor, “whether the Creator ever created one altogether so great as Milton taking into one view at once his manly virtues, his superhuman genius, his zeal for truth, for true piety, true freedom, his eloquence in displaying it, his contempt of personal power, his glory and exultation in his country's.” “Milton,” says Macaulay, “did not strictly  belong to any of the classes which we have described. He was not a Puritan. He was not a Freethinker. He was not a Cavalier. In his character the noblest qualities of every party were combined in harmonious union... We are not much in the habit of idolizing either the living or the dead; but there are a few characters which have stood the closest scrutiny and the severest tests, Which have been tried in the furnace and have proved pure, which have been declared sterling by the general consent of mankind, and which are visibly stamped with the image and superscription of the Most High. These great men we trust we know how to prize; and of these was Milton.... His thoughts are powerful not only to delight, but to elevate and purify. Nor do we envy the man who can study either the life or the writings of the great poet and patriot without aspiring to emulate, not indeed the sublime works with which his genius has enriched our literature, but the zeal with which he labored for the public good, the fortitude with which he endured every private calamity, the lofty disdain with which he looked down on temptation and dangers, the deadly hatred which he bore to bigots and tyrants, and the faith which he so sternly kept with his country and with his fame” (Essay on Milton).

Literature. — Miltonic bibliography is so extensive that it would be ridiculous to enumerate even the most important works. A general reference to Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, will answer a better purpose than any copious list presented here. It may then suffice to mention a few authorities of special interest for the assistance they afford for the appreciation of the poet and his labors. Masson, Life and Times of Milton, narrated in connection with the Political, Ecclesiastical, and Literary History of his Time (Lond. 3 volumes, 8vo; 1859 sq.; still unfinished); Keightley, Account of the Life, Opinions, and Writings of John Milton (Land. 1855, 8vo); Brydges, The Poetical Works of John Milton (Lond. 1835, 6 volumes, 12mo); St. John, The Prose Work of John Milton (Lond. 5 volumes, 12mo); Prendergast, A Complete Concordance to the Poetical Works of John Milton (Madras, 1857-59): Hamilton, Origin of Papers illustrative of the Life of John Milton (Camden Society); Dunster, Considerations on Milton's Early Reading, and on the Prima Stannia of the Paradise Lost (Lond. 1800); Coleridge, Lectures on Shakespeare and Milton (Lond. 1857); Channing, Remarks on the Character and Genius of' Milton; De Quincey, Milton, in Theological Essay; Skeats, Hist. of the Free Churches of England, page 61; Perry, Ch. Hist. vol. ii; Tulloch, Puritan Leaders, ch. v; Hunter, Religious Thought in  England (see Index, volume 3); Hallam, Hist. of Lit. (Harper's edition). 2:375 sq.; Hume, Hist. of England, chapter 62; Kitto, Journal ofSac. Lit. i, 236 sq.; volume 23; Christian Examiner, 2:423 sq.; 3:29 sq.; volume 57; Retrospective Rev. 1825, volume 14; Emerson, in the North Amer. Rev. 82:388 sq.; Biblioth. Sac. 1859, page 857; 1860, page 1; Meth. Qu. Rev. 1859, page 495 sq.; North British Rev. May 1859; Edinb. Rev. April 1860; Lond. Qu. Rev. April 1872; Prescott, Biog, and Crit. Miscellanies; Bayne, Contemporary Rev. August 1873; Brit. Qu. Rev. January 1871, page 115; July 1872, page 127 sq.; July 1871, page 111 sq.; Presb. Qu. Rev. April 1872, art. 10; Catholic World, February 1, 1873. Those who desire to know how the English Homer is regarded by a nation whose taste and habits of thought differ most widely from the Anglo-Saxon race, may consult the article “Milton” in the Biographie Universelle, from the pen of the justly-celebrated French critic Villemain. He admits that Milton's picture of our first parents in Eden surpasses, in graceful and touching simplicity, anything to be: found in the creations of any other poet, ancient or modern, and that the human imagination has produced nothing more grand or more sublime than some portions of Paradise Lost. Comtare also the lately issued work on the History of English Literature by Taine (Lond. and N.Y. 1872, 2 volumes, 8vo); Geoffroy, Etudes sur les Pamphlets Politiqus et Reliyieux de Milton (Paris, 1848), and Revue Chretienne, 1869, page 19 sq. A revised edition of Milton's poetical works has been prepared under the editorship of Prof. David Masson, the able biographer of Milton, and a multifarious worker, which when published will no doubt be the standard edition of the poetical writings of John Milton. (G.F.H.)

## Mimansa[[@Headword:Mimansa]]

             (from the Sanscrit man, to investigate; hence, literally, investigation) is the collective name of two of the six divisions of orthodox Hindu philosophy. SEE HINDUISM. These two divisions are respectively distinguished as Purva-mimansa and Uttara-mimansa; the latter being more commonly called Veddata (q.v.), while the former is briefly styled Mimansa. Native writers rank the Mimansa with the five other philosophical systems; but the term philosophy — as understood in a European sense — can scarcely be applied to it, as it is neither concerned with the nature of the absolute or of the human mind, nor with the various categories of existence in general — topics which are dealt with more or less by the other five philosophies. The object of the Mimansa is in reality simply to lay down a correct interpretation of such Vedic passages as refer to the Brahminic ritual, to  solve doubts wherever they may exist on matters concerning sacrificial acts. and to reconcile discrepancies — according to the Mimansa always apparent only — of Vedic texts.

The foundation of this system is therefore preceded by a codification of the three principal Vedas [the fourth Veda, the “Atharvan,” never attained in India the high consideration paid to the others, and is not universally accepted as a Veda (q.v.)] — the Rik, Black-Yajus, and Smaan — and by the existence of schools and theories which, by their different interpretations of the Vedic rites, had begun to endanger, or, in reality, had endangered a correct, or at least authoritative understanding of the Vedic texts. It is the method, however, adopted by the Mimansa which imparted to it a higher character than that of a mere commentary, and allowed it to be looked upon as a philosophy; for, in the first place, the topics explained do not follow the order in which they occur in the Vedic writings, especially in the Brahminic portion of the Vedas (q.v.); they are arranged according to certain categories, such as authoritativeness, indirect precept, concurrent efficacy, coordinate effect, etc.; and, secondly, each topic or case is discussed according to a regular scheme, which comprises the proposition of the subject-matter, the doubt or question arising upon it, the prima facie or wrong argument applied to it, the correct argument in refutation of the latter, and the conclusion devolving from it. Some subjects treated of in the Mimansa, incidentally, as it were, and merely for the sake of argument, belong likewise rather to the sphere of philosophic thought than to that of commentatorial criticism such, for instance, as the association of articulate sound with sense, the similarity of words in different languages, the inspiration or eternity of the Veda, the invisible or spiritual operation of pious acts, etc.

The reputed founder of this system is Jaimini — of unknown date — who taught it in twelve books, each subdivided into four chapters, except the third, sixth, and tenth books, which contain eight chapters each; the chapters, again, are divided into sections, generally comprising several Sutras or aphorisms, but sometimes only one. The extant commentary on this obscure work is the Bhashya of Sabara-swamin, which was critically annotated by the great Mimanas authority, Ku-marila-swamin. Out of these works, which, in their turn, quote several others, apparently lost, has arisen a great number of other writings, explaining and elucidating their predecessors. The best compendium, among these modern works, is the Jaiminiya-nyaya-mala-vistura, by the celebrated Madhavachairva (q.v.).  See Mullens, The Religious Aspects of Hindu Philosophy (Lond. 1860); the Reverend K.M. Banerjew, Dialogues on the Hindu Philosophy (Lond. 1861); Chunder Dutt, Essay on the Vedanta (Calcutta, 1854); Duncker, Gesch. des Alterthums, 1;205; Clarke, Ten Great Religion, page 116 sq.

## Mina[[@Headword:Mina]]

             (in Greek μνᾶ, A.V. “pound”), a weight and coin which, according to the Attic standard, was equivalent to 100 drachmae (Plutarch, Solon, 16; Pliny, 21:109) or Roman denarii, i.e. (estimating the average value at the time of Christ) about $16. It is the sum named in the parable of Luk 19:13 sq., where the amount of 100 mince is therefore some $1600. On the other hand, the mina mentioned in 1Ma 14:24 (comp. 15:18) is a weight, and (as being originally equivalent to the Heb. shekel) it may be reckoned at 8220 Paris grains (Bickh, Metrol. Untersuch. page 124); and the sum of 1000 mince of gold would then amount to about $16,910. SEE MONEY.

Different from this is the Heb. maneh (מָנֶה), originally likewise a weight, but used of the precious metals, and hence ultimately determining the value of coin. The word has perhaps an etymological connection with the Greek mina. SEE METROLOGY.

## Minard, Abel[[@Headword:Minard, Abel]]

             a prominent layman of the Methodist Episcopal Church, noted for his great philanthropic labors, was born in Massachusetts September 25, 1814. His father died soon after his birth, and he lost his mother when he was about eight years old, so that as a mere youth he was left alone in the world. His early life was an earnest struggle for success; he was subjected to all the disadvantages which attend those who are compelled to work their own way from poverty to fortune. He learned the trade of a tanner; but his energy of character soon sought a broader field of action in business operations, which proved successful, and rapidly secured him wealth and influence. In 1846 he went to California; in 1856 removed to Lockport,  N.Y.; and in 1866 settled at Morristown, N.J., where he died, January 31, 1871. In early life. Mr. Minard was a member of the Free-will Baptist Church, but in the prime of his days he neglected his Church privileges. In the spring of 1870 he united with the Methodist Episcopal Church at Morristown, in whose communion he spent his last days. In early life he promised his God that if he would bless him he would give away the tenth part of his income, and he dealt out largely to the poor and to the Church; in later years, fearing that he had not kept the vow fully he failed not to make compensation for his neglect by numerous private and public benefactions. The churches both of Morristown and Lockport were remembered in his will. He also left a sum, the interest of which is annually applied for the education of four young men in Drew Theological Seminary at Madison, N.J. But the crowning work of his life was the establishment of the “Minard Home,” in Morristown (valued at $50,000), for the education of the female orphans of missionaries and home ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church. See New York Christian Advocate, June 15, 1870; Prof. Buttz, in the Ladies' Repository, 1872. (J.H.W.)

## Minard, Louis Guillaume[[@Headword:Minard, Louis Guillaume]]

             a French ecclesiastical writer, was born at Paris January 31, 1725. Educated at the College of France by the care of Rivard, with whom he was a favorite pupil, he joined the “Brothers of the Christian Doctrine,” and was appointed while still young to some of the superior offices of his congregation. He entered the secular clergy and obtained the benefice of Bercy, near Paris. His tolerance and easy profession of religion brought upon him many admonitions from his superiors; finally, Christophe de Beaumont, archbishop of Paris, suspended him from his sacred functions- having been offended by a book that Minard had written, entitled Panengyrique de Saint Charles Borromee. Minard continued to dwell among his ex-parishioners, devoting all his time to study and to charity. In 1778 he refused the generalship offered him by the lay brethren. In 1795 he became a member of the Presbytery of Paris. He died, poor and infirm, at Paris, April 22, 1798. Besides the Panegyrique de Saint Charles Borromee, condemned by the Sorbonne and his provisor the archbishop of Paris, Minard wrote Avis aux fideles sur le schisme dont l'Eglise de France est menacee (Paris, 1795, 8vo). In this tract, written to establish peace with the Jansenists, he says that all parties should unite to establish harmony in the Church, and that the resistance of a part of the clergy to the laws is as injurious to the divine service as to the state. It was replied to by  Bernard Lambert la Plaigne, a Dominican Jansenist, who, aided by Maultrot, wrote four Lettres aux ministres de la ci-devant eglise constitutionelle (1795-1796). Minard afterwards replied to these by a Supplemente to the Avis aux Fideles. See Nouvelles ecclesiastiques (Utrecht, 1798); Dict. historique, s.v.

## Minaret (Or Minar)[[@Headword:Minaret (Or Minar)]]

             is the name of a tall turret used in Saracenic architecture. The minaret, as it is called by the Turks, contains a staircase, and is divided into several stories, with balconies from which the priests summon the Mohammedans to prayer bells not being permitted in their religion, see MOHAMAMEDANISM, and is terminated with a spire or ornamental finial. The minarets are among the most beautiful features of Mohammedan architecture, and are an invariable accompaniment of the mosques (q.v.). In India, minars, or pillars of victory, are frequently erected in connection with mosques; some of these are lofty and splendid monuments, that of Kutub, at Old Delhi, being 48 feet 4 inches in diameter at the base, and about 250 feet high. They are often built on a plan of a star-like form, and ire divided into stories by projecting balconies, like the minarets.

## Minchah[[@Headword:Minchah]]

             (מַנְחָה), properly a gift (as often rendered) or present (Gen 32:14; Gen 19:21; Gen 43:11 sq.), especially to nobles and kings (Jdg 3:15; 1Sa 10:23; 2Ch 17:5; 2Ch 17:11; Psa 45:13; Isa 39:1; 1Ki 10:25); hence tribute from a subject nation (2Sa 8:2; 2Sa 8:6; 1Ki 5:1 [1Ki 4:21] 2Ki 17:4; Psa 72:10); but specifically an offering to God, i.e., sacrifice (Isa 1:13; 1Ch 16:29), particularly a godless one, “meat-offering,” consisting of flour, meal, or cakes, with oil and frankincense, burned upon the altar by itself, or in connection with a bloody offering Lev 2:1 sq.; Lev 7:9, etc.). SEE OFFERING.

In Jewish liturgy the word Minchah is the technical term for the afternoon service of prayer. SEE LITURGY (I).

## Mincing[[@Headword:Mincing]]

             (טָפִ, tpaphaph', Isa 3:16) occurs in the prophet's description of the behavior of the “daughters of Jerusalem.” The Hebrew word, as well as the Arabic taf, refers to the taking small and quick steps, the affected pace of a coquettish woman. The passage might be rendered, “They walk and trip along.” Although the Hebrew word has perhaps a slightly different sense, yet the gait of the females seems to have been very much like the modern practice of swaying the body in walking. SEE WOMAN.

## Mind[[@Headword:Mind]]

             the exercise or expression of the spiritual part of man's nature. It is obviously divisible into the three elementary functions, thought, emotion, and volition; but scientific writers greatly differ as to the subordinate or detailed faculties, as they are called. Reilt thus classifies the mental powers: Perception, memory, conception, abstraction, judgment, reasoning. Stewart thus: Perception, attention, conception, abstraction, association, imagination, reason. Others propose a, deeper analysis of the intellectual faculties, and find three properties which appear fundamental and distinct, to one in any degree implying the other, while the whole taken together are sufficient to explain all intellectual operations: namely, discrimination, retentiveness, and association of ideas. Sir W. Hamilton, departing from common classifications, sums the intellections into six:

(1.) The presentative faculty, or the power of recognising the various aspects of the world and of the mind.

(2.) The conservative faculty or memory, meaning the power of storing up.

(3.) The reproductive faculty, or the means of recalling sleeping impressions or concepts.

(4.) The representative faculty, or imagination.

(5.) The elaborative faculty, or the power of comparison, by which classification, generalization, and reasoning are performed.

(6.) The regulative faculty, or the cognition of the a priori or instinctive notions of the intellect, as space, time, causation, necessary truths, etc.

Noah Porter divides his “Human Intellect” into four parts:

(a.) He treats of natural consciousness, philosophical consciousness; sense perception, its conditions and process; of the growth and products of sense perception.

(b.) He treats of representation and representative knowledge; by which he means memory, imagining power, etc.

(c.) He treats of thinking and thought knowledge; by which he means the formation and nature of the concept, judgment, reasoning, etc.

(d.) He treats of intuition and intuitive knowledge, in which he discourses on mathematical relations, causation, design, substance, attribute; the finite and conditioned; the infinite and absolute.

Berkeley and his school teach a pure idealism, which asserts that everything we can take cognizance of is mind or self; that we cannot transcend our mental sphere; whatever we know is our own mind. Others, again, as Locke, resolve all into empiricism, and look on mind as simply the result of material organization. These two views contain the extreme angles to which speculation has run. The former is idealism or spiritualism, the latter materialism or empiricism.

The pre-Socratic school of philosophers was materialistic, of which Anaximenes, Pythagoras, Heraclitus, were patrons. Between these and Plato, Socrates was a transitional link. The post-Platonic philosophers were spiritualistic in the main, notwithstanding French materialism and German rationalism. SEE MATERIALISM. Dr. McCosh, in his Intuitions of the Mind, makes a triplet of parts. In part first (which is on the “Nature of the Intuitive Convictions of the Mind”) he shows that there are no innate mental images; no innate or general notions; no a priori forms imposed by the mind on objects; no intuitions immediately before consciousness as law principles. But there are intuitive principles operating in the mind; these are native convictions of the mind, which are of the nature of perceptions or intuitions. Intuitive convictions rise up when contemplations of objects are presented to the mind. The intuitions of the mind are primarily directed to individual objects. The individual intuitive convictions can be generalized into maxims, and these are entitled to be represented as philosophic principles. In part second he shows that the mind begins its intelligent acts with knowledge; that the simple cognitive powers are sense, perception, and self-consciousness. It is through the bodily organism that the intelligence of man attains its knowledge of all material objects beyond.  ‘The qualities of matter — extension, divisibility, size density or rarity, figure, incompressibility, mobility, and substance — are known by intuition; and it is by cognition we know self as having being, and as not depending for existence on our observation; as being in itself an abiding existence; as exercising potency in spirit and material being “Cogito, ergo sum.” The primitive cognitions recognise being, substance, mode. quality, personality, number, motion, power.

The primitive beliefs recognise space, time, and the infinite. The mind intuitively observes the relations of identity, of whole to part, of space, time, quantity, property, cause, and effect. The motive and moral convictions as appetencies, will, conscience are involved in the exercise of conscience. In part third he shows that the sources of knowledge are sense, perception, self-consciousness, and faith exercise. But there are limits to our knowledge, ideas, and beliefs. We cannot know any substance other than those revealed by sense, consciousness, or faith. We can never know any qualities or relations among objects except in so far as we have special faculties of knowledge. The material for ideas must be brought from the knowledge sources. These sources are limited, and our belief is limited. Professor Bain, in his book, shows that human knowledge falls under two departments — the object department, marked by extension; the subject department, marked by the absence of extension. Subject experience has three functions — feeling, will, thought. The brain is the organ of the mind. The nervous systems are only extensions or ramifications of the brain, and through these the mind transmits its influence. In this nervous system, which acts as a channel for the transmission of messages from the mind, are two sets of nerves — the in-carrying, the out-carrying. The intellectual functions are commonly expressed by memory, reason, imagination. The primary attributes of intellect are difference, agreement. retentiveness, or continuity. J.S. Mill propounds a psychological theory of the belief in a material world- postulates, expectation, association, laws, substance, matter. The external world is a permanent possibility of sensation. Then follows the distinction of primary and secondary qualities; application to the permanence of mind, etc.

The true theory is both scriptural and scientific, methodic and encyclopedic; and though it may not explain all ideation amply, yet it shows that the nature and functions of mind can only be seen in connection with all the other parts of the human system, just as the nature and functions of a fountain are only seen when considered in connection with  the other parts of the cosmos. We can only understand the nature and office of ducts, glands, veins, or arteries when we view them in their mutual relations, and in their relations with all the other parts of the physical system. We can only understand civil polity, social statics, natural phenomena, when taken in their reciprocal relations; and so we can only understand mind when viewed in connection with everything else it touches. Views taken from any other premise must be partial and imperfect. We hold that mind has seven great forces or modes. The so- called scientific writers acknowledge this, at least substantially. These are consciousness, conception, abstraction, association, memory, imagination, reason. Now if science shows us that there are seven great corresponding qualities or forces in the body, and if Scripture (which reveals what science cannot) shows us that there are seven great corresponding powers in the soul which lie back of and control all powers of body and of mind, why not conclude that this trial septenary of forces interlace and overlap each other, so as to constitute a human personality? We do not claim for this theory a scientific status, but is it not worthy of a speculative niche? Our observation shows us that this universe progresses by a duplex method, unfolding and infolding, or evolving and involving. Scripture shows that this unfolding comes from a sevenfold force; science shows that it comes through a sevenfold faculty. The following curious coincidences may not be out of place here, as illustrating a somewhat abstruse problem of this subject. The Revelation by John reveals ἑπτὰ πνεύματα, or “the seven spirits,” as the constituent powers of Deity.

The question arises, What are these seven spirits? (Isa 11:2; Psa 111:10; Pro 1:7; Job 28:28). It is held by many influential writers that the spirits mentioned in these references are to be taken in connection with Zechariah's sevenfold lamp (Zec 4:1). Delitzsch, in his work on Psychology, endeavors to find these elements in the Hebraistic distinctions of “the spirit of fear,” i.e., of divine veneration (יַרְאָה), “the spirit of knowledge” (דִּעִת), “the spirit of power” (גְּבוּרָה), etc.; but these are highly mystical and even fanciful. Whatever, however, may be thought of such abstractions, as to what Scripture says, or is imagined to say, about the sevenfold doxa or soul life, science does seem to discover, or at least point out, a sevenfold means of mind representation in the body. She recognizes seven forms of life: the embryonic, the breathing, the blood, the heart, the sensation, containing the five senses, the externalization of the voig by the tongue, and the outpressure of the entire mental phases and spirit feelings through the entire bodily habifus. In the trichotomy of nature  the soul is first, the mind- second, the body third. The mind is therefore moulded by the soul, and the body by the mind. As the soul lies at the base of the being, all its ramifications are tinged with the hues of the soul. The mind, nevertheless, is moulded by whatever it plays upon. Thus mind is a middleman standing between the world of morals and of matter (yet interlacing both), communicating the will of the spirit to the external sphere. It is not a monarch, but a marshal; yet it is august in its capacity; in its elasticity, eternal. SEE PSYCHOLOGY.

For further discussion of the mind, see the works mentioned above; also the early Greek writers, as Diogenes, Anaxagoras, Heraclitus, Empedocles, Democrituis and the Socratic school, as Plato, Aristotle, etc. The modern schoolmen who treat of the subject are chiefly the following: Gassendi (1592-1655), Des Cartes (1596-1650), Geulinx (1625-1699), Spinoza (1632-1677), Malebranche (1688-1715), Hume (1711-1776), Reid (1710- 1796), Brown (1778-1820), Condillac (1715-1780), Collard (1763-1845), Leibnitz (1646-1716), Kant (1724-1804), Schleiermacher (1768-1834). Many of these were rather metaphysicians than mental philosophers; yet their theories and discussions involve the nature and functions of the human mind, especially in its intellectual aspects; and they therefore may be said to have laid the foundations for mental science in its present development. The principal works more expressly relating to the intellectual faculties are Stewart, Treatise and Essay on the Mind; Brown, Philosophy of the Human Mind; Abercrombie, Intellectual Powers; Watts, On the Mind; Cudworth, Intellectual System; Reid, Essays on the active Powers of the Human Mind: Mill (James), Analysis of the Phenomena of the Humans Mind; McCosh, Intuitions of the Mind; Wilson (W.D.), Lectures on the Psychology of Thought and Action; Bain, Mind and Body: the Theories of their Relation; Carpenter, Principles of Mental Physiology; Maudsley, Body and Mind: their Connection and mutual Influence. The works on Mental Science treat likewise of the emotional elements of the mind. SEE PHILOSOPHY. Most of the works named include the third or causative faculty of the mind, i.e. the will; but the importance of this, in its theological bearings, requires a separate treatment. SEE WILL. See also Christian Monthly Spectator, 8:141, 184; Lit. and Theol. Rev. 1:74,169, 614; 2:261, 576; North Amer. Rev. 19:1; 24:56; Monthly Rev. 68:441; Brit. Qu. Rev. December 1871, page 308; Contemporary Rev. April and Oct. 1872; Meth. Qu. Rev. 4:243; April 1870, page 221; Popular Science Monthly, July 1873, art. 10; December  art. 4 and 6; The Academy, November 1, 1873, page 445. SEE MONOMANIA.

## Mine[[@Headword:Mine]]

             The word does not occur in the Bible, but that mining operations were familiar to the Hebrew people from an early age is evident from many Scriptural allusions. SEE METAL. A remarkable description of the processes of ore mining occurs in the book of Job (28:1-11):

Why, [there] exists for silver a vein; And a place for gold, [which] they may filter: Iron from clod can be taken, And stone will pour forth copper. An end has [one] put to the [subterranean] darkness, And to every recess [is] he prying [after] The stone of gloom and death-shade. He has pierced a shaft [down] away from, [any] sojourner. [Where] the [miners] forgotten of foot [hold] Have hung [far] from man, [and] swung. Earth-from it shall issue [means to procure] bread, Though under it [its bosom] has been overturned as [by] fire: A sapphire-place [are] its stones And gold-clods [are] his [that explores it]. A beaten [path thither]-bird of prey has not known it, Nor hawk's eye scanned it; Sons of rampancy [fierce beasts] have not trodden it. Roarer [lion] has not wended over it. On the flint he has stretched forth his hand; He has overturned from [the] root mountains: In the cliffs channels has he cleft, And every precious [thing] has his eye seen. From trickling [the adjacent] rivers has he stopped, While [the] concealed [thing] he shall bring forth [to] light.

The following comments on this passage (which maybe a later addition of the time of Solomon), as well as the remarks on metallurgy in general, are indicative of its pertinence to the subject. SEE JOB, BOOK OF.

It may be fairly inferred from the description that a distinction is made between gold obtained in the manner indicated, and that which is found in the natural state in the alluvial soil, among the debris washed down by the torrents. This appears to be implied in the expression “the gold they  refine,” which presupposes a process by which the pure gold is extracted from the ore, and separated from the silver or copper with which it may have been mixed. What is said of gold may be equally applied to silver, for in almost every allusion to the process of refining the two metals are associated. In the passage of Job which has been quoted, so far as can be made out from the obscurities with which it is beset, the natural order of mining operations is observed in the description. The whole point is obviously contained in the contrast, “Surely there is a source for the silver, and a place for the gold which men refine; but where shall wisdom be found, and where is the place of understanding?” No labor is too great for extorting from the earth its treasures. The shaft is sunk, and the adventurous miner, far from the haunts of men, hangs in mid-air (5:4): the bowels of the earth — which in the course of nature grows but corn — are overthrown as though wasted by fire. The path which the miner pursues in his underground course is unseen by the keen eye of the falcon, nor have the boldest beasts of prey traversed it, but man wins his way through every obstacle, hews out tunnels in the rock, stops the water from flooding his mine, and brings to light the precious metals as the reward of his adventure.

No description would be more complete. The poet might have had before him the copper mines of the Sinaitic peninsula. In the Wady Magharah, “the valley of the Cave,” are still traces of the Egyptian colony of miners who settled there for the purpose of extracting copper from the freestone rocks, and left their hieroglyphic inscriptions upon. the face of the cliff. That these inscriptions are of great antiquity there can belittle doubt, though Lepsius may not be justified in placing them at a date B.C. 4000 (Letters from Egypt, page 346, Eng. tr.). In the Magharah tablets, Mr. Drew (Scripture Lands, page 50, note) “saw the cartouche of Suphis, the builder of the Great Pyramid, and on the stones at Sarabit el-Khadim there are those of kings of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties.” But the most interesting description of this mining colony is to be found in a letter to the Athenceum (June 4, 1859, No. 1649, page 747), signed Μ.Δ., and dated from “Sarabit el-Khadim, in the desert or Sinai, May 1859.” The writer discovered on the mountain exactly opposite the caves of Magharah traces of an ancient fortress, intended, as he conjectures, for the protection of the miners. The hill on which it stands is about 1000 feet high, nearly insulated, and formed of a series of precipitous terraces, one above the other, like the steps of the Pyramids. The uppermost of these was entirely surrounded by a strong wall, within which were found remains of 140 houses, each about ten feet square. There were, besides, the remains of  ancient hammers of green porphyry, and reservoirs “so disposed that when one was full the surplus ran into the others, and so in succession, so that they must have had water enough to last for years. The ancient furnaces are still to be seen, and on the coast of the Red Sea are found the piers and wharves whence the miners shipped their metal in the harbor of Abu Zeniineh. Five miles from Sarabit elKhadim the same traveller found the ruins of a much greater number of houses, indicating the existence of a large mining population, and, besides, five immense reservoirs formed by damming up various wadys. Other mines appear to have been discovered by Dr. Wilson in the granite mountains east of the Wady Mokatteb. In the Wady Nasb the German traveller Ruppell, who was commissioned by Mohammed Ali, the viceroy of Egypt, to examine the state of the mines there, met with remains of several large smelting furnaces, surrounded by heaps of slag. The ancient inhabitants had sunk shafts in several directions, leaving here and there columns to prevent the whole from falling in. In one of the mines he saw huge masses of stone rich in copper (Ritter, Erdkunde, 13:786). The copper mines of Phaeno, in Idumaea, according to Jerome, were between Zoar and Petra: in the persecution of Diocletian the Christians were condemned to work them.

The gold mines of Egypt in the Bishart desert, the principal station of which was Eshuranib, about three days' journey beyond Wady Allaga, have been discovered within the last few years by M. Linant and Mr. Bonomi, the latter of whom supplied Sir G. Wilkinson with a description of them, which he quotes (Anc. Eng. 3:229, 230). Ruins of the miners' huts still remain as at Sarhbit elKhadim. “In those nearest the mines lived the workmen who were employed to break the quartz into small fragments, the size of a bean, from whose hands the pounded stone passed to the persons who ground: it in hand-mills, similar to those now used for corn in the valley of the Nile, made of granitic stone; one of which is to be found in almost every house at these mines, either entire or broken. The quartz, thus reduced to powder, was washed on inclined tables, furnished with two cisterns, all built of fragments of stone collected there; and near these inclined planes are generally found little white mounds, the residuum of the operation.” According to the account given by Diodorus Siculus (3:12-14), the mines were worked by gangs of convicts and captives in fetters, who were kept day and night to their task by the soldiers set to guard them. The work was superintended by an engineer, who selected the stone and pointed it out to the miners. The harder rock was split by the application of  fire, but the softer was broken up with picks and chisels.The miners were quite naked, their bodies being painted according to the color of the rock they were working, and in order to see in the dark passages of the mine they carried lamps upon their heads. The stone as it fell was carried off by boys; it was then pounded in stone mortars with iron pestles by those who were over thirty years of age, till it was reduced to the size of a lentil.

The women and old men afterwards ground it in mills to a fine powder. The final process of separating the gold from the pounded stone was intrusted to the engineers who superintended the work. They spread this powder upon a broad slightly-inclined table, and rubbed it gently with the hand, pouring water upon it from time to time so as to carry away all the earthy matter, leaving the heavier particles upon the board. This was repeated several times; at first with the hand, and afterwards with fine sponges gently pressed upon the earthy substance, till nothing but the gold was left. It was then collected by other workmen, and placed in earthen crucibles, with a mixture of lead and salt in certain proportions, together with a little tin and some barley bran. The crucibles were covered and carefully closed with clay, and in this condition baked in a furnace for five days and nights without intermission. Three methods have been employed for refining gold and silver: 1, by exposing the fused metal to a current of air; 2, by keeping the alloy in a state of fusion and throwing nitre upon it; and, 3, by mixing the alloy with lead, exposing the whole to fusion upon a vessel of bone- ashes or earth, and blowing upon it with bellows or other blast; the last appears most nearly to coincide with the description of Diodorus. To this process, known as the cupelling process, SEE LEAD, there seems to be a reference in Psa 12:6; Jer 6:28-30; Eze 23:18-22, and from it Mr. Napier (Metals of the Bible, page 24) deduces a striking illustration of Mal 3:2-3, He shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver,” etc. “When the alloy is melted upon a cupel, and the air blown upon it, the surface of the melted metals has a deep orange-red color, with a kind of flickering wave constantly passing over the surface. As the process proceeds, the heat is increased and in a little time the color of the fused metal becomes lighter. At this stage the refiner watches the operation, either standing or sitting, with the greatest earnestness, until all the orange color and shading disappears, and the metal has the appearance of a highly-polished mirror, reflecting every object around it; even the refiner, as he looks upon the mass of metal, may see himself as in a looking-glass, and thus he call form a very correct judgment respecting the purity of the metal. If he is satisfied, the fire is withdrawn, and the metal  removed from the furnace; but if not considered pure, more lead is added and the process repeated.”

Silver mines are mentioned by Diodorus (1:33), with those of gold, iron, and copper, in the island of Meroe, at the mouth of the Nile. But the chief supply of silver in the ancient world appears to have been brought from Spain. The mines of that country were celebrated (1Ma 8:3). Mount Orospeda, from which the Guadalquivir, the ancient Baltes,, takes its rise, was formerly called “the silver mountain,” from the silver mines which were in it (Strabo, 3, page 148). Tartessus, according to Strabo, was an ancient name of the river which gave its name to the town that was built between its two mouths. But the largest silver mines in Spain were in the neighborhood of Carthago Nova, from which, in the time of Polybius, the Roman government received 25,000 drachmae daily. These, when Strabo wrote, had fallen into private hands, though most of the gold mines were public property (3, page 148). Near Castulo there were lead mines containing silver, but in quantities so small as not to repay the cost of working. The process of separating the silver from the lead is abridged by Strabo from Polybius. The lumps of ore were first pounded, and then sifted through sieves into water. The sediment was again pounded, and again filtered, and after this process had been repeated five times the water was drawn off, the remainder of the ore melted, the lead poured away, and the silver left pure. If Tartessus be the Tarshish of Scripture, the metal workers of Spain in those days must have possessed the art of hammering silver into sheets, for we find in Jer 10:9, “silver spread into plates is brought from Tarshish, and gold from Uphaz.”

We have no means of knowing whether the gold of Ophir was obtained from mines or from the washing of gold streams. Pliny (6:32), from Juba, describes the littus Hammceum on the Persian Gulf as a place where gold mines existed, and in the same chapter alludes to the gold mines of the Sabaeans. But in all probability the greater part of the gold which came into the hands of the Phoenicians and Hebrews was obtained from streams; its great abundance seems to indicate this. At a very early period Jericho was a centre of commerce with the East, and in the narrative of its capture we meet with gold in the form of ingots (Jos 7:21, A.V. “wedge,” lit. “tongue”), in which it was probably cast for the convenience of traffic. That which Achan took weighed twenty-five ounces.  As gold is seldom if ever found entirely free from silver, the quantity of the latter varying from two per cent. to thirty per cent, it has been supposed that the ancient metallurgists were acquainted with some means of parting them, an operation performed in modern times by boiling the metal in nitric or sulphuric acid. To some process of this kind it has been imagined that reference is made in Pro 17:3, “The fining-pot is for silver, and the furnace for gold;” and again in Pro 28:21. “If, for example,” says Mr. Napier, “the term fining-pot could refer to the vessel or pot in which the silver is dissolved from the gold in parting, as it may be called with propriety, then these passages have a meaning in our modern practice” (Metals of the Bible, page 28); but he admits that this is at best but plausible, and considers that “the constant reference to certain qualities and kinds of gold in Scripture is a kind of presumptive proof that they were not in the habit of perfectly purifying or separating the gold from the silver.”

A strong proof of the acquaintance possessed by the ancient Hebrews with the manipulation of metals is found by some in the destruction of the golden calf in the desert by Moses: “And he took the calf which they had made, and burnt it in fire, and ground it to powder, and strewed it upon the water, and made the children of Israel drink” (Exo 32:20). As the highly malleable character of gold would render an operation like that which is described in the text almost impossible, an explanation has been sought in the supposition that we have here an indication that Moses was a proficient in the process known in modern times as calcination. The object of calcination being to oxidize the metal subjected to the process, and gold not being affected by this treatment, the explanation cannot be admitted. M. Goguet (quoted in Wilkinson's Anc. Eg. 3:221) confidently asserts that the problem has been solved by the discovery of an experienced chemist that “in the place of tartaric acid, which we employ, the Hebrew legislator used natron, which is common in the East.” The gold so reduced and made into a draught is further said to have a most detestable taste. Goguet's solution appears to have been adopted without examination by more modern writers. but Mr. Napier ventured to question its correctness, and endeavored to trace it to its source. The only clew which he found was in a discovery by Stahll, a chemist of the 17th century, “that if one part gold, three parts potash, and three parts sulphur are heated together, a compound is formed which is partly soluble in water. If,” he adds, “this be the discovery referred to, which I think very probable, it certainly has been made the most of by Bible critics” (Met. of the Bible, page 49). The whole  difficulty appears to have arisen from a desire to find too much in the text. The main object of the destruction of the calf was to prove its worthlessness and to throw contempt upon idolatry, and all this might have been done without any refined chemical process like that referred to. The calf was first heated in the fire to destroy its shape, then beaten and broken up by hammering or filing into small pieces, which were thrown into the water, of which the people were made to drink as a symbolical act. “Moses threw-the atoms into the water as an emblem of the perfect annihilation of the calf, and he gave the Israelites that water to drink, not only to impress upon them the abomination and despicable character of the image which they had made, but as a symbol of purification, to remove the object. of the transgression by those very persons who had committed it” (Kalisch, Comm. on Exo 32:20). SEE CALF, GOLDEN.

How far the ancient Hebrews were acquainted with the processes at present in use for extracting copper from the ore, it is impossible to assert, as there are no references in Scripture to anything of the kind, except in the passage of Job already quoted. Copper smelting, however, is in some cases attended with comparatively small difficulties, which the ancients had evidently the skill to overcome. Ore composed of copper and oxygen, mixed with coal and burned to a bright red heat, leaves the copper in the metallic state, and the same result will follow if the process be applied to the carbonates and sulphurets of copper. Some means of toughening the metal, so as to render it fit for manufacture, must have been known to the Hebrews as to other ancient nations. The Egyptians evidently possessed the art of working bronze in great perfection at a very early time, and much of the knowledge of metals which the Israelites had must have been acquired during their residence among them.

Of tin there appears to have been no trace in Palestine. That the Phoenicians obtained their supplies from the mines of Spain and Cornwall there can be no doubt, and it is suggested that even the Egyptians may have procured it from the same source, either directly or through the medium of the former. It was found among the possessions of the Midianites, to whom it might have come in the course of traffic; but in other instances in which allusion is made to it, tin occurs in conjunction with other metals in the form of an alloy. The lead mines of Gebel er- Rossass, near the coast of the Red Sea, about half-way between Berenice and Kossayr (Wilkinson, Handb. for Egypt, page 403), may have supplied the Hebrews with that metal, of which there were no mines in their own  country, or it may have been obtained from the rocks in the neighborhood of Sinai. The bills of Palestine are rich in iron, and the mines are still worked there, though in a very simple, rude manner, like that of the ancient Samothracians: of the method employed by the Egyptians and Hebrews, we have no certain information. It may have been similar to that in use throughout the whole of India from very early times, which is thus described by Dr. Ure (Dict. of Arts, etc., art. Steel): “The furnace or bloomery in which the ore is smelted is from four to five feet high; it is somewhat pear-shaped, being about five feet wide at bottom and one foot at top. It is built entirely of clay... There is an opening in front about a foot or more in height, which is built up with clay at the commencement, and broken down at the end of each smelting operation. The bellows are usually made of a goat's skin... The bamboo nozzles of the bellows are inserted into tubes of clay, which pass into the furnace... The furnace is filled with charcoal, and a lighted coal being. introduced before the nozzles, the mass in the interior is soon kindled. As soon as this is accomplished, a small portion of the ore, previously moistened with water to prevent it from running through the charcoal, but without any flux whatever, is laid on the top of the coals, and covered with charcoal to fill up the furnace. In this manner ore and fuel are supplied, and the bellows are urged for three or four hours. When the process is stopped, and the temporary wall in front is broken down, the bloom is removed with a pair of tongs from the bottom of the furnace.”

It has seemed necessary to give this account of a very ancient method of iron smelting, because, from the difficulties which attend it, and the intense heat which is required to separate the metal from the ore, it has been asserted that the allusions to iron and iron manufacture in the Old Testament are anachronisms. But if it were possible among the ancient Indians in a very primitive state of civilization, it might have been known to the Hebrews, who may have acquired their knowledge by working as slaves in the iron furnaces of Egypt (comp. Deu 4:20). The question of the early use of iron among the Egyptians is fully disposed of in the following remarks of Sir Gardner Wilkinson (Ancient Egyptians, 2:154-156): “In the infancy of the arts and sciences, the difficulty of working iron might long withhold the secret of its superiority over copper and bronze; but it cannot reasonably be supposed that a nation so advanced, and so eminently skilled in the art of working metals as the Egyptians and Sidonians, should have remained ignorant of its use, even if  we had no evidence of its having been known to the Greeks and other people.; and the constant employment of bronze arms and implements is not a sufficient argument against their knowledge of iron, since we find the Greeks and Romans made the same things of bronze long after the period when iron was universally known... To conclude from the want of iron instruments, or arms, bearing the names of early monarchs of a Pharaonic age, that bronze was alone used, is neither just nor satisfactory; since the decomposition of iron, especially when buried for ages in the nitrous soil of Egypt, is so speedy as to preclude the possibility of its preservation. Until we know in what manner the Egyptians employed bronze tools for cutting stone, the discovery of them affords no additional light, nor even argument; since the Greeks and Romans continued to make bronze instruments of various kinds long after iron was known to them; and Herodotus mentions the iron tools used by the builders of the Pyramids. Iron and copper mines are found in the Egyptian desert, which were worked in old times; and the monuments of Thebes, and even the tombs about Memphis, dating more than 4000 years ago, represent butchers sharpening their knives on a round bar of metal attached to their apron, which from its blue color can only be steel; and the distinction between the bronze and iron weapons in the tomb of Rameses III, one painted red, the other blue, leaves no doubt of both having been used (as in Rome) at the same periods. In Ethiopia iron was much more abundant than in Egypt, and Herodotus states that copper was a rare metal there; though we may doubt his assertion of prisoners in that country having been bound with fetters of gold. The speedy decomposition of iron would be sufficient to prevent our finding implements of that metal of an early period, and the greater opportunities of obtaining copper ore, added to the facility of working it, might be a reason for preferring the latter whenever it answered the purpose instead of iron.” SEE METAL.

## Mineralogy[[@Headword:Mineralogy]]

             This science, like all others of modern date, was in a very imperfect state among the Hebrews. Hence the sacred writers speak of minerals without any scientific classification, and according to their merely external characteristics. This occasions the utmost difficulty in identifying any but the commonest mineral substances. In precious stones, particularly, this vagueness of name and description precludes the possibility of any certainty as to the actual mineral intended, or, rather, leads to the presumption that in most instances no one substance is denoted, but that the name is generic, including all stones of the same general appearance,  color, hardness, etc. SEE GEM. The following is a list of the mineral productions mentioned in the Bible, with their probable modern representatives. For details, see each word in its place.

AchlamahAmethyst“amethyst.”AstroAlabaster“alabaster.”AmethustosAmethyst“amethyst.”ArgurosSilver“silver.”Bahat.Marble“red marble.”BarekethEmerald?“carbuncle.”BarzelIron“iron.”BeddAlloy?“tin”BedolachBdellium“bdellium.”BerullosBeryl“beryl.”BetserOre“gold.”Bor, Borith}Alkali“soap,” etChalkedonChalcedony“chalcedony.”ChalkolibdnonElectrum“fine brass.”ChalkosCopper“brass.”ChallamishFlint“flint,” etc.ChashmaalBurnished Copper“ amber.”ChemarBitumen“slime.”CholSand“sand.”ChrusolethosChrysolite“chrysolite.”ChrusoprasosChrysoprase“chrysoprase.”ChrusosGold“gold.”DarPearl-stone“white marble.”EkdachCarbuncle“carbuncle.”GabishCrystal“pearl.”GirLime“chalk.”GophrthSulphur“brimstone.”HalsSalt“salt.”HuakinthosHyacinth“jacinth.”HuilosGlass“glass.”JaspisJasper“jasper.”

KadkodRuby“agate.”KerachCrystal“crystal.”KesephSilver“silver.”Kethem,Virgin Gold”gold.”KrustallosCrystal“crystal.”LeshemOpal?“ligure.”MargaritesPearl“pearl.”MarnurosMarble“marble.”MelachSalt“salt.”Nechash, NechoshethCopper“brass.”NetherNitre“nitre.'NophekEmerald?“emerald.”O'demGarnet“sardius.”OpherethLead“lead.”PaldahSteeltorch.”PazRefined Gold“fine gold.”PitdahTopaz?“topaz.”PukAntimony“paint.”Sappheiros,sapphire“sapphire.”Sardinossapphire“sardius.”SardiosCarnelian“sardine.”SardonuxSardonyx“Sardonyx.”ShaishAlabaster“marble.”ShamirDiamond“diamond,” etc.ShasherRed Ochre“vermilion.”SheboAgate?“agate.”SheshWhite Marble“marble.”ShohamOnyx?“onyx.”SidrosIron“iron.”SigScoriae, etc“dross.”SmaragdosEmerald“emerald.”SocherethSpotted Marble“black marble.”TarshishTopaz?“bervl.”TheionBrimstone“brimstone.”Topazion.Topaz“topaz.”

TsarNodule“flint.”Yahalon.…Onyx?“diamond.”YashephethJasper“jasper.ZahabGold“gold.”ZekukethGlass“crystal.”See Rosenmuller, Biblical Mineralogy and Botany (Edinb. 1846, 12mo); Moore, Ancient Mineralogy (N.Y. 1834, 12mo).

## Minerva[[@Headword:Minerva]]

             the name of a Roman goddess, identified by the later Grecizing Romans with the Greek Athene, whom she greatly resembled, though, like all the old Latin divinities, there was nothing anthropomorphic in what was told concerning her. Her name is thought to spring from an old Etruscan word preserved in the roots of mens (the mind) and monere (to warn or advise); and the ancient Latin scholar and critic, Varro (ap. August. De Civ. Dei, 7:28), regarded her as the impersonation of divine thought — the plan of the material universe, of which Jupiter was the creator, and Juno the representative. Hence all that goes on among men, all that constitutes the development of human destiny (which is but the expression of the divine idea or intention), is under her care. She is the patroness of wisdom, arts, and scienices, the personification, so to speak, of the thinking, inventive faculty-and was invoked alike by poets, painters, teachers, physicians, and all kinds of craftsmen (Ovid, Fast. 3:809, etc.; August. 1.c. 7:16). She also guides heroes in war; and, in fact, every wise idea, every bold act, and every useful design, owes something to the high inspiration of this virgin goddess (Livy, 45:33; Virgil, AEn. 2:615). Popular tradition accounted for her origin as follows: “She was the offspring of the brain of Jupiter, from which she issued in full armor.” She was always represented as a virgin. In war she was contradistinguished from Mars (the god of brute force) as the patroness of scientific warfare, and hence, according to the ancient poets, was always superior to him. The favorite plant of Minerva was the olive, and the animals consecrated to her were the owl and the serpent. As she was a maiden goddess, her sacrifices consisted of calves which had not borne the yoke or felt thesting (Fulgentius, page 651). She had many temples and festivals dedicated to her. Her oldest temple in Rome was that  on the Capitol. Her most popular festival was held in March, and lasted five days, from the 19th to the 23d inclusive. Minerva was popularly believed to be the inventor of musical instruments, especially wind instruments, the use of which was very important in religious worship, and which were accordingly subjected to an annual purification, which took place during the festival just alluded to (Ovid, Fast. 3:849).

## Mingarelli, Fernando[[@Headword:Mingarelli, Fernando]]

             an eminent Italian theologian, was born at Bologna in 1724. He flourished as professor of theology at the University of Malta for several years. Impaired health finally obliged his return to France. He died at Faenza December 21, 1777. He was a member of the Academy of the Arcadians. Mingarelli wrote several works; the most important are, Vetera monumenta ad classem Ravennatem nuper eruta (Faenza, 1756, 4to; notes of Mauro Fattorini and of Bianchi): — Veterunm testimonia de Didynmo Alexandrino ceco, ex quibus tres libri de trinitate nuper detecti eidem asseruntur (Rome, 1764, 4to).

## Mingarelli, Giovanni Lodovico[[@Headword:Mingarelli, Giovanni Lodovico]]

             an eminent Italian bibliographer, the elder brother of the preceding, was born at Bologna February 27, 1722. He held successively the principal offices of the congregation of the regular canons of San Salvatore. Afterwards he was a professor of Greek literature at the College della  Sapienza, at Rome. Mingarelli employed his hours of leisure in visiting the principal libraries of the great papal city, and published some important works which he thus discovered. He died at Rome March 6, 1793. We owe to him, as editor, the Annotationes literales in Psalmos of father Marini (Bologna, 1748-50); he added new explanations of the Psalms, which are included in the Roman liturgy, and a life of the author, the exactitude of which is praised by Tiraboschi: — Veterum Patrum Latinorum opuscula numquam antehac edita (Bologna, 1751): — Sopra un' opera inedita d'un antico teologo lettera (Venice, 1763, 12mo; and in the Nuova Raccolta Calogerana, tom. 11). This is a treatise on the Trinity, which Mingarelli regards as the product of the 11th century, and he ascribes its authorship to Didymus of Alexandria. There is an analysis of his dissertation in the Journal de Bouillon, January 1766: — AEgyptiorum codicum reliquiae Venetiis in Bibliotheca Naniana asservatae (ibid. 1785, 2 parts, 4to). These catalogues are greatly valued by scholars. He left a number of works in MS. form; they are now kept at Bologna. See Cavalieri, Vita di Mingcrelli (Novara, 1817, 8vo); Tipaldo, Biographia degli Ital. illustr. 5:59.

## Mingled People[[@Headword:Mingled People]]

             (עֵרֶב, e'reb, a mixture), spoken of a “mixed” multitude, such as accompanied the Israelites from Egypt (Exo 12:38), and joined them after their return from Babylon (Neh 13:3); but specifically (with the def. article) of the promiscuous mass of foreign auxiliaries, e.g. of Solomon (1Ki 10:15), of Egypt (Eze 30:5; Jer 25:20; Jer 25:24), of Chaldaea (Jer 50:37). “The phrase (הָעֶרֶב, ha- ereb), like that of the mixed multitude, which the Hebrew closely resembles, is applied in Jer 25:20, and Eze 30:5, to denote the miscellaneous foreign population of Egypt and its frontier-tribes, including every one, says Jerome, who was not a native Egyptian, but was resident there. The Targum of Jonathan understands it in this passage, as well as in Jeremiah 1:37, of the foreign mercenaries, though in Jer 25:24, where the word again occurs, it is rendered Arabs. It is difficult to attach to it any precise meaning, or to identify with the mingled people any race of which we have knowledge. ‘The kings of the mingled people that dwell in the desert,' are the same apparently as the tributary kings (A.V. ‘kings of Arabia') who brought presents to Solomon (1Ki 10:15); the Hebrew in the two cases is identical.

These have been  explained (as in the Targum on 1Ki 10:15) as foreign mercenary chiefs who were in the pay of Solomon, but Thenius understands by them the sheiks of the border tribes of Bedouins, living in Arabia Deserta, who were closely connected with the Israelites. The ‘mingled people' in the midst of Babylon (Jer 50:37) were probably the foreign soldiers or mercenary troops, who lived among the native population, as the Targum takes it. Kimchi compares Exo 12:38, and explains ha-ereb of the foreign population of Babylon generally, ‘foreigners who were in Babylon from several lands,' or it may, he says he intended to denote the merchants, ereb being thus connected with the עֹרְבֵי מִעֲרָבֵךְof Eze 27:27, rendered in the A.V. ‘the occupiers of thy merchandise.' His first interpretation is based upon what appears to be the primary signification of the root עָרִב, ‘arab, to mingle, while another meaning, ‘to pledge, guarantee,' suggested the rendering of the Targum ‘mercenaries,' which Jarchi adopts in his explanation of ‘the kings of ha-ereb,' in 1Ki 10:15, as the kings who were pledged to Solomon and dependent upon him. The equivalent which he gives is apparently intended to represent the French garantie. The rendering of the A.V. is supported by the Sept. σύμμικτος in Jeremiah, and ἐπίμικτος in Ezekiel.” SEE MIXED MULTITUDE.

## Mingrelia[[@Headword:Mingrelia]]

             an Asiatic province of Russia, situated between the Black and Caspian seas, in the country formerly called Colchis. It covers a territory of 2600 square miles, inhabited by nearly 250,000 people. The country is mountainous, but is largely cultivated. Tobacco, rice, and millet are raised, and a great deal of silk, honey, and wine are produced. Mingrelia became subject to Russia in 1803, but was until 1867 governed by its own prince, called Dadian, who resided in the small town of Zoobdidee. The inhabitants of Mingrelia are generally inferior in appearance to the mountaineers of the Caucasus. We are told by travellers that they are an ignorant, superstitious, and corrupt people.

Religious Condition. — The Mingrelians are ostensibly members of the Greek Church, but their religion consists rather in outward practices and observances than in inward purity and heart devotion. Many of their practices are open to severe censure. They observe four Lents, comprehending (1) the forty-eight days before Easter; (2) the forty days before Christmas; (3) the month preceding St. Peter's day; and (4) a Lent  devoted to the Virgin Mary, and observed for a fortnight. Their chief saint is St. George, who is also the special patron of the Georgians, the Muscovites, and the Greeks. Their worship of images is of such a description that even Romanists declare it deserving the reproach of idolatry. They offer them stags' horns, tusks of boars, pheasants' wings, and weapons, with a view of insuring a happy success to their wars and hunting expeditions. It is even said that, like the Jews, they offer bloody sacrifices, immolate victims, and, like our Western savages, feast on them in general assembly; that they kill animals at the tombs of their parents, and pour wine and oil over the graves, as the pagans did. They abstain from meat on Mondays, out of regard for the moon, and Friday is observed as a holiday. They are exceedingly thievish: theft is not regarded as a crime, but rather a proof of skill that disgraces no one; he who is caught in the act has nothing to fear beyond a trifling fine.

Introduction of Christianity. — Some ecclesiastical historians insist that the king, the queen, and the nobility of Colchis were converted to the Christian faith by a female slave, under the reign of Constantine (Socrates, lib. 1, c. 20; Sozomen, lib. 2, c. 7). Others assert that the Mingrelians were instructed in the Christian doctrines by one Cyrillus, whom the Sclavonians in their own tongue call Chiusi, and who is said to have lived about A.D. 806. Perhaps religion was extinguished altogether in these regions during the time that elapsed between the fifth and the ninth centuries. The Mingrelians show, on the sea-shore, near the Corax River, a large church, in which, according to their statement, St. Andrew preached; but this is to be taken “cum grano salis.” In former times the Mingrelians acknowledged the spiritual supremacy of the patriarch of Antioch; but this supremacy has been transferred to the patriarchal see of Constantinople. Nevertheless they have two primates of their own nation, whom they call catholicos: one for Georgia, the other for Mingrelia. There were formerly twelve bishoprics. There are only six left at the present time, the other six having been changed into abbeys. The primate or chief bishop of Mingrelia, who resides at Constantinople, makes his appearance in Mingrelia only once in his life, and then only for the purpose of consecrating the holy oil, or chrism, which the Greeks call myron.

The statements of some travellers respecting the treasures of the primate and the bishops of the Mingrelians, the splendor of their garments, the extortions they commit, and the enormous sums of money they exact for mass, confession, ordination, etc., are rather at variance with the  statements relating to the general poverty of the nation; there is likely to be exaggeration on both sides. What is said of the ignorance and corruption of the clergy in general may be more readily believed. The bishops who are very loose in their morals, are regarded as acceptable if they abstain from meat, strictly observe Lent, and say mass in conformity with the Greek rite. Priests are allowed to marry, not only before their ordination, but also afterwards, and even to take a second wife, with dispensation.

The observances at baptism are very peculiar. As soon as a child is born, the priest anoints his forehead, drawing a cross on it with the chrism. .The baptism is deferred until the child is two years of age, when he is christened by immersion in warm water; again unctions are made on almost every part of his body; holy bread is given him to eat, and wine to drink. The priests do not stick to the traditional form of baptism, and have been known to use wine for the christening of great people's offspring.

There are in Mingrelia monks of the order of St. Basil, who are called berres. They are dressed like Greek monks, and do not differ from them in their manner of living. Avery condemnable abuse is that parents are allowed to engage their children to this state, in their tenderest years, when they are themselves incapable of choice. There are also nuns of the same order; they wear a black veil, and observe the same fastings and abstinence as the monks; but they do not submit to claustration, and make no vows, being thus at liberty to leave-the monastic state when so inclined. The cathedral churches are adorned with painted images (no rilievi), covered, it is said, with gold and gems; but the parochial churches are sadly neglected. It is asserted that the Mingrelians are in possession of quite a number of precious relics, brought to them by the Greek fugitives, after the downfall of Constantinople among others they claim to have a piece of the true cross, eight inches long; but the statements of the Greeks and the Romanists, in the matter of relics, are somewhat subject to caution. The Theatins of Italy in 1627 established a mission in Mingrelia, and so have the Capuchins in Georgia, and the Dominicans in Circassia; but the small success which attended these endeavors caused the missions to be suffered to fall into decay, and finally to be abandoned. See Dr. J. Zampi, Relation de Mingrlie; Cerry, Etat present de l'Eglise Romaine; Chardin, Voyage de Perse; and especially Bergier, Dictionnaire de Theologie, 4:347 sq.

## Miniamin[[@Headword:Miniamin]]

             (Heb. Minyamin', מַנְיָמַין, fr from the right hand, or perhaps corrupted from Benjamin), the name of two men. SEE MIAMIN.

1. (Sept. Βενιαμείν v.r. Βενιαμίν, Vulg. Benjamin.) One of the Levites (or priests) who had charge of the distribution of the sacred offerings among the families of the sacerdotal order under Hezekiah (2Ch 31:15). B.C. 726.

2. (Sept. Μιαμίν,.Vulg. Mimamin.) One of the priests that returned with Zerubbabel from Babylon (Neh 12:17), and celebrated with trumpets the completion of the walls of Jerusalem (Neh 12:41); probably the same elsewhere called MIAMIN (Neh 12:5) or MIJAMIN (Neh 10:7).

## Miniatis, Elias[[@Headword:Miniatis, Elias]]

             an Eastern theologian and teacher, was born at Liguri, Cephalonia, in 1669, and was educated at Venice. He filled offices as public instructor, and became afterwards clergyman at Constantinople, Corfu, and the Peloponnesus, and was finally bishop of Calaoryta. He died in 1714. His works are: Πέτρα σκανδάλου (Leipsic, 1718), a treatise on the schism between the Greek and Latin churches: a Latin and German version of it was published at Leipsic in 1843, and at Vienna in 18838: Διδαχαὶ εἰς τἡν ἁγίαν καὶ μεγάλην Τεσσαρακοστὴν καὶ εἰς ἄλλας ἐπιστήμους ἑορτάς (Venice, 1727, and often).

## Miniato (Or Minias), St.[[@Headword:Miniato (Or Minias), St.]]

             an Armenian prince, who belonged to the Roman army, and served under Decius. When that emperor was encamped. outside the city of Florence, according to the Florentine legend, this saint was denounced as a Christian, and condemned to be thrown to the beasts of the amphitheatre. A panther was first set upon him, but the saint was delivered from him in answer to his prayers. He was then hanged, put inboiling oil, and stoned, without being destroyed, for an angel descended to comfort him, and clothed him in a garment of light. Finally he was beheaded. It is said that this severe measure was executed in A.D. 254. Miniato is represented dressed as a prince, with scarlet robe and a crown. His attributes are the palm, the lily, and javelins.

## Miniature[[@Headword:Miniature]]

             is a picture illustrating the text of a MS.; so called because filling up the outline sketched in vermilion (minimum).

## Minims[[@Headword:Minims]]

             (ordo fratarum minimorum S. Francisci den Paula), a religious order in the Church of Rome, founded by St. Francis de Paula, of Calabria, in the year 1453. The new order was called at first Hermits of St. Francis (Eremite Minimoarum Firatrum S. Francisci de Paula).

Pope Sixtus IV, in 1474, confirmed the statutes of the order, thus uniting them in conventual order, and named Francis superior-general. He enjoined on his disciples a total abstinence from flesh, wine, and fish; besides which they were always to go barefoot, and not permitted to quit their habit and girdle night or day. Their habit is a coarse, black woollen stuff, with a woollen girdle of the same color, tied in five knots. The order increased rapidly; it gained many disciples, especially in France, where Francis was in high favor with Louis XI, Charles VIII, and Louis XII. Many houses of the order were established throughout the kingdom, and the friars themselves were called les bons hommes (Boni homines). In Spain they also gained influence, Ferdinand the Catholic building their first monastery for them at Malaga. A new name, “the Fathers of Victory,” was bestowed upon them, because Ferdinand believed that only by their prayerful intercession Malaga had been captured from the Moors. In 1497 the emperor Maximilian called them to Germany, and founded three monasteries for the order.

For a long time the order had no special rules and regulations, the example of the superior-general serving as a pattern. In 1493 Franciscus finished lis threefold rules, and they were confirmed by pope Alexander VI. Humility and repentance, poverty, fasting, praying, and silence form the principal features of these ascetic rules, and Franciscus called his brethren “Minimos Fratres.” This name was given them because they should be “ the least among the brethren,” and Christ's words (Mat 25:40), “Quamdiu fecistis uni de his fratribus meis minimis, mihi fecistis,” should have a peculiar reference to them. The austerity of the rules is particularly great in the selection of food. The brethren are debarred not only the use of meat, but also of eggs, butter, milk, and cheese. In 1493 Franciscus also instituted a female order of Minims, and subjected it to the guidance of the older order.  The order is at present divided into thirty-one provinces, of which twelve are in Italy, eleven in France and Flanders, seven in Spain, and one in Germany. In the beginning of the last century the order had about 450 convents. At present their number has greatly decreased. The Minims have passed even into the Indies, where there are some convents which do not compose provinces, but depend immediately on the general. Their principal house is at Rome. The superior of each male body is called corrector; that of each female body, correctrix; the superior of the order is called generalis corrector. There are now but few houses for female Minims, The tertiaries of the order are secular persons; but while they are not obliged to retire from society, they are required to observe the abstinence from meat, etc. They have also correctors and correctrices, and are subject to the order of the general corrector. Their distinguishing mark is a girdle with only two knots. See Bonanni, Verz. der geistlichen Ordenisleute, 2:58 sq.; Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, 6:152; Herzog, Real-Encyklopddie, 9:538. (J.H.W.)

## Minister[[@Headword:Minister]]

             one who acts as the less (from minus or minor) or inferior agent, in obedience or subservience to another, or who serves, officiates, etc., as distinguished from the master, magister (from magis), or superior. It is used in the A.V. to describe various officials of a religious and civil character. The words so translated in the Scriptures are the following:

1. מְשָׁרֵת, meshareth', which is applied,

(1) to an attendant upon a person in high rank, as to Joshua in relation to Moses (Exo 24:13, Sept. παρεστηκὼς αὐτῷ; Aquila and Symm. ὁ λειτουργὸς αὐτοῦ; comp. Exo 33:11, Sept. θεράπων Ι᾿ησοῦς; Num 11:28; Jos 1:1, Sept. ὑπουργὸς Μωυσῆ; Alex. λιτουργός), and to the attendant on the prophet Elisha (2Ki 4:43; 2Ki 6:15, Sept. λειτουργός; comp. 2Ki 3:11; 1Ki 19:21);

(2) to the attaches of a royal court (1Ki 10:5 [Sept. λειτουρός, where, it may be observed, they are distinguished from the “servants” or officials of higher rank [עֶבֶד, a more general term, Sept. παῖς], answering to our ministers, by the different titles of the chambers assigned to their use, the “sitting” of the servants meaning rather their abode, and the “attendance” of the ministers the ante-room in which they were stationed);  persons of high rank held this post in the Jewish kingdom (2Ch 22:8); and it may be in this sense, as the attendants of the King of kings, that the, term is applied to the angels in Psa 103:21 (λειτουργοί); comp. Psa 104:4 (Heb 1:7; and see Stuart's Comment. ad loc.);

(3) to the priests and Levites, who are thus described by the prophets and later historians (Jer 33:21; Eze 44:11; Joe 1:9; Joe 1:13; Ezr 8:17; Neh 10:36), though the verb, whence meshareth is derived, is not uncommonly used in reference to their services in the earlier books (Exo 28:43; Num 3:31; Deu 18:5, etc.). Persons thus designated sometimes succeeded to the office of their principal, as did Joshua and Elisha. Hence the term is used of the Jews in their capacity as a sacred nation, “Men shall call you the ministers of our God” (Isa 61:6).

2. פְּלָה, pelach' (Chald.), Ezr 7:24, “minister” of religion, λειτουργός (comp. פלחן, Ezr 7:19), though he uses the word משרתים in the same sense, Ezr 8:17. In the N.T. we have three terms, each with its distinctive meaning.

3. Λειτουρός, a term derived from λεῖτον ἔργον, “public work,” and the leitourgia was. the name of certain personal services which the citizens of Athens and some other states had to perform gratuitously for the public good. From the sacerdotal use of the word in the N.T., it obtained the special sense of a “ public divine service,” which is perpetuated in our word “liturgy.” The verb λειτουργεῖν is used in this sense in Act 13:2. It answers most nearly to the Hebrew meshareth, and is usually employed in the Sept. as its equivalent. It betokens a subordinate public administrator, whether civil or sacerdotal, and is applied in the former sense to the magistrates in their relation to the divine authority (Rom 13:6), and in the latter sense to our Lord in relation to the Father (Heb 8:2), and to St. Paul in relation to Jesus Christ (Rom 15:16), where it occurs among other expressions of a sacerdotal character, “ministering” (ἱερουργοῦντα), “offering up” (προσφορά, etc.). In all these instances the original and special meaning of the word, as used by the Athenians, namely, with respect to those who administered the public offices (λειτουργίαι) at their own expense (Bockh, Staatshaush. der Athener, 1:480; 2:62; Potter's Gr. Ant. 1:85), is preserved, though this comes, perhaps, yet more distinctly forward in the cognate terms λειτουργία and  λειτουργεῖνapplied to the sacerdotal office of the Jewish priest (Luk 1:3; Heb 9:21; Heb 10:11),to the still higher priesthood of Christ (Heb 8:6), and in a secondary sense to the Christian priest who offers up to God the faith of his converts (Php 2:17, λειτουργία τῆς πίστεως), and to any act of public self-devotion on the part of a Christian disciple (Rom 15:27; 2Co 9:12; Php 2:30).

4. The second Greek term, ὑπηρἐτης, differs from the two others in that it contains the idea of actual and personal attendance upon a superior. Thus it is used of the attendant in the synagogue, the חָזָן, chazan, of the Talmudists (Luk 4:20), whose duty it was to open and close the building, to produce and replace the books employed in the service, and generally to wait on the officiating priest or teacher (Carpzov, Apparat. p. 314). It is similarly applied to Mark, who, as the attendant on Barnabas and Saul (Act 13:5), was probably charged with the administration of baptism and other assistant duties (De Wette, ad loc.); and again to the subordinates of the high-priests (Joh 7:32; Joh 7:45; Joh 18:3, etc.), or of a jailor (Mat 5:25= πράκτωρ in Luk 12:58; Act 5:22). Josephus calls Moses τὸν ὑπηρέτην θεοῦ (Ant. 3:1,4). Kings are so called in Wis 6:4. The idea of personal attendance comes prominently forward in Luk 1:2; Act 26:16, in both of which places it is alleged as a ground of trustworthy testimony (“ipsi viderunt, et, quod plus est, ministrarunt,” Bengel). Lastly, it is used interchangeably with διάκονος in 1Co 4:1, comp. with 1Co 3:5, but in this instance the term is designed to convey the notion of subordination and humility. In all these cases the etymological sense of the word (ὑπὸ ἐρέτης) comes out. It primarily signifies an under-rower on board a galley, of the class who used the longest oars, and consequently, performed the severest duty, as distinguished from the θρανίτης, the rower upon the upper bench of the three, and from the ναῦται, sailors, or the ἐπιβάται, marines (Dem. 1209, 11, 14; comp. also 1208, 20; 1214, 23; 1216, 13; Pol. 1:25, 3): hence in general a hand, agent, minister, attendant, etc. The term that most adequately represents it in our language is “attendant.”

5. The third Greek term, διάκονος, is the one usually employed in relation to the ministry of the Gospel: its application is twofold, in a general sense to indicate ministers of any order, whether superior or inferior, and in a special sense to indicate an order of inferior ministers. In the former sense  we have the cognate term διακονία applied in Act 6:1; Act 6:4, both to the ministration of tables and to the higher ministration of the Word, and the term διάκονος itself applied, without defining the office, to Paul and Apollos (1Co 3:5), to Tychicus (Eph 6:21; Col 4:7), to Epaphras (Col 1:7), to Timothy (1Th 3:2), and even to Christ himself (Rom 15:8; Gal 2:17). In the latter sense it is applied in the passages where the διάκονος is contradistinguished from the bishop, as in Php 1:1; 1Ti 3:8-13. The word is likewise applied to false teachers (2Co 11:15), and even to heathen magistrates (Rom 13:4), in the sense of a minister, assistant, or servant in general, as in Mat 20:26. The term διάκονοι denotes among the Greeks a higher class of servants than the δοῦλοι (Athen. 10:192; see Buttm. Lex. 1:220; comp. Mat 22:13, and Sept. for משרת, Est 1:10; Est 2:2; Est 6:3). It is worthy of observation that the word is thus of very rare occurrence in the Sept., and then only in a general sense: its special sense, as known to us in its derivative “deacon” (q.v.) seems to be of purely Christian growth. SEE MINISTRY.

MINISTER is a Latin word applied in that portion of the Christian Church known as the Western to designate that officer who is styled deacon in Greek. The word was applied generally to the Anglican clergy about the time of the great rebellion, since which time it has come into general use, and is now applied to any preacher of the Gospel. Even the Jews have adopted the use of this word, and rabbi is scarcely ever heard in English- speaking congregations of that people. Ministers are also called divines, and may be distinguished into polemic, or those who possess controversial talents; casuistic, or those who resolve cases of conscience; experimental, those who address themselves to the feelings, cases, and circumstances. of their hearers; and, lastly, practical, those who insist upon the performance of all those duties which the Word of God enjoins. An able minister will have something of all these united in him, though he may not excel in all; and it becomes every one who is a candidate for the ministry to get a clear idea of each, that he may not be deficient in the discharge of that work which is the most important that can be sustained by mortal beings. Many volumes have been written on this subject, but we must be content in this place to offer only a few remarks relative to it.

1. In the first place, then, it must be observed that ministers of the Gospel ought to be sound as to their principles. They must be men whose hearts  are renovated by divine grace, and whose sentiments are derived from the sacred oracles of divine truth. A minister without principles will never do any good; and he who professes to believe in a system should see to it that it accords with the Word of God. His mind should clearly perceive the beauty, harmony, and utility of the doctrines, while his heart should be deeply impressed with a sense of their value and importance.

2. They should be mild and as fable as to their dispositions and deportment. A naughty, imperious spirit is a disgrace to the ministerial character, and generally brings contempt. They should learn to bear injuries with patience, and be ready to do good to every one be courteous to all without cringing to any; be affable without levity, and humble without pusillanimity; conciliating the affections without violating the truth; connecting a suavity of manners with a dignity of character; obliging without flattery; and throwing off all reserve without running into the opposite extreme of volubility and trifling.

3. They should be superior as to their knowledge and talents. Though many have been useful without what is called learning, yet none have been so without some portion of knowledge and wisdom. Nor has God Almighty ever sanctified ignorance, or consecrated it to his service; since it is the effect of the fall, and the consequence of our departure from the fountain of intelligence. Ministers therefore, especially, should endeavor to break these shackles, get their minds enlarged, and stored with all useful knowledge. The Bible should be well studied, and that, especially, in the original languages. The scheme of salvation by Jesus Christ should be well, understood, with all the various topics connected with it. - And in the present day a knowledge of history, natural philosophy, logic, mathematics, and rhetoric is peculiarly requisite. A clear judgment, also, with a retentive memory, inventive faculty, and a facility of communication, should by obtained.

4. They should be diligent as to their studies. Their time, especially, should be improved, and not lost by too much sleep, formal visits, indolence, reading useless books, studying useless subjects. Every day should have its work, and every subject its due attention. Some advise a chapter in the Hebrew Bible, and another in the Greek Testament, to be read every day. A well-chosen system of divinity should be accurately studied. The best definitions should be obtained, and a constant regard paid to all those studies which savor of religion, and have some tendency to public work.  5. Ministers should be extensive as to their benevolence and candor. A contracted, bigoted spirit ill becomes those who preach a Gospel which breathes the purest benevolence to mankind. This spirit has done more harm among all parties than many imagine, and is, in our opinion, one of the most powerful engines the devil makes use of to oppose the best interests of mankind; and it is really shocking to observe how sects and parties have all, in their turns, anathematized each other. Now, while ministers ought to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints, they must remember that men always think differently from each other; that prejudice of education has great influence; that difference of opinion as to subordinate things is not of such importance as to be a ground of dislike. Let the ministers of Christ, then, pity the weak, forgive the ignorant, bear with the sincere though mistaken zealot, and love all who love the Lord Jesus Christ.

6. Ministers should be zealous and faithful in their public work. The sick must be visited, children must be catechised, the ordinances administered, and the Word of God preached. These things must be. taken up, not as a matter of duty only, but of pleasure, and executed with faithfulness; and, as they are of the utmost importance, ministers should attend to them with all that sincerity, earnestness, and zeal which that importance demands. An idle, frigid, indifferent minister is a pest to society, a disgrace to his profession, an injury to the Church, and offensive to God himself.

7. Lastly, ministers should be-consistent as to their conduct. No brightness of talent, no superiority of intellect, no extent of knowledge, will ever be a substitute for this. They should not only possess a luminous mind, but set a good example. This will procure dignity to themselves, give energy to what they say, and prove a blessing to the circle in which they move. In tine, they should be men of prudence and prayer, light and love, zeal and knowledge, courage and humility, humanity and religion.

See Dr. Smith, Lecture on the Sacred Office; Gerard, Pastoral Care; Macgill, Address to Young Clergymen; Massillon, Charges; Baxter, Reformed Pastor; Herbert, Country Parson; Burnet, Pastoral Care; Dr. Edwards, Preacher; Mason, Student and Pastor; Brown, Address to Students; Mather, Student and Preacher; Ostervald, Lectures on the Sacred Ministry; Robinson, Claude; Doddridge, Lectures on Preaching; Miller, Letters on Clerical Manners; Burder, Hints; Ware, Lecture on the Connection of Pulpit Eloquence and the Pastoral Care; Christ. Examiner;  Plumer, Pastoral Theology; Tyng, Office and Duty of a Christian Pastor; Bridge, Christian Ministry; Kidder, The Christian Pastorate; Townsend, Tongue and Sword; Presb. Qu. and Princet. Rev. 1854, pages 386, 708; 1859, pages 15, 366; January 1873, art. 6 and 7; Universalist Qu. October 1872, art. 7; Kitto, Journal, April 1853, page 192; Meth. Quar. Review, July 1851, page 430. SEE MINISTRY.

## Minister of the Altar[[@Headword:Minister of the Altar]]

             was a title applied in the Church of Rome, since the close of the 12th century, to the provider of pure bread, wine, and water for the mass. The ministrant, as he is called by the clergy, also responds to the prayers and benedictions. Originally a clerk, deacon, or subdeacon was delegated for this position, but now the duty is assigned to boys, except on unusually solemn and festive occasions.

## Ministerial Call[[@Headword:Ministerial Call]]

             a term used to denote that right or authority which a person receives to preach the Gospel. This call is considered as twofold: divine and ecclesiastical. The following things seem essential to a divine call: 1. A holy blameless life; 2. An ardent and constant inclination and zeal to do good; 3. Abilities suited to the work: such as knowledge, aptness to teach, courage, etc.; 4. An opportunity afforded in Providence to be useful. The Methodists hold that no man should seek to enter the ministerial ranks who does not feel especially called to preach the Gospel. They are quite decided on this point. An ecclesiastical call consists in the election which is made of any person to be a pastor. But here those governed by an episcopacy differ from the Presbyterians, Baptists, Congregationalists, etc.; the former believing that the choice and call of a minister rest with the superior clergy, or those who have the gift of an ecclesiastical benefice; the latter teaching that it should rest on the suffrage of the, people to whom he is to minister. SEE EPISCOPACY; SEE ORDINATION.

## Ministerial Education[[@Headword:Ministerial Education]]

             It is rather an inference than a demonstrable historical fact that in the Levitical cities of the Jews schools were maintained for the instruction of priests and Levites in the knowledge and ceremonies of the law. SEE EDUCATIONS. It is certain, however, that under Samuel “schools of the prophets” were established for the purpose of training men for the high  function of moral and spiritual teaching. Not less than five such schools are named in sacred history; one at Naioth, one at Bethel, one at Jericho, one at Gilgal, and another at Mount Ephraim. The number of the sons of the prophets was often large. Obadiaih hid one hundred of them in a cave to save them from the malice of Jezebel, and at the translation of Elijah fifty of the sons of the prophets were present to witness the wonderful scene.

At a subsequent period of Jewish history a species of schools came into vogue, known as the “assemblies of the wise.” The Talmud mentions some twelve of these institutions, of which those at Tiberias and Jerusalem were the most celebrated. Nevertheless they were not exclusively for the education of the priests, but also of elders and teachers. When Jesus the Christ appeared among men, no inconsiderable portion of his ministry was employed in the instruction and training of his disciples in a kind of peripatetic school, of which he was the great Teacher, as he went about doing good and explaining the things of the kingdom of God. From the Acts and the Epistles it is evident that the apostles imitated their divine Lord in giving personal attention to the instruction of younger disciples designed to succeed them in the holy vocation. As the great Head of the Church had commanded his disciples to “go teach all nations,” so Paul, in handing down his apostolical responsibility to the future Church, exhorts Timothy and his successors in this language: “The things that thou hast heard of me among many Witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also” (2Ti 2:2).

In harmony with such examples and precepts, it is recorded, in the early history of the Church, that the apostle John spent his advanced years at Ephesus in qualifying youth for the Christian ministry, that Mark founded a ministerial school at Alexandria, and Polycarp another at Smyrna. Subsequently, similar schools were established at Caesarea, in Palestine; at Antioch, Laodicea, Nicomedia, Athens, Edessa, Nisibis in Mesopotamia, Seleucia, Rome, and Carthage. Less distinguished than these were many episcopal schools connected with the prominent dioceses of the ancient Church. In some of the better periods and phases of monasticism conventual schools were established, in which young ecclesiastics were qualified as missionaries and teachers for the tribes and nations, to which they were sent forth. Prominent among these were the schools at Iona, at Bangor, in Wales, and Armagh. in Ireland. During the mediaeval period the Waldenses, although few in number and obscure in their seclusion, required  all their candidates for the ministry to be diligent students, prescribing to them a course of study, and testing them by specific examinations.

The schools of Charlemagne, and the various universities founded in sequence of the Crusades, appear to have contemplated primarily, though not exclusively, the instruction of ecclesiastics. The University of Prague and that of Strasburg are celebrated for their aid to religion and the diffusion of piety in the Church. Nor must Paris be omitted. All these institutions exerted their influence for the purifying of Christian doctrine, not only at home, but abroad. We need but mention, the names of John Huss and Jerome of Prague; and here let us not forget John Wickliffe, who labored so faithfully at Oxford, and instilled English students with those principles that gave life to the Reformation. D'Aubigne says: “The first rays of the sun from on high gilded with their fires at once the Gothic colleges at Oxford and the antique schools at Cambridge.” During the Reformatory period, the Continental universities became the main agencies for the spread of the new doctrines. Wittenberg, then but recently founded, became the nursery, the citadel, of the Protestants. The lecture-rooms of the Reformers were their principal pulpits; and, as has been declared by Melancthon in his Life of Luther, the great cause owes its success to the universities. The University of Heidelberg heard with joy the lectures of the exile Reuchlin. Witteiberg was the starting-point of the great Reformer himself, and from all Europe students flocked thither to sit at the feet of the immortal Melancthon. All the leaders of the new cause, in short, were university men — most of them professors, who diffused their opinions through attentive listeners. Calvin, first at Strasburg, and later, aided by Beza, at Geneva, exerted an influence chiefly through the famous schools with which he was connected. Fleury says, in his Life of Calvin: “He was indebted to the academy (at Geneva), which soon became greatly frequented, for the rapid diffusion of his doctrines in Germany, Holland, and France.” In passing, we may remind our readers also of those university laborers, the ardent servants for the Christian cause, Erasmus of Paris, OEcolampadius of Strasburg, Peter Martyr and Martin Bucer of Oxford and Cambridge, and Arminius of Leyden.

From those days to the present all complete universities had had faculties of theology of greater or less extent. Their character and influence we shall consider in an article on Theological Education (q.v.). We confine ourselves for the present to a review of the educational advantages offered by the various religious organizations independent of the state; and as even  such are in Europe subject to more or less state aid, we shall consider here only those of religious bodies in the United States of America, but mainly in so far as they have in view the instruction of ministers.

In the colonial days of this country's history the ministers were, with few exceptions, men who had been trained for the work in Europe, and in a majority of cases were skilled laborers in the vineyard before they left the old country. It has been estimated that there was in the New England colonies, twenty years after the landing of the Pilgrims, a graduate of college for every 240 inhabitants. A few of these graduates were employed in the civil administration of the colonies, but most of them were in the ministry. As the population increased, it became necessary to supply the ministry from the rising generation. For this purpose, and this mainly, the university at Cambridge was founded in 1636, and as its motto was chosen “Christo et ecclesiae” (To Christ and the Church). Amid much sacrifice and denial this school was started, and for years, yea, decades, as new churches were planted, or as the early ministers passed away by death, the ministerial office was supplied, in great measure, from among the graduates of the infant college. ‘ More than half of its graduates, during the first century of its existence, entered into the labors of the ministry. Cotton Mather, in his Magnolia, furnishes a list of the New England churches in 1696, from which it appears that of the 129 pulpits supplied by 116 pastors, 107 of the preachers were graduates of Harvard College. In the charters of several of the oldest colleges it is declared that virtue and religion are the principal objects for the founding of these higher institutions of learning. “The Virginians have souls to be saved” was the plea presented by the pioneers in 1693, when the college was asked for Virginia; “and though the chancellor cursed their souls, saying, ‘Let them raise tobacco,' William and Mary granted both a charter and money to the college which still bears their name.” In a few generations all the leading churches, as they grew and found a need for training-schools to supply the ministry, founded colleges, until at present full four hundred chartered Christian colleges have grown into life as the outward material expression of the Christian zeal within American bosoms.

What is peculiarly strange about American colleges is that all of them have felt more or less constrained to consecrate their work to religion. “Secular and state colleges, so called, many of them, surpass those under denominational control in their vigorous appeals to the religious feelings of the people.” Placing some eminent worker of the Christian Church in the presidency,  they install the Word of God in the daily college prayers. They require all the students to attend church each Sabbath. They have daily prayermeetings among the students. These students generally attend Sabbath-schools. The Greek Testament is read in the college lessons. The evidences of Christianity are taught in the classes. Free tuition and other inducements are offered to attract candidates for the ministry to these institutions. Revival measures are introduced. All the means of grace known to the evangelical churches are used as regularly, as frequently, as earnestly in the colleges as they are in any of the congregations. Of late years, the Church, working unitedly under the auspices of the “Evangelical Alliance,” has appointed a day of prayer to be observed once annuallynow on the last Thursday in January and many have ‘been the conversions and fruits for the ministry. It is asserted by those who have carefully searched the records of our colleges that nearly one third of their graduates enter the ministry. Of Amherst College, e.g., it is told that “nearly half of its ‘alumni,' since the beginning of its career, have become ministers of the Gospel.” “Even West Point Military Academy, where they talk of war, and drill to the time of martial music every day, the cross of Jesus has won many a trophy. In one of the awakening seasons there the college chaplain was busy circulating tracts. A cadet to whom he gave a tract called soon afterwards to see him, exclaiming, ‘I am a lost sinner; what must I do to be saved?' The chaplain led him gently to Jesus. The cadet was afterwards bishop Polk.” Such is the religious influence upon the higher literary institutions in the United States of America.

Theological Seminaries. — Ministerial education, properly so called, was afforded to but few of the earlier preachers of this country. In the colleges no special advantages were known, except what the instructors could grant by special arrangement. Principally the custom prevailed in some churches of associating ministerial candidates as students with experienced pastors, from whom they might receive instruction in theology and pastoral duty, and to whom in turn they might render some assistance. In other churches, in which the pressure for ministerial aid was great, young and inexperienced men were associated in actual service with senior ministers, by whom they were expected to be taught. While such modes of instruction and training were the best practicable at an initial period of Church development, and, indeed, not without some intrinsic advantages, yet the increase of general education, and the necessity for more thorough study on the part of ministers, were thought to demand the establishment of a  class of institutions specially devoted to ministerial preparation and the cultivation of sacred learning.

The history of this class of institutions in the United States is limited to the present century, with the single exception of a Roman Catholic seminary in Baltimore, founded in 1791. The first theological seminary of the Congregationalists, that of Andover, was founded in 1807. The dates at which the other principal denominations followed these examples are as follows: The Presbyterians at Princeton in 1812; the Protestant Episcopalians at New York in 1817; the Baptists at Hamilton, N.Y., in 1820; the Methodists at Newbury, Vermont, in 1843 consolidated with Concord, N.H., in 1847.

The extent to which institutions for ministerial education have since been multiplied is indicated by the following summary, given in the report of the United States commissioner of education for 1886-7.

Denomination.Number of InstitutionsNumber of InstructorsNumber of Students.Roman Catholic20140646Presbyterian1481739Baptist181011011Protestant Episcopal1268286Methodist Episcopal13101655Congregational1165378Lutheran14591013Reformed62195Christian619229Minor sects2536987Total1396916039Of the influence of this class of institutions as a whole, it may be said that it is greatly conducive to the advancement of sacred learning. By the accumulation of libraries, by the classification of studies, by the devotion of able men to special departments, more thorough instruction is provided, and students are enabled to secure, within limited periods, a more thorough acquaintance with the various branches of theological science than would be possible by any form of isolated or individual effort. (D.P.K.)  Educational Aid Societies. — In this connection a word must be said about the many educational' societies founded by the various religious bodies to aid young men financially during their preparations for the sacred office of the ministry. The amount of work accomplished by these agencies may be estimated by reference to the following items: The American Education Society (including the parent society at Boston and its Presbyterian branches), since its formation in the year 1815, has raised and expended in the work of ministerial education not far from $2,000,000. It has afforded aid to over 5000 young men in their course of education for the ministry. The amount raised by this society for one year was $38,914, and the number of young men assisted for the same year was 432. The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions since its formation has sent out into the great foreign mission field not far from 500 ordained ministers. Of these over one half have been beneficiaries of the American Education Society. About one third of the Congregational ministers of New England at the present time were aided in their education by this society, while more than one third of that large body of men who have labored so efficiently in connection with the Home Missionary Society were raised up in the same way. The Board of Education of the Presbyterian Church (Old School) has since its formation furnished aid to about 2200 young men. How many of these men have been employed in foreign and home missionary service we have no means at hand for determining. The amount raised by this board from year to year for the purposes of ministerial education is not far from $50,000, and the number of young men now assisted yearly is but little less than 400. There is also an Education Society in connection with the Baptist churches, which has rendered efficient aid in the same great work. In the Methodist Episcopal Church this agency has assumed such vast importance that special provision was made for a “Board of Education” during the American Centennial of Methodism, and there is now (1874) a fund of $100,000, the interest of which is annually expended to aid candidates for the Methodist ministry There are also educational societies for the same purpose in connection with most of the Annual Conferences. Even the non- evangelical churches support such agencies. See Knight, Utility of Theol. Seminaries; Kentish, Importance of Min. Education; Clarke (Adam), Letter to a Preacher; Mason, Student and Pastor; Raike, Remarks on Clerical Education; New-Englander, 1:126; Eclectic Rev. (new series), 1:99; Princeton Rev. 5:55; 15:587; Christian Examiner, 11:84; Amer. Bible Repository, 9:474: 11:187; 2d series, 8:444; 10:462; Evangel. (Luth.) Qu. Rev. 1868, July; Meth. Qu. Rev. July 1845, art. 2; January  1872, page 94; Theol. Medium (Cumberland Presbyt. Rev.), January 1873, art. 1.

## Ministerium[[@Headword:Ministerium]]

             is a term applied to an ecclesiastical body within the pale of the Lutheran Church. It is composed only of ordained ministers, and transacts business pertaining only to the interests of the ministry, such as the examination, licensure, and ordination of candidates for the ministry. “This is the specific and chief business of the ministerium. It also, when necessary, examines and decides charges of heresy against any of its own members, and may, by appeal, act in the cause of a layman charged with heresy — but only by appeal ‘from the decision of a Church Council.”' It will thus be seen that the business transacted by the ministerium is of a special and definite character; and to preclude any attempt to go beyond this, it is expressly provided that “all business not specifically intrusted to the ministerium... shall belong to the synod.” Of late efforts have been made, especially in this country, to abolish the ministerium, and to transfer its power to the synod, in order that the lay members of the Church may have a voice in the management of the affairs now within the jurisdiction of the ministerium; and this demand has been made upon the ground that the Lutheran Church has suffered more from heresy and immorality in her ministry than other churches, because the minister is amenable only to his clerical brethren. See an able discussion on this subject in the Quarterly Review of the Evangelical Luth. Church, January 1873, art. 5.

## Ministration[[@Headword:Ministration]]

             (διακονία, λειτουργία, both usually rendered “ministry”), the period during which an office is administered (Luk 1:23). The law of Moses is called the “ministration of death” and “condemnation.” It convinces men of .sin, the penalty for which is eternal death; and to this they are already condemned. The Gospel is the “ministration of the Spirit” that “giveth life;” it proceeds from the Holy Ghost; is confirmed and applied by him; and by means of it he conveys life, and all spiritual graces and benefits, to the souls of men (2Co 3:7-8). The term is also used for the distribution of alms (Act 6:1; 2Co 9:13).

## Ministry[[@Headword:Ministry]]

             (עֲבוֹדָה, work; שָׁרֵת, attendance,; λειτουργία, waiting upon; διακονία, service). Besides the ordinary applications of this term to the common affairs of life, it is specially used in the Scriptures, chiefly those of the New Testament, to denote a devotion to the interests of God's cause, and, in a technical sense, the work of advancing the Redeemer's kingdom. It is in this sense, namely, of the Christian Ministry, that we propose here to treat of some features of this office, leaving to special titles other parts, such as the literary qualification for it, SEE MINISTERIAL EDUCATION, and a more general view of its relations to the article PASTORAL THEOLOGY SEE PASTORAL THEOLOGY . The essential functions of evangelical ministry are the following:

I. Preaching. — The duty of disseminating the Gospel is not confined to the ministry. A comparison of all the narratives relative to the event in the New Testament renders it clear that the great commission in Mat 28:19-20 was not delivered to the eleven apostles merely, but to the general body of the disciples then assembled (1Co 15:6). It is the great character of evangelization. In like manner it appears that, although the twelve apostles were originally sent out on a preaching tour of Galilee (Matthew 10), subsequently seventy others were despatched on a similar mission (Luke 10). So on the day of Pentecost the whole mass of believers at Jerusalem seem to have been inspired with preaching powers, and they actually exercised them (Act 2:4). Nor was this an occasional though extraordinary instance; on the contrary, a similar practice is implied in all the later exhibitions of the then universal gift of the Holy Spirit (Act 10:44-47; Act 19:6-7; 1 Corinthians 12, 14). Indeed, the technical  distinction between clergy and laity in this particular is almost ignored in the New Testament, and we find members of the Church, whether official or private, male or female, freely exercising their liberty in proclaiming Jesus everywhere (Act 6:8; Act 8:4-8; Act 9:20; Act 18:24-28; Act 21:9). This is in accordance with the universal impulse of the newly-converted soul to communicate the glad tidings of his own salvation to others, without waiting for any formal license or authorization. Such evangelization is the very essence of preaching, by whatever name it may be called, or by whatever conventionalities it may be surrounded. We may add that whoever loses this spirit of his early zeal, has lost, be his success or attainments in other respects what they may, the great divine seal of his call to preach. SEE LAY PREACHING.

The call, as above defined, to preach the Gospel to the best of our ability and opportunity, is one that every Christian should recognise and obey. It is, however, a duty entirely distinct from, although in some cases closely related to, the general question of our vocation in life. It is precisely at this point that the thought of the ministry has probably occurred, sooner or later, to every considerate young man of the Church. If earnest and devoted, he is apt to infer the farther duty of giving himself exclusively as an avocation to the work of preaching. The idea having once been vividly presented to his imagination, is likely, in proportion to his conscientiousness, to fasten more and more deeply upon his convictions, while at the same time his judgment of his fitness, his inclinations, and his circumstances may be totally adverse to the course. Hence he is in a twofold danger of error; on the one hand he may mistake for a distinctive divine call his own general promptings to do anything, however uncongenial, for the sake of his Master; or, on the other, he may yield to a self-deprecating modesty and the force of obstacles, and neglect a real call. Under this balancing of arguments. perhaps the safest guides are two — one internal, the other external. In the first place let him carefully examine his own heart, and see what motive secretly prompts him in this direction. If it be the love of applause, a desire for distinction, a vanity for public prominence, or a wish to gain a ready mode of subsistence, of course he must conclude himself to be unworthy and unfit for the holy office. If, again, he is chiefly drawn to the work under a mere sense of condemnation if he refuse, we apprehend he has not reached the highest intimation of an incentive to duty in this path. He, like every other believer, of course, must quiet his conscience by being willing to do any duty, even this, if clearly  made known; but it does not follow that he is called upon to do any and every disagreeable thing, simply because it would be a cross to him. A better and more decisive, as well as consistent test, is to ask himself, “Do I seek this place, or consent to assume it, because I look upon it as the most exalted and useful one I could occupy? Is it one in which I feel that I can most effectually glorify God and serve my generation?” If he still have doubt in answering the question, then let him turn to the other outward test. Let him try it, and experiment will soon satisfy him whether his call is genuine or not. This experience will especially determine four points; namely,

1. His natural qualification or disqualification, in point of physical, mental, and spiritual adaptation;

2. His probable measure of success, as evinced by the fruit of his efforts;

3. His greatest lack, and consequently the points where, by study and care, he should more fully prepare himself in the future;

4. The providential indications, by way of opening, means, etc., for his farther progress. The Church, meanwhile, through his friends, fellow- members, and the pastor, will thus have an opportunity of judging on all these points, and then advice will not only be welcomed by him, but must in the end be conclusive.

Our result, therefore, under this head is, that while preaching the Gospel in some form, and as a specific work, is the general duty of all believers, it is the sole or exclusive duty of those only who, by undoubted internal and external marks, are divinely called to the office, and sanctioned in it by the Church at large. This last is the ultimate or determinative sign.

II. Ordination. — The second great and peculiar function of the Christian ministry is the administration of the holy sacraments — namely, Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Other clerical offices — such as officiating at marriages, funerals, chaplaincy, expounding the Scriptures, dispensing ritual duties, etc. — are entirely subordinate and immaterial to these. The sacraments likewise may, no doubt, lawfully be administered by a lay unordained person, or even by a woman, in case of emergency or private celebration; but, for the sake of propriety and system, they should be a matter of Church order, and this is the meaning of the term “ordination.”  This, therefore, is a purely ecclesiastical distinction, which affects the ordained individual only as to certain churchly relations or functions appertaining to himself individually. For this reason it is performed but once, and as a ceremony. Whether it be executed by the bishop, a presbyter, or neighboring pastor, is entirely conventional. The true “apostolical succession” is maintained wherever the line is in accordance with the established Church usage in the case.

It will be observed that preaching and “orders” do not necessarily concur in the same person. Hence some churches have ordained elders who are not clergymen Hence, likewise. there are ordained local preachers and unordained travelling preachers. The election to clerical orders rests, in the Episcopal churches, with the bishop; in the Presbyterian churches, with the Presbyterial Synod; in Methodist churches, with the Annual Conference; among Congregationalists, Baptists, etc., with the congregation itself. III. The Pastorate. — This is the last and crowning office of the Christian ministry. It does not necessarily involve the two preceding, for in all churches there are occasionally pastors who are not ordained men. In the Methodist Church there are at least sub-pastors, namely, class-leaders, who have no other clerical functions; and many of the Roman Catholic priests do not preach at all, On the other hand, there are numerous “evangelists” who, as local preachers, have no pastoral relations, nor any ordained status. The pastorate, moreover, differs from the preaching element of the ministry in its local and transferable character. The commission to preach is world-wide, long as mind and body last; but the pastoral jurisdiction is necessarily limited to a particular community and on stipulated terms. The appointment under it always implies a mutual understanding and consent between the pastor and his people; and it is a piece of clerical imposition when the latter are permitted to have no voice in its formation and dissolution; as it is an act of prelatical tyranny when the former is not consulted, or allowed to express his wishes and judgment.

We have said that the pastorate is the highest function of the ministry. It is so, because it combines in their most complete, regular, and effective form all the elements of the ministerial relation. A man who has the hearts of his people, and can sway them from. the pulpit, as well as touch them in the tender and intimate connections of his pastoral ministrations; who introduces their babes to Christ, and dispenses to them the symbols of the body and blood of their Lord, wields a power which kings might envy, and  holds a place with which Gabriel's cannot vie. He is God's ambassador to a dying community, and his angel in the Church.

IV. To the foregoing ministerial functions many are disposed to add a fourth, namely, administration. This, so far as it applies to the execution of discipline in any particular Church, is merely a part of the pastorate; and even here it is very doubtful whether the pastor have legitimately any power beyond that of presiding in meetings, and guiding in a general way the affairs of the Church. His personal influence, of course, is very great; and if the people have confidence in his judgment, his advice will be freely sought and cheerfully followed. But the assumption of any dictatorial rights will quickly be resented and resisted as a “lording over God's heritage” equally unwarranted by Scripture or ecclesiastical law.

The extension of the clerical administration to the general Church, in distinction from the laity, is a prelatical usurpation characteristic only, and everywhere, of High-Churchism. It is the essence of popery, and is not the less offensive if advocated or practiced by a bishop in any Protestant Church. Even the Episcopal churches, strictly so called, do not hold this theory; the Methodist Church has lately discarded it, and the Presbyterians admit the lay elders to a full participation in the highest legislative assemblies.

Referring once more to our Lord's constitutional behest (Mat 28:19-20), we find four duties enjoined upon his disciples: 1. Preaching — that is, evangelization. 2. Discipling — that is, enrolling as followers of Jesus. 3. Baptism — that is, initiation by a public ordinance. 4. Instruction — that is, inculcation of Christian doctrine in detail. Not one of these is the essential or peculiar, much less exclusive prerogative of the ministry; although the minister, as such, naturally takes the lead in them, devoting himself professionally to them, especially in the more public and formal relations.. Of all the really characteristic functions of the ministry, we have found — to recapitulate — that the true basis of authorization arises in the Church itself, as the final earthly judge of qualification and fidelity; and that she expresses her decision with respect to it through the preacher's own immediate brethren; while she signs his credentials to the second through the ecclesiastical organism which he thereby, enters; and she issues her mandate respecting the third through the local community which thus invites his care.  See, besides the works quoted under MINISTER, Schaff, Hist. Apostol. Ch. page 495 sq.; Bearcroft, Thirteen Discourses on the Ministry; Boardman, On the Christian Ministry; Collings, Vindication of a Gospel Ministry; Crosthwaite, On the Christian Ministry; Edmonson, On the Christian Ministry; Fancourt, Nature and Expediency of a Ministry; Taylor, Institution and Necessity of the Ministry; Turner, The Christian Ministry Considered; Vinet, Theory of the Evangel. Ministry; Wallace, Guide to the Christian Ministry; Wayland (Francis), Letters on the Christian Ministry; Amer. Bible Repository, 9:64; Christian Exam. 5:101; 15:334; Christian Monthly Spectator, 3:401; 8:441; 9:487; Christian Observer, 14:13; 19:433; 20:533, 544; 22:329, 546; 28:137, 416; Christian Qu. Spect. 4:207; 6:542; 7:353; 8:411; Christian Rev. 1:15; 3:254, 576; 11:256; 13:501; 15:400; Edinb. Rev. 19:360; North Amer. Rev. 49:206; Kitto, Journ. of Sac. Lit. volume 29; Cumberl. Presb. Qu. October 1871. See also Poole, Index to Periodical Lit. s.v.; Malcom, Theol. Index, s.v.

## Minni[[@Headword:Minni]]

             (Heb. Minni', מַנַּי, etymology unknown; Sept. παῤ ἐμοῦ,Vulg. Menni) occurs only in Jer 51:27 (and so in the Targ. at Psa 45:9, but wrongly), as the name of an Armenian province, joined with Ararat; i.e., as Bochart well observes (Phaleg, 1:3, page 19, 20), probably the Minyas (Μινύας) of Nicholas of Damascus in Josephus (Ant. 1:3, 6), a tract of Armenia overhung by the mountain Baris, on which are the traces of the ark. St. Martin (Memoires sur l'Armenie, 1:249) rightly compares the region of the Manavasscei, in the middle of Armenia, so called from Manavas, the son of Haigus, who is said to have been the founder of Armenia (Moses Choren. 1:11). Less likely is the supposition (Bochart, ut sup.) that the Greek name Armenia itself sprung from הִראּמַנַּי, “mountain of Minni,” since it is rather derived from Aram (see St. Martin, ut sup. page 259). “The name may be connected.with the Minnai of the Assyrian inscriptions, whom Rawlinson (Herod. 1:464) places about lake Urumiyeh, and with the Minuas who appears in the list of Armenian kings in the inscription at Wan (Layard's Nin. and Bab. page 401). At the time when Jeremiah prophesied, Armenia had been subdued by the Median kings (Rawlinson, Herod. 1:103, 177).” SEE ARMENIA.

## Minnis, William, D.D[[@Headword:Minnis, William, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian divine, was born, of Scotch-Irish parents, in Blount County, Tennessee, December 28,1799. He was educated at Maryville College, Tennessee; studied divinity in the South-western Theological Seminary at Maryville; was licensed in 1825, and ordained in 1826 as pastor of Westminster Church, Tennessee. In 1838 he received and accepted a call to the charge of Salem and New Market, Tennesee; became a member of the United Synod at its organization in 1857, and died May 5, 1863. Dr. Minnis was a man of extraordinary energy, thorough in the investigation of every subject, clear in the illustration of the deepest thought, and truly in earnest in the conversion of souls. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1867, page 446.

## Minnith[[@Headword:Minnith]]

             (Heb. Minnith', מַנַּית. distribution; Sept. in Judg. Μενίθ v.r. Α᾿ρνών,Vulg. Mennith; in Ezekiel μύρα, balsamunm), a town in the country of the Ammonites, to which Jephthah pursued them (Jdg 11:33), celebrated for the excellence of its wheat, which was exported to the markets of Tyre (Eze 27:17). It still existed in the age of Eusebius, four Roman miles from Heshbon, on the road to Philadelphia (Onomastis.v. Μαανίθ Jerome Mannith). Schwarz (Palest. page 230) thinks it the same with the present Minja, five miles east of Hesban. “‘From Aroer to the approach to Minnith' (עִד בּוֹאֲךָ מ) seems to have been a district containing twenty cities. Minnith was in the neighborhood of Abel-Ceramim, the ‘meadow of vineyards.' In this vicinity were possibly situated the vineyards in which Balaam encountered the angel on his road from Mesopotamia to Moab (Num 22:24). An episcopal city of ‘Palestina secunda,' named Mennith, is quoted by Reland (Palaest. page 211), but with some question as to its being located in this direction (page 209). A site bearing the name Menjah is marked in Van de Velde's Map, perhaps on the authority of Buckingham, at seven Roman miles east of Heshbon, on a road to Amman, though not on the frequented track.”

## Mino, Maestro[[@Headword:Mino, Maestro]]

             a distinguished sculptor, flourished during the 15th century. The exact dates of his birth and death are unknown. He is sometimes called MINO DEL REGNO. The statues of San Pietro and San Paolo, which are in the  sacristy of St. Peter's, at Rome, but which until 1847 stood at the foot of the steps of St. Peter's, are his work; also the Tomb of Pope Paul II, in the Basilica of St. Peter's. See Vasari, Lives of the Painters, transl. by Mrs. Foster (Lond. 1850. 5 volumes, 8vo), 2:85.

## Minoeans[[@Headword:Minoeans]]

             (i.e., deniers, heretics) is the name of a Jewish sect mentioned in the writings of the Church fathers. This is only another name for the Nazarceans (q.v.). Comp. Keim, Leben Jesu, page 608.

## Minor Canon[[@Headword:Minor Canon]]

             is the name frequently applied to a petty canon, petty prebendary, or sub- canon:

(1.) A vicar in priest's orders in the old foundations; a representative and auxiliary who celebrated at the high altar in the absence of a canon. Generally there were four, occasionally as many as eight. In most cases they were the vicars of the four dignitaries. In the Romish Church of England the word designated in some instances the prebendaries who were in minor orders, and at York a major canon was one who had kept the greater residence. At St. Paul's they form a college, instituted in 1395, over and above the thirty vicars. The latter sung the matin and lady mass, but the minor canons chanted the mass of requiem for their founder, as well as the apostles' and high or chapter masses, being required in addition to attend all the hours. All were priests under a superior, called a warden. Their almoner looked after the choristers. The two cardinals, who had a doubled stipend, were parish priests of the close. They furnished the librarian, subdean, succentor, and divinity lecturer, and the perpetual gospeller and epistoler. In 1378 they wore surplices, dark almuces of calaba, lined with minever, with a black cope and hood, trimmed with silk or linen.

(2.) A subordinate or stipendiary priest, appointed by the dean and chapter in the new foundations; and by the original constitution the number equalled that of the canons, and the stipend half that of the latter. They had a share in the quotidian. In the time of Charles I their numbers were reduced. They had no estates of their own, and lived in a common hall, along with the schoolmasters, lay singers, and choristers. Minor canons are removable by the dean and chapter, and are now choral substitutes of the canons resideptiary, officiating in turn, under, their authority, jointly with the dean. See Walcott, Sacred Archeology, s.v.; Staunton, Eccles. Dict. s.v. SEE CANON, ECCLESIASTICAL.

## Minor, Launcelot Byrd[[@Headword:Minor, Launcelot Byrd]]

             a missionary of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born at Topping Castle, Carolina County, Virginia, September 9, 1813. In 1833 he entered the theological seminary of Virginia. Missionaries being required for West Africa, he determined to give himself to the work. He was ordained in 1836, and sailed from Baltimore for Cape Palmas May 8, 1837. Immediately after arrival in his field of labor, he assumed the charge of a school at Mount Vaughan, Cape Palmas. In April 1839, he visited. the Gold Coast, of which he gave a graphic account, to the Board of Missions. In the same year he returned to the United States on, a visit, and while here he married. Shortly after he returned to Africa, to take charge of a small chapel at Mount Vaughan. In 1841 he took part in an exploring expedition, having for its object the establishment of a station in the district of Taboo, and in 1843 he removed his family to that locality; but just as he was ready to commence his labors there he died. He possessed neither brilliant talents nor a strong intellect, but his devotion to his work made him so earnest and zealous that everything gave way before him. The natives were attracted by the amiableness of his character, and his influence over them was most potent and blessed. See H.W. Pierson, American Missionary Memorial, page 449.

## Minor, Melchior Gottlieb[[@Headword:Minor, Melchior Gottlieb]]

             a German theologian, was born at Zilzendorf, in the Silesian county of Brieg, Dec. 281693; received his preparatory education at the orphan school at Halle, where he distinguished himself by great proficiency in the ancient languages; in 1709 he entered the gymnasium at Zittau, and in 1712 the university. He studied theology and philosophy at Wittenberg; soon afterwards he went to Halle, to study modern languages, civil and ecclesiastical law, and mathematics. Upon the completion of his course in 1715, he returned to his native city, where he got a position as tutor; in 1720 he was appointed minister at Teppliwode, in the principality of Miinsterberg; and in 1722 minister at Landshut. Some time after he was appointed counsellor of the Prussian consistory, and inspector of churches and schools of the district of Schweidnitz. He died September 24, 1748. Some of his most important works are, Das Leben im Leiden, eine Leichenpredigt uber Psa 42:2-3 (Landshut, 1723, fol.): — Das nothige Wissen eines Christen (Janer, 1723,1 2mo): — Kurze Nachricht- von den Altiren der Juden, Heiden und Christen, mit einer Beschreibung  des in der Gnadesnkirche von Landshut erbauten Altars (Landshut, 1725, 4to): —Hauptsumme der christlichen Lehre (ibid. 1726, 12mo): — Geistliche Reden und Abhandlungen (Leipsic and Breslau, 2 vols. 1752, 8vo): —Heilige Betrachtungen fiber die Evangelien (ibid. 1756, 8vo): — Heilige Betrachtungen fiber die Leidensgeschichte Jesu (ibid. 1757, large 8vo). See Doring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlinds, s.v.

## Minorca[[@Headword:Minorca]]

             (Span. Menorca), one of the Balearic Isles, some twenty-five miles distant from Majorca, the largest of the group, is 31 miles long and 13 miles wide, covering in all a territory of about 300 square miles, and counting 37,280 inhabitants, subject to the Spanish government. The coast of Minorca, broken into numerous bays and inlets, is fringed with islets and shoals, and its surface, less mountainous than that of Majorca, is undulating, rising to its highest point in Mount Toro, 4793 feet above the sea-level. Its chief productions are marble, slate, plaster, the common cereals and legumes, oranges, silk, lemons; oil, wine, olives, and aromatic herbs. The chief towns are Port Mahon, the capital, and Ciudadela, the former capital, with a population of about 4000. There are many remains of Celtic civilization on the island. The people of Minorca (Menorqulnes) are very indolent, the women very stylish and polite. The religious history of the Menorquines is so intimately connected with that of their rulers that we must refer to the article SPAIN SEE SPAIN .

## Minoress[[@Headword:Minoress]]

             is another name under which the followers of St. Clare are distinguished. SEE CLARE, ST.

## Minorites[[@Headword:Minorites]]

             a name of the Franciscan order, derived from the later denomination adopted by their founder, Fratres Minores. SEE FRANCISCANS.

## Minos[[@Headword:Minos]]

             a Cretan hero and lawgiver, figures in Greek mythology and legends. There are many writers who speak of two characters of that name, but Homer and Hesiod know of only one Minos, the king of Cnossus, and son and friend of the god Jupiter himself. We are told that Minos secured the throne by promising sacrifices to the gods, and that when he had acquired  the power he was cruel and tyrannical; and that after he had subjected the Athenians he treated them mercilessly, and required their boys and virgins as sacrifices to the Minotaur (q.v.). Although these legends and fables are of but little interest, Minos deserves a place here as a benefactor of the race; and, if his existence be not mythical, he must be ranked among the wise men of the earth. To him the celebrated Laws of Minos, which served as a model for the legislation of Lycurgus, are ascribed. He is said to have dealt out justice, and to have so pleased the gods that he became a judge of the souls which entered the infernal regions. Minos has by some writers on antiquity been identified with Manu (or Menu), the great Hindu lawgiver.

## Minot, Thomas[[@Headword:Minot, Thomas]]

             an Irish prelate, was consecrated archbishop of Dublin on Palm Sunday in 1363. In 1366. the revenues of the precentor of St. Patrick's having been much reduced by the invasion of the Irish from the mountains, he united to that dignity the Church of Kilmactalwav. This addition was for the purpose of enabling the incumbent to live hospitably, give alms, and answer the expenses and charges of his office. About 1370 Minot repaired part of St.  Patrick's Church, which had been destroyed by fire. In 1373 he was one of those who advised the customs and assessments imposed, and other arbitrary measures enforced by William de Windsor, lord deputy. In 1374 he erected the Church of Rathsallagh into a prebend, and in 1375 had the royal mandate to attend a council to consider and provide against the hostilities of the O'Briens of Thomond, who invaded Munster. But in June of 1375 he died in London. See D'Alton, Memoirs of the Archbishops of Dublin, page 138.

## Minotaur[[@Headword:Minotaur]]

             (i.e., the Bull of Minos) is one of the most repulsive conceptions of Grecian mythology. He is represented as the son of Pasiphae and a bull. for which she had conceived a passion. It was half man, half bull-a man with a bull's head. Minos, the husband of Pasiphae, shut him up in the Cnossian Labvrinth, and there fed him with youths and maidens, whom Athens was obliged to supply as an annual tribute, till Theseus, with the help of Ariadne, slew the monster. SEE MINOS. The Minotaur is, with some probability, regarded as a symbol of the Phoenician sungod.

## Minshall, Robert[[@Headword:Minshall, Robert]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Pennsylvania in 1788; entered the Baltimore Conference in 1813; and died in Mercersburg, Pennsylvania, July 15, 1828. He was a man of fine talents and great piety and zeal. He was especially useful as a promoter of Sunday-schools and tract societies, and was also an excellent and faithful minister of the Word. See Minutes of Conferences, 2:37.

## Minster[[@Headword:Minster]]

             signified originally, as in the writings of Cassian, St. Athanasius, and Jerome, the cell of a solitary; but the word was extended by Eusebius to embrace the church or the abode of a religious community.

(1.) A church of regular canons.

(2.) A church formerly served by monks (in Germany the term Minster is still employed, and Marmoutier in Francemajus monasterium, or great minster).  (3.) A cathedral.

(4.) Many large churches, held by secular canons, were dignified by the title of minster.

(5.) Paris churches, in 960, were called minsters, and several retain the name. These were the original outposts of the Church, isolated stations of priests living under rule and in community, which in time became parishes.

## Minster Ham[[@Headword:Minster Ham]]

             is the term applied to a sanctuary house, in which persons were afforded refuge for three days. If it were burdened with the king's purveyance, they might remain for a longer period.

## Minstrel[[@Headword:Minstrel]]

             (מְנִגֵּן, menaggen', one striking the harp, 2Ki 3:15; αὐλητής, Mat 9:33, a flute player, “piper,” Rev 18:22). Music was often employed by the Hebrews for sacred purposes, and in the case of Elisha it appears to have conduced to inspiration (2Ki 3:15). See Music. It was a usual accompaniment of funerals likewise (Mat 9:33; comp. Josephus, War, 3:9, 5), as it is still in the East (see Hackett's Illustra. of Script. page 113). SEE BURIAL.

The English word minstrel represents the French word menestral, which is itself a diminutive of ministre, and is applied to the class of persons who administered to the amusement of their patrons by their skill in music and poetry. Chaucer uses the word minister in the sense of minstrel in his Dr- eame (Richardson, s.v., and Du Cange, Gloss.). The class of minstrels had in mediaeval times a social position almost akin to the bards and scalds whose Sagas they sung and whose inspiration they imitated at humble distance. Musical sound has been an accompaniment of religious worship in all countries. The expert player on the musical instrument has been associated with the possessor of yet higher faculties (see Wilkinson's Ancient Egyptians, chap. 2 and representations of harpers in the tomb of Rameses III, Thebes; Muller's Hist. of Greek Literature, chapter 12). The “pleasant voice and lovely song,” and the art of “playing well on an instrument,” were associated with the functions of prophecy (Eze 33:31-33). Various passages of Holy Scripture show that the skilful  performance of sacred music formed a large portion of the education of the sons of the prophets; 1Sa 10:5 : “Thou shalt meet a company (חֶבֶל, Sept. χορός) of prophets coming down from the high place, with a psaltery, a tabret, a pipe, and a harp before them, SEE PROPHET, and they shall prophesy.” It is not certain whether the prophets were here distinct from the players on instruments, but most probably they were the same individuals as those of whom we read elsewhere, that they “should prophesy with harps, with psalteries, and with cymbals” (1Ch 25:1); that they resembled” the sons of Asaph, of Heman, and of Jeduthun, who should prophesy with a harp, according to the order of the king, to give thanks and to praise the Lord” (see also 1Ch 25:6-7). In this passage the performance of sacred song and choral music in the temple received the exalted designation of prophecy. Sacred music, “a joyful noise unto the Lord,” and “thanksgiving to the Lord upon an instrument of ten strings, and upon the psaltery” (Psa 66:1; Psa 87:7; Psa 92:1-3; c. 1), were characteristics of close communion with God. The effect produced upon the auditors is described (1Sa 10:6) as being in that instance very remarkable Saul is assured that when he hears the prophetic minstrelsy, “the Spirit of the Lord will come upon him, and he shall prophesy with them, and be turned into another man.” See 1Sa 10:2, and comp. 1Sa 19:20-24, the account of the prophets being instructed by Samuel, and the effect of the holy song under the influence of the, Spirit of God upon Saul's messengers, and afterwards upon Saul himself. Saul is thus seen to be peculiarly accessible to the highest influences of music, and hence the advice tendered to him by his servants (1Sa 16:16), “ Seek out a man who is a cunning player on a harp, and it shall come to pass that when the evil spirit from God is upon thee, that he shall play with his hand and thou shalt be well.” The participial form מְנִגֵּן (from נַגֵּן, in ‘Pielb which is used of striking the strings of a musical instrument) is here translated “ a player,” and in 2Ki 3:15, “minstrel.” The effect produced on Saul was remarkable. SEE SAUL.

The custom of applying such a remedy to mental disturbance may be traced in other writings. Thus Quintil. (Instit. Orat. lib. 9 chapter 4) says, “Pythagoreis moris fuit, cum somnum peterent ad lyram prius lenire mentes, ut si quid fuisset turbidiorum cogitationum componerent” (comp. Plutarch, De Musica, and Aristotle, Pol. lib. 9, chapter 5; Apollonius Dyscolos, De Miris, quoted by Grotius, ad loc. Ι᾿ᾶται ἡ κατάλαυσις τῆς διανοίας ἐκστάσεις See also King Lear, Acts 2, c. 5, where music is used to bring back the wandering mind of Lear). Josephus (Ant. 6:8, 2), in his account of the  transaction, associates the singing of hymns by David with the harp- playing, and shows that though the tragedy of Saul's life was lightened for a while by the skilful minstrelsy of David, the raving madness soon triumphed over the tranquillizing influence (comp. 1Sa 18:10; 1Sa 19:10). Weemse (Christ. Synagogue, chapter 6:§ 3, par. 6, page 143) supposes that the music appropriate to such occasions was “ that which the Greeks called aplonian, which was the greatest and the saddest, and settled the affections.”

In many references of Holy Scripture the minstrel and the prophet appear to be identical, and their functions the same; but in 2Ki 3:15 their respective functions are clearly distinguished. The prophet Elisha needed the influence of “the minstrel” to soothe the irritation occasioned by the aggravating alliance of Israel with Judah. Not until this was effected would the prophetic influence guide him to a sound vaticination of the duty and destiny of the allied forces. The minstrelsy was produced, according to Procopius; by a Levite, who sung the Psalms of David in the hearing of the prophet; if so he was thus the means of producing that condition of mind by which the prophet was lifted above the perceptions of his. senses, and the circumstances which surrounded him, into a higher region of thought, where he might by divine grace penetrate the secret purposes of God. Jarchi says that “on account of anger the Shechinah had departed from him;” Ephraem Syrus, that the object of the music was to attract a crowd to hear the prophecy; J.H. Michaelis, that the prophet's mind, disturbed by the impiety of the Israelites, might be soothed and prepared for divine things by a spiritual song. According to Keil (Comm. on Kings, 1:359, Eng. tr.), “Elisha calls for a minstrel, in order to gather in his thoughts by the soft tones of music from the impression of the outer world, and, by repressing the life of self and of the world, to be transferred into the state of internal vision, by which his spirit would be prepared to receive the divine revelation.” This in effect is the view taken by Josephus (Ant. 9:3, 1), and the same is expressed by Maimonides in a passage which embodies the opinion of the Jews of the Middle Ages. “All the prophets were not able to prophesy at any time that they wished; but they prepared their minds, and sat joyful and glad of heart, and abstracted; for prophecy dwelleth not in the midst of melancholy, nor in the midst of apathy, but in the midst of joy. Therefore the sons of the prophets had before them a psaltery, and a tabret, and a pipe, and a harp, and [thus] sought after prophecy” (or prophetic inspiration) (Yad hachazakah, 7:5, Bernard's  Creed and Ethics of the Jews, page 16; see also note to page 114). Kimchi quotes a tradition to the effect that, after the ascension of his master Elijah, the spirit of prophecy had not dwelt upon Elisha because he was mourning, and the spirit of holiness does not dwell but in the midst of joy. The references given above to the power and dignity of song may sufficiently explain the occurrence. The spiritual ecstasy was often bestowed without. any means, but many instances are given of subordinate physical agencies being instrumental in its production (Eze 2:2; Eze 3:24; Isa 6:1; Act 10:9-10; Rev 1:9-10).

The word minstrel is used of the αὐλήτας who, in Mat 9:23, are represented as mourning and making a noise on the death of Jairus's daughter. The custom of hiring mourners at the death of friends is seen on Etruscan amphorae, tombs, and bass-reliefs (see Dennis's Etaruria, 1:295; 2:344, 354, where music was considered appropriate; and Wilkinson, Ancient Egyptians, 2:366-373). Skill in lamentation (Amo 5:16; Jer 9:17) was not necessarily skill in playing on the pipe or flute, but probably included that accomplishment (Ecc 12:5; 2Ch 35:25). SEE MOURNING.

## Minstrels Gallery[[@Headword:Minstrels Gallery]]

             in a church, forms a sort of orchestra for the accommodation of vocal and instrumental performers. It is quite common in Continental churches, but is very rarely met with in England. There is a gallery of this sort over the altar-screen at Chichester cathedral, and another, much more remarkable, near the middle of the north side of the choir of Exeter cathedral. It is supported upon thirteen pillars, between every two of which, in a niched recess, there is a sculptured representation of an angel playing upon a musical instrument. Among these we observe the cittern, bagpipe, harp, violin, pipe, tambourine, etc. The roof of Outwell Church, Norfolk, and the minstrels' column at Beverley, also exhibit a great variety of musical instruments anciently used in our churches, independent of the organ and the regalls, which was a small portable organ, having one row of pipes giving the treble notes, the same number of keys, and a small pair of bellows moved with the left hand.

## Mint[[@Headword:Mint]]

             (ἡδύοσμον, sweet-scented) occurs (Mat 23:23; Luk 11:42) among the smaller garden herbs which the Pharisees punctiliously tithed. SEE ANISE; SEE DILL. It was much esteemed as a warming condiment by the ancients (Pliny, 19:47; 20:53; 21:18; Dioscor. 3:41; Martial, 10:48,8 sq.; the Romans calling it mentha, and the Greeks μίνθη) as well as the Jews (Mishna, Okzim. 1:2; Ohol. 8:1; also the Talmudical tracts. Shem ve- Jobel, 7:2; Sheb. 7:1; the rabbins call it מַינְתָא; it was even strewed, for the sake of its odor, upon the floors of houses and synagogues, Buxtorf, Lex. Rab. page 1228), and as it still is in Eastern countries (Raffenau Delile, Flora Aegypt. in the Descr. de l'Egypte, 19). “Some commentators have supposed that such herbs as mint, anise (dill), and cumin, were not tithable by law, and that the Pharisees solely from an overstrained zeal paid tithes for them; but as dill was subject to tithe (Masseroth, 4:5), it is most probable that the other herbs mentioned with it were also tithed, and this is fully corroborated by our Lord's own words: ‘These ought ye to have done.' The Pharisees, therefore, are not censured for paying tithes of things untithable by law, but for paying more regard to a scrupulous exactness in these minor duties than to important moral obligations.”

“It is difficult to determine the exact species or variety of mint employed by the ancients. There are numerous species very nearly allied to one another. They usually grow in moist situations, and are herbaceous, perennial, of powerful odor, especially when bruised, and have small reddish-colored flowers, arranged in spikes or whorls. The taste of these plants is bitter, warm, and pungent, but leaving a sensation of coolness on the tongue; in their properties they are so similar to each other, that, either in medicine or as a condiment, one species may safely be substituted for another. The species most common in Syria is Mentha sylvestris, found by Russell at Aleppo, and mentioned by him as one of the herbs cultivated in the gardens there. It also occurs in Greece, Taurus, Caucasus, the Altai Range, and as far as Cashmere. Marvensis is also a widely-diffused species, being found in Greece, in parts of Caucasus, in the Altai Range, and in Cashmere.” (See Celsii Hierob. 1:543 sq.) Lady Calcott (Script. Herb. page 280) makes the following ingenious remark: “I know not whether mint were originally one of the bitter herbs with which the Israelites eat the Paschal lamb, but our use of it with roast lamb, particularly about Easter time, inclines me to  suppose it was.” The same writer also observes that the modern Jews eat horseradish and chervil with lamb. The wood-cut represents the horse mint (M. sylvestris), which is common in Syria, and, according to Russell (Nat. Hist. of Aleppo, page 39), found in the gardens at Aleppo: M. sativa is generally supposed to be only a variety of M. arvensis, another species of mint; perhaps all these were known to the ancients. The mints belong to the large natural order Labiatae.

## Mintert, Peter[[@Headword:Mintert, Peter]]

             a Dutch theologian, flourished for many years at Heerle, in Holland, about the beginning of the 18th century. He was noted for his great learning as a Biblical scholar and theologian. His principal work was the Lexicon Graeco-Latinum in Novur Testamentum Jesu Christi; cum Praefatione J.G. Pritii (Francof. 1728, 4to). There was no better lexicon than this of Mintert previous to the publication of Schleusner's Novunv Lexico. ‘ It is valuable for its numerous references to the Hebrew Scriptures and the Septuagint; and is helpful as a concordance as well as a lexicon to the student of the N.T. Scriptures in the original version.

## Minturn, Robert Brone[[@Headword:Minturn, Robert Brone]]

             “an American philanthropist, who was born in New York City November 16, 1805, and with a good preparatory education entered business and became a successful merchant, deserves a place here as one of the founders of the celebrated St. Luke's Hospital, one of the noblest of New York charities. Minturn also labored for the poor and the sick in many other ways, and his name deserves to be remembered in Christian society. He was one of the first commissioners of emigration, and an originator of the association for improving the condition of the poor. He died January 9, 1866.

## Minuccio (or Minucci)[[@Headword:Minuccio (or Minucci)]]

             a learned Roman Catholic prelate, was born at Serravalle, Italy, in 1551. After having been prevost at Oettingen, Germany, he became counsellor to the duke of Bavaria. He was next secretary successively to popes Innocent IX and Clement VIII. The latter appointed him in 1596 archbishop of Zara, in Dalmatia. He was appointed by the republic of Venice to negotiate a peace with the Uscoques (adventurers), fugitives from Dalmatia, who availed themselves of the difficulties existing between Austria and Venice  to rob and ransack the inhabitants of the borders of both countries. Minuccio died in Munich in 1604. He wrote in Italian the history of these filibusters up to 1602; it was published at Venice (1676, 4to) under the title of Storia degli Uscocchi, with a continuation as far as 1616 by Paoli Sarpi. He also wrote Vita sanctce Augustae de Serravalle, in the Bollandists (of March 27), and in the Supplement de Surins. See Ughelli, Italia Sacra, volume 5; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Minucius Felix, Marcus[[@Headword:Minucius Felix, Marcus]]

             one of the most celebrated apologists of the early Latin Church, flourished in the 3d century. But little is known of his early history beyond the fact that he was a native of Africa, but removed to Rome, and there successfully exercised the profession of advocate until his conversion to Christianity. Lactantius (Inst. Di,. 1.1: c. q, 1. 5, 6) and Jerome are loud in his praise, and assure us that Minucius was much admired for his eloquence. He is ever to be remembered by the Christian Church as one of her ablest defenders in a work of his entitled Octavius, which is a dialogue between a Christian called Octavius and a heathen called Caecilius, concerning the merits of the two religions which were then striving for supremacy. In this dialogue, Octavius repels the absurd imputations of the heathens against the early Christians, whom they accused of all sorts of impurities and crimes in their religious meetings. Through fear of persecution, these meetings took place mostly at night and in concealed places, which circumstances exposed them to the obloquy of vulgar ignorance. At the same time Octavius retorts upon his co-disputant by exposing the notoriously licentious practices of the heathens. The style of this work is argumentative and sufficiently pure; the language is animated, and the mode of treating the subject attractive, being mixed up with mythological learning and much information concerning the customs and opinions of that interesting period. “It is,” says Neander, “a felicitous and dramatic representation seized from life, replete with good-sense, and pervaded by a lively Christian feeling.” As an apology of Christianity, the work of Minucius Felix is a companion to those of Clemens Alexandrinus, Athenagoras, Theophilus of Antioch, Justin, Tertullian, and other early advocates of the Christian faith in its times of' trial and depression, and forms a link between them and those of Arnobius, Lactantius, Eusebius, Ambrose, and the other fathers of the 4th century. Octavius was at one time attributed to Arnobius, and was inserted as the eighth book of his disputations Adversus Gentes; but Balduin published a Dissertation on  Minucius (Kiel, 1685), which unquestionably places the authorship where it belongs with Minucius. Octavius is now extant only in one MS. copy, which had remained unnoticed in the Vatican library until the pontificate of Leo X, who gave it to Francis I of France. It has gone through many editions, among which those by James Gronevius (Leyden, 1709), by Davis (Cambridge. 1712), and by Orelli (Turic. 1836), deserve notice. The latter is accompanied by numerous notes by Dr. Davis and others, and a dissertation, or commentary, by Baldwin. It has been translated into French by the abbe De Gourcy, into German by Kusswurm (Turic. 1836) and Lubkert (eips. 1836), and into English, also, in Reeve's Apologies of Justin Martyr, etc., volume 2. The latest and best edition of the original is by Carl Halm (Vienna, 1867).

Another work, entitled De Fatoo, against astrologers, is mentioned by Jerome as being ascribed to Minucius, although Jerome expresses doubts concerning its authorship. This work is not known to be extant now. See Schaff, Ch. Hist. volume 1; Hagelibach, Hist. of Doctrines 1:63 sq.; Du Pin, Biblioth. des aut. Eccles. 1:117 sq.; Schrockh, Kirchengesch. 3:420 sq.; Jahrb. deutsch. Theol. 1867, October; Meier, De Minucio Felice (Zurich 1824, 8vo). (J.H.W.)

## Minution[[@Headword:Minution]]

             is a term applied by monastics of the Middle Ages to phlebotomy, which was much in fashion in those times. In some abbeys a bleeding-house, called Flebotomaria, was sustained. For details on the practices of the monastics inminution, see Fosbrooke, British A Moaachisun (Lond. 1817, 4to), page 321.

## Minzocchi, Francesco[[@Headword:Minzocchi, Francesco]]

             a renowned painter of the Bolognese school, sometimes called Il vecchio di Snan Bernardo, was born in Florence in 1513. In his youth he studied the works of Ialmigiani in his native city, and from him he acquired a weak style, as evinced in his picture of the Crucifixion at the Padri Osservanti. Afterwards he changed his manner, assuming a more correct and beautiful style; and his subsequent productions are marked by a beauty and grace rivalling nature herself. Among his most careful works may be mentioned two lateral pictures at the cathedral of Loretto, in a chapel of S. Francisco di Paola. They represent the Sacrifice of Melchizedek and the Miracle of the Manna, in which the prophets and principal characters are given with  great dignity and nobleness. Scanneli extols a specimen of his works in fresco on the ceiling of S. Maria della Grata in Forli, representing the Deity surrounded by a number of angels: figures full of spirit, majestic, varied, and painted with a power and skill in foreshortening which entitles him to greater celebrity than he enjoys. He left, also, a number of productions in the cathedral at S. Domenico. He was so much admired that upon the demolition of the chapels his least celebrated frescos were carefully cut out and preserved. He died in 1574. See Lanzi's History of Painting, trans. by Roscoe (London, 1847, 3 volumes, 8vo), 3:56.

## Miphkad[[@Headword:Miphkad]]

             (Heb. Miphckad', מַפְקָד, review or census of the people, as in 2Sa 24:9, etc.; or mandate, as in 2Ch 31:13; Sept. Μαφεκάδ,Vulg. judicialis), the name of a gate of Jerusalem, situated opposite the residence of the Nethinim and the bazaars, between the Horse-gate and the angle of the old wall near the Sheep-gate (Neh 3:31); probably identical with the Prison-gate (Neh 12:39), under the middle of the bridge spanning the Tyropneon (see Strong's Harm. and Expos. of the Gosp. Append. 2, page 15). Barclay (City of the Great King, page 156) identifies it with the High. gate of Benjamin (Jer 20:2), and locates it at the west end of the bridge; but that gate was probably situated elsewhere. “The name may refer to some memorable census of the people, as, for instance, that of David (2Sa 24:9, and 1Ch 21:5, in each of which the word used for ‘number' is miphcad), or to the superintendents of some portion of the worship (Pekidim, see 2Ch 31:13).” SEE JERUSALEM.

## Mira Bais[[@Headword:Mira Bais]]

             a subdivision of the Vallabhacharis (q.v.),originated by Mir Bai, who flourished in the reign of Akbar, and was celebrated as the authoress of poems addressed to Vishna. She was the daughter of a petty rajah, the sovereign of a place called Merta. Further than that her history is enveloped in fable.

## Mirabaud, Jean Baptiste[[@Headword:Mirabaud, Jean Baptiste]]

             a French philosopher of some celebrity, was born in Paris in 1675, and died in 1760. He was it home in the literature of Italy and of Spain, and made many valuable translations; among others, he rendered Tasso's Jerusalem Delivered and the Orlando Furioso. He also wrote several philosophical treatises, which in 1726 secured him admission to the French Academy. His most important works are, Le Monde, son origine, son antiquite; and Sentimzens des Philosophes sur la nature de l'ame. Mirabaud was for a long time regarded as the author of the Systeme de la Nature, now known to have been written by baron D'Holbach. See D'Alembert, Histoire des  Membres de l'Academie Francaise; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Ueberweg, Hist. of Philosophy, volume 2.

## Miracle Plays[[@Headword:Miracle Plays]]

             SEE MYSTERIES.

## Miracles[[@Headword:Miracles]]

             In every age there are certain great movements of human thought, which more or less influence the convictions of men in the mass, and carry them on to conclusions which, but a few years before, would have seemed altogether improbable. Sometimes it is very difficult to account for these movements. There has often been no master-mind leading the way whatever works have been written have rather been the result of the wave of thought passing over that small portion of the world which thinks than the cause of the wave. As far as cause can be traced, the new movement is a reaction, a recoil of the mind, from that which has gone before, whether in the way of dissatisfaction at the sloth and inactivity of the previous age, and at its being ignobly content to have no high aspiration, no high sense of the nobleness of man's mission, or a rebound from overstrained dogmatism and principles urged on to an extent which made them practically a burden and wearisomeness too great for men to endure.

The latter is perhaps the more common origin of new developments of thought, and is a power larger and more constantly at work than men are apt to imagine. But the explanation of the movements of the mind in our own time is rather to be sought in the meanness of the last century. Upon the whole, it was not a time of high purposes, though the War of Independence on the one side of the Atlantic, and the resistance to the despotism of Napoleon on the other, show that it was not wanting in great practical results. But as the present century advanced, the old lethargy which had enwrapped the minds of the English-speaking race gave way. Some men became intensely active in working for practical reforms; others set new modes of thought in motion, and everywhere there was On eager desire for thoroughness, and for probing: the principles of things to the very bottom. The old argument of “continuance” — that a thing should still exist because it had existed — gave way to an intense realism, which would let nothing exist unless it could prove its right to existence. Utilitarianism became the order of the day, and that poetry which often gilds a sleepy age, and makes it dwell at peace in a dreamland of repose,  vanished before the energy of men keenly alive to the necessities and imperfections of the present.

It is this intense realism that has made men restless and ill at ease athaving to believe in miracles. A miracle stands on entirely different grounds from the whole present order of things, and is out of harmony with the main current of our thoughts. There have been ages when men lived for the future, when the present was neglected, and things unseen were the realities which engrossed their thoughts. When we read the accounts of the trials for witchcraft in New England a century or two ago, we find not the accusers only, but the accused full of ideas of the preternatural. What they saw had but slight influence upon them; what they imagined had alone power over their minds. We, on the contrary, live in the present. The turn of our minds is to verify everything. We call for proof, and whatever cannot be proved we reject. It is not merely miracles which we treat thus, but most of what the last century regarded as historical realities. The intense historical activity of the present day, which has rewritten for us the annals of Greece and Rome, of the Church and of England, of the great eras of Spain and the Netherlands, besides special studies of great value, has its origin in that same spirit for searching and proving which leads so many to reject miracles.

It is altogether unfair to lay the rejection of miracles to the charge of physical science. The leaders of science are as thoroughly realistic as our historians and men of letters, but not more so. They are themselves phenomena of an age which perpetually asks What is? They inquire into the conformation of the earth and its constituents; into the motions of the heavenly bodies, and the laws which govern them, with the same eagerness to find out present facts, and the explanation of them, as animates the historian and the practical reformer. Old beliefs in our day can no more stand their ground than old laws and old customs, unless they can prove their right to stand by an appeal to present usefulness. It is of no use to appeal to anything else. In the present state of men's minds, if a thing does not fit in to the present, it seems to have no right to exist at all.

But if the progress of physical science has little to do with the dislike to miracles and the supernatural, the rapid increase of material wealth, and the advance made in everything which tends to present comfort and enjoyment, have much to do with it. We are living in an age when the present is full of enjoyment. By our large ascendency over the powers of nature, the earth  yields us its treasures with a bountifulness never known before. Our homes are replete with comforts and luxuries little dreamed of by those who went before; and the secret forces of nature are pressed into our service, and do our bidding. Side by side with this subjection of nature there has grown up a greatness of material enterprise unknown before. Vast projects are undertaken and persevered in, before which the greatest merchant princes of antiquity would have quailed. There is a grandeur of conception, a nobleness of purpose, an unflinching courage in many of the commercial undertakings of the present day, which, though gain may be their final object, yet give them a dignity and a poetry that make them for the time enough to conceal the deep cravings which are man's peculiar endowment, and which mark him out as a being destined for no common purposes.

Yet this present greatness of material things dwarfs many of man's higher gifts. Its influence begins early. Even in education it makes men aim chiefly at utilitarian objects, and at too early results. Parents do not care for anything which does not lead directly and at once to profit and pay. Whatever develops man's thinking powers, and aims simply at making him better and nobler in himself, is thrust aside. It would take too much time; defer too long the quick harvest of gains; might make men even indifferent to worldly prosperity, and unwilling to sacrifice everything to material wealth. Or, at all events it lies out of the circle of men's every day thoughts. Life is an eager race, with boundless prizes for all who press onwards and upwards. In so active a contest, with every energy on the stretch, and every exertion richly rewarded, it is no wonder if the present is enough; and in its enjoyment men thrust from them indignantly everything that would interfere with and render them less fit for the keen struggle after earthly success.

It is this spirit which makes it so difficult for men to believe in miracles. The purpose of miracles, and their whole use and intention hold so entirely distinct a place from that which is now the main purpose of the mass of men, that they will hear no evidence for them, nor stop calmly to consider whether they may not after all hold a necessary place in the order of things, and be as indispensable for man's perfectness as is this present activity. What too many do is to put aside the consideration of them entirely. They have a sort of notion that miracles contradict the laws of nature, and are therefore impossible. Without perhaps denying the historical accuracy of the Gospels in the main, they yet suppose that they were written by credulous men in a credulous age, and that if cool observers had been  present, they could have explained on natural grounds all that took place. Probably they do not think much about the supernatural at all. They have plenty to occupy them; have no spare time; find their lives full of interest; they rise early to their labor and late take rest; and so are content with a general feeling that, whatever may be the explanation of man being what he is, and of the world being what it is, time will reveal it, and that no obligation lies upon a busy man to inquire into abstruse questions, with no present profit. When business is over and old age has come, then it will be his duty to make his peace with God. And he will do so in the ordinary way. as other men do. Religion is a thing relegated to the background for the present; in due time he will attend to it as a practical matter, in the same way in which he will attend to the making of his will.

This thorough realism of the 19th century, intensified by the vast facilities of combined action and, mutual intercourse, which make us live constantly in one another's company, would banish all care and thought of the future from our minds, if it were not that the belief in the existence of a God and of a future life is an undying conviction of our nature. It is a necessary part of ourselves to look forward. No present gains or successes can content us. We turn always to the future, and that with an eagerness which would make life unendurable if we were forced to believe that life were all. The doctrine of annihilation may be professed, but call never really be believed; for it violates the deepest instincts of our hearts. And thus compelled by the very constitution of our natures to believe that there is a God, and that we exist after death, religion itself becomes a very real thing, and supplies a real need. The existence of a God and the immortality of man are not doctrines which need proving. They are intuitions, innate ideas, which may and do gain form and shape from advancing knowledge, but which grew out of the soul itself. Over the savage they have little influence, but civilized and thinking man can never be complete and entire unless these deep instincts of his inner being have their needs fully met and satisfied. In a mail who stands perfect and complete, the necessities of the future must be as fully and entirely recognised and supplied as the requirements of the present. He must have a religion.

Now religion is either natural or revealed. Not that these two are opposed. The revealed religion which we Christians profess contains and gives new authority to all the truths of natural religion, while extending itself far beyond them. Natural religion is a dim feeling and groping after God as manifested in his works, and a distinguishing of right from wrong, as far as  the indications of a righteous government existing now, and the laws of our own nature, and the marvellous gift of conscience, enable us to do so. In revealed religion we have fuller knowledge: knowledge of God's attributes, not merely as far as we can trace them in his works, but still more as they are manifested in his dealings with man as made known to us in revelation itself; knowledge of man, both as regards his present state and his future hopes; more exact knowledge, too, of right and wrong, the appeal now lying not to the varying codes of human morality, nor even to the inner conscience, which, as a faculty capable of education and development, is no rigid rule, but one which bends to every state of things, and adapts itself to every stage and degree of human progress and decay. Under a revealed religion the appeal is to an unchanging law of God. Morality has at last a settled basis, and man a fixed standard by which to judge his actions.

Now it seems almost supererogatory to show that natural religion was not suffice for man's wants. We know of no one who has definitely asserted that it does. Even Kant, though he appears to think that Christianity might now be dispensed with, yet distinctly holds that natural religion, without the teaching of Christianity, would not even now have been enlightened enough, or pure enough, or certain enough, to guide man's life.\* But the whole state of the heathen world before Christ came, and now wherever Christianity is unknown, is proof sufficient of the utter powerlessness of natural religion. The Greek world, with its marvellous taste in art and appreciation of the beautiful, was yet intensely wicked. The state of things at Rome under the empire was so foul that modern pens would blush to describe it. What natural religion is where civilization does not exist, the condition now of savage tribes proves clearly enough. We will touch therefore only upon one point, that of progress. Apart from Christianity, there are at most in the world the very faintest indications of progress; usually none at all. In no form of natural religion, in no heathen religion, was there anything to lead man onward, or to make him better. At best, as under Mohammedanism, or the religion of Confucius, there was stagnation. And when, as in the case of so many of the older civilizations of the world, decay set in, there was no recuperative force. Man sank steadily and hopelessly. In the Old Testament alone do we find the thought of progress. A nation is there formed for a high and unique purpose; and to shape it for its end it is placed in a special and immediate relation to God, and is taught by messengers sent directly by him. Under this special dispensation, its one business was to grow fit for the work prepared for it; its one motto,  progress. In the New Testament, progress is the central thought everywhere present; but no longer now for one nation — it is progress for all mankind. It is a new kingdom that is proclaimed, and all who enter it are required to put away old things, and become new. It belongs to men who have left their previous condition far behind, and who, forgetting what is past, “reach forth unto those things which are before.” And special stress is laid everywhere upon the duty of bringing all men into this new kingdom, and of Christians being the purifying salt which is to preserve the whole world.

The means by which Christianity thus renovates mankind, and becomes the moving force of all modern and real progress, is partly that it alone proposes to us principles so perfect that at the utmost our approach to their realization is a very distant one. The complete abnegation of self, the treatment of others with that justice, liberality, and love with which we would wish ourselves to be treated, and a holiness as absolute and entire as that of God himself such principles, while practically aiding us in our upward course, yet set us a standard which as a matter of fact, is unattainable. How often this is misunderstood! Men contrast our Christianity with what is set before us in the Gospels, and, either in mockery or in grief at the disparity, assert that our state is practically a mere heathenism. But while there is ample room for lamentation that we Christians are content to remain so very much below the standard set us, yet, so far as there is progress towards it — so far as it can be truly said that this generation is in a higher stage than the last was, and is training the youth to attain in the next to a still nearer approximation to Christian perfectness, so far Christianity is doing its work; not merely its work on individuals these constantly, even where the general state of things is bad and low, it raises to a high degree of virtue and holiness — but its work on the mass. If nationally we are making no progress, then our Christianity is not having its proper work, and, in an age which judges by results, is not proving its right still to exist. But even at the worst no Christian nation is hopeless: heathen nations sank without hope. Christian nations have again and again risen from the lowest degradation.

\* “We may well concede that if the Gospel had not previously taught the universal moral laws, reason would not yet have attained so perfect an insight into them. Letter of Kant to Jacobi, in Jacobi's Werke, 3:523.  But Christianity tends to progress not merely by the high ideal it sets before us, but by its power over men's sympathies. This power resides mainly in the human nature of Christ, but only when viewed in its relation to his Godhead. As the great proof of the Father's love to man, it does arrest our feelings, dwell upon our imagination, and inspire our conduct with motives such as no other supposed manifestation of the Deity to man has ever produced. Christ incarnate in the flesh is not merely the realization of the high standard of Christianity, and the model for our imitation, but acts also as a motive power, by which men are aroused and encouraged to the attempt to put into practice the principles of the religion which Christ taught.

If there be a God — and the man who denies it contradicts the intuitions of his own nature — it is religion, and revealed religion only, that gives us adequate knowledge of his nature and attributes, If there be a future — and the very instincts of our nature testify that there is — again it is revealed religion only that tells us what the future life is, and how we may attain to it. Yet necessary parts as both these beliefs are of oar nature, men may bring themselves to deny them. For a time they can put away from them both the future and a God. But if there be a present — and this is just the one thing in which the 19th century does thoroughly believe — even then, granting only this, if this present is to have any progress, and is to move onwards to anything better; if there is to be in it anything of healthful and vigorous life, this, too, is bound up with the one religion, which has satisfactory proof to give that it is revealed; proof that it did come really from God; and proof that it is the one motive power of human progress. If the light of nature hitherto has been insufficient to secure virtue or raise men towards it, that light will not suffice now, even though it has been fed and strengthened by centuries of Christian teaching. In asserting this, Kant asserted too much. Neither Christians nor Christian communities have as yet risen to anything like a high general standard of morality, to say nothing about holiness; remove the high ideal and the strong motives supplied by the religion of Christ, and there would result, first stagnation, and then decay. An “enlightened self-love” never yet successfully resisted any carnal or earthly passion. Christianity has effected much; the contrast between heathen and Christian communities is immense: but it has tot raised men yet to its own standard, nor even to a reasonably fair standard of moral excellence.  Now, grant but the possibility of there being a God; grant but the possibility of there being a future, as there must necessarily be a connection between man's future and his present, and as our idea of God forbids our excluding any existent thing from connection with him, then at least a revelation would be useful, and as God must be good, there is no antecedent improbability in his bestowing upon man what would be of use and benefit to him. You must get rid of God — must resolve him into a sort of nebulous all-pervading ether, with no attributes or personal force or knowledge (the Pantheists do this beautifully, and call God cosmic force) — you must get rid of a future life, and account yourselves simple phenomena, like the monkey, and ascidian jellybags, from which you are supposed to be descended, with no connection with the past, no reason for your present existence, mere shooting-stars in the realms of space, coming from nowhere, and going nowhither, and so only, by the extirpation of these two ideas from your nature, can you make a revelation improbable. Even then your position is open to grave doubt. We can understand the law of evolution; and if the law be proved, though as yet it is unproved, it would involve me in .no religious difficulties, provided that evolution really worked towards a solid end. Accustomed everywhere else in nature to see things fitted to their place, and all things so ordered that there is a use for everything, I could understand the meanest thing in creation rising upwards in the scale through multitudinous forms and infinite periods of time, if finally there were some purpose for all this rising. The plan is vast and marvellous. It can be justified only by some useful end. And such an end there would be if, after vast ages of development, the tiny atom ended in becoming a reasonable and responsible creature, with some purpose for all this vast preparation, because capable of still rising upwards, and of “becoming partaker of the divine nature.” But if the law of evolution stops at man without a future, then its product is not worthy of it, and so purposeless a law, ending in so mean a result — for what is there meaner than man without Christ? — falls to the ground as too grand in its design for so bare and worthless a result.

Yet even this is but part of the argument; the evidences in favor of Christianity have a collective force, and it is upon them as to whole that one fain rests secure. But we may well contend that if Christianity is necessary for our present well-being; if the advance of society; if the removal of the bad, the vile, and the sorrowful in our existing arrangements; if the maintenance and strengthening of the noble, the  earnest, the generous, and the pure, is bound up with Christianity, as being the only sure basis and motive towards progress, then, at all events, religion can show cause enough for existence to make it the duty of men to examine the evidence which it offers in its proof. Nineteenth century men may decline to listen to arguments which concern only things so remote as God and the future. Have they not built railways, laid the Atlantic telegraph, found out the constituent elements of the sun through the spectrum, and gained fortunes by gambling on the stock exchange? What can men want more?' Well, they want something to bind society together: even the worst want something to control in others those passions to which they give free play in themselves. No man wants society to grow worse, however much he may do himself to corrupt it. But the one salt of society, the one thing that does purify and hold it together, is religion.

Now antecedently there is no reason why God might not have made natural religion much more mighty and availing. As it is, nothing is more powerless in itself, though useful as an ally to revelation. Religion or no religion means revelation or no revelation. Reject revelation, and the only reason for not rejecting natural religion is that it is not worth the trouble. If religion, then, is a necessity of our present state, this means that revelation is a necessity. We are quite aware that even revealed religion does not explain all the difficulties of our present state. There is very much of doubt suggested by our philosophy to which Christianity gives only this answer, Believe and wait. It is, in fact, rigidly careful in refusing to give any and every explanation of things present except a practical one: in the most marked way it is silent as to the cause of our being what we are, and as to the nature of the world to come. It tells us that we do not now see the realities themselves, but only reflections of them in a mirror, and even that only in a riddling way (1Co 13:12). Hereafter it promises that we shall see the things themselves, and understand the true nature and exposition of the enigmas of life. Meanwhile it gives us every practical help and necessary guidance for the present. Judged thus by practical results and by its working powers, it is a thing indispensable. Without it man is imperfect, and society has nothing to arrest its dissolution, or arouse it to a struggle after amendment. Reformation is essentially a Christian idea. That a state should throw off its ignoble past and start on a new quest after excellence and right is possible only where there is a religion strong enough to move men, and noble enough to offer them a high ideal. Reform movements have therefore been confined to Christian states; and for the  individual, his one road to perfection has been a moving forwards towards God.

Upon this, then, we base our argument for miracles. The universal instincts of men prove the necessity of the existence of religion. Without it the promptings of our hearts, compelling us to believe in a God and to hope for a future, would be empty and meaningless; and this no human instincts are. There is no instinct whatsoever which has not in external nature that which exactly corresponds to it, and is its proper field of exercise. And, in the next place, natural religion, though in entire agreement with revealed, is, as we have shown, insufficient for the purposes for which religion is required. And, finally, there is the phenomenon that the revealed religion which we profess does act as a motive to progress. Christian nations — in morals, in freedom in literature, in science, in the arts, and in all that adorns or beautifies society and human life — hold undoubtedly the foremost place, and are still moving forward. And in proportion as a Christian nation holds its faith purely and firmly, so surely does it advance onwards. It is content with nothing to which it has attained, but sees before it the ideal of a higher perfection (Php 3:13-14).

Now a revealed religion can be proved only by that which involves the supernatural. What our Lord says to the Jews, that “they would not have sinned in rejecting him but for his works” (Joh 9:41), commends itself at once to our reason. No proof can rise higher than the order of things to which it belongs. And thus all that can be proved by the elaborate examination of all created things, and the diligent inquiry into their conformation and uses and instincts, and the purposes for which each organ or faculty was given them; yea, even the search into man's own mind, and all the psychologic problems which suggest so very much to us as to the purposes of our existence — all this can rise no higher than natural religion. They are at best but guesses and vague conjectures, and a feeling and groping after truth. Nothing of this sort could prove to us a revealed religion. For how are we to know that it is revealed? In order to its being revealed, God must be the giver of it. And how are we to know that it is he who speaks? Its strength, its value, its authority, all depend upon its being the voice of God. No subjective authority can prove this. The nature of the truths revealed, their adaptability to our wants, their usefulness, their probability nothing of this would prove that they had not been thought out by some highly-gifted man. We must have direct evidence  something pledging God himself before we can accept a religion as revealed.

We shall see this more clearly if we reflect upon the nature of the obedience which we are required to render to a revealed religion. Its authority is summary, and knows no appeal. It is God who speaks, and there is no higher tribunal than his throne. Take, for instance, the Ten Commandments. Essentially they are a republication of the laws of natural religion, excepting perhaps the fourth commandment. But upon how different a footing do they stand! The duty of not killing is in natural religion counteracted by the law of selfpreservation, and in heathen communities has been generally very powerless, and human life but little valued. Even in fairly-civilized communities murder was not a crime to be punished by the state, but to be avenged by the relatives of the murdered man. This even was the state of things among the Jews when the Ten Commandments were promulgated, and Moses, by special enactments, modified and softened the customs which he found prevalent, and which did not distinguish between wilful murder and accidental homicide. Natural religion, therefore, gave no special sanctity to human life, but regarded only the injury done to the family of the sufferer. The divine commandment has gone home straight to the conscience. It has made the shedding of blood a sin, and not merely all injury. Accordingly, Christian states have recognised the divine nature of the law by punishing murder as a public offence, instead of leaving it to be dealt with as a private wrong. A revealed religion therefore claims absolute power over the conscience as being the direct will of God. No question of utility or public or private expediency may stand in its way. It must be obeyed, and disobedience is sin. But plainly we ought not to yield such absolute obedience to anything that we do not know to be the law of God. Man stands too high in the scale of existence for this to be right. Were it only that he is endowed with a conscience, and thereby made responsible for his actions, it is impossible for him to give up the control over his own actions to any being of less authority than that One to whom he is responsible. But a revelation claims to be the express will of that very Being, and therefore a sufficient justification of our actions before his tribunal. Surely, before we trust ourselves to it, we may fairly claim adequate proof that it is his will. The issues are too serious for less than this to suffice.

But, besides this, when we look at Christianity, the nature of its doctrines brings the necessity of supernatural proof before us with intense force. It  teaches us that God took our nature upon him, and in our nature died in our stead; and, as we have pointed out before, the strength of Christianity, and that which makes it a religion of progress, is this union of the divine and human natures in Christ. He is not merely the “man of sorrows,” the ideal of suffering humanity — and a religion that glorifies a sinless sufferer may do much to alleviate sorrow and sweeten the bitter cup of woe — but he is much more than this. It is only when that sinless sufferer is worshipped as our Lord and our God that we reach the mainspring which has given Christianity its power to regenerate the world.

But how could such a doctrine be believed on any less evidence than that which directly pledged the divine authority on its behalf? The unique and perfect character of the Jesus of the evangelists; the pure and spotless nature of the morality he taught; the influence for good which Christian doctrines have exercised; the position attained by Christian nations, and the contrast between the ideals of heathenism and of Christianity all this and more is valuable as subsidiary evidence. Some of it is absolutely necessary to sustain our belief. Even miracles would not convince us of the truth of a revelation which taught us a morality contrary to our consciences. For nothing could make us believe that the voice of God in nature could be opposed to his voice in revelation. It is a very axiom that, however it reaches us, the voice of God must be ever the same. But these subsidiary proofs are but by-works. They are not the citadel, and can never form the main defence. A doctrine such as that of God becoming man must have evidence cognate to and in pari materie with the. doctrine itself. Thus, by a plain and self-evident necessity, revelation offers us supernatural proof of its reality. This supernatural proof is twofold, prophecy and miracle.

Now these two not merely support one another, but ,are essentially connected. They are not independent, but correlative proofs. It was the office of the prophet gradually to prepare the way for the manifestation of the Immanuel upon earth. In order to do so effectually he often came armed with supernatural authority. But a vast majority of the prophets had no other business than to impress on the consciences of the people truths already divinely vouched for and implicitly accepted; and such no more needed miracles than the preachers of Christianity do at the present day. But among the prophets were here and there men of higher powers, whose office was to advance onwards towards the ultimate goal of the preparatory dispensation. Such men offered prediction and miracle as the seals which ratified their mission. In general men could be prepared to  receive so great a miracle as that set forth in the opening verses of John's Gospel only by a previous dispensation which had brought the supernatural very near to man. If the Old Testament had offered no miracles, and had not taught the constant presence of God in the disposal of all human things, the doctrines of the New Testament would have been an impossibility.

But we shall understand their connection better when we have a clearer idea of the true scriptural doctrine of miracles. The current idea of a miracle is that it is a violation of the laws of nature, and as the laws of nature are the laws of God, a miracle would thus signify the violation by God. of his own laws. This is not the teaching of the Bible itself, but an idea that has grown out of the Latin word which as supplanted the more thoughtful terms used in the Hebrew and in the Greek Scriptures. A “miracle,” miraculum, is something wonderful — marvellous. Now no doubt all God's works are wonderful; but when the word is applied to his doings in the Bible, it is his works in nature that are generally so described. In the Hebrew, especially in poetry, God is often described as doing “wonders,” that is, miracles. But the term is not merely applicable to works such as those wrought by him for his people in Egypt and the wilderness (Exo 15:11; Psa 78:12), but to a thunder-storm (Psa 77:14), and to his ordinary dealings with men in providence (Psa 9:1; Psa 26:7; Psa 40:5), and in the government of the world. But this term wonder is not the word in the Hebrew properly applicable to what ‘we mean by miracles, and in the New Testament our Lord's works are never called “miracles” (θαύματα) at all. The people are often said to have “wondered” (Mat 9:33; Mat 15:31) at Christ's acts, but those acts themselves were not intended simply to produce wonder; they had a specific purpose, indicated by the term properly applicable to them, and that term is sign.

This is the sole Hebrew term for what we mean by miracle; but there are other words applied to our Lord's doings in the New Testament which we will previously consider. And, first, there is a term which approaches very nearly to our word miracle, namely, τέρας, portent, defined by Liddell and Scott, in their Greek Lexicon, as a “sign, wonder, marvel, used of any appearance or event in which men believed that they could see the. finger of God.” But, with that marvellous accuracy which distinguishes the language of the Greek Testament, our Lord's works are never called τέρατα in the Gospels. The word is used of the false Christs and false prophets, who by great signs and portents shall almost deceive the very elect (Mat 24:24; Mar 13:22). The populace, however,  expected a prophet to display these portents (Joh 4:48), and Joel had predicted that such signs of God's presence would accompany the coming of the great and notable day of Jehovah (Act 2:19).

In the Acts of the Apostles our Lord is said to have been approved of God by portents as well as by powers and signs, the words literally being “Jesus of Nazareth, a man displayed of God unto you by powers, and portents, and signs” but the portents refer to such things as the star which appeared to the magi, and the darkness and earthquake at the crucifixion. Exactly parallel to this place are the words in Heb 2:4, where God is said to have borne witness to the truth of the apostles' testimony “by signs and portents, and manifold powers, and diversified gifts of the Holy Ghost,” the description being evidently intended to include every manifestation of God's presence with the first preachers of the Gospel, ordinary and extraordinary, in providence and in grace, and not merely the one fact that from time to time they wrought miracles.

But the term portents is freely applied to the miracles wrought by the apostles, being. used of them no less than eight times in the Acts, and also in Rom 15:19, and 2Co 12:12. In every case it is used in connection with the word signs, the Greek in Act 6:8; Act 15:12, being exactly the same as that in Act 2:43; Act 4:30; Act 5:12; Act 14:3, though differently rendered. The two words, however, express very different sides of the apostles' working, the term sign, as we shall see hereafter, having reference to the long-previous preparation for the Messiah's advent, while portents were indications of the presence with them of the finger of God.

In the Synoptic Gospels, the most common term for our Lord's miracles is δυνάμεις, powers. Full of meaning as is the word, it nevertheless is not one easy to adapt to the idiom of our language, and thus in the Gospels it is usually translated “mighty works” (Mat 11:20-21; Mat 11:23, etc.), but miracles in Act 2:22; Act 8:13; Act 19:11; 1Co 12:10; 1Co 12:28, etc. Really it signifies the very opposite of miracles. A δύναμις is a faculty, or capacity for doing anything. We all have our faculties some physical, some mental and moral-and these are all strictly natural endowments. We have also spiritual faculties, and these also primarily are natural endowments of our inner being, though heightened and intensified in believers by the operation of the Holy Ghost. Yet even this is, by the ordinary operation of the Spirit, in accordance with spiritual laws, and not in violation of them. The teaching therefore of this word δυνάμεις, powers or faculties, is that  our Lord's works were perfectly natural and ordinary to him. They were his capacities, just as sight and speech are ours. Now in a brute animal articulate speech would be a miracle, because it does not lie within the range of its capacities, and therefore would be a violation of the law of its nature; it does lie within the compass of our faculties, and so in us is no miracle. Similarly, the healing of the sick, the giving sight to the blind, the raising of the dead-things entirely beyond the range of our powers, yet lay entirely within the compass of our Lord's capacities, and were in accordance with the laws of his nature. It was no more a “miracle” in him to turn water into wine than it is with God, who works this change every year. Nor does John call it so, though his word is rendered miracle in our version (Joh 2:11).

His language, as becomes the most thoughtful and philosophic of the Gospels, is deeply significant. He does not use the term δύναμις, faculty, at all, but has two words, one especially his own, namely, ἔργον, a work (yet used once by Mat 11:2, who has so much in common with John); the other, the one proper term for miracle throughout the whole Bible, σημεῖον, a sign.

Our Lord's miracles are called ἔργα, works, by John some fifteen or more times, besides places where they are spoken of as “the works of God” (Joh 9:3; Joh 5:20; Joh 5:36). Now this term stands in a very close relation to the preceding word, δύναμις, a faculty. A faculty, when exerted, produces an ἔργον, or work. Whatever powers or capacities we have, whenever we use them, bring forth a corresponding result. We have capacities of thought, of speech, of action, common to the species, though varying in the individual; and what is not at all remarkable in one man may be very much so in another, simply because it is beyond his usual range. But outside the species it may be not only remarkable but miraculous, because it lies altogether beyond the range of the capacities with which the agent is endowed. And so, on the contrary, what would be miraculous in one class of agents is simply natural in another class, because: it is in accordance with their powers.

Now had our Lord been merely man, any and every work beyond the compass of man's powers would have been a miracle. It would have transcended the limits of his nature; but whether it would necessarily have violated the laws of that nature is a question of some difficulty. Supposing that man is an imperfect being, but capable of progress, the limits of his  powers may be indefinitely enlarged. Those who hold theory of evolution concede this, and therefore concede that there is nothing miraculous in a remarkable individual being prematurely endowed with capacities which finally and in due time will be the heritage of the whole species. It is the doctrine of the Bible that the spiritual man has a great future before him, and the prophets of old, and the apostles and early Christians, endowed with their great charismata, or gifts, may be but an anticipation of what the spiritual man may finally become. Still, among the “works” of our Lord and his apostles, there is one which seems distinctly divine, namely, the raising of the dead. Gifts of healing, of exciting dormant powers, such as speech in the dumb, of reading the thoughts of others' hearts, may be so heightened in man as he develops under the operations of the Spirit that much may cease to be astonishing which now is highly so. But the raising of the dead travels into another sphere; nor can we imagine any human progress evolving such a power as this. We cannot imagine man possessed of any latent capacity which may in time be so developed as naturally to produce such a result. So, too, the multiplying of food seems to involve powers reserved to the Creator alone.

But the Gospel of John does not regard our. Lord as a man prematurely endowed with gifts which finally will become the heritage of the whole species; it is penetrated everywhere with the conviction that a higher nature was united in him to his human nature. It shows itself not merely in formal statements like the opening words of the Gospel, but in the language usual with him everywhere. And so here. Our Lord's miracles to him are simply and absolutely ἔργα, works only. But, as we have seen before, they are also divine works, “works of God.” Still in Christ, according to John's view, they were perfectly natural. They were the necessary and direct result of that divine nature which in him was indissolubly united with his human nature. The last thing which the apostle would have thought about them was that they were miraculous, wonderful. That God should give his only- begotten Son to save the world was wonderful. That such a being should: ordinarily do works entirely beyond the limits of man's powers did not seem to John wonderful, and hence the simple yet deeply significant term by which he characterizes them.

Yet such works were not wrought without a purpose; nor did such a being come without having a definite object to justify his manifestation. If wisdom has to be justified of all her children, of all that she produces, there must be some end or purpose effected by each of them, and especially in  one like Christ, confessedly the very highest manifestation of human nature, and, as we Christians believe, reaching high above its bounds. Now John points this out in calling our Lord's works σημεῖα, signs. It is devoutly to be hoped that in the revised translation of the New Testament this term will be restored to its place, instead of being mistranslated miracle, as in our present version. Really, in employing it, John was only following in the steps of the older Scriptures, and the unity of thought in the Bible is destroyed when the same word is translated differently in one book from its rendering in another. However wonderful may be God's works, they are not wrought simply to fill men with astonishment, and least of all are those so wrought which lie outside the ordinary course of God's natural laws.

The word σημεῖον, sign, tells us in the plainest language that these works were tokens calling the attention of men to what was then happening; and especially is it used in the Old Testament of some mark or signal confirming a promise or covenant. Such a sign (or mark) God gave to Cain in proof that his life was safe (Gen 4:15). Such a sign (or token) was the rainbow to Noah, certifying him and mankind throughout all time that the world should not be again destroyed by water (Gen 9:13). And here learn we incidentally that God's signs need not be miraculous. The laws of refraction probably were the same before as after the flood, and the fact of the rainbow being produced by the operation of natural laws does not make it a less fit symbol of a covenant between God and man relative to a great natural convulsion. So, again, circumcision was a sign (or token) of the covenant between God and the family of Abraham (Gen 17:11). It was to recall the minds of the Israelites to the thought not merely that they stood in a covenant relation to God, but that that covenant implied personal purity and holiness. In the same way the Sabbath was a sign (Exo 31:13; Eze 20:12) of a peculiar relation between the Jew and his God.

But there are places where it distinctively means what we call a miracle. Thus Ahaz is told to ask a sign, and a choice is given him either of some meteor in the heavens, or of some appearance in the nether world: “Make it deep unto Hades, or high in the vault of heaven above” (Isa 7:11). And when the unbelieving king will ask, no sign, the prophet gives him that of the Immanuel, the virgin's son. So the sign unto Hezekiah of his recovery was the supernatural retrogression of the shadow upon the sundial of Ahaz, however significant it might also be of the hand of time  having gone back as regards Hezekiah's own life (Isa 38:7). Elsewhere the divine foreknowledge is the sign (Exo 3:12; Isa 37:30), and generally signs of God's more immediate presence with his people would either be prophecy (Psa 74:9) or miracle (Psa 105:27; Jer 32:20; Dan 4:2).

Very much more might be learned by a filler consideration of the manner in which the word sign is used in the Old Testament, but what is said above is enough to explain the reason why John so constantly used the term to express our Lord's miracles. The water changed into wine at Cana he calls “the beginning of signs” (Joh 2:11), and the healing of the centurion's son is “the second sign” (Joh 4:54), as being the first and second indications of Christ's wielding those powers which belong to God as the Creator and Author of nature, and which therefore pledged the God of nature, as the sole possessor of these powers, to the truth of any one's teaching who came armed with them (Joh 3:2, where again the Greek is signs). So he tells us that the people assembled at Jerusalem for the Passover believed Jesus “when they. saw the signs which he did” (Joh 2:23). It was, in fact, the very thing they had asked (Mat 12:38; Mat 16:1; Joh 2:18; Joh 6:30), and candid minds confessed that they were a sufficient ground for belief (Joh 6:14; Joh 7:31; Joh 9:16; Joh 12:18); in fact, they were wrought for that purpose (Joh 20:30-31), though men might and did refuse to accept them as proof conclusive of the Saviour's mission (Joh 11:47; Joh 12:37), and vulgar minds, saw in them nothing more than reason for astonishment (Joh 6:2; Joh 6:26). To them they were simply miracles-wonders.

A sign is more and means more than a miracle, for it does not stand alone, but is a token and indication of something else. Thus John's word shows that our Lord's works had a definite purpose. They were not wrought at random, but were intended for a special object. What this was is easy to tell. The Old Testament had always represented the Jews as holding a peculiar position towards the Godhead. They were a chosen people endowed with high privileges and blessings, but so endowed because they were also intended for a unique purpose. They were the depositaries of revelation, and in due time their Torah, their revealed law, was to go forth out of Zion (Isa 2:3) to lighten the whole Gentile world (Isa 42:6). This promise of a revelation extending to the whole world was further connected with the coming of a special descendant of Abraham (Gen 22:18; Deu 18:15), and prophecy had gradually  so filled up the outline that a complete sketch had been given of the person, the offices, the work, and the preaching of the great Son of David, to whose line the promise had subsequently been confined (Isa 11:1; Jer 23:5; Hosea 3:8; Mic 5:2, etc.).

But how were people to know when he had come? The prophets had indeed given some indications of the time, especially Daniel (Dan 9:24-27), and so clear were their words that all the world was expecting the arrival of some mighty being, in whom magnus ab integro sceclorrum nascitur ordo, and an entire transformation of the world should take place. But how, among many claimants, was he to be known? He might come, perhaps, as a conqueror, and by force of arms compel men to submit to his authority. But no! Prophecy had described him as the Prince of Peace; nor was his kingdom to be of this world, but a spiritual empire. Now, if we reflect for a little, we shall see that there is no obligation incumbent upon men to accept, or even examine, the claims of any and every one professing to be the bearer of a revelation from God. Before this duty arises, there must at least be something to call our attention to his claims. Mere self- assertion imposes no obligation upon others, unless it have something substantial to back it up. Life is a practical thing, with very onerous duties, and few, like the Athenians of old, have the taste or the leisure to listen to and examine everything new. The herald of a divine dispensation must have proof to offer that he does come from God, and such proof as pledges the divine attributes to the truth of his teaching. This is the reason why the Old-Testament dispensation was one of signs. On special occasions justifying the divine interference, and in the persons of its great teachers, the prophets, supernatural proof was given in two ways of God's presence with his messengers in a manner superior to and beyond his ordinary and providential presence in the affairs of life. The divine omniscience was pledged to the truth of their words by the prediction of future events and his omnipotence by their working things beyond the ordinary range of nature. The two Old Testament proofs of a revelation were prophecy and miracle. We can think of no others, and nothing less would suffice.

As we have said, the whole of the Old Testament looked forward to the manifestation of a divine person, in whom revelation would become, in the first place, perfect; in the second, universal; and, thirdly, final. As being a final revelation, prophecy, which was the distinctive element of the preparatory dispensation, holds in it no longer an essential place, though it is present in the New Testament in a subordinate degree. But miracle must,  in the bearer of such a revelation, rise to its highest level; first because of the superiority of his office to that of the prophets. For he was himself the end of prophecy, the person for whose coming prophecy had prepared, and in whom all God's purposes of love towards mankind were to be fulfilled. The office of Christ as the bearer to mankind of God's final and complete message involves too much for us lightly to ascribe it to him. And no merely natural proof would suffice. We could not possibly believe what we believe of him had he wrought no miracles. We could not believe that he was the appointed Savior, to whom “all honor was given in heaven and earth” (Mat 28:18), for man's redemption, if he had given no proof during the period of his manifestation on earth of being invested with extraordinary powers. But we go further than this. Perhaps no one would deny that the sole sufficient proof of such a religion as Christianity must be supernatural. We assert that no revealed religion whatsoever can be content with a less decided proof. The sole basis upon which a revelation can rest is the possession by the bearer of it of prophetic and miraculous powers.

For a revealed religion claims authority over us. If it be God's voice speaking to us, we have no choice but to obey. Our reason might not approve; our hearts and wills might detest what we were told; yet if we knew that it was God's voice, we must sadly and reluctantly submit to it. But it would be wrong in the highest degree to yield up ourselves to anything requiring such complete obedience unless we had satisfactory. proof that God really was its author. And no subjective proof could be satisfactory. The purity of the doctrines of Christianity, their agreement with the truths of natural religion, their ennobling effects upon our characters, and the way in which they enlighten the conscience — all this and more shows that there is no impossibility in Christianity being a divine revelation: the perfectness of our Lord's character, the thoroughness with which. Christ's atonement answers to the deepest needs of the soul, the way in which Christianity rises above all religions of man's devising — all this and more makes it probable that it is God's gift. But at most these considerations only prepare the mind to listen without prejudice to the direct and external proofs that Christianity is a revelation from God. The final proof must pledge God himself to its truth. But what are the divine attributes which would bear the most decisive witness? Surely those which most entirely transcend all human counterfeits — omniscience and  omnipotence. Now these are pledged to Christianity by prophecy and miracle.

The first had performed its office when Christ came. All men were musing in their hearts upon the expected coming of some Great One. His miracles, his works, the products of his powers, were the signs that prophecy was in course of fulfilment, The two must not be separated. Our Lord expressly declares that but for his works the Jews would have been right in rejecting him (Joh 15:24), His claims were too high for any less proof to have sufficed. But the nature of his works did put men under a moral obligation to inquire into his claims; and then he sent them to the Scriptures (Joh 5:39). The miracles were thus not the final proof of Christ's mission. Had they been such, we might have expected that they would still be from time to time vouchsafed, as occasion required, even to the end of the world. The agreement of Christ's life and death and teaching with what had been foretold of the Messiah is the leading proof of his mission, and, having this, we need miracles no more. Christ's works called men's attention to this proof, and made it a duty to examine it. They also exalt his person, and give him the authority of a messenger accredited from heaven; but the Old Testament remains for all ages the proper proof of the truth of the New. Miracles were signs for the times; prophecy is for all time, and as Christianity no longer requires anything especially to call men's attention to its claims, prophecy is proof enough that it is a message from God.

The more clearly to set this before our readers, we repeat that prediction was the distinctive sign of God's presence under the Old-Testament dispensation, and miracles subordinate. Revelation was then a growing light, and was ever advancing onward; and thus the prophets were ever preparing for the future. It was only on special occasions that miracle was needed. ‘But when revelation became perfect and final in the person of One who, according to the terms of prophecy, transcended the bounds of human nature, it was necessary that miracle should rise in him to its highest level, both because of the dignity of his person, as one invested with all power, human and divine, and also as the proper proof at the time of his being the Son, the last and greatest therefore whom the Father could send; and, finally, to call the attention of men to his claims, and compel them to examine them. For this reason they were called signs. But as soon as the dispensation thus given could force. its claims on men's attention by other means, and its divine bounder had with drawn, miracles necessarily ceased, as being inconsistent with man's probation. Look over the. list of Scripture  names for miracles, and ask what one would be appropriate now? Of what would they now be signs? Of what person would they be the proper faculties? For whom now would they be suitable works? The whole scriptural theory of miracles is contravened by the supposition of miracles being continued after Christianity had once been established. What history teaches us, namely, that they were rapidly withdrawn, is alone consistent with what we gather from Scripture concerning them.

They were an essential part of the proof at the time, and have an essential use now. For we could not believe what is taught us of Christ if he had not been accredited by miracles. But the proper evidence for the truth of Christianity now is that of prophecy, not as existing any longer in living force, but as manifested in the agreement of the long list of books forming the Old Testament with one another; and still more in the fulfilment of the Old Testament in the New. It is a proof in everybody's hands, and open to every one to examine. The proof of miracles requires, of course, large historical evidence, and not every one possesses bishop Stillingfleet's Origines Cause, or even Paley; but every Christian has his Bible, and in it will find the proper proof now of its truth.

Agreeably with this, dean Lyall, in his Propaedia Prophetica, has well remarked that the apostles “scarcely allude to Christ's miracles at all, and never in the way of proof (page 4). Miracles, he shows, now hold a disproportionate place in the argument from that assigned to them in the New Testament; and, in fact, it is very remarkable that Peter but twice refers in his speeches to Christ's miracles, and never but once to those wrought by himself. Paul, in his thirteen epistles, only thrice appeals to his own miraculous powers, and never mentions Christ's miracles, or even directly alludes to them. The key of this we have in the names applied to them by the apostles, and especially by John. They were the natural works of one such as was Christ, but also signs that in him the long preparation of the Old-Testament dispensation had reached its final purpose, and that the new and lasting dispensation had begun.

In their proper place and degree, however, they were and still remain essential to the proof of a divine revelation. We could not accept a revelation, or give it the authority over our conscience due to the direct voice of God, unless we had indubitable proof that it was God's voice. The supernatural can only be proved by the Supernatural. If, then, a revelation was necessary as well for the present progress of mankind as for their  future perfectness, miracle was also necessary, and the believer in revelation cannot possibly discard it from its place among the evidences.

Necessarily, therefore, from first to last, the Bible is a book of miracle. Miracle is present not as an accident, separable from the main thread, but is itself the very essence of the narrative. The facts of the Old Testament were the basis of the faith of the Jew. They were so as being miracles, and because, as such, they involved certain dogmatic propositions concerning the divine Being and his relations to themselves. So as regards ourselves. When we repeat the Apostles' Creed, we acknowledge our belief first in the existence of a God — an instinct, as we have shown, of our nature — but upon this follow certain historical facts recorded in the New Testament, which are either directly miraculous, or become dogmatic because of being based upon miracle. Without miracle Christianity is absolutely nothing. All that distinguishes it from simple Theism is miraculous.

Miracles in the present day are at a discount. Our men of science have so well studied the laws of the material universe, and shown us so clearly the existence there of a calm, unbroken, unvarying order, that our minds, enamored of so grand a truth, are impatient of any truth or theory rising above these material laws. Thus the controversy whether Christianity is true or not really turns upon miracle. The close and exact examination of all the facts of holy Scripture which has marked our days has served only to confirm men's belief in the authenticity of the sacred writings. Our increased knowledge, especially that obtained from the cuneiform inscriptions corroborative of the Old-Testament history, and from similar unquestionable authorities contemporaneous with the New-Testament records has well-nigh swept away every so-called historical difficulty; while subjective criticism has not merely failed in substantiating any case against the several books of the Bible, but has done very much: to place them upon a surer basis. At no time was the external evidence in favor of Christianity, or the argument drawn from prophecy, so clear and so little liable to objection as at the present day. And this is no slight matter. A host of eager and competent critics have examined with unfavorable intentions the whole line of our defences, and the result of their operations has been to show how thoroughly tenable it is in every part.

Thus the whole attack is now thrown upon miracle. Miracle is roundly asserted to be contrary to the whole course of nature, and to be a violation  of that grand law of invariable order which we find everywhere else throughout the universe. In this way a sort of induction is drawn against miracle. Wherever we can examine into the causes of phenomena, we always find them the products of forces acting according to unchanging laws. Whole regions of phenomena,: which were once supposed to be under the sway of chance, have now been reduced to order, and the causes of them made manifest. Men of science have entered one field after another, and have added it to their domains, by showing what laws govern it, and how those laws work. With some show of reason therefore they affirm that law prevails everywhere, and that where at present it cannot be shown to prevail, we may yet be sure of its presence, and convinced that the patient investigations of science will in due time demonstrate its sway. And therefore miracle as being a violation of these universal laws, is not merely, they say, contrary to that experience of men of which Mr. Hume spoke, and upon which he founded an .argument repeatedly shown to be untenable, but of an induction drawn from a vast field of observation and scientific inquiry. In miracle, and miracle alone, science finds something which contradicts its experience. The examination of this most important objection will complete our inquiry.

The proposition contained in this objection, when we consider it, seems a most true conclusion as regards the material universe. All material things apparently are governed by general laws, and it is probable that scientific men are quite right in endeavoring to show that even in creation all things were produced by law. For our own part, we cannot imagine a perfect Being like the Deity working except by law, and therefore we read all theories about evolution and selection, and the formation of the solar system by slow degrees out of a vast nebula, and the like, with no prejudice regarding them, however intended, simply as attempted answers to the question, In what way — by what secondary processes — did God create and shape the world? If, — after reading the arguments, we conclude by thinking them often ingenious rather than true, and put the book down with the Scotch verdict, “Not proven,” we do not therefore think that science is on the wrong track, nor doubt that all these inquiries do in the main give us juster views of God's method of working. But miracle seems to us to belong to another field, of thought, and to be outside the domains of science. For we venture to ask, Is the material universe everything? Is there nothing but matter? nothing but dull, inert particles, acted upon by material forces — attraction, repulsion, affinity, and the like. What is force? What is  law? If there be a God — a perfect, omnipotent, omnipresent Being — then law has to us a meaning. It is his will, working permanently and unchangeably because he is a perfect and omnipotent worker. We can understand force. It is his presence, acting upon and controlling all things, but always in the same way, because he changes not. To believe in universal order without a universal will to order all things, to believe in universal laws without a universal lawgiver, is to us an absurdity. Ex nihilo nihil fit. In a world where every effect has a cause, who and what is the cause of all? Who but God? And who sustains the world now but he who first made it?

But it is not the office of science to inquire into the being and attributes and nature of this First Great Cause. Science is solely occupied with the secondary processes. When it has reached the law, it has done its work. It is not the business of science to examine into the law as such, but only into the mode of its operations. Whose is the law, what power sustains it, how it came into being — all this lies outside the domain of science. Thus science never rises above material things; and by remembering this by remembering that, after all, the field of science (of course we mean physical science) is limited — we see that an induction made in its proper field does not justify any conclusions in fields outside its limits.

Let us take the case of man. Science, looking at him in his physical aspect, tells us that he consists of several pounds of salts and earths, combined with a larger number of gallons of water. It tells us by what chemical affinities these commonplace materials are held together, how they operate upon one another, by what processes the waste is renewed, and by what a mass of curious mechanical contrivances man's body, considered as a machine, performs its operations. If we ask how it comes to think, science tells us much about the brain; how like it is to a galvanic trough, and by what an elaborate, threefold apparatus of nerves it sends its commands to every part of the body. But when we ask how it is that the brain does consciously what the voltaic battery does unconsciously; how it is that these earths and salts, when combined into a man, know that they are a man, we get only the unmeaning answer that it is the result of organization. But give science all the bottles in a chemist's shop, and it cannot organize a sentient being out of them. In fact, it owns itself that life is a mystery. It can tell how life works, but not what life is. Life is as much beyond the reach of science as is God. It knows the laws of life, but no more.  Man therefore, when considered only physically, contains more than science can master. But is life the only mystery in man? Why does man think? Why does he speculate upon his own actions? Why muse upon the purpose of all things here below? Of all beings upon this earth, man alone is self-conscious. He alone knows that he exists; he alone feels that he exists for a purpose, and can and does consciously interfere with other things in order to shape them to his own ends. He alone has not the mere rudiments, but the full gift of a conscience, which is always interfering with him, and giving him endless annoyance, because it will pass judgment upon his actions, and condemn much that he does.

Now it is in connection with this higher world that miracle has its proper place. It distinctly has reference to man as a being in whom there is more than mere material. forces at work. Prove that there is nothing more in man than salts and earths and water, and there would be no place for miracle. Now physical science stops at proving this. The most skilful analyst could get nothing more out of man than salts, earths, and water; but then, confessedly, he labors under this disadvantage, that he cannot begin his analysis until life, and with it the sentient soul, has withdrawn from the machine. All he can examine is the residuum only.

We want some science therefore which can examine man while he is alive, and report upon him. For physical science is not the sole science. There are other sciences, and each. is authoritative only upon its own domain. The psychologist, who examines into the workings of man's inner nature, is quite as worthy of a hearing as the physicist, who examines into the materials out of which he is composed. Ne sutor ultra crepidam — a homely but wise motto, which a rising and progressive study, such as is physical science, in the hours of its first triumphs, is in danger of neglecting. After all, a man of only one science tries to see with only one eye, and to walk with only one leg. Before we can form a true estimate of the question that so deeply concerns us. What is man's place and work and purpose in the world? — we must include a far wider induction than that offered by physical science.

If, as the instincts of our nature teach us, there be a God; if man be more than a very highly-organized machine; if within him there be an immortal soul, and before him a future life, then miracle is essential to his well-being. It is the sole possible proof of conscious relation between man and God. Man could not be sure that God had spoken to him, had revealed to him  any knowledge requisite for his use, had entered into covenant relation with him, without miracles. We know nothing in physical science to disprove this relation. Suppose that we find a stage elaborately constructed and adorned. No theory, however true, of the manner in which this stage was constructed, no examination of the mechanical laws by which it is still kept in being, will justify us in concluding that it was not intended for some further purpose. Nor, because the boards are all safely nailed in their place, does it follow that actors may not' enter upon it, higher in nature than the boards, and capable of spontaneous motion. Nor, because we have never seen the builder, does it follow that he did not erect the stage on purpose that these actors might play upon it their parts. Geology, chemistry, astronomy, so far from proving that the world had no purpose, and that the actors upon it have no freedom and no responsibility, rather suggest the contrary. They teach us what a vast amount of skill, patience, wisdom, and goodness has been expended in forming the stage. Quorsum ic? What was the object of all this? What the end? Oh! but some physicists answer, We reject teleology. That is, we reject something which lies beyond our province, and on which we have no authority to speak. They tell us all about the stage, and then, instead of saying frankly, We have done our part, Plaudite (and richly they deserve our applause), they tell us, Be satisfied with the stage. It is very pretty, very nicely constructed, but utterly unmeaning. An elaborate universe without a purpose, is a poor, mean thing, unworthy to exist. It would be a disgrace to a man to erect a noble structure without a purpose: there are many buildings in England called So-and-So's Folly, because erected without a sufficient purpose. Let us beware of ascribing such child's play to that Power which called the universe into being.

No. The more we consider man, and the more we learn about him, and about the world which he inhabits, the more sure we are that he is no fortuitous concurrence of atoms, but the chief and culminating point, in whom, and in whom alone, all the skill and wisdom and long patience displayed in the formation of the world find their purpose and their justification. The wonders of physical science all lead up to this. There are some among its teachers who would persuade us that the universe is a mere curiosity shop, fitted to raise our wonder, but never reasonable, because nowhere the product of mind, or controlled by mind. But the very harmony which they find in nature, and the calm reign of law, proves that mind does pervade all nature. Without mind there can be no harmony;  without a universal mind no universal law. But grant that mind may exist as well as matter, and you grant the possibility of this world having a purpose — a purpose which, as we have shown, can be realized only in man. But to realize this purpose men's finite mind may need converse with the universal, the infinite mind, and, if so, miracle is justified by this necessity.

Thus, then, miracle is not contrary to nature, but rises simply above the sphere of mere material forces. And it is untrue and unphilosophic to regard it as an interference by God with his universal laws, much: less a violation of them. Man daily interferes with the material laws and forces of nature, but we never violate them. The stone thrown into the air interferes with the law of gravitation, but does not violate it. And if God be an intelligent and moral worker like man, only in a superior and perfect degree, he, too, must be capable of bending the powers of nature to instantaneous obedience to his will, or he could not do what man can do. His own laws he could not violate, because they are his laws; but his interference with them would necessarily be what we call a miracle, something which the ordinary operations of nature could not produce; something which transcends nature, and goes utterly beyond it. If a sheep possessed the power of reasoning upon its own actions and those of man, the latter would seem to it absolutely miraculous, because they so entirely exceed its own powers. Yet to man they would be no miracles, but the ordinary exercise of his powers. And so what we call miracles are not miracles to the Deity, and therefore the evangelists call them in Christ simply δυνάμεις, his faculties; and John calls them ἔργα, works, only, the natural products of his faculties; yet not wrought without a purpose. They were also σημεῖα, signs, tokens indicating that something was done, which man was thereby required to examine and observe; and living as the Jews did under a preparatory dispensation. they were signs that the fulness of time had come, and the final dispensation being ushered in..

In conclusion. Without miracles there can be only natural religion; revealed religion is impossible. Revelation is itself a miracle; and its very object is to tell us things which we could not otherwise know. Such things cannot be verified as we verify the facts of science. No man hath or can see God. No man can tell us by experience what is the state of the soul after death, for from that bourne no traveller returns. Yet some knowledge of the relations of the soul with God may be absolutely necessary for our moral and spiritual well-being. Now the utter failure of natural religion convinces us that it is necessary. And therefore we feel no difficulty in the belief that  God, in creating the world such as it is, and placing man upon it such as he is, and under such circumstances as those in which we find ourselves, did from the first purpose this reasonable interference with the material laws of his own framing, by which, he grants man the only sufficient proof that he is willing to enter into covenant relations with him. If the physicist reply that such action on God's part is inconceivable, we answer that he also must conceive of some such action. Students of physical science deal in long numbers, but these numbers are as nothing compared with the eternity past. Work back with the geologist, and you come at last to a first beginning of matter. Looked at by the light of mental science, the eternal existence of matter is impossible. To the metaphysician, matter is but a phenomenon of mind. Confining ourselves, then, to our universe, what a momentous change was that in God when he passed from the passive state of not willing it to the active state of willing the existence of our system! Grant that by his fiat he only called into existence an atom, out of which bye evolution all things here below have sprung, what a stupendous act it was, and how entirely it placed the Deity in relations, and, to speak with all reverence, under obligations from which he was free before! For the Creator is under, the obligations of justice and love to his creatures. He made us, and not we ourselves. But he neither was nor is under any moral obligations to his material laws. They abide in power and might because he abideth continually. And' miracle simply means that he, the Creator, has from time to time, under the operation of a higher law, given us the necessary proof that he does love us, and that certain messengers, chosen from among men, had authority to teach us truths which concerned our peace; and that, finally, by “powers and portents and signs, he has manifested and displayed Jesus of Nazareth in the midst of us” as “a leader and Saviour; to give repentance unto his people and the remission of sins.”

Miracles, then, were no after-thought, no remedial process to set right what had gone wrong before. They form an essential and necessary part and condition of the intercourse between the universal mind of God and the finite mind of man, and that intercourse was necessary for man's good. Why man is just what he is, and why the state of things in which he-finds. himself is what it is, we cannot tell. We call only reason from facts as we find them. But man being such as he is, we assert that the world would be a failure without miracles; for either man would exist without a purpose, or, ‘having been placed here for some purpose, he would not know with sufficient certainty or clearness what that purpose was, and therefore  would neither have the means of effecting it, nor even any obligation laid upon him of trying to accomplish what his Maker had willed in his creation. (R.P.S.)

For the relations of miracles to prayer, SEE PRAYER. We have thus far considered simply the positive evidences on which the belief in miracles properly rests, and it remains to notice the objections that have from time to time been urged against it, and the different views as to the: character and office of miracles.

The Christians even of apostolic days were in the habit of appealing to the miracles and prophecies in support of the truth of their religion, and hence it became important to define exactly the idea of a miracle; and in consequence of a desire for such preciseness division arose among the interpreters of Scripture, provoking heresy in the Church, while from without attacks were constantly made against the credibility of the Gospel history, the divine authenticity of the prophetic announcements, and the wonderful works claimed to have been wrought under the old dispensation. Dean Trench, in his Notes on Miracles, has furnished an excellent and interesting account of the various assaults made on the argument for miracles, and to it we must refer for detailed information. Suffice it to say here that the controversy respecting the possibility of miracles is as old as philosophic literature. Indeed, from the writings of Jewish savans, it would appear that the controversy respecting the possibility of miracles commenced even in the days of the O.T. dispensation, and that near the appointed time for the coming of the Saviour the world was greatly animated by a controversy on the subject. There is a very clear view of it, as it stood in the pagan world, given by Cicero in his books De Divinatione. In the works of Josephus there are occasionally suggestions of naturalistic explanations of O.T. miracles; but these seem rather thrown out for the purpose of gratifying sceptical pagan readers than as expressions of his own belief. The other chief authorities for Jewish opinion are Maimonides's Moreh Nebochim, lib. 2, c. 35, and the Pirke Aboth, in Surenhusius's Mishna, 4:469, and Abrabanel, Miphaloth Eloim, page 93.

Dean Trench, in his classification of the objectors, places the Jewish first, then follows with the heathen (Celsus, etc.), and puts as third in the list the pantheistic objectors led by Spinoza. He evidently regards Cardan (De Contradictione Medicorum, 2, tract. 2), and those other Italian atheists  who referred the Christian miracles to the influence of the stars, as unworthy of notice. If these be omitted, as Trench has done, the controversy in the modern Christian world regarding miracles may be said to date back to the 17th century, and to have been ushered in by Spinoza's Tractatus Theologici Politici, “which contained the germ of almost all the infidel theories that have since appeared.” Rationalists since the days of Spinoza have opposed the reality and credibility of miracles, while the adherents of the modern (formal) supernaturalism rested belief in revelation especially on that branch of evidence. One of these objections, urged by Spinoza, and repeated in various forms by subsequent writers, is thus stated by dean Mansel: “The laws of nature are the decrees of God, and follow necessarily from the perfection of the divine nature; they must therefore be eternal and immutable, and must extend to all possible events. Therefore, to admit an exception to these laws is to suppose that God's order is broken, and that the divine work is but an imperfect expression of the divine will.

This objection is perfectly intelligible in the mouth of a pantheist, with whom God and nature are convertible terms, and a divine supernatural act is a self-contradiction but it is untenable in any system which admits a personal God distinct from nature, and only partially manifested in it. In such a system nature is not infinite, as Spinoza makes it, but finite. There is a distinction between the actual and the possible; between the visible world as a limited system, with limited laws, and the whole mind of God, embracing all possible systems as well as the present. From this point of view, nature, as actually existing, does express a portion, and a portion only, of the divine purpose; the miracle expresses another portion belonging to a different and more comprehensive system. But in addition to this consideration, even the actual world furnishes us with an answer to the objection. God's order, we have too much reason to know, actually is broken. His will is not carried out. Unless we make God the author of evil, we must admit that sin is a violation of his will, a breach made in his natural order, however impossible it may be to give an account of its origin. The pantheist evades the difficulty by denying that evil has any real existence; but to the theist, who admits its existence, it is conclusive evidence that, as a fact, however little we may understand how it can be, the world, as it exists, is not a perfect expression of God's law and will. The miracle, as thus viewed, belongs to a spiritual system appointed to remedy the disorders of the natural system; and against the self-complacent theory which tells us that disorders in the natural system are impossible, we have the witness of a melancholy experience which tells us that they are  actually there. Thus viewed, the miracle is in one sense natural, in another supernatural. It is natural as forming a part of the higher or spiritual system; it is supernatural as not forming a part of the lower or material system. The same considerations may serve to obviate another form of the same objection — a form in which it is likewise suggested by Spinoza, though developed by other writers in a form more adapted to the language of theism. We are told that it is more worthy of God to arrange a plan which shall provide by its original laws for all possible contingencies than one which requires a special interposition to meet a special emergency. We know so little about the process of creating and governing a world, that it is difficult for us to judge what method of doing so is most worthy of God but this whole objection proceeds on the gratuitous assumption that the plan of the world, as it exists in the counsels of God, must be identical with the plan of the world as it is contemplated by man in relation to physical laws. Doubtless the miracle, like any other event, was foreseen by God from the beginning, and formed part of his eternal purpose; but it does not therefore follow that it is included within that very limited portion of his purpose which is apprehended by man as a system of physical laws. To Omnipotence no one event is more difficult than another; to Omniscience no one event is more wonderful than another.

The distinction between miracles and ordinary events, as has already been observed, is a distinction, not in relation to God, but in relation to man. Moreover, even from the human point of view, the miracle is not wrought for a physical, but for a moral purpose; it is not an interposition to adjust the machinery of the material world, but one to promote the spiritual welfare of mankind. The very conception of a revealed, as distinguished from a natural religion, implies a manifestation of God different in kind from that which is exhibited by the ordinary course of nature; and the question of the probability of a miraculous interposition is simply that of the probability of a revelation being given at all.” A list of the principal replies to the pantheistic objectors may be seen in Fabricius, Delectus Argumentorum, etc., c. 43, page 697 (Hamburg, 1726). A full account of the controversy in England with the deists during the last century will be found in Leland's View of the Deistical Writers (reprinted at London, 1836). The debate was renewed about the middle of that century by the publication of Hume's celebrated essay, which teaches that “a miracle is a violation of the laws of nature; and as a firm and unalterable experience has established these laws, the proof against a miracle, from the very nature of the fact, is as entire as any argument from experience can possibly be imagined.” According to the  position taken in the preceding remarks by the dean of Canterbury, it cannot with any accuracy be said that a miracle is “a violation of the laws of nature.” It is the effect of a supernatural cause, acting along with and in addition to the natural causes constituting the system of the world. It is produced therefore, by a different combination of causes from that which is at work in the production of natural phenomena. The laws of nature are only general expressions of that uniform arrangement according to which the same causes invariably produce the same effect.

They would be violated by the production, at different times, of different effects from the same cause; but they are not violated when different effects are produced from different causes. The experience which testifies to their uniformity tells us only what effects may be expected to follow from a repetition of the same cause; it cannot tell us what effects will follow from the introduction of a different cause. This, which is in substance the answer given to Hume by Brown, appears the most satisfactory among the various arguments by which the sceptical philosopher's position has been assailed. It is questioned by some of the critics of Hume (notably Sir William Hamilton; comp. Hamilton's Reid, pages 129, 444, 457, 489), whether his sceptical arguments are offered in a spirit of hostility to the processes of common-sense and the truths of religion, and not rather in a spirit of hostility to philosophy itself, by representing the results of its analysis as equally probable in favor of and against two opposite directions of thought. The form of dialogue which is adopted by Hume in this discussion favors somewhat this construction; but it cannot be reconciled with the impression left upon the unbiased mind that Hume had no confidence in speculation of any kind when applied to supersensual or spiritual beings and relations (comp. Ueberweg, Hist. Philos. 2:379). The ablest replies to Hume's arguments were sent forth by Principal Campbell in his Dissertation on Miracles; Hey, Norrisian Lectures, 1:127 sq.; Elrington, Donellan Lectures (Dublin, 1796); Dr. Thomas Brown, On Cause and Effect; Paley,. Evidences of Christianity (Introduction); Archbp. Whately, Logic (Appendix); and Historic Doubts respecting Napoleon Bonaparte; Dean Ryall, Propaedia Prophetica (reprinted, 1854); Bp. Douglas, Criterion, or Miracles Examined, etc. (Lond. 1754); Farrar, Critical Hist. of Free Thought, page 150 sq. SEE HOME.

Within the last few years the controversy has been reopened by the late professor Baden Powell in the Unity of Worlds, and some remarks on the study of evidences published in the now-celebrated volume of Essays and Reviews. See Goodwin, in Am. Theol. Rev. July 1861; Christian Renzembrance; July 1861.  From England the controversy shifted again to the Continent, and finds, its ablest representatives against the supernaturalists now not only in the camp of the atheistic and pantheistic, but also among theologians, and dean Trench therefore adopts as his next or fifth class those who regard miracles, as such, only subjectively, placing as its standard-bearer the celebrated Schleiermacher, who advanced a doctrine as incompatible with any belief in a real miracle as was that taught by Hume. “A miracle,” says Schleiermacher, “has a positive relation, by which it extends to all that is future, and a negative relation, which in a certain sense affects all t at is past. In so far as that does not follow which would have followed, according to the natural connection of the aggregate of finite causes, in so far an effect is hindered, not by the influence of other natural counteracting causes belonging to the same series, but notwithstanding the concurrence of all effective causes to the production of the effect. Everything, therefore, which from all past time contributed to this effect is in a certain measure annihilated; and instead of the interpolation of a single supernatural agent into the course of nature, the whole conception of nature is destroyed. On the positive side, something takes place which is conceived as incapable of following from the aggregate of finite causes. But, inasmuch as this event itself now becomes an actual link in the chain of nature, every future event must be other than it would have been had this one miracle not taken place.” On this and other grounds, Schleiermacher is led to maintain that there is no real distinction between the natural and the supernatural; the miracles being only miraculous relatively to us, through our imperfect. knowledge of the hidden causes in nature, by means of which they were wrought. “This objection,” says dean Mansel, “proceeds on an assumption which is not merely unwarranted, but actually contradicted by experience. It assumes that the system of material nature is a rigid, not an elastic system; that it is one which obstinately resists the introduction of new forces, not one which is capable of adapting itself to them. We know by experience that the voluntary actions of men can be interposed among the phenomena of matter, and exercise an influence over them, so that certain results may be produced or not, according to the will of a man, without affecting the stability of the universe, or the coherence of its parts as a system. What the will of man can effect to a small extent, the will of God can surely effect to a greater extent; and this is a sufficient answer to the objection which declares the miracle to be impossible; though we may not be able to say with certainty whether it is actually brought to pass in this or in some other way. There may be many means, unknown to us, by which  such an events may be produced; but if it can be produced in any way it is not impossible.”

The rationalists, thus encouraged by the mediating theologians, endeavored to explain the miraculous as something natural, while the natural philosophers asserted that nature transfigured by spirit (the blending of the two in one) is the only true miracle. But thus the reality of the miracle (in the scriptural sense) was destroyed, and it was regarded simply as the symbolical expression of a speculative idea. See Schelling, Methode, pages 181, 203; and comp. Bockshammer and Rosenkranz, cited in Strauss, Dogmatik, page 244 sq. Bockshammer (Freiheit der Willens, transl. by Kaufman, Andov. 1840) says that what is willed in the spirit of truth and purity with a mighty will, is willed in the Spirit of God, and it is only a postulate of reason that nature cannot withstand such a will. Hence Christ is the great miracle-worker. Rosenkranz (Encykl. d. Theol. page 160) defines miracle as nature determined by spirit; spirit is the basis of nature, and hence nature cannot limit it. This power was fully concentrated in Christ.]

The natural interpretation of miracles rather served the purposes of rationalism, while the. adherents of modern speculative philosophy gave the preference to the hypothesis that the miracles related in Scripture are myths, because it is more agreeable to the negative tendency of that school — that the antecedent improbability of a miracle taking place must always outweigh that of the testimony in its favor being false; and thus that the occurrence of a miracle, if not impossible, is at least incapable of satisfactory proof. Such is in the main the argument of Hume, but it came more recently to be revived and assumed as an axiomatic principle by the so-called naturalistic, or, better, rationalistic Paulus and by the historico- critical school, represented mainly by Woolston, Strauss, and Renan. “The fallacy of this objection,” says dean Mansel, “consists in the circumstance that it estimates the opposed probabilities solely on empirical grounds; i.e., on the more or less frequent occurrence of miraculous events as compared with false testimony. If it is ever possible that an event of comparatively rare occurrence may, in a given case and under certain circumstances, be more credible than one of more ordinary occurrence, the entire argument falls to the ground in reference to such cases. And such a case is actually presented by the Christian miracles. The redemption of the world is an event unique in the world's history: it is therefore natural to expect that the circumstances accompanying it should be unique also. The importance of that redemption furnishes a ‘distinct particular reason' for miracles, if the  divine purpose can be furthered by them. Under these circumstances the antecedent probability is for the miracles, not against; them, and cannot be outweighed by empirical inductions drawn from totally different data, relating to the physical, not to the religious condition of the world. It must, however, be always remembered that abstract and general considerations like the above, though necessary to meet the unbelieving objections which are unhappily rife on this subject, do not constitute the grounds of our belief in the miracles of Scripture, especially those of Christ.

The abstract argument is the stronghold of scepticism, and to deal with it at all it is necessary to meet it on its own ground. On the other hand, the strength of the Christian argument rests mainly on the special contents of the Gospel narrative, particularly as regards the character of the Saviour portrayed in it, and the distinctive nature of his miracles as connected with his character, and on the I subsequent history of the Christian Church. It is far easier to talk in general terms about the laws of nature, and the impossibility of their violation, than to go through the actual contents of the Gospels in detail, and show how it is possible that such a narrative could have been written, and how the events described in it could have influenced, as they have, the subsequent history of the world, on any other supposition than that of its being a true narrative of real events. Accordingly we find that, while the several attacks on the Gospel miracles in particular, with whatever ability they may have been conducted, and whatever temporary popularity they may have obtained, seem universally destined to a speedy extinction beyond the possibility of revival, the general a priori objection still retains its hold on men's minds, and is revived from time to time, after repeated refutations, as often as the changing aspects of scientific progress appear to offer the opportunity of a plausible disguise of an old sophism in new drapery.

The minute criticisms of Woolston and Paulus on the details of the Gospel history are utterly dead and buried out of sight; and those of Strauss show plain indications of being doomed to the same fate, though supported for a while by a spurious alliance with a popular philosophy. And the failure which is manifest in such writers, even while they confine themselves to the merely negative task of criticising the Gospel narrative, becomes still more conspicuous when they proceed to account for the origin of Christianity by positive theories of their own. The naturalistic theory of Paulus breaks down under the sheer weight of its own accumulation of cumbrous and awkward explanations; while the mythical hypothesis of Strauss is found guilty of the logical absurdity of deducing the premise from the conclusion: it assumes that men invented an imaginary  life of Jesus because they believed him to be the Messiah, when the very supposition that the life is imaginary leaves the belief in the Messiahship unexplained and inexplicable. On the other hand, the a priori reasonings of Spinoza and Hume exhibit a vitality which is certainly not due to their logical conclusiveness, but which has enabled them in various disguises to perplex the intellects and insettle the faith of a different generation from that for which they were first written. Hence it is that a writer who is required, by the exigencies of his own day, to consider the question of miracles from an apologetic point of view, finds himself compelled to dwell mainly on the abstract argument concerning miracles in general, rather than on the distinctive features which characterize the Christian miracles in particular. The latter are the more pleasant and the more useful theme, when the object is the edification of the believer; the former is indispensable when it is requisite to controvert the positions of the unbeliever. There is, however, one phase of the sceptical argument which may be met by considerations of the special rather than of the general kind. It has been objected that no testimony can prove a miracle as such. ‘Testimony,' we are told, ‘can apply only to apparent, sensible facts; testimony can only prove an extraordinary and perhaps inexplicable occurrence or phenomenon; that it is due to supernatural causes is entirely dependent on the previous belief and assumptions of the parties.'

Whatever may be the value of this objection as applied to a hypothetical case, in which the objector may select such occurrences and such testimonies as suit his purpose, it is singularly inapplicable to the works actually recorded as having been done by Christ and his apostles. It may, with certain exceptions, be applicable to a case in which the assertion of a supernatural cause rests solely on the testimony of the spectator of the fact; but it is not applicable to those in which the cause is declared by the performer. Let us accept, if we please, merely as a narrative of ‘apparent sensible facts,' the history of the cure ‘of the blind and dumb demoniac, or of the” lame man at the Beautiful Gate; but we cannot place the same restriction upon the words of our Lord and of St. Peter, which expressly assign the supernatural cause If I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you.' ‘By the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth doth this man stand here before you whole.' We have here, at least, a testimony reaching to the supernatural; and if that testimony be admitted in these cases the same cause becomes the most reasonable and probable that can be assigned to the other wonderful works performed by the same persons. For if it be admitted that our Lord exercised a  supernatural power at all, there to use the words of bishop Butler, ‘no more presumption worth mentioning against his having exerted this miraculous power in a certain degree greater, than in a certain degree less; in one or two more instances, than in one or two fewer.' This brings us to the consideration on which the most important part of this controversy must ultimately rest; namely, that the true evidence on behalf of the Christian miracles is to be estimated, not by the force of testimony in general, as compared with antecedent improbability, but by the force of the peculiar testimony by which the Christian miracles are supported, as compared with the antecedent probability or improbability that a religion of such a character should have been first introduced into the world of superhuman agency. The miracles of Christ, and, as the chief of them all, that great crowning miracle of his resurrection, are supported by all the testimony which they derived from his own positive declarations concerning them, taken in conjunction with the record of his life, and the subsequent history of the Christian religion The alternative lies between accepting that testimony, as it is given, or regarding the Gospels as a fiction, and the Christian faith as founded on imposture.

n adopting this argument, we do not, as is sometimes said, reason ill a circle, employing the character of Christ as a testimony in favor of the miracles, and the miracles again as a testimony in favor — of the character of Christ. For the character of Christ is contemplated in two distinct aspects: first, as regards his human perfectness; and, secondly, as regards his superhuman mission, and powers. The first bears witness to the miracles, the miracles bear witness to the second. When our Lord represents himself as a human example to be imitated by his human followers, he lays stress on those facts of his life which indicate his human goodness: ‘Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly of heart.' When, on the other hand, he represents himself as divinely commissioned for a special purpose, he appeals to the superhuman evidence of his miracles as authenticating that mission: ‘The works which the Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do, bear witness of me that the Father hath sent me.' It is true that the evidence of the miracles, as addressed to us, has a different aspect, and rests on different grounds, from that which belonged to them at the time when they were first performed. But this change has not diminished their force as evidences, though it has somewhat changed its direction. If we have not the advantage of seeing and hearing and questioning those who were eye-witnesses of the miracles, the deficiency is fully supplied by the additional testimony that has accrued to us, in the  history of Christianity, from their day to ours.

If we have stricter conceptions of physical law, and of the uniformity of nature, we have also higher evidence of the existence of a purpose worthy of the exercise of God's sovereign power over nature. If the progress of science has made many things easy of performance at the present day which would have seemed miraculous to the men of the 1st century, it has also shown more clearly how inimitable and unapproachable are the miracles of Christ, in the maturity of science no less than in its infancy. And when it is objected that ‘if miracles were, in the estimation of a former age, among the chief supports of a former Christianity, they are at present among the main difficulties and hinderances to its acceptance,' we may fairly ask, What is this Christianity which might be more easily believed if it had no miracles? Is it meant that the Gospel narrative, in general, would be more easy to believe were the miracles taken out of it? The miracles are so interwoven with the narrative that the whole texture would be destroyed by their removal. Or is it meant that the great central fact in the apostolic preaching — the resurrection of Christ — would be more natural and credible if he who thus marvellously rose from the dead had in his lifetime exhibited no signs of a power superior to that of his fellow-men? Or is it meant that the great distinctive doctrines of Christianity — such as those of the Trinity and the Incarnation — might be more readily accepted were there no miracles in the Scripture which contains them? We can scarcely imagine it to be seriously maintained that it would be easier to believe that the second person of the divine Trinity came on earth in the form of man, were it also asserted that while on earth he gave no signs of a power beyond that of ordinary men. In short, it is difficult to understand on what ground it can be maintained that the miracles are a hinderance to the belief in Christianity, except on a ground which asserts also that there is no distinctive Christianity in which to believe.

It may with more truth be said that the miraculous element, which forms so large a portion of Christianity, has its peculiar worth and service at the present day as a protest and safeguard against two forms of unchristian thought to which an intellectual and cultivated age is liable — pantheism, the danger of a deeply speculative philosophy; and materialism, the danger of a too exclusive devotion to physical science. Both these, in different ways, tend to deify nature and the laws of nature, and to obscure the belief in a personal God distinct from and above nature; against both these, so long as the Christian religion lasts, the miracles of Christ are a perpetual witness; and in so witnessing they perform a service to religion different in kind, hut not less important than  that which they performed at the beginning. The miracles of the O.T. may be included in the above argument, if we regard, as Scripture requires us to regard, the earlier dispensation as an anticipation of and preparation for the coming of Christ. Many of the events in the history of Israel as a people are typical of corresponding events in the life of the Saviour; and the earlier miraculous history is a supernatural system preparing the way for the later consummation of God's supernatural providence in the redemption of the world by Christ. Not only the occasional miracles of the O.T. history, but, as bishop Atterbury remarks, some of the established institutions under the law — the gift of prophecy, the Shechinah, the Urim and Thummim, the sabbatical year — are of a supernatural character, and thus manifest themselves as parts of a supernatural system, ordained for and leading to the completion of the supernatural in Christ.”

A question has also been raised whether it is not possible that miracles may be wrought by evil spirits in support of a false doctrine. This question affects Christian evidences simply, and in this line the only question that can practically be raised is whether the Scripture miracles — supposing them not to be pure fabrications — are real miracles wrought by divine power, or normal events occurring in the course of nature, or produced by human means. Indeed, the possibility of real miracles other than divine is a question rather of curiosity than of practical value. An able discussion of this subject will be found, in Farmer's Dissertation, though the author has weakened his argument by attempting too much. So far as he undertakes to show that there is no sufficient evidence that miracles actually have been wrought by evil spirits in behalf of a false religion, his reasoning is logical and satisfactory, and his treatment of the supposed miracles of the Egyptian magicians is in this respect highly successful. But when he proceeds from the historical to the theological argument, and maintains that it is inconsistent with God's perfections that such miracles ever should be wrought, he appears to assume more than is warranted either by reason or by Scripture, and to deduce a consequence which is not required by the former, and appears difficult to reconcile with the latter.

That there may be such a thing as “the working of Satan, with all power and signs and lying wonders,” and that such working will actually be manifested before the last day in support of Antichrist, is the natural interpretation of the language of Scripture. That such a manifestation has as yet taken place is, to say the least, a conclusion not established by existing evidence.  Another question has been raised as to the means of distinguishing between true and false miracles, meaning by the latter term phenomena pretended to be miraculous, but in fact either natural events or human impostures or fabrications. Various rules for distinguishing between these have been given by several authors, the best known being the four rules laid down in Leslie's Short and Easy Method with the Deists, and the three given in bishop Douglas's Criterion. and to some extent the six given by bishop Stillingfleet in Origines Sacra, book 2, chapter 10. and the very acute observations in a similar kind of work, J.H. Newman's Life of Apollonius Tyanceus,. published in the Encyclopedia Metropolitana. Yet the practical value of these rules, though considerable as compared with the inquiry previously noticed, is available rather for particular and temporary phases of controversy than for general and perpetual edification. A more permanent principle in relation to this question is suggested by Leslie in his remarks' on the pretended miracles of Apollonius, where he shows that the assumed miracles, even if admitted, have no important connection with our belief or practice. “But now,” he says, “to sum up all, let us suppose to the utmost that all this said romance were true, what would it amount to?

Only that Apollonius did such things. What then? What if he were so virtuous a person that God should have given him the power to work several miracles? This would noways hurt the argument that is here brought against the deists, because Apollonius set up no new religion, nor did he pretend that he was sent with any revelation from heaven to introduce any new sort of worship of God; so ‘that it is of no consequence to the world whether these were true or pretended miracles; whether Apollonius were an honest man or a magician; or whether there ever were such a man or not. For he left no law or gospel behind him to be received upon the credit of those miracles which he is said to have wrought.” “To this,” says dean Mansel, “it may be added that there. is an enormous a priori improbability against miracles performed without any professed object, as compared with those which belong to a system that has exercised a good and permanent influence in the world. This improbability can only be overcome by a still more enormous mass of evidence in their favor; and until some actual case can be pointed out in which such evidence exists, the unimportance of a reported series of miracles is a valid reason for withholding belief in them, The Scripture miracles, in this respect, stand alone and apart from all others as regards the evidence of their reality, combined with their significance, if real.”  Among the most important works on Scripture miracles, and not incidentally mentioned in the article on Christian Evidences, are: Fleetwood, Essay upon Miracles (1701); Locke, Discourse of Miracles (1701-2); Pearce, The Miracles of Jesus Vindicated [in reply to Woolston] (1729); Smallbrook, Vindication of our Saviour's Miracles [in reply to Woolston] (1729, 2 volumes, 8vo); Lardner, Vindication of Three of our blessed Saviour's Miracles [in reply to Woolston] (1729); Sherlock, The Trial of the Witnesses (1729); Stevenson, Conference upon the Miracles of our Saviour (1730, 8vo); Sykes, Credibility of Miracles, etc. (1749, 8vo); Douglas, The Criterion (1754); Claparede, Miracles of the Gospel [in answer to Rousseau] (Lond. 1758, 8vo); Campbell, Dissertation on Miracles (1763); Farmer, Dissertation on Miracles (1771); Bishop Douglas, Criterion of Miracles (1774, 8vo); De Haen, De Miraculis (Francf. 1776, 8vo); Scherer, Ausf. Erklarung der Weissagungen d. N.T. (Lpz. 1803, 8vo); The Hulsean Prize Essay for 1814; Collyer, Miracles (1812); Penrose, Evidence of the Scripture Miracles (1826); Le Bas, Considerations on Miracles (1828); Newman, Life of Apollonius Tyaneus, in Encycl. Metrop. [written before his defection to Rome]; Tholuck, Glaubenswurdikeit d. evangel. Gesch. (Hamb. 1837); Muller, Disputatio de Miraculoarum Jesu Christi Natura et Necessitate (1839-1841); Nitzsch, in Studien und Kritiken of 1843 Wardlaw, On Miracles (1852; New York, 1853); Rothe, in Studien und Kritiken of 1858; Trench, Miracles of our Lord (6th ed. 1858); Koestlin, De Miraculorum, quae Christus et primi ejus discipulifecerunt, natura et ratione (1860); Evans, Christian Miracles (Lond. 1861); McCosh, The Supernatural in Relation to the Natural (1862); Mozley, Lectures on Miracles (Bampton for 1865; Lond. 1865, 8vo); Fisher, Supernat. Origin of Christianity (1865); Duke of Argyle, Reign of Law (1866); Litton, Miracles (Lond. 1817); Uhlhorn, Modern Rep. of the Life of Jesus (Bost. 1868); Fowler, Mozby and Tyndale on Miracles (Lond. 1868); Archbishop of York, Limits of Philos. Inquiry (Edinb. 1868); Mountford, Miracles, Past and Present (Boston, 1870. 12mo); Bender, Wunderbegrid. N.T. (Frankfort a.M. 1873); Upham, Star of our Lord (N.Y. 1873, 8vo); Belcher, Our Lord's Miracles of Healing Considered (London. 1873); Fowle, Religion and Science (1873, 8vo); Christlieb, Mod. Doubts (1874), chapter 5; Bushnell, Nature and the Supernatural (new ed. 1874); Cudworth, Intellectual System. (see Index in volume 3): Watson, Theol. Instit. 1:73 sq., 146 sq., 234; Hodge, Systematic Theol. volume 1, chapter 12; Hagenbach, Hist. Doctr. 1:314 sq., 414 sq.; 2:467 sq.; Haag, Histoire des Dogmas Chretiens, part 1,  chapter 4, et al.; J. Pye Smith, First Lines of Christian Theol. page 62 sq., 582 sq., et al.; Pascal, Pensees, part 2, art. 19, § 9; Lyall, Prop. Proph. page 441; Kitto, Cclop. Bibl. Lit.: s.v.; Smith, Bibl. Dict. s.v.; Christian Magazine, 1797; Christian Instructor, 17:145; Christian Rev. July 1856; Theol. Rev. volume 4; For. Qu. volume 22; Bibl. Sacra, volumes 2 and 7; North Brit. Rev. February 1846, art. 8; April 1862, art. 3; North Amer. Rev. July 1860; Journ. of Sac. Lit. April-October 1854; January 1856; South. Presb. Rev. 1856; South. Qu. Rev. July 1857; Princet. Rev. April 1856; Amer. Theol. Rev. July 1861; Christian Remembrancer, July 1861; (Lond.) Qu. Rev. October 1862, page 242; Amer. Presb. Rev. April 1863, art. 1; January 1865; Brit. and For. Rev. 10:11, 55; Bulletin Theologique, September 1863, page 137; Theol. Eclectic, volume 5, No. 3; Westm. Rev. January 1818, page 106; Meth. Rev. April 1853, page 181; 1870, page 299; 1872 (January), page 154; Brit. and For. Ev. Rev. 1863 (January), pages 29-55; Blackwood's Magazine, June 1867; Bibl. Sacra, April 1863, art. 3; 1867, page 189; Jahrb. deutscher Theol. 1869, page 572; Contemp. Rev. May 1869, page 89 sq.; November 1872, art. 5; Christian Qu. October 1873, art. 3; Brit. Qu. Rev. July 1873, art. 6; Bapt. Qu. Rev. 1870; January 1874, art. 1; Qu. Rev. of Luth. Ch. July 1874, art. 5.

## Miracles, Ecclesiastical[[@Headword:Miracles, Ecclesiastical]]

             The Port Royalists taught that “there would never have been any false miracles if there had been none true.” Many Protestants, taking hold of this wise adage, set down as incontrovertible the assertion that the so-called “miracles” wrought in the Church since the patristic period are not of God, because they are not prophesied as were those of the Israelitish and apostolic days (see Exo 3:12; Mar 16:17-18), and that, as Dr. Hodge has it “while there is nothing in the N.T. inconsistent with the occurrence of miracles in the post-apostolic age of the Church... when the apostles had finished their work, the necessity of miracles, so far as the great end they were intended to accomplish was concerned, ceased” (Syst. Theol. 3:452).

This position of Protestant writers seems to gain strength from a close examination of the practices of the early patristic period, for it is an uncontested statement that during the first hundred years after the death of the apostles we hear little or nothing of the working of miracles by the early Christians. Says bishop Douglas, “If we except the testimonies of Papias and Irenaeus, who speak of raising the dead... I can find no  instances of miracles mentioned by the fathers before the 4th century” (Criterion, pages 228-232); and if we come down to the fathers of the 4th century, we find that they freely speak of the age of miracles as past; that such interpositions, being no longer necessary, were no longer to be expected. Whatever may appear to the contrary in the more oratorical and panegyrical writings of the fathers, whenever they address themselves theologically to the question of miracles, they admit clearly and unreservedly the truth that this kind of evidence has ceased in the Christian Church.

The miracles of divine. power (according to St. Augustine) are now to be sought in the works of nature, in the wonders of its ever- recurring changes, and in the regular course of the divine providence. After enumerating the miracles of Christ, he asks, “Cur (inquis) ista modo non fiunt? Quia non moverent nisi mira essent; at si solita essentia mira non essent” (De Utilitate Credendi), which he only so far qualifies in his retractions as not absolutely to deny the possibility of a modern miracle. In another place he speaks of “miracles not being permitted to last to our times,” or to survive the propagation of Christianity over the world (De vera Relogione, c. 25, § 47). St. Chrysostom bears the same testimony to the cessation of miracles in his beautiful sermons on the Resurrection and on the Feast of Pentecost (Ser. 32 and 36), where he solves the same question “Why are no signs and miracles intrusted to us now?” — by claiming those higher miracles of grace and inward change which enable us to use the prayer of faith, and to exclaim, “Our Father, which art in heaven!” Chrysostom says himself: “Ne itaque ex eo, quod nunc signa non fiunt, argumentum ducas tune etiam non fuisse. Etenim tune utiliter fiebant, et nunc utiliter non fiunt” (In Epistolam i. ad Corinth. Homil. 6:2; comp. Augustine, De Civitate Dei, 22:8, 1). Yet these fathers also supply us with accounts of deeds wrought by Christian believers, which the Roman Catholic Church has pleased to stamp as miraculous, but which these early writers of the Church mark out clearly as natural results. If indeed they pleased to call them miracles, they yet betray that even in their own view there was a vast difference between the scriptural and ecclesiastical miracles, and that they did not count them as of the same category. St. Augustine, referring to the wonderful deeds wrought by the faithful of the Church in his day, concedes also that they were not wrought with the same lustre as in the apostolic days, nor with the same significance and authority for the whole Christian world (comp. Fr. Nitzsch, jun., Augustinus' Lehre vom Wunder [Berlin, 18651, page 32 sq.).

Bishop Douglas says that these miraculous workings were confined to “the cures of diseases, particularly  the cures of daemoniacs, by exorcising them; which last indeed seems to be their favorite standing miracle;” and Prof. Newman, one of the richest prizes gained by the Romanists from the Church of England in this generation, is candid enough to admit the contrast between the scriptural and what he calls ecclesiastical miracles. He says, “The miracles of Scripture are, as a whole, grave, simple, and majestic: those of ecclesiastical history often partake of what may not unfitly be called a romantic character, and of that wildness and inequality which enters into the notion of romance.” “It is obvious,” he says elsewhere, “to apply what has been said to the case of the miracles of the Church, as compared with those in Scripture. Scripture is to us a garden of Eden, and its creations are beautiful as well as very good; but when we pass from the apostolic to the following ages, it is as if we left the choicest valleys of the earth, the quietest and most harmonious scenery, and the most cultivated soil for the luxuriant wilderness of Africa or Asia, the natural home or kingdom of brute nature uninfluenced by man” (Two Essays on Scripture Miracles and on Ecclesiastical, 2d ed. Lond. 1870, pages 116, 150). Dr. Hodge, in commenting upon Romish miracles, quotes these words of Prof. Newman, and says of them, “A more felicitous illustration can hardly be imagined. The contrast between the Gospels and the legends of the saints is that between the divine and the human, and even the animal; between Christ (with reverence be it spoken) and St. Anthony” (3:455).

The Roman Catholic Church, notwithstanding the want of any trustworthy patristic testimony, asserts that the power of performing all manner of miraculous works remains with the Church since the days of its first founding, henceforth and forever. “Roman Catholics,” says Butler, “relying with entire confidence on the promises of Christ [quoting Act 2:3 sq.; Joh 14:12; Mar 16:17-18], believe that the power of working miracles was given by Christ to his Church, and that it never has been, and never will be withdrawn from her” (Book of the Rom. Cath. Ch. Letter 3 page 37 sq.; see also page 46 sq.). Another, even greater celebrity, the learned Bellarmine, goes so far as to prove from this continuity of the miraculous power in the Church of Rome that the Protestant Church, lacking this, is manifestly not of God. He argues that miracles are necessary to evince any new faith or extraordinary mission; that miracles are efficacious and sufficient. By the former, he then tells us, may be deduced that the Church is not to be found among Protestants; by the latter, that it is most assuredly among Catholics: “Undecima nota est gloria miraculorum; sunt autem duo fundamenta praemittenda. Unum quod  miracula sint necessaria ad novam fidem vel extraordinariam missionem persuadendam. Alterum, quod sint efficacia et sufficientia; nam ex priore deducemus non esse apud adversarios veram ecclesiam, ex posteriore deducemus eamr esse apud nos. Quod igitur miracula sint necessaria, probatur primo Scripturae testimonio, Exodus 4 cum Moses mitteretur a Deo ad populum, ac diceret: ‘Non credent mihi, neque audient vocem meam.' Non respondet Deus, ‘Debent credere, velint nolint,' sed dedit illi potestatem faciendi miracula, et ait: ‘Ut credant, quod appartuerit tibi Dominus,' etc. Et in Novo Testamento, Matthew 10. Euntes, praedicate, dicentes: Appropinquovit regnum coelorum; infirmos curate, mortuos suscitate, leprosos mundate, daemones ejicite.' Joan. 15: ‘Si opera non fecissem in eis quae nemo alius fecit, peccatum non haberent'' (Opera, volume 2; De Notis Ecclesiae, lib. 4 cap. 14 col. 206 D [Col. 1619]). Even the liberal-minded Dr. Milner, who displayed learning in almost every department of science; who possessed experience, intelligence, and taste; who wrote well and reasoned acutely; teaches, in a letter devoted to the subject of miracles, that “if the Roman Catholic Church were not the only true Church, God would not have given any attestation in its favor... Having demonstrated the distinction,” by which he means the exclusive holiness of the Roman Catholic Church, he professes himself “prepared to show that God has borne testimony to that holiness by the many and incontestable (?) miracles he has wrought in her favor, from the age of the apostles down to the present time” (Lett. 26, page 163 sq., et al.).

The reasoning of Dr. Milner brings us to reconsider the statement made in the early part of this article that “no miraculous events mark the history of the Church after the days of the apostles, if we may depend on the authority of the patristic writers.” Romanists frequently refer us to what St. Ignatius, who flourished in the 1st century after Christ, relates about the wild beasts which were let loose upon the martyrs being frequently restrained by a divine power from hurting them, and also to the miracle which deterred the apostate Julian (this, however, brings us to the 4th century) from rebuilding the Temple of Jerusalem. As to the first of these miraculous workings, a single observation must suffice. The words of Ignatius are: “Ne sicut in aliis, territae sint et non eos tetigerunt;” implying that the fierce animals did not behave as in ordinary cases, but that, being terrified at the sight of the surrounding spectators, they refused to fight. Ignatius himself considered the occurrence purely accidental and natural; otherwise he would have given the glory to God, and have besought him to  repress their fury. As to the second miracle, it must of necessity have occurred, or the prophecy which related to it could not be fulfilled (Dan 9:27).

Says Elliott: “In its exact completion I perfectly agree with Dr. Milner, and for the very reason assigned by Gibbon himself, that if it were not verified, ‘the imperial sophist would have converted the success of his undertaking into a specious' (he should have said solid) ‘argument against the faith of prophecy and the truth of revelation' (Decline and Fall, 4:104). But I am not equally disposed to admit that there were other as extraordinary miracles, besides the one mentioned, since the apostolic age; or, if there were, that they were performed for the purpose alleged by him” (Delin. of Romanism, page 527). Dr. Neander, bishop Kaye, Dr. Schaff, and others, hold to the gradual cessation theory. That is to say, they teach that “there is an antecedent probability that the power of working miracles was not suddenly and abruptly, but gradually withdrawn, as the necessity of such outward and extraordinary attestation of the divine origin of Christianity diminished and gave way to the natural operation of truth and moral suasion.” They also hold that “it is impossible to fix the precise termination, either at the death of the apostles, or their immediate disciples, or the conversion of the Roman empire, or the extinction of the Arian heresy, or any subsequent era, and to sift carefully in each particular case the truth from legendary fiction.” “Most of the statements of the apologists,” says Dr. Schaff, “are couched in general terms, and refer to extraordinary cures from demoniacal possession (which probably includes, in the language of that age, cases of madness, deep melancholy, and epilepsy) and other diseases, by the invocation of the name of Jesus.

Justin Martyr speaks of such cures as a frequent occurrence in Rome and all over the world, and Origen appeals to his own personal observation, but speaks in another place of the growing scarcity of miracles, so as to suggest the gradual cessation theory. Tertullian attributes many, if not most, of the conversions of his day to supernatural dreams and visions, as does also Origen, although with more caution. But in such psychological phenomena it is exceedingly difficult to draw the line of demarcation between natural and supernatural causes, and between providential interpositions and miracles proper. The strongest passage on this subject is found in Ireneus (Adv. haer. 2:31, § 2, and 2:32, § 4), who, in contending against the heretics, mentions, besides prophecies and miraculous cures of daemoniacs, even the raising of the dead among contemporary events taking place in the Catholic Church; but he specifies no particular case or name; and it should be mentioned also that his youth still bordered almost on the Johannean  age” (Ch. History, 1:206, 207). In another place, referring to the testimony of Ambrose and Augustine for belief in a continuation of miracles, Dr. Schaff, while himself advocating the gradual cessation theory, and also the possibility of miraculous power dwelling in the Church of today, teaches, nevertheless, that even the best of patristic testimonies may be impeached if they appear on the witness stand in behalf of miraculous deeds wrought in the Church in post-apostolic days: “We should not be bribed or blinded by the character and authority of such witnesses, since experience sufficiently proves that even the best and most enlightened men cannot wholly divest themselves of superstition and of the prejudices of their age. Recall, e.g., Luther and the apparitions of the devil, the Magnalia of Cotton Mather, the old Puritans and their trials for witchcraft, as well as the modern superstitions of spiritual rappings and table-turnings, by which many eminent and intelligent persons have been carried away” (3:461).

But, differ as we may regarding the cessation or noncessation of miraculous power in the Church of Christ, there is, nevertheless, one point on which Protestants unite in opposing the pretensions of Rome; some betraying an undue dogmatic bias, but all agreeing that it is remarkable that the genuine writings of the ante-Nicene Church are more free from miraculous and superstitious elements than the annals of the Middle Ages, and especially of monasticism. Indeed, it would appear that the Nicene age is the first marked as one of miracles, and that miracles rapidly increased in number from henceforth until they became matters of every-day occurrence. Dr. Isaac Taylor adds: “No such miracles as those of the 4th century were pretended in the preceding sera, when they might seem to be more needed. If, then, these miracles were genuine, they must be regarded as opening a new dispensation” (Anc. Christianity, 2:357). This new dispensation, no doubt, they heralded, for it is manifest that the miracles, of the Nicene age and post-Nicene age “were always intended to propagate the belief of certain rites and doctrines and practices which had crept into the Church; to advance the reputation of some particular chapel or image or religious order, or to countenance opinions, either such as were contested among themselves, or such as the whole Church did not teach” (Bishop Douglas, Criterion, page 40). Says Dr. Taylor: “Whereas the alleged supernatural occurrences related, or appealed to by the earlier Christian writers, are nearly all of an ambiguous kind and such as may, with little difficulty, be understood without either the assumption of miraculous interposition or the imputation of deliberate fraud, it is altogether  otherwise with the miracles of the Church of the 4th, 5th, and 6th centuries, From the period of the Nicene Council and onward miracles of the most astounding kind were alleged to be wrought from day to day, and openly, and in all quarters of the Christian world. These wonders were solemnly appealed to and seriously narrated by the leading persons of the Church, Eastern and Western; and in many instances these very persons — the great men now set up in opposition to the leaders of the Reformation — were themselves the wonder-workers, and have themselves transmitted the accounts of them. But then these alleged miracles were, almost in every instance, wrought expressly in support of those very practices and opinions which stand forward as the points of contrast distinguishing Romanism from Protestantism. We refer especially to the ascetic life-the supernatural properties of the eucharistic elements — the invocation of the saints, or direct praying to them, and the efficacy of their relics; and the reverence or worship due to certain visible and palpable religious symbols” (2:235).

Dr. Hodge, commenting upon these Romish miracles, says, “they admit of being classified on different principles. As to their nature, some are grave and important; others are trifling, childish, and even babyish; others are indecorous; and others are irreverent, and even blasphemous... Another principle on which they may be classified is the design for which they were wrought or adduced. Some are brought forth as proofs of the sanctity of particular persons or places or things; some to sustain particular doctrines, such as purgatory, transubstantiation, the worshipping of the saints and of the Virgin Mary, etc., some for the identification of relics. It is no injustice to the authorities of the Church of Rome to say that whatever good ends these miracles may in any case be intended to serve, they have in the aggregate been made subservient to the accumulation of money and to the increase of power...

The truth of Christianity depends on the historical truth of the account of the miracles recorded in the N.T. The truth of Romanism depends on the truth of the miracles to Which it appeals. What would become of Protestantism if it depended on the demonology of Luther, or the witch- stories of our English forefathers?

The Romish Church, in assuming the responsibility for the ecclesiastical miracles, has taken upon itself a burden which would crush the shoulders of Atlas” (3:456; comp. Princet. Rev. April 1856, art. 5, especially page 272). And Dr. Schaff, who, as we have already seen, inclines to the belief  that miracles may have been wrought in post-apostolic days, and may continue to be wrought today and hereafter, yet ventures to say that “the following weighty considerations rise against the miracles of the Nicene and post-Nicene age; not warranting, indeed, the rejection of all, yet making us at least very cautious and doubtful of receiving them in particular:

1. These miracles have a much lower moral tone than those of the Bible, while in some cases they far exceed them in outward pomp, and make a stronger appeal to our faculty of belief. Many of the monkish miracles are not so much supernatural and above reason as they are unnatural and against reason, attributing even to wild beasts of the desert, panthers and hyenas, with which the misanthropic hermits lived on confidential terms, moral feelings and states, repentance and conversion, of which no trace appears in the N.T.

2. They serve not to confirm the Christian faith in general, but for the most part to support the ascetic life, the magical virtue of the sacrament, the veneration of saints and relics, and other superstitious practices, which are evidently of later origin, and are more or less offensive to the healthy evangelical mind.

3. The further they are removed from the apostolic age, the more numerous they are, and in the 4th century alone there are more miracles than in all the three preceding centuries together, while the reason for them, as against the power of the heathen world, was less.

4. The Church fathers, with all the worthiness of their character in other respects, confessedly lacked a highly-cultivated sense of truth, and allowed a certain justification of falsehood ad majorem Dei gloriam, or fitaus pia, under the misnomer of policy or accommodation (so especially Jerome, Epist. ad Pammachium); with the single exception of Augustine, who, in advance of his age, rightly condemned falsehood in every form.

5. Several Church fathers, like Augustine, Martin of Tours, and Gregory I, themselves concede that in their time extensive frauds with the relics of saints were already practiced; and this is confirmed by the fact that there were not rarely numerous copies of the same relict, all of which claimed to be genuine.

6. The Nicene miracles met with doubt and contradiction even among contemporaries, and Sulpitius Severus makes the important admission that the miracles of St. Martin were better known and more firmly believed in foreign countries than in his own (Dialog. 1:18).

7. Church fathers, like Chrysostom and Augustine, contradict themselves in a measure in sometimes paying homage to the prevailing faith in miracles, especially in their discourses on the festivals of the martyrs, and in soberer moments, and in the calm exposition of the Scriptures, maintaining that miracles, at least in the Biblical sense, had long since ceased (comp. Robertson, Hist. of the Christian Church to Gregory the Great [Lond. 1854], page 334). We must, moreover, remember that the rejection of the Nicene miracles by no means justifies the inference of intentional deception in every case, nor destroys the claim of the great Church teachers to our respect. On the contrary, between the proper miracle and fraud there lie many intermediate steps of self-deception, clairvoyance, magnetic phenomena and cures, and unusual states of the human soul, which is full of deep mysteries, and stands nearer the invisible spirit-world than the every-day mind of the multitude suspects. Constantine's vision of the cross, for example, may be traced to a prophetic dream; and the frustration of the building of the Jewish Temple under Julian, to a special providence, or a historical judgment of God. The mytho-poetic faculty, too, which freely and unconsciously produces miracles among children, may have been at work among credulous monks in the dreary deserts, and magnified an ordinary event into a miracle. In judging of this obscure portion of the history of the Church we must, in general, guard ourselves as well against shallow naturalism and scepticism as against superstitious mysticism, remembering that

“There are more things in heaven and earth

Than are dreamt of in our philosophy” (CI. Hist. 3:463-465).

If we institute a direct and careful comparison between the Biblical and the ecclesiastical miracles, we find, besides matter of fact, as to the certainty of the thing and the reasons of credibility, there is a great difference in the force and efficacy of the former and a confirmation of that for which it is produced, while it is not so in the case of the latter. “Those Biblical miracles,” says Butler, “were generally very beneficial to human nature, doing mighty offices of kindness towards those who were the subjects of  them, such as healing the sick, raising the dead, restoring the deaf, the lame, and the blind, etc.; all which bore an excellent proportion to the great design of redeeming and saving mankind. And if at any time there were any mixture of severity in the ver act, such as striking some dead by a word spoken, or putting others in the immediate possession of the devil by excommunication; yet was even this done either in kindness to posterity, by fixing, in the first institution of things, one or two standing pillars of salt, that might be for example and admonition to after-ages, against some practices that might otherwise in time destroy Christianity; as, in .the first instance, of Ananias and Sapphira, against the sin of hypocrisy; or else to some good purposes for the persons themselves, as in the last instance of excommunication; so in the case of the incestuous person, it was adjudged by Paul, ‘to deliver such a one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus' (1Co 5:5). None of these miracles were such useless, ludicrous actions as the Romish authors have filled their histories with; such as that of St. Berinus, who, ‘being under full sail for France, and half his voyage over, finding he had forgot something, walks out upon the sea, and returns back dryshod;' such as St. Mochua, by his prayer and staff hindering the poor lambs from sucking their dams, when they were running towards them with full appetites; such, again, as St. Francis bespeaking the ass in the kind compellation of brother, ‘to stand quiet till he had done preaching, and not disturb the solemnity;' and such as St. Fiutanus keeping the calf from the cow, that they should neither of them move towards one another; such, in a word, as St. Frimianus and St. Ruadanus, sporting their miracles with each other, as if they had the power given them for no other end but mere trial of skill, or some pretty diversion of bystanders” (Notes, pages 252-258). The Breviary (q.v.) teems with descriptions of all manner of miraculous manifestations, but we have not room to enumerate others here, and must refer the reader to it and to Elliott (Delineation of Romanisnm, pages 527- 543). On the most important so-called miracles claimed by the Church of Rome in modern days, see the articles SEE ST. FRANCIS; SEE HOLY COAT OF TREVES; SEE ST. JANUARIUS; SEE LOURDES; SEE XAVIER, etc. SEE SUPERSTITION; SEE VISIONS.

It appears, moreover, from the writings of many distinguished Roman Catholic authors that the post-Nicene miracles are not generally accepted. Thus Peter, abbot of Cluny, as far back as the 13th century, says: “You know how much. those Church sonnets grieve me” (lib. 5, Epist. 29). He  mentions one of Benedict which he declares contained no less than twenty- four lies. Ludovicus Vives, speaking of the Legenda Aurea, observes: “How unworthy both of God and man is the story of their saints, which, I do not know why, was called the Golden Legend, it having been written by one who had an iron mouth and a leaden heart” (lib. 2 De Currupt. Artib., in fine). And Espencius declares: “No stable is fuller of dung than their legends are of fables” (in 2 Timothy 4 Digress. 21). These authorities might be multiplied to a great extent. We must content ourselves with a few of the leading minds since the reformatory ideas took root in the Church of Rome. First among these we must place the learned French chancellor Gerson, of Paris University, who, when, in the Council of Constance, the canonization of St. Bridget (q.v.) was proposed, thus spoke out: “It cannot be said how much this curiosity for knowing future and hidden things, and for seeing miracles and performing them, hath deluded most persons, and constantly turned them away from true religion. Hence all those superstitions among the people which destroy the Christian religion, while, like the Jews, they only seek a sign, exhibiting to images the worship due to God, and attaching their faith to men yet uncanonized, and to apocryphal writings, more than to the Scriptures themselves.”

In the 15th century the appearance of a rival to the Franciscan visionary in the person of St. Catharine of Sienna as the champion of the more powerful Dominicans, provoked the following utterance from cardinal Cajetan, utterly nullifying the former declarations of the Church in her favor: “It is alleged,” he writes, that St. Bridget had a revelation that the Blessed Virgin was preserved from original sin. But the probability of this opinion is very slender, for it is opposed to very many saints, and none of those alleged were themselves canonized. To St. Bridget, moreover, we may oppose St. Catharine of Sienna, who said that the contrary doctrine had been revealed to her, as the archbishop of Florence relates in the first part of his Summa. And St. Catharine would seem to deserve greater credit, because she was canonized like the other saints, while St. Bridget was canonized in the period of the schism, during the obedience of Boniface IX, in which there was no certain and undoubted pope.” Further on he adds the fatal words: “New revelations against so many saints and ancient doctors must seem to the wise to bring in an angel of Satan transformed into an angel of light, to bring in fancies, and even figments. These, truly, with the so-called miracles which are cited in this cause, are rather for old women than for the holy synod, whence I do not deem them  worthy of mention.” “There is need of great caution,” writes this great divine, “first on account of the miracle itself, inasmuch as Satan transforms himself into an angel of light, and can work many signs and wonders, such as we might deem that none but God could work — as works of healing, power over the elements, and the like. Hence it is said that Antichrist will perform so many miracles in the sight of men that, if it were possible, he would deceive the very elect themselves. Secondly, there is need of caution on the ground of illusions, as happens in the case of prophesyings. Thirdly, it may be urged that signs (according to 1 Corinthians 14 and St. Gregory, Hom. x) are given to the unbelieving, and not to believers; while to the Church as faithful, and not unfaithful, are given the prophetical and apostolical revelations. Hence the way of signs unless not merely a wonder, but a true and indisputable miracle, is wrought before the Roman Church in the most evident manner, ought not to determine any doubtful doctrine; and the reason is, because we have from God an ordinary way for the determination of matters of faith; insomuch that if an angel from heaven were to say anything contrary to this ordinary ‘way he ought not to be believed (Gal 1:8). Add to this that the miracles received by the Church in the canonization of saints, which are most authentic of all, are not, inasmuch as they rest on human testimony, absolutely certain (for it is written, ‘Every man is a liar'); although they may be certain after a human manner. But the certainty of the Christian faith ought not to be certain after a human manner, but ought to have altogether an infallible evidence such as no human being, but only God, can produce. :Hence the apostle Peter, after giving his own testimony to the heavenly voice heard by him in the transfiguration of our Lord, as a human evidence, subjoins: ‘And we have a more sure word of prophecy,' adding that ‘Prophecy came not by the will of man.' Wherefore certainty in the judicial determination of the things of faith must be obtained by divine and not by human testimony” (De Conceptione B.V.f. cap. 1).

We can even go to the chair of St. Peter and learn from some of its incumbents a like disposition to ignore, or even to reject the miraculous manifestations in the Church. Thus pope Gregory XI, having been persuaded by the prophecies of St. Catharine of Sienna to return to Rome from Avignon, “when on his death-bed, and having in his hands the sacred body of Christ, protested before all that they ought to beware of human beings, whether male or female, speaking under pretence of religion the visions of their own brain. For by these (he said) he was led away; and,  setting aside the reasonable advice of his own people, had drawn himself and the Church to the verge of an imminent schism, .unless her merciful Spouse, Jesus, should save her,” which the dreadful result too clearly proved (Gerson. De Exam. Doctrinarum, part 2 consid. 3). Nor need pope Benedict XIV be forgotten. His utterances are clearly laid down in his great work on the Canonization of the Saints (lib. 4 chapter 31, § 21-25).

If from these celebrated Romish authorities we come down to our own day, we find bishop Milner, who is himself an advocate of the doctrine, yet admitting “that a vast number of incredible and false miracles, as well as other fables, have been forged by some and believed by other Catholics in every age of the Church, including that of the apostles. I agree... in rejecting the Legenda Aurea of Jacobus de Voragine, the Speculaim of Vincentius, Belluacensis, the Saints' Lives of the patrician Metaphrastes, and scores of similar legends, stuffed as they are with relations of miracles of every description” (End of Controversy, Lett. 27, pages 175, 176).

It is, however, by no means to be inferred from what we have said that these miraculous exhibitions are confined to the Church of Rome. The Protestants have now and then prophets and visionaries who claim supernatural power. But while the Protestant Church has always discarded the authors, or at least, under the most favorable circumstances, has refused to accord to such exhibitions any divine origin, the Church of Rome clearly teaches that these things are so to be. Hence, occasionally, sects departing from the Church of Rome have tried to establish their authority by miraculous signs and works. Thus some of the persecuted Jansenists availed themselves of the utility of modern miracles for the purpose of propagating a new doctrine or deciding a controverted one, and had recourse to the same weapons of defence against their implacable adversaries. Franlois de Paris, the son of an advocate of the Parliament of Paris, became in this sense the apostle of the Jansenist doctrine, and the prophet against the famous bull Unigenitus. His holiness and mortification of life, and the reaction of public opinion after the cruel persecutions of the Jesuits, greatly favored the success of his claim to work miracles, which, according to his biographers, was proved both in his life and at his tomb after death, in a degree that few canonized saints have attained to. The learned reviewer of his life, in the Acta Eruditorum of Leipsic, merely concludes from his history that the city of Paris was filled at the time with the followers of Jansenius, and that they were comnpelled to appeal thus to the popular superstition in order to lessen the persecutions of the Jesuits,  and in a manner to attack them with their own weapons. These miracles chiefly involved powers of healing and restoration of outward faculties, and bore (if true) a much closer resemblance to the healing gifts which inaugurated Christianity than to the senseless and aimless wonders of mediaeval miracle-working. But the contagion which was thus spread over the Church, and throughout almost every age, was by no means confined to the Roman Church, its orders or disorders.

Though the churches of the Reformation, in their bold appeal “to the law and to the testimony,” had treated the visions and miracles upon which the inner power of Rome had been built with as little ceremony as they treated the forged decretals on which her external power had been carried up in the darkness of the Middle Ages, it was not long before the old love of the marvellous, and the inextinguishable longing after the forbidden fruit of visions and revelations which had been so abundantly enjoyed but a little before, extended into the churches of the Reformation., But the occasion of their. appearance was different altogether from that which had evoked it in the Roman Church, though by a singular coincidence the scene of the Protestant and of the Romish revelations was the same. The province of Dauphiny, which gave a birthplace to the peasant visionaries of La Salette, was also, in an earlier day, the native country of Isabel Vincent, whose miraculous preachings in her sleep and ecstatic visions enlisted the faith of the good and learned M. Jurieu, and produced from him an energetic and not ineloquent appeal in behalf of modern miracles. The very title of his treatise in its English dress is almost as sensational as a novel of Miss Braddon: The Reflections of the reverend and learned M. Jurieu upon the strange and miraculous Ecstasies of Isabel Vincent, the Shepherdess, of Saon, in Dauphines, who ever since February last hath sung Psalms, prayed, preached, and prophesied about the present. Times in her Trances; as also upon the wonderful and portentous Trumpetings and singing of Psalms that were heard by thousands in the air in many Parts of France in the Year 1686. Not nursed into life in the bosom of Rome, and nourished as the visions of Lourdes and La Salette by a priesthood too deeply interested in the success of the imposition, the Protestant wonders sprang into a vigorous and sturdy existence out of the terrible hot-bed of cruelty and persecution which the revocation of the Edict of Nantes had produced in every province of France, and which, in the more imaginative region of the south, bore strange and exotic fruits. The visions of the poor shepherdess and ‘her preachings were little more,' in fact, than the broken  and wild recollections of the Protestant services thereso cruelly prohibited — prophecies of future trials or deliverances being intermingled with her sermons in the same manner as they had doubtless been by the exiled and often martyred pastors of that period of bitter persecution, whose judgment, “though of a long time,” was read in the dreadful anarchy of the first Revolution, and seems hardly fully ended in our own day.

The crushing out of a rational faith was followed by the rise of the school of Voltaire and Diderot, and it well might shame the advocates of the Church of Rome in every age to find that the proscribed infidel was the first to bring to justice, or, rather, to public reprobation, the judges who, at the instigation of the Jesuits, so horribly tortured and murdered the poor silk-mercer of Toulouse, Calas, whose only crime, like that of the victims of Thorn in a somewhat earlier day, was his firm and consistent Protestantism. The wonderful sounds in the air — which were testified by so many thousands, and described in a public letter by M. de Besse, a pastor who had contrived to escape from his prison to Lausanne — might perhaps be referred, without charge of scepticism, to the effects of this dreadful persecution upon the minds and the nerves of its wretched and homeless victims, of whom it might well be said, in the words of Paul, “They were slain with the sword; they wandered about in sheep-skins and goat-skins; being destitute, afflicted, tormented, they wandered in deserts, and in mountains, and in dens, and in caves of the earth.” Indeed, some even imagined, as M. de Besse tells us, that the wonderful sounds which were heard by so many were but the singing of the poor exiles met together in woods or in caves; but the variety of places in which he himself heard these mysterious harmonies soon convinced him that so simple a solution of them was erroneous. In vain the ear-witnesses of these phenomena were taken to prison for declaring them, and forbidden to say anything about them again. The witnesses multiplied more and more. Sometimes the sounds were like those of a trumpet, and had a warlike character; at other times they are described as combining the most ravishing strains of harmony; sometimes they were heard by day, sometimes, again, at night, “but in the night in a more clear and distinct manner than in the day” (Jurieu, Reflections, page 36). “The trumpet always sounds as if an army were going to charge, and the harmony is like the composition of many voices, and of an infinite number of musical instruments.” “I do believe,” adds the good pastor, who found it more easy to interpret the sign than to account for it, “that the trumpet is a sign of a cruel war that will be made in  a little time, and that the harmony comes from the mouth of angels, who, to put our enemies to the last confusion, thunder out the praises of God at a time when these wretched men forbid it to reformed Christians.” The outbreak of the French Revolution, and the overthrow of the Church just a century after, would seem to verify, though at a later date, the interpretation of the poor exile, whose fellow-witness was a “Sieur Calas,” probably one of the family of the martyr of a later day; while the testimony to the authenticity of his letter is given by an exiled minister, bearing the equally suggestive name of Murat.

Passing over to Germany, we find that the contagion of new revelations and prophecies had spread itself in the eastern part of the empire at an earlier period in the 17th century. Temporarily with the mystical and hieroglyphical system of Jacob Bohme, there sprang up in Silesia and Saxony the cognate revelations of Kotter, Drabitz, and Christina Poniatovia, all having a political rather than strictly religious character, and foretelling the final triumph of Protestantism in the empire, and the regeneration of Christianity, by the overthrow of the Roman power. Kotter, fortunately for his head, escaped into Lusatia, where some noblemen of influence became his adherents. Drabitz, not so fortunate, lost his head at Presburg, by order of the emperor, to whom his visions had a somewhat treasonable aspect; while Poniatovia, more fortunate than either, closed her revelations by marrying the tutor of the son of the king of Bohemia, and the threefold revelations, though introduced with much pomp and circumstance, and with a vast number of curious illustrations of the dreams and visions in which they were disclosed, by the famous Amos Comenius, fell still-born on the world, and have now a place on the shelves of the curious, on the ground of their rarity and of the grotesque ingenuity of their pictorial representations. (Two editions of these revelations, both in 4to, appeared under the editorship of Comenius. The former is called Lux in Tenebris, the latter Lux e Tenebris. A copy of one of these was burned with Drabitz after he was beheaded at Presburg. Both editions are very rare.) In Western Germany they were almost unknown, and it is memorable that almost all the prophets and mystics of Central Europe belonged to that mixed Teutonic and Sclavonic race which peoples the eastern frontier lands of the empire. But, though Germany contributed so little to the visionary lore of Europe at this period in a direct manner, it had produced a system of mystical divinity which laid the foundations of many future visions and ecstasies. The wild theology or theosophy, or whatever  else it might be called, of Jacob Bohme, was a fruitful soil for the growth of new revelations and prophecies, and might well prepare the mind it obscured for the most startling apparitions of the beings of another world. The writings of this celebrated enthusiast, forbidden and suppressed in his own country, found vent in Holland and England. The mysticism of Jane Leade (q.v.) and her followers, the Philadelphians (q.v), the Quietism of Molina (q.v.), are subjects tor consideration in the article MYSTICISM SEE MYSTICISM.

But it may not be amiss, in this place, to call attention to the singular contrast between the Roman Catholic miracles, visions, and revelations, and those of the Protestant world. While the former are always invoked in order to found some new and undiscovered system of worship or object of superstition, the latter have a very practical end, and stand in close connection with holiness of life, which modern Roman revelations tend so little to promote. Even Jane Leade's revelations had a really Christian moral, which cannot in any sense be affirmed of the wonders of Lourdes or La Salette, and of the miracles with which, as Dr. Newman affirmed, the Roman Church is hung about on every side. “The Anglo Saxon nature,” says a writer in the British Quarterly Review (July 1873, page 97), “does not often indulge in visions, but when it does they seem to partake of that practical character which belongs to the race. No doubt some good may have arisen even from Mrs. Leade and her Philadelphian Society in its various branches in that age of spiritual deadness in which her lot was cast. Possibly even now we may be deriving some advantage from the example and the labors of this aged enthusiast, even as the decayed vegetation of an earlier year may have contributed to the fruitfulness of our own. The Philadelphian Society seems but a short time to have survived its foundress, though the ramifications of it were so extended, and its temporary success so remarkable. But notwithstanding the success of visionaries and pretenders to miraculous powers, both in medieval and modern times, it cannot be denied that the current of feeling in the general body of the Church has run strongly and steadily against their pretensions, and that even those which had been attributed to a divine influence in the beginning, have often been referred to a diabolical inspiration in the end. Nor was this the only peril to which miracle-mongers and visionaries were exposed. So long as they fell in with the ruling power, and flattered the prejudices or the tastes of the day, all was well with them. St. Bridget, whose bitter denunciations against the crimes of the court of Rome made her the popular saint of those who looked for their reformation during the great schism, or who began that difficult work at  Constance, would have been handed over to Satan in the day when the ‘Curia' was again restored in all its old deformity, and only pledged to a reform which it never attempted to carry out. Nicholas Bulwersdorf, whose revelations against Rome were uttered, unhappily for himself, in the Council of Basle, and were mixed up with the old heresy of the Millenarians, expiated for them at the stake; while the poor monk whose revelations and prophecies are mentioned by the Dominican, Nyder, was found to have derived his inspiration, or, rather, his diabolic possession, from having swallowed the devil through greedily devouring a most tempting cauliflower in the garden of the monastery without saying grace — avide comedit, ac daemonem ignoranter deglutivit. Another monk, who had a revelation which led him to found a new order, of which he assumed the government, incurred bodily as well as spiritual destruction — ‘incineratus est rector cum regula.' The presumption of diabolic influence was, however, not less decisive in Protestant England than in Rome itself, and the grotesque history of the Surey Demoniack, or Satan's strange and dreadful Actions in and about the Person of Richard Dugdale, in 1697, exhibits the popular superstition in the fullest degree. This poor creature, who seems to have been an epileptic patients fortunately escaped the Roman ordeal, for we read that he was ‘dispossessed by God's blessing on the fastings and prayers of divers ministers and people.' It had been well if the spiritual authorities of Lourdes and La Salette, instead of ‘believing every spirit,' had ‘dispossessed' the poor visionary peasants of their fond conceit, instead of instituting pilgrimages for the canonization of so foolish a story.” Well might they have fallen back from the visions and miracles of a darker age upon that great and last revelation of God to man, those Scriptures of eternal truth, that “pure and living precept of God's Word, which, without more additions, nay, with the forbidding of them, hath within itself the promise of eternal life, the end of all our wearisome labors and all our sustaining hopes” (Milton, On Prelatical Episcopacy). The question of ecclesiastical miracles was slightly touched by Spencer in his notes on Origen against Celsus, and more fully by Le Moine; but did not attract general attention till Middleton published his famous Free Inquiry (1748). Several replies were written by Dodwell (junior), Chapman, Church, etc., which do not seem to have attracted much permanent attention. Some good remarks on the general subject occur in Jortin's Remarks on Ecclesiastical History, and in Warburton's Julian. This controversy has also of late years been reopened by Dr. Newman, in an  essay on miracles, originally prefixed to a translation of Fleury's Ecclesiastical History, and since republished in a separate form.

See, besides, Elliott; Cramp, Text-book of Popery; Hodge, Divinity; Forsyth, Italy, 2:154 sq.; Rome in the 19th Century, 1:40, 86; 2:356; 3:193 sq.; Lady Morgan, Italy, 2:306; 3:189; Graham, Three, Months' Residence, etc., page 241; Middleton, Letter from Rome; Southey, Vindicice Ecclesice Auylicaute, 1:125 sq.; Blanco White, Poor's Man's Preservation against Popery, page 90; Brownlee, Letters in the Roman Catholic Controversy; Brand, Popul. Antig.; Hone, Anc. Mysteries.

## Miraculous Conception[[@Headword:Miraculous Conception]]

             a term used to denote the supernatural formation of the human nature of Jesus Christ, i.e., that it was brought forth not in the ordinary method of generation, but out of the substance of the Virgin Mary, by the immediate operation of the Holy Ghost. The evidence upon which this article of the Christian faith rests is found in Mat 1:18-23, and in the more particular narration which Luke has given in the first chapter of his Gospel. If we admit this evidence of the fact, we can discern the emphatic meaning of the appellation given to our. Saviour when he is called “the seed of the woman” (Gen 3:15); we can perceive the meaning of a phrase which Luke has introduced into the genealogy of Jesus (Luk 3:23), “being (as was supposed) the son of Joseph,” and of which, otherwise, it is not possible to give a good account; and we can discover a peculiar significance in an expression of the apostle Paul (Gal 4:4), “God sent forth his Son, made of a woman.” The conception of Jesus is the point from which we date the union between his divine and human nature; and, this conception being miraculous, the existence of the Person in whom they are united was not physically derived from Adam. But, as Dr. Horsley says in his sermon on the Incarnation, the union with the uncreated Word is the very principle of personality and individual existence in the Son of Mary. According to this view of the matter, the miraculous conception gives a completeness and consistency to the revelation concerning Jesus Christ. Not only is he the Son of God, but, as the Son of man, he is exalted above his brethren, while he is made like them. He is preserved from the contamination adhering to the race whose nature he assumed; and when the only-begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, was made flesh, the intercourse which, as man, he had with God, is distinguished, not in degree only, but in kind, from that which any prophet ever enjoyed; and it  is infinitely more intimate, because it did not consist in communications occasionally made to him, but arose from the manner in which his human nature had its existence. SEE INCARNATION; SEE JESUS CHRIST.

## Miradoro, Luigi[[@Headword:Miradoro, Luigi]]

             a noted Italian painter of the school of Cremona, was born at Genoa about the commencement of the 17th century. He is commonly designated I1 Genovesino, from his native city, from whence, after being initiated into the rudiments of his art, he appears to have gone to Cremona, where he began to study the works of Panfilo Nuvolone. Afterwards he painted in the manner of the Caracci — bold, large, correct in coloring, and productive of fine effect. While he appears to be little known in his native city, he nevertheless enjoyed a high reputation in Cremona and in parts of Lombardy. His S. Gio. Damasceno, in the church of S. Clemente, at Cremona, is highly commended. The Merchants' College at Piacenza possesses likewise a beautiful Pieta from his hand, representing the Dead Christ in the Lap of the Virgin. He appears to have been remarkably successful in the treatment of all subjects, but especially so in compositions of a terrific or tragic nature. The exact time of his death is unknown: but one of his works in S. Imerio bears the date 1651; therefore his demise must have been subsequent to this date. See Lanzi's Hist. of Painting (transl. by Roscoe, Lond. 1847, 3 volumes, 8vo), 2:451; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts (N.Y. 1865, 2 volumes, 8vo), 2:568.

## Miraeus, Albert[[@Headword:Miraeus, Albert]]

             (Aubert le Mire), a Roman Catholic theologian of Belgium, was born at Brussels in 1573 and was educated for the Church at the high-schools of Douai and Louvain. Shortly after taking orders he was appointed canon at Antwerp; in 1598 he became also private secretary to his uncle, bishop John Miraeus; afterwards he became court preacher and librarian to the archduke Albert of Austria; and in 1624 dean of the cathedral at Antwerp, where he died in 1640. Most of his life was consecrated to the good of his Church and country. Mirseus was also a multifarious writer. Many of his works are on ecclesiastical history. We will mention here Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica (Antwerp, 1639-1649, 2 volumes, fol.; a new edition of this work was published. at Hamburg in 1718 by Job. Alb. Fabricius, who says in the preface, “Vir et hoc et tot allis monumentis in lucem editis non minus de veteri memoria quam de posteritate omni insigniter promeritus”): De  state religiomis Christian ceper totum orbum (Helmst. 1671): — Notitia episcopatum orbis Christiani (Antwerp, 1613) Chronicon Cisterciense (Cologne, 1614): — Geographia Ecclesiastica: — Codex egularum et constitutionum clericalium: — Origines caenobiorum Benaedictinorum, Curthusianorum, etc.: — Opera historica et diplomatica, Elogia illustrium Belgii scripto Urnu, Chronicon nuerum Belgicarum, Chronicon rerum toto orbe gestarum, etc. All his works were collected and published at Brussels in 1733, in 4 volumes, fol.

## Mirage[[@Headword:Mirage]]

             the French name of an optical illusion common in the East, and directly referred to by Isaiah (שָׁרָב, sharab', “parched ground,” Isa 35:7; “heat,” Isa 49:10), and perhaps indirectly by Jeremiah (Jer 15:18, “waters that fail;” literally, that cannot be trusted). It is still known by the name of serib, the Arabic equivalent of the above Heb. term.. This phenomenon is as simple in its origin as it is astonishing in its effects. Under it are classed the appearance of distant objects as double, or as if suspended in the air, erect or inverted, etc. The cause of mirage is a diminution of the density of the air near the surface of the earth, produced by the transmission of heat from the earth, or in some other way; the denser stratum being thus placed above, instead of, as is usually the case, below the rarer. Now rays of light from a distant object, situated in the denser medium (i.e., a little above the earth's level), coming in a direction nearly parallel to the earth's surface, meet the rarer medium at a very obtuse angle, and, instead of passing into it, are reflected back to the dense medium. the common surface of the two media acting as a mirror. Suppose, then, a spectator to be situated on an eminence, and looking at an object situated like himself in the denser stratum of air, he will see the object by means of directly transmitted rays; but, besides this, rays from the object will be reflected from the upper surface of the rarer stratum of air beneath to his eve. (See fig. 1.) The image produced by the reflected rays will appear inverted, and below the real object, just as an image reflected in water appears when observed from a distance. If the object is a cloud or portion of sky, it will appear by the reflected rays as lying on the surface of the earth, and bearing a strong resemblance to a sheet of water. (See fig. 2.) This form of mirage, which is most common in sandy, desert countries, is an illusive appearance of pools and lakes of water, in places where water  is most needed and least likely to occur. This phenomenon offers so perfect a delusion in all its circumstances that the most forewarned and experienced travellers are deceived by it, as are even the natives of the deserts, when not sufficiently acquainted with the locality in which it appears to be aware that no water actually exists. No one can imagine, without actual experience, the delight and eager expectation, followed by the most intense and bitter disappointment, which the appearance of the serab often occasions to travelling parties, particularly when the supply of water which they are obliged to carry with them upon their camels is nearly or quite exhausted. (See fig. 3.)

“Still the same burning sun!

no cloud in heaven!

The hot air quivers, and the sultry mist Floats o'er the desert, with a show

Of distant waters mocking their distress.” — SOUTHEY.

Major Skinner, in his Journey Overland to India, describes the appearance of the serab in that desert, between Palestine and the Euphrates, which probably supplied the images employed by Isaiah: “About noon the most perfect deception that can be conceived exhilarated our spirits and promised an early resting-place. We had observed a slight mirage before, but this day it surpassed all I had ever fancied. Although aware that these appearances have often led people astray, I could not bring myself to believe that this was unreal. The Arabs were doubtful, and said that, as we had found water yesterday, it was not improbable that we should find some today. The seeming lake was broken in several parts by little islands of sand, that gave strength to the delusion. The dromedaries of the sheiks at length reached its borders, and appeared to us to have commenced to ford, as they advanced and became more surrounded by the vapor. I thought they had got into deep water, and moved with greater caution. In passing over the sand banks their figures were reflected in the water. So convinced was Mr. Calmuin of its reality that he dismounted and walked towards the deepest part of it, which was on the right hand. He followed the deceitful lake for a long time, and to our sight was strolling on its bank, his shadow stretching to a great length beyond. There was not a breath of wind; it was a sultry day, and such a one as would have added dreadfully to the  disappointment if we had been at any time without water.” SEE PARCHED GROUND.

## Miramion, Marie Bonneau, Lady[[@Headword:Miramion, Marie Bonneau, Lady]]

             a very estimable French female philanthropist of the 17th century, was born at Paris November 2, 1629. She was the daughter of Jacques Bonneau, lord of Rubelles, and of Maria d'Issy, both very wealthy. She married (March, 1645) Jean Jacques de Beauharnais, lord of Miramion, who died the same year. Many desirable parties solicited her hand, but she preferred to consecrate herself to God and to the care of the poor and sick, and took religious vows February 2, 1649, when only twenty years of age. Every hour of her life was devoted to some charitable or pious act. In 1660 she collected twenty-eight poor monks driven from Picardy by the war, and nourished and cared for them for six months. Her zeal and liberality prompted her to found at Paris the House of Refuge and that of Sainte- Pelagie; she drew up the rules for these two houses, destined to serve as asylums for wives and repentant women. She contributed largely for the establishment of the Seminary of Foreign Missions. Civil war had increased the misery of the people of Paris; Madame de Miramion sold her necklaces, estimated at 24,000 pounds, and her plate, and distributed the proceeds in alms. In 1661 she established a society of twelve girls to teach country children how to dress wounds and succor the sick. This little community was called the “Sainte-Famille;” Madame de Miramion subsequently united it to the daughters of “Sainte-Genevieve.” She bought for them a large house on the wharf of the Tournelle, sufficiently endowed the establishment, and consented to become superior. She gave more than 70,000 pounds to her parish of Saint-Nicolas de Chardonnet, the seminary of which she endowed with a sum of 35,000 francs. The hospital for foundlings was also greatly indebted to her. She died March 24, 1696. See Abbe de Choisy, Vie de Madame de Miramion (Paris, 1706, 4to, and 1707, 8vo); Saint-Simon, Memoires; Richard and Giraud, Bibliotheque Sacrae; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v. SEE GENEVIVE, ST., DAUGHTERS OF.

## Mirandula, Giovanni Francesca della[[@Headword:Mirandula, Giovanni Francesca della]]

             a noted theological and philosophical writer of the 16th century, was born about 1469. He cultivated learning and the sciences, after the example of his uncle. SEE MIRANDULA, GIOVANNI PICO DELLA. Upon the death  of his father, in 1499, he succeeded, as eldest son, to his estates, and thus became involved in great trouble, which finally cut short not only his literary labors but also his life. His brothers Lewis and Frederick combined against him, and, by the assistance of the emperor Maximilian I and Hercules I, duke of Ferrara, succeeded in driving him from his principality in 1502, and he was forced to seek refuge abroad, until at length pope Julius II, invading and becoming master of Mirandula, re-established him in 1511. After the pope's defeat at Ravenna (April 11, 1512), Giovanni Francisca became a refugee a second time, and so continued for two years. After the French were driven out of Italy he was restored to his possessions. He died in October, 1533, when Galeoti Picus, his nephew, i.e., the son of his brother Lewis, entered his castle by night with forty armed men, and assassinated him and his eldest son Albert. He seems to have been a more voluminous writer than his uncle. His earlier works were inserted in the Strasburg edition of his uncle's, in 1504, and continued in those of Basle, 1573 and 1601. Among these are:

(1.) De studio divinae et humanae philosophiae libri duo: in this he compares profane philosophy with a knowledge of Holy Scripture, and shows how preferable the latter is to the former.

(2.) De imaginatione libero

(3.) De imitatione ad Petrum Bembum episolae duae, et ejus responsum.

(4.) De rerum praenotione libri 9: in this book of the Prescience of things, he treats of the divine prescience, and of that knowledge which some pretend to have of things future, by compacts with evil spirits, by astrology, chiromancy, geomancy, and the like means, which he confutes at large.

(5.) Examen vanitatis doctrinae gentium et veritatis disciplinae Christianae, etc., wherein he opposes the errors of philosophers, Aristotle particularly.

(6.) Epistolarum libri quatuo.

(7.) De reformandis moribus oratio ad Leonem X.

These are the most important of his writings to be found in the editions above mentioned of his uncle's works; but there are other works, which  have never been collected together, but have always continued separate, as they were first published: such are Vita Hieronymi Savonarolae: — De veris calamitatum temporum nostrorum causis liber: — De animae immortalitate: Dialogus cui nomen Strix, sive de ludificatione daemonum: Hymni heroici tres ad Trinitatem, Christum, et Virginem: — De Venere et Cupidine expellendis carmen heroicum: — Liber de Providentia Dei contra philosophastros: — De auro tum aestimando, tum conficiendo, tum utendo libri tres, etc. “There is not,” says Du Pin, “so much wit, sprightliness; subtlety, and elegance in the works of Francis Pico as in those of his uncle: no, nor yet so much learning: but there is more evenness and solidity.” See the books referred to in the article following.

## Mirandula, Giovanni Pico della[[@Headword:Mirandula, Giovanni Pico della]]

             an Italian philosopher and theologian, one of the writers of the days of the Renaissance, noted for his attempt to reconcile Christianity with the ideas of paganism, was one of the greatest lights of the 15th centurs. He was born February 24, 1463. Even as a youth, the prince of Mirandula was noted for his preciousness, and remarkable for his memory and intelligence. He challenged disputations on abstruse subjects with the learned of his day, as if one of their number. In 1477 he entered the University of Bologna, to study canonical law, besides which he devoted himself especially to the study of philosophy and theology. After this he visited the other universities of note on the Continent, and everywhere attracted attention by his learning and the facility with which he acquired knowledge. Besides a mastery of Greek and Latin, he could claim acquaintance with the Hebrew. Chaldee, and Arabic. He was also well acquainted with the various philosophical systems of antiquity, and with those of the scholastics and of Raymond Lully. But vain of his knowledge, he came to consider himself qualified to solve the problem of reconciling philosophy and theology, and even to conciliate the philosophical systems of Plato and Aristotle. This would have required a critical knowledge more profound than was to be found in the 15th century, as well as an originality of mind which Mirandula did not possess. He has, indeed, in his writings, rendered great service to theology in pointing out the aid it may derive from the knowledge of Oriental languages, but we vainly seek in them a single new metaphysical idea.

After many wanderings, “wanderings of the intellect as well as physical journey,” says Parr, “Pico came to rest at Florence.” But his stay at the  different universities had made him only the more sanguine of carrying out the plan formed of reconciling the philosophers with each other, and all alike with the Church. To Rome, the centre of the Church, he therefore now directed his steps, satisfied that there he should first disclose to the world his great project, and there he should promptly receive the honors of the clergy. Mirandula arrived at Rome in 1487. Innocent VIII was then reigning. Like some knight-errant, the young man of only twenty-three summers now, published, to the astonishment of the learned world, nine hundred propositions on subjects of dialectics, morals, natural philosophy, mathematics, theology, natural magic, and cabalism, taken not only from Greek and Latin, but also from Hebrew and Arabic writers, and declared himself ready to defend these propositions openly against any one. For that object, he invited all the savans of Europe to come to argue against him at Rome, offering to defray the expenses of such as would have to travel a great distance. These famous theses, De omni re scibili, as Mirandula called them (et de quibusdam aliis; adds Voltaire, thus making the best criticism on Mirandula's pretensions), were posted all over Rome, and awakened great curiosity as well as jealousy. Parties envious of Mirandula's reputation succeeded in awakening the doubts of the papal court as to the orthodoxy of some of the propositions, and Mirandula not only struggled in vain for over a year at Rome simply to obtain leave to publish his theses, but even the reading of the book containing them was forbidden by the pope. Disgusted with this treatment, Mirandula finally quitted Rome for. Florence. Made restless by the opposition he had encountered, he remained here but a short time, went to France, and did not return to Italy till several years later. Shortly after Alexander VI had ascended, the papal throne (1492) the case of Mirandula was reconsidered, and, June 18, 1493, Pico was finally absolved from all heresy by a brief of the pontifical court. Mirandula by this time had, however, given up all profane sciences, to devote himself exclusively to theology. The remainder of his life was spent in attempts to refute Judaism, Mohammedanism, and judicial astrology. He died at Florence, Nov. 17, 1494, the day when Charles VIII, who had received him at Paris, entered the city. He was interred in the cemetery of St. Mark, in the habit of a Jacobin, having taken a resolution, just before his death, to enter into that order; and upon his tomb was inscribed this epitaph:

“Joannes jacet hic Mirandula: caetera norunt Et Tagus, et Ganges; forsan et Antipodes.”  The greater part of his immense fortune he gave over in his last days to his friend, the mystical poet Benivieili, to be spent by him in works of charity, chiefly in the sweet charity of providing marriage-dowries for the peasant girls of Florence.

Short as his life was, Mirandula composed a great number of works, which have often been printed separately and together. They have been printed together Bologna (1496), at Venice (1498), at Strasburg (1504), and at Basle (1557, 1573,1601) — all in folio. The principal works in the collection are, Heptaplus, id est de Dei creatoris opere sex dierum libri septem (Strasburg, 1574, fol.; translated into French by Nicolas le Fevre de la Boderi, under the title L'Heptaple, ou en sept facons et autant de livres est exposee l'historie des sept jours de la creation du monde [Florence, about 1480; Paris, 1578, fol.]). “Pico de la Mirandula,” says Matter, “convinced that the books of Moses, interpreted with the aid of the Cabala and of Neo-Platonism, would appear as the source of all speculative science, wrote an exposition of Genesis according to the seven meanings given to it by some of the exegetes of that period. But this work, rather short for such a subject and such a purpose, is really but a weak imitation, even in regard to its title, of the works of some of the fathers. Here is a specimen of his manner of interpretation. The words ‘God created the heavens and the earth,' are made by him to signify that God created the soul and the body, which can very well be considered as represented by heavens and earth. The waters under the heavens are our sensitive faculties, and their being gathered together in one place indicates the gathering of our senses in a common sensorium. This allegorical manner, borrowed from Origen, or rather from Philo, is probably anterior even to the latter; and it is evident that this could not afford the means of reconciling philosophy and theology. Generally speaking, Mirandula, whose genius was so precocious, so brilliant, and so comprehensive, wrote too young and too fast, and with too much confidence in secondhand learning, while his imagination was too vivid not to prevent his giving full satisfaction to the claims of reason. All his works bear the marks of that general kind of knowledge one possesses in leaving the schools, but nowhere do they evince that depth and originality which are the fruits of meditation and of patient research. He was a prodigy of memory, of elocution, of dialectics; he was neither a writer nor a thinker.”

The reader may do well to compare with this estimate of Mirandula, Pater's enthusiastic tribute to the author of the “Heptaplus:” — Conclusiones  philosophicae cabalisticae et theologicae (Rome, 1486, fol.); these are the famous theses which made such a sensation at the time, but are now looked upon only as curiosities: — Apologia J. Pici Mirandulani, Concordiae comitis (1489, fol., very scarce); it is Mirandula's defence against the charge of heresy; the writer corrects some singular instances of ignorance on the part of his accusers: one of them, for instance, took Cabala for the name of a man, and asserted that it was a scoundrel who had written against Christ: — Disputationes adversus astrologiam divinatricens libri 12 (Bologna, 1495, fol.): — Aureae ad familiares epistolae (Paris, 1499, 4to; Venice, 1529, 8vo; reprinted by Cellarius, 1682, 8vo): — Elegia. deprecatoria ad Deum (Paris, 1620, 4to): — De Ente et Uno opus, in quo plurimi loci in Aloise, in Platone et Aristotele explicantur; De hominis dignitate (Basle, 1580, 8vo): — Commento del signor Giovanni Pico sopra una canzone de amore, composta da Girolamo Benivieni, cittadino Fiorentino, secundo la mente ed opinione dei Platonici (Florence, 1519, 8vo; Venice, 1522, 8vo), a commentary in the manner of Plato's Banquet, and very readable. “With an ambitious array of every sort of learning, and a profusion of imagery borrowed indifferently from the astrologers, the Cabala, Homer, Scripture, and Dionysius the Areopagite, he attempts to define the stages by which the soul passes from the earthly to the unseen beatitudes.” It has been well said that the Renaissance of the 15th century was in many things great rather by what it designed than by what it achieved. The same may be appropriately applied to Mirandula's efforts “He had sought knowledge, and passed from system to system, and hazarded much; but less for the sake of positive knowledge than because he believed there was a spirit of order and beauty in knowledge, which would come down and unite what man's ignorance had divided, and renew what time had made dim. And so while his actual work has passed away, yet his own qualities are still active, and he himself remains, as one alive in the grave, ‘caesiis et vigilibus oculis,' as his biographer describes him, and with that sanguine clear skin, ‘decenti rubore interspersa,' as with the light of morning upon it; and he has a true place in that group of great Italians who fill the end of the 15th century with their names” (Pater). See Paul Jove, Elogia; Sir Thos. More, Pico, Earl of Mirandula, and a great Lord of Italy (from the Italian of Francis della Mirandula); Niceron, Memoires, volume 34; Tiraboschi, Storia della litteratura Italiana, 6:323; Ginguene d Hist. liteaire d'Italie, volume 3; Matter, Dict. des sciences philosophiques; Meiners, Lebensbeschreibungen berihimter Manner, etc., volume 2; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 40:43; Sigwart, Ulrich Zwingle,  der Charakter seiner Theologie, mit besonderer Rucksicht auf Picus von Mirandula (Stuttg. 1855), page 14 sq.; Dreydorft (Georg), Das System des John Picus Graf von Mirandula (Marburg, 1858); Pater. Studies in the History of the Renaissance (Lond. and N.Y. Macmillan, 1873,12mo), chapter 2.

## Mirepoix, Gui De Lewis, Seigneur de[[@Headword:Mirepoix, Gui De Lewis, Seigneur de]]

             one of the great soldiers of the French who battled for the Church in the days of the Crusades, flourished in the early part of the 13th century. He was a friend of Simon de Montfort, marshal of France, conducted the warfare against the Albigenses, and was rewarded for his blind adherence to the papal cause with the title of “Marshal of the Faith.” He died in 1230.

## Miriam[[@Headword:Miriam]]

             (Heb. Miryam', מַרְיָם, rebellion; Sept. Μαριάμ, but in 1Ch 4:17 Μαών v. r. Μαρών; Josephus Μαριάμμη, Ant. 4:4, 6), the name of a woman and of a man. The name reappears in the N.T., Μαριάμ being the form always employed for the nominative case of the name of the Virgin Mary, though it is declined ; while Μαρία is employed in all cases for the three other Marys. At the time of the Christian era it seems to have been common. Among others who bore it was Herod's celebrated wife and victim, Mariamne. SEE MARY.

1. The sister of Moses and Aaron, and supposed (so Josephus, Ant. 2:9, 4) to be the same that watched her infant brother when exposed on the Nile; in which case she was probably ten or twelve years old at the time (Exo 2:4 sq.). B.C. 1738. She was the daughter of Amram and Jochebed, of the tribe of Levi (Num 26:59; comp. Mic 6:4). When the Israelites left Egypt, Miriam naturally became the leading woman among them. “The sister of Aaron” is her Biblical distinction (Exo 10:20). In Num 12:1 she is placed before Aaron; and “Miriam the Prophetess” is her acknowledged title (Exo 15:20). The prophetic power showed itself in her under the same form as that which it assumed in the days of Samuel and David poetry, accompanied with music and processions. The only instance of this prophetic gift is when, after the passage of the Red Sea, she took a cymbal in her hand, and went forth, like the Hebrew maidens in later times after a victory (Jdg 18:1; Jdg 11:34; 1Sa 18:6; Psa 68:11; Psa 68:25), followed by the whole female population of Israel, also beating their cymbals and striking their guitars  (מְחֹלֹת, otherwise “dances”). It does not appear how far they joined in the whole of the song (Exo 1:15-19); but the opening words are repeated again by Miriam herself at the close, in the form of a command to the Hebrew women. “She answered them, saying, Sing ye to Jehovah, for he hath triumphed gloriously: the horse and his rider hath he thrown into the sea.” B.C. 1658. The arrival of Moses's Cushite wife in the camp seems to have created in her an unseemly dread of losing her influence and position, and held her into complaints of and dangerous reflections upon Moses, in which Aaron joined (see Kitto's Daily Bible Illustr. ad loc.). SEE ZIPPORAH.

Their question, “Hath Jehovah spoken by Moses? Hath he not spoken also by us?” (Num 12:1-2), implies that the prophetic gift was exercised by them; while the answer implies that it was communicated in a less direct form than to Moses. “If there be a prophet among you, I Jehovah will make myself known unto him in a vision, and will speak unto him in a dream. My servant Moses is not so... With him will I speak mouth to mouth, even apparently, and not in dark speeches” (Num 12:6-8). A stern rebuke was administered in front of the sacred tent to both Aaron and Miriam. But the punishment fell on Miriam, as the chief offender. The hateful Egyptian leprosy, of which for a moment the sign had been seen on the hand of her younger brother, broke out over the whole person of the proud prophetess. How grand was her position, and how heavy the blow, is implied in the cry of anguish which goes up from both the brothers — “Alas my lord!... Let her not be as one dead, of whom the flesh is half consumed when he cometh out of his mother's womb... Heal her now, O God! I beseech thee.” And it is not less evident in the silent grief of the nation: “The people journeyed not till Miriam was brought in again” (Num 12:10-15). The same feeling is reflected, though in a strange and distorted form, in the ancient tradition of the drying up and reflowing of the marvellous well of the Wanderings. SEE BEER.

This stroke, and its removal, which took place at Hazeroth, form the last public event of Miriam's life. She died towards the close of the wanderings at Kadesh, and was buried there (Num 20:1). B.C. 1619. Her tomb was shown near Petra in the days of Jerome (Onomast. s.v. Cades Barnea). According to the Jewish tradition (Josephus, Ant. 4:4, 6), her death took place on the new moon of the month Xanthicus (i.e., about the end of February), which seems to imply that the anniversary was still observed in the time of Josephus. The burial, he adds, took place with great pomp on a mountain called Zin, i.e. the wilderness of Zin); and the mourning which lasted, as in the case of her brothers, for thirty days was  closed by the institution of the purification through the sacrifice of the heifer (Num 19:1-10), which in the Pentateuch immediately precedes the story of her death. According to Josephus (Ant. 3:2, 4; 6, 1), she was married to the famous Hur, and, through him, was grandmother of the architect Bezaleel. In the Koran (chapter 3) she is confounded with the Virgin Mary; and hence the Holy Family is called the Family of Amram, or Imram (see also D'Herbelot, Bibl. Orient. s.v. Zakaria). In other Arabic traditions her name is given as Kolthum (see Weil's Bibl. Legends, page 101).

2. The first named of the sons of Mered (the son of Ezra, of the family of Caleb) by Bithiah, the daughter of Pharaoh (1Ch 4:17). B.C. prob. cir. 1658. SEE MERED.

## Mirkhond, Mohammed Ebn - Emir Khowand Shah[[@Headword:Mirkhond, Mohammed Ebn - Emir Khowand Shah]]

             a noted Eastern historian, a native of Persia, was born in 1434, and died in 1498. He is the author of a work containing legends concerning Persian kings and sages, extracts of which were first published by Davity (Etats, empires, royaumes du monde). He also wrote a history of the Samanites, published in German by Wilken (Geschichte der Samaniden), at Gottingen, in 1808, and in French by Defremeny (Paris, 1845).

## Mirma[[@Headword:Mirma]]

             (Heb. Mirmah', מַרְמָה, deceit, as often; Sept, Μαρμά), the last named of the sons of Shaharaim by Hodesh, and a chieftain of the tribe of Benjamin (1Ch 8:10). B.C. post 1612.

## Miron, Charles[[@Headword:Miron, Charles]]

             a French prelate, was born in 1569. At eighteen, holding already the abbotship of Cormeri and Airvaux, he was appointed by the king bishop of Angers. Of the different parties: which then divided France, Miron espoused the cause of Henry IV. He was also one of the preachers who pronounced a funeral eulogy upon the king when assassinated by the hand of Ravaillac. Miron, upon removing from Angers to Paris, continued to hold his relation to the Church at Angers, and thereby provoked a grave dispute between the bishop and his chapter. The chapter, insisting upon the pope's appointment, declared themselves free from Miron's episcopal jurisdiction, to which the bishop took decided exception, and the disputes  called forth by this affair finally led Miron to vacate his bishopric. He transmitted his insignia to Guillaume Fouquet de la Varenne, and became, by exchange, abbot of Saint-Lomer de Blois. This transaction took place in 1615. But in 1621, Guillaume Fouquet having died, Miron reclaimed his bishopric, obtained it a second time, and entered Angers April 23, 1622. Very soon the discussions between the bishop and the chapter were resumed, and only terminated by the papal appointment of Miron to the archbishopric of Lyons, December 2,1626. This nomination was denounced by Salon as detrimental to the liberties of the Galliean Church. He died, however, before much could come of the opposition, Aug. 6, 1628. See Gallia Christiana, 4, col. 192; 14, col. 584, 585; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 35:668.

## Mirror[[@Headword:Mirror]]

             Although this word does not occur in the Auth. Vers., except in the Apocrypha (Wis 7:26), it is the proper representative of at least two Heb. and one Gr. term, for which our translators employ the less correct rendering “LOOKING-GLASS” (מִרְאָה, marah', a vision, as often, Exo 38:8; Sept. κάτοπτρον, Vulg. speculum; רְאַי, rei', a spectacle, Job 37:18, Sept. ὅρασις; Vulg. ces; גַּלְיוֹן, gilyon', a tablet of wood, stone, or metal on which to inscribe anything, so called as being made bare, Isa 8:1; in Isa 3:23 the plural refers, according to the Chald., Abarbanel, Jarchi, and others, with the Vulg. specula, and the Auth. Vers. 6 “glasses,” to mirrors or polished plates of metal, see Gesenius, Comment. ad loc., but Kimchi and others understand, with the Sept. διαφανῆ Λακονικά, transparent garments, such as show the body, comp. Schrider, De Vest. mul. Heb. pages 311, 312). In the first of the foregoing passages the mirrors in the possession of the women of the Israelites, when they quitted Egypt, are described as being of brass; for “the layer of brass, and the foot of it,” were made from them. In the second, the firmament is compared to “a molten mirror.” In fact, the mirrors used in ancient times were almost universally of metal (the passage in the Mishna, Chelim, 30:2, does not allude to glass mirrors); and as those of the Hebrew women in the wilderness were brought out of Egypt, they were doubtless of the same kind as those which have been found in the tombs of that country, and many of which now exist in our museums and  collections of Egyptian antiquities. These are of mixed metals, chiefly copper, most carefully wrought and highly polished; and so admirably did the skill of the Egyptians succeed in the composition of metals that this substitute for our modern looking-glass was susceptible of a lustre, which has even been partially revived at the present day in some of those discovered at Thebes, though buried in the earth for so many centuries. The mirror itself was nearly round, and was inserted in a handle, of wood, stone, or metal, the form of which varied according to the taste of the owner (see Wilkinson's Ancient Egyptians, 3:384-386).

In the N.T. mirrors are mentioned (ἔσοπτρα, Jam 1:23; comp. 1Co 13:12; see Harenberg, in Hasaei et Iken. nov. thesaur. 2:829 sq.). They are alluded to in the Rabbinical writings (אספקלריא,i.e., specularia, Targ. Jon. in Exo 19:17; Deu 33:19; Mishna, Chelim, 17:15; Edujotlh, 2:7; see Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. Page 379). See generally, Th. Carpzov, De speculis Hebraeor. (Rostock, 1752); Jahn, I, 2:155 sq.; Hartmann, Hebr. 2:240 sq.; 3:245 sq. It appears likewise from other positive statements that mirrors anciently were of metal, namely, of copper (χαλκεῖον, Xenoph. Symp. 7:4) or tin, also of an alloy of both these metals, answering to brass, and sometimes even of silver (Pliny, 33:45; 34:48; comp. Resell. AIonum. II, 2:528 sq.; Becker, Gallus, III, 3). Occasionally they were of great size (Senec. Nat. Qucest. 1:16, 17, page 185, Bip.; Quintil. Inst. 2:3, 68). Finally, mirrors of polished stone are mentioned (Pliny, 36:45; comp. Sueton. Domit. 14). “Pliny mentions that anciently the best were made at Brundusium. Praxiteles, in the time of Pompey the Great, is said to have been the first who made them of silver, though these were afterwards so common as, in the time of Pliny, to be used by the ladies' maids. Silver mirrors are alluded to in Plautus (Mostell. 1:4, Hebr. 2:101) and Philostratus (Icon. 1:6); and one of steel is said to have been found. They were even made of gold (Eur. Hec. 925; Senec. Nat. Quaest. 1:17). According to Beckmann (Hist. of Inv. 2:64, Bohn's transl.), a mirror which was discovered near Naples was tested, and found to be made of a mixture of copper and regulus of antimony, with a little lead. Beckmann's editor (Mr. Francis) gives in a note the result of an analysis of an Etruscan mirror, which he examined and found to consist of 67.12 copper, 24.93 tin, and 8.13 lead, or nearly eight parts of copper to three of tin and one of lead; but neither in this, nor in one analyzed by Klaproth, was there any trace of antimony, which Beckmann asserts was unknown to the ancients. Modern experiments have shown that the mixture of copper and tin produces the best metal for specula (Phil. Trans. 67:296).

Beckmann is of the opinion that it was not till the 13th century that glass, covered at the back with tin or lead, was used for this purpose, the doubtful allusion in Pliny (36:66) to the mirrors made in the glass-houses of Sidon having reference to experiments which were unsuccessful. Other allusions to bronze mirrors will be found in a fragment of AEschylus preserved in Stobneus (Serm. 18. page 164, ed. Gesner, 1608) and in Callimachus (Hym. in Lav. Pall. 21). Convex mirrors of polished steel are mentioned as common in the East in a manuscript note of Chardin's upon Sir 12:11, quoted by Harmer (Observ. volume 4, c. 11, obs. 55). The metal of which the mirrors were composed being liable to rust and tarnish, required to be constantly kept bright (Wis 7:26; Sir 12:11). This was done by means of pounded pumice-stone, rubbed on with a sponge, which was generally suspended from the mirror. The Persians used emery-powder for the same purpose, according to Chardin (quoted by Hartmann, Die Hebr. am Putztische, 2:245). The obscure image produced by a tarnished or imperfect mirror appears to be alluded to in 1Co 13:12. On the other hand, a polished mirror is among the Arabs the emblem of a pure reputation. ‘More spotless than the mirror of a foreign woman' is with them a proverbial expression, which Meidani explains of a woman who has married out of her country, and polishes her mirror incessantly, that no part of her face may escape her observation (De Sacy, Chrest. Arab. 3:236). Mirrors are mentioned by Chrysostom among the extravagances of fashion for which he rebuked the ladies of his time, and Seneca long before was loud in his denunciation of similar follies (Nat. Quest. 1:17). They were used by the Roman women in the worship of Juno (Senec. Ep. 95; Apuleius, Metam. 11. c. 9, page 770). In the Egyptian temples, says Cyril of Alexandria (De ador. in Spir. 9; Opera, 1:314, ed. Paris, 1638), it was the custom for the women to worship in linen garments, holding a mirror in their left hands and a sistrum in their right; and the Israelites, having fallen into the idolatries of the country, had brought with them the mirrors which they used in their worship.” This is a practice to which one of the above Scripture passages (Exo 38:8) appears to allude (see Gesenmis, Comment. on Isa. 1:215; on the contrary, B.F. Qulistorp, Die'speculis labri cenei, Gryph. 1773).

## Mirs, Adam Erdmann[[@Headword:Mirs, Adam Erdmann]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born November 26, 1656. He studied at Wittenberg, was in 1684 conrector at Zittau, and died June 3, 1727. He wrote, Philologia Sacra (Leipsic, 1699): — Philologia Biblica (1713): — Isagoge Biblica (1687): — Summarium Ebraece-Linguae 10:7 Tabulis Inclusum (1719): — Onomasticon Biblicum sive Lexicon Nominum Propriorum (1721): — De Ebraeorum Sectionibus Legalibus et Prophet. (1683): — Biblisches Antiquitaten-Lexicon (1727): — Kurze Fragen aus de faeien Mechanik und Baukunst der Ebrder (1713): — Kurze Fragen aus der Heraldica Sacra: (1719): — Kurze Fragen aus der Musica Sacra (1707), etc. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:381; Jocher Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Mirth[[@Headword:Mirth]]

             the expression of joy, gayety, merriment, is thus distinguished from its synonym, cheerfulness: Mirth is considered as an act, cheerfulness a habit of the mind. Mirth is short and transient; cheerfulness fixed and permanent.  Those are often raised into the greatest transports of mirth who are subject to the greatest depressions of melancholy: on the contrary, cheerfulness, though it does not give such an exquisite gladness, prevents us from falling into any depths of sorrow. Mirth is like a flash of lightning, that breaks through a gloom of clouds, and glitters for a moment; cheerfulness keeps up a kind of daylight in the mind, and fills it with a steady and perpetual serenity.

Mirth is sinful,

1. When men rejoice in that which is evil.

2. When unreasonable.

3. When tending to commit sin.

4. When a hinderance to duty.

5. When it is blasphemous and profane.

## Misael[[@Headword:Misael]]

             the Greek form (a, 1Es 9:44; comp. Neh 8:4; b, Song of the Three Child. 66; comp. Dan 1:6 sq.) of the Heb. name MISHAEL SEE MISHAEL (q.v.).

## Misanthropist[[@Headword:Misanthropist]]

             (from the Greek μισεῖν, to hate, and άνθρωπος, man), a hater of mankind; one that abandons society from a principle of discontent. The consideration of the depravity of human nature is certainly enough to raise emotions of sorrow in the breast of every man of the least sensibility; yet it is our duty to bear with the follies of mankind; to exercise a degree of candor consistent with truth; to lessen, if possible, by our exertions, the sum of moral and natural evil; and by connecting ourselves with society, to add at least something to the general interests of mankind. The misanthropist, therefore, is an ungenerous and dishonorable character. Disgusted with life, he seeks a retreat from it; like a coward, he flees from the scene of action, while he increases his own misery by his natural discontent, and leaves others to do what they can for' themselves.

The following is his character more at large: “He is a man,” says Saurin (Sermons), “who avoids society only to free himself from the trouble of being useful to it. He is a man who considers his neighbors only on the side of their defects, not knowing the art of combining their virtues with their vices, and of rendering the imperfections of other people tolerable by  reflecting on his own. He is a man more employed in finding out and inflicting punishments on the guilty than in devising means to reform them. He is a man who talks of nothing but banishing and executing, and who, because he thinks his talents are not sufficiently valued and employed by his fellow-citizens, or, rather, because they know his foibles, and do not choose to be subject to his caprice, talks of quitting cities, towns, and societies, and of living in dens or deserts.”

## Misciroli, Tommaso[[@Headword:Misciroli, Tommaso]]

             a painter of the Bolognese school, was born at Faenza in 1636. He gained considerable reputation, and executed several works for the churches. His principal picture is the Martyrdom of St. Cecilia, an altar-piece in the church of St. Cecilia at Faenza, which is finished with great care. Lalzi says that in some of his works Misciroli equals the best Viennese painters, but accuses him of plagiarism in many instances, notably in the picture above alluded to, in which he introduced an executioner stirring up the flames, a feature copied almost entirely from Lionello' grand picture of the martyrdom of St. Domenico in the church of that name at Bologna. Misciroli died in 1699. See Lanzi's Hist. of Painting, transl. by Roscoe (Lond. 1847, 3 volumes, 8vo), 3:131; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts (Phila. 1865, 2 volumes, 8vo), 2:569.

## Miser[[@Headword:Miser]]

             (Lat. unhappy), a term formerly used in reference to a person in wretchedness or calamity; but it now denotes a parsimonious person, or one who is covetous to extremity; who denies himself even the comforts of life to accumulate wealth. “Avarice,” says Saurin, “may be considered in two different points of light. It may be considered in those men, or rather those public bloodsuckers, or, as the officers of the Roman emperor Vespasian were called, those sponges of society, who, infatuated with this passion, seek after riches as the supreme good, determine to acquire it by any methods, and consider the ways that lead to wealth, legal or illegal, as the only road for them to travel. Avarice, however, must be considered in a second point of light. It not only consists in committing bold crimes, but in entertaining mean ideas and practicing low methods, incompatible .with such magnanimity as our condition ought to inspire. It consists not only in omitting to serve God, but in trying to associate the service of God with that of mammon. How many forms doth avarice take to disguise itself from  the man who is guilty of it, and who will be drenched in the guilt of it till the day he dies! Sometimes it is prudence, which requires him to provide not only for his present wants, but for such as he may have in future. Sometimes it is charity, which requires him not to give society examples of prodigality and parade. Sometimes it is parental love, obliging him to save something for his children. Sometimes it is circumspection, which requires him not to supply people who make ill use of what they get. Sometimes it is necessity, which obliges him to repel artifice by artifice. Sometimes it is conscience, which convinces him, good man, that he hath already exceeded in compassion and alms-giving, and done too much. Sometimes it is equity, for justice requires that every one should enjoy the fruit of his own labors and those of his ancestors. Such, alas! are the awful pretexts and subterfuges of the miser” (Sermuons, volume 5, ser. 12). SEE AVARICE; SEE COVETOUSNESS.

## Miser, Justus[[@Headword:Miser, Justus]]

             a great German statesman and author, whose writings have had much moral influence upon the general public mind, was born in Osnabrtick December 14, 1720. In 1740 he entered the university at Jena, and there and at Gottingen studied jurisprudence. In 1746 he became an attorney, and was soon noted for his ability and integrity. He resisted the arbitrary arrogance of the vicegerent of Osnabrtick, in consequence of which the citizens elected him advocatus patrice. For twenty years during the minority of the duke Frederick of York, who came into possession of Osnabriick in 1763, he was the principal adviser of the regent, and enjoyed the full confidence of George III, king of England. From 1762 to 1768 he officiated as a magistrate in the criminal court, and afterwards until his death as one of the superior officers of justice. His services were as disinterested as they were important. "I enjoyed," he once said, "many things; was sorrowful about a few; defamed by none." He enjoyed excellent health, and died quietly, with hardly a struggle, January 8, 1794.

In his writings, which take high rank in German literature, Moser often presents his ideas in a humorous garb, which, suiting the tastes of the people, made him deservedly popular. His most important contribution to literature is his Geschichte von Osnabriick (2 volumes, 1768; 2d and improved ed. 1780; 3d ed. 1820; a 3d volume, published from his literary remains by Herbert von Bar, 1824), a work which for critical research and popularity of diction still stands unsurpassed. His celebrated short essays, which originally appeared from 1766-1782, in the Osnabrtck Intelligenblatter, and were afterwards published under the title of Patriotische Phantasien (3d ed. prepared by his daughter, in 4 volumes, [Berl. 1804]), relate mostly to local subjects, but are to this day calculated to enlighten the mind and improve the character of German officials. In his work on the German language and literature, he attacks the Gallomania and infidelity of Frederick the Great, and in a letter addressed to Jean Jacques Rousseau he opposes the theories of that philosopher. Rousseau had gained many followers even in Germany, and the public burning of his works (1765), instead of harming him, had gained him new admirers. The burning of his works proved nothing. Moser, knowing that writings have to be refuted by writings, undertook the task of opposing Rousseau with his own weapons. He issued his letter To the Vicar in Savoy, to be had of J.J. Rousseau, in which he maintained the necessity of a positive religion for the people. He ridiculed the impractical character of a merely natural  religion with plain mother-wit. In order to meet Rousseau on his own stand-point, he adopted a very moderate idea of religion, such as even Hume might have shared. "It is of the greatest necessity to have certain fortified articles of faith, which comfort the unfortunate, restrain the fortunate, humble the proud, bind kings, and keep tradesmen within limits. It is impossible for the rough masses to be affected by the preaching of mere nature." "The preaching of God's works, that we have daily before our eyes, is like the singing of a canary bird, which its possessor has long since ceased to hear." "Natural religion," he argues, "is not only insufficient for those classes which are commonly called 'the populace' (der Pobel), but for all." "We are all populace, and God has done better in putting a bridle on our soul instead of on our noses; for at least in one place, I think, it was very necessary for us, in order to be led to certain ends. Our religion was made for us populace, and not for angels." "The sentiment that men can be saved in all religions," he says, "stifles the very germ of true religion. I have found that the Christian religion is perfectly sufficient for all purposes which God can have for man, and I draw therefrom this conclusion, that we act foolishly in weakening or breaking so perfect a bond." These outspoken, manly views of the eminent jurist had a great influence on the German mind, and his efforts proved most beneficent to men like Schleiermacher and others. A complete edition of his works was published by R. B. Abeken (Berl. 1842, 10 volumes), See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 20:170; Jocher, Gelehrten Lex.; Bechstein, Deutsche Manner; Hurst's Hagenbach, Hist. of the 18th and 19th Centuries, 1:220.

## Miserere[[@Headword:Miserere]]

             (Lat. have compassion), the name of a liturgic prayer, set to music, and used in Roman Catholic worship. It is a sort of paraphrase on the 51st or 57th Psalm, and is used on penitential occasions, and particularly in Passion-week. It is therefore not only set to a regular Gregorian melody (see Keller, Die acht Psalmentone, etc., Aix-la-Chap. 1856, page 18), but has also become a theme for compositions to the most eminent masters, such as Palestrina, Orlando di Lasso, Allegri, Scarlatti, Leonardo Leo, Thomas Bai, Zingarelli, Pergolese, Jomelli, Fioravanti, Fdtis, Vogler, Stadler, etc. The most renowned among these compositions is that by Gregorio Allegri (a descendant of Correggio, born at Rome in 1590, t 1640), in which two choirs, one of four, the other of five parts, sing alternately until the finale, where all join in pianissimo, the measure also becoming gradually slower. This piece, from the time it was composed, has always been sung on Wednesday and Friday of Passion-week in the Sistine Chapel at Rome. One writer says: “Never by mortal ear was heard a strain of such powerful, such heart-moving pathos. The accordant tones of a hundred human voices, and one which seemed more than human, ascended together to heaven for mercy to mankind — for pardon to a guilty and sinning world. It had nothing in it of this earth — nothing that breathed the ordinary feelings of our nature. Its effects upon the minds of those who heard it were almost too powerful to be borne, and never can be forgotten. One gentleman fainted and was carried out; and many of the ladies near me were in agitation even more distressing, which they vainly struggled to  suppress. It was the music of Allegri; but the composition, however fine, is nothing without the voices which perform it here.” Another writer says: “At the conclusion of this portion of the service, and when the darkness is complete by the concealment of the last light, commences the Miserere. This is the 51st Psalm. And as it is breathed by the choir — the most perfect and practiced choir in the world — as it is heard in all the stillness and solemnity of the scene, wrapped in darkness, and leaving nothing to distract the eye where all looks dim and shadowy, it has a strange and wonderful effect. It is designed to express, as far as music can express, the deep and mental agonies of the dying Saviour; and certainly there never yet was heard, except among the shepherds of Bethlehem on the night of the nativity, such sounds, so unearthly, and unlike the music of the world. It is plaintive, intensely melancholy, and has a powerful effect under the peculiar circumstances of the scene.” It was formerly the exclusive property of the Sistine Chapel, the partition being jealously kept there; Mozart succeeded, however, in writing it down after hearing it twice. It has since been repeatedly published. While the Miserere is sung, the pope kneels at the altar, the cardinals at their desks, and as it proceeds the lights at the altar are extinguished one by one, which is explained by Gavanti, Thes. 2:99: “Ad unumquemque psalmum (there are other psalms sung before the Miserere) exstinguitur una candela, una post aliam, quia apostoli paulatim defecerunt a Christo.” In fact, the whole use of this psalm in Passion-week is intended ad designandum apostolorumn timorem. The word miserere has in modern days come to be applied to any sacred composition of a penitential character. See Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 9:547; Eadie, Eccles. Cyclop. s.v.; Siegel, Christliche Alterthumer (see Index in volume 4).

## Misereres[[@Headword:Misereres]]

             Elbowed stalls, often found in cathedral, collegiate, and minster churches, with seats that may be turned up, so as to give an opportunity of kneeling in those parts of the service in which the language of supplication (“miserere”) occurs. They were allowed in the Roman Catholic Church as a relief to the infirm during the long services that were required to be performed by the ecclesiastics in a standing posture. They are always more or less ornamented with carvings of leaves, small figures, animals, etc., which are generally very boldly cut. Examples are to be found in almost all  English churches which retain any of the ancient stalls; the oldest is in Henry the Seventh's Chapel at Westminster, where there is one in the style of the 13th century.

## Misericord[[@Headword:Misericord]]

             is a term used to denote various offices and articles.

(1) Subsellia-Spanish subsilia-the folding seat of a stall. SEE MISERERES.

(2) A compassionate mitigation of full penance.

(3) According to Lyndwood, a custom in certain monasteries of relieving a number of monks, in alternate weeks, from attendance in choir, and claustral duties.

(4) A hall for eating flesh-meat in a monastery. Some convents, as Canterbury and Westminster, had country hospitals for convalescents.

(5) The word also implied stated indulgences and allowances, according to circumstances, of food, drink, wine or beer, or clothing or bedding, beyond the rule. And, finally, some writers, misled by the glossarist of Matthew Paris, have called a misericord a guzzle of wine, an imperfect definition taken from the refreshment of that liquor granted during the above period. See Walcott, Sacred Archeology, s.v.; Fosbrooke, British Monachism, chapter 48.

## Misericordia Domini[[@Headword:Misericordia Domini]]

             is the name of the second Sunday from Easter, so called from the opening lines of the mass read on that day in the Romish churches. In the Greek Church the day is frequently called St. Thomas's Sunday.

## Misgab[[@Headword:Misgab]]

             (Heb. Misgab', מַשְׂגָּב, height, as often; Sept. Α᾿μάθ τὸ κραταίωμα v.r. Μασιγάθ, and τὸ ὀχύρωμα Μωάβ,Vulg. fortis), a town in Moab, situated on the desolating track of the invading Babylonians (Jer 48:1), probably so called from being located on an eminence. De Saulcy (Narrative, 1:391) suggests a connection with the present Wady el-Mujeb, the ancient Arnon; but this is merely fanciful. The place is doubtless to be sought near the associated localities of Kiriathaim and Heshbon; perhaps it is only an appellative (as it usually has the article) for the older locality  BAMOTH SEE BAMOTH (q.v.). Others think it may be the MIZPEH of Moab (1Sa 23:3), or a general name for the highlands of Moab, as in Isa 25:12 (without the art. A.V. “high fort”). SEE MOAB.

## Mishael[[@Headword:Mishael]]

             (Heb. Misphal', מַישָׁאֵל, who is like God Sept. Μισαήλ), the name of three men.

1. The eldest of the three sons of Uzziel (the son of Kohath and grandson of Levi), and consequently the cousin of Aaron (Exo 6:22). He, with his brother Elzaphan, at the command of Moses, carried out the bodies of Nadab and Abihu to burial (Lev 10:4). B.C. 1657. They may thus have been two of those whose defilement by a dead body prevented their keeping the passover at Sinai on the regular day (Num 9:6; see Blunt, Coincidences, ad loc.).

2. The second named of the three Hebrew youths (Dan 1:6) trained along with Daniel at the Babylonian court (Dan 1:11), and promoted to the rank of magi (Dan 1:19). Having assisted Daniel in solving the dream of Nebuchadnezzar (Dan 2:17), they were advanced to civil dignities (Dan 3:12); but were afterwards cast into the blazing furnace for refusing to worship the royal idol; and, being miraculously delivered from it, they were still more highly honored by the king (Dan 3:13-30). His Chaldaean name was MESHACH (Dan 1:7). B.C. cir. 580.

3. One of those (apparently chief Israelites) who supported Ezra on the left hand while reading the law to the people after the captivity (Neh 8:4). B.C. 410.

## Mishal[[@Headword:Mishal]]

             (Heb. Mishal', מַשְׁאָל, prob. entreaty; Sept. Μισαλά), a city of the tribe of Asher (Jos 19:26, where it is Anglicized “Misheal”), assigned to the Levites of the family of Gershom (Jos 21:30); elsewhere called MASHAL (1Ch 6:74). It is doubtless the Masan referred to by Eusebius (Onomast. s.v. Μασάν) as situated on the Mediterranean, near Carmel, a position with which the text (Jos 19:26) agrees (see Keil, Comment. ad loc.). It is probably the modern ruined village Misalli, near  the shore about three miles north of Athlit (Van de Velde, Memoir, page 335).

## Misham[[@Headword:Misham]]

             (Heb. Misham', מַשְׁעָם, according to Gesenins, their cleansing or their beholding; according to Mirst, madness; Sept. Μισσάλ, Vulg. Misaam), one of the sons of Elpaal, of the tribe of Benjamin, mentioned as the rebuilders of Ono, Lod, and their suburbs (1Ch 8:12). B.C. post 1612.

## Misheail[[@Headword:Misheail]]

             (Jos 19:26). SEE MISHAL.

## Mishma[[@Headword:Mishma]]

             (Heb. Mishmanza', מַשְׁמָע, hearing, as in Isa 11:3; Sept. Μασμά), the name of two men.

1. The fifth of the twelve sons of Ishmael, and heads of Arabian tribes (Gen 25:14; 1Ch 1:30). B.C. considerably post 2061. The people called by Ptolemy Mcescemanes (6:7, 21, ), who were located to the north-east of Medina, were probably descended from him. Arabic writers mention the Beni-Mismah (Freytag, Hamas, II, 1:220), but nothing is known of them (Kilobel, Genes. ad loc.). SEE ARABIA.

2. The son of Mibsan, of the tribe of Simeon, and father of Hamuel (1Ch 4:25-26). B.C. considerably ante 1053.

## Mishmannah[[@Headword:Mishmannah]]

             (Heb. Mishmannah', מַשְׁמִנָּה,afntness; Sept. Μασμάν v.r. Μασμανά), the fourth of the Gadite braves who repaired to David in the wilderness of Adullam (1Ch 12:10). B.C. cir. 1061.

## Mishna[[@Headword:Mishna]]

             (Heb. מַשְׁנָה, Mishndh)', the code of Jewish laws arranged about the year A.D. 200 or 220, at Tiberias, in Palestine, by R. Jehudah, surnamed Hakkadosh (q.v.). The title is by some understood as importing “second,” like מַשְׁנֶהin Gen 43:23, the rabbinical code being second or next to  the Pentateuch; it is so interpreted in the rabbinical lexicon Schulchan Aruch, but we think it is more likely derived from שׁנה, to study, also to teach, which perhaps at first meant only “to repeat.” In the Talmud (q.v.), quotations from the Mishna are introduced by the Aramaic word תְּנִן, Tenan, i.e., we have studied; and the book itself is called מִתְנַיתַיןAmathnithin; while the rabbins who lived before the publication of the Mishna are spoken of as, learners, or perhaps teachers; and their sayings, not found in that collection, are quoted תניא, “it was learned or taught.” The version “learners” for Tannain is not unnatural, as the Heb. official name for Rabbins is תִּלְמַידַי חֲכָמַיםdisciples of the wise. The sons of R. Jehudah are named among the Tannain, and they most probably assisted in the completion of the work of the Mishna.

The sayings recorded in the Mishna reach back to the times of Simon the Just, a contemporary of Alexander the Great; and it expounds also some religious and political usages introduced by Ezra; but the bulk of the book is made up of the decisions or opinions of the rival schools of Hillel and Shammai, who arose at the beginning of the 1st century of the Christian sera, and of the subsequent teachers, who followed generally the rulings of Hillel's school, and among whom Hillel's descendants were prominent. In a few instances a case (מִעֲשֶׂה) is stated to have arisen, and the decision of the Sanhedrin (q.v.) upon it, or of some prominent rabbi, is given; very often the names of the teachers who taught any particular point are mentioned, even where no disagreement is spoken of; but much oftener in cases of disagreement. Still oftener, however, the text of the law appears without any one to propound it: these parts of the Mishna are ascribed to R. Meir, who flourished about A.D. 145, and it is therefore probable that R. Meir made an older collection, of which the .Mishna as now found is only an enlargement.

The authority for the laws of the Mishna is, best explained in the first section of the first chapter of its treatise, אָבוֹת (Aboth, fathers): “Moses received the law from Sinai, and handed it over to Joshua, and Joshua to the elders, and the elders to the prophets, and the prophets to the men of the Great Synod” (the companions and followers of Ezra down to about B.C. 300). The meaning hereof is, that Moses received not only the written law from God, but also certain rules for its construction and application; and that even in the most corrupt times of Israel's history there were always some pure and holy men, who kept up the study of this tradition,  and handed it over unbroken to their successors. Moreover, it was inferred from Deu 17:9 that the supreme judges for the time being might make authoritative decisions on facts as they arose; and that these decisions must serve as precedents for the future, unless reversed by a court of “greater wisdom and greater number.” The words “priests and Levites” in that verse were construed by the Pharisees merely to indicate the place at which tie supreme judges must hold their sessions. The rules of construction of the Pentateuch are stated as thirteen, among which the foremost are קִל וְחֹמֶר, Kal ve-chomer, a minori ad majus, and שָׁוָהגְּזֵרָה, Gezerah shavah, “like decision.” The latter, however, rests generally on the arbitrary comparison of the same word in two wholly disconnected passages, and is not allowed unless tradition itself sanction it. Besides these rules of construction, certain ceremonies in their full form were also believed to have thus been handed down, while the letter of the law only hinted at the manner of performing them. Thus Exo 13:9; Exo 13:16; Deu 6:10; Deu 11:18, command the tying of those respective passages to the hand and between the eyes of the Israelite; but tradition supplied the manner of doing it, that is, the construction of the phylacteries. The second section of the above-quoted chapter proceeds: “They (the men of the great synod) said three things: . . make a fence to the law.”

That is, put around the law a wall of restrictions and injunctions, which the Israelite will have to break through before he feels tempted to break the law itself. This was, in fact, done to a great extent by the teachers whose sayings are recorded in the Mishna. Many of their so-called גְּזֵרוֹת (decisions) — a name given to the extra-Mosaic laws — refer to a stricter observance of the Sabbath, and these are comprehended under the name of שַׁבּוּת which decisions Selden renders Sabbathismvus; forbidding, for instance, the handling on the Sabbath of anything that has been unlawfully made on that day; the causing a Gentile (unless in case of necessity) to work on the Sabbath for the Israelite; to play musical' instruments on that day, etc. Others refer to Levitical cleanness; among these are numberless rules about the washing of hands, of cups, etc., at the ordinary meals, in imitation of the rules which the Aaronitic priesthood had to observe at their sacrificial meals. It was principally by these observances that the followers of the rabbins, whom Christian writers generally denote as the Pharisaic sect, but who called themselves חֲבֵרַים (companions), distinguished themselves not only from the Sadducees (q.v.), but also from  the indifferent mass, who are known in the Mishna as עִם הָאָרֶוֹ. (people of the land), and are often spoken of with a great deal of bitterness.

The writers of the Mishna never seek to make their readers believe that a rabbinical ordinance, which is intended only as a part of the fence around the law, is of :divine origin; but where doubt can arise about the meaning, they expressly show what is intended for a construction of the law, and what is their own addition, often by the words פָּטוּר (free; that is, not liable to stripes for a wilful offence, or to a sin-offering for offence. through ignorance or forgetfulness); yet אָסוּר (forbidden). In the very first section of the first chapter of the Mishna — where the question arises how late at night the passages Deu 6:5-10; Deu 11:13-21, may be read in fulfilment of the command to speak of them “when thou liest down,” we find: “The learned (חֲכָמַים as opposed to any one rabbi by name) say until midnight; and rabbi Gamaliel said until the morning dawn; in fact, when his sons came home from a feast, and told him We have not read the Shema (Hear, O Israel), he told them, As the morning has not dawned, you should read it; not this only, but wherever the wise have said until midnight, the command reaches to dawn, etc.; and why have they said till midnight? in order to keep man from transgression.”

The style of the Mishna is, with very few exceptions, dry and crowded, with not a word to spare; and the book is written for men who already know the great principles of which they only seek the details. Historical or legendary notices are rare; and the few dogmatic passages — for instance, the chapter about a future life run in the same style as if they were given for the guidance of an ordinary court of justice; the chapter, Who has no share in the world to come? follows naturally upon the chapters, Who are to be hanged? Who are to be stoned? A few instances will be given below.

The language of the Mishna is in the main not Aramaic, but Hebrew; stripped, however, of all that is idiomatic about Hebrew, such as the use of the conversive vav, and filled with many Aramaic forms, such as the masculine plurals in יו for the truly Hebrew . - That the people of Palestine generally spoke pure Aramaic as early as the days of Christ, and even long before, is well enough known from other sources; but the Mishna attests it by quoting terse sayings in that language, e.g. צִעֲרָא אִגְרָא כְּפוּם— “like the toil is the reward.” A very large number of Greek words are also found: thus אסטניס (ἀσθενής) is always put for “sickly;” לסטים (λῃσταί) for  “robbers.” Latin words also occur, but not so frequently, and generally in a somewhat corrupt form, while the Greek words .are rendered about as exactly as the Hebrew alphabet will allow. (Gomp. Bondi, אֶסְתֵּר אוֹר, Beleuchtung der in Talmud. v. Babylon u. Jerusalem. in d. Targumnim u. Midraschim vorkommenden fj'emden, besonders lateinischen Worter [Dessau, 1812, 8vo; Hartmann, Supplenmenta [Rost. 1813, 4to]; especially his Thesaurus linguce Hebraicae Mishna augendae [3 parts, 1825-26, 4to]).

We proceed to give an analysis of the Mishna, keeping strictly to it, and leaving out of view anything that may be taught by the Tannain, but which is regarded as בָּרִיתָא, Baraytha, i.e., ‘outside,' although known to be sayings of these teachers, because they are not collected in the Mishna, and simply occur either in quotations in the Talmud or elsewhere.

The Mishna is divided into six parts (סְדָרַים, Sedarim, arrangements), which contain 62 treatises (מִסָּכוֹת, Massakoth), and 514 chapters (פְּרָקַים, Perakim). The latter, again, are divided into numbered sections, each of which is called a Mishna. The great parts and the treatises are named after their contents, the chapters after their opening words. (The figures set after each treatise show its number of chapters.)

I. The first part — זְרָעַים, Zera'imn, seeds — contains eleven treatises. The first of these — בְרָכוֹת, Berakoth, benedictions (9) — treats of the reading of the Shema (see above), daily prayers, and grace before and after meals, the purgations to be made as a preparation for prayer, and like subjects. The ten other treatises refer to the laws of the field and of its produce: פֵּאָה, Peah, corner (8), treats of the field corners, gleanings, etc., to be left to the poor; דְּמִאי, Demai, doubtful (7), of corn or fruits coming from the indifferent, who might have failed to tithe it; כַלְאִיַם, Kilayim, mixtures (9), of the prohibited mingling of fruit and grain crops on the same field or vineyard, and incidentally of the forbidden mixture of wool and flax in garments (Lev 19:19); שְׁבַיעַית, Shebi'ith, seventh (10), of the Sabbatic year; תְּרוּמוֹת, Terumoth, tributes (11), of the tributes from the crop; which were due to the Aaronitic priests, including the tithe of tithe due them from the Levites; מִעֲשֵׂרוֹת, Ma'aseroth, tithes (5), of the tithes due to the Levites; מִעֲשֵׂר שֵׁנַי, Ma'aser Sheni, second tithe (5), of the tithe which was eaten or otherwise spent in the joy of the yearly feasts,  but which in the third year was given to the poor; חִלְּה, Challah, dough (4), refers to the tribute from the baking-trough, which was given to the priests; עָרְלָה, ‘Orlah, literally foreskin (3), of the forbidden fruits of the trees in Palestine during the first three years of their growth (Lev 19:23); בַּכּוּרַים, Bikkurim, first-fruits (4), treats in its first three chapters of the firstfruits which were to be brought to the tabernacle and given to the priests (Deu 26:5), while the fourth chapter is only added to it to bring it to the close of one of the six great parts, and is called Α᾿νδρόγυνος, androgynos, spelled in Hebrew אנדרוגינוס, the man- woman, and contains a few laws as to persons of doubtful sex.

II. The next great division, מוֹעֵד, Mo'ed, season, contains twelve treatises. The first, שִׁבָּת, Sabbath (24), treats of the duties of that day; remarkable for the enumeration of thirty-nine different kinds of work, by each of which; separately, the guilt of Sabbath-breaking may be incurred. Of each kind a type is given, to which many other actions may be compared as falling within the same reason. A very great proportion of the treatise is taken up with the laws of mere “Sabbathismus” (see above). The next treatise, עֵרוּבַין, ‘Erubin, mingling (10), deals with those ceremonies by which the Sabbath boundary was extended, “mingling” a whole town into one fictitious yard, so that carrying within it should not be unlawful; or how the Sabbath boundary of a town, within which one might walk on the Sabbath-day, can be extended. Then comes פְּסָחַים, Pesachim (10), which relates to the Passover, and all things connected with its celebration; שְׁקָלַים, Shekalim, shekel-pieces (8), about various tributes, going to the Temple, and various rites in it, at different seasons of the year; יוֹמָא, Yoma, the day (8), on the service of the day of Atonement; סֻוּכָּה, Sukkah, hut (5), about the hut and festival bunch of the Feast of Tabernacles, and the rules about reading the Psalms of Praise (113-118) on that and other feasts; בֵּיצָה, Betsah, egg (5), so called from its first word. An egg laid on a feast-day, the school of Shammai says, may be eaten; the school of Hillel says, may not be eaten (i.e., on the same day) —this being one of the very few cases in which the latter school is stricter than the other. It is not pretended that “guilt” under the law is incurred by eating fresh-laid eggs on holidays. The treatise deals mostly with what may or may not be done on the great holidays in the preparation of food, actions which on the Sabbath would be clearly unlawful. Next, הִשָּׁנָה ראֹשׁ, Rosh Hash-shanah, New-  year (4), gives the laws of the feast which goes by that name among the later Jews, but which in the Bible (Lev 23:24) is called the first of the seventh month; it also teaches how to fix the days of new moon. The treatise תִּעֲנַית, Ta'anith, fast (4), refers principally to the prayers for rain, and to the fasts, private and public, that were kept in years of drought; מְגַלָּה, Megillah, the scroll (4), refers to the feast of Purim, the reading of (the scroll of) the Book of Esther, then of the reading of the Pentateuch and Prophet lessons, and denounces as heretical certain variations in the liturgy and certain spiritual modes of construing passages of the law; for instance, “He who takes the law of incest figuratively should be silenced;” that is, he who extends it to the disgracing his father or mother. This passage is evidently directed against the early Christians, and their modes of teaching. The treatise מֹועֵד קָטָן, Mo'ed Katan, small holiday (3), treats mainly of the mourning rites, these being forbidden on all feasts, even on the half-holidays between the first and last day of Passover and of the Feast of Huts; while the last treatise, חֲגַיגָה, Chagigahl, feasting (3), speaks of the voluntary sacrifice-other than the Paschal lamb — offered by the individual Jews on the great feasts.

III. The third part of the Mishna is called נָשַׁים, Nashim, women, and embraces seven treatises. The first of these, יְבָמוֹת, Yebamoth, Levirate (16), discusses the law found in Deu 25:5-9. Its first section may give a good idea of the manner of the Mishna: “Fifteen women free their rival wives and their rival's rivals from the ‘shoe-pulling' (Deu 25:9) and brother's marriage to the world's end: his daughter (the dead brother's wife being the daughter of a surviving brother), son's daughter or daughter's daughter; his wife's daughter, wife's son's daughter, or wife's daughter's daughter; his mother-in-law, mother- in-law's mother, father-in-law's mother; his sister on the mother's side, mother's sister or wife's sister, and the wife of his brother by the mother's side, and the wife of his brother, who was not alive at the same time with him, and his daughter-in-law; all these free their rival wives,” etc. (that they are free themselves is taken for granted). The treatise כְּתוּבוֹתKethuboth (13), discusses the prescribed marriage contracts and marital rights in general, and shows a much higher regard for the rights of wives and daughters than most, if not all, ancient codes of law; נְדָרַים, Nedarim (11), treats of vows, and contains some of that harsh casuistry which meets with rebuke in the New Testament; נָזַיר, Nazir, the crowned (9), of the  special vow of the Nazarite (Num 6:2); סוֹטָה, Sotah, the erring woman (9), of the ordeal for wives suspected of faithlessness (Numbers chapter 5). The last chapter of this treatise relates the gradual decay and downfall of national and religious life in Israel from the times of the early Maccabees; it foretells the signs of the approaching Messiah, and winds up with setting forth the qualities that lead upwards to eternal life. The next treatise, גַּטַּין, Gittin, divorce-bills (9), is set apart to the law of divorce; and קַדּוּשַׁין, Kiddushin, betrothals (4), the last of this great division, to the laws of the marriage ceremony. But a great part of it is taken up with counsels as to the trade or profession in which an Israelite should bring up his son; and many occupations are named which unmarried men should not follow, on account of the great facilities they offer for unchaste practices.

IV. The fourth grand division is styled נְזַיקַין, Nezikin, injuries, and most of the ten treatises contained in it deal with the principles and the practice of civil and criminal law. The first three treatises, each of ten chapters, are called by Aramaic names — בָּבָא קִמָּא, Baba Kamma, the first gate, i.e., court; בָּבָא מְצַיעָא, Baba Metsi'a, the middle gate; בָּבָא בִתְרָא, Baba Bathra, last gate-and discuss the laws between man and man in matters of property, that are deducible from the Pentateuch, or had been suggested by experience. In the “first gate” the law of bailment is taught, without being involved in the obscurities of the degrees of negligence which the Roman lawyers have thrown around it; the only principle recognised is, What was the intent of the bailor when he made the loan, or pledge, or deposit of his goods? against what dangers did he intend to secure them? what risks did he intend to take? The text in Exo 22:6-14 shows that even a depositary without hire is liable for theft, though not for forcible robbery; for that the goods should not be stolen was the very object of the deposit. The same general doctrine prevailed in the English law, till lord Holt, chief justice during the reign of queen Anne, disturbed it by views imported from Roman jurisprudence. The measure of damages for assault and bodily injuries is also given, and the “ eye for eye” of the sacred text is construed as meaning only damages in money for the lasting injury; while an additional allowance must be made for loss of time, cost of cure (Exo 21:19), pain and disgrace — this last element of damages being derived from the “cutting off the hand” in Deu 25:12, which is taken figuratively only.

The fourth treatise is named סִנְהֶדְרַין, Sanhedrin (i.e.Συνέδρια), courts of justice (11). The first two chapters  set forth the constitution of the Jewish commonwealth, rather as the Pharisaic party would have wished to see it, than as it ever was, with all the great powers, political and judicial, in the hands of the supreme court of seventy-one learned judges; and both the high-priest and king as figure- heads. Of the latter it is said, “The king does not judge, and none judges him; does not testify, and none testifies concerning him.” The practice in criminal cases is minutely set forth; while cases of bailments or trespasses, arising under the peculiar Mosaic law, were to be tried by three judges, and ordinary commercial cases even by a single judge; criminal charges must be tried before courts composed of twenty-three members. The forms were analogous to those of England and America — that is, based on the idea of accusation and defence, not of inquiry and confession. No person — once acquitted could be retried, but all facilities were given, to the last moment, to establish the innocence of the convicted, either on points of law or fact. The modes of capital execution are also given — stoning and burning in such a way as to cause instant death. Among the chapters which begin, “The following are stoned,” “The following are hung,” we find also one which begins thus, “The following have no share in the world to come: he who says, The resurrection is not found in the law, or the law is not from heaven, and the Epicurean (materialist).” The next treatise, מִכּוֹת, Makkoth, stripes (3), treats of the punishment of false witnesses, and of crimes punishable by stripes; then comes שְׁבוּעוֹת, Sheb'oth, oaths (8), about the decisive oath in civil causes; there was no other oath, as witnesses always testified without oath under sanction of the commandment not to bear false witness. The admission and forms of testimony are then discussed in עֵדָיוֹת, ‘Edayoth, testimonies (8). Then comes עֲבוֹדָה זָרָה, ‘Abodah Zarah, idolatry (5), showing what manner of intercourse with idolaters and what things connected with idolatry are forbidden to the Israelite; for instance, the use of wine handled by a Gentile; for he might have made an idolatrous libation of it. The next treatise, אָבוֹת, Aboth, fathers (5), contains the collected wisdom of the “ fathers,” which name here, but nowhere else, is bestowed upon the sages of the Mishna. The whole of it, with a good English translation, can be found in the common (orthodox) Jewish prayer-book, SEE LITURGY, where a sixth chapter of somewhat later origin is added. The treatise opens, as above stated, by bringing the tradition down from Moses to the Great Syiod; it then carries it from (1) Simon the Just, one of its last survivors, to (2) Antigonus of Socho. who taught to despise reward, and is  said to have given rise to the Sadducaean heresy; (3) Jose of Zeredah and Jose of Jerusalem; (4) Joshua, son of Perahiah, whom later legends, by an anachronism, describe as the teacher of Jesus and Nittai the Arbelite; (5) Jehudah, son of Tabbai, and Simeon ben-Shetah, the reformer of the criminal and civil law, and defender of religion and liberty against the tyranny of king Jannaeus; (6) Shemaiah and Abtalyon, said to be of convert descent; (7) Hillel and Shammai, the founders of the great rival schools; (8) Johanan, or John, the son of Zaccai; (9) Gamaliel, known as the teacher of Paul, and seemingly a son or grandson of Hillel; (10) Simeon, his son; (11) Gamaliel. the son of Simeon; (12) Jehudah Hakkadosh, the compiler of the Mishna. The “couples” in this chain are generally thought to consist of the president and vice-president of the Sanhedrin for the time being, called respectively נָשַׂיא(prince) and אִב בֵּית דַּין(father of the court). The treatise contains the favorite moral and dogmatic sayings of these and other rabbins. Many of them are merely practical rules of life; some address themselves to judges; but more of them exhort to the study of the law, and still more to good works. The future world is much: referred to; and one rabbi Jacob (chapter 4:§ 21) says, in the spirit of the early Christians. “This world is the anteroom to the coming world; prepare in the anteroom, that thou mayest enter the banqueting-hall” (triclinium). But the study of the law and good works (מַצְוֹת, Mitzvoth, commandments), and not faith, is recommended as the road to future happiness. Elsewhere unbelief is denounced as forfeiting the world to come; but it seems that in the present treatise this tenet was not insisted on. A very remarkable point is the endeavor (chapter 5:8, 9) to reconcile the philosophic view of unchangeable laws of nature with the Biblical account of miracles: “Ten things were created in the twilight of the eve of Sabbath (of creation week) — that is, the mouth of the earth (which swallowed Korah), the mouth of the well (in the wilderness), the mouth of Balaam's ass, the rainbow, the manna, the rod (of Moses), the diamond worm (said to have cut the stones for the Temple), the alphabet, the writing (on the tables), and the tables.” The last treatise of this part is הוֹרָיוֹת, Horayoth (3), concerning forms of trial.

V. The fifth grand division, קֹדָשַׁים, Kodashim, with its eleven treatises, relates mostly to sacrifices, and was obsolete when the Mishna was composed. The very full treatment given to this subject shows how strong were the hopes of a speedy restoration. We have here זְבָחַים, Zebachim,  slaughtered offerings (14); מְנָחוֹת, Menachoth, offerings made of flour (13), whose subject is indicated by their title, though somewhat more is comprised in them. But the next treatise, חוֹלין, Cholin, unsanctified things (12), treats of the food allowed or disallowed to the Jew; especially of the mode of slaughtering beasts and fowls, and of the marks of disease, which render the eating of their flesh unlawful. We have then בְּכוֹרוֹת, Bekoroth, (sacrifices of) first-born animals (9); עֵרָכַין, ‘Erakin, estimates (9), i.e., for redeeming consecrated men or beasts in money, according to the standard laid down in Leviticus (chapter 5 and 27); תְּמוּרָה, Temurah, exchange (7), referring to the exchange of the beasts; כְּרַיתוֹת, Kerithoth, excisions (6), which teaches what sins are threatened with the punishment, “That soul shall be cut off from its people.” This treatise is put in this connection because most of the sacrifices dealt with in this division are penances for sin. It is followed by מְעַילָה, Me'ilah, (the sacrifice for) embezzlement (6), see Lev 5:15; and תָּמַיד, Tamid, daily sacrifice (7), whose titles express their main subjects. The latter closes with the list of the psalms that were sung by the Levites in the Temple on the seven days of the week: Sunday, Psalms 24; Monday, Psalms 48; Tuesday, Psalms 82; Wednesday, Psalms 94; Thursday, Psalms 81 : Friday, Psalms 93; on the Sabbath, of course, Psalms 92. The next treatise, מַדּוֹת, Middoth, measures (5), gives an exact description of the Herodian temple, and of all its appointments. The division closes with the rather mystical treatise, קַנַּים, Kinnim, nests (3), which discusses the law on birds' nests (Deu 22:6).

VI. The last grand division, טָהַרוֹת, Tohoreth, cleanness, is the largest of all, though it was also in most of its parts useless when the Mishna was written: as the right to enter the Temple or to eat of sanctified food (respectively to be eaten as sanctified food) are the main tests of technical cleanness. We find here twelve treatises: כֵּלַים, Kelim, vessels (30); אֹהָלוֹת, Ohaloth, tents (18), the latter of which treats of the communication to a house and to its contents of uncleanness by the presence of a dead body in it. This remained of interest to the Aaronitish priests, who must not defile themselves with a dead body other than of their next blood relations; which law is supposed to remain in force notwithstanding the disuse of sacrifices. Then comes נְגָעַים, dega'im,  plagues (14), about leprosy; פָּרָה, Parcah, the cow (12), the ashes of which were used to purge the defilement by the touch of the dead (Num 19:2); טָהַרוֹת, Tohoroth, here in the sense of purification (10); מַקְוָאוֹת, Mikvaoth, bathing-cisterns (10), which retain an interest beyond the Holy Land, and beyond the times of the Temple, in connection with the next treatise; נַדָּה, Niddah, the separated, i.e., the menstruating woman (10). Then we have מִכְשַׁירַין, Makshzrin, what renders fit (to receive uncleanness) (6); זָבַים, Zabim, spermatorrhoea (5); טַבּוּל יוֹם, Tibbul Yom, dipping of the (same) day (4), the ablution of vessels in cisterns, which, as a shadow of Levitical cleanness, was kept up in post- templic times; יָדִיַם, Yadayim, hands (4), which refers to the washing of hands, an avowedly rabbinic institution. The last treatise of the whole collection is עוּקָצַין, ‘Ukatsin, fruit stems (3), with some unimportant laws about Levitical cleanness; among others, those that relate to fruitstems. At the end is placed a reflection on the blessing of peace, so that the book may close with the favorite verse (Psa 29:11), “The Lord give strength to his people; the Lord bless his people with peace.”

The principal commentaries on the Mishna are, of course, the Talmuds — Jerusalem and Babylonian: the former covers the whole work, while the latter omits much of the obsolete parts. But the Mishna, or by the more appropriate phrase מַשְׁנָיוֹת, in the plural (setting aside the singular form for the single section), is found published, without either Talmud, in six volumes, each of which contains one of the great divisions. It is generally accompanied by two running commentaries, both of which take most of their matter from the Talmud; the first of these, by R. Obadiah, of Bartenora, is explanatory; the other, called the Tosephoth (i.e., additions), of R. Yom Tob, of Prague, raises and solves difficulties and seeming contradictions, and was written towards the beginning of the Thirty-Years' War. Maimonides wrote a much more valuable commentary on the Mishna in 1168; but being written in Arabic, and but partially rendered into the rabbinical Hebrew, it is seldom used or seen. The Hebrew abridgment, entitled מַשְׁנֶה תוֹרָה, or סֵפֶר הִי8ד, i.e., the book of fourteen (books), and divided into four parts, was published at Soncilio (1490, 2 volumes, fol.): republished at Venice (1524, 3 vols. fol.) and at Amsterdam (1701, 4 volumes, fol.). Selections from it were made in English by Bernard, entitled The [Main Principles of the Creed and Ethics of the Jews, exhibited in Selections from the Yad Hach azakah of Maimnonides, with a literal  English Translation, copious Illustrations from the Talmud, etc. (Camb. 1832, 8vo); and an entire version into English made by several writers, under the editorship of E. Soloweyezik, was begun at London (1863, 8vo). Various commentaries in the rabbinical language, of no great merit, written during the 17th and 18th centuries, are printed in the ordinary editions of the Mishna, which are quite cheap To the Persian Jews the Mishna is the only standard, as the Talmuds are almost unknown among them. (L.N.D.)

Editions of the Mishna. — The principal editions of the Mishna are by (1) Menasse ben-Israel, with short glosses (Amsterd. 1631); (2) Jose ben- Israel (ibid. 1646); (3) Israel ben-Elijah Gbtz, with Cabalistic Book Jetsira (Venice, 1704, 8vo); (4) with the commentary of Maimonides (Naples, 1492, fol.); (5) do., Mishnaioth in Perush Rambarn (Venice, 1606, fol.); (6) and by far the best and favorite edition, by Prof. Surenhusius of Amsterdam, which is furnished not only with the commentaries, but also with a Latin translation. It is entitled, Mischna, sive totius Hebrceorum Juris, Rituue, Antiquitatum, et Legumn oralium Systema, cum clarissimorum Rabbinorum Maimonidis et Bartenorae Commentariis in tegris, quibus accedunt variorum Auctorum Notes et Versionis in eos quos ediderunt Codices (Amst. 1668-1703, 6 volumes, fol.). The several treatises of the Mishna have also been translated into Latin by different authors, the principal of whom are:

Order./Treatise.Translator.Publication.I. BerakothEdzardHamb. 1713, 4to.PeahGnisiusOxf. 1690, 4to.Demai““Kilaim““Shebiith““Terumoth““Maaseroth““MaaserSheni Surenhusius.Challah“OrlahLudwigLeipsic, 1695.Bikknrim““1696.II. SabbathSchmid & WottollLeipsic 1670.Erubin“

PesachimSurenhusius.ShekalimOthoGeneva, 1675.YomaSheringhamLondon, 1648.SukkahDachsCologne, 1726.BetsahSurenhuuis.Rosh-hashanah.HoutingAmsterd. 1695.TaanithLundyCologne, 1694.MegillahSurenhusius.Moed Katan“ChagigahLudwigLeipsic, 1796.III. YebamlothSurenlhusius.KethubothFastBasle, 1699.NedarimUlmnannLeipsic, 1663.Nazir“SotahWagenseilAltorf, 1663.GittinSurenhubius.Kiddushin“IV. Baba KamaL'Empereur1637.Baba MetsiaSurenhusius.Baba Bathra“SanhedrinCocceisAmsterd. 1629.Makkoth“ShebuothUlmann1663.EdaothSurenhusius.Aboda ZaraPeringerAltorf, 1680.AbothSurenhusius.HoriothLudwigLeipsic, 1696.

V. ZebachimUlman1663.MenachothSurenhusius.CholinBekorothErakin“Temurah“KerithothUlmann1663.

MeilaSurenhusius.TamidPeringerAltorf, 1680.MiddothL'Empereur1630.KinnimSurenhusius.VI. Kelim, Ohaloth, Negaim, Parab, Tohoroth, Mikvaoth, Niddah, Makshirin, Zabim, Tibbul Yom, Yadaim, and Ukazin — all by Suirenhusins.

The entire Mishna has been translated into Spanish by Abraham ben- Reuben (Venice, 1606, fol.); into German by Rabe: Die ganze Mischna (Ausbach, 1760-63, 6 volumes, 4to); and by Dr. Jost (Berlin, 1832-33, 6 volumes, 4to). Into English have been rendered the treatises Sabbath and Erubin by Dr. Wotton (Lond. 1718); the treatise Aboth, in the Jewish Prayer-book, by Young (Edinb.); the treatises Berakoth, Kilaim, Sabbath, Erubin, Pesachim, Yoma, Sukkah, Yom Tob, Rosh-hashanah, Taanith, Megilla, Moed Katan, Yebamoth, Kethuboth, Gittin, Kiddushin,.Cholin, and Yadainz, wholly or in part by De Sola and Raphall (Lond. 1843, 8vo; 2d ed. 1845).

From all this it appears that the Christian Church has been largely identified with a study of the Mishna, and that the charge, so frequently reiterated, that Christian theologians are unacquainted with Jewish traditional lore is unjust. Indeed it is very apparent that even the Church fathers were more or less familiar with the Mishna, which they termed δευτερώσεις. Jerome first mentions it (Epist. ad Aglas, qu. 10): “I cannot declare how vast are the traditions of the Pharisees, or how anile their myths, called by them δευτερώσεις (Mishnaioth); neither would their bulky nature permit the attempt.” Epiphanius also says, but with a dislocation of text (Hoer. 15, Jud.; also Haer. 13:26). “The Jews have had four streams of those traditions that they term δευτερώσεις— the first bears the name of Moses the prophet; the next they attribute to a teacher named Akiba; the third is fathered on a certain Andon, or Annon, whom they also call Judas [Hannasi]; and the sons of Apamonaeus [Asamonmi] were the authors of the fourth.” So, too, Augustine, writing shortly before the date of the Jerusalem Talmud, says: “Besides the Scriptures of the law and the prophets, the Jews have certain traditions belonging to them, not written, but retained in memory, and handed down from one to another named”  δευτερώσεις(c. Adv. Leg. et Ptoph. 2:1); and again, “‘Deliramento Judaeorum ad eas traditionis quas δευτερώσεις vocant pertinentia.” In the Middle Ages the gross ignorance of the clergy left this important field unstudied. With the Reformation, the Mishna became again an open book to the Christian clergy; and in modern days many of their number, especially in Germany, Holland, and England, have carefully covered this department of Biblical knowledge. Perhaps exception will be taken to this term by some, but let it be remembered that the Mishna, “as the original text of the Talmud, and as a faithful picture of Jewish theology and ecclesiology in the apostolic and post-apostolic ages, should be known to every Christian student — at least in its general outlines — and a nearer acquaintance with its contents is indispensably required for successful investigation of the Hebrew element in primitive Christianity, as found in the New Testament, and in the New Testament alone” (Rule, Keraites, pages 57-58). As to the estimate of this compiled tradition by the orthodox Hebrew, let us refer to a Jewish historian, who, in his eulogy of the Mishna, pronounced it “a work, the possession of which by the Hebrew nation compensates them for the loss of their ancestral country; a book which constitutes a kind of homestead for the Jewish mind, an intellectual and moral fatherland of a people who, in their long discipline of suffering, are exiles and aliens in all the nations of the earth.”

The dogmatic and moral teachings of the Tannain are well sketched by Jost in his Geschichte des Judenthums u. seiner Sekten, volume 2. The sketches in Milman's History of the Jews., 2:461 sq., are instructive on some points, though they do not always distinguish between the teaching of the Tannain and of later rabbins. See also Chiarini, Le Talmude; Geiger, Das Judenthunm; Gritz, Gesch. d. Juden, volume 4 (transl. N.Y. 1874); Rule, Karaites, ch. vi; Etheridge, Introd. to Hebr. Lit. page 114 sq.; the excellent articles on the Talmud by Dr. Deutsch in the Quarterly Review, October 1867, reprinted in the Eclectic Review, 1867; Christian Rememsbrancer, 1868, October; Amer. Biblical Repository, 2d series, 2:261 sq.; Kitto, Journal of Sacred Lit. 6:42 sq.; Edinburgh Rev. 1873, July, art. 2; Furst, Bibliotheca Judaica, 2:40 sq.

## Mishneh[[@Headword:Mishneh]]

             SEE HULDAH.

## Mishor[[@Headword:Mishor]]

             THE (הִמַּישׁוֹר; Sept. Μισώρ, also πεδινη;' Vulg. planities and campestria; A.V. “the plain”). This word is applied in Scripture to any plain or level tract of land, as in 1Ki 20:23, and 2Ch 26:10; but in a number of passages it is used with the article as the proper name of the plateau of Moab; and when thus employed it is generally Graecized in the Sept. (Deu 3:10; Jos 13:9; Jos 13:16-17; Jos 13:21; Jer 48:8; Jer 48:21). Stanley brings out the meaning of this word: “The smooth downs (of Moab) received a special name (Mishor), expressive of their contrast with the rough and rocky soil of the west” (Sin. and Pal. page 317); and probably, it might be added, in contrast with the' wooded heights and picturesque vales of Gilead. The word comes from the root יָשִׁר, to be level or just, and is sometimes employed in a moral sense (Psa 45:6; Psa 143:10). Stanley supposes that the whole of the upland downs east of the Jordan are called Mishor, and that this fact fixes the true site of the battle of Aphek (1Ki 20:23 sq.). It seems doubtful, however, whether the word Mishor, in the description of that battle, will bear the meaning thus assigned to it. It appears to be simply put in opposition to harim, hills.” “Their gods are gods of the hills, therefore they were stronger than we,but let us fight against them in the rain,”. (mishear). In 2Ch 26:10, mishor also means “a plain” west of the Jordan. As a proper name, or a special appellative, it was given only to the great plateau of Moab, even as distinguished from that of Bashan (Deu 3:10). This plateau commences at the summit of that range of hills, or rather lofty banks, which bounds the Jordan valley, and extends in a smooth, gently undulating surface far out into the desert of Arabia. Medeba was. one of its chief cities, and hence it is twice called “the Mishor of Medeba” (Jos 13:9; Jos 13:16). It formed the special subject of the awful curse pronounced by Jeremiah-”Judgment is come upon the land of the Mishor” (Jer 48:21). It was chiefly celebrated for its pastures; but it also contained a number of large and strong cities, the ruins of which still dot its surface (Porter, Damascus, 2:183). SEE MOAB; SEE TOPOGRAPHICAL TERMS.

## Mishpat[[@Headword:Mishpat]]

             SEE EN-MISHPAT.

## Mishra[[@Headword:Mishra]]

             SEE MISHRAITE.

## Mishraite[[@Headword:Mishraite]]

             (Heb. Mishrat', מַשְׁרָעַי, gentile, used collectively, from some noun Mishra', מַשְׁרָע, perhaps slippery; Sept. ῾Ημασαραείν v.r. ῾Ημασαραϊvμ, Vulg. Maserei, Auth.Vers. “Mishraites”), an inhabitant of a place called MISHRA, alluded to only in 1Ch 2:53, as founded by the descendants of Caleb, and associated with the Ithrites and others, who were in some way connected with Kirjath-jearim; probably therefore a village in the vicinity of this last town.

## Misler, Johann Nicolas[[@Headword:Misler, Johann Nicolas]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born in 1615. He was archdeacon at Marburg, was in 1652 professor of theology and Hebrew at Giessen, in 1654 doctor of theology, and died February 20, 1683. He wrote, Scrutinium Scripturae Sacrae: — Synopsis Theologica Totius Christianae Religionis: — Theognosia sire de Deo Triuno et λόγῳ Incarnato: — Speculum anti-Jesuiticum: — Diss. V de Saera Scriptura ex Joh 5:39 : — De Dicto Prophetico Esa. 52:4 : — De Mysterio Sanctce Trinitatis. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Misology[[@Headword:Misology]]

             (from μισεῖν, to hate, and λόγος, reason) is a term employed to designate the hatred of reason the most unreasonable kind of hatred that can possibly be thought of. But as reason is the point of demarcation between man and brute, the misologist generally claims to be opposed only to the false application of the reasoning powers. SEE REASON.

## Misotheia[[@Headword:Misotheia]]

             (μισέω,'to hate, and θεός, God) is hatred of God and everything divine — hatred of truth, wisdom, virtue, and reason. In classic Greek we only find μισόθεος, hating the gods, godless (AEsch. Ag. 1090). Sometimes the word is changed to θεομίσης, a person hating the gods, and to θεομίσητος, a person hated by the gods. The misotheist is akin to the misologist. SEE MISOLOGY.

## Mispereth[[@Headword:Mispereth]]

             (Heb. id. מַסְפֶּרֶת, enumerating; Sept. Μαασφαράθ v.r. Μασφαράθ), one who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Neh 7:7); elsewhere called MIZPAR (Ezr 2:2).

## Misrachi, Elia, Ben-Abraham[[@Headword:Misrachi, Elia, Ben-Abraham]]

             (called also Elia Parnas), a noted rabbi, flourished at Constantinople towards the close of the 15th century. Misrachi was versed not only in rabbinic lore, but also in astronomy and mathematics. He maintained a  lively controversy with his contemporary, Mose Kapsoli, a teacher and judge in the old Romanesque congregation of Jews at Constantinople about 1500, on the question whether the children of Karaites ought to be admitted into the rabbinical schools. Kapsoli denounced the practice as illegal. Misrachi argued not only that it was lawful, but highly expedient, as a means of bringing them to conform to rabbinism. Misrachi labored much in the cause of Jewish education. He died about 1525. Besides his Chidtshin (חַדּוּשַׁים), a collection of novellas on the Sepher Mizvoth Gadol of Moses de Coucy, and a super-commentary on Rashi's Pentateuch (סֵ8 אֶלַיָה מַזְרָחַי עִל הִתּוֹרָה סֵ8 הִמַּזְרָחַי); he wrote also a treatise on arithmetic, מְלֶאכֶת הִמַּסְפָּר; not; also סֵ8 הִמַּסְפָּר, which was translated into Latin by O. Schreckfuchs and S. Minster (Basle, 1546). See First, Bibl. Jud. 2:381; id. Gesch. d. Karlerthums, 2:304; De Rossi, Dizionario (Germ. transl. by Humberger), page 201; Etheridge, Introd. to Hebr. Literat. page 461 sq.; Cassel, Leitfaden fuir jud. Gesch u. Literat. (Berlin, 1872), page 91; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 8:292, 297; Jost,-Gesch. d. Juden. u.s. Sekten, 3:127; Lindo's Conciliator of R. Manasseh ben-Israel (Lond. 1842), page 28. (B.P.)

## Misrephoth-maim[[@Headword:Misrephoth-maim]]

             (Heb.. Misrephoth'-Mayirm, מַשְׂרְפוֹת מִיַם, burnings of water; according to Kimchi, with allusion to warm baths; but, as Gesenius thinks, from lime- kilns or smelting-furnaces situated near the water; Sept. Μασρεφὼθ Μαϊvν, Vulg. aquae Maserephoth), a place between Zidon and the valley of Mizpeh, whither Joshua pursued the allied Canaanites after the defeat of Jabin (Jos 11:8); from which passage, as well as from the only other where the place is mentioned (Jos 13:6), it appears to have been a valley (containing springs or a running stream; see Unger, De thermis Sidonis, Lips. 1803), situated in the mountainous region, near the northern border of Canaan, opposite Mount Lebanon; probably therefore in the middle portion of the valley of the Leontes-a position that may have given occasion for the name (i.q. glass-houses by the water side, see Keil, Comment. ad loc.) by furnishing facilities for the manufacture of glass (a substance said to have been first invented in ‘this region) from the sand washed down by the stream. Dr. Thomson (Land and Book, 1:469) still adheres to a location given by him and Schulz (Bibliotheca Sacra, 1855, page 826) at a collection of springs called Ain-Mesherfi, with ruins adjacent on the shore near Ras en-Nakura, at the foot of Jebel Mushakka,  on the northern border of the plain of Akka (Van de Velde. Memoir, page 335); but the locality is entirely too far south of Sidon.

## Misrepresentation[[@Headword:Misrepresentation]]

             the act of wilfully representing a thing otherwise than it is. We ought to be careful not to misrepresent the actions of others; and we should, with equal solicitude, avoid any misrepresentations of their words. Verbal misrepresentations may be productive of the greatest injury, and are indicative of radical malevolence. Words, in themselves, and taken in their insulated state, are capable of diverse meanings; and he who reports any impressions without noticing what went before, or what followed after, may easily pervert the most harmless into the most criminal expressions; or cause the foulest inferences to be drawn from the most innocent discourse. What confusion and inquietude in society, what suspensions of confidence, what interruptions of good neighborhood, what bitterness and animosity, are occasioned by verbal misrepresentations! How often has the fondest love been ‘thus blighted, and the warmest friendship turned cold! The perverse construction, the imperfect repetition, or the mutilated statement of what others have said, is one of the common expedients which the artful and treacherous know so well how to employ to serve their own sinister ends, to promote their own interested views, and to produce endless feuds, inextinguishable jealousies, and irreconcilable animosities. As the words of men may thus be misrepresented to serve the most mischievous purposes, it earnestly behooves us, on all occasions, when we repeat the discourse of others, to adhere as closely as possible to the words, and never wilfully to deviate from the sense. We ought to beware of stating that to have been designed as a positive declaration which was intended only as a casual supposition; we are not to represent that as a literal affirmation which was meant only' as an incidental illustration, or as a figurative ornament; for it is possible in this way to render an exact copy of the words, and yet a malicious perversion of the sense. But when we report what others have said, and particularly when the interest of the individual is in the least degree concerned in the fidelity of the representation, we are not only to repeat the expressions that were used, but the sense in which they were at the time designed to bear, and which was evident either from the context of the discourse or from the manner of the speaker. SEE TRUTH.

By subtle queries, invidious remarks, and treacherous insinuations, the slanderer infuses doubt into the mind of one respecting the integrity or the  conduct of another; and thus he often effects his purpose with more. safety than he could by a more open and direct attack.

Thus he gradually but surely undermines the reputation of his neighbor, or supplants those who seem to stand in the way of his own advancement. As secret is more dangerous than open hostility, so the characters of men are often more irreparably injured by calumnious suggestions than by unreserved and unqualified calumnies. Sometimes slander is covered under the garb of praise, but then the praise is never bestowed except where it is likely to prove injurious to the person, by the aversion which it occasions, or the jealousy which it inflames. We all have many faults, but the slanderer aggravates them by his description. Regardless of adherence to truth, he distorts and magnifies whatever he relates. Where the habit of falsehood, as in the base calumniator, is joined with a malevolent disposition, venial defects are magnified into criminal atrocities; and a trivial speck, almost too small to be noticed is spoken of as an incurable ulceration. The malevolence of the slanderer is never willing to balance the vices with the virtues, the defects with the perfections of the human character; but he censures and condemns without moderation or indulgence. Men cannot insure the effect which they intend, the issue of their actions, or the success of their exertions. We may deserve. but we cannot command success. Good endeavors and honest efforts are in our power, but the ultimate event is in the hands of God. But when things go wrong, when good endeavors are frustrated, and pernicious effects issue from good principles or meritorious attempts, which could neither have been prevented nor foreseen, then how apt are men to impute the unexpected effect to deliberate contrivance, and to slander the intention which they ought to praise! Thus, those who are ever ready to calumniate what merits praise, impute the good which follows any particular action to chance, and the evil to design. See Fellowes, Body of Theology, 2:324-329. SEE SLANDER.

## Misri-Effendi[[@Headword:Misri-Effendi]]

             a Turkish poet and religious enthusiast, is noted for his attempt at a revolution, under a religious garb, during the reign of Achmet III (1703- 1739). Misri was born in Egypt about 1660. Of his personal history but little is known previous to 1693. At this time he was flourishing at Broussa as mollah, an office both of an ecclesiastical and civil character, corresponding somewhat to our “justice of the peace.” SEE MOLLAH. Dissatisfied with the manner in which the war against Austria was  conducted, and believing himself inspired for leadership, he gathered about him three thousand fanatics, and with these crossed the Bosphorus, landed at Adrialiople, and stormed the great mosque, in which the sultan, with his court, was at the time attending the noon-service. Misri was defeated in his attempt, and he was arrested with his ringleaders and carried back to Broussa. No other punishment was inflicted, because Misri had gained popular favor by his religious enthusiasm. The occurrence of a large fire and a violent earthquake two. days after Misri's removal disturbed the popular mind. and it was generally held that Misri had been truthful in his declarations, and he was hereafter regarded as endowed with supernatural visions. The sultan even requested Misri to return; but he refused, declaring his mission finished, as he had accomplished the task of rousing the authorities to more vigorous action towards the Austrians. Hereafter Misri gave himself up to religious studies, and wrote poetry on sacred subjects. The most important of his productions celebrates the incarnation of Christ, wherein it is said, “I am always with Jesus, and united with him.” These verses, because Misri's production, received the certificate of orthodoxy, but it was ordered also that they be prefaced by these warning words: “Whosoever writes verses like these of Misri shall be committed to the flames; Misri alone shall be spared, for we cannot condemn one who is possessed with enthusiasm.” There is little left of the poetical compositions of Misri, and that little is not printed. The patriarch Callinicos, who was in friendly relations with some eminent Protestant members of the German universities, was Misri's intimate friend. Misri died at Broussa in 1710.

## Missa Catechumenerum[[@Headword:Missa Catechumenerum]]

             is the name of that portion of the liturgies of the early Church at which catechumens were permitted to be present. It consisted of the Prefatory Prayer, the Hymn, the Little Entrance, the Trisagion, the Epistle and Gospel, and the Prayers after the Gospel. Before the Great Entrance, or procession of the elements to the altar, all the catechumens were obliged to leave the church, with such words of dismissal as those used in the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom: “As many as are catechumens depart; catechumens depart; as many as are catechumens depart; let none of the catechumens remain.” The catechumens being still unbaptized, it was not considered  fitting that they should witness the actual celebration of the holy Eucharist, though they were permitted to take part in the earlier prayers of the liturgy, and to hear the reading of the holy Scripture. See Boia, Rer. Liturg. 1:16; Bingham, Origines Ecclesiasticce, pages 10, 114, 567, 677 et sq.; Riddle, Christian Antiquities, page 192 sq.; Coleman, Ancient Christianity Exemplified, pages 110, 180, 185, 415. SEE CATECHUMENS.

## Missa Fidelium[[@Headword:Missa Fidelium]]

             a term for the latter part of the liturgy, as distinguished from that portion at which only catechumens were allowed to be present. SEE MISSA CATECHUMENORUM.

## Missa Praesanctificatorum[[@Headword:Missa Praesanctificatorum]]

             is the term applied to a eucharistic office, observed by the advocates of the doctrine of transubstantiation, and in which the great oblation is made and communion administered with elements consecrated at a previous celebration.

The 49th canon of Laodicea (q.v.), which dates from the 4th century, states that bread ought not to be offered during Lent, save on the Sabbath- day and Lord's day. The 52d canon of the council in Trullo, or Quinisext (A.D. 692), renewed this canon, and ordered the use of the rite of the presanctified every day in Lent except on Saturday, the Lord's-day, and the Feast of the Annunciation. The Greek Church has accepted these regulations, and closely followed them, excepting that the Liturgy of Basil is said on Maundy-Thursday and on Easter eve, instead of the presanctified mass (Neale, Hist. East. Ch. part 1 chapter 7 page 713). For the rite itself we refer to Goar, Euchologium; Neale, Hist. East. Ch.; and Renaudot, Liturg. Or. Collectio (ed. 1847). 1:76. We have room here only for its essentials, and in presenting these depend chiefly upon Neale, who says that, technically speaking, the office of the presanctified is merely an addition to the usual vespers.

In the prothesis of the Sunday preceding, when reservation is to be made, the priest, having as usual cut and stabbed the first loaf, cuts also the other loaves, saying for each, “In remembrance,” etc., as in the usual office. Then he pours forth wine and water in the holy chalice. When he is about to sign the loaves, he speaks in the singular, “Make this bread,” because Christ is one. He elevates all the loaves together, and breaks the first loaf of the  oblations, and puts the portion in the holy cup, and pours in the warm water as usual. Then taking the holy spoon in his right hand, he dips it in the holy blood; and in the left hand he takes each loaf by turns, and holding the holy spoon that has been dipped in the holy blood, he moves it crosswise on the part where the cross has been made on the crumb, and puts it away in the artophorion. So with the other loaves of reservation. In the rite itself, after the prayers and responses of the three antiphons, while the troparia are sung, the priest goes to the holy prothesis, and taking the presanctified bread from the artophorion, puts it with great reverence on the holy disk, putting also wine and water, after the accustomed manner, into the holy chalice, and saying, not the prayer of prothesis, but only, Through the prayers of our holy Father, Lord, God, Jesus Christ, have mercy upon us. For the sacrifice is presanctified and accomplished.

After the Cathisma, etc., the little entrance takes place without the Gospel; then the prayers of the catechumens, and the prayers of the faithful, in the second of which is, “Behold at the present time his spotless body and quickening blood entering in, and about to be proposed on this mystic table, invisibly attended by the multitude of the heavenly host.” Then is sung the hymn, “Now the heavenly powers invisible minister with us, for behold the King of Glory is borne in. Behold the mystic sacrifice, having been perfected, is attended by angels: with faith and love let us draw near, that we may become partakers of life eternal.” After this the great entrance is made, but instead of the prayer of the cherubic hymn, the fifty-first, Psalm is said. After the entrance, the deacon says, “Let us accomplish our evening supplication unto the Lord. For the proposed and presanctified gifts, let,” etc. In the following prayer occur the words, “ Look down on us who are standing by this holy altar as by thy cherubic throne, on which thine only-begotten Son and our God is resting in the proposed and fearful mysteries.” After further prayers, the priest, the divine gifts being covered, stretches out his hand and touches the quickening blood with reverence and great fear; and when the deacon says, “Let us attend,” the priest exclaims, “ Holy things presanctified for holy persons.” Then, having unveiled them, he finishes the participation of the divine gifts. The communion being finished, and the holy things that remain being taken away from the holy table, the concluding prayers are made.

In the controversy regarding this rite between cardinal Humbert and Nicetas Pectoratus, the only matter of real liturgical interest appears to be Humbert's objection that a double oblation is made of the same thing first  in the liturgy, in which it is consecrated, next in that in which it is received. Neale denies the existence of the second oblation. “The mere fact of the great entrance,” he writes, “without any formal oblation, and simply considered, does not involve of necessity a sacrifice.”

Leo Allatius, in his tract on this rite (at the end of his work, De Eccl. Occ. et Or. Perpetua Consensione), names several variations. One is on the point just mentioned: “Alii sustollebant Praesanctificata. Alii non exaltabant, sed tantum modo tangebant” (1595). Another important variation is, “Constantinopolitanus praesanctificatum panem sanguine non tingit; cteteri tingunt” (1593). Again, as to the times when the rite is used, “Alii, prima et secunda primae jejuniorum hebdomadis feriis, Praesanctificata non celebrant; alii celebrant” (1594).

In the Roman Church the omission of consecration is limited to Good Friday and Easter eve. The Missal rubric for “Feria v in Coena Domini” is, “Hodie sacerdos consecrat duas hostias, quarum unam sumit, alteram reservat pro die sequenti, in quo non conficitur sacramentum; reservat etiam aliquas particulas consecratas, si opus fuerit, pro infirmis; safiguinem vero totum sumit; et ante ablutionem digitorum ponit hostiam reservatam in alio calice, quem diaconus palla et patena cooperit, et desuper velurni expandit, et in medio altaris eollocat.”

On Good Friday the reserved host is brought in procession to the altar, after the adoration of the cross, while the hymn is sung, “Vexilla Regis prodeunt.” “Cum venerit sacerdos ad altare, posito super illud calice, genuflexus sursum incensat et accedens deponit hostiam ex calice super patenam quam diaconus tenet; et accipiens patenam de manu diaconi, hostiam sacram ponit super corporale, nihil dicens... Interim diaconus imponit vinum in calicem et subdiaconus aquam, quam sacerdos non benedicit, nec dicit super earn orationem consuetam; sed accipiens calicem a diacono ponit super altare nihil dicens; et diaconus illum cooperit palla.” After censing the oblations and the altar, the priest, turning to the people, says as usual, “Orati fratres ut meum ac vestrum sacrificium acceptabile fiat.” “Tune celebrans... supponit patenam sacramento, quod in dextera accipiens elevat ut videri possit a populo; et statim supra calicem dividit in tres partes, quarum ultimam mittit in calicem more solito, nihil dicens. Pax Domini non dicitur nec Agnus Dei, neque pacis osculum datur.” The priest's prayer before reception follows. “Et sumit Corpus reverenter.” “Deinde omissis omnibus quae dici solent ante sumptionem sanguinis,  immediate particulam hostiae cum vino reverenter sumit de calice.” “Quod ore sumpsimus,” etc. “Non dicitur Corpus tuum Domine, nec Post Communio, nec Placeat Tibi, nec datur Benedictio; sed facta reverentia coram altare sacerdos cum ministris discedit; et dicuntur Vesperae sine cantu; et denudatur altare.”

The principle upon which these regulations regarding Lent are founded is that the Eucharist is a feast, and the consecration service is proper only for festivals. The Sabbath as well as the Sunday was a stated feast in the early Church, and the Western Church received the Laodicaean canon; but in later. times in the Roman obedience Saturday has been held a fast. Yet Socrates (E.H. 5:21) tells us that at Rome they fasted three weeks before Easter, excepting Saturdays and Sundays. See Bingham, Origines Ecclesiasticae, book 15: chapter 4:§ 12.

For a statement of the position in which the Church of England stands on these questions, see Blunt, Annotated Book of Common Prayer (in the notes for Good Friday.)

## Missa Sicca[[@Headword:Missa Sicca]]

             or dry service, as it is sometimes called, consists in the recital of the ordinary of the mass without the canon, there being neither consecration nor communion. The rite is described and commented upon by Durandus, Rationale, IV, 1:23; Durantus, De Ritibes, II, 4; Bona, Rerum Liturg. I, 15:6; Martene, De Ant. Eccl. Ritibus, , 3:1; Bingham, Antiq. XV, 4:5; Neale, Eastern Church, I, 7:4. “As the canons forbid priests to celebrate the liturgy more than once in the day, except in cases of urgent necessity; and as some covetous and wicked priests were desirous of celebrating more frequently, with the object of receiving oblations from the people; they availed themselves of the missa sicca, and thus deceived the people, who intended to offer their prayers and alms at a real commemoration of the sacrifice of Christ” (Palmer). The earliest mention of this abuse is its condemnation in the Capitulars of Charlemagne (Neale), that is, in A.D. 805: the leading example is its practice by St. Louis, who died A.D. 1270. Durantus says that the book Liber Sacerdotalis, in which this rite is described, was approved by Leo X; and he finds the Missa Sicca in the passage of Socrates, Hist. 5:22, where Leo Allatius finds the rite of the presanctified. The more learned Roman theologians of the 16th century condemned this abuse, and Bona states its general suppression. Neale,  however, says that it was common in Belgium as late as A.D. 1780. The rite was never in use in the East, except in Egypt.

Neale has charged the Church of England with deliberately retaining the Missa Sicca, but Blunt (Dict. of Hist. and Doctrinal Theol. s.v.) holds that “this charge is without foundation. There is an essential difference between the use of the eucharistic hymns, without which the rite could hardly be called a Missa, and the use of the prayer for the Church militant only, made real, as far as can be, by the offering of alms. The English custom is not an approval of abstaining from communion, such as certainly was more or less implied in the Missa Sicca, but a practical illustration of the words of the priest's exhortation, ‘I for my part shall be ready,' and a protest against the remissness of the people.” See calmer, Origines Liturgice, 2:164,165. (J.H.W.)

## Missabib[[@Headword:Missabib]]

             SEE MAGOR-MISSABIB.

## Missal[[@Headword:Missal]]

             (Lat. Missale plenarium, or simply Plemarium) is the name given to an office-book of the Roman Catholic Church, containing the liturgy, i.e., all of the litargy required for the celebration of the Mass (q.v.) or Missa, viz. the fixed Ordinary (q.v.), and Canon (q.v.), with the changeable Introits, Collects, Epistles, Gospels, etc. In the early Western Church it was called sacramentarium, but it then contained only parts of what is now comprehended in the Missal. Some copies, as required in every parish by the bishops, contained the Gospels, the sacramentary, prayers, prefaces, benedictions, and the canon, the lectionary, a book of epistles, and the antiphon, or, in a word, all that was to be sung by the priest at the altar, and by the ministers in the ambon. These books were called Plenars (q.v.), i.e., complete or full; but usually their contents were distributed into separate volumes-the Gradual, Collectar, Benedictional, Hymnar, etc. The complete Missal was requisite when priests, from the 9th century, began to say low masses, and especially for country clergy; as laymen, by the Capitulars of 789, were forbidden to sing the lessons and alleluia, and the priests were required to sing the Sanctus with the people before the canon was commenced. The earliest Frank, Gothic, or Gallican missals, of the 6th century, contained only the portion of the liturgy recited by a bishop or priest — that is, the canon, prayers, and prefaces. At a later date, those of small churches comprised the Introit, Gradual, Alleluia, Tract, Offertory, Sanctus, and Communion, where, although there were a deacon and  subdeacon, the smallness of the choir required the celebrant and his two assistants to chant together.

The Missal was probably compiled near the close of the 5th century, was amplified by Gelasius I, and corrected by pope Gregory I. But, although the Missal was contained in the Gregorian rite, it appeared in such varied forms in different churches, and frequently with so many improper additions, that the wish for an emendation became general, and, having been expressed at the Council of Basle, and in 1536 at a synod at Cologne, it was successfully urged at the Council of Trent. During the early part of the council no agreement could be effected. In the eighteenth session a commission was appointed, which, however, could not bring to an end the work intrusted to it; whereupon the council, in the twenty-fifth session, resolved upon recommending to the pope the reform of the Breviary, Missal, and Rituals. As the question was not to create a new liturgy, but to purify the existing one, to restore it to its original simplicity, etc., the work was recommended to be done in Rome. It was commenced under Pius IV. and completed under Pius V. The only members of the commission whose names are known are cardinal Bernardino Scossi and Tomaso Golduelli, bishop of Asaph. Perhaps a great share in the execution of the work may be ascribed to cardinal Sirlet and to the learned Giulio Poggi. The new Missal appeared in 1570; it was followed by two revisions under Clement VIII (bull of July 7, 1604) and Urban VIII (bull of September 2, 1634). It is composed of an introduction, three parts, and an appendix. The introduction gives the calendar, the general rubrics, a summary of the rite, and instructions about possible deficiencies. The three parts are:

1. “Proprium missarum de tempore,” with the formularies for the successive solemnities of the year. It treats of all the Sundays, from the first Sunday of Advent to the last after Pentecost. The whole ecclesiastical year pivots around the three capital feast-days: Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost-Easter being the center. Between the Saturday before Easter and Easter Sunday the Ordo Missal is inserted.

2. “Proprium missarum de sanctis” contains the formularies for the celebration of the mass on particular feasts of saints, etc. This part of the Missal is arranged after the months and days of the civil year.

3. “Commune sanctorum” is a kind of complement of the preceding for such saint-days as have no particular mass — formular in proprium. The division is founded on the character of the saint, and on the order of rank  as given by the litany of All Saints. There are mass-formularies for the vigil of an apostle-day, for the days of the martyrs, within and without the Easter period, for the days of the confessors, the virgins, aid of those who did not die in the virginal state. The Appendix is very comprehensive: it gives the annual mass, different votival masses, and the masses for the deceased, several benedictions, and, lastly, the masses for such feasts or commemorations as are celebrated in certain places with papal approbation, and called therefore “Missse ex indulto apostolico.'

In the Anglican Church, previous to the Reformation, the missals used varied very greatly; and even after the compilation of the Roman Missal, the English missals known as “Sarum Use,” “Hereford Use,” “Lincoln Use,” “Bangor Use,” etc., continued to be general. Near the end of the 16th century, however, the Jesuits succeeded in forcing the Roman Missal into the Romish churches of England. The old missals, before the invention of the art of printing, were generally written in the most sumptuous manner, ornamented with beautiful initials, and most splendidly bound. A kind of large Gothic letters (monachal writing), for the writing of the missals, came into use in the 13th century. After the invention of the art of printing, patterns were cut after these letters, and used for the printing of missals; hence the name of missal letters given to a certain kind of large types. The missal of the Oriental rites differs from that of the Roman Church, each having, for the most part, its own proper form. See Rosarius, Observationes; Pisart, Expositio Rubicarum missalis; Mohrenius, Expos. Missae atque Rubicarum; Huebner, Historia Missae; Lewis, Bible, Missal, and Breviary; Maskell, Dissert. chapter 4, page 49 sq., 49 sq.; Zaccaria, Bibliotheca Ritualis, 1:39 sq.; Palmer, Origines Liturgicae, 1:111, 308; Walcott, Sacred Archaeology, s.v.

## Missi Dominici[[@Headword:Missi Dominici]]

             is the name of a class of extraordinary commissaries sent by the Carlovingian dynasties. to different parts of their dominions for various purposes of civil and ecclesiastical government. The importance of these officers was vastly increased by Charles the Great, who employed them as an efficacious means of restraining the dangerous power of the dukes; but the importance thus given to these dignitaries having proved under Pepin to be dangerous to royal authority, Charles strove to weaken them, and destroy their power altogether, by transferring their supervisory functions over the jurisdictions of the counts, the administration of the bishops, etc.,  to the. missi dominici. The whole empire was accordingly divided into districts (missatica, legationes), coinciding generally with the province of a metropolitan. The missi received special instructions regarding the different points of their mission. So great was the importance the emperor attached to the careful execution of his designs, that to the written instructions always given to his travelling representatives, he' frequently added oral explanation and discussion. Thus the missi became the organ by which the central authority managed the administration of the whole empire; and there was, in fact, no part of the affairs of government entirely removed from their competence. Their principal duties were as follows:

(1) To see that the laws, both of the State and the Church, were observed.

(2) To superintend jurisdiction. In whatever cause or suit there was no decision given by the court, the decision was expected from the missi; they also received complaints against the courts. To that effect they held sessions four times every year in different places. They appointed meliores et veteriores, whose duty it was to denounce the crimes, transgressions, etc., that had transpired.

(3) To superintend the execution of the laws regarding the army, and to exact the fine of sixty solidi (heribannum) from the defaulters.

(4) To generally supervise the possessions of the State and of the Church, and to make registers and descriptions thereof. To carry out these measures the missi held a kind of diet (placita provincia), and at these sessions the superior clergy, the counts, and some other officers, were obliged to appear, under penalty of the heribam. Those who persisted in their refusal were denounced to the king.

The missi were expected to give detailed accounts of their mission at court. In difficult matters, of which they declined to take the responsibility, the decision was left to the king. Every one to whom justice had been denied by the court and the missi had always resort to the king. In order to give the missi sufficient authority, they were allowed the right of imposing the fine of the heribann; and the disobedient were threatened even with death. Compensations were allowed them for the expenses of their travels. See Franc. de Roye, De Missis dominicis, eorun officio et potestate; Neuhauss, De A Miss. domin. ad disciplin. publ. (Leipsic, 1744, 8vo). (J.H.W.)

## Mission[[@Headword:Mission]]

             is the word used by Roman Catholics, Anglicans, and American Ritualists in a sense somewhat synonymous to the word Revival (q.v.). Among Roman Catholics the Mission is a series of special services, conducted generally by propagandists, who do not themselves preside over a parish; they are mostly members of a monastic order. The word “Mission” in this sense is of recent use. In the Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church the word designates “a series of services in which prayer, praise, preaching, and personal exhortation are the main features, and is intended to call souls to repentance and faith, and deepen the spiritual life in the faithful.” The “mission” is conducted in a particular parish, or in a number of parishes at once, directed by the rector, or by some priest experienced in such matters, whom he obtains to aid him. “ Its themes are heaven, hell, the judgment, sin, the atonement for sin, God's justice, and God's mercy.” “The purpose is the proclamation of the old foundations of faith and repentance to souls steeped in worldliness and forgetful of their destiny, whether they be the souls of the baptized or the unbaptized.” The usual period of the year for the “mission” is the season of Lent (q.v.). In England it has been the practice for years. A correspondent of the New York Church Journal (March 12, 1874), after describing the interest awakened by the mission services in the English metropolis (in 1874), says that the bishops, persuaded by the good results of the propriety of the missions, “have declined to lay down special rules, and trust to the loyalty of the clergy to conduct the mission in accordance with the rules of the Church,” and then adds that “the clergy are now too busy with the real work of the mission to discuss the proper pronunciation of ‘Amen,' the length of surplices, and the color of stoles.” In the United States it has as yet found favor with few of the Protestant Episcopal churches. A serious obstacle is the Liturgy. In the mission the largest spontaneity and freedom are allowed. Prayers are extemporaneous. The preaching is pungent and personal. The singing is participated in by the whole congregation, and familiar hymns and tunes are selected. The tendency is towards a general introduction of the “mission” into all Protestant Episcopal churches. The Church Journal and Gospel Messenger of December 25, 1873, made a special plea in its behalf, and the Reverend B.P. Morgan has published a book to enlist his Church in revival work. SEE RETREAT. (J.H.W.)

## Mission, Inner[[@Headword:Mission, Inner]]

             SEE INNER MISSIONS.

## Mission-Priests[[@Headword:Mission-Priests]]

             is the name by which those priests of Rome are designated who have been educated for mission work at home or abroad. There are certain monastic institutions that greatly aid in this work. Indeed, several monastic orders aim particularly at missionary work, e.g. the Congregation of the Oratory, the Congregation of St. Vincent of Paula, or Lazarists (q.v.), the Congregation of the Sacred Sacraments, the Congregation of Jesus and Mary, SEE EUDISTS, etc.

## Mission-Schools[[@Headword:Mission-Schools]]

             These are of two kinds.

(1.) The schools aiming to supply the particular want of the missionary before he enters the field, fitting him in his theological studies, and in the knowledge of languages, etc., for the work in view. This class of schools have been but recently organized among the English. speaking people. In Germany they have existed for some time. Usually, however, the course of study in inferior to the university course in theology. English and American schools for missionaries seek to afford the best advantages possible. Several American religious bodies have schools for the training of native missionaries in the country where they are to labor. Thus, for example, the Methodist Episcopal Church has such an institution at Frankfort-on-the- Main. The Church of England has a number of them, particularly in India and Africa. In the United States there are facilities for missionary training provided at Yale College, Boston University, and Syracuse University. The different theological seminaries have lectures on Missions and on Comparative Religion to aid those preparing for the ministry with a possibility of missionary service.

(2.) Institutions aiming to aid the missionary in propagating Christianity, or seeking to prepare the way by educating the minds of the people, in order that they may be more capable of understanding and appreciating the facts and evidences, the doctrines and duties of Scripture. Another reason for such an education is that it procures means and opens ways of access to the people, and opportunities of preaching to them. “Ignorant of God and  his law, as well as of their own, and the moral character of the world; content with mental inactivity, and indifferent to moral elevation; untaught in the principles of science, and fast bound in. errors venerated for their antiquity; vicious in their habits, and absorbed in sensual indulgences; accustomed to the profane rites of religions glittering yet grovelling, and degrading yet commanding and terrible — the heathen nations are unprepared to listen to the annunciation of glory to God in the highest, and to appreciate the Gospel as proclaiming deliverance from the dominion of sin and death... The stupidity of the Hottentot, the sensuality of the Hindii, the prejudice of the Mohammedan, the ancestral pride of the ‘son of heaven,' and the sottishness of the South Sea Islander, alike interpose a wall high as heaven between the Christian missionary, and the child of ignorance” (Dr. Storrs, Sermon before the A.B.C.F.H. in 1850). In such circumstances schools become very important as a means of communication with different classes of people, with children and parents, with men and women. Mission-schools, therefore, are a wise and most effective agency in prosecuting the missionary work. They communicate true science,. and thus undermine the errors of heathenism; they inspire and foster a love for knowledge, and thus help to overcome the deep debasement of the heathen mind and heart. They conciliate the favorable regards of the heathen, convincing them that the missionary seeks to benefit them, and thus furnish an opportunity for the systematic instruction of youth and children in the principles of Christianity. These mission- schools have been of different grades, according to the circumstances and requirements of the case. Boys' schools have usually been found most practicable, especially at the commencement of a mission, and most effective for accomplishing the objects in view. The heathen readily appreciate the value of education for their boys, and both the pupils and their parents are usually found as hearers at preaching services. Girls' schools were of necessity a later supply, for these find the strongest prejudices of the heathen to contend with. Woman is of an inferior condition; she is secluded, and no foreigner surely is to have access to her; hence girls' schools are usually established after other schools have succeeded in winning confidence and making the natives understand. the true objects of the mission. Indeed, in heathen communities, whenever an attempt was made to establish female schools at the outset of the mission, great prejudice and misapprehension have been the consequence, often seriously embarrassing the progress of all mission work. There is hardly a field occupied for missionary labor but within its territory schools are  located and in successful operation. As a rule, female teachers are employed; generally the wives of the missionaries or their lady friends. Of course all missionary workers are Christians, holding a connection with some religious body. The most successful schools are now found in India (see Butler, Land of the Veda). In China and Japan there are several in successful operation. In Constantinople, the American Roberts College may be looked upon as a valuable auxiliary of Christian mission work. In Beirut also there is an American college greatly aiding the Protestant cause. In Africa, where the people to be converted are in a very abject state of mind, missionaries have largely availed themselves of educational aids. Many of the most successful mission-workers advocate the building up of schools as a very essential step to progress in converting the heathen world, and to this end missionary societies are founding schools in their respective fields. In the heathen world evidently the secular school supplies the same want that is afforded us in the religious school, better known as the Sunday-School. See American Bible Repository, 12:87; Christian Rev. 5:580.

## Missions[[@Headword:Missions]]

             True Christianity is essentially missionary in character. The Gospel having been designed for all nations, and its field being the world, it was from the first associated with means for its own extension. In a highly important sense, the Lord Jesus may be considered the first missionary. He was sent by the Eternal Father to set up his own kingdom upon the earth. The patriarchs, and all faithful priests and prophets among the Jews, were agents preparatory to the introduction of that kingdom. Having called disciples and established a Church, the risen Saviour, before his ascension, commissioned his chosen apostles, in the presence of the great body of the disciples, the then existing Church. To them, as the leaders and representatives of the actual and the prospective Church, he addressed the great missionary command, “Go ye into all, the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature.”

Christ's mission had been to the Jews. He said, “I am not sent but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.” The apostles were sent to the Jews and Gentiles. “ The Acts of the Apostles” is the first official missionary, report- the first volume of missionary history; unless, indeed, it rank second, as it is subsequent to the Gospel history of him “who went about doing good.” So vast has been the expansion of the missionary enterprise since the  outpouring of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, and so voluminous have become its records, that this article is of necessity limited to a very brief sketch of the subject as a whole. Nevertheless, the design of the article is to give, in the briefest practicable space, a just and duly proportioned view of the principal missionary agencies of successive periods, and some indication of their results, together with references to the sources of more detailed information.

There are two leading modes of studying the subject of missions. The first regards primarily the agencies employed, following them to their different fields of action. The second contemplates in succession the several fields, where necessarily it gives attention to the different agencies employed upon them. Each mode has some peculiar advantages, as well as defects or difficulties, and both are essential to a full comprehension of the subject. They will consequently be followed in the order named. As a natural guide to study and help to memory, the order of time will be followed in the survey of missionary agencies.

I. Apostolic Missions. — It is safe to affirm that no just or adequate comprehension of the New-Testament history can be gained by any one who does not read or study it from a missionary point of view. But when, in the light of their' great commission, the apostles are regarded as Christian missionaries going forth to evangelize the nations, not only the narrative of their Acts or doings, but their epistles to the churches which they planted and trained, become instructive, both as to their modes of proceeding, their difficulties, and their successes.

Paul, as the apostle to the, Gentiles, stands forth in deserved prominence as a model missionary. Although originally a relentless persecutor of the Christians, he experienced a thorough spiritual conversion, and thus became “a new man in Christ Jesus.” Having been called of God to be an apostle or missionary of Jesus Christ, he “conferred not with flesh and blood,” he “counted not his life dear unto him,” but went forth preaching the everlasting Gospel wherever he could find hearers, encountering perils of robbers, perils by his own countrymen, perils by the heathen, perils in the city, perils in the wilderness, and perils among false brethren (2Co 11:26); nevertheless winning souls to Christ, rescuing communities from paganism, founding churches, training ministers, and at length finishing his course with joy, having won both the martyr's crown and the crown of eternal life. Until the consummation of all things, the  study of Paul's missionary character, travels, and labors, will be a standard and profitable topic for all who desire to comprehend the true principles, agencies, and measures of Christian propagandism. In the subsequent history of the Church it will be found that all departures from the spirit of his example have been aberrations from the line of true success; whereas efforts put forth from similar, motives and in a like spirit have been invariably attended by the divine blessing and the salvation of men.

But although prominent as the founder of the infant Church in the principal cities of the Roman empire, and although, for some wise but not easily comprehended reason, his successive missionary journeys chiefly occupy the sacred narrative, yet Paul was only one of the noble band of apostolic missionaries. Peter was the acknowledged leader of the opening mission of the infant Church to Jerusalem, and afterwards of missionary efforts in behalf of Jews throughout the world. Not only was he the chief actor in the scenes of the Pentecost, but he laid the foundation for missions to the Gentiles by baptizing the centurion Cornelius and other Gentiles at Caesarea. According to Origen and Eusebius, he preached to the Jews scattered in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia. Many scholars have become satisfied that his mission extended to Babylon, on the Euphrates, while the general voice of antiquity ascribes to him a martyr's death at Rome. Whatever may have been true as to his actual presence at those extreme points of the East and the West, his general epistles sufficiently demonstrate his personal acquaintance, as well as ministerial authority, in vast regions intermediate.

Next to that of Peter we recognise the prominence of the apostle John, who, after protracted labors among the Jews in Palestine, took up his abode at Ephesus, from which centre he exercised supervision of the churches of Asia Minor till the period of his exile to Patmos, whence he yet speaks to the churches.

As to the other apostles, neither Scripture nor history gives definite information, but early and uncontradicted tradition assigns them severally to important and widespread mission fields. According to the general voice of antiquity, James the Just. remained at Jerusalem. Andrew preached in Scythia, Thrace, Macedonia, Thessaly, and Achaia; Philip in Upper Asia, Scythia, and Phrygia, where he suffered, martyrdom. Bartholomew penetrated India. Thomas visited Media and Persia, and possibly the coast of Coromandel and the island of Ceylon. Matthew went to Ethiopia,  Parthia, and Abyssinia; Simon Zelotes to Egypt, Cyrene, Lybia, and Mauritania; and Jude to Galilee, Samaria, Idumea, and Mesopotamia. Whatever of literal truth is embodied in the traditions quoted, they at least show that the grand missionary idea was associated with the history of the several apostles from the earliest period; and, taken in connection with known results, they leave no doubt that the lives of those chosen men were spent in zealous and self-sacrificing efforts for the spread of the Gospel. Nor was this true only of the apostles, but also of the Christian believers of that period generally, who, when even scattered by persecution, “went everywhere preaching the word” (Act 8:4). On no other hypothesis than that of universal missionary activity on the part of both ministers and members of the Church of the apostles and their immediate successors, attended also by the divine blessing, is it possible to account for the extensive spread ,of early Christianity. During the last sixty years of the 1st century the new religion became diffused, to a greater or less extent, throughout the numerous countries embraced in the Roman empire, inclusive of Egypt, Northern Africa, Spain, Gaul, and Britain. As a direct result of the apostolic missions, the Christian Church is supposed to have contained in the year 100 half a million of living members, those of the first and second generations having mostly gone forward to join the Church triumphant.

The churches of the present and the future will find the most important lessons as to their responsibilities and duties in the history of apostolic missions. It may also be said that modern missions, and the comparatively recent development of the missionary spirit, have thrown much light upon the instrumentalities by which Christianity was first established in the earth, and by which it was designed to become universal. From both classes of events it appears that consecrated men and consecrated means are the active agencies to be employed for the establishment of Christ's kingdom upon the earth; and that these combined, under the guidance and blessing of the Head of the Church, may be expected to triumph over the most frigid indifference and the most violent opposition.

In the penury, the obscurity, and the lack of facilities of the, early Church, the work of promoting the salvation of men, and of extending the truth, was one of individual and personal exertion, supplemented, of course, by the influence of the Holy Spirit. At first there were no churches for public assembly, no books for auxiliary influence, no organizations for the support of missionaries, home or foreign. Nevertheless, regenerated men went  everywhere preaching the word. They founded churches wherever the word was received by believers, and the members of the churches were taught to sustain those who labored among them in the Lord, and also to let the riches of their liberality abound, even out of their deep poverty, for the furtherance of the Gospel. They were also taught the duty of constant prayer, not only for one another, but especially that the word of God might have free course and be glorified, and that God would open to his servants a door of utterance to speak the mystery of Christ (2Th 3:1; Col 4:3). Thus the whole Apostolic Church was an agency for self-extension, and for the propagation of the truth. Though public preaching was practiced to the greatest extent practicable, yet the inference is inevitable that the extension of Christian truth was accomplished largely by means .of personal influence in conversation, example, and private persuasion. In this way all could be “helpers of the truth.” And by public and private means, united and in constant action, Christianity was diffused, notwithstanding the apparently insuperable obstacles that confronted it on every hand. There is good reason to believe that had the true character of the Apostolic Church been preserved, and its singleness of missionary aim and action been maintained, the development of Christianity in the world would have been constant, if not rapid, and that long ere this the remotest nations would have been evangelized.

II. Ancient Missions. — Under this head, allusion will be made to the aggressive movements of the Church between the apostolic and mediaeval periods. That the 2d and 3d centuries witnessed great missionary activity on the part of Christians in the countries to which access could be secured, is proved not only by the multiplication of their numbers and influence, but by the bloody persecutions that were waged against them under successive Roman emperors. Owing to various causes there have come down to us but few details of the precise work that was done, or of the modes in which it was done. It is, however, but reasonable to suppose that apostolic measures and usages were, during the earlier parts of this period, quite in the ascendant. Eusebius says that “the followers of the apostles imitated their example in distributing their worldly goods among necessitous believers, and, quitting their own country, went forth into distant lands to propagate the Gospel.” It was at the beginning of the 2d century that the younger Pliny, governor of Bithynia, after official investigation, made to the emperor Trajan his celebrated report concerning the customs and prevalence of the Christians. Said he, “Many persons, of all ages, of every  rank, and of both sexes. likewise are accused, and will be accused [of Christianity]. Nor has the contagion of this superstition pervaded cities only, but the villages and open country.” The allegations of this persecutor of Christians, in respect to the numbers accused of Christianity, are corroborated by various statements of Christians themselves. Justin Martyr, writing about one hundred and six years after the ascension says, “There is not a nation, either of Greek or barbarian, or of any other name, even of those who wander in tribes and live in tents, among whom prayers and thanksgivings are not offered to the Father and Creator of the universe in the name of the crucified Jesus.” Tertullian, in his Apology, written fifty years later, says, “Though of yesterday, we have filled every sphere of life: cities, castles, islands, towns; the exchange, the very camps, the plebeian populace, the seats of judges, the imperial palace, and the forum.” When it is remembered that these results had been attained in the face of persecution, and in spite of tortures and martyrdom, no other comment is needed upon the missionary diligence and devotedness of those who were the agents of such wide-spread and effective evangelization. In harmony with measures of this character was the translation of the Scriptures into several important languages, as the Latin. the Syriac, the Ethiopian, and the Egyptian. In the absence of statistics, which were then impossible, all attempts to estimate numbers must be-chiefly based upon probabilities. Yet some have estimated that the number of Christians at the end of the 2d century was not less than two millions, and increased during the 3d century to perhaps twice that number.

The opening of the 4th century, A.D. 313, witnessed the issue of Constantine's edict of toleration, an event which shows about as conclusively as figures could the continuous growth of Christian influence and numbers. That edict was proclaimed in immediate sequence of the Era Martyrium, the Diocletian persecution — the tenth in the series of those fierce attacks upon the non-offending and non-resisting followers of Christ, which successively proved that “the blood of the martyrs was the seed of the Church.” As the edict referred to suppressed official persecution in all parts of the empire, it may be regarded as in itself an unmingled blessing, a recognition of an indefeasible right of humanity, and all that Christianity needed on the part of the world for further advancement and complete success. When the way of the Lord had been thus prepared, through so much toil and suffering, it was to be expected that thenceforward the cause of Christian truth would be advanced with accumulated moral and spiritual  power. It is, however, a sad, but, in the history of missions, a usually overlooked fact, that the very period at which so much had been gained, and from which so much was to be hoped in the legitimate extension of Christianity, witnessed the development of agencies and influences that antagonized the peculiar aims of the Gospel and marred its missionary character, sowing throughout the extended field of its influence the seeds of premature and almost fatal decay. The circumstance of these influences being more or less antagonistic to each other did not relieve their evil effect, but rather increased their power, as multiplied diseases sooner reduce the vital energies of the human system. Had there been no previous departures from the true spirit of the Gospel, and had the Christians of the 4th century been content to rely on spiritual agencies for the promotion of Christianity, the advantages which followed the professed conversion of Constantine might in all probability have tended to extend and consolidate a pure type of Christianity. But, unhappily, insidious influences had already been initiated, which, in the sunshine of apparent prosperity, grew with the rankness and rapidity of noxious weeds. Of these influences, allusion can only be made summarily to doctrinal errors, monasticism, and worldly conformity. It was not merely that Docetism, Ebionism, Gnosticism, Montanism, Arianism, and other heresies induced bitter and protracted controversies, thus dividing the Church with partisan strife, but they absorbed the thought and energies of thousands of professed Christian ministers, who ought to have been exclusively engaged in preaching the Gospel. So when, in the 2d century, the doctrine of a Christian priesthood began to be developed with an attempted imitation of the Jewish, the evil was not merely the diversion of ministerial talent from the one work of preaching and teaching in the name of Christ to a burdensome routine of ritual ceremonies, but a direct step towards conformity with certain pagan theories and practices which in later periods were put forward as elements of Christianity itself.

As it has often been asserted, and indeed extensively believed. that the world owes something to monasticism in consideration of certain missionary labors conducted by members of monastic orders, it seems proper to set forth the true bearing of that subject, from which it will appear that monasticism was, in fact, one of the earliest and greatest hindrances to the missionary development of the Church, and that whatever good was subsequently done by missionaries who were monks was done by force of Christian impulse or character, in direct contravention of the spirit  and intent of monasticism. It is unnecessary to dwell upon the historic fact that monasticism existed in the far East as a heathen practice anterior to the Christian aera. The first strictly ascetic sect in the Church was that of the Montanists, which arose in Phrygia about A.D. 150, from Montanus, who had been previously a priest of the heathen deity Cybele. During the 2d and 3d centuries a growing disposition manifested itself in the Church to exaggerate the virtue of fasting, and to attach special merit to celibacy, specially among the clergy. Vows of celibacy began to be taken by persons of both sexes, in the idea that such a life was more holy than that of wedlock. About the year A.D. 250 the Decian persecution raged with extreme severity in Upper Egypt, causing many to flee for their lives to deserts and secluded places. Already the minds of many Christians in Egypt had been predisposed to asceticism by the writings of Clement, Origen, and Dionysius of Alexandria. Under a combination of these and similar influences, many persons who ought to have been contending earnestly for “the faith once delivered to the saints” withdrew themselves from society, and wasted their lives in idleness, and in useless struggles with the phantoms of their own excited imaginations. The true spirit of Christianity would have given them courage to face danger, and doubtless have enabled them in many cases to win even their persecutors to the faith. But the impulse of cowardice, whether moral or physical, is contagious; hence multitudes of well-meaning but weak persons abandoned scenes of Christian conflict, and betook themselves to desert solituaes and caves of the mountains. At first they lived as hermits, and sought by means of labor to provide for themselves, and to devote a surplus of their earnings to charitable objects. By degrees the austerities of some won for them notoriety, and caused them to become objects of charity, and even of superstitious reverence, among the ignorant. Thus such men as Anthony of Egypt, Paul of Thebes, Hilarion of Palestine, and others, became severally the centres of great communities of men, who might at their homes or in mission fields have been very useful, but who now wasted their lives in idleness and self-mortifications, to the disgrace of the Christianity which they professed. Pachomius, originally a soldier, but afterwards an anchoret, developed a certain organizing power by gathering his imitators out of their individual huts into a coenobium, or community residence, thus founding the first Christian monastery. It was at Tabenna, an island of the Nile. Pachomius also founded cloisters for nuns; and the members of his community, during his lifetime, reached the large number of 3000. By the middle of the 5th century this order of monks alone, and there were various  others, had attained the great number of 50,000. From this brief statement as an index let the mind of the reader survey the vast expansion of the monastic idea and of monastic ambition as orders of monks became multiplied and powerful, spreading themselves throughout Europe and the East during the long period of fifteen centuries. SEE BENEDICTINES; SEE CARMELITES; SEE CARTHUSIANS; SEE DOMINICANS; SEE JESUITS; SEE MONASTICISM; SEE MONKS; etc.

Considering the hundreds of thousands, and even millions, of persons whose lives were by this unscriptural and unnatural system withdrawn from spheres of Christian usefulness in society and in mission fields' to profitless and often degrading austerities, to say nothing of worse excesses that sometimes followed in its train, it is easy to perceive that monasticism acted as a gigantic and wide- spread antagonism to the evangelization of the world. It may be assumed that the persons embraced within its influence meant well. and as a rule lived up to the theories of which they were the victims. But how different might have been the position and influence of the Christian Church had the lives and sacrifices of all those persons been applied in accordance with the Saviour's precept, “Go teach all nations.”

While, therefore, monasticism was decimating the Church by the profitless seclusion of thousands if its best members, worldly conformity, on the other hand, came into the Church like a flood, with the elevation of many of the clergy to imperial favor. Thus the ancient Church, instead of remaining a unit in its zeal and efforts for the conversion of the world, became embarrassed by two opposite and equally injurious systems of error and practice, both alike fatal to its missionary faithfulness and progress. To this day the Greek Church remains under the incubus of the monastic system fastened upon it at that early period, while the Latin Church soon after became so closely identified with secular power that, although it resumed propagandism, it practiced it with motives and measures often highly exceptionable, and thus contaminated and enfeebled the Christianity it disseminated. “In regard to missions, the inaction of the Eastern churches is well known. As a general rule, they have remained content with the maintenance of their own customs.” “The preaching of Ulphilas to the Goths, of the Nestorian missions in Asia, of Russia in Siberia and the Aleutian Islands, are but striking exceptions. The conversion of the Russian nation was effected, not by the preaching of the Byzantine clergy, but by the marriage of a Byzantine princess. In the midst of the Mohammedan Ehst the Greek populations remain like islands in the barren sea, and the  Bedouin tribes have wandered for twelve centuries round the Greek convent of Mount Sinai, probably without one instance of conversion to the creed of men whom they yet acknowledge with almost religious veneration as beings from a higher world” (Stanley, Eastern Ch.).

In taking a historical view, however brief, of the Christian missions of successive ages, it seems desirable to exercise charity in the largest degree consistent with truth. And, in fact, great allowance must be made for the ignorance and difficulties of ancient and mediaeval times. Nevertheless, in the light of the Saviour's rule “by their fruits shall ye know them,” it is necessary to concede that much in ecclesiastical history that has passed for Christianity is scarcely less than a caricature of the reality. So of missionary propagandism and the conversion of nations, it must be confessed that many familiar and comprehensive phrases, such as the “ conversion of the Roman empire,” “the conversion of the Northern nations,” “the conversion of Germany,” “of Poland,” “of Norway,” etc., can only signify nominal conversion, and such ‘outward changes as might take place wholly apart from the influence of that true faith which “works by love and purifies the heart.” While, therefore, facts may be mentioned as they are represented to us in history, a careful judgment will discriminate as to their true moral or evangelical significance. Nor must the important consideration be overlooked that God, who can make the wrath of man praise him, and overrule the most untoward events to the accomplishment of his own glory, could, and doubtless did, overrule much that was imperfect, and even censurable, in the mode of promoting a nominal Christianity for the ultimate furtherance of the truth.

III. Period and Elements of Transition. — There is no positive line of demarcation between the ancient and the mediaeval churches. Indeed writers never cease to differ in regard to the limits assigned to each. In point of fact, the former gradually and almost insensibly blended into the latter; but, in a missionary, point of view, we are forced to consider the ancient Church as coming to a close when her purity and her aggressiveness began simultaneously to decline. During the first three centuries Christianity maintained a complete antagonism to false religions and pagan worship in all its forms. Conversions to Christianity were individual, not national; the new faith made its way upward from the humbler strata of society to the higher, from the Catacombs to the palace, till at length the number of converts became too great and too influential to be ignored either by emperors or by senates. In the 4th century we have the  example of the emperor Constantine, as yet unbaptized, taking an active part in preaching and in .the councils of the Church; and subsequently the leading missionary efforts were specially addressed to kings and princes, to whose determination their subjects were expected to conform.

One of the saddest aspects of the closing period of the ancient Church appeared in the growing tendency on the part of the clergy to accept nominal instead of real conversions, outward conformity instead of actual faith. Many bishops encouraged this tendency, wishing to make what they called conversion as easy as possible. Hence they baptized even those who lived in open sin, and who plainly indicated their purpose to continue in it. Perhaps they imagined that such persons, when once introduced to the Church, would be more easily and certainly reformed, although, for the most part, they merely told them what they would have to believe in order to be Christians, without insisting on the obligations of a holy life, lest the candidates should decline baptism. “These corrupt modes of procedure originated partly in the erroneous notions of worth attached to a barely outward baptism and outward Church fellowship, and partly in the false notions of what constituted faith, and of the relation of the doctrines of faith and of morals in Christianity to each other” (Neander, Church Hist. 2:100). Against such views and measures there were not wanting remonstrances on the part of such men as Chrysostom and Augustine. The former, reprobating bishops animated by a false zeal for increasing the numbers of nominal Christians, says: “Our Lord utters it as a precept, ‘Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine.' But, through foolish vanity and ambition, we have subverted this command too by admitting those corrupt, unbelieving men, who are full of evil, before they have given us any satisfactory evidence of a change of mind, to partake of the sacraments. It is on this account many of those who were thus baptized have fallen away and occasioned much scandal.” Augustine complained: “How many seek Jesus only that he may benefit them in earthly matters! One man has a lawsuit, so he seeks the intercession of the clergy; another is oppressed by his superior, so he takes refuge in the Church; and still another that he may secure the wife of his choice. The Church is full of such persons. Seldom is Jesus sought for Jesus's sake.” Nor were worldly motives the only agencies which led to spurious and hypocritical conversions, Many were awakened by outward impressions: some supposed they had seen miraculous effects produced by the sign of the cross; others were affected by dreams, and did little more  than exchange one superstition for another. Against these insidious and contagious errors Augustine uttered faithful exhortations and warnings in his tract De Catechizandis Rudibus and other writings, but the current of things, and the swelling tide of barbarian invasion, greatly antagonized his influence. Some were doubtless led from poor beginnings to better results, becoming in the end true Christians, although they entered the Church from unworthy motives; but far earlier, and more extensively than is generally supposed, the true spiritual character of the ancient Church, as a whole, had lamentably declined, and with it all genuine zeal for the spiritual conversion of men.

IV. Mediaeval Missions. — It is not to be denied that the mediaeval period was one of revolution, and therefore unfavorable to the propagation of true religion; but it is by no means conceded, as is argued by some Protestant writers, including Milman, Guizot, and others of high reputation, that a defective development of Christianity was therefore inevitable, or that the semi-monastic and secular measures employed to civilize and Christianize the barbarians of Europe were “adapted as a transitionary stage for the childhood of those races.” On the other hand, it is claimed, in the light of Scripture and experience, both among ancient and modern heathen, that the grand desideratum for those times, as for all others, was the unadulterated Gospel of Christ and his apostles, which not only would have availed tenfold more than did all worldly and semi-secular expedients, but would have remained as a pure, instead of a corrupting, leaven to work in after ages. It is pleasing to observe that in some of the earlier missions, of which brief sketches will now be submitted, there was no inconsiderable mixture of just and appropriate evangelical agencies, such as the translation and circulation of the Scriptures, and self-denying examples of missionary life. Instead of attempting, as has often been done, to sum up by centuries what was done, or said to have been done, to extend Christianity, it is thought better to present from historic sources a few sample missionary events and characters from successive periods of mediaeval .Church history, illustrating the actual introduction of the Church into different countries and among various races.

1. The Mission of Ulphilas to the Goths. — “When we proceed to inquire in what way a knowledge of Christianity was diffused among the nations which thus established themselves on the ruins of the Roman empire, we find, at least at the outset, that ecclesiastical history can give us but scanty information. ‘We know as little in detail,' remarks Schlegel, ‘of the  circumstances under which Christianity became so universally spread in a short space of time among all the Gothic nations as of the establishment, step by step, of their great kingdom on the Black Sea.' The rapid and universal diffusion, indeed, of the new faith is a proof of their capacity for civilization, and of the national connection of the whole race; but where shall we find the details of their conversion? We have not a record, not even a legend, of the way in which the Visigoths in France, the Ostrogoths in Pannonia, the Suevians in Spain, the Gepidae, the Vandals, the followers of Odoacer, and the fiery Lombards, were converted to the Christian faith. We may trace this, in part, to the terrible desolation which at this period reigned everywhere, while nation warred against nation, and tribe against tribe; we may trace it, still more, to the fact that every one of the tribes above mentioned was converted to the Arian form of Christianity, a sufficient reason in the eyes of Catholic historians for ignoring altogether the efforts of heretics to spread the knowledge of the faith. And till the close of the 6th, and the opening of the 7th century, we must be content with the slenderest details, if we wish to Know anything of the early diffusion of Christianity on the European continent.

“The record, however, of one early missionary has forced its way into the Catholic histories.' In the reigns of Valerian and Gallienus, the Goths, descending from the north and east, began, from their new settlements on the Danube, to threaten the safety of the southern provinces of the empire. Establishing themselves in the Ukraine and on the shores of the Bosphorus, they spread terror throughout Pontus, Bithynia, and Cappadocia. In one of these inroads they carried off from the latter country a multitude of captives, some belonging to the clergy, and located them in their settlements along the northern bank of the Danube. Here the captives did not forget their Christian duties towards their heathen masters, nor did the latter scorn to receive from them the gentle doctrines of Christianity. The work, indeed, went on in silence, but from time to time we have proofs that the seed had not been sown in vain. Among the 318 bishops at the Council of Nice, the light complexion of the Gothic bishop Theophilus must have attracted notice, as contrasted ‘with the dark hair and tawny hue of almost all the rest.' But Theophilus was the predecessor and teacher of a still greater missionary. Among the involuntary slaves carried off in the reign of Gallienus were the parents or ancestors of Ulphilas, who has won for himself the title of ‘Apostle of the Goths.' Born, probably, in the year 318, he was, at a comparatively early age, sent on a mission to Constantinople,  and there Constantine caused him to be consecrated bishop by his own chaplain, Eusebius of Nicomedia. From this time he devoted himself heart and soul to the conversion of his countrymen, and the Goths were the first of the barbarians among whom we see Christianity advancing general civilization, as well as teaching a purer faith.

“But his lot was cast in troublous times: the threatened irruption of a barbarous horde, and the animosity of the heathen Goths, induced him to cross the Danube, where the emperor Constantine assigned to his flock a district of country, and here he continued to labor with success. The influence he had already gained, and the natural sense of gratitude for the benefits he had bestowed upon the tribes by procuring for them a more peaceful settlement, rendered his efforts comparatively easy. Rejoicing in the woodlands and pastures of their new home, where they could to advantage tend their numerous flocks and herds, and purchase corn and wine of the richer provinces around them, they listened obediently to the voice of their bishop, whom they likened to a second Moses. And the conduct of Ulphilas justified their confidence. With singular wisdom he did not confine his efforts to the oral instruction of his people; he sought to restore to them the art of writing, which probably had been lost during their migration from the east to the north of Germany. Composing an alphabet of twenty-five letters, some of which he was fain to invent, in order to give expression to sounds unknown to Greek and Latin pronunciation, he translated the Scriptures into the native language of his flock, omitting only the four books of Kings, a precaution he adopted from a fear that their contents might tend to rouse the martial ardor and fierce spirit of a people who, in this matter, to use the quaint language of the historian, ‘required the bit rather than the spur.'”

“After a while he was constrained to act the part of mediator between the Visigothic nation and the Roman emperor Valens. In the year A.D. 374 the barbarous horde of the Huns burst upon the kingdom of the Ostrotgoths, and, having subdued it, turned their eyes to the lands and possessions of the Visigoths. Unable to defend the line of the Dniester, the latter fell back upon the Pruth, hoping for safety amid the inaccessible defiles of the Carpathian mountains. But, sensible that even here they were not secure, a considerable party began to long for an asylum within the Roman dominions, and it was agreed that ambassadors, with Ulphilas among their number, should repair to the court of Valens, and endeavor to obtain a new settlement.  “Valens was an Arian and a controversialist. At this very time he was enforcing at Antioch, ‘by other weapons than those of reason and eloquence,' a belief in the Arian theology; and when the poor bishop presented himself, and requested aid in the dire necessity of his people, the emperor is reported to have persecuted him with discussions on the hypostatic union, and to have pressed upon him the necessity of repudiating the Confession of Nice, and adopting that of Rimini. Ulphilas was in a great strait, but, being a simple-minded man, and considering the question one of words, and involving only metaphysical subtleties, not worthy of consideration in comparison with the sufferings of his people, he assented to the emperor's proposal, and promised that the Gothic nation should adopt the Arian Confession. The emperor, on his part, consented to give up certain lands in Moesia, but annexed to this concession two harsh and rigorous conditions: that before they crossed the Danube the Goths should give up their arms, and suffer their children to be taken from them as hostages for their own fidelity, with the prospect of being educated in the different provinces of Asia.

“On these hard terms instructions were issued to the military governors of the Thracian diocese, bidding them make preparations for the reception of the new settlers. But it was found no easy matter to transport across a river more than a mile in breadth, and swelled by incessant rains, upwards of a million of both sexes and of all ages. For days and nights they passed and repassed in boats and canoes, and before they landed not a few had been carried away and drowned by the violence of the current. But, besides the disciples of Ulphilas, thousands of Goths, crossed the river who still continued faithful to their own heathen priests and priestesses. Disguising, it is even said, their priests in the garb of Christian bishops and fictitious ascetics, they deceived the credulous Romans; and only when on the Roman side of the river did they throw off the mask, and make it clear that Valens was not easily to have his wish gratified, and see them converted to Arianism. One of the hereditary chiefs, Fritigern, a disciple of Ulphilas, adopted the creed of the empire, the other, Athanaric, headed the numerous party which still continued devoted to the altars and rites of Woden. The latter faction, placing their chief god on a lofty wagon, dragged it through the Gothic camp; all who refused to bow down, they burned, with their wives and children; nor did they spare the rude church they had erected, or the confused crowd of women and children who had fled to it for protection. But while the great bulk of the Gothic nation were  involved in constant wars with the Roman armies, and, under the two great divisions of Ostrogoths and Visigoths, were gradually spreading themselves over Gaul, Italy, and Spain, Ulphilas continued, till the year 388, to superintend the temporal and spiritual necessities of the peaceful and populous colony of shepherds and herdsmen which, as in another Goshen, he had formed on the slopes of Mount Hoemus, and to whom he had presented the Gothic Bible in their own tongue.

“The zeal he had displayed found an imitator in the great Chrysostom. What was the measure of his success we have no means of judging, but it is certain that he founded in Constantinople an institution in which Goths might be trained and qualified to preach the Gospel to their fellow- countrymen. Even during the three years of his banishment to the remote and wretched little town of Cucusus, among the ridges of Mount Taiurus, amid the want of provisions, frequent sickness without the possibility of obtaining medicines, and the ravages of Isaurian robbers, his active mind, invigorated by misfortunes, found relief not only in corresponding with churches in all quarters, but in directing missionary operations in Phoenicia, Persia, and among the Goths. In several extant epistles we find him advising the despatch of missionaries, one to this point, another to that, consoling some under persecution, animating all by the example of the great apostle Paul,: and the hope of an eternal reward. And in answer to his appeals, his friends at a distance supplied him with funds so ample that he was enabled to support missions and redeem captives, and even had to beg of them that their abundant liberality might be directed into other channels. How far his exertions prevailed to win over any portion of the Gothic nation to the Catholic communion we have no means of judging. Certain it is that from the Western Goths the Arian form of Christianity extended to the Eastern Goths, to the Gepidae, the Alans, the Vandals, and the Suevi; and it has been justly remarked that we ought not to forget ‘that when Augustine, in his great work on the “city of God,” celebrates the charity and clemency of Alaric during the sack of Rome, these Christian graces were entirely due to the teaching of Oriental missionaries' “(Maclear's Missions in the Middle Ages, pages 37-43).

2. The Conversion of Clovis and the Frankes. — In the year 481 Clovis succeeded to the chieftaincy of the Salian Franks. In 493 he married Clotilda, the daughter of the king of Burgundy, who professed Christianity, and sought to persuade her husband to embrace it also; but her efforts for a time were without success. “At length, on the battle-field of Tolbiac, his  incredulity came to an end. The fierce and dreadful Alemanni, fresh from their native forests, had burst upon the kingdom of his Ripuarian allies; Clovis, with his Franks, had rushed to the rescue, and the two fiercest nations of Germany were to decide between them the supremacy of Gaul. The battle was long and bloody; the Franks, after an obstinate struggle, wavered, and seemed on the point of flying, and in vain Clovis implored the aid of his own deities. At length he bethought him of the vaunted omnipotence of Clotilda's God, and he vowed that if victorious he would abjure his pagan creed arid be baptized as a Christian. Thereupon the tide of battle turned; the last king of the Allemanni fell, and his troops fled in disorder, purchasing safety by submission to the Frankish chief. On his return Clovis recounted to his queen the story of the fight, the success of his prayer, and the vow he had made. Overwhelmed with joy, she sent without delay for Remigius, the venerable bishop of Rheims, and on his arrival the victorious chief listened attentively to his arguments. Still he hesitated, and said he would consult his warriors. These rough soldiers evinced no unwillingness; with, perhaps, the same indifference that he himself had permitted the baptism of his children, they declared themselves nothing loth to accept the creed of their chief. Clovis therefore yielded, and the baptism was fixed to take place at the approaching festival of Christmas. The greatest pains were taken to lend as -much solemnity as possible to the scene. The church was hung with embroidered tapestry and white curtains, and blazed with a thousand lights, while odors of incense, ‘like airs of paradise,' in the words of the excited chronicler, ‘filled the place.' The new Constantine, as he entered, was struck with awe. ‘Is this the heaven thou didst promise me?' said he to the bishop. ‘Not heaven itself, but the beginning of the way thither,' replied the bishop. The service proceeded. As he knelt before the font to wash away the leprosy of his heathenism, ‘Sicambrian,' said Remigius, ‘gently bow thy neck, bur that thou didst adore, adore that which thou didst burn.' Thus together with three thousand of his followers, Clovis espoused Clotilda's creed, and became the single sovereign of the West who adhered to the Confession of Nicaea. Everywhere else Arianism was triumphant. The Ostrogoth Theodoric in Italy, the successors of Euric in Visigothic France, the king of Burgundy, the Suevian princes in Spain, the Vandal in Africa — all were Arians.

“The conversion of Clovis, like that of Constantine, is open to much discussion. It certainly had no effect upon his moral character. The same  ‘untutored savage' he was, the same he remained. But the services he rendered to Catholicism were great, and they were appreciated. ‘God daily prostrated his enemies before him, because he walked before him with an upright heart, and did what was pleasing in his eyes.' In these words Gregory of Tours expresses the feelings of the Gallic clergy, who rallied round Clovis to a man, and excused all faults in one who could wield the sword so strenuously in behalf of the orthodox faith. His subsequent career was a succession of triumphs: Gundebald, the Burgundian king, felt the vengeance of Clotilda's lord on the bloody field of Dijon on the Ousche, and the cities on the Saone and the Rhone were added to the Frankish kingdom. A few more years and the Visigothic kingdom in the south felt the same iron hand. The orthodox prelates did not disguise the fact that this was a religious war, and that the supremacy of the Arian or the Catholic Creed in Western Europe was now to be decided. Clovis himself entered fully into the spirit of the crusade: on approaching Tours, he made death the penalty of injuring the territory of the holy St. Martin; in the church of the saint he publicly performed his devotions, and listened to the voices of the priests as they chanted the 18th Psalm: ‘Thou hast girded me, O Lord, with strength unto the battle; thou hast subdued unto me those which rose up against me. Thou hast also given me the necks of mine enemies, that I might destroy them that hate me.' Whether he understood the words or not, they seemed prophetic of the subsequent, career of the new champion of Catholicism. The orthodox historians exhaust the treasury of legends to adorn his progress. A ‘kind of wonderful magnitude' guided him through the swollen waters of the River Vienne; a pillar of fire blazed forth from the cathedral as he drew nigh Poitiers, to assure him of success. At last the bloody plains of Vougle witnessed the utter defeat of the Arian Goths, and Alaric, their king, was mingled with the crowd of fugitives. Bordeaux, Auvergne, Rovergne, Toulouse, Angoulame, successively fell into the hands of the Frankish king, and then before the shrine of St. Martin the ‘eldest son of the Church' was invested with the titles of Roman Patricius and Consul, conferred by the Greek emperor Anastasius.”

“We have thus sketched the rise of the Frankish monarchy because it has an important connection with the history of Christian-missions. Orthodoxy advanced side by side with the Frankish domination. The rude warriors of Clovis, once beyond the local boundaries of their ancestral faith, found themselves in the presence of a Church which was the only stable  institution in the country, and bowed before a creed which, while it offered infinitely more to the soul and intellect than their own superstitions, presented everything that could excite the fancy or captivate the sense. Willingly, therefore, did they follow the example of their king; and for. one that embraced the faith from genuine — a thousand adopted it from lower motives. And while they had their reward, the Frankish bishops had theirs too, in constant gifts of land for the foundation of churches and monasteries, and in a speedy admission to wealth and power.”

“But the Frankish Church was not destined to evangelize the rude nations of Europe. The internal dissensions and constant wars of the successors of Clovis were not favorable to the development of Christian civilization at home or its propagation abroad. Avitus of Vienne, Caesarius of Aries, and Faustus of Riez, proved what might be done by energy and self-devotion. But the rapid accession of wealth more and more tempted the Frankish bishops and abbots to live as mere laymen, and so the clergy degenerated, and the light of the Frankish Church grew dim. Not only were the masses of heathendom lying outside her territory neglected, but within it she saw her own members tainted with the old leaven of heathenism, and relapsing, in some instances, into the old idolatries. A new influence, therefore, was required, if the light of the Frankish Church was to be rekindled, and the German tribes evangelized, And this new influence was at hand. But to trace its origin, we must leave the scenes of the labors of Ulphilas and Severinus for two sister isles high up in the Northern Sea, almost forgotten amid the desolating contest which was breaking up the Roman world. We must glance first at the origin of the Celtic Church in Ireland and the Scottish highlands, whose humble oratories of timber and rude domes of rough stone might, indeed, contrast unfavorably with the prouder structures of the West, but whose missionary zeal burned with a far steadier flame. We must then turn to the shores of Kent, where the story of Clovis and Clotilda was to be re-enacted, and a Teutonic Church was destined to arise, and send forth, in its turn, missionary heroes among their kindred on the Continent” (Maclear's Missions in the Middle Ages, pages 54-58).

3. Patrick and the Irish Missionaries. — The Gospel was planted in Ireland by a single missionary, self-moved — or, rather, divinely moved — and self-supported. His historic name was Patrick, and the Roman Catholics (claiming him, without reason, as their own) call him St. Patrick. He was born about the year 410, and most probably in some part of  Scotland. His parents were Christians, and instructed him in the Gospel. Patrick's first visit to the field of his future mission was in his youth, as a captive of pirates, who carried him away, with many others, as a prisoner. Patrick was sold to a chieftain, who placed him in charge of his cattle. His own statement is that his heart was turned to the Lord during the hardships of his captivity. ‘I prayed many times a day,' he says. ‘The fear of God and love to him were increasingly kindled in me. Faith grew in me, so that in one day I offered a hundred prayers, and at night almost as many; and when I passed the night in the woods or on the mountains, I rose up to pray in the snow, ice, and rain before daybreak. Yet I felt no pain. There was no sluggishness in me, such as I now find in myself, for then the spirit glowed within me.' This is extracted from what is called the ‘Confession' of Patrick, written in his old age.

“Some years later he was again taken by the pirates, but soon regained his liberty, and returned home. His parents urged him to remain with them, but he felt an irresistible call to carry the Gospel to those among whom he had passed his youth as a bondman. ‘Many opposed my going,' he says in his ‘Confession,' ‘and said behind my back, “Why does this man rush into danger among the heathen, who do not know the Lord?” It was not badly intended on their part, but they could not comprehend the matter on account of my uncouth disposition. Many gifts were offered me with tears if I would remain. But, according to God's guidance, I did not yield to them; not by my own power — it was God who conquered in me, and I withstood them all; so that I went to the people of Ireland to publish the Gospel to them, and suffered many insults from unbelievers, and many persecutions, even unto bonds, resigning my liberty for the good of others. And if I am found worthy, I am ready to give up my life with joy for his sake.' In such a spirit did this apostle to Ireland commence his mission, about the year 440; not far from the time when Britain was finally evacuated by the Romans...

“Patrick being acquainted with the language and customs of the Irish people, as a consequence of his early captivity, gathered them about him in large assemblies at the beat of a kettle-drums and told the story of Christ so as to move their hearts. Having taught them to read, he encouraged the importation of useful books from England and France. He established cloisters after the fashion of the times, which were really missionary schools for educating the people in the knowledge of the Gospel, and for  training a native ministry and missionaries; and he claims to have baptized many thousands of people...

“‘The people may not have adopted the outward profession of Christianity, which was all that, perhaps, in the first instance they adopted, from any clear or intellectual appreciation of its superiority to their former religion; but to obtain from the people even an outward profession of Christianity was an important step to ultimate success. It secured toleration, at least, for Christian institutions. It enabled Patrick to plant in every tribe his churches, schools, and monasteries. He was permitted, without opposition, to establish among the half-pagan inhabitants of the country societies of holy men, whose devotion, usefulness, and piety soon produced an effect upon the most barbarous and savage hearts. This was the secret of the rapid success attributed to Patrick's preaching in Ireland. The chieftains were at first the real converts. The baptism of the chieftain was immediately followed by the adhesion of the clan. The clansmen pressed eagerly around the missionary who had baptized the chief, anxious to receive that mysterious initiation into the new faith to which their chieftain and father had submitted. The requirements preparatory to baptism do not seem to have been very rigorous; and it is, therefore, not improbable that in Tirawley, and other remote districts, where the spirit of clanship was strong, Patrick, as he himself tells us he did, may have baptized some thousands of men.'

“When this zealous missionary died, about the year 493, his disciples, who seem all to have been natives of Ireland — a native ministry — continued his work inn the same spirit. The monasteries became at length so numerous and famous that Ireland was called Insula Sanctorum, the ‘Island of Saints.' It gives a wrong idea of these institutions to call them monasteries, or to call their inmates monks. ‘They were schools of learning and abodes of piety, uniting the instruction of the college, the labors of the workshop, the charities of the hospital, and the worship of the Church. They originated partly in a mistaken view of the Christian life, and partly out of the necessity of the case, which drove Christians to live together for mutual protection. The missionary spirit, and consequent religious activity, prevailing in the Irish monasteries, preserved them for a long time from the asceticism and mysticism incidental to the monastic life, and made them a source of blessing to the world.' The celibacy of the clergy was not enjoined in those times. Married men were connected with the cloisters, living, however, in single houses. The Scriptures were read, and ancient  books were collected and studied. The missions which went forth from these institutions, as also those from England and Wales, are frequently called ‘Culdee' missions. SEE CULDEES and SEE IONA.

“The names of Columba and Columbanus are familiar to the readers of ecclesiastical history. Both were Irish missionaries, and both were from the institution at Bangor, in Ireland. Columba's mission was to the Picts of Scotland, and was entered upon at the age of forty-two, in the year 563. This was thirteen hundred years ago, and about seventy years after the time of Patrick. He was accompanied by twelve associates, and was the founder of the celebrated monastery on Iona, an island situated on the north of Scotland, now reckoned one of the Hebrides. This school, which had an enduring fame, became one of the chief lights of that age. Continuing thirty-five years under Columba's management, it attained a high reputation for Biblical studies and other sciences; and missionaries went from it to the northern and southern Picts of Scotland, and into England, along the eastern coast to the Thames, and to the European continent. Columbanus entered on his mission to the partially Christianized, but more especially to the pagan portions of Europe, in the year 589. That he was an evangelical missionary may be confidently inferred from the tenor of his life, and from the records of his Christian experience. He thus writes: ‘O Lord, give: me, I beseech thee, in the name of Jesus Christ, thy Son, my God, that love which can never cease, that will kindle my lamp but not extinguish it, that it may burn in me and enlighten others. Do thou, O Christ, our dearest Saviour, thyself kindle our lamps, that they may evermore shine in thy temple; that they may receive unquenchable light from thee that will enlighten our darkness and lessen the darkness of the world. My Jesus, I pray thee, give thy light to my lamp, that in its light the most holy place may be revealed to me in which thou dwellest as the eternal Priest, that I may always behold thee, desire thee, look upon thee in love, and long after thee.' Columbauus went first to France, taking with him twelve young men, as Columba had done, to be his co-laborers-men who had been trained under his special guidance. Here, as a consequence of continual wars, political disturbances, and the remissness of worldly- minded ecclesiastics, the greatest confusion and irregularity prevailed, and there was great degeneracy in the monastic orders. Columbanus preferred casting his lot among the pagans of Burgundy, and chose for his settlement the ruins of an ancient castle in the midst of an immense wilderness, at the foot of the Vosges Mountains. There they often suffered hunger, until the  wilderness had been in some measure subdued and the earth brought under cultivation. The mission then became self-supporting, but we are not informed by what means the previous expenses were defrayed. Preaching was a part of their duty, though there is less said of this than of their efforts to impart the benefits of a Christian education to the children of the higher classes. The surrounding poor were taught gratuitously. All the pupils joined in tilling the fields, and such was their success in education that the Frankish nobles were forward to place their sons under their care. It was the most famous school in Burgundy, and there was not room in the abbey for all who pressed to gain admittance; so that it became necessary to erect other buildings, and to bring a large number of teachers over from Ireland to meet the demand. Here the eminent missionary pursued his labors for a score of years. As he represents himself to have buried as many as seventeen of his associates during twelve years, the number of his co- laborers must have been large. The discipline which Columbanus imposed on the monastic life was severe, but perhaps scarcely more so than was required by the rude spirit of the age; and he took pains to avoid the error, so prevalent in the Romish Church, of making the essence of piety consist in externals. The drift of his teaching was that everything depended on the state of the heart. Both by precept and example he sought to combine the contemplative with the useful. At the same time he adhered, with a free and independent spirit, to the peculiar religious usages of his native land. As these differed in some important respects from what were then prevalent among the degenerate Frankish clergy, he had many enemies among them, who sought to drive him from the country. This they at length effected, with the aid of the wicked mother of the reigning prince. Columbanus was ordered to return to Ireland, and to take his countrymen with him. This he did not do, but repaired first to Germany, and then to Switzerland. He spent a year near the eastern extremity of the Lake Constance, laboring among the Suevi, a heathen people in that neighborhood. This territory coming at length under the dominion of his enemies, he crossed the Alps, in the year 612, into Lombardy, and founded a monastery near Pavia; and there this apostle to Franks, Swabians, Bavarians, and other nations of Germany, passed the remainder of his days, and breathed out his life November 21, 615, aged seventy-two years. Gallus, a favorite pupil and follower of Columbanus, remained behind in consequence of illness, and became the apostle of Switzerland. He also was an Irishman. and was characterized, as was his master, by love for the sacred volume. In what was then a wilderness he founded a monastery, ‘which led to the clearing  up of the forest, and the conversion of the land into cultivable soil, and it afterwards became celebrated under his name, St. Gall.' Here he labored for the Swiss and Swabian population till his death, in the year 640. This monastery was pre-eminent for the number and beauty of the manuscripts prepared by its monks; many of which, and, among others, some fragments of a translation of the Scriptures into the Allemanni language, about the year 700, are said to be preserved in the libraries of Germany.

“Neander is of the opinion that the number of missionaries who passed over from Ireland to the continent of Europe must have been great, though of very few is there any exact information. Wherever they went, cloisters were founded, and the wilderness soon gave place to cultivated fields. According to Ebrard, there were more than forty cloisters in the vicinity of the Loire and Rhone, which were governed according to the rules of Columbanus, and to which emigrants came from Ireland as late as the close of the 7th century. He also affirms that Germany was almost wholly heathen when that missionary entered it. But before the year 720 the Gospel had been proclaimed by himself and his countrymen from the mountains of Switzerland down to the islands in the delta of the Rhine, and eastward from that river to the River Inn, and the Bohemian forest, and the borders of Saxony, and still farther on the seacoast; and all the really German tribes within those borders were in subjection to the Christian faith as it had been taught by the Irish missionaries. Ebrard's earnest testimony to the evangelical nature of the Irish missions should not be overlooked. He declares that they read the Scriptures in the original text, translated them wherever they went, expounded them to the congregations, recommended the regular and diligent perusal of them, and held them to be the living Word of Christ. The Scriptures were their only rule of faith. They preached the inherited depravity of man, the atoning death of Christ, justification without the merit of works, regeneration as the life in him who died for us, and the sacraments as signs and seals of grace in Christ. They held to no transubstantiation, no purgatory, no prayers to saints, and their worship was in the native language. But, though they used neither pictures nor images, they seem to have been attached to the use of the simple cross; and Gallus, the distinguished champion of Columbanus, is said, when marking out a place on which to erect a monastery, to have done it by means of a cross, from which he had suspended a capsule of relics. Complete exemption from superstition was perhaps among the impossibilities of that age” (Anderson's Foreign Missions, pages 69-82).  4. Similar in interest, though varied in detail, are the stories of Augustine's mission to England, A.D. 596; that of Boniface to Germany, A.D. 715; and that of Anksgar to Scandinavia, A.D. 826; together with that of many of their associates and successors. Nor were the missions among the Sclavonic races during the 9th and 10th centuries without many incidents of great interest. See Maclear's Missions in the Middles Ages; Milman's Latin Christianity; Merivale's Conversion of the Northern Nations; Guizot's History of Civilization etc.; S.F. Smith, Medieval Missions.

5. A period has now been reached when it is necessary to take note of another important element in the history and character of missions, viz., papal influence. Gregory the Great, A.D. 568-604, was the first of the bishops of Rome who exerted any decided official influence on the' propagation of Christianity by means of missions. “His project of sending missionaries to England, formed before his attaining the pontifical dignity, was among the first to be carried into execution. In the year 596 he despatched Augustine, with forty assistant monks, to effect the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons. Conversion, in the dialect of Rome, signified nothing more than proselytism; and it was sanguinely hoped that by influencing the chiefs to renounce idolatry their subjects would soon be converted in a mass... The success of Augustine and his brethren was even beyond their expectation. Landing on the Isle of Thanet, they applied to Ethelbert, the king of Kent, for permission to preach in his kingdom. Ethelbert had married a Christian princess, and was therefore not unfavorably disposed towards his uninvited guests. Yet so ignorant was he of the nature of their errand that he insisted that their first interview with him should take place in the open air, lest he should fall a victim to their magical arts. Augustine's eloquence, however, soon inspired the king with confidence, and Ethelbert then granted to the missionaries an old, ruinous church at Canterbury, dedicated to St. Martin, and which had existed from the time of the Romans, as their first station for preaching the Gospel. Ere long the king yielded to the arguments of Augustine or the persuasions of his wife, and his baptism was followed by that of many of his subjects, no fewer than ten thousand being thus nominally received into the Church on a single occasion... Gregory was overjoyed at the success of his mission and needed no solicitations to send a re-enforcement of preachers, all of whom were monks. He next divided the whole island into two archbishoprics, appointing Augustine to be archbishop of London, and constituting York the metropolitan city of the north when Christianity should have penetrated  so far.

As London had not yet, however, embraced the new religion, and was not within the domains of Ethelbert, Augustine made Canterbury his abode and see. In the true spirit of Roman arrogance, Augustine assumed. to himself the right of governing all the churches in Britain, whether planted by the recent laborers or existing from earlier times. But the ancient British churches were indignant at such an encroachment on their independence and liberties. ‘We are all prepared,' said Deynoch, abbot of Bangor, on one occasion, ‘to hearken to the Church of God, to the pope of Rome, and to every pious Christian, so as to manifest to all, according to their several stations, perfect charity, and to uphold and aid them both byword and deed. What other duty we can owe to him whom you call pope, or father of fathers, we do not know; but this we are ready to exercise towards him and every other Christian.' This independence by no means pleased Augustine; and he was heard to say to his Anglo-Saxon followers, ‘Well, then, since they will not own the Anglo-Saxons as brethren, or allow us to make known to them the way of life, they must regard them as enemies, and look for revenge.' The horrible spirit which dictated such a speech is too apparent to need comment, and shows how little of real Christianity the Roman missionaries mingled with their zeal for the papal see. In the contests which the new Church thus waged with the old, the influence of Augustine and his followers with the Saxon kings generally enabled them to triumph; and although the British churches long persevered in maintaining their freedom, they gradually became absorbed in the Anglican hierarchy; and, long before the Norman invasion, those who ventured to dissent from the Roman forms of worship were only to be found in the extreme parts of the island.

“During the pontificate of Gregory, the Spanish Church also became subject to the primacy of Rome. Before this period the Goths, who had established their power in Spain, were of the Arian party; but on their king, Reckared, professing his belief in the doctrine of the Trinity, the bishops in a body requested the pope to undertake the supervision of their affairs — a request with which Gregory was only too happy to comply. He attempted, moreover, to obtain the subjection of the French clergy, but in this he could only partly succeed. Nevertheless, he formed alliances with the French princes, nobles, and bishops; and, considering their Church as subject to his inspection, did not hesitate to interfere on many occasions both with advice and with admonition.  “It was, perhaps, the zeal of Gregory for multiplying nominal converts to Christianity that led him to introduce alterations in the forms of worship, which were so exaggerated by succeeding pontiffs as to change the solemn service of God into a ridiculous show. Observing the influence which the harmonies of music and the beauties of painting and sculpture exerted upon the minds of the Lombards and other half-civilized tribes, he resolved to employ the arts as handmaids to religion” (Lives of the Popes, pages 78- 81).

For more than one hundred years following, although the papacy was constantly making advances towards temporal sovereignty, no one of the popes possessed the character of Gregory. In 715 Gregory It came to the papal chair. It was he that sent Corbinian as missionary to France and Boniface to Germany. Gregory III, about 741, sent the first ambassador of Rome to France. From the middle of the 8th century the popedom laid claim to a temporal sovereignty, and from A.D. 800 when pope Leo III crowned Charlemagne as emperor of the West, that monarch assumed the protectorate of Christendom, and stood ready to the extent of his power to promote the interests of the Roman see, which he chiefly did by means of conquest. From that time, more than before, missions were made an agency for the propagandism not merely of a ceremonial Christianity, but of the power of the popes. Monasticism, already widely extended, became an auxiliary of great power, that could be wielded for any special object contemplated by the Roman see. The popes wielded the prerogative of establishing and controlling the various orders of monks, and, by granting them exemption from the local supervision of bishops, were able always to hold them in the most direct subservience to their own ambitions. From the middle of the 9th century onward there was a vast increase of monasteries in various parts of Europe. The Benedictine order was in the ascendency, but, notwithstanding repeated reforms of its rule aid practice, many of the monks were dissolute, and, as the clergy of various countries were chiefly taken from the monasteries, anarchy, simony, and concubinage largely prevailed. This was the saeculum obscurum, the darkest of the dark ages; and, in the general stagnation which prevailed, there was but little activity in any form of missionary effort. Europe was considered Christian, and there were no elements at work to improve the type of Christianity it had received, while, on the contrary, many germs of evil that had been sowed as tares were springing up to choke whatever of wheat was left to grow.  6. The Crusades. — About this period rumors of violence and insult to Christian pilgrims in the East began. to excite attention, and the certainty that Christians were greatly oppressed by the Moslems at Jerusalem and throughout Palestine became the pretext for the crusades. The idea of rescuing by force the Holy Sepulchre from the pollution of the infidels was first developed as a duty of the Church under pope Sylvester II, A.D. 999- 1003. It took form and action in eight successive crusades or wars of the cross, extending through two centuries and a half. These so-called holy wars scarcely differed in principle from the wars of Clovis, Charlemagne, and others, by which the Church had been extended among the nations and tribes of Northern Europe; and also of Cortez and Pizarro, made after the discovery of the New World, to Christianize (?) the nations of Mexico and Central and South America. The peculiarity of the crusades consisted in the remoteness of the land they aimed to conquer, the resistance offered by the Moslem races, and the defeats which overwhelmed in one form or another the. armies of eight successive crusades, until, by the loss of millions of men and treasure, all Europe was exhausted.

The only proper view to take of these wars is to regard them as grand but mistaken missionary expeditions. As such they were sanctioned by the popes, preached by the monks, sustained by the people, and enterprised by the warriors, who went forth prepared to sacrifice treasure and life, but confident of winning heaven as a result. Mark the history and language of pope Innocent III, A.D. 1198-1216: “The event of the crusades might have crushed a less lofty and religious mind than that of Innocent to despair. Armies after armies had left their bones to crumble on the plains of Asia Minor or of Galilee; great sovereigns had perished or returned discomfited from the Holy Land. The great German crusade had ended in disgraceful failure. All was dissension, jealousy, hostility. The king of Antioch was at war with the Christian king of Armenia. The two great orders, the only powerful defenders of the land, the Hospitallers and the Templars, were in implacable feud. The Christians of Palestine were in morals, in character, in habits, the most licentious, most treacherous, most ferocious of mankind. But the darker the aspect of affairs the more firmly seemed Innocent to be persuaded that the crusade was the cause of God. In every new disaster, in every discomfiture and loss, the popes had still found unfailing refuge in ascribing them to the sins of the Christians, and their sins were dark enough to justify the strongest language of Innocent. It needed but more perfect faith, more holiness, and one believer would put to flight twelve  millions; the miracles of God against Pharaoh and against the Philistines would be renewed in their behalf. For the first two or three years of Innocent's pontificate, address after address, rising one above another in impassioned eloquence, enforced the duty of contributing to the holy war. This was to be the principal, if not the exclusive theme of the preaching of the clergy. In letters to the bishop of Syracuse, to all the bishops of Apulia, Calabria. and Tuscany, he urges them to visit every city, town, and castle; he exhorts not only the nobles, but the citizens, to take up arms for Jesus Christ. Those who cannot assist in person are to assist in other ways, by furnishing ships, provisions, and money. Somewhat later came a more energetic epistle to all archbishops, bishops, abbots, priors, and princes and barons of France, England, Hungary, and Sicily. The vicar of Christ himself would claim no exemption from the universal call; he would, as became him, set the example, and in person and in estate devote himself to the sacred cause.

He had therefore himself invested with the cross two cardinals of the Church, who were to precede the army of the Lord, and to be maintained, not by any mendicant support, but at the expense of the holy see. After the pope's example, before the next March, every archbishop, bishop, and prelate was to furnish a certain number of soldiers, according to his means, or a certain rate in money for the support of the crusading army. Whoever refused was to be treated as a violator of God's commandments, threatened with condign punishment, even with suspension. To all who embarked in the war Innocent promised, on their sincere repentance, the remission of all their sins, and eternal life in the great day of retribution. Those who were unable to proceed in person might obtain the same remission in proportion to the bounty of their offerings and the devotion of their hearts. The estates of all who took up the cross were placed under the protection of St. Peter” (Milman, Lat. Christianity, 5:75 sq.). Had such language been used, such influence exerted, and such sacrifices made in harmony with the Savior's plan of evangelizing the world, who can tell what happy and far-reaching results might not have been attained as the issue? But bad efforts in a good cause, no less than well-meant efforts in a bad cause, can only be expected to result disastrously. Hence true Christianity, instead of being promoted, was perverted and antagonized, till the hope of its very existence had well-nigh fled the earth. Nevertheless, some fragments of the true leaven still remained, sometimes in the Church, and sometimes in small and obscure sects. like the Waldenses. A specimen of the higher and better aspirations cherished by individuals is illustrated in the history of Raymond Lull, SEE  LULLY, but the difficulties in their way were insuperable. It need not be denied that the terrible evils of the crusades were in a subsequent period in many respects overruled for the good of humanity. But as it does not enter into the scope of providential action to atone for the crimes of men or the errors of Christians, the world and the Church are destined to suffer perpetual loss as a result of the milito-missionary fanaticisms of the mediaeval Church. What was needed to bring in the light of truth and civilization into the dreary centuries under consideration was the simple, earnest Gospel, accompanied by the pure Word of God, and illustrated by the lives, of its teachers. But a long. period was destined to elapse before that most desirable consummation was to be realized. Indeed, it was only by slow degrees, and through long and painful struggles, that the Church again recovered the apostolic idea of missions.

7. Roman Catholic missions assumed a new and. in some respects, an improved phase during the 13th and 14th centuries, chiefly through the mendicant and preaching orders. of Dominic and Francis d'Assisi. By them a vigorous effort was made to revive the Catholic faith in all the countries of Europe, and even to extend it by peaceful foreign missions among pagans and Mohammedans, in various parts of Asia and Africa. “In one important respect the founders of these new orders absolutely agreed — in their entire identification with the lowest of mankind. At first amicable, afterwards emulous, eventually hostile, they, or rather their orders, rivalled each other in sinking below poverty into beggary. They were to live upon alms; the coarsest imaginable dress, the hardest fare, the narrowest cell, was to keep them down to the level of the humblest. Both the new orders differed in the same manner, and greatly to the advantage of the hierarchical faith, from the old monkish institutions. Their primary object was not the salvation of the individual monk, but the salvation of others through him. Though, therefore, their rules within their monasteries were strictly and severely monastic, bound by the common vows of chastity, poverty, and obedience, seclusion was no part of their discipline. Their business was abroad rather than at home; their dwelling was not like that of the old Benedictines, or others, in uncultivated swamps and forests of the North, on the dreary Apennines, or the exhausted soil of Italy, in order to subdue their bodies, and occupy their dangerously unoccupied time, merely as a secondary consequence, to compel the desert into fertile land. Their work was among their fellow-men, in the village, in the town, in the city, in the market, even in the camp. Monastic Christianity would no longer flee  the world ; it would subjugate it, or win it by gentle violence” (Milman, Lat. Christianity, 5:238). But, being monastic still, this form of Christianity lacked the vital elements of evangelical power, and soon ran into fearful excesses. Dominic himself personally took part in the bloody crusade against the Albigenses, which ere long was followed by the establishment of the Spanish Inquisition, with Dominican friars as its generals and chief inquisitors. SEE INQUISITION. The pretext in both cases was the conversion of heretics, for which confiscation, torture, and murder were as relentlessly applied to praying and Bible-reading Christians as to Jews and Moors. Thus the world had still to wait long centuries before the apostolic idea of Christian missions returned to the Church.

V. Modern Missions. —

1. Roman Catholic. — Prior to the close of the 15th century, the zeal of the Church of Rome had been roused to a fervid state of excitement by the reported successes of the missionaries of the men-: dicaut orders who had followed in the train of Portuguese discoveries along the coast of Africa and beyond the Cape of Good Hope to India. At that period the New World was discovered, and the grandeur of the fields that as a consequence were opened to conquest and adventure inflamed anew the zeal of propagandism. The idea of planting the cross upon the islands and continents of America was deemed sufficient to justify if not to hallow any violence necessary to subjugate the native idolators. Missionaries sailed in every fleet, and every new discovery was claimed by the Church in the name of some Christian sovereign. About the same period the order of the Jesuits was founded, which by its rapid increase and decisive influence soon rivalled all preceding orders, sending .forth its missionaries to India, China, and Japan. SEE JESUITS. Thus a new and exciting impulse was given to agencies which succeeded in planting Latin Christianity throughout regions of vastly greater extent than it had ever before occupied.

No unprejudiced mind can become acquainted with the vast extent of the missionary operations undertaken and maintained by the missionaries of the Church of Rome during the 16th, 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries without according to the actors in them the need of high admiration for their devotion and self-sacrifice, however he may lament the defects and errors of the system in connection with which they acted, and the low grade of Christian life they promoted.  “In the East, missions were founded in Hindustan, the East India Islands, Japan, China, Tonquin, Abyssinia; in America, the half-civilized natives of Peru and Mexico were converted, and their descendants now form the mass of the people, and the Church of Rome has enrolled two of Indian blood among her canonized saints. The nomadic tribes from Labrador to Cape Horn were visited; many were completely gained, in other parts reductions were formed, and such as could be persuaded to enter were instructed alike in the truths of Christianity and the usages of civilized life. Close on these discoveries came the religious feuds of the 16th century, and the defection of nearly every prince in Northern Europe from the Roman see. State churches were formed in many of the German states, the Scandinavian kingdoms, Holland, England, and Scotland, based on the doctrines of Luther and Calvin. . This led to a new species of mission: colleges were established in Catholic countries for the education of their fellow-believers in the northern countries, and the training of such as wished to enter the priesthood; and from these seminaries missionaries proceeded to their native country to minister to their brethren, and to gain back such as Seemed to repent the late change. Many suffered the penalty of death; but this, as usually happens, only raised up others to fill their places. From this period the Catholic missions were either home missions for instructing the ignorant and neglected in Catholic countries, or those in which the exercise of religion is permitted (comp. Nitzsch, Praktische Theologie, volume 3 part 1); missions in Protestant countries to supply clergy for the Catholic portion; missions among schismatics to reunite them to Rome ‘ missions to pagan nations. These missions became at last so important a part of the Church government that Gregory XV (1621-23) instituted the Congregation de Propaganda Fide, SEE PROPAGANDA, which gave a new impulse to the zeal and fervor of missionaries, and all interested in the missionary cause. This congregation or department consisted of thirteen cardinals, two priests, a. religious, and a secretary; and to it exclusively was committed the direction of missions and Church matters in mission countries.

Considerable sums were bestowed by public and private munificence on this department, and under Urban VIII a college, usually styled the Urban College, or the Propaganda, was erected and richly endowed. Here candidates for the priesthood and the missions are received from all quarters of the globe, and a printingpress issues devotional works in a great number of languages. Besides this college, there soon rose the Armenian College at Venice, the Germanic, English, Irish, and Scotch colleges at Rome, the English colleges at Rheims and  Douay, the Irish and Scotch at Paris, the Irish colleges at Louvain and Valladolid, and some others, all intended to train the missionaries for their own countries; and at a later date the Chinese college at Naples was founded in the same view, and of late years a missionary college has arisen at Drumcondra. Convents and religious houses of various orders were also founded on the Continent for natives of the British Isles, and from these also missionaries annually set out for the missions in the English dominions. Most of these latter have, however, since disappeared, swept away by the French Revolution, or transferred to England or the United States” (Newcomb, Cyclopcedia of Missions, page 299 sq.). See English Review, 16:421 sq. We also extract from Newcomb a detailed account of the results of these missionary operations; for still later particulars we refer the reader to the articles on the several countries in this Cyclopaedia.

“I. Missionary Societies. — There are, properly speaking, no missionary societies in the Catholic Church similar to those among Protestants. Three societies, of quite recent origin — the Society for the Preparation of the Faith, centring at Lyons; the Leopoldine Society, at Vienna: and the Society of the Holy Childhood, in France — raise funds by a small weekly contribution, which the directors distribute to various missions, as they think proper, but over the missionaries and stations they exercise no control. The various missions are conducted entirely independent of this aid, relying, in default of it, on other resources. The last-named society is made up of children, and has a special object, the raising of money to save and baptize children exposed to death by their unnatural parents in China and Annam. Besides the aid thus given, some missions have funds established before the present century, and formerly French, Spanish, and Portuguese missionaries received a regular stipened from the government. The great mass of the missions at present are individual efforts, supported by the zeal and sacrifices of the bishops and clergy employed on them.

“II. Receipts. — The amount raised in 1852 by the Society for the Propagation of the Faith was $950,000; by the Society of the Holy Childhood, $117,000; total, $1,067,000.

“III. Missionary Stations. —

A. EUROPE. —

1. Among the Protestant states of Europe, the only countries where the Catholic Church is still a mere mission are Denmark, Norway, and Sweden. Here the number of Catholics is very small, and no details are published, as many severe civil penalties are still enforced against members, and especially converts of the Roman Church. The whole number does not probably exceed 150,000.

“2. Turkey. — The United Armenians have an archbishop at Constantinople; the Latins, several bishops and vicars apostolic; the distinct missions are those of the Franciscans in Moldavia, Jesuits in Herzegovine, and Lazarists at Constantinople and Salonica — the latter aided in their labors by the Sisters of Charity. The whole number of Latin Christians is estimated at 613,000, and is constantly on the increase.

“3. Greece. — In this, kingdom there are constant accessions to the Latin and united Greek churches, especially at Athens, Piruns, Patras, Nauplia, Navarino, and Heraclia. There are in this kingdom and the Ionian republic flourishing missions of the Capuchins and Jesuits.

“B. ASIA. —

1. Turkey in Asia. — The Franciscans have had missions in the Holy Land since the crusades, which, more or less active at times, are now pushed with energy. The Jesuits have since their origin had missions among the Eastern Christians, won many back to Rome, established schools, and raised the standard of clerical instruction. At Antioch there are Maronite, United Greek, and Syrian patriarchs, and elsewhere an Armenian and a Chaldeean patriarch, all in communion with Rome; and the number of Christians who acknowledge the supremacy of Pius IX is about a million.

“2. Persia. — In this country there is a mission directed by the Lazarists and protected by France, as well as a United Armenian Church well established and tolerated.

“3. India. — The Hindu mission dates back to the conquest of Goa by the Portuguese in 1510, and was at first conducted by the Franciscans, Dominicans, and zealous secular priests. Its progress was, however, slow, till the arrival of Francis Xavier in 1542. By his labors, and those of other fathers of the Society of Jesus, numbers were converted on the  Fishery Coast, the islands of Manar and Ceylon, and Travancore, while the former missionaries renewed their efforts in other parts, and gained to Rome all the Chaldaic Christians who had fallen into Nestorianism. The Jesuit mission is, however, the most celebrated, and, after Xavier, owed its chief progress to.

Robert de Nobili, nephew to pope Marcellus II, who originated the plan of having missionaries for each caste, adopting the life of each. He himself became a Brahminsamassi. The blessed John de Brito converted the Maravas; Aquaviva, at Delhi, won Akbar to the Christian religion; and Goes traversed Thibet and Tartary to Pekin. These missions were affected by the overthrow of the Portuguese and French power in India, by the persecution of the Danes, by the disputes as to the Malabar rites, by the suppression of the Jesuits, and by the troubles of the French Revolution. A large number of converts had, however, been made, and their descendants remained faithful. During the Dutch rule in Ceylon, Catholicity was maintained there by the labors of the Portuguese Oratorians. All Hindustan is now divided into vicariates apostolic for European and native Christians, the most extensive Hindi missions being those of Madura, conducted by the Jesuits of Mysore, conducted by the priests of the Foreign Missions; and of Ceylon, by the priests of the Oratory — all of which are rapidly gaining the ground lost in darker days. Hindustan contains 15 vicariates, 16 bishops, a large number of priests, including 500 native clergymen, and nearly 4,000,000 of Latin and Chaldee Christians. Ceylon contains 2 vicariates, 3 bishops, and 150,000 Catholics.

“4. Farther India. — The Tonquin mission was founded by the Jesuit Alexander Rhodes, who labored in that field from about 1624 to 1648, and gathered a Church of 60,000 Christians. Driven at last from the country, he originated at Paris the Seminary of the Foreign Missions, founded in 1633, and induced the Holy See to appoint bishops to Tonquin. Since then the priests of the Foreign Missions have had the chief direction of the mission in Annam and the neighboring province of Su-Tchuen, in China. The Jesuits also continued their mission, and by the labors of both many native clergy were formed. The Cochin China mission was founded about the same time by F. Rossi, and passed also to the Foreign Missions. Both churches have undergone terrible persecutions, even of late years, under the emperor Minh-Menh, but have steadily increased. Tonquin contains 6 vicariates apostolic,  governed by 12 bishops. One of these vicariates in 1847 contained 10 European and 91 native priests, 200 catechists, and about 200,000 Christians. Another, 2 bishops. 3 European and 43 native priests, 60 catechists, and 710,000 Christians. Cochin China contains 3 vicariates apostolic, all directed by clergy of the Seminary of the Foreign Missions and native priests.

“Siam, Laos, and Cambodia. — These missions are also directed by the priests of the Foreign Missions and native clergymen. They have been subjected to repeated persecutions, but are now at peace. Ava, Pegu, and Malacca are vicariates, with 2 bishops and about 10,000 Catholics.

“5. China. — The Chinese mission was attempted in the 13th century by John de Molltecorvino, who founded a metropolitan see at Pekin, which subsisted for over a century. Xavier attempted to restore it in 1552, but died near Canton. After several other attempts, the Jesuits Ruggieri and Paiio founded a mission, which, under the great Matthew Ricci (1584-1610), obtained a permanent footing in the. empire. The early Jesuits adopted the dress of literati, and thus. secured the esteem of the emperors, and would probably have gained them to Christ but for the Tartar invasion. After that change persecutions began, and as differences arose between the Jesuits on the one side, and the Dominicans in Fokieu and the priests of Foreign Missions in Suchuen on the other, as to the use of certain ceremonies, these dissensions formed a pretext for very severe edicts. For many years the blood of the Chinese Christians and their missionaries flowed in torrents. At present the Church enjoys peace, although the insurgents are decidedly hostile to the Chinese Catholics, and treat them with great severity. Among the celebrated Chinese missionaries may be named Ricci, Schall, and Verbiest, mathematicians; Maill, an American, who attempted a mission in 1556; Lopez, a native Chinese priest and bishop; Denis de la Cruz, another Chinese, who died at Carthagena, in South America; Navalrrette, Amlot, Sanz, Perboyre, a recent martyr. The suppression of the Jesuits and the French Revolution seriously affected these missions by cutting off a supply of learned and adventurous missionaries. Since the restoration of peace in Europe, and especially since the establishment of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, the mission has recovered mulch of its former extent. At the present time China contains 21 sees or vicariates, 23 bishops, 628 European  and 335 native priests many convents and houses of religious women, and a population of 541,720 Catholics. The great mass of the old Jesuit missions are directed by the French Lazarists; the missions in Suchnen, Yunnan, Quaychoo, and Leaotong, by the priests of the Foreign Missions; those in Chansi, Chensi, and Houquang, by Italian Franciscans; those in Fokien by Spanish bominicans; and those in Chantong and Kiangnan by French Jesuits, who have recently returned.

“6. Corea. — Christianity was introduced here from China about 1632, and has since grown amid persecution of the severest kind. The history of the. Corean Church is written in blood. Her first neophyte was a martyr; her first Chinese apostle, a martyr; her first native priest, a martyr; her first European missionaries, all martyrs. The number of Catholics is about 13,650, directed by a bishop, 18 European priests, if still alive, and some native clergy. This mission is intrusted to the Seminary of the Foreign Missions.

“7. Mongol Tartary. — This is a Lazarist mission, directed by a bishop, 3 European and 10, native priests, a. college seminary, 8 schools, and 5000 Christians.

“8. Ma-stch-iria. — A mission under the priests of the Foreign Missions, with a bishop. and some European clergymen.

“9. Thibet. — Missions were attempted here in the 13th and 14th centuries by Hyacinth of Poland, and Odelic of Fruili; in the 17th century by the Jesuits and Capuchins; but in the interval Buddhism had grown up and expelled all but the traces of Christianity. The mission was restored in 1846 by the Lazarists Huc and Gabet., Others have followed, and a bishop has lately been appointed.

“East India Islands. — Missions exist on some of these of ancient date, but the data are not very full or recent.

“10. Japan. — Christianity was introduced into this empire in 1549 by Francis Xavier, who had converted a Japanese at Goa. During a stay of two years he visited several kingdoms, and founded missions, which he confided to zealous priests of his order. The faith spread rapidly. In 1562 the prince of Omura, and soon after the kings of Bungo and Arima, embraced Christianity, and sent a splendid embassy to pope Gregory XIII. Soon after Taycosoma, a powerful general, usurped the  throne, and in 1586 issued a law against Christianity, which his predecessor, Nabunanga, had greatly favored. The number of Christians increased with the persecution, and in 1638 they rose in arms in Arima, but were crushed by Dutch aid. Since then the faith has been almost entirely extinguished. The number of Christians put to death has been estimated at nearly two millions, and the annals of the Jesuits, Franciscans, and Dominicans are filled with narratives of the deaths of members of their orders in Japan. Besides Xavier, the greatest missionaries were Valignani, father John Baptist, a Spanish Franciscan, Philip of Jesus, a Mexican Franciscan, both crucified at Nagasaki, father Charles Spinola, etc. The last Catholic priest who entered Japan was M. Sedotti, who in 1709 found means to land, but he was never again heard of. Within a few years great efforts have been made to reach the forsaken Christians still said to exist in Japan; and a bishop appointed to the mission has already founded stations on the Lew- Chew Islands.

“C. AFRICA. —

1. Congo. — The earliest missions were those of Congo, began by the Dominicans, Franciscans, and Jesuits. From 1500 to about 1560 the success was great; thee king and many of his people were converted,. native priests ordained, and one raised to the episcopacy. Catholicity flourished there for many years, but insensibly declined for want of priests. The Carmelites established missions in Guinea, the Jesuits in Angola and Loango; and on these chiefly the Catholics of Congo depended as late as 1622. In 1642 the Capuchins undertook the mission, headed by Fray Francisco de Pampeluna,. once a military officer of high rank. This body and their successors continued the mission till about 1700, when Cistercians took their place. About the middle of the last century the priests of the Foreign Missions established stations in Loango, and converted many. These missions still exist in several parts.

“2. Barbarn. — Missions have from the earliest times been conducted there by Franeuiscans, Dominicans, Trinitarians, and Mercedarians; still later by the Jesuits and Lazarists. The number of Christians is, however, very. small, and the clergy do not number a score.

“3. Egypt. — The Latin mission there is due chiefly to the Jesuits, of whom father Siciard was the leader. Many Copts were recalled to the  Latin Church, and are now directed by Lazarist missionaries, aided by brothers of the Christian School.

“4. Abyssinia. — The Portuguese, about 1530, attempted to convert the schismatics of Abyssinia, and revive morality and learning, but the efforts and the zeal of the Jesuits failed; the missionaries were excluded, after a long. persecution. In 1839 the mission was revived by the Lazarists, and a bishop appointed, while the Galla country was allotted to the Capuchins in 1846.

“5. Madagascar. — The first missions among the Malagasies was begun, by the Lazarists in 1648, and continued till 1674, when Louis XIV forbade French vessels to stop at the island. The mission was revived in 1837 by Mr. Dalmond, who founded the station of Nossibe in 1840. Since 1845 this mission has been confided to the Jesuits, who have made rapid progress.

“6. Other Parts. — Missions have been founded at different spots on the eastern and western coast, which have been discontinued, or are not yet firmly established. That of Guinea is the most thriving. A bishop was at first selected for it from among the Catholic clergy in the United States; but on the failure of his health the mission was transferred to the Society of the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary, who still administer it.

“D. Oceania. — The first Catholic mission in Oceanica was that of Messrs. Bachelot, Armand, and Short, of the ‘Congregation of the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary,' at the Sandwich Islands. They began it in 1826, and continued it till their expulsion by the government in 1832. In the following year vicars apostolic were appointed, and missions begun at Gambier, Tahiti, and, for a second time, at the Sandwich Islands. These missions are chiefly directed by priests of the Society of Picpry and the Marists. Other stations were begun in New Zealand, at Futuna, in the Marquesas, Nukahwa, and elsewhere. These missions extended so rapidly that several new vicariates were formed; and, in spite of martyrdom, disease, and shipwreck, they are still advancing. Oceanica now contains 8 bishops, 10 vicariates, and 300 missionaries.

“E. AMERICA. —

1. Spanish Missions. — Missions were established in all Spanish America, and great numbers were converted, especially in Mexico and Peru, where their descendants are still the majority, mingled with the Spanish race. Even in Cuba the Spanish blood is much mixed with Indian blood. The missions among the wild tribes were of a different character. The most celebrated are those of the Jesuits in Paraguay and California, the missions among the Moxos and Abipones in Chili and New Grenada. Few of these are now properly missions, and they are matter for a history rather than a gazetteer.

“2. Portuguese Missions. — The missions of Brazil were chiefly conducted by Portuguese Jesuits, who converted several tribes, although their numbers were diminished by the cruelty of the savages on land and pirates at sea. Several of these missions still subsist, but - details are not easily accessible as to their numbers and extent..

“3. United States and Canada. — The early Catholic missions in New Mexico, Florida, and California were Spanish. The natives of New Mexico were converted, and, being now Christians, are not considered a mission. In Florida, while a Spanish province, the Indians were converted by Franciscans, and formed villages on the Apalachicola and around the city of St. Augustine. The English drove these Indians from their villages, and their descendants, now called Seminoles, or wanderers, have not all traces of Christianity. The Upper California missions were conducted by Franciscauns, and till a recent period were in a very flourishing state, but are now destroyed. The Canada missions were begun by French Jesuits, in Nova Scotia and Maine, about 1612. The Recollects followed, succeeded again by the Jesuits. This mission converted the Abenaquis of Maine, now forming two villages in the state- of Maine and two in Canada; the Huroin of Upper Canada, a part of whom are Catholics, are still at Lorette, near (Quebec; a part of the Iroquois, or Five Nations, who form the three Catholic villages at Caughnawaga, St. Regis, and the Lake of the Two Mountains; the Algonquins, who, form a mission village with the lastnained band of Iroquois; the Micmacs of Nova Scotia, now attended by the secular clergy; the Montagnais, at Chicoutimi and Red River, under a bishop and missionaries; the Ottawas of Lake Superior, who, with the Ojibwas and Menomonuees, are now under the care of Canadian clergy on the north, and on the south of bishop Baraga, a philologist, whose talents have been acknowledged, by the government; the Illinois and Miamis,  whose descendants are now on Indian Territory and in Louisiana; the Arkansas, whose descendants, under the name of Kappas, are also there.

The Catholics of Maryland began missions among the neighboring tribes, but tribe and mission have long since disappeared. Since the Revolution and, the establishment of a Catholic hierarchy in the United States, attention has been gradually turned to the Indian missions; 2 vicariates are devoted to them alone. That of Upper Michigan contains I bishop, 5 priests, 5 schools, and a large number of Catholic Ottawas and Ojibwas; that of Indian territory has a bishop, 8 clergymen, 4. schools, 5300 Catholics of the Pottawotamies, Osages, Miamis, Illinois, Kansas, and Kappas. Besides these, there are in the diocese of Milwaukee and Menomonee and an Ojibwa mission; in that of St. Paul's, Minnesota, a Sioux, a Winnebago, and 3 Ojibwa missions; and in Oregon there are missions among the Waskos, Caynsus, Pointed Hearts, and Flatheads — the Indian Catholics of the territory numbering 3100. Besides these, a few hundred converted Indians are to be found in California.

“This is an outline of the widely-extended and much diversified Catholic missions. As to their history, the work of Henrion, Histoire Generale des Missions Catholiques; Wittmanun, Die Herrlichkeiten der Kirche in ihren Missionen (Augsbiurg, 1841); Marshall, Missions, Roman Catholic and Protestant (Loud. 1865); and the annals of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, will give a general idea: but the sources are the accounts of the various religious bodies engaged on the several missions, voluminous works which would alone form a library.” See also Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, 7:157 sq.; (Regensburg) Real-Encyklopadie, volume 9, s.v.

2. The Greek Church. — Movements have recently occurred in Russia, the principal stronghold and promoter of the Greek Church, indicating some slight development of the modern missionary spirit.

A Russian Bible Society has been organized at St. Petersburg, with the sanction of the emperor Alexander. A former society, which had 279 auxiliaries, and had circulated 861,000 copies of the Scriptures, was uppressid by the emperor Nicholas.

The Russian government has also organized the establishment of a missionary society for the spread of the orthodox religion among the heathen Mussulmen and Buddhists within its territory. The operations of  the society have primary reference to the conversion of the pagan tribes of the Altai and Trans-Balkan country, the Caucasus being assigned to another society of the same kind. The following is an account of the inauguration of the missionary society first referred to: “In 1870 the Greek Church of Russia organized an institution called ‘The Orthodox Society on behalf of Missions,' the object of which was the conversion of the non- Christians of all parts of the Russian empire except the Caucasian and Trans-Caucasian provinces already provided for, and both the spiritual edification and social advancement of the converts thus made. The society was inaugurated at Moscow: under the presidency of Innocent, metropolitan of that city, and therefore known as ‘the Apostle of Kamtchatka.' Liturgy and Te Deue were performed, and a sermon preached in the cathedral before a crowded congregation, among whom were present the governor-general of the province and others of the highest officials, although the solemnity had no official character. The society is placed under the patronage of the Russian empress, and the ultimate control of the holy synod. ‘The president is the metropolitan of Moscow, and the society's affairs are administered by a council at that place. Committees are also to be formed in every city under the local bishop. The society is annually to observe the day of Sts. Cyril and Methodius, May 11 (O.S.). Any person subscribing at least three ‘roubles may be a member of the society. Its council possesses, besides the president, two vice-presidents, chosen for two years, one by the president from his coadjutor bishops, and one by the members of the society from the laity. Of the twelve members of the council, four are biennially nominated by the president, and the rest by the members of the society at a general meeting.”

3. Protestant Missions. —

(1.) Beginnings and Gradual Development.— The 16th century covered the period of the great Reformation, in which, by severance from the Church of Rome, an effort was made to escape from the accumulated errors and abuses of more than ten centuries, and to establish Christianity on a Scriptural basis. SEE REFORMATION.

On the part of the Reformers, it was for a long time a struggle for existence, and the first and everywhere present necessity was the establishment of churches as the nuclei of future action. Unhappily a lack of unity, combined with the inherited spirit of intolerance, for a time led to strifes among themselves, which greatly retarded the development of the Protestant churches, and postponed the  day of their active efforts for the conversion of the world. Nevertheless the Church of Geneva, as early as 1556, inaugurated foreign missions by sending a company of fourteen missionaries to Rio de Janeiro, in hope of being able to introduce the Reformed religion into Brazil; but the mission was defeated by a combination of treachery with religious and political opposition (see Kidder, Sketches of Brazil, volume 1, chapter 1). In 1559 a missionary was sent into Lapland by the celebrated Gustavus Vasa, king of Sweden. Early in the 17th century the Dutch, having obtained possession of Ceylon, attempted to convert the natives to the Christian faith. About the same time, many of the Nonconformists who had settled in New England began to attempt the conversion of the aborigines. Mayhew in 1643, and the laborious Eliot in 1646, devoted themselves to this apostolic service. In 1649, during the protectorate of Cromwell; there was incorporated by act of Parliament the “Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in New England.” In 1660 the society was dissolved; but, on urgent application, it was soon restored, and the celebrated Robert Boyle was appointed its first governor. The zeal of this distinguished individual for the diffusion of the Gospel in India and America, and among the native Welsh and Irish; his munificent donations for the translations of the sacred Scriptures into Malay and Arabic, Welsh and Irish, and of Eliot's Bible into the Massachusetts Indian language, as well as for the distribution of Grotius de Veritaite Christiance Religionis; and, lastly, his legacy of £5400 for the propagation of Christianity among the heathens, entitle him to distinct attention. Besides these incipient efforts to diffuse the Gospel, glowing sentiments on the subject are to be found scattered through the sermons and epistolary correspondence of the age, which show that many a Christian heart was laboring and swelling with the desire of greater things than these. Still the century closed with witnessing little more than individual and unsustained endeavors. The “Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge,” which will be noticed hereafter, whose Objects, to a certain extent, embrace the labors of missionaries, was organized in England in 1698; but it was not till the early part of the 18th century that what has been denominated the age of missionary association fairly began to dawn. It opened very faintly ‘and slowly, but nevertheless it has since been growing brighter and brighter to the present day.

(2.) Present Extent. — To convey some faint idea of what has subsequently been accomplished, and put in the way of accomplishment, it is deemed proper now to submit a brief sketch of the principal missionary  organizations and agencies of the Protestant world. In this exhibit a grouping is adopted which is designed to show primarily the countries in which the several societies originated and have been sustained; secondly, the date of their origin, and a summary view of their character and early history; and, thirdly, the fields of their operation, the amount of their income, and the present condition of their enterprises. For further particulars, consult the articles on each country and society in this Cyclopaedia.

The principal Protestant missionary societies may be classified as —

I. Continental;

II. British;

III. American.

“I. Continental Missionary Societies. — Danish College and Missions. —As early as the year 1714 the Danish Colleae of Missions was opened in Copenhagen by Frederick IV king of Denmark, for the training of missionaries. Danish missions to the heathen had been commenced even before this period, agents having been obtained from the University of Halle, in Saxony. On July 9, 1706, two missionaries arrived from Denmark on the Coromandel coast in India, and settled at Tranquebar. They immediately commenced the study of Tamil, the language spoken in that part of the country. Although they had gone to a part of the Danish empire, and were patronized by royalty, the missionaries encountered great opposition from the prejudices of the natives, and even from the Danish government, who on several occasions arrested and imprisoned the missionaries for months together. Privation, as well as persecution, was the lot of the mission staff at an early period of their labors. The first remittance sent from Europe, which at that time was greatly needed, was lost at sea, but friends were raised up in a manner unexpected, and loans of money were offered them till they could obtain supplies from the society at home. When their borrowed stock was nearly exhausted, remittances reached them, along with three more missionaries, in 1709. This was but the beginning of better times, for shortly afterwards the London Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge became a liberal patron of their mission, giving them not only an edition of the Portuguese New Testament for circulation among the people, but also a printing-press, with a stock of types and paper, and a Silesian printer. When opposition to the mission subsided, and the cause expanded somewhat, a type-foundery and paper-  mill were established, and the work of translation and printing was prosecuted with vigor. In 1715 the Tamil New Testament was completed, and eleven years afterwards the Old Testament made its appearance. Several of the elder missionaries were called away by death, but zealous young men were sent out from Europe from time to time, and a native pastorate was raised up as the fruit of missionary labor, which rendered good service to the cause. In 1758 a mission was opened at Calcutta by one of this society's missionaries, but at the expunse of the Society for Promoting Chiristian Knowledge. In 1762 the celebrated missionary Schwartz, who had already been in the idialn field for twelve years, commenced his labor in Trichinopoly, in connection with which he fulfilled a long, honorable; and successful period of labor, and finished his course with joy in 1798. In the year 1835 the principal Danish missions in India, which had been so largely sustained by the Christian Knowledge Society, were transferred to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts.

“Mission to Greenland. — In 1721 the Danish mission to Greenland was commenced by the Reverend Hans Egede, a zealous Christian pastor of Vogen, in Norway. For thirteen years this good man had prayed and planned for a mission to that dreary region. Having at length obtained the consent and patronage of the king of Denmark to the undertaking, the missionary convened a few friends together, opened a subscription list, and in the face of formidable difficulties pushed forward the work, till a ship was purchased to convey him and a small party of settlers to Greenland. During the voyage, which lasted eight weeks, they suffered much from storms, floating mountains of ice, and a leak in the vessel, which they were obliged to stop with their clothes. On landing at their destination, their first work was to build a house of turf and stone, in which the natives, who appeared friendly, assisted them as best they could, intimating by signs, however, that if they intended to live in it they would be frozen to death. While engaged in these exercises, and in striving to acquire the strange language of the Greenlanders, Mr. Egede encountered innumerable difficulties. His greatest trial was the dissatisfaction of the colonists, several of whom resolved to return home, as they were very uncomfortable, and found the natives unwilling to trade. He was supported by the courage and resolution of his heroic wife, however, and by the arrival of two ships with provisions in the summer of 1722, when their stores were nearly exhausted. The missionary found it extremely difficult to induce the people to attend  to receive such instruction as he was able to give, and it was only by offering a fish-hook for every letter of the alphabet they learned that he succeeded in getting a few children to come to school. The following year another missionary came to the assistance of Mr. Egede; and the mission was carried on with praiseworthy perseverance, but with little success for a long time. On the accession of Christian VI to the throne of Denmark, government aid was withdrawn from the mission; but the senior missionary, having the option to remain in the country, nobly stood to his post, and continued his labors amid untold privations, troubles, and sufferings, not the least of which arose from the introduction of small-pox into the settlement, which swept off about 2000 of the natives. In 1734 the mission was re-enforced by the appointment of three new agents, one of whom was the son of the pioneer missionary, Mr. Egede. The following year, his beloved wife having been called away by death, Mr. Egede returned to Denmark, but still exerted himself on behalf of the mission. Through his influence the colony and the mission were re-enforced, his son published a Greenland lexicon, the Scriptures were translated into the native language of the people, and 4000 persons were reported as halving been brought under religious instruction, although it is admitted that very few of them could be regarded as converts to the faith of the Gospel. The Danish mission to Greenland was ultimately transferred to the ‘United Brethren.' Here should be mentioned the mission to Lapland (q.v.).

“United Brethren's Missions SEE MORAVIAN. — The missionary spirit of the Moravian Church manifested itself at an early period after the. establishment of the settlement at Hernihut. When falsely accused, and declared an exile from Germany, count Zinzendorf gave a reply which indicated the spirit by which he was actuated, and the genius of the people with whom he had cast in his lot. He said: ‘Now we must collect a congregation of pilgrims, and train laborers to go forth into all the world, and preach Christ and his salvation to every creature.' He was led to this by a visit made to the Danish capital in 1731. When the new colony only numbered about 600 persons, all of whom were poor exiles, and when just beginning, to build a church for their own, accommodation in what has lately been a wilderness, they resolved to labor for the conversion of the heathen world. Within ten years from that date, 1732, they sent missionaries to St. Thomas and St. Croix, in the West Indies; to the Indians in North and South America; to Lapland, Tartary, Algiers, Western Africa, the Cape of Good Hope, and Ceylon. Alount the year 1831 an association  was formed in London, which raised about £5000 per annum in aid of Moravian missions, and this proved a great help to the cause. Subsequently the United Brethren sent out agents to other West India islands, including Jamaica, Tobago, Antigua, Barbadoes, and St. Christopher's; to South America, Labrador, Greenland; Egypt, Persia, and India. The first missions of the Moravian Brethren were not very successful, but their agents persevered amid numerous difficulties, privations, and sufferings, to which they had been well trained by the painful experience of their previous history, and the ultimate result has been very gratifying.

“Statistics of Moravian Missions. — A recent publication says: ‘The Moravian mission statistics for 1889 show 127 stations; 286 missionary' agents; 1663 native assistants Landi overseers; 84,201 communicants; 18,280 non-communicants under regular instruction. l£16,803 are raised from home sources, and £50,000 is the full amount received annually from all sources. A “Leper Home” at Jerusalem is under their care. In the year 1887 five Christian workers were ministering to about 25 sufferers from that terrible disease. Alaska is the scene of their latest missionary enterprise. It was commenced in 1885 and is directed to the Eskimo of the Northwest. Since 1818 the number of members in the entire field has increased from 80,000 to S4,000.

“Netherlands Missionary Society. — This institution was formed at Rotterdam in 1796, mainly through the influence of Dr. Vanderkemp. ‘Before the eccentric doctor embarked for his distant sphere of labor in South Africa, to which he had been appointed by the London Missionary Society, he visited Rotterdam to take leave of his friends, and while there he found leisure to publish a Dutch version of an earnest address which had emanated from the London Society, the result of which was the organization of the Netherlands Missionary Society. For some time the financial aid offered to the enterprise was very slender, and no immediate steps were taken towards commencing operations. This interval was wisely employed by the directors in endeavoring to leaven the Dutch mind with the true missionary spirit. When the funds were available, and they contemplated entering upon foreign fields of labor, they were deterred from doing so from the loss of most of the Dutch colonies, which had fallen into the hands of France during the war, The directors therefore made an arrangement with the London Missionary Society to supply men and means for carrying on the work in Africa and India under their auspices and management. In this way they trained and sent out several  excellent missionaries to the Cape of Good Hope and the East, where their knowledge of the Dutch language was at once available for carrying on the work. In 1814 Holland rose again to independence, and recovered its colonies, when the Netherlands Society took immediate advantage of the favorable change in national affairs, and sent out five young missionaries from their seminary on their own account, to enter favorable openings which presented themselves in the Eastern Archipelago among the Malays. Other agents followed from year to year, and that part of the world was largely and well occupied by the society.' In 1820 two) missionaries -were sent out to India, and a few years afterwards they were followed by Dr. Gutzlaff, who, finding a number of Chinese at Riosew, his appointed station, was ultimately induced to extend his labors to the ‘Celestial Empire.' A mission was also established at Surinam, in Dutch Guiana, and the Netherlands Society was able to report 17 stations and 19 missionaries under their direction, with a goodly number of native converts to the faith of the Gospel united in Church fellowship.

“Other Dutch Missions. — It must not be supposed that the organization of the Netherlands Missionary Society is all that Holland has done for the conversion of the heathen. Long anterior to that event, even as early as 1612, the famous Anthony Walwens planted a seminary at Leyden for the preparation of foreign missionaries, the Dutch East India Company countenancing and approving of the institution. When Ceylon came under the power of Holland, in 1636, a number of missionaries were sent out to propagate the Reformed religion among the idolatrous natives. A very superficial mode of making converts seems to have been adopted, however, for when they were reported as amounting to 400,000 in number, there were only l00 communicants. The sad disproportion reveals a system of action which was not only reprehensible in itself, but greatly prejudicial to all subsequent missionary labor, as has been proved by painful experience. Dutch missionaries were also sent out at an early period to Southern Africa, Java, Formosa, Amboyna, and other places.

“Basle Missionary Society. — In the year 1815 a seminary was established for the training of missionaries at Basle, in Switzerland. It owed its origin to the gratitude of a few pious people. who recognised the providence of God in a violent storm which occurred at a particular juncture, and which proved the means of preserving their town from ruin when the armies of Russia and Hungary were hurling shells into it. The form which the gratitude of these people assumed was a desire to educate pious teachers  to send to the heathen, to make them acquainted with the good news of salvation. The school was at first very small, with few scholars, and a slender income of about £50 per annum. In the course of a few years a missionary college was built, and liberal support came from Germany and France, as well as from various parts of Switzerland, so that the income rose to £5000. This result flowed from the formation of auxiliary or branch societies in those countries. The institution was now conducted with vigor, and furnished the English Church Missionary Society with some of its most devoted laborers. In forty years after its commencement it had sent forth nearly 400 missionaries to foreign lands, and 80 were still under training. It was no part of the original plan of this institution to engage in. the support and management of foreign missions, but merely to prepare agents for the work. In 1821, however, a society was formed for this object, and from year to year missionaries were sent to North ‘America, Western Africa, India, and China. A society was also organized for the special purpose of disseminating the Gospel among the Jews. The missionaries of the Basle Society are not all ministers.' They send out pious mechanics and agriculturists to teach the natives the arts of civilized life, at the same time that they instruct them in the principles of Christianity by the preaching of the Gospel and the establishment of schools. The Basle Missionary Society is generally conceded to have first awakened. an interest in missions among the Germans. See Ostertag, Enstehungsgesch. der Missionsgesellschaft zu Basel (1865).

“Paris Evangelical Missionary Society. — The origin of this institution is somewhat curious and interesting. In the year 1822 a meeting was convened at the house of an American merchant, S.V.S. Wilder, Esq., then residing in Paris, to take into consideration the best means of propagating the Gospel in heathen lands. There were present the presidents of the Lutheran and Reformed consistories, as well as many of the ministers of these churches, and others of different persuasions then in the French metropolis. The result was the formation of this society, which, in its commencement, contemplated two objects: the one to employ the press as a means to enlighten the public mind on the nature and character of Protestant missions, and the other to educate young men, who had been duly recommended, in a knowledge of the languages of the East. The Rev. Jonas King was then in Paris, and received an invitation to go to the Holy Land with the Reverend Mr. Fisk, the new society charging itself with his support for a certain period. Subsequently the society devoted all its efforts  to South Africa, where its agents have labored for many years with great advantage to several scattered tribes of natives. In 1829 three missionaries were sent by the society to the Cape of Good Hope, one of whom settled among the French refugees at Wellington, near Cape Town, and the other two proceeded to the Bechuana country, and commenced a station at Motito. Reenforcements arrived from time to time, which enabled the missionaries to extend their labors to various parts of a country that stood in great need of the light of the Gospel. That part of the interior known as Bassutoland was occupied by the French missionaries. New stations were formed, schools were established, and chapels built at Bethulia, Moljia, Beersheba, Thaha, Bassion, Mekuatling, Friedor, Bethesda, Berea, and Carmel. At several of these places a goodly number of natives were brought to a saving knowledge of the truth, and united in Church fellowship, although the notorious chief Moshesh still adhered to his heathenism, notwithstanding his superior intelligence. The French mission in South Africa has repeatedly suffered from devastating wars among the natives and settlers, but the greatest blow to its prosperity was the war which raged in France in 1870-71, through which the supplies of the missionaries were in a great measure cut off. Providence, however, raised up friends in the time of need, and the work still goes on.

“Rhenish Missionary Society.-The institution now known as the Rhenish Missionary Society was organized in 1828 by the amalgamation of three other associations which had previously maintained a separate existence in Elberfeld, Barmen, and Cologne. The society was afterwards further strengthened by the incorporation of several other small associations in the Rhenish provinces and Westphalia. In 1829 three missionaries were sent out to South Africa. These were followed in after-years by several others, and stations were ultimately established at Stellenbosch, Worcester, Tulbagh, Saron, Schietfontein, Ebenezer, Kamaggas, and other places within the boundaries of the Cape-Colony; and at Bethany, Berseba, Rehoboth, Rood-Volk, Wesley Vale, and Barmen in Namaqualand, and Danlaralaud. Some of these stations were originally commenced by Wesleyan missionaries who had for many years labored on the south- western coast of Africa. But in 1851, an arrangement was made by which they were given over to the Rhenish Society, as was also the station at Nisbett Bath a few years afterwards, the Wesleyans finding it necessary to concentrate their labors in other localities. In 1834 the Berlin Missionary Society sent two agents to Borneo, and others followed at intervals, who  were employed in educational labors. In 1846 the work was extended to China, where several baptisms were soon reported as having taken place. Indeed, undue importance appears to have been attached to baptism by the missionaries of this institution, for when this society had been in existence about twenty-two years, nearly 5000 baptisms were reported, when comparatively few of the number could be regarded as communicants, or Church members. Perhaps this and some other peculiarities may be accounted for by the Lutheran type of theology which the agents generally seem to have espoused.

“Berlin Missionary Society. — This society was formally organized in 1824, but it arose out of efforts which had been previously made for missionary objects. As early as the year 1800 an. institution was formed in the Prussian capital by members of the Lutheran Church to educate pious youths for foreign mission service. During the following twenty-five years forty students were so educated. In 1834 the Berlin Missionary Society sent out four missionaries to South Africa. These Were followed by others during successive years, and arrangements were made for carrying on the work on an extensive scale. One of the first stations occupied by this society was. at Beaufort, and thence the missionaries went among the Korannas and Kaffirs. Subsequently the work was extended to Zoar, Bethel, Emmaus, Bethany, Priel, New Germany, and other stations, some of which are situated within the boundaries of the Cape Colony, others in the Orange Free State, the Trians-Vaal Republic. Kaffraria, and in the distant regions of Natal. The last report gives forty-seven stations in South Africa, with sixty-four laborers and 9772 communicants. China was entered in 1883 and now has three stations, ten workers, and 446 communicants. The number of scholars for both missions was 3542; native contributions were £4338.

“Swedish Missionary Society. — The Swedes made vigorous though unsuccessful efforts to propagate the Gospel in heathen lands as early as the year 1559. The sphere of their operations was Lapland, and their work was conducted under royal auspices. Gustavus Vasa headed the missionary movement of his country for the enlightenment of the Laplandese, and succeeding monarchs threw the weight of their influence into the Christian enterprise. In 1775 the New Testament, translated into Laplandese, was published. The mission was far from prosperous, however, and, after years of hoping against hope, it was abandoned. Nor is this to be wondered as if one half of what has been recorded in reference to the drinking and other  immoral habits of both priests and people is true. After an interval of nearly three centuries, Lapland again engrossed the attention of the Swedes. In 1835 the Swedish Missionary Society was formed, and sent forth a pious young man, named Carl Ludovic Tellstroem, the fruit of the Wesleyan Mission in Stockholm, as a catechist to Lapland. He had many difficulties to encounter from the migratory and dissipated habits of the people; but by following them to their markets and fairs with his Bible, to instruct them in the truths of the Gospel, there is reason to hope that his labors were productive of some good' results. Schools were afterwards established for the training of the rising generation, and the children were taught, fed, and clothed at the expense of the society, and at the end of two years were sent home with tracts and books to interest and instruct their parents, families, and friends. It also is a mission in Lapland.

“Evangelical Lutheran Mission. — This society was instituted in 1836, with its head-quarters at Dresden. The seat of direction was in 1848 removed to Leipsic. Its efforts have been chiefly turned to Southern- India, to the occupation of those fields of labor which had been previously cultivated by the Danish missionaries. From a report published some time ago, it appears that they had in their employ 24 missionaries, with 12 native candidates, in 22 different stations, counting 14,014 Church members and 3653 scholars under their pastoral care. They have all labored as a society in New South Wales, but the results did not long warrant the continuance of this work.

“North German Missionary Society. — This institution was organized in the year 1836, with its seat first at Hamburg and afterwards at Bremen. The scene of its earliest labors was India, one station being in the Telogoo country, and the other in the Neilgherries. A serious diminution in the financial receipts led to the transference of the mission for some years to the United States Evangelical Lutheran Church. When the finances revived, however, the responsibilities connected with carrying on the work were again assumed by the Bremen Union, and the field of effort has recently called forth a large amount of sympathy in North Germany. 10 missionaries, 409 communicants, and 321 scholars are now reported.

“Norwegian Missionary Society. — This society was formed in 1842, and soon afterwards sent out missionaries to labor among the warlike Zulus in South-eastern Africa. The aim of the institution is to supply agents who are able and willing to instruct the people in the arts of civilized life, as well as  in religious knowledge. With this object an estate was purchased in Natal, and an industrial institution established, which has already been productive of much good, reporting 20,660 adherents.

“Swedish (Lund) Mission. — In 1846 this society was established at Lund, and three years afterwards it sent out 2 missionaries to China, who were killed by pirates. Other agents were at length sent out, who were spared to take their share in attempting to evangelize the Chinese with a hopeful prospect of success.

“Berlin Missionary Union for China. — This society was established in the month of June, 1850, during a visit of Dr. Gutzlaff to Berlin. Dr. F.W. Krnmmacher was appointed president, and Prof. Lachs secretary. The object of the society is to send out European laborers, and to aid training institutions. In a field so wide as the vast Chinese empire there is ample room for all, and from the last published accounts it is pleasing to learn that the missionaries of this small but useful association were actively employed in diffusing abroad the light of the Gospel.

“Of minor account is the Evangelical Mission Society, founded in 1858 by Gitzlaff, until then a member of the Berlin Missionary Society. No stress is laid upon the education of the missionary, but the mission field as a life home is insisted upon. This society labors in New South Wales, among the Papuas, and in the South Sea Islands and East India. The Hermannsburg Mission, with head-quarters at Hanover, founded by pastor Harms, labors in East Africa, India, Australia, and New Zealand. 13,424 native Christians are connected with them.

“Miscellaneous Jewish Societies. — On the continent of Europe there are sundry associations which have for their object the evangelization of the lost sheep of the house of Israel, but their labors are so local and diversified that they cannot well be described separately. The Jewish Society at Berlin was formed in 1822 the Bremenlehe Society in 1839, the Rhenish Westphalia Union in 1843, the Hamburg Altona in 1844, the Hesse-Cassel in 1845, and the Hesse Darmstadt in 1845. These are but a few of the many organizations which exist in connection with Christian churches of various denominations for the special benefit of the Jews, and the interest in the spiritual welfare of Abraham's seed is deepening and widening every year.

“II. British Missionary Societies. — Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. — This is the oldest Protestant missionary  society in England, and its origin may be traced to a very remote period: About the year 1644, while the civil wars still continued in that country a petition was presented to Parliament by a clergyman of the Church of England, supported by many English and Scotch divines, urging the duty of attempting to convert the natives of North America to Christianity. This, no doubt, led to the ordinance passed on July 27, 1648, by the Independents of the Commonwealth, by which a corporation was established, entitled ‘The President and Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in New England.' The preamble recites that the Commons of England assembled in Parliament, having received intelligence that the heathens in New England are beginning to call upon the name of the Lord, feel bound to assist in the work.' They ordered the act to be read in all the churches of the land, and collections to be made in aid of the object. This was the first missionary association formed in England, and may be considered as the parent of the present ‘venerable' Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. The colonial settlements first attracted public attention to the spiritual wants of their European and heathen populations. The colonists of New England from the commencement displayed great zeal for the conversion of the Indians. The labors of Eliot, Mather, and others will never be forgotten by the Christian Church. After the Restoration in Great Britain, Baxter and Boyle distinguished themselves by their practical sympathy with the work in which these excellent men were engaged. Meanwhile the Church of England became interested in supplying the new colonies with Episcopalian ministers. In 1675 it was found ‘that there were scarcely four members of the Church of England in all the vast tracts of North America.' In view of this lamentable state of things, royalty was moved to liberality. Charles II was induced by Compton, bishop of London, to allow £20 for passage money for ministers and schoolmasters willing to go out to supply the deficiency, and the sum of £1200 was also granted to supply American parishes with Bibles and other religious books. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts was organized June 16, 1701; when it received a charter from Williams III. The main objects for which it was instituted are stated to be twofold. It was designed ‘to provide for the ministrations of the Church of England in the British colonies, and to propagate the Gospel among the native inhabitants of those countries.'

“The income of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts is derived from various sources, embracing Parliamentary grants,  collections in churches, schoolrooms, and public halls, in which anniversary sermons are preached and missionary, meetings held, and subscriptions and legacies from individuals. In this way the institution is liberally supported, and a large' amount of agency is brought to bear upon the people where mission stations have been formed.

“During the long period of its existence the venerable Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts has gradually extended its labors to various parts of the world, and has been instrumental of much good, especially to British colonists at an early period of their struggles, long before modern missionary societies had commenced their operations. This useful institution now occupies important stations in the British provinces of North America, the Dominion of Canada, British Columbia, the West Indies, Southern Africa, Australia, New Zealand, India, and China. To all these places Anglican bishops and clergymen have gone forth, carrying with them their own views of Church order and discipline; and in connection with every important Colony a diocese has been formed, and parishes have been organized after the style of the mother country. The main object of the institution is to supply the services and the ordinances of the Church of England to the tens of thousands of British emigrants who have been annually leaving the shores of their native country from generation to generation, to better their condition in foreign lands. And with much zeal and earnestness have the agents of this society followed their countrymen in all their wanderings, ministering to their spiritual necessities, and bringing home to their recollections the tender associations of the ‘old country,' where they were favored in times of yore to listen with pleasure to the sound of the ‘church-going bell.' Nor have the dark, benighted heathen population within the boundaries and in the neighborhood of the respective colonies been neglected by this time- honored institution. Many poor wandering Indians in the north-western wilds of America, as well as idolatrous Hindus in the East, and warlike Kaffirs in Southern Africa, to say nothing of the aborigines of other lands, have been favored with the means of grace and religious instruction through its instrumentality, especially of late years, since attention was more particularly directed to this department of the work.

“The Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge. — Although not strictly missionary in its primary object, this was at a very early period an auxiliary to Christian missions, and is at this day a most powerful help to the Church of England in her desolate places abroad, as well as at home. It  was founded in 1698, mainly by a private clergyman, Dr. Thomas Bray, who, subsequently acting as commissioner in Maryland, and seeing the great necessity for some further effort at home for the advancement of religion in the colonies, happily succeeded in rousing public attention to the matter. Having afterwards been the chief instrument in the formation of the Gospel Propagation Society, Dr. Bray may be fairly considered the founder of both these institutions, and in them of many other noble societies which followed them, by imitation or natural consequence. As early as the year 1709 the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge established a connection with the Danish mission to the Hindus at Tranquebar, and rendered considerable aid towards the support of the work. The Tanjore mission originated in 1726, and the one at Trichinopoly in 1762, which, with the celebrated Schwarts as its missionary, was taken up five years afterwards by the Christian Knowledoe Society, and prosecuted with vigor and success. When other institutions of the Church of England were afterwards organized for the express purpose of propagating the Gospel in foreign lands, the Christian Knowledge Society thenceforth confined its attention to the circulation of religious works — Bibles, Prayer-books, tracts, etc. — at a cheap rate in Great Britain and its several dependencies. There are branch societies in various parts of the country, and persons are constituted members by subscribing annually a sum not less than one guinea.

“The Church Missionary Society was instituted in London April 12, 1799. The original design of the society was to act more especially in Africa and the East. That fact was embodied in its first designation, but afterwards dropped. Though the sphere contemplated by the first board of directors was neither small nor unimportant, this society has planted missions over still more widely extended regions. At first, and for a long time after its commencement, this society was simply supported and governed by the members of the Episcopal Church, and was not in any way subject to ecclesiastical authority. At length the appointment of English bishops to foreign countries rendered a change in the administration of the Church Missionary Society absolutely necessary: and it was decided that in future the institution should be conducted in strict conformity with the ecclesiastical principles of the Establishment. Hence all the missionaries who now go out in its service are placed under the government and direction of the bishops nearest to their respective stations. The funds of the Church Missionary Society are supplied in the usual way by personal  contributions, legacies, collections after sermons. and at public meetings; and hitherto the institution has been supported in a very liberal manner.

“The principal spheres of labor entered upon and efficiently worked by the agents of the Church Missionary Society have been in Western Africa, Continental India, and Ceylon, British North America, and the West Indies. In all these countries, but especially in the one first named, the missionaries, catechists, and teachers of this institution have toiled with commendable zeal and diligence, and have been favored to see the fruit of their labor on a large scale. In 1882 Egypt and Arabia were entered. The Missionary Year-Book, for 1890, gives the statistics of the society as follows: 294 stations, 282 ordained, 43 lay, and 40 female foreign workers; 266 ordained, 2940 lay, 690 female native workers; 185,538 adherents, 47,531 communicants, 1928 schools, 77,451 scholars. The total income of the society amounted to £221,330 19s. lid. In 1830 there were only 318 conmmunnicansts; in 1870 only 21,705. Only 30 missionaries were employed in 1830, and 203 in 1870. In 1830 there was not a single native ordained clergyman employed by the society; ino 1870 there were only 109. Up to March 1, 1862, there had gone forth on foreign service, in connection with the Church Missionary Society, 562 men of various countries and races, of whom 121 were Germans.

“The Colonial Church and School Society may be regarded as supplementary to the Church Missionary Society. It has rendered valuable assistance to the missionaries employed in the far north-western wilds of British America, formerly included in the Hudson's Bay territories, to clergymen and teachers laboring among the scattered settlers of Australia, and to mission stations and schools in several of the British colonies.

“The London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews was founded in the year 1808, although it was not fully organized until the following year. The constitution originally contemplated two objects: ‘To relieve the temporal distress of the Jews, and to promote their spiritual welfare.' Public worship, and the education of the children under the care of the society, within the United Kingdom, are conducted in strict conformity to the principles and formularies of the Church of England, with which it has always been identified both in its management and principal support. The first sphere of its action was among the Jews in London. In 1811 a printing-press was established to give employment to poor Jewish converts. Two years later a chapel and schools were opened  for the benefit of seventy-nine proselytes and their families. In 1818 the first foreign missionary was sent forth to labor in Poland, where a seminary was soon afterwards established for the training of Jewish converts as missionaries. The society also published a Hebrew edition of the Scriptures for the Jews generally, and prepared a Judaeo-Polish version for Poland, and a Syriac version for the Cabalistic Jews. In 1840 the Jewish college for the complete training of missionary agents was established. It has proved an important auxiliary to Jewish missions, not only in connection with the London society, but also to kindred institutions which were afterwards called into existence. The London Society has above 30 mission stations for the benefit of the Jews in Europe, Asia, and Africa; more than 100 missionaries, of whom upwards of 60 are converted Israelites; about 20 schools, with an aggregate of Hebrew children during the last thirty years of upwards of 10,000. This society has seen 50 of its converts ordained as clergymen of Christian congregations at home, and it has distributed above 212,000 copies of the Hebrew Scriptures.

“Scottish Society for Proparating Christian Knowledge. — This institution was established in Edinburgh in the year 1709, being the first missionary association organized by the Presbyterians of North Britain. Its original design was the extension of religion in the British empire, and especially in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland. The pagan world subsequently arrested the attention of the directors, and called forth their sympathies and efforts. About twenty years after its formation this society entered into correspondence, with a view to forming stations among the American Indians in the vicinity of New England; Three agents were appointed to labor among the aborigines of these settlements; but, from some untoward circumstances which occurred, they appear to have been wanting in adaptation for their work, and were withdrawn. In 1741 a mission was established among the Delaware Indians, which met with great success. A number of native converts were received into the Church by baptism, and the heart of the missionary was cheered by manifest tokens of the divine presence and blessing. A good work was also carried on for some time among the Indians of Long Island by the agency of this society; but an attempt to evangelize the natives settled on the banks of the Susquehanna was not so successful.

“The Scottish Missionary Society was instituted in the month of February, 1796, under the designation of the Edinburgh Missionary Society. The first mission of this society to Sierra Leone was not a success. Nothing daunted  by the comparative failure of the mission to Western Africa, in 1802 the Scottish Missionary Society sent out two missionaries to Tartary. This mission also failed in consequence of the oppressive and restrictive measures of government. The agents of this society were more successful, however, in Asiatic Russia, where they commenced their labors in 1805. In 1822 missionaries were also sent to India, when Bombay and Puna were occupied as principal stations. In 1835 this branch of the work was transferred to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, which had recently commenced operations in India., In 1824 a mission was organized for Jamaica, which was productive of much good. This produced a mission to Old Calabar, Western Africa, which has been prosecuted with vigor and success. In 1847 the stations of this society in Jamaica were transferred to the United Presbyterian Church, by which they are now carried on with. efficiency and success.

“The Glasgow Missionary Society was organized in February 1796. It sent missionaries to Western and Southern Africa, but without very marked success. In 1844 the missions of the Glasgow Society were transferred to the Free Church of Scotland.

“The Church of Scotland's Foreign Mission Scheme. — The formation of several missionary societies of a general nature towards the close of the last century appears to have excited the zeal, if not the jealousy, of the Church, of Scotland, and overtures were presented to the General Assembly from different synods, praying that attention might be paid to the claims of the heathen world. For some time these were disregarded; but in 1824 the subject was brought forward again, and a committee was appointed to prepare a program for the organization of what was justly designated as ‘a pious and benevolent object.' At the next Assembly, in 1S25, the committee reported in favor of British India as a field of labor, and advised the establishment of a great central seminary, with auxiliary district schools for the instruction of Hilldus children and young persons of both sexes. In 1829 the Reverend Alexander Duff sailed for Calcutta as the head of the educational institution. The ship was wrecked off the Cape of Good Hope, but without loss of life. After some delay and many dangers, Mr. and Mrs. Duff arrived at Calcutta on May 27, 1830, having lost a valuable library, and ‘being more dead than alive.' The seminary was opened in the month of August, and met with remarkable success. Within a few days of the opening 200 pupils were in attendance. Both the elementary and collegiate sections of the institution prospered. The English  language was chosen as the medium of instruction in the highest classes, but as soon as qualified teachers and suitable school-books could be obtained, due attention was paid to the vernacular. In 1835 three missionaries — the Reverend James Mitchell, John Wilson, and Robert Nisbet — were transferred by their own desire from the Scottish Missionary Society to the General Assembly's Mission; and in 1843 still further changes were made by the disruption of the General Assembly, which issued in the formation of the Free Church of Scotland, to which all the missionaries in India adhered, with the buildings, furniture, and property of the ,respective stations. After laboring in connection with the: Indian Mission for nearly thirty-five years, Dr. Duff finally returned to his native land in 1863, having meanwhile made but a brief visit to England and the United States in 1854 and 1855.

“The Free Church of Scotland's Foreign Mission. — This Church, after its organization in 1843, made arrangements for carrying on the missionary work both at home and abroad. The educational establishment at Calcutta, under the able superintendence of Dr. Duff, and the mission stations at Bombay, Puna, Nagpore, Madras, and other places in India, as well as those in Southern Africa, the colonies of Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, the West Indies, Madeira, the Mediterranean, Australia, and Natal, were prosecuted with vigor and success under the new administration.

“The Free Church of Scotland also assumed the responsibility of supporting and carrying on a mission to the Jews which had been organized a short time before the disruption. The history of this branch of the work, so far as Hungary and Austria are concerned, is of more than ordinary interest. Pesth was the scene of a remarkable: awakening among the scattered seed of Abraham. Hundreds of Jews, many of them persons of distinction, became simultaneously interested inquiries into the truth. of Christianity. The revolution in Hungary caused the suspension of the mission for a time, and the despotism of Austria well-nigh extinguished it. Of late years there have been considerable changes in the scene of its operations, and Frankfort, Amsterdam, Breslau, Pesth, Galatz, and other places are mentioned in the society's report as places where its agents are now laboring for the conversion of the Jews to the faith of the Gospel.

“United Presbyterian Synod's Foreign Mission. — In the year 1835 the United Secession Church planted a mission in the West Indies by the  agency of the Revs. William Paterson and James Niven. In the course of a few years several stations were opened in Jamaica, Trinidad, and the Grand Caymanas. The progress of the mission to these parts is indicated by the following scenes of labor, and the dates when the work was commenced at each place respectively: Jamaica-Stirling, 1835; New Broughton, 1835; Friendship, 1837; Goshen, 1837; Mount Olivnet 1839; Montego Bay, 1848; Kingston, 1848. Trinidad-Port of Spain, 1839; Arauca, 1842. The Great Caymanas Georgetown, 1846. In 1846 a mission was commenced at Old Calabar, in Western Africa, intended to be worked chiefly by converted negroes from Jamaica. The synod also sent several missionaries to Canada, who have since succeeded in forming self-sustaining congregations, and even in organizing large and influential presbyteries. The first work of the United Presbyterian Church, formed in May 1847, was to accept of the transference of the stations and agents of the Scottish Missionary Society in Jamaica, and of the Glasgow African Missionary Society in Kaffraria, which it has since conducted with vigor and success. It has also a Jewish mission to Algiers, Aleppo, and other places.

“English Presbyterian Synod's Foreign Mission. — This Church entered upon foreign missionary operations in 1844. The principal scene of its labors is China, and although the work has not as yet been conducted on a large scale, it is hoped that lasting good will be the result. The funds of the society were considerably augmented a few years ago by the handsome bequest of the late Mr. Sandeman, to whose benevolence and general Christian character a graceful tribute is paid in the annual report for 1859. Promising mission stations have been formed at Amoy and Swatow, where a few converted natives have been united in Church fellowship, and an additional missionary has recently been ordained and sent forth to strengthen the hands of the brethren who have been some time in the field.

“Reformed Presbyterian Church Mission. — Foreign missionary operations were commenced by this body in 1842. The principal scene of its labor has been the South Sea Islands, especially New Zealand and the New Hebrides. The Reverend John Inglis labored for many years in the island of Aneiteum with considerable success. By the blessing of God on his unwearied efforts a goodly number of converted natives were gathered into the fold of Christ, some; of whom became efficient Church officers and teachers of others, while the rising generation were carefully trained in a knowledge of God's holy Word to an extent which is not often witnessed even on mission stations. At one time, out of a population of 1900 in a  certain district, 1700 were able to read the Bible — a proportion of readers perhaps scarcely surpassed in any country.

“Irish Presbyterian Church's Mission. — The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland commenced its missionary operations in 1840. Their first field was India. Considerable attention has also been paid to the British colonies by this body, missionaries having been sent out at different times to North America, Australia, Tasmania, and New Zealand. The Assembly has also Jewish missions at Hamburg, Bonn, and in Syria.

“Scottish Society for the Conversion of Israel. — This society was instituted in the year 1845, not in connection: with any particular branch of the Christian Church, but on a broad and catholic basis, the directors being chosen from different denominations. It was originally designed to afford temporal relief to the migrating Jews who visited Glasgow. Subsequently it extended its operations to the seed of Abraham in foreign lands, and sought their spiritual benefit as well as temporal welfare. Stations were formed and agents employed at Hamburg, Algiers, and Alexandria; but in 1857, when the United Presbyterian Church originated a mission to the Jews, these foreign stations were transferred to that body, from which most of the funds had been derived, and the Scottish Society again confined its labors to home, as before.

“Edinburgh Medical Missionary Society. — In the year 1841 several of the leading medical practitioners in the Scotch metropolis, in the course of their reading, having come to the conclusion that medical skill might be greatly helpful to Christian missions, formed themselves into an association for this object. Their first efforts were directed to China, where the want of medical knowledge was sorely felt. The constitution of the society does not restrict its operations to the Celestial empire, but leaves it at liberty to afford its aid to the missionary enterprise in any part of the world. The intention of its patrons is to give gratuitous medical aid to the suffering poor, and at the same time to embrace every opportunity of imparting religious instruction to the dark, benighted heathens who are the objects of its benevolence.

“London Missionary Society. — Towards the close of the year 1794 a spirited paper appeared in the Evangelical Magazine advocating the formation of a mission to the, heathen on the broadest possible basis. This led to the. organization of the London Missionary Society. The Reverend David Bogue, D.D., of Gosport, the author of the paper alluded to, may  therefore be regarded as the father and founder of this noble institution; and his name will ever be held in grateful remembrance by the friends of missions. Two months after the appearance of Dr. Bogue's practical paper, a conference was held to take steps for giving effect to the laudable proposal That conference was attended by representatives from several evangelical bodies, in accordance with the proposed catholicity of the spirit of action. The result of that conference was a carefully-prepared address to the ministers and members of the various churches, and the appointment of a committee to diffuse information, and to learn the sentiments of the Christian public upon the subject. A conference upon a larger scale was held in September, 1795 twelve months after the publication of Dr. Bogue's paper. The conference lasted three days, and comprised a large and influential body of Christians. The Reverend Dr. Haweis, preached an eloquent and impressive sermon on the occasion, taking for his subject the great commission (Mar 15:16); and the Reverend J. Burder and the Reverend Rowland Hill also took part in the preliminary work which issued in the formation of the institution. Thus, amid many prayers, much fraternal love, and the promise of large support both in counsel and contributions, the London Missionary Society was launched.

“The first question which pressed upon the attention of the directors of the London Missionary Society after its formation was the selection of the most suitable fields of labor. Wishing to commence their operations in a part of the world where no efforts had as yet been made by any other society for the evangelization of the natives, and encouraged by the reports which had been brought to England from the South Seas by an exploring expedition which had discovered many new islands. they decided, in the first place, to send missionaries to Polynesia. The field once chosen, and that choice published, it was found that neither agents nor money were wanting for the enterprise. The enthusiasm which prevailed was broad and deep, and the readiness with which service was offered and funds furnished cheered the hearts of the directors, and was regarded by them as a clear indication of the divine favor. In the early part of 1796 the missionary ship Duff was purchased, and freighted with a suitable cargo; and twenty-nine agents who had volunteered their services embarked for their distant sphere of labor. These were not all missionaries, properly so called, only four of them being ordained ministers, and the rest mechanics or artisans of different kinds, intended to take a part in the good work. Everything appeared providential hitherto, and, to crown all, Mr. James Wilson, a  retired captain of excellent spirit and great professional skill, proffered his services to navigate the ship with its precious cargo to Polynesia. After some detention at Portsmouth, the Duff went to sea on September 23, followed by the earnest prayers of thousands; and by the good providence of God reached her destination in safety, notwithstanding a severe storm which she encountered off the Cape of Good Hope.

“The missionary ship Duff arrived at Tahiti on March 6, 1797, and anchored safely in Matavia Bay, at a distance of about three quarters of a mile from the shore. In the afternoon the captain and a member of the mission landed, and were met on the beach by Paitia, the aged chief of the district, who welcomed them to the country, and offered them a large native house for their accommodation. It was arranged that to the four ordained ministers and fourteen of the unmarried brethren should be confided the establishment and prosecution of the mission at Tahiti; that ten should endeavor to effect a settlement at Tonga,: one of the Friendly Islands; and that two should proceed to the Marquesas. The agents were distributed according to this arrangement, and commenced their labors, no doubt, with the best intentions. It would be an exercise of painful interest, if our space permitted us, to give the sequel of this enterprise in all its particulars. It may suffice to say that in this large band of missionary agents, selected in such haste, there were several men who proved altogether deficient in mental power, moral courage, and other necessary qualifications for the work. Consequently, some proved unfaithful and abandoned the enterprise altogether; others were discouraged, and the few who were stout-hearted and courageous labored under many difficulties. In some of the islands the mission totally failed, several of the. agents being murdered, and the rest having to flee for their lives. In after-years the London Missionary Society learned to select its missionaries with greater care, and seminaries for their proper training were speedily established. After numerous reverses, disappointments, and long delay, the missionaries of the London Society ultimately prosecuted their labors in various islands of Polynesia, with results of a most remarkable character, in connection with which the name of John Williams, the martyr of Erromanga, and those of other worthies, will be handed down to posterity as entitled to affectionate remembrance.

\*“In 1798, about three years after its commencement, the London Missionary Society sent forth four missionaries to Southern Africa: Dr. Vanderkemp and Mr. Edmonds to labor in that part of the Cape Colony  which bordered upon Kaffraria, and Messrs. Kitchener and Edwards were stationed north of the colony among the Bushmen. In the following year Dr. Vanderkemp and his colleague penetrated into Kaffirllnd, and offered the Gospel to the warlike natives, but with little success at that time. They afterwards labored among the Hottentots living within the colonial boundary, several of whom were successfully instructed in the things of God, and brought to a saving knowledge of the truth. In 1806 the missionaries crossed the Orange River, and commenced their labors among the wild Namaquas. Here the celebrated Robert Moffatt began his honorable and eventful career, and was favored to rejoice over the notorious Hottentot chief Africaner. Mr. Moffatt afterwards established a prosperous mission at Kurnman, among the Bechuanas, many of whom he saw gathered into the fold of Christ, and into whose language he translated the Holy Scriptures. After a long, laborious, and honorable missionary career, extending over half a century, Mr. Moffatt finally returned to England in 1870, a remarkable instance of God's preserving goodness and of entire. devotion to the mission cause. To the north of Bechuanaland, in the region of the Zambeze, Dr. Livingstone performed his wonderful missionary travels, and there also the ill-fated mission of the London Society to the Makololo was attempted.

“British India was the next field of labor on which the London; Missionary Society entered. In 1804 the Reverend Messrs. Ringeltaube, Cran, and Des Granges were sent out with the view of establishing a mission on the coast of Coromandel. On their arrival, Messrs. Cran and Des Granges proceeded to Vizagapatam, which lies about 500 miles south-west of Calcutta. and which was then unoccupied by any other society's missionaries. There they met with a cordial reception, and soon succeeded in establishing schools, and in translating portions of the Scriptures into the Telinga language. 1808 the mission was greatly strengthened by the conversion of a celebrated Brahmin, named Ananderayer, an interesting account of which was given in the Evangelical Magazine. In 1809 Mr. Cran died, and his colleague, Mr. Des Granges, only survived him about twelve months. Thus was the station left desolate for a time; but other zealous missionaries were sent out, and the cause again prospered. The good work was afterwards extended to Madras, Belgaum, Bellary, Bangalore, Mysore, Salem, Combaconum, Coimatoor, Travancore, Chinsarah, Berhampore, Benares, Surat, and other parts of India. At all these places schools were established,  congregations gathered, the Gospel faithfully preached, and many souls won for Christ through the agency of this excellent institution.

“At an early period of its history, the London Missionary Society was led to turn its attention to the West Indies. In 1807 a Dutch planter in British Guiana made an earnest appeal to the directors for a missionary, accompanied by a liberal offer of pecuniary assistance. This led to the appointment of the Reverend John Wray as the first agent of the society in Demerara. As the work extended, additional missionaries were sent out, and stations were ultimately established in George Town, Berbice, and various parts of the colony, much to the advantage of the poor negroes, who made rapid progress in religious knowledge. The mission was progressing delightfully, when it received a severe check by the general rising of the slaves. But after the emancipation in 1834, the London Missionary Society realized the benefit of the change in common with other kindred institutions, and their numerous stations in Demerara, Berbice, and Jamaica have been favored with a pleasing measure of prosperity under the more favorable circumstances of entire and unrestricted freedom.

“To the London Missionary Society must be awarded the honor of organizing the first Protestant mission from England to China. In the year 1807 the Reverend Robert Morrison was sent out, chiefly for the purpose of securing if possible, a good translation of the Scriptures into the difficult language of the Chinese empire. In this he succeeded beyond the expectations of the. most sanrurine friends of the enterprise. He proved admirably adapted for the peculiar and untried sphere upon which he entered. After laboring at his translation for some years, Dr. Morrison was joined by other missionaries, and the work of preaching and teaching was commenced in good earnest. The progress of the mission was slow at first, and it was not till the year 1814 that the first convert was baptized. Afterwards, however, a considerable number of Chinese were brought to a saving knowledge of the truth, and gathered into the fold of Christ, through the united labors of the missionaries of this society.

“But the most interesting mission of the London Society was the. one which was undertaken to the island of Madagascar in 1818 by the appointment of the Reverend Messrs. Jones and Bevan as the first missionaries. Returning for their families, whom they had left at the Mauritius until they should learn the state of the country, these excellent  brethren proceeded to Tamatave in the course of the following year, and commenced their work. Within seven weeks of their arrival five of this little band sickened and died, and Mr. Jones was left alone. He nobly resolved to persevere in his solitary work as he best could, and having returned from the Mauritius, whither he was obliged to retire for a season for the recovery of his health, he was joined by other missionaries from England, and their united labors proved very successful. During the first fifteen years of this mission the entire Bible was translated into the Malagasy language, and printed at the mission press in the capital, and the missionaries frequently preached to a congregation of 1000 persons with the most blessed results. Then came a dark and gloomy night of persecution, during the bloody reign of a cruel pagan queen. The missionaries were driven from the island, hundreds of the converted natives suffered martyrdom rather than deny Christ, and the once promising mission was laid desolate. This state of things had continued for more than a quarter of a century, when, in the order of divine providence, by the death of the queen in 1867, the way was opened once more for the preaching of the Gospel in Madagascar. The mission was now recommenced, and it was found that the native Christians had generally proved faithful, numerous accessions also having been made to their number. Several memorial churches were built to commemorate the death of the martyrs, and the work was extended to various parts of the island, with the prospect of still greater good in time to come.

“The report of the London Missionary Society for 188S stated: ‘In China there are connected with the society 39 missionaries; in India, 97; in Madagascar, 32: in South Africa, 25; in the West Indies, and in the South Sea district, 141; The total income of the society amounted to £124,860 ls. 9d., the expenditure to £128,254 5d.' Three magazines are published by the society — the Chronicle, the Juvenile Monthly, and Quarterly News of Woman's Work. Up to 1888 the society had sent out 887 missionaries.

“British Society for the Propagation of the Gospel among the Jews. — This institution was established in London in the year 1842, and draws. its chief support from the various Dissenting communities in England. Its object is identical with the Episcopal Society for Propagating Christianity among the Jews; but, being organized on a more catholic and general basis, it affords an appropriate sphere of evangelical labor in this department of missionary work of Nonconformists of every name. This society does not aim so much to baptize and found churches as to preach the Gospel and circulate the Scriptures and religious tracts among the seed of Abraham in  various countries. Its first sphere of operations was among the Jews in the cities and seaport towns of Great Britain. It afterwards extended its labors to the Continent, and opened stations at Frankfort, Paris, Lyons, Wirtemberg, and Breslan, and also at Gibraltar and Tunis, the place last amned having been found an excellent centre from which to work in Northern Africa, as well as a position of great influence from its being in the direct highway to the Holy Land. This society has also its mission college for the Jews, in which it trains many of its own agents. The twenty- four missionaries employed by this institution are all converted Jews, with the exception of two or three more than one half of whom were trained at the mission college. Nor are the religious interests of the rising generation neglected. From the beginning attention has been paid to Sabbath and week-day schools for Jewish children; and a few years ago an orphan asylum was established, in which a considerable number of destitute Hebrew boys and girls are fed, clothed, and instructed; and when they grow up they are put to useful trades and occupations, that they may earn their own livelihood.

“Congregational Home Missions. — The report presented to the last anniversary of this association stated that the society consists of 475 home mission pastors, who occupy central positions composed of four, five, or six villages, where, with the help of 121 voluntary lay preachers, the Gospel is preached in 786 mission chapels and rooms, the attendance ill which had exceeded 102,000 persons. There is in connection with this organization a department of lay and colportor evangelists, 100 of whom are now at work, who had visited 80,000 families during the year, distributed 250,000 tracts, sold 3000 copies of the Bible, and 120,000 periodicals. One thousand members had been added to the churches by means of this agency during the year.

“Baptist Missionary Society. — Like most other great and good things, the Baptist Missionary Society had a small and humble beginning. Its early history is inseparably connected With that of William Carey, who may be fairly regarded as its father and founder, as well as its first missionary to the heathen world. Although of humble parentage and low condition in life, Mr. Carey was a man of great mental energy and unwearied perseverance. While plying his lowly avocations, first as a shoemaker and afterwards as a humble pastor. and village schoolmaster, he conceived the grand idea of attempting to propagate the Gospel among heathen nations; and, to make himself better acquainted with the wants of the world, and to prepare  himself for future action, he constructed maps of various countries, read numerous books, and studied two or three different languages. At length, in 1784, the Nottingham: Baptist Association, to which he belonged, resolved upon holding monthly concerts for prayer. Mr. Carey's one topic at these meetings was the degraded state of heathen lands; but few entirely sympathized with him in his views. Seven years later, when he had removed to Leicester, he introduced his favorite theme, and pressed it upon the attention of his ministerial brethren when assembled together. He respectfully submitted for their consideration. ‘Whether it was not practicable, and their bounden duty, to attempt somewhat towards spreading the Gospel in the heathen world.' At the next meeting of the association, in the month of May, 1792, Mr. Carey preached his ever- memorable sermon from Isa 54:2-3, and dwelt with great power on his two leading divisions — ‘Expect great things from God, and attempt great things for God.' The impression produced by. this discourse was so deep and general that the association resolved upon instituting a mission to the heathen at their next meeting in autumn. On October 2 the society was formed, and although the collection on the occasion only amounted to £13 2s. 6d., ample funds speedily flowed in from various quarters.

“After the formation of the Baptist Missionary Society, the next great question was in reference to the specific field in which operations should commence. Mr. Carey had thought long and anxiously about the South Sea Islands, and held himself in readiness to proceed thither if he could be promised support even for one year. Just at that time he met with a Mr. Thomas, from India, who was busily engaged in collecting funds for the establishment of a Christian mission in Bengal. In consequence of the representations made by this well-meaning but somewhat eccentric stranger, it was arranged that Mr. Carey should accompany him to. the East, and that they should unite their efforts to establish a Baptist mission among the Bindlds. After encountering numerous and complicated difficulties, financial, domestic, and political, they at length embarked — for India — in the Princess Maria, a Danish East Indiaman, on June 13 1793. They landed in safety at Balasore on November 10; but finding the way closed by the restrictions of the East India Company against their openly pursuing their sacred vocation as Christian missionaries, and being uncertain as to what amount of support, if any, they would receive for themselves and their families from England, they went up the country, and took situations which were offered to them in connection with  establishments for the cultivation and manufacture of indigo. At the same time. they studied the language of the natives, held religious meetings with the people, and labored in every way to bring them to a saving knowledge of the truth. Mr. Carey, moreover, from the beginning gave great attention to the translation of the Scriptures into the Bengalee and other languages of the East, and the extent to which he succeeded was perfectly marvellous. As the prospects of success improved, additional missionaries were sent out from England: the head-quarters of the mission .were removed to the Danish settlement of Serampore; printing-presses were set up, and the work of translating and preaching the Gospel was carried on in a manner which has scarcely ever been equaled in any other part of the mission field. Mr. Carey became one of the most learned men in India, and for several years held the high office of professor of languages in the Calcutta College, in addition to his missionary duties. After a long and honorable career, during which he saw the Baptist mission in India greatly extended, and the whole or parts of the sacred Scriptures translated into about forty different languages of the East, Dr. Carey died in peace at Serampore, at the advanced age of seventy-three, on Monday, June 9,1834, leaving a noble example of disinterested zeal and entire devotedness to the service of Christ among the heathen.

“The attention of the Baptist Missionary Society was directed at an early period to the West Indies, and in 1814 the first station was commenced at Falmouth, in Jamaica. The first regular missionary appointed to this interesting sphere of labor was the Reverend John Rowe, but the ground had been partially prepared by Mr. Moses Baker, a man of color from America. The favorable reports sent home by the first missionary to Jamaica induced the society to send out two more laborers in the course of the following year. The number of agents was increased still further afterwards, till, in the course of fifteen years, fourteen pastors were employed, and the Church members numbered upwards of 10,000. Prosperous stations were established not only at Falmouth, but also in Kingston, Montego Bay, and in most of the other chief towns on the island. All went on well till the year 1831, when there occurred one of those insurrections of the Negro slaves which have repeatedly been so disastrous in their results to the missionary enterprise. As usual, the planters strove to involve the missionaries in the consequences of their own folly. In their fury the. colonists destroyed nearly all the chapels of the Baptist Missionary Society throughout the island, with a view to secure the  expulsion of their agents; but in this they were disappointed. The value of the property thus wantonly destroyed was estimated at 20,000. The local government gave no redress; but the Imperial Parliament made handsome grants to compensate for the loss, and the British public came forward most liberally to help to restore the waste places of Zion. When the storm had passed over, the work again revived and prospered, not only in Jamaica, but also in the Bahama Islands, Trinidad, Honduras, St. Domingo, and other parts of the West Indies.

“In the year 1848 the Baptist Missionary Society extended its labors to Western Africa, and stations were established in the island of Fernaudo Po, and also on the banks of the Cammaroons, in the Bight of Benin. The Reverend A. Saker was the first missionary to this part of the coast, and he was spared to labor for manly years, and to see the fruit of his labor, while many others fell a sacrifice to the climate soon after their arrival. At length the Baptist missionaries were expelled from Fernando Po by the Spanish government on their taking possession of the island on the termination of their agreement with the English. On the mainland, however, where unrestricted religious liberty was allowed by the native chiefs, the good work took deep root, and a goodly number of hopeful converts were gathered into the fold of Christ. When China was thrown open to European missionaries, the Baptist Missionary Society responded to the call for Gospel preachers, and sent out two or three agents, who succeeded in making a good beginning, notwithstanding numerous difficulties which had to be encountered. Nor has this institution been unmindful of the claims of Europe. It has recently appointed missionaries to Norway and Italy; and in Rome itself its agents are taking their share in the glorious work of shedding the light of divine truth on the darkness of popish error and superstition.

“According to the last annual report, the number of European missionaries employed in various parts of the world by the Baptist Missionary Society (not including the Jamaica Baptist Union) is 118, in addition to 306 native pastors and preachers, who have been raised up in distant lands as the fruit of missionary labor. These occupy 446 stations, and minister in 320 chapels of various kinds, and they have under their pastoral care 7822 European and 12,776 native Church members. The number of scholars attending the mission schools is 3777. In connection with the Jamaica Baptist Union there are 59 pastors, 144 churches, 32,342 Church members.  “General Baptist Missionary Society. The General Baptists, so called from their general or Arminian views of redemption, formed a missionary society in 1816. The origin of this association is, under God, traceable mainly to the able advocacy of the Reverend J.G. Pike. Regarding the field as wide enough for all the agents that could be sent into it, this society also first turned its attention to India. In the month of May 1821, two missionaries, the Reverend Messrs. Bampton and Peggs, sailed for Cuttach, the principal town in Orissa, the seat of the notorious idol Juggernaut. The first of these devoted servants of Christ soon finished his course; but other agents followed at intervals, and opened new stations in adjoining districts. They were driven, however, by the force of external circumstances, to make frequent changes in their locations and plans of action. Their chief work consisted in combating the prejudices and practices of idolatry, and their stations were generally found in the neighborhood of the head-quarters of the venerated idols. The missionaries succeeded in establishing schools for both sexes, and an asylum for orphan or destitute children. Many a precious life they instrumentally preserved, which had been devoted to the blood-stained altar. As elsewhere, the great enemy to Christianity in Orissa was caste, change of creed being attended by enormous sacrifices-not only separation from kindred, but the loss of the wonted means of support. Despite all obstacles, and they were many and serious, the Gospel was ultimately embraced by considerable numbers, although the missionaries had to wait six years for their first convert. To counteract in some measure the evils which followed upon the loss of caste, the missionaries set themselves to the formation of villages, where the converts might be mightily helpful to each other. A carefully executed translation of the Bible into the Orissa language, and the preparation of a dictionary and grammar, were the work of Mr. Sutton, one of the society's missionaries, who exerted himself nobly in this department of Christian labor. In 1845 this society established a mission at Ningpo, in China, which, although feeble in its commencement, encourages the hope of its friends and patrons as to a fair measure of success in time to come.

“Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society. — The name of Dr. Coke must ever be associated with the early history of Methodist missions. He. was raised up and called by the providence of God to this department of Christian labor just at the time when his services were specially required. Mr. Wesley was fully engaged in guiding that great religious movement which took place in the United Kingdom in the latter part of the 18th  century, when the foreign work was commenced, and could ill afford to have his attention called off to distant fields of labor. It was at this critical period that Dr. Coke appeared on the stage of action. Wearied with the restrictions and petty annoyances which he met with in the discharge of his duties as a parish clergyman, and with a heart fired with true missionary zeal, after his remarkable conversion to God, he joined the Methodist connection, and at Mr. Wesley's request took the general superintendency of the home and foreign missions — an office which he filled with credit to himself and advantage to the cause during the remainder of his long, active, and useful life. In the prosecution of his arduous duties, Dr. Coke crossed the Atlantic eighteen times, established a number of new missions, and went about from door to door himself to collect the means for their support in the most praiseworthy manner, long before the Missionary Society was regularly organized.

“Methodism had only been planted in the United States of America a few years when, in 1780, the work was extended to Canada; in 1783, to Nova Scotia; in 1791, to New Brunswick, and about the same time to Prince Edward's Island and Newfoundland. A few years afterwards Wesleyan missions were established in the Hudson's Bay Territory and British Columbia; while at the same time the Methodist Episcopal Church was spreading itself over every state in the Union, and planting mission stations in California and Oregon, and in other distant parts of the great continent. Dr. Coke was on his voyage to Nova Scotia with three missionaries- Messrs. Wairrener, Hammett, and Clarke — when the vessel in which they sailed was driven by a storm to the West Indies. Observing, as they believed, the hand of God in this event, the missionaries at once began to labor in those interesting islands, where their services were much required; and their numbers being soon increased, on the return of the zealous doctor to Europe, the foundation of a great and glorious work was laid, which continued to grow and expand from year to year, with great advantage to all classes of people. Dr. Coke had crossed the Atlantic eighteen times in superintending and carrying on the missions in America and the West Indies, and was advanced in years when, in 1813, he conceived the grand idea of Methodist missions to India. Bent upon his noble purpose, he pushed onwards through every difficulty, and on the last day of the year he sailed for the far-distant East, accompanied by six devoted young missionaries appointed to this service by the Wesleyan Conference. On the morning of May 3, 1814, Dr. Coke was found dead in his cabin, having, it  is supposed, expired in the night in a fit of apoplexy. The Reverend Messrs. Harvard, Clough, Squance, Ault, Erskine, and Lynch keenly felt the sudden removal of their leader and head; but, having committed his remains to their watery grave in the Indian Ocean, they proceeded to India in the true missionary spirit, and by the blessing of God succeeded in laying the foundation of the present prosperous Wesleyan mission in Ceylon and continental India.

“The burden of superintending and collecting for the support of the early Methodist missions devolved almost entirely on the indefatigable Dr. Coke, although a nominal missionary committee occasionally sat in London to transact business in his absence. But when the Conference sanctioned his departure for India, it was deemed necessary to, make new arrangements for carrying on the work, to which he could no longer attend as formerly. It is believed that the idea of forming a Methodist Missionary Society originated with the late Reverend George Morley. It was not till 1817 that the connectional society was formally inaugurated, with a code of ‘Laws and Regulations,' having the express sanction and authority of Conference; but 1813 and the Leeds meeting are regarded as the true commencement of the society. At this time Wesleyan foreign missions had been successfully carried on for forty-four years, and upwards of one hundred missionaries were usefully employed in foreign fields of labor. Thus it will be seen that Methodist missions do not owe their origin to the Missionary Society, but that, on the other hand, the Missionary Society owes its origin to the missions.

“When the Wesleyan Missionary Society had been fully organized, and axililaries and branches established in various parts of the United Kingdom, the early foreign missions of the connection were not only maintained in their wonted efficiency and good working order, but they were extended to other countries from year to year as openings presented themselves, and men and means were found available for the work. In 1811 a mission was commenced in Western Africa, and the work was extended to Southern Africa in 1814, to Australia in 1815, to Tasmania in 1821, to New Zealand in 1822, to the Friendly Islands in 1826, to China in 1845, and to Italy in 1860. In all these countries congregations have been gathered, churches organized, schools established, and places of worship erected on a scale more or less extensive, according to circumstances, and the Wesleyan Missionary Society has endeavored to take its full share in the work of evangelizing the inhabitants of those and other distant regions of the globe.  “According to the report for the year 1871, the Wesleyan Missionary Society has now, in connection with the various fields of labor occupied by its agents in Europe, Africa, Asia, America, and Australia, 1029 ordained missionary ministers and assistants, including supernumeraries; 779 central or principal stations, called circuits; 4366 chapels and other preaching- places; 95,924 full and accredited Church members, and 144,733 scholars receiving instruction in the mission schools. The total amount of income from all sources for the year was £149,767 5s. lid. Of this sum, £39,698 Is. 6d. was contributed of affiliated conferences and foreign districts.

“Ladies' Committee for Ameliorating the Condition of Heathen Women. — In the year 1858 the degraded condition of heathen women was brought to the notice of a few eminent Christian ladies in London connected with the Wesleyan Missionary Society, who at once formed themselves into a committee to devise the means of promoting their welfare. The first measure decided upon was to send out female teachers to assist missionaries' wives in the schools already formed, and up to the present time 27 teachers have been sent abroad: to the West Indies, 3; continental India, 10; Ceylon, 3; South Africa, 7; China, 3; and Italy, 1. The committee also supports nine Bible women in Mysore, Bangalore, Canton, and Jaffna. Important assistance has also been rendered by grants of pecuniary aid or materials to 13 schools in continental India, 17 in Ceylon, 3 in China, 17 in South Africa, 1 in Italy, 1 in Honduras, and 5 in the Hudson's Bay Territory. In this good work about £1000 has been ‘collected and spent annually, and Christian counsel and encouragement have often been communicated to female teachers and missionaries' wives abroad of more value than any material aid.

“Wesleyan Home Missions. — Methodism was professedly missionary in its character from the beginning, and it has ever sought to spread scriptural holiness throughout the land. But of late years the Wesleyan Conference has organized a systematic plan of home missionary work to supply and maintain earnest ministers for the benefit of the neglected population of our large cities and rural districts, as well as to afford aid to the poor, dependent circuits of the United Kingdom. Seventy-six missionary ministers are now employed in home mission work in England, Scotland, and Wales, besides eight as chaplains to minister to soldiers and sailors in the British army and royal navy. About £30,000 are annually contributed and expended in carrying on this good work, with gratifying results, and much more good might be done if funds were available for the purpose.  Since the commencement of the work under its present organization, to the Conference of 1870, there had been an increase in the home mission circuits of 14,686 persons. In connection with that increase, and springing from it, the higher work of spiritual. conversion to God was everywhere manifested. Last year more than 800 excellent people, constrained by the love of Christ, aided the home missionary ministers in the work in which they were engaged.

“Primitive Methodist Missionary Society. — Its missions may be divided into Home, Colonial, and Foreign, all of which are prosecuted with vigor. Besides supplying many neglected districts in England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland with plain, faithful preachers of the Gospel, it has sent forth foreign missionaries to British North America, Australia, Western and Southern Africa, and some other distant lands. The success which has already attended the efforts of the society is very encouraging, and it bids fair to take its full share of labor in seeking to evangelize the heathen at home ‘and abroad. The number of missionaries employed in England is 92; in Wales, 8; in Ireland, 7; in Scotland, 7; in circuits, 9; in Victoria, 7; in New South Wales, 15; in Queensland, 4; in Tasmania, 4; in New Zealand, 4; in Canada, 51; in Western Africa, 2; in Southern Africa, 1; total, 211. The total number of stations is 143, and of members, 13,898.

“Minor British Missionary Societies. — In addition to the leading missionary societies of the United Kingdom which carry on the work of propagating the Gospel in heathen countries on a large scale in various parts of the globe, there are several minor institutions which have been made very useful, notwithstanding the comparatively limited sphere of their influence. These associations have generally been organized for special objects or single missions, and have been conducted with varied results, according to circumstances. Of these the following may be mentioned:

“Welsh Calvinistic Methodist Foreign Missionary Society. — The first foreign mission of the Welsh Calvinistic Methodists was to the north-east district of Bengal, among the Kassias, one of the hill-tribes of natives. This work was undertaken soon after the formation of the society (1840), and about ten years subsequently, in 1850, another station was commenced at Sythet. The missionaries did not confine their labors to preaching and teaching; they also turned their attention to those literary studies which are so necessary to success in all evangelical efforts in India. Messrs. Jones and Lewis succeeded in translating the four Gospels and the Acts of the  Apostles into the Kassia language; nor did they labor without success in their direct efforts to turn the heathen from dumb idols to serve the true and living. God. The Calvinistic Methodists have also established a mission in Brittany, the language of that part of the European continent being similar, it is said, to the Welsh. They have also a mission to the Jews, which has been prosecuted with as much success as could be expected considering the peculiar difficulties of the enterprise.

“Evangelical Continental Society. — The object of this institution is to disseminate the saving truths of the Gospel among the various nations of the European continent. Its principal fields of labor are France, Belgium, Spain, Italy, and Bohemia. About £4000 per annum is raised and expended in carrying on this work, and the results have so far been encouraging.

“The Foreign Aid Society. — This association exists, not for the purpose of supporting and maintaining foreign missions, but to aid such as have been established and are carried on by other societies, and especially for the maintenance of Christian schools for the training of the rising generation. Its principal spheres of labor have hitherto been on the continent of Europe. In France the work formerly aided by this society was interrupted during the prevalence of the late war, but in Italy the work of evangelization was vigorously prosecuted. At Naples no fewer than 500 children are receiving instruction in schools to which this society has regularly contributed assistance. In Madrid the church under the care of Senor Carraso has been substantially assisted, and 350 persons have been admitted to Church membership.

“Vernacular Education Society for India. — This society was instituted in 1858 as a memorial of the mutiny, and has for its' object the providing of Christian vernacular education and literature for India. It has 118 schools, with 5122 scholars, who are instructed in 113 different languages, at a cost of about £8000 per annum, and bids fair to be a powerful and useful auxiliary to the various missionary societies which are laboring for the spread of the Gospel throughout the Indian empire.

“III. American Missionary Societies. — American Board of Foreign Missions. — This useful institution was organized September 10, 1810, under circumstances which clearly show the superintending providence of God in the interests of missionary work. A few years before a theological seminary had been established at Andover, Massachusetts, for the support of which a Mr. Norris, of Salem had presented a donation of $10,000, to  be devoted to the education of missionaries. At the same time a gracious influence descended upon several of the students, turning their hearts especially to the subject of Christian missions. One of these, Samuel Mills, called to mind with feelings of deep emotion the words of his beloved mother with reference to him: ‘I have consecrated this child to the service of God as a missionary.' This young man shortly afterwards engaged with Gordon Hall and James Richmond in conversation and prayer upon the subject of missions in the retirement of a lonely glen, and was delighted to find that their hearts also were drawn to the same subject. These three were soon joined by Messrs. Judson, Newell, Nott, and Hall, the whole of whom offered themselves for mission work, and the American Board of Foreign Missions was forthwith established.

“As it was proposed to found the institution on a broad and unsectarian basis, after the plan of the London Missionary Society, Mr. Judson was despatched to England to inquire into the working of that institution. The board was at first appointed by the General Association of Massachusetts, which is Congregational; but since the first election there has been no preference given to any Christian sect. In 1831, of 62 corporate members, 31 were Presbyterians, 24 Congregationalists, 6 Reformed Dutch, and 1 Associate Reformed. Of the 79 ordained missionaries of that period, 39 were Presbyterians, 2 Reformed Dutch, and the others Congregationalists. The missions are not under the control of ecclesiastical sects, but are governed as communities, where the majority of the votes of the missionaries is decisive. Nor are they regarded as permanent, but as established to plant churches, and to train them to self-support, with a view to a still wider diffusion of the Gospel. Hence, at an early period, seminaries were opened for the training of native teachers and preachers, and also for the education of girls who might engage actively in foreign service, or prove suitable partners to missionaries. From the very commencement this society was liberally supported, and proved very successful.

“The first field of labor occupied by the agents of the American Board of Foreign Missions was India. The Reverend Messrs. Judson, Nott, Newell,. Hall, and Rice arrived in Calcutta in June 1812, and were followed by other laborers in a few months afterwards. Numerous difficulties met them on the very threshold of the enterprise. The country was involved in war; no missionary operations were allowed by government; Messrs. Judson and Rice joined the Baptists, and Mr. Newell proceeded to Mauritius, where  his wife and child found an early grave. At length, however, after many discouragements and delays, the way opened for the commencement of missionary labor in India, and a station was formed by Messrs. Hall and Nott in Bombay in 1814. Afterwards the work was extended to Ahmednlimgur, Satara, Kolapur, Madura, Arcot, Madras, and other places, with a measure of success which more than compensated for the early trials and bereavements which were endured. In 1817 a mission was commenced by this society among the Cherokee Indians, in the state of Georgia, by the appointment of the Reverend Mr. Kingsbury, who was joined a few months afterwards by Messrs. Hall and Williams. The first station was called Brainerd, and the second Eliot, in honor of the celebrated missionaries of former times. To these several other stations were ultimately added, and a good work was carried on for many years among the Cherokees, Choctaws, Osages, Chicasaws, Creeks, Ottawas, Ojibwas, Dakotas, Abenaquis, Pawnees, and other tribes of North American Indians. In 1820 the good work was commenced in Syria. The first missionaries were the Reverend Messrs. Parsons and Fisk, who arrived in Smyrna on January 15. They were followed by other zealous laborers, who, amid many difficulties, succeeded in their literary and evangelical labors among the Armenians, Nestraians, and others, as well as could be expected. In 1828 the missionaries extended their labors to Greece, and shortly afterwards missions were commenced in China and India. In 1833 the Reverend J.L. Wilson was appointed to Cape-Palmas, in Western Africa, and in the following year the Reverend Messrs. Grout, Champion, and Adams were sent out to labor among the Zulus, on the south-eastern coast of the great African continent, ‘but perhaps the most remarkable and successful of the society's missions was that which was established in the Sandwich Islands in 1819. The Reverend Messrs. Bingham and Thurston were-the first who were sent out to the Pacific, but they Were accompanied by a farmer, a physician, a mechanic, a catechist, and a printer, with their wives, the band in all amounting to seventeen souls, including John Honoree, Thomas Hoper, and William Temoe, native youths who had been educated in America. On their arrival they found that the native idols had already been destroyed and abolished by public authority, and the people were thus in a measure prepared to receive the Gospel, untrammeled by those attachments to long-cherished: systems which in other instances have proved such a serious barrier to the dissemination of divine truth. From that day, to this the mission to the Sandwich Islands has continued to advance in all its departments. The Scriptures have been translated into the  native language of the people, schools have been established for the training of the rising generation, and thousands of converted natives have been united in Church fellowship, so that the whole population of those beautiful islands are now at least nominally Christian.

“American Baptist Missionary Society. — This, society was established as early as 1814, but it did not receive its present name till 1846. It was first called the Baptist Triennial Convention for Missionary Purposes, and was commenced in Philadelphia, but afterwards transferred to Boston. It belongs to and is almost exclusively supported by the Calvinistic Baptists of the Northern States. There were some interesting circumstances connected with the early history of this institution which deserve ma passing notice. The Reverends A. Judson and L. Rice, of the American Board of Foreign Missions, underwent a change of views with regard to the subjects and mode of baptism when on their voyage to India, and having resolved to join the Baptist denomination, they were immersed by the Reverend Mr. Ward at Serampore, so in after their arrival in Calcutta. This circumstance was the means of stirring, to the missionary spirit among the Baptists in America, and of the formation of a society from the support of the new converts in their foreign labors, and for the propagation of the Gospel in heathen lands. The loss thus sustained by one society was gain to another, and resulted in a large increase of missionary agency and in a wide extension of the means of religious instruction. This society, which originated in the manner described, ultimately extended its labors from Rangoon, where they were commenced, through the Burman empire, to Siam, China, and Assam, to the Teloogoos in India; to Western Africa, to Greece, Germany, and France, and to various tribes of Indians on the American continent. Both in the character, extent, and results of its labors, this institution has proved itself worthy of the high commendation and liberal support with which it has been favored, and-it-bids fair to maintain its honorable position among the leading American missionary societies of the present day.

“Methodist Episcopal Missionary Society. — The Methodist Episcopal Church in America was itself the offspring of the-missionary zeal of English Methodism, the first Wesleyan missionaries ever sent abroad having been appointed to New York and Philadelphia in 1769. Within half a century from this period the work had spread over the whole continent, reaching even to California and Oregon, and in 1819 the missionary society was provisionally organized in New York, and was formally adopted as an  authorized institution of the Church by the General Conference the following year. It has for its object the spread of the Gospel at home and abroad, among all ranks and classes of men. The bishop in charge of the foreign missions appoints the agents to their respective spheres of labor, and places a superintendent over each station. The pecuniary interests of the society are managed by a board, which is constituted in the usual way, and which meets at stated periods for the transaction of business. Its first field of labor, after arrangements had been made to supply the spiritual wants of German and other European immigrants, was among the North American Indians. In 1832 the Reverend Melville B. Cox was appointed as the first Methodist missionary to Liberia, in Western Africa. Before he had been six months in the country, however, he had been cut down by malignant fever, and the people were left as sheep having no shepherd. Other zealous laborers followed, and a good work has ever since been carried on in the small republic of Liberia by this society, chiefly through the agency of colored missionaries, who are found by experience to be best adapted to the climate. The work in Western Africa has since been organized into a separate Conference, over which a bishop has been ordained of African descent, and himself the fruit of missionary labor. In 1847 a mission was commenced in China, and soon afterwards in India, to the great advantage of vast numbers of the dark, beunghted heathens of the densely-populated regions. Nor has the continent of Europe been neglected by the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church of America. By a remarkable providence, some of the German immigrants converted in America were made the means of conveying the blessings of the Gospel back to their native land, where a blessed work was commenced through their instrumentality, which soon extended from Germany to Sweden, Norway, Scandinavia, and other countries in the North of Europe. By their genuine missionary. spirit the Methodists of America prove themselves worthy of their noble and honored ancestry.

“Protestant Episcopal Board of Missions. — The Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States of America was organized by the General Convention of 1820, with the seat of operations in Philadelphia. In 1835 an entire change was made in the constitution of the society, when the title given above was adopted by general consent. The first scene of labor entered upon by the missionaries of this institution. was Greece, the Reverends J.J. Robertson and J.W. Hill, and Mr. Bingham, a printer, being sent out towards the close of 1830. They first settled at  Tenos, but subsequently removed to Athens, where they were very successful in their educational labors. Their principal object was not to proselytize, but to revive and reform the Greek Church, and their labors were not without fruit. Stations were also formed in Syria and Crete, but afterwards. abandoned. In 1836 the board extended their labors to Western Africa, by the commencement of a station at Cape Palmas, among a dense population speaking the Grebo language. The first missionaries were the Reverend Messrs. Painei, Minor, and Savage, the last of whom was a medical man, and his skilful services were highly valuable in a country noted for its insalubrious climate. Considerable success was realized in this part of the mission field, several converted natives being gathered into Church fellowship, Christian schools established, and a small newspaper published in English and Grebo, called the Cavalla Messenger. In 1834 missionaries were sent to Bavaria and China by this society, and about ten years afterwards Dr. Boone was consecrated missionary bishop, and went out with a large staff of laborers to Shanlghbai. Nor were the heathen nearer home neglected by this institution. Mission stations were commenced among various tribes of North American Indians; and, notwithstanding numerous difficulties which had to be encountered, arising from the wandering habits of the people and other causes, 310 native children were soon reported as being under Christian instruction. In 1837 bishop Kemper consecrated a new church at Dutch Creek, and appointed Solomon Davis, a converted native, as pastor over it, whose ministry was made a blessing to many of his fellow-countrymen.

“American Society for Ameliorating the Condition of the Jews. — The primary object of this society, which was organized in 1820, was the temporal relief of persecuted converts. It was not until 1849 that anything like missionary effort was put forth for the benefit of the lost sheep of the house of Israel. It was found in 1851 that there was a Jewish population statedly residing within the United States amounting to 120,000, in addition to which there were hundreds and thousands constantly moving from place to place. In this wide field of labor the society at an early period employed ten missionaries and seven colporteurs, who visited forty towns, in which they endeavored to sow the good seed of the kingdom, with some visible proofs of spiritual success.

“Freewill Baptist Foreign Missionary Society. — The founders of this institution conceived the idea, after the plan of the eccentric Gossner, of tending forth missionaries to the heathen without any guarantied support,  expressing great aversion to what they called the hireling system. Their principles were lacking in true missionary power; but at length the Rev. Amos Sutton, of the English Baptist Mission in Orissa, succeeded in awakening a few earnest spirits out of their deep slumber — first of all by a letter, and secondly by a personal address while on a visit to the States for the benefit of his health in 1833. The result was that the Reverends Eli Noyes and Jeremiah Phillips left for Orissa in September, 1835, accompanied by Mr. Sutton, with whom they passed the first six months of their foreign residence. The society has only occupied this one mission; and, although their agents have suffered much from the climate, their labors have not been without success, especially in dispensing medicine and establishing Christian schools. Some time ago there were 17 missionaries employed, with 16 native preachers, 11 churches, and 654 members.

“Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. — The Presbyterians of the United States were engaged in missionary work at a very early period. The Scottish Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge secured a board of correspondence in 1741, and appointed a minister to the Indians on Long Island, and in the following year sent the distinguished David Brainerd to the Indians in Albany. John Brainerd succeeded his brother David in 1747, and they were both partly sustained by the American Presbyterians. In 1765 the Presbytery of New York made a collection in all the churches for the mission to the Indians. In 1796 the ‘New York Missionary Society' was instituted. This was followed in 1797 by the organization' of the ‘Northern Missionary Society;' and in 1831 these were meraed in the Board of Missions of the Presbyterian Church, which established and conducted several interesting stations among the American Indians, in addition to those which had been previously commenced. In 1832 this society sent out a mission to Liberia, in Western Africa, and the work was afterwards extended to the island of Corisco and other places on the coast, where it has been carried on with a varied measure of success amid many difficulties incident to the climate and a deeply debased heathen population. In 1833 the Reverend Messrs. Reed: and Lowrie were sent out to India, and succeeded in establishing a mission station in the city of Lodiana, on the River Sutlez, one of the tributaries of the Indus — a place far distant from any other scene of missionary labor. The first band of missionaries suffered much from the inroads of sickness and death, but were soon aided or followed by a reinforcement of laborers, who succeeded in forming a native  Church in 1825, the first two members of which became eminently useful as preachers of the Gospel to their fellow-countrymen. In 1838 the American Presbyterians commenced a mission at Singapore; and after the Chinese war three stations were formed alt Canton, Amoy, and Ningpo, to which a fourth-was afterwards added at Shanghai. The society suffered a severe blow in the death of the Reverend W.M. Lowrie, who was murdered by a party of pirates. The board has also sent missionaries to labor among the Chinese in California, and in every department of the work considerable success has been realized. Corea was entered in 1884:

“Evangelical Lutheran Church Mission. — The Evangelical Lutheran Church of Nova Scotia is a religious community which numbers only four or five thousand members, chiefly of German extraction, and yet it has shown a most praiseworthy zeal in the cause of missions.. This Church entered upon its foreign missionary labors in 1837, and a few years. afterwards it reported 5 ordained and 2 unordained native preachers as engaged in the goodwork in India, with 86 Church members and 355 scholars under their care.

“Seventh-day Baptist Missionary Society. — This institution was organized if 1842, and has been engaged ever since chiefly in Western Africa and China, where three or four agents have been usefully employed. The Chinese mission was begun in 1847 in Shanghai by the Rev. Messrs. Carpenter and Worden, who secured a house within the walls, fitted up a portion of it as a chapel, and commenced public worship in it soon afterwards. A few converts have been gathered into the fold of Christ as the result of their evangelistic labors.

“American Indian Mission Association. — This society was founded also in 1842, and is connected with the Baptist churches in the south-west, having its executive in Louisville. The agents of this society, numbering about thirty, have labored among different tribes of American Indians with a considerable measure of success, notwithstanding the difficulties which they have had to encounter. They report upwards of 1000 converted natives as united in Church fellowship on their respective stations.

“Free Baptist Missionary Society. — This small but useful institution was organized in 1843 at Utica, in the State of New York, on the broad Christian ground of having no connection with slavery. For several years-it has had a successful mission in Haiti, with 1 missionary, 3 female assistants, I native pastor, and 4 native teachers.  “Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church. — This organization dates from 1844, and has sent forth three missionaries to India, two to Turkey, and three to the Pacific; but we have been unable to gather any very definite information with reference to the history or the results of their labors.

“Southern Baptist Convention's Missions. — The Foreign Missionary Society of the Southern Baptists was formally instituted in 1845, missionaries having been sent out to China the year before. Important stations were formed at Macao, Hong Kong, and Shanghai, which were very prosperous. In 1848 a gloom was cast over the mission by the loss of Dr. and Mrs. James, who were drowned by the upsetting of a boat when on their way to Shanghai; but the places of the dear departed were soon supplied by other laborers, and the good work continued to advance. The next field of labor occupied by this society was Western Africa. Soon after a station had been established in Liberia the work was extended to the Yarriba country, where several colored missionaries were usefully employed, who, from their being of African descent, could better endure the climate. According to the last returns, this society had 40 missionaries, 26 native assistants, 1225 Church members, and 633 scholars in the mission schools.

“American Missionary Association. — This society was formed at Albany, N.Y., in the year 1846, by those friends of missions who declared themselves aggrieved by the countenance given by some other philanthropic institutions to slavery, polygamy, and kindred forms of evil. Their avowed object was to secure a broad, catholic basis for the cooperation of Christians, but to exclude from their organization all persons living in or conniving at the flagrant forms of iniquity alluded to, The formation of this society was no sooner made known than it was joined by other smaller institutions, as the ‘West India Mission,' the ‘Western Evangelical Missionary Association,' and the ‘Union Missionary Society,' who transferred their influence and their agencies to it, and thus gave to the new organization laborers in the West Indies, among the North American Indians, and in Western Africa. ‘The labors of the society were subsequently extended to Siam, the Sandwich Islands, California, and Egypt. In 1867 it supported over 200 missionaries at home and abroad. Since that time the pressing needs of the freedmen of the Southern States have absorbed almost all the means at the disposal of the board, which they withdrew from other work to do this duty which lay nearest to them. This  association have their schools and churches scattered through the former slave and border states. The whole number of missionaries and teachers commissioned during the last ten years amount to 3470; and schools have been established in 343 localities, the pupils under instruction numbering 23,324, who, as a rule, make rapid progress in learning. The interest and zeal of the colored people ill urging their children's education increases every year, and every year they also become more able to assist in the work. In a short time both schools and churches are expected to become self-supporting.

“American and Foreign Christian Union. — This institution was organized in New York in 1849. It was, in fact, the union of three other small societies — the ‘Foreign Evangelical Society,' the ‘American Protestant Society,' and the ‘Philo-Italian Society' — which was afterwards called the Christian Alliance. The principal fields of labor cultivated by these associations, both before and after their union, were the papal countries of France, Belgium, Sweden, Canada, Hayti, and South America. In 1854, the fifth year of the new organization, it numbered 140 missionaries of all grades, one half of whom were ordained, and belonged to seven different nations, and a proportionate number of converted natives united in Church fellowship, and scholars in the mission schools.

“French Canadian Missionary Society. — This society was organized in 1839. Its object is to evangelize the French Canadian Roman Catholics, of whom there are nearly a million in the province of Quebec. It is conducted by a committee in Montreal, and employs a threefold agency education, evangelization, and colportage. Above 240 scholars are supported in whole or in part by the mission; eight small French Protestant churches have been organized, and about 1300 copies or portions of the Scriptures are annually circulated, in addition to other religious works which have been translated for the purpose.

“Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church of Nova Scotia. — The board was organized in 1844 in consequence of an overture on foreign missions by the Presbytery of Prince Edward's Island. The principal promoter of the enterprise, the Reverend John Geddie, was the first missionary who proceeded to Polynesia, accompanied by Mr. Isaac Archibald as catechist. On reaching their destination, they were kindly received by the agents of the London Missionary Society, and proceeded to establish a station at Anetteum, one of the New Hebrides group, where  they arrived in July 1848. The entire population of the island soon renounced their pagan practices, and became professing Christians. An anxious desire for religious instruction was manifested, and a goodly number of the natives were brought under gracious religious influences.

“Minor Associations. — There are several minor missionary associations, both in Europe and America, concerning which our limited space prevents a separate description.”

In order to make the above list complete, it would be necessary to add the numerous Bible societies, SEE BIBLE SOCIETIES, and also Tract and Book publication societies, which are in constant and intimate cooperation with the regular missionary societies, together with a constantly increasing number of smaller organizations contemplating missionary results. Some of the above will be included in the subjoined tabular exhibit on pages 368 and 369.

Notwithstanding the numerous points of interest shown in our tabular exhibit, it is utterly impossible to reduce to statistics anything like a full showing of the work accomplished and in progress by modern missions. Indeed, as human language cannot fully set forth the horrors of heathenism, so no form of description can adequately portray the actual and possible results of missionary efforts earnestly and perseveringly put forth in harmony with the divine plan for evangelizing the world.

VI. General Views suggested by the Present Period of Missionary History as compared with Preceding Periods. —

1. The field of missionary operations is now more comprehensive than ever before, and more nearly illustrative of the Gospel design of evangelizing the whole world. In the apostolic period the Roman empire comprised the then known world. Up to the end of the mediaeval period, the world formerly known to the Romans was chiefly enlarged by the addition of the northern countries of Europe. Now, every continent and island of the globe is not only known by discovery, but accessible to Christian influence. In fact, all the important and many of the :unimportant nations of the earth have been actually made the subjects of missionary instruction, in accordance with the fullest literal meaning of the Savior's precepts, “Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature;” “Go teach all nations.”

2. The Church of modern times has returned to the apostolic idea of Christian missions. Hence missionary operations now throughout the world are peaceful, No more crusades, no more inquisitions and autos dafe are employed for the pretended advancement of Christianity, but rather preaching and teaching generally of the pure Word of God as a means of persuading men to become followers of Christ.

3. The number of workers for this object is greater than ever before, and is rapidly increasing by the enlistment of native converts in almost every land.

4. The appliances and advantages of Christian civilization, such as the press and general education, are everywhere brought to the aid of missionary effort.

5. The sympathies of the Christian Church at large are extensively, though as yet for from fully, enlisted in the grand enterprise of Christianizing the human race.

In this enterprise unity of idea is to a large extent neutralizing diversity of action, and making even the rivalries of different Christian organizations conducive to a common advantage.

6. The progress and results, especially of Protestant missions within the current century, not only justify all the efforts of the past, but give most hopeful signs of promise for the future. These results comprise not only the conversion and salvation of individuals of every race and condition of humanity, but the actual Christianization of whole nations, and the initial steps by which whole races of men may be expected at no distant period to receive the Gospel. Of necessity, a large share of the work of modern evangelical missions has thus far been preparatory; such as the acquisition of languages, the translation and printing of the Scriptures, and the education of native ministers in heathen lands. If, therefore, what has been done shall by the blessing of the Head of the Church be made to act as leaven, according to our Saviour's promise, we may in due time expect the whole mass of human population to be leavened with the influence of Christian truth.

“The social and moral advantages which the missionary enterprise has conferred on the heathen are before the world. What vast tracts has it rescued from barbarism, and with what creations of benevolence has it  clothed them! How many thousands whom ignorance and selfishness had branded as the leavings and refuse of the species, if not actually akin to the beasts that perish, are at this moment rising under its fostering care, ascribing their enfranchisement, under God, to its benign interposition; taking encouragement from its smiles to assume the port and bearing of men; and by their acts and aspirations retrieving the character and the dignity of the slandered human form! When did literature accomplish so much for nations destitute of a. written language? or education pierce and light up so large and dense a mass of human ignorance? When did humanity save so many lives, or cause so many sanguinary ‘wars to cease?' How many a sorrow has it soothed; how many an injury arrested; how many an asylum has it reared amid scenes of wretchedness and oppression for the orphan, the outcast, and the sufferer! When did liberty ever rejoice in a greater triumph than that which missionary instrumentality has been the means of achieving? or civilization find so many sons of the wilderness learning her arts, and agriculture, and commerce? or law receive so much voluntary homage from those who but yesterday were strangers to the name? By erecting a standard of morality, how vast the amount of crime which it has been the means of preventing! By asserting the claims of degraded woman, how powerful an instrument of social regeneration is it preparing for the future! And by doing all this by the principle and power of all moral order and excellence — the Gospel of Christ — how large a portion of the world's chaos has it restored to light, and harmony, and peace!

“But great as are the benefits enumerated, most of which can in a sense be seen and measured and handled, we venture to affirm that those which are at present comparatively impalpable and undeveloped are greater still. The unseen is far greater than that which appears. The missionary has been planting the earth with principles, and these are of as much greater value than the visible benefits which they have already produced as the tree is more valuable than its first year's fruit. The tradesman may take stock and calculate his pecuniary affairs to a fraction; the astronomer may count the' stars, and the chemist weigh the invisible element of air; but he who in the strength of God conveys a great truth to a distant region, or puts into motion a divine principle, has performed a work of which futurity alone can disclose the results. At no one former period could either of our missionary societies have attempted to ‘number Israel' — to reduce to figures either the geographical extent or the practical results of its  influence, without having soon received, in the cheering events which followed, a distinct but gracious rebuke. How erroneous the calculation which should have set down the first fifteen years of fruitless missionary labor in Greenland, or the sixteen in Tahiti, or the twenty in New Zealand, as years of entire failure! when, in truth, the glorious scene which then ensued was simply that which God was pleased to make the result of all that had preceded the explosion, by the divine hand, of a train which had been lengthening and enlarging during every moment of all those years. Therefore were the whole field of missions to be suddenly vacated, and all its moral machinery at once withdrawn, we confidently believe that the amount of temporal good arising from what has been done will be much greater twenty years hence than it is at present” (Harris's Great Conmmission, pages 185, 186).

But happily there is no prospect that the field of missionary effort will soon be vacated. The thirty years that have elapsed since the above paragraph was written have proved to be the most productive of missionary results of any similar period since the days of the apostles. During their lapse the “moral machinery” of the Protestant Church in particular has become vastly augmented in volume and in power, and has been set to working with great efficiency in many important localities which were then wholly inaccessible. The records of even that period fill numerous Volumes, and yet the half has not been written.

VII. Missionary Aspect of the World, with the Literature appropriate to each Region. — So vast is the field of modern missions, so numerous are the workers, and so various are the departments of effort, that it is difficult, though very important, to form an adequate idea of the enterprise as a whole. In order to do so even approximately, an inquirer has to glean from many sources, and to combine into one view all the various lines and successive phases of action which focalize towards the contemplated result. The proper mode of studying this subject may be indicated by a comprehensive grouping of the different sections and countries of the world in reference to missionary occupation and progress, coupled with such references to the literature of missions as will enable a student to prosecute thorough inquiry into the history, condition, and prospects of each particular field.

It may here be remarked that the literature of modern. missions is already very extensive. It embraces two distinct classes of publications, of which  the first may be denominated auxiliary, the second descriptive. To the first belong versions of the Scriptures, and all tracts and books designed for circulation in mission fields, whether educational, apologetic, or devotional. To the second belong accounts of countries, peoples, and systems of false religion, also missionary explorations, experiences, biography, and history. Publications of the latter class are specially interesting and valuable to Christian workers in all lands. As there is a common brotherhood in humanity, which is greatly strengthened by the ties of Christian relationship, so the experiences of foreign mission life become not only interesting but instructive to the agents and supporters of Christian work in Christian lands. The converse of this proposition is equally true, and thus it is that home missions and regular Church work in Christian countries practically blend together with missionary work in foreign and pagan countries, forming one great system of effort for the evangelization of the world.

In proceeding to a brief panoramic survey of the principal divisions of the earth in reference to missions, it seems proper to begin with the earlier scenes of Christian occupation and labor, and pass around to the American continent and islands, thus completing the circuit of the habitable globe.

1. The Continent of Europe presents at this time the interesting spectacle of active missionary labor prosecuted not only by British but also by American Protestants in most of those old countries where a ceremonious or a nominal Christianity has long held sway. In Northern Europe, especially in Germany, Denmark, Sweden, and Norway, the missionaries are in many cases natives of those countries, who as emigrants to the United States of America became experimental Christians, and who have returned to preach the doctrines of vital godliness to their fatherlands., Protestant missions are also established in France, Switzerland, Austria, Portugal, Spain, and Italy. In all these countries the Scriptures and Christian tracts are circulated more freely and more numerously than ever before.

With some correspondence to the activity of Protestants in the Roman Catholic countries of Europe, the Church of Rome has become very zealous for the reconversion of England to mediaeval Christianity. The Jesuits expelled from Germany and the monks disfranchised in Italy are sent there in great numbers. These measures have a tendency to stimulate  greater activity among British Christians in home missions, and thus, so long as peaceful measures are employed on both sides, it is to be hoped that mutually good results will follow. Thought will be stimulated, liberality increased, watchfulness will be awakened, and Christ will be preached, even though of contention. As the movements now referred to are for the greater part quite recent, the latest information respecting them must be sought in the current reports and correspondence of the societies engaged in them, inclusive of the Bible and Tract societies. In this field comparatively little has been required in the matter of Bible translations, but much attention has been given to the revision of versions to make them as perfect as possible for popular circulation. See Rule, Mission to Gibraltar and Spain; Arthur, Italy in Transition; Scott, Telstrom and Lapland; Reports of Missionary Societies; Toase, Wesleyan Mission in France; Mrs. Peddie, Dawn of the Second Reformation in Spain; Ellis, Denmark and her Missions; Henderson's Life and Labors.

SEE BAPTISTS; SEE METHODISTS; SEE PRESBYTERIANS; SEE PROTESTANT EPISCOPALIANS; SEE WESLEYANS.

2. Greece, Turkey, Asia Minor, and Western Asia. The modern populations of the northern shores of the Mediterranean are greatly mingled. The Moslem races predominate, but nominal Christians are found in every country and under all the governments. They constitute more than a third part of the inhabitants of Constantinople, and are found in every province of the Turkish empire, while in Persia they are supposed to number twelve millions. Hence a wise plan for the conversion of the Mohammedans of those lands involved the primary necessity of evangelical missions to the nominal Christians of the East. To this task, as a republication of the Gospel in Bible lands, the American Board of Foreign Missions has addressed itself energetically and perseveringly. It has in so doing established missions in Greece, in Palestine, in Syria, among the Jews, Mohammedans, and Bulgarians of Turkey. the Armenians, the Nestorians, and the Druses. A very interesting history of these missions and their adjuncts has recently been published by Dr. Anderson, from which it appears that, notwithstanding many difficulties, great and encouraging results have been attained, not only in the direct experience of the Christian life, but in the awakening of a general spirit of inquiry, the improvement of education, increased toleration, and the diffusion of the Word of God throughout the various regions that have been occupied and permeated by the influence of the missions. The printing of the board has been on a very  extensive scale, including the issue of the Scriptures and other publications in the following languages, viz. Italian, modern Greek, Graeco-Turkish, ancient Armenian, modern Armenian, Armeno-Turkish, Osmani-Turkish, Bulgarian, Hebrew, Hebrew-Spanish, modern Syriac, and Arabic. The printing of the whole Bible in Arabic, at the expense of the American Bible Society, was completed in 1865. The great work of its translation and conduct through the press was accomplished by the zeal and energy of sixteen years' labor or the part of two learned missionaries of the American Board, Drs. Smith and Van Dyck. This one publication offers the Word of God to the Arabic reading world comprising a population (though largely uneducated of 120,000,000 of people. See Anderson, Oriental Missions; Smith and Dwight, Missionary Researches in Arpzenia; Hartley, Researches in Greece and the Levant; Perkins, Eighteen Years in Persia; Grant, Nestorians Wortabet, Syria and the Syrians; Dwight, Christianity in Turkey; Churchill, Residence in Mount Lebanon, Ewald, Mission in Jerusalem Thomson, The Land and the Book; Wilson, Greek Mission; Yeates, Gospel in Syria; Wilson, Lands of the Bible.

3. Missions among the Jews. — For more than eighteen centuries the Jews have been a cosmopolitan people. The very first missions of the apostles were to the Jews “scattered abroad.” In subsequent ages the once chosen but now dispersed race was in many countries made the object of cruel and wasting persecution. Still as a peculiar people the Jews have continued “among all nations” to maintain their own beliefs and customs, and especially an inveterate prejudice against Christianity. SEE JEWS; SEE JUDAISM.

As such they could not be reached by missionary efforts of the usual type. Hence at an early period of the missionary movement of the current century it was deemed important to organize special missions to the Jews in the various countries where they resided in the greatest numbers. Indeed, some beginnings of this character were made in Holland and Germany during the preceding century, and not without good results. August Hermann Francke took a lively interest in this subject. One of the ablest workers raised up under him was professor Callenberg, who in 1728 founded an institute for the education of Christian theologians in Hebrew antiquities and the Rabbinic theology. February 15, 1809, the London Society for promoting Christianity among the Jews was organized. In 1820 the American Society for ameliorating the condition of the Jews was begun. In 1849 it was greatly enlarged in its scope. In 1842 the British Society for the propagation of the Gospel among the Jews was organized  by the Dissenting churches. In 1839 the Church of Scotland commenced missionary efforts in behalf of the Jews. In 1845 the Scottish Society for the conversion: of Israel was organized. Besides these principal organizations, there have been various local societies for the same object both in Great Britain and on the continent of Europe, and also various missionary societies, e.g. the American Board, the Presbyterian Board, and that of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, have maintained special missions to Jewish populations. The aggregate result of these efforts is impossible of indication by figures, and yet it is no small thing to be able to say that many thousands of copies of the Scriptures of both the Old and New Testaments have been circulated among the 5,000,000 of Jews accessible to Christian effort. The versions used have been Hebrew; Hebrew-Spanish, German, French, Portuguese, and those of other European languages. The number of missionary stations established is over 130, missionaries employed over 350, mostly converted Jews, and an aggregate of probably 70,000 confessed converts. Many of these converts have given the best proofs of their sincerity and faithfulness by the endurance of bitter persecution from their kindred; and many who have not identified themselves with the Christian Church are believed to have accepted the vital truths of Christianity, and to have received to their hearts Jesus as the true Messiah. An intelligent writer says, “If all things be taken into consideration, we have no doubt that the results of these labors (missions to the Jews) exceed in proportions rather than fall short of those of other valued missionary societies.”

Missions to Jews have been prosecuted in the following countries: Great Britain, Holland, Poland, Germany, France, Italy, North Africa, Smyrna, Hungary Moldavia, Wallachia, Turkey, Egypt, Palestine, Persia, Abyssinia, and the United States of America. While it must be admitted that the results of these efforts have not been as great as might have been hoped, yet they must not be undervalued in their past influence nor in their promise for the future. Great changes are now taking place among the Jews, especially those inhabiting the more enlightened countries, and although certain forms of rationalism seem to be most popular with many who have relinquished the faith of their ancestors, yet when the insufficiency of these shall have been proved they may be found to have served as stepping-stones to evangelical truth. Should this be the case, the beginnings of missionary effort in behalf of Israel in so many lands may ere long prove to be of inestimable value in hastening the grand consummation  of the world's conversion. See Steger, Die Evangelische Judenmission, in ihrer Wichtigkeit u. ihren gesegeneten Fortgange (1847); Hausmeister, Die Judenmission (Heidelb. 1852), an address read at the Paris meeting of the Evangelical Alliance; id., Die evangel. Mission unter Israel (1861); Harens, Ueber Judenmission (Altona, 1862); Kalkar, Israel u. die Kirche (Hamburg, 1869); Halsted, Our Missions (Lond. 1866); Anderson, Oriental Missions; Reports of societies.

4. Egypt. — A form of Christianity has long existed among the Copts of Egypt. But they, together with the followers of Mohammed, are sunk in a state of deplorable ignorance and moral depravity. The United Brethren were the first to form a mission in Egypt, but, meeting with little or no success, it was relinquished in 1783. The missionary societies now operating are the American Association, United Presbyterian Church, Kaiserswerth Deaconesses' Institute, and Jerusalem Union, at Berlin. The Bible versions in use are the Coptic and Ethiopic. The mission of the United Presbyterian Church of America has been. particularly successful. They have stations both in Cairo and Alexandria, together with a number of minor stations. A Church has been organized with a large and increasing membership. The customs that doom women to a life of seclusion and degradation have been gradually invaded. The Sabbath is more and more sacredly revered, and the vicious and idle habits so common among the people are somewhat abandoned. See Boaz, Egypt; Lansing, Egypt's Princes; Thompson, Egypt, Past and Present; Miss Whately, The Huts of Egypt.

5. Northern Africa, with the exception of Egypt, seems abandoned to Moslem predominance. Owing to its vast deserts of sand, it is in fact but thinly inhabited — indeed only traversed occasionally by tribes of wandering and savage Arabs. The French occupation of portions of Algeria, including the locality of the churches of Tertullian, Cyprian, and Augustine, has done little toward restoring the Christianity taught by those fathers, and for the present the prospect of a re-evangelization of Northern Africa is in no sense hopeful. See Davies, Voice front North Africa; Carthage and her Remains.

6. Western Africa. — This title includes Senegambia, the British colony of Sierra Leone, the American settlement of Liberia, and the country of Guinea. In the latter are included the kingdoms of Ashantee and Dahomey. A large proportion of the people are pagans; among the remainder a very  corrupt form of Mohammedanism exists. The earliest efforts made by the Protestant Church to Christianize them were made by the Moravian Brethren in 1736. The missionary societies now in the field are the Church, Wesleyan, Baptist, North German, Society of Bremen, Evangelical Mission at Basle, Free United Methodists, United Presbyterian Church, American Southern Baptist, American Episcopal Board, American Methodist Episcopal, and American Presbyterian. Some of the Bible versions in use are the Berber, Mandingo, Grebo, Yarriba, Haussa, Ibo, and Dualla. In all, twenty-five dialects have been mastered. There are now many thousands of hopeful converts to Christianity; also above 200 schools, with more than 20,000 scholars under instruction. A very important result has been achieved in the success of native agency. See Wilson, Western Africa; East, Western Africa; Mrs. Scott, Day-dawn in Africa; Schon and Crowther, Expedition up the Niger; Beecham, Ashantee and the Gold Coast; Randolph, The People of Africa; Tucker, Abeokuta; Walker, Sierra Leone; Bowen, Central Africa; Cruikshank, Eighteen Years on the Gold Coast; Fox, Western Coast of Africa; Liberia and its Resources; Life of Daniel West; Memoirs of M.B. Cox; Waddell, Twenty-nine Years in the West Indies and Central Africa; Freeman, Ashantee.

7. Southern Africa. — The section of Africa now under consideration comprises the six provinces of Cape Colony, British Kaffraria, Kaffraria Proper, the sovereignty beyond the Orange River, Natal, and Amazula, The ideas of the people about God were very confused and indefinite, and, there appeared to be no particular form of worship among them. The first mission to the tribes of Southern Africa was established by the Moravian Church in 1737. The missionary societies now in the field are the American Board of Commissioners, Propagation, London, Wesleyan, Free Church of Scotland, United Presbyterian, and Evangelical Moravian Brotherhood, with six Coictiieital societies. The Bible versions in use are the Benlga, Namacqua, Becluana, Sesuto, Zulu, Pedi, and Kaffir. There are nearly a quarter of a million of communicants. Numerous schools have been opened, with a large average attendance of scholars. As a Hottentot has expressed it, the missionaries have given them a religion where formerly they had none: taught them morality, whereas before they had no idea of morality; they were given up to profligacy and drunkenness, now industry and sobriety prevail among them. See Moffat, Missionary Labors in South Africa; Livingstone, Missionary Travels; Philips, Researches; Campbell, Travels in South Africa; Holden, Kaffr Races; Shaw, Memorials of South  Africa; Broadbent, Martyrs of Namcaqualand; Taylor, Adventures in South Africa.

8. Abyssinia was formerly divided into three independent states; now, however, there is but one. The Christianity of the Abyssinians is so impure as to be little better than heathenism. Thus far it has proved a discouraging field for missionary effort. The Bible versions in use are the Amharic and Ethiopic. See Salt, History of Abyssinoia; Hotten, Abyssinia and its People (Lond. 1868); Gobat, Three Years' Residence in Abyssinia; Flad, Abyssinia; Isenberg and Stern, Missionary Journals; Stern, The Captive Missionary; Krapf, Eighteen Years in Eastern Africa. SEE ABYSSINIAN CHURCH.

9. Madagascar is one of the largest islands in the world, with a population of five millions. The native religion is idolatrous, but no public worship is offered to the idols. The London Missionary Society introduced the Gospel into Madagascar in the year 1818. The work of that society has been very successful, having largely secured the Christianization of the island. The other missionary societies are the Church and Propagation. The Bible version in use is the Malagasy. The native Church passed through a terrible persecution in 1849. Two thousand persons suffered death rather than renounce Christ. So plentiful has been the ingathering since that Madagascar is now in an important sense counted a Christian country. See Ellis, History of Madagascar; id., Martyr Church of Madagascar; Freeman, Persecutions in Madagascar; Reports of the London Missionary Society.

10. Mauritius. — This island has a population of 300,000, three quarters of whom represent the races of India. The missionary societies in this field are the London, Propagation, and Church. An extensive and promising work is carried on among the Tamils and Bengali-Hindustani-speaking coolies, and also by the London Society among the refugees and other emigrants from Madagascar. See Bond, Brief Memorials of the Rev. J. Sarjant;. Backhouse, Visit to Mauritius; Le Brun, Letters.

11. Ceylon is an island situated off the south-west coast of Hindustan. The inhabitants are divided into four classes: the Singhalese, who are Buddhists; the Tamils, who profess Hinduism; the Moormen, and the Whedahs. A form of Christianity was introduced into Ceylon by the Jesuits as early as 1505. Protestant missions were commenced by the Dutch in 1656, by the London Missionary Society in 1804, by the Baptists in i812,  and by the American Board in the same year. The Wesleyans of England commenced their important mission in the same island in 1813. Glorious triumphs have been wrought in this field during the last halfcentury, and a steady advance now characterizes the work. The Wesleyan mission has been very successful. It reports 1535 members. The missionary societies are the Baptist, Church, Propagation, and American Board. The Bible versions in use are the Pali, Singhalese, and Indo-Portuguese. See Tennent, Christianity in Ceyloon; Hardy, Buddhism in Ceylon; Echard, Residence in Ceylon; Harvard, Mission in Ceylon; Selkirk, Recollections of Ceylon; Hardy, Jubilee Memorials of the Wesleyan Mission in South Ceylon.

12. India has been divided by the British into the three presidencies of Bengal, Bombay, and Madras; these again are subdivided into districts. Its entire extent is about 1,357,000 square miles, with a population of 250,000,000. The religions may be divided into four classes: Hinduism, Buddhism, Mohammedanism, and that taught by Zoroaster. Under their individual and united influence the condition of the people was deplorable. Children were thrown into the River Ganges as offerings to imaginary deities; widows were burned with the dead bodies of their husbands, and numbers destroyed themselves by throwing their bodies under the wheels of the cars of their bloodthirsty idols. The pioneers of Protestant missions in this country were two Danes, who arrived in 1706. There are now twenty-seven missionary societies laboring in the field. The following are a few: Church, Propagation, London, Baptist, Wesleyan, Church of Scotland, American Presbyterian, American Baptist, and American Methodist Episcopal. A few of the Bible versions in use are the Bengali, Hindui, Urdu Telinga, Tamil, Mahratti, and Punjabi. The number of native Christians at the close of 1871 was 224,161. Within the preceding ten years an increase of 85,430 took place. The system of caste, which has proved a great barrier to the triumph of the Gospel, is becoming lax, and showing signs of its coming dissolution. Widows are often remarried. Females for the first time are under education. There is a better appreciation of justice, morality, and religion than ever there was. The native Church promises to become gradually self-supporting. The number of towns and villages scattered over the country inhabited by Protestant Christians is 4657. Statistical facts, however, can in no way convey an adequate idea of the work which has been done in any part of India. The Gospel has been working like leaven, and the effect is very great even in places where there are but few avowed conversions. Even Keshub Chunder  Sen, the leader of the new Theistic school, has been constrained to use the following language: “The spirit of Christianity has already pervaded the whole atmosphere of Indian society, and we breathe, think, feel, and move in a Christian atmosphere.

Native society is aroused, enlightened, and reformed under the influence of Christian education.” Sir Bartle Frere, who was thirty years in India in various official positions, says: “I speak simply as to matters of experience and observation, and not of opinion, just as a Roman prefect might have reported to Trajan or the Antonines, and I assure you, whatever you may be told to the contrary, the teaching of Christianity among one hundred and sixty millions of civilized, industrious Hinduis and Mohammedans in India is effecting changes — moral, social, and religious — which, for extent and rapidity of effect, are far more extraordinary than anything which you or your fathers have witnessed in modern Europe. It has come to be the general feeling in India that Hinduism is at an end — that the death-knell has been rung of that collection of old superstitions which has been held together so long.” Similar testimony has been borne by lord Lawrence in his famous letter to the London Times; also by lord Napier, Sir William Muir, colonel Sir Herbert Edwards, and others in the civil and military service in India. The general opinion, not only of the missionaries, but of thoughtful and intelligent laymen, is that India is much in the condition of Rome just previous to the baptism of the emperor Constantine. Idolatry now in India, as then in Rome, is falling into disgrace — men are becoming wiser. Truth in its clearness and power is gradually entering their minds and changing their habits and lives. An intelligent Hindu said to a missionary on one occasion: “The story which you tell of him who lived, and pitied, and came, and taught, and suffered, and died, and rose again — that story, sir, will overthrow our temples, destroy our ritual, abolish our shastras, and extinguish our gods.” The preaching of Christ crucified, and the proclaiming of him who is the way, the truth, and the life, is already accomplishing in some measure what this Hindu said it would, and we may hope, with the divine blessing, to see in the near future a great turning of the people unto the Lord, and the utter destruction of all idols. See Thornton, India, its State and Prospects; Duff, India and Indian Missions; Kay, History of Christianity in India; Butler, Land of the Veda; Hough, Christianity in India; Hoole, Madras and Mysore; Clarkson, India and the Gospel; Massie, Continental India; Tinling, Early Roman Catholic Missions in India; Weitbrect, Missions in Bengal; Wylie, Bengal; Storrow. India and Christian Missions; Stirling, Orissa Arthur, Mission to  Mysore; Long, Bengal Missions; Mullen, Missions in South. India; Memoirs of Carey, Marshnan, Ward, and Schwtartz; Reverend E.J. Robinson, The Daughters of India; Marv E. Leslie, The Zenana Mission; J.F. Garey, India.

13. Indo-China comprises the kingdoms between India and China. The whole district may be divided into four parts: the British territories, Burmah, Siam, and Cochin China, including Cambodia and Tonquin. Buddhism is the leading religion. The missionary societies are the American Baptist, American Presbyterian, American Missionary Association, and Gossner's Evangelical. The Bible versions in use are the Burmese, Bghai- Karen, Sgau-Karen, Pwo-Karen, and Siamese. The Baptists have achieved great success in these regions. Heathen' customs are loosened, prejudices are dissolved. The king of Burmah sends his son to the mission school. The late king of Siam sought his most congenial associates among European Christians. Evangelization is going on with great vigor among the Karens of Burmah. Though poor, they support their own pastors. See Mrs. Wylie, Gospel in Burmah; Mrs. Judson, American Baptist Mission to the Burman Empire; Life of Judson; Malcom, Travels; Gutzlaff, Notices of Siam, Corea, and Loo Choo; Gammell, Baptist Missions.

14. The Indian Archipelago. — This vast extent of islands forms a bridge as it were to Australia, and from thence northward to China. The outer crescent begins with the Nicobar and Andaman Islands, followed by Sumatra and Java, and then by the Lesser Sunda Islands. Northward of these are the Moluccas, which are followed by the Philippines, and lastly by Formosa. The superficial area is estimated at 170,000 square miles. The population is 20,000,000. The most ancient inhabitants were the Papoos; they were supplanted by the Malays; these in turn are threatened with the same fate by the Chinese coolies. The religions are numerous: Hindus, Buddhists, and Mohammedans form the larger proportion of the populations. The missionary societies are the Netherland Society of Rotterdam (1797), Java Society of Amsterdam, Separatist Reformed Church, Utrecht, Netherland Society of Rotterdam (1859), Netherland Reformed, Church of England, and Rhenish. The Bible versions in use are the Malay, Javanese, Dajak, and Sundanese. Considerable good has been accomplished among the Saribas tribes and the Land Dyaks of Borneo. Both their moral and social state testify to the civilizing power of Christianity. See Wigger, Hist. of Missions; Memoirs of Munson and Lyman; Hist. of the Missions of the American Board.  15. China. — This is an extensive country of Eastern Asia. Its superficial area is equal to about one third that of Europe, and its population is estimated at 434,000,000. The empire is divided into eighteen provinces. The religions of China are chiefly Buddhism and Confucianism. The first Protestant mission in China was that of the London Missionary Society, founded by Dr. Morrison in the year 1807. The missionary societies now in the field are twenty-two in all, a few of which are the following: London, American Board of Commissioners, American Baptist, American Methodist Episcopal, American Episcopal, American Presbyterian, Baptist, Wesleyan, and Presbyterian.

The Bible versions in use are the Chinese, Mandarin, Ningpo, Canton, Hakka and other local dialects of China. For several years there was little or no visible fruit of the missionary's labor, but at length the tide of success set in, and a large ingathering of converts took place. All the open ports are occupied by mission stations, and some places that are not open by treaty stipulations are occupied on sufferance. There are now one hundred ordained missionaries, and one hundred and eighty native catechists and teachers. The result of their united labors is encouraging as to the past and fill of promise for the future. A review of the results which have been accomplished in India (see above), and of the spiritual revolution which is in progress there, is in a high degree encouraging to those who are laboring for the conversion of the still more populous empire of China. Missions in China have been established only about half the period that they have in India, and there have been only about half as many laborers. When they shall have been continued for as long a time, and with as many missionaries, the prospect is that there will be an equal or greater number of converts, and the prospect for the utter overthrow of the religious systems of China will be equally bright. The obstacles to the conversion of the Chinese people are many and great, but they are not more numerous or formidable than those which are now successfully encountered in India. If the Chinese are a more materialistic people than the Hindus, and their leading men more sceptically inclined, there is, on the other hand, an absence of the immense obstacle of caste; nor is there any set of men in China that are looked up to with such awe and reverence, and wield such immense power, as the Brahmins of India. Moreover, there is not the same diversity of races in the Chinese empire, and the number of languages is but about half the number of those in India. There is, too, this advantage in China, that, whatever the mother-tongue may be, all who have received a good education can read books. understandingly, which are in the general written (unspoken) language. The  Chinese also are becoming a ubiquitous people, and if the multitudes who come to our own and other Christian lands, vie have good reason to believe that not a few will return to China prepared in heart and mind to aid in spreading the Gospel of Christ. The number of Chinese converts at the present time is 35,000, which is about the number there were in India thirty years ago, and the stage of progress of the missions in other respects is about the same as it was in the latter country at that period; but the outlook in China now is much more encouraging than it was in India then, and all those who are seeking the spiritual conquest of the most ancient and most populous nation of the world have abundant encouragement to press forward in their efforts. See Medhurst, China; Huc, Christianity in China, Tartary, and Thibet; Morrison's Life; Abeel, Residence in China; Kidd, China; Williams, Middle Kingdom; Doolittle, China; Williamson, Journeys in North China, Manchuria, and Mongolia; Lockhart, Medical Missionary in China; Milne, Life in China; Matheson, Presbyterian Mission in China; Deann, China Mission; Wiley, Fuh-Chau and its Missions.

16. Japan. — This empire consists of three large islands and several smaller ones, which have a superficial area of 90,000 square miles, and a population of 40,000,000. The Japanese are divided into two religious sects, called Sinto and Budso, or Buddhists. The missionary societies are the American Episcopal, American Presbyterian, American Reformed (Dutch) Church, and American Methodist Episcopal Church. The Bible version in use is the Japanese. This peculiar country, which, following the expulsion of the Jesuits in the 17th century, could not be brought under missionary influence from being closed to foreigners, has now become so freely open, and brought into such favorable relations with Christian nations, as to encourage the hope that as a nation it will be entirely Christianized at no distant period. See Smith, Visit to Japan; Caddell, Missions in Japan; recent Reports of missionaries; Mori, Education in Japan.

17. Australia is the largest island in the world, being nearly the size of the whole of Europe. The aborigines, a race more degraded than either the Hottentot or Bushmen of South Africa, are fast diminishing in numbers. The missionary societies are the Colonial Presbyterian, Gossner's Evangelical, Evangelical Moravian Brotherhood, and Wesleyan Propagation. The migratory habits of the native tribes have stood in the way of any great success of missionary labors. Some, however, have been  reached by localizing them on mission reserves. The colonization and occupation of Australia by Great Britain has introduced Christian civilization and English institutions throughout its vast extent, and made it the subject of evangelical labor in modes peculiar to all Protestant Christian countries. See Young, Southern World; Jobson, Australia; Strachan, Life of Samuel Leigh; Memoirs of Rev. B. Carvosso, D.J. Draper, and Nathaniel Turner; Angus, Savage Life in Australia.

18. New Zealand comprises a group of islands in the Pacific Ocean, the principal of which, three in number, are distinguished as the Northern, Middle, and Southern Islands. The natives were savage cannibals, without any fixed idea of worship, but believers in a great spirit called Atua and an evil spirit called Wiro. The first missions to this people were commenced in 1814 by the Church and Wesleyan missionary societies. The missionary societies now in the field are the Propagation, Church, North German, and Wesleyan. The Bible versions in use are the Maori and New Caledonian. The natives are now chiefly professed Christians. The Christian-Sabbath. and Christian ordinances are observed all over the islands, and this triumph of Christianity, in rescuing such a nation from the depths of heathenism and even from the practice of the bloodiest cannibalism, is indeed glorious. See Yates, New Zealand; Thompson, Story of New Zealand; Miss Tucker, The Southern Cross and Southern Crown; Brown, New Zealand and its Aborigines; Memoirs of J.H. Bumby.

19. Tonga and Fiji. — Although embraced in the generic title of Polynesia, and even in the minor term South Sea Islands, yet the insular groups known as Tonga and Fiji deserve special notice as having exhibited some peculiar features of savage life, and, correspondingly wonderful triumphs of Christian labor. Then population of the Tonga, frequently called the Friendly Islands, is estimated at 50,000; that of Fiji, 127,000, scattered over-not less than eighty different islands. Cannibalism is a characteristic practice of the heathen of Polynesia. In Fiji it was an institution of the people interwoven in the elements of society, forming one of their pursuits, and regarded by the mass as a refinement. But even this revolting crime has yielded before the mild influence of Christianity, and is for the most part abolished. Perhaps it may be still secretly practiced by a few in some of the islands. The triumphs of the Gospel in these remote parts of the earth have been in every sense wonderful. Cruel practices and degrading superstitions have given way before Christian teaching. “Thousands have been converted, have borne trial and persecution, well maintained good conduct,  and died happy. Marriage is sacred; the Sabbath regarded; family worship regularly conducted; schools established generally; slavery abolished or mitigated; the foundation of law and government laid; many spiritual churches formed, and a native ministry raised up for every branch of the Church's work.” The missionary societies are the London, Wesleyan, and a few smaller organizations. The Bible versions are the Fijian and Rotuman. See Williams and Calvert, Fiji and the Fijiais; Miss Farmer, Tonga and the Friendly Isles; West, Ten Years in South Central Polynesia; Martin, Tonga Islands; Lawry, Visits to the Friendly Islands; Seemann, Mission to the Fiji Islands; Turner, Nineteen Years in Polynesia; Waterhouse, King and People of Fiji; Memoirs of Mrs. Cargill.

20. The South Sea Islands. — The above term is popularly applied to the islands of the Pacific south of the equator, including the Marquesas, the Austral, the Society, the Georgian, the Harvey, the New Hebrides, and the Solomon Islands, as well as the groups above noticed. A mission was begun in that distant and degraded region as early as 1797, but the difficulties were so great that it came near being abandoned. But in 1812 the night of heathenism seemed to be suddenly illuminated by the Sun of Righteousness. It has since been followed by a glorious awakening. Up to that time a native Christian in Polynesia was unknown. Two generations later it was difficult to find a professed idolator in all Eastern or Central Polynesia where Christian missions had been established. “The hideous rites of their forefathers have ceased to be practiced. Their heathen legends and war-songs are forgotten. Their cruel and desolating tribal wars appear to be at an end. The people are gathered together in peaceful village communities, and live under recognized codes of law. On the Sabbath a large proportion of them attend the worship of God. In some instances more than half the adults are members of Christian churches. They educate their children, they sustain their native ministers, and send their noblest sons as missionaries to heathen lands farther west.” In fact, those islands are no longer to be regarded as heathen. See Ellis, Polynesian Researches; Williams, Missionary Enterprises in the South Sea Islands; Martyr of Erromanga; Life of John Williams; Gill, Gems from the Coral Islands; Lundie, Mission in Samoa; Pritchard, Missionary's Reward; .Murray, Missions in Western Polynesia; History of the London Missionary Society.

21. Sandwich Islands. — The Sandwich or Hawaiian Islands constitute the most important Polynesian group north of the equator. They have been the locality of one of the most important missions of the American Board. That  mission was commenced in 1820. Its history for forty years following is one of struggle, trial, perseverance, and encouraging success. The report of the mission in 1857 said, “When we contrast the present with the not very remote past, we are filled with admiration and gratitude in view of the wonders God has wrought for this people. Everywhere and in all things we see the marks of progress. Instead of troops of idle, naked, noisy savages gazing upon us, we are now surrounded by well-clad, quiet, intelligent multitudes, who feel the dignity of men. Instead of squalid poverty, we see competence, abundance, and sometimes luxury. Instead of brutal howlings and dark orgies, I've heard “the songs of Zion and the supplications of saints.” The year 1860 was distinguished for revivals of religion over a large part of the islands. As a result, nearly 1500 were received into the churches during that year, and 800 the year following. So great had been the success of this mission that the American Board, as early as 1848, incepted measures for creating an independent and self-supporting Church in the islands. Carefully and slowly following the leadings of Providence, the native churches were by degrees educated up to this idea, which was happily consummated in 1863, and has since been put in practice with excellent results. Thus, following about fifty years of missionary labor, not counting the good intermediately accomplished, the world witnesses the. grand result of a nation converted from barbarism, and a native Christian community supporting its own pastors and maintaining foreign missions in islands and regions beyond. See Stewart, Missions to the Sandwich Islands; Dibble, Sandwich Islands Mission; Bingham, Twenty-one Years in the Sandwich Islands; Jarves, History of the Hawaiian Islands; Anderson, History of the Mission of the American Board to the Sandwich Islands.

22. North America. — The aboriginal races of the North American continent have, to a greater or less extent, been the subjects of missionary labor almost from the period of the first settlements by Europeans. Eliot's mission to the Indians of Massachusetts was begun in 1646. The French Catholic mission to the natives of Canada dates back to 1613. Spanish missions were commenced in Florida in 1566, in New Mexico in 1597, and in California in 1697. The vast extent of the continent, the lack of national affiliation among the numerous native tribes, the imperfection and multiplicity of languages, together with the extreme unsusceptibility of American Indians to the influences and habits of civilized life, have rendered this class of missions peculiarly difficult. Nevertheless they have been prosecuted by Christians of various denominations with a zeal and  perseverance that have not been without encouraging results, both as to individuals and communities. A full history of these missions has never been written, yet many volumes have been filled with sketches embodying material for such a history. In no part of the world have there been greater personal sacrifices or more diligent toil to Christianize savages with results less proportioned to the efforts made. Without enumerating or discussing causes, the fact must be recognised that throughout the whole continent the aboriginal races are dying out to an extent that leaves little present prospect of any considerable remnants being perpetuated in the form of permanent Christian communities. Still missions are maintained in the Indian territories and reservations; and the government of the United States is effectively cooperating with them to accomplish all that may be done for the Christian civilization of the Indians and Indian tribes that remain. The Canadian government also maintains a similar attitude towards the Indian missions within its boundaries. See Tracy, Eliot, and Mayhew, Gospel among the Indians; Lives of Eliot and Brainerd; Mather, History of New England; Gookin, Christian Indians of New England; Shea, Catholic Missions; Kip, Early Jesuit Missionaries; Winslow, Progress of the Gospel in New England; Hallet, Indians of North America; Heckewelder, Missions among the Delawares and Mohicans; Latrobe, Moravian Missions in North Anerica; Loskiel, Moravian Missions in North America; Hawkins, Episcopal Missions in North American Colonies; M'Coy, Baptist Indian Missions; Finley, Wyaindot Mission; Hines, Indian Missions in Oregon; Pitezel, Mission Life on Lake Superior; Jones, Ojibway Indians; West, Mission to the Indians of the British Provinces; Marsden, Mission to Nova Scotia; Churchill, Missionary Life in Nova Scotia; Ryerson, Hudson's Bay Mission; Tucker, Rainbow in the North; De Schweinitz, Life of Zeisberger.

23. The United States and Canada. — In no part of the world is there more enlightened and persevering activity in missionary effort than in these great Christian countries. To them the tide of emigration has been flowing from Europe for a hundred years, and of late it has set in from Asia. Hence, in addition to the providential call upon American Christians for efforts to evangelize the Indians of their forests, there has been even a louder call upon them to teach the Gospel to the foreign populations in their midst, including the African slaves and their descendants. In recognition of this call, missions have been prosecuted with great effect among the German and Scandinavian populations, the fruits of which are already seen in the  American missions to Europe. Missions have also been prosecuted to some extent among the French in America and their descendants, but with less success. But, as the tendency is strong towards the mingling of all nationalities in a homogeneous American population, the greatest results have been secured in the normal spreading of the various churches on the ever-enlarging frontier, and in the accumulating masses of our ever- growing cities. In this work of home evangelization, Sunday-schools, SEE SUNDAY-SCHOOLS, have served as a most efficient auxiliary. In addition to the various general and local home missionary societies, there have been missions to seamen in the ocean ports and along the inland waters of the nation, and also especially, since the extinction of slavery, to the freedmen of the South. Recently efficient missions have been established among the Chinese in California.

24. Mexico and Central America. — These countries were favorite fields of the Spanish Roman Catholic missionaries, and by them were pronounced Christianized at a comparatively early period in the settlement of America. The intermediate history of those countries, however, illustrates in a striking manner the defectiveness of that form of Christianization which contents itself with ceremonious conversion, and the exclusion of the Word of God from the people. Within a recent period, and more particularly since the extinction of the empire of Maximilian, there has been a reaction in favor of religious liberty, in consequence of which Protestant missions have been established in the city of Mexico, and in several of the more important provinces. The Scriptures in the Spanish language are now freely circulated throughout Mexico, and to some extent in the republics of Central America. The greatest obstacles to their influence on the public mind are found in the prevailing ignorance and superstition of the people. It may be hoped, however, that these will gradually pass away. See Robertson, History of America; Prescott, Conquest. of Mexico; History of the British and Foreign and American Bible Societies; Bishop Haven, Letters from Mexico; recent Reports of the American Christian Union, the Presbyterian Board, the American Board, and the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church; Crowe, Gospel in Central America, Honduras, and Guatemala; Griffin, Mexico of Today.

25. South America. — With the exception of Brazil, which was settled by the Portuguese, the several countries of South America were populated by colonies from Spain. The entire continent was long ago Christianized after the Roman Catholic type. It was in Paraguay, the centre of the continent,  that the Jesuits planted and developed the most remarkable mission known to their history, and yet by Roman Catholic power they were summarily expelled both from Paraguay and Brazil. The aboriginal races of South America have to some extent become mingled with the European and African races that have come to be occupants of their territory, but to a large extent they have declined in numbers, giving omen of ultimate extinction. The tribes that have been pronounced Christianized resemble in superstition and their low grade of intelligence the native races of Mexico, and their religious aspirations are equally hopeless. Most of the South American governments maintain a limited toleration, under which Protestant missions have been established in Guiana, Guatemala, Brazil, Montevideo, Buenos Ayres, Peru, and Chili. Most of these missions have met with encouraging success, which, although as yet on a limited scale, may prove the beginning of great results hereafter, especially in elevating the standard of Christianity hitherto prevailing in those vast regions. Pata- gonia is still wholly abandoned to a sparse population of cruel savages. An unsuccessful mission to them was attempted in 1848 by captain Allen Gardiner, of the English navy, and several associates. Nevertheless efforts for the evangelization of the Patagonians are still kept up by English Christians. See Robertson, History of America; Prescott, Conquest of Peru; Southey, History of Brazil; Kohl, Travels in Peru; Muratori, Missions in Paraguay; Bernan, Missionary Labors in British Guiana; Brett. Indian Missions in Guiana; Kidder, Sketches of Brazil; Reports of the Presbyterian Board and of the Methodist Episcopal Missionary Society; Marsh, Memoir of Captain Gardiner; Hamilton, Life of R. Williams.

26. West Indies. — The West India Islands are divided into three principal groups: 1, the Bahamas; 2, the Greater Antilles; 3, the Lesser Antilles. The population is estimated at about 3,400,000. Of these, about two thirds are negroes, one fifth white men, and the remainder mixed races. Through cruel oppression on the part of the early European emigrants to these islands, the native races, with a few exceptions, have long been extinct. To supply their place as laborers, African slaves were imported. The religion of the negroes was a mixture of idolatry. superstition, and fanaticism. Obeism and myalism, species of witchcraft, were commonly practiced. The first missionary efforts among the negroes were made by the Moravian Brethren in 1732. Since then the following missionary societies have entered the field: the Wesleyan, American Free Baptist, Propagation, Baptists American Missionary, London, Church, and United Presbyterian.  Since the abolition of slavery in 1838 the negroes have given increasing heed to the precepts and practices of Christianity, and thus secured a higher degree of moral improvement and social elevation. The most prosperous society, the Wesleyan, numbers 44,446 Church members. See Coke, History of the West Indies; Duncan, Wesleyan Mission to Jamaica; Phillippo, Jamaica, Past and Present; Samuel, Missions in Jamaica and Honduras; Horsford, Voice from the West Indies; Candler, Hayti; Knibb, Memoirs; Memoirs of Jenkins, Bradnack, and Mrs. Wilson; Trollope, West Indies.

27. Greenland and Labrador. — The arrival of Hans Egede on the shores of Greenland in 1721 marked an epoch in the history of modern missions, and the whole subsequent history of Moravian missionary effort among the inhabitants of Greenland and the coasts of Labrador is full of intense though sometimes of melancholy interest. In several instances both the missionaries and the people for whom they labored were decimated alike by disease and famine. But, notwithstanding all discouragements, the missionaries toiled on. By them it was effectually demonstrated that the one agency adapted to elevating degraded savages was the preaching of Christ and him crucified. By this appointed agency, first one and subsequently many of the Greenlanders were awakened and converted, after which civilization and education followed. From the original nucleus of Christian effort at Disco, Christianity has been effectively disseminated by missionary settlements in other parts of the island. Five such settlements are now occupied, and nearly two thousand souls are under the direct care of the missionaries. About one fifth of the population of West Greenland receive Christian instruction at the mission settlements, and there are scarcely any unbaptized Greenlanders on the whole west coast up to the seventy-second degree of north latitude. On the east coast the inhabitants are still heathen; but they are very few in number, and practically inaccessible to foreigners. The peninsula of Labrador is sparsely inhabited by Esquimaux, a race of natives similar in language and customs to the Greenlanders. To that land, therefore, the Moravians extended their efforts successfully in 1771, since which time they have been extending Christian influence by means of mission stations, of which there are now fourNain, Okak, Hopedale, and Hebron. At these stations thirty-five missionary agents are employed, and about twelve hundred natives are under Christian instruction. The Gospel has triumphed in frozen Labrador as well as in Greenland. See Crantz, History of Greenland; Egede, Greenland Mission;  Holmes, United Brethren; Histories of Moravian missions in Greenland and Iceland.

VIII. Missionary Geography. — From the above survey it may be seen that in an important sense the world is already occupied as the field of active missionary enterprise. A few brief statements of results accomplished by it during the current century may serve as a just indication of still greater results that may now be safely anticipated in time to come from its increasing and maturing agencies.

The mission to Tahiti in 1793-4 was the first attempt in modern times to carry the Gospel to an isolated and uncivilized people. It was commenced at a period when the greater heathen nations of the world were wholly inaccessible. In the islands of the southern seas, as upon a trial-ground, all the great problems of humanity have since been wrought out. The densest ignorance has been enlightened, the fiercest cannibalism has been confronted, the lowest conditions of humanity have been elevated, and the most abominable idolatries overthrown and substituted by a pure worship. The various languages and dialects of the islands of the Pacific have been committed to writing. Dictionaries, grammars, translations of the Scriptures, and many other books, have been printed and introduced to the daily use of the populations, a large proportion of whom have been taught by schools to read and write in their own languages. The civil condition of the various communities has also been improved by modifications of their laws and customs adapted to the new and improved state of public feeling and knowledge.

It is hardly possible for the processes of elevating nations from pagan barbarism to Christian civilization to be better stated than in the language of John Williams, the renowned missionary martyr of Erromanga. “I am convinced,” wrote he, forty years ago, “that the first step towards the production of a nation's temporal and social elevation is to plant among them the tree of life, when civilization and commerce will entwine their tendrils around its trunk, and derive support from its strength. Until the people are brought under the influence of religion they have no desire for the arts and usages of civilized life, but that invariably creates it.” “While the natives are under the influence of their superstitions, they evince an inanity and torpor from which no stimulus has proved powerful enough to  arouse them but the new ideas and the new principles imparted by Christianity. And if it be not already proved, the experience of a few more years will demonstrate the fact that the missionary enterprise is incomparably the most effective machinery that has ever been brought to operate upon the social, the civil, and the commercial, as well as the moral and spiritual interests of mankind.” At the present time the mission field of the South Sea Islands presents every variety of communities, from those of the coral islets, just emerging from barbarism and learning their first lessons of Christianity, to those that have been longest taught and most thoroughly tried by intercourse with the outer world, which has sometimes been as destructive as their original paganism. It has been thought by some that the first experiments of modern missions to the heathen were providentially directed to the small islands of Polynesia, among an impressible people, rather than to the great and ancient nations of India and China; that comparatively the easiest work was given to the churches at first, in the process of which they might solve the great problems of missionary measures and economies preparatory to the greater work awaiting them in larger and in some respects more difficult fields.

The marvellous rise and progress of civilization in Australia during the last half-century is largely due to missionary effort. Three generations ago there was not a civilized man on the Australian continent, nor in the adjacent islands of Tasmania and New Zealand. Now there are two millions of English-speaking Protestants, in the enjoyment of a good government, a free press, and all the immunities of liberty, education art, and commerce. The influence which the Australian colonies will eventually exert upon Polynesia and the Asiatic nations, from Japan to India, as well as upon the Indian Archipelago and New Guinea, cannot fail to be great. There is, moreover, every reason to hope that it may be both good and Christian. In no communities does there exist a greater desire for the spread of education and the circulation of sound literature. In Sydney, Melbourne, and Adelaide there are excellent public libraries. Whatever disadvantages were fastened upon those regions by the original plan and effort of England to populate them with transported criminals, have now been largely if not wholly counteracted. Indeed, it is asserted by English writers that there is on the whole a larger proportion of well-informed, educated people in the Australian colonies than among the same number of people in Great Britain, while the religious feeling is fully equal. The proportion of the  aboriginal population is now not only small, but, notwithstanding all influences, growing relatively less, so that the missionary activity of Australian Christians may be expected to seek fields in the surrounding countries in the midst of which they are placed.

As the voyage of Columbus, by which America was discovered, and many of the expeditions by which the New World was opened up to settlement, were in a certain sense missionary in their character, so from that day down to the present, missionary effort has been making geographical explorations, and increasing both the extent and thoroughness of geographical knowledge. Of this the expeditions and journeys of Livingstone in Africa are a striking proof and illustration. Moreover, the influence which missions have exerted, and are now more than ever promising to. exert over vast portions of the earth, renders the subject of missionary occupation in various countries one of peculiar interest. For a full illustration of this subject nothing less than a missionary map of the world is requisite; nevertheless, very suggestive indications are practicable on a condensed scale, like those herewith presented to the reader. Without any attempt to show the island world of the southern hemisphere, to which reference has been made above, a miniature outline of India is first introduced, followed by similar outlines of other important fields, to which, for lack of space, we cannot further allude.

It would be difficult, even with the largest map, to impress the mind adequately with the extent and importance of India. That ancient country embraces a territory twenty-three times as large as England, and, leaving out Russia and Scandinavia, equal in extent to all Europe. It contains twenty-one races and thirty-five nations, while its inhabitants speak fifty- one different languages and dialects. Its population, according to the census of 1872, is 237,552,958, of which number 191,300,000 are directly governed by-British rulers, and 46,250,000 by native governments dependent upon the British.

Notwithstanding some praiseworthy efforts to introduce the Gospel into India during the 18th century, all such efforts were opposed, and to a great extent neutralized, by the East India Company, which then practically ruled the country in the name of Great Britain. It was not till 1815 that toleration  was obtained for missions in India from the British Parliament. Since that period diligent efforts have been made, both by English and American Christians, to antagonize idolatry, and introduce Christian truth and worship by all appropriate means. Yet the government connection with idolatrous worship was not fully withdrawn till 1849.

A most interesting exhibit of the work and influence of missions in India may be found in a Parliamentary Blue-book ordered to be printed by the House of Commons, April 2, 1873. From it the following facts are abridged and copied:

“The Protestant missions of India, Burmnah, and Ceylon are maintained by 35 missionary societies, in addition to local agencies. They employ the services of 606 foreign missionaries. They occupy 522 principal stations and 2500 subordinate stations. A great impulse was given to these societies by the changes in public policy inaugurated by the charter of 1833, and since. that period the number of missionaries and the outlay on their missions have continued steadily to increase.”

Cooperation of Missionary Societies. — “This large body of European and American missionaries bring their various moral influences to bear upon the country with the greater force because they act together with a compactness which is but little understood. From the nature of their work, their isolated position, and their long experience, they have been led to think rather of the numerous questions on which they agree than of those on which they differ, and they cooperate heartily together. Localities are divided among them by friendly arrangements; and, with few exceptions, it is a fixed rule among them that they will not interfere with each other's converts and each other's spheres of duty. The large body of missionaries resident in each of the presidency towns form conferences, hold periodic meetings, and act together on public matters. They have frequently addressed the Indian government on important social questions involving the welfare of the native community, and have suggested valuable improvements in existing laws.”

Various Forms of Labors. — “The labors of the foreign missionaries in India assume many forms. Apart from their special duties as public- preachers and pastors, they constitute a valuable body of educators. They contribute greatly to the cultivation of the native languages and literature,  and all who are resident in rural districts are appealed to for medical help for the sick.”

Knowledge of the Native Languages. — “No body of men pays greater attention to the study of the native languages. The missionaries, as a body, know the natives of India well. They have prepared hundreds of works, suited both for schools and for general circulation, in the fifteen most prominent languages of India, and in several other dialects. They are the compilers of several dictioinaries and grammars; they have written important works on the native classics and the system of philosophy; and they have largely stimulated the great increase of the native literature prepared in recent years by native gentlemen.”

Mission Presses and Publications. — “The mission presses in India are 25 in number. During the ten years between 1862 and 1872 they issued 3410 new works in thirty languages. They circulated 1,315,503 copies of books of Scripture, 2,375,040 school-books, and 8,750,129 Christian books and tracts.”

Schools and Training Colleges. — “The missionary schools in India are chiefly of two kinds, purely vernacular and Anglo-vernacular. In addition to thee work of these schools, several missions maintain training colleges for their native ministers and clergy, and training institutions for teachers of both sexes. An important addition to the efforts made on behalf of female education is seen in the Zenana schools and classes, which are maintained and instructed in the houses of Hindu gentlemen. The great progress made in the missionary schools and the area they occupy will be seen from the following fact. They now contain 60,000 scholars more than they did twenty years ago. In 1872 the scholars numbered 142,952.”

Christian Communities. — “A very large number of the Christian communities scattered over India are small, and they contain severally fewer than a hundred communicants and three hundred converts of all ages. At the same time some of these small congregations consist of educated men, have considerable resources, and are able to provide for themselves. From them have sprung a large number of the native clergy and ministers in different churches, who are now taking a prominent place in the instruction and management of an indigenius Christian Church. Taking them together, the rural and aboriginal populations of India which have received a large share of the attention of the missionary societies now contain among them a quarter of a million native Christian converts.”  General Influence of Missions. — “The missionaries in India hold the opinion that the winning of these converts, whether in the city or in the open country, is but a small portion of the beneficial results which have sprung from their labors. No statistics can give a fair view of all that they have done. They consider that their distinctive teaching, now applied to the country for many years, has powerfully affected the entire population. The moral tone of their preaching is recognized and highly approved by multitudes who do not follow them as converts. Insensibly a higher standard of moral conduct is becoming familiar to the people; the ancient systems are no longer defended as they once were, many doubts are felt about the rules of caste, and the great festivals are not attended by the great crowds of former years. This view of the general influence of their teaching, and of the greatness of the revolution which it is silently producing, is not taken by missionaries only. It has been accepted by many distinguished residents in India and experienced officers of the government, and has been emphatically endorsed by the high authority of Sir Bartle Frere. Without pronouncing an opinion upon the matter, the government of India cannot but acknowledge the great obligation under which it is laid by the: benevolent exertions made by these six hundred missionaries, whose blameless example and self-denying labors are infusing new vigor into the stereotyped life of the great populations placed under English rule, and are preparing them to be in every way better men and better citizens of the great empire in which they dwell.” The following is the testimony of Sir Bartle Frere,, governor of Bombay: “I speak simply as to matters of experience and observation, and not of opinion — just as a Roman prefect might have reported to Trajan or the Antonines — and I assure you that, whatever you may be told to the contrary, the teaching, of Christianity, among the one hundred and sixty millions of civilized, industrious Hindus and Mohammedans in India is effecting changes, unmoral, social, and political, which, for extent and rapidity of effect, are far more extraordinary than anything you or your fathers have witnessed in .modern Europe.”

To the above may be fitly added the following similar authoritative testimonies:  “I believe, notwithstanding all that the English people have done to benefit India, the missionaries have done more than all other agencies combined.

“Lord LAWRENCE, viceroy and governor-general.”

“In many places an impression prevails that the missions have not produced results adequate to the efforts which have been made; but I trust enough has been said to prove that there is no real foundation for this impression, and those who hold such opinions know but little of the reality.  Sir DONALD M'LEOD, “Lieutenant-governor of the Punjaub.”

In the light of such competent and unequivocal testimony it would seem impossible for any reasonable mind to doubt the grandeur or the beneficence of the results accomplished by Christian missions during the current century, or to question their still greater promise in time to come. The above notices of missionary work in India may serve as a sample of similar testimony which might be adduced from various other countries. In nearly all cases the most that has been done is to be regarded as in a large measure preparatory to greater efforts and successes hereafter.

The great empire of China affords another remarkable example. That most populous country of all the earth had for ages maintained a rigid system of non-intercourse with the people of foreign nations, whom it indiscriminately stigmatized as outside barbarians. Until within a little more than thirty years all Christian efforts in behalf of China had to be made outside of the empire, or stealthily if within its borders. On the opening of the “Five Ports” to commerce in 1842 missions also entered, and, notwithstanding multiplied obstacles, have since made wonderful progress. Already there are 34,000 unative Christians in China. The principal great cities of the empire have become recognised centres of missionary effort, from Canton on the south to the old Tartar capital, Peking, on the north. What is perhaps most interesting of all is the demonstrated fact that, notwithstanding the peculiarities of the Chinese character, the power of the Gospel has proved itself adequate to its complete transformation and renewal after the New-Testament model. Many ministers of the Gospel have already been raised up. The native churches are also developing both the capacity and the disposition for self-support. Thus all the elements of a successful and progressive establishment of Christianity throughout the empire of China seem now to be happily at work.  In Japan a few recent years have witnessed extraordinary changes in favor of Christianity. Not less than 527 Protestant missionaries. of whom half are American, are now energetically but peacefully at work within the empire, from whose borders, owing to passions and prejudices, excited by the Jesuit missionaries of the 16th century, Christianity had long been excluded by the most barbarous decrees. Native churches have already been formed. and converted Japanese are becoming apostles to their countrymen, while a system of education, indirectly under Christian influence, promises to elevate the general intelligence and character of the nation at an early day. The old edicts against Christians, if not formally repealed, are practically set aside and a favorable sentiment towards Christianity has become very general in various grades of society.

In South Africa a mission was commenced by the Moravians as early as 1737; but it was withdrawn in 1744, and not effectively resumed till 1792. In 1798 the London Missionary Society entered the field, in 1812 the Wesleyan, and since various others. Although Hottentots and Kaffirs are not promising subjects for missionary influence, yet the Gospel, through missionary agency, has not been wanting in glorious triumphs among them, as well as other native tribes of South Africa, while it has made substantial progress among the Dutch and English colonists who now permanently occupy that portion of the African continent.

In 1815 the Church of England Missionary Society first turned its attention to the countries on the eastern border of the Levant. In 1819 the American Board commenced its work in the same regions. The missions in Greece, Turkey, and Persia have been mainly addressed to the nominal Christians of those lands. As a result, thousands have been converted, and a large number of evangelical congregations have been established both in European and Asiatic Turkey. Most interesting and promising also have been the results of the educational efforts made in connection with the Protestant missions in the Orient.

IX. General Missionary Literature. — Notwithstanding the numerous references in this article to books relating to the several fields of missionary effort through. out the world, the subject of missions as a whole would be but imperfectly delineated without allusion to its general literature, which embraces several classes of valuable works not heretofore named, and which can now be but briefly indicated.

1. General Histories of Missions, by Wiggers, Steger, Klumpp, Blumhardt, Brown, Callenburg, Clarkson, Huie, Choules and Smith, Pearson (Propagation of the Gospel).

2. Cyclopaedias, Gazetteers, etc. — Newcombe, Aikman, Hassel (Pole to Pole), Moister (Missionary World), Edwards (Gazetteer), Hoole (Year- book), Grundeman (Missions Atlas, Gotha, 1867-71); Bliss, Miss. Yearbook, 1890.

3. Histories of Missionary Societies. — Annales de la Propagation de la Foi; Lettres Edifiantes; Anderson, Hist. of the Colonial Church; Alder, Wesleyan Missions; Moister, Wesleyan Missions; Bost, Moravians; Cox, Baptist Missionary Society; Gammell, Baptist Missionary Society; Jubilee of the Church Missionary Society; Ellis, London Missionary Society; Kennett, Accounts of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel; Jubilee of the Religious Tract Society; Jubilee of the British and Foreign Bible Society; American Bible Society; Tracy, Hist. of the American Board; Strickland, American Methodist Missions; Green, Presbyterian Missions; Lowrie, Presbyterian Missions; Reid, Missions of the M.E. Ch.

4. Missionary Biographies. — Morison, Lives of the Fathers; Pierson, American Missionary Memorial; Tarbox, Missionary Patriots; Yonge, Pioneers and Founders; Eddy, Daughters of the Cross; Lives of Schwartz, Carey, Marshman, Coke, Morrison, Phillips, Shaw, Judson, Hall, and. many others.

5. Discussions of Missionary Principles. — Harris, Great Commission; Duff, Missions the Chief End of the Church: Hamilton, End and Aimn of Missions; Campbell, Philosophy of Missions; Kingsmill, Missions and Missionaries; Muller, On Missions, a lecture delivered at Westminster Abbey, December 3, 1873, with an introductory sermon by dean Stanley; Beecham, Christianity the Means of Civilization; Maitland, Prize Essay; Stowell, Missionary Church; Stowe, Missionary Enterprises; Wayland, Moral Dignity of Missions; Liverpool Conferences on Missions; Richard Watson, Sermons; Macfarlane, The World's Jubilee; Seelye, Chr. Missions; the addresses on Missions delivered at the New York meeting of the Evangelical Alliance; and many others. The following periodicals contain valuable articles on the subject of missions: English Rev. 7:42 sq.; 18:354 sq.; Western Rev. January 1855; July 1856; Christian Rev. 1:325 sq.; 2:449 sq.; 6:285; 10:566 sq.; volume 14 November; Amer. Bibl. Repository, 3d series, 4:453; 6:161 sq.; January 1867, page 58; Bibl.  Repos. and Princet. Rev. Oct. 1870, p. 613; New-Englander, 8:489; 9:207 Princet. Rev. 5:449; 10:535; 15:349; 1858, page 436; 17:61; 36, 324; July 1867; Christian Examiner, 1:182; 3:265, 449; 29, 51; 44, 416; Biblioth. Sacra, Oct. 1867; Brit. and For. Evangel. Rev. April, 1871; Evangel. Qu. Rev. October 1870, page 373; Meth. Qu. Rev. 7:269; 8:165 sq.; Baptist Qu. October 1873, art. 7; April 1874, art. 6; Theol. Medium, July 1873, art. 2; October art. 2; Catholic World, 1870, page 114. See also Malcom, Theol. Index, s.v.

6. Missionary Periodicals. — Their number is legion. Every country interested in missionary enterprises is publishing one or more. Germany, Engiand, and America have them by the score. Among the most valuable are the Missionary Chronicle (Lond.), the Missionary Magazine (Lond.), and the Missionary Herald (Boston); Missionary Review of the World (N.Y.); also Mission Life (Lond. 1866 sq.), a magazine consisting chiefly of readings on foreign lands with reference to the scenes and circumstances of mission life; the Basle Evang. Missions-Magazin (established in 1816); Burkhardt, Missions bibliothek. A General Missionary Periodical, a monthly, is just starting at Gutersloh, Germany. Its editors are Christlieb, Grundemann, and Warneck. It is to be published in English, and its contributors are to be of the world at large.

The above outline will serve at least as an indication of the great extent and value of a species of Christian literature which is obviously destined to increase in volume and in interest from year to year and from age to age. Whoever, by means of the authentic information now accessible, will acquire a full and just comprehension of the grand enterprise of missions, as it stands embodied in the active movements and growing successes of Christian missionaries and churches, can hardly fail to recognise with wonder and gratitude the rapid and substantial progress that is now made towards the fulfilment of the Saviour's great command, “Go teach all nations.” (D.P.K.).

## Misson, Francois Maximilien[[@Headword:Misson, Francois Maximilien]]

             an eminent French lawyer, distinguished himself by his pleadings before the Parliament of Paris in behalf of the Protestants during the persecution of the Huguenots in the 17th century. He retired to England on the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and afterwards travelled as tutor to an English nobleman. He published. A Voyage to Italy (3 volumes): — A Tour in England: — and Le Theatre sacre des Cevennes, in which the author  betrayed his credulity and fanaticism by espousing the cause of the French prophets. He died in London in 1701.

## Missy, Cesar De[[@Headword:Missy, Cesar De]]

             a writer of French parentage, was born June 2, 1703, at Berlin, and studied theology at Frankfort-on-the-Oder; but for his persistent refusal to sign the official formula of creed he was excluded from the ministry in Prussia. He went to Holland, where he allied with his duties of a minister the pursuits of a literary critic and poet. In 1731 he was appointed minister at the church of Savoy, London; in 1762, at St. James's Chapel. He died at London, August 10, 1775. His judgment was very good, his taste refined, and his love of study passionate. He numbered among his friends several distinguished men of learning, as Beausobre, Formey, Jordan. His rich library, together with his manuscripts, went to the library of the duke of Sussex. He left a work in verse, Paraboles ou fables et outres narrations d'un citoyen de la republique Chretienne du dix-huitieme siecle (Londres, 1769, 1770, 1776, 8vo): — Sermons sur divers textes (ibid. 1780, 3 volumes, 8vo). Missy was also one of the editors of the Bibliotheque Britannique, of the Journal Britannique, and of the Magasin Francais, of London. Other poetical productions and critical articles of his were published in the Mercure de France and in English newspapers.

## Mist[[@Headword:Mist]]

             (אֵד, ed, Gen 2:6) signifies a rising vapor, a fog, or cloud, which again distils upon the ground (Job 36:27). The Chaldee paraphrase renders it עננא, the cloud.

## Mistletoe[[@Headword:Mistletoe]]

             (Anglo-Sax. misteltan, Ger. mistel; the tan of the Anglo-Saxon name means a tine or prong, a shoot of a tree; mistel is of uncertain etymology, but probably the same, in meaning at least, as the Latin viscus), a genus (Viscumn) of small parasitical shrubs of the natural order Loranthacce. This order is exogenous, and contains more than four hundred known species, mostly tropical and parasites. The leaves are entire, almost nerveless, thick and fleshy, and without stipules. The flowers of many species are showy. The calyx arises from a tube or rim, which sometimes  assumes the appearance of a calyx, and is so regarded by many botanists; what others deem the colored calyx being viewed by them as a corolla of four or eight petals or segments. Within this are the stamens, as numerous as its divisions, and opposite to them. The ovary is one-celled, with a solitary ovule; the fruit one-seeded, generally succulent. The stems are dichotomous (i.e., divide by forking); the leaves are opposite, of a yellowish-green color, obovate-lanceolate, obtuse. The flowers are inconspicuous, and grow in small heads at the ends and in the divisions of the branches, the male and the female flowers on separate plants. The berries are about the size of currants, white, translucent, and full of a very viscid juice, which serves to attach the seeds to branches, where they take root when they germinate, the radicle always turning towards the branch, whether on its upper or under side. The mistletoe derives its nourishment from the living tissue of the tree on which it grows, and from which it seems to spring as if it were one of its branches.

Superstitious Use. — The mistletoe was intimately connected with many of the superstitions of the different branches of the Aryan race. In the Northern mythology, Baldur is said to have been slain with a mistletoe. Among the Celts the mistletoe which grew on the oak was in peculiar esteem for magical virtues. Traces of the ancient regard for the mistletoe still remain in some old English and German customs, as kissing under the mistletoe at Christmas. The British Druids are said to have had an extraordinary veneration for it, and that mainly because its berries as well as its leaves grow in clusters of three united to one stock, and, as is well known, they had a special veneration for the number three (comp. Vallancey, Grammar of the Irish Language). Stukeley (Medallic History of Carausius, 2:163 sq.), speaking of the Druids' festival, the Jul (q.v.), and the use of the mistletoe, relates as follows: “This was the most respectable festival of our Druids, called Yule-tide, when mistletoe, which they called all-heal (because used to cure disease),was carried in their hands, and laid on their altars, as an emblem of the salutiferous advent of Messiah... The custom is still preserved in the north, and was lately at York. On the eve of Christmas-day they carry mistletoe to the high altar of the cathedral, and proclaim a public and universal liberty, pardon, and freedom to all sorts of inferior and even wicked people at the gates of the city, towards the four quarters of heaven.” See Brand, Popul. Antiquities of Great Britain, 1:521-4.

## Mitakshara[[@Headword:Mitakshara]]

             is the name of several Sanscrit commentatorial works of the Hindus. One of these is a commentary on the text-book of the Vedanta philosophy; another, a commentary on the Mimansa work of Kumarila; a third, a commentary on the Brihadhranyaka, etc. SEE VEDA.

The most renowned work, however, bearing this title is a detailed commentary by Vijnaneswara (also called Vijnananatha) on the lawbook of Yajnavalkya (q.v.); and its authority and influence are so great that “it is received in all the schools of Hindi law from Benares to the southern extremity of the peninsula of India as the chief groundwork of the doctrines which they follow, and as an authority from which they rarely dissent” (comp. Two Treatises on the Hindu Law of Inheritance, translated by H.T. Colebrooke, Calcutta, 1810). Most of the other renowned law-books of recent date, such as the Smriti- Chandrika, which prevails in the south of India, the Chintamani, Vramitrodaya, and Mayukha, which are authoritative severally in Mithila, Benares, and with the Mahrattas, generally defer to the decisions of the Mitakshara; the Dayabhaga of Jimutavahana alone, which is adopted by the Bengal school, differs on almost every disputed point from the Mithkshara; and does not acknowledge its authority.

The Mitakshara, following the arrangement of its text-work, the code of Yajnavalkya, treats in its first part of duties in general; in its second, of private and administrative law; in its third, of purification, penance, devotion, and so forth; but, since it frequently quotes other legislators, expounding their texts, and contrasting them with those of Yajnavalkya, it is not merely a commentary, but supplies the place of a regular digest. The text of the Mitakshara has been edited several times in India. An excellent translation of its chapter On Inheritance was published by Colebrooke in the work above referred to; and its explanation of Yajnavalkya is also followed by the same celebrated scholar in his Digest of Hindu Law (Calcutta and London, 1801, 3 volumes).

## Mitchell, Alfred[[@Headword:Mitchell, Alfred]]

             a Congregational minister, was born May 22, 1790, at Wethersfield, Conn. He graduated at Yale College in 1809; was ordained pastor in Norwich October 1814; and died December 19, 1831. He published five occasional sermons. — Sprague, Annals, 2:601.

## Mitchell, Donald[[@Headword:Mitchell, Donald]]

             a Scotch missionary to India, flourished in the first half of our century. Of his early history nothing is known to us. He was the first missionary sent out by the Scottish Missionary Society. He settled at Bombay, where he labored with zeal, and saw his efforts crowned with much success. His plan was to convert the people by influencing the young, and, to secure their confidence, he established schools for their mental training. He succeeded in starting, in connection with his mission, eight schools, which were attended by some three thousand pupils. More filly to fit himself for the important work in which he was engaged, Mr. Mitchell mastered the difficult Morathi language. He preached to the people, not only in the immediate neighborhood of the station which he occupied, but also for many miles along the coast and in the interior, with very encouraging results for several years, till called to rest from his labors. See The Missionary World (N.Y. 1873, 12mo), page 493.

## Mitchell, Elisha, D.D[[@Headword:Mitchell, Elisha, D.D]]

             an American scientist in early years, and later a popular preacher, was born at Washington, Connecticut, August 19, 1793, and was educated at Yale College (class of 1813). From 1816-18 he taught in his alma mater. In 1817 he was elected professor of mathematics in the North Carolina University, whither he removed at once. In 1825 he was transferred to the chair of chemistry, and in this position he greatly distinguished himself. In 1831 he turned towards the ministry, was ordained by the Presbytery of Orange, and became noted as an able preacher and a good Biblical scholar. He died at Black Mountain, N.C., June 27, 1857. Dr. Mitchell contributed frequently to the Journal of Science.

## Mitchell, Jacob Duche, D.D[[@Headword:Mitchell, Jacob Duche, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, November 2, 1806. When eighteen years of age he entered the College of New Jersey, where he graduated in 1827, and in the same year went to Princeton Seminary and studied two years there. He was licensed to preach by the Oneida Presbytery, September 18, 1829; first labored in Albany, and was ordained as an evangelist, November 17 of the same year. He afterwards served at Shepherdstown, Martinsburg, and Smithfield, in Jefferson Co., Virginia. In this early period of his ministry, and for years following, when he labored far and wide in Virginia as a revival preacher, all testimonies agree that he exhibited extraordinary pulpit power. In 1832 he became pastor at Lynchburg, From 1835 to 1837 he served as secretary of the Central Board. of Foreign Missions for Virginia and South Carolina. In. 1858 he became pastor at Peaks, near Liberty, Virginia, where he labored for fourteen years, having very. great success in winning souls.. Next he went to Alexandria and labored as an evangelist in the Chesapeake Presbytery, and in 1873 and 1874 acted as general agent for Hampden Sidney College. He died June 28, 1877. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Semn. 1878, page 23.

## Mitchell, John[[@Headword:Mitchell, John]]

             a Congregational minister, editor, and author, was born at Chester, Connecticut, December 27, 1794; was educated at Yale College (class of 1821) and at Andover Theological Seminary; edited the Christian Spectator from 1824 to 1829; was then licensed to preach; in 1830 became pastor of the First Congregational Church in Fair Haven, Connecticut; and of the Edwards Church, Northampton, Massachusetts, in 1836. In 1842 he went abroad for his health, and after his return spent most of his remaining years at Stamford, Conn., engaged, as far as his strength allowed, in literary work. He died in April 1870. Mr. Mitchell published Principles and  Practice of the Congregational Churches of New England (Northampton, Mass., 1838, 16mo): — Notes from Over Sea (New York, 1844, 2 volumes, 8vo): — Letters to a Disbeliever in Revivals (32mo); and occasional sermons and contributions to periodicals and newspapers. See Sprague, Annals of the American Pulpit (see Index); Drake, Dict. of Amer. Biog. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Mitchell, John S., D.D[[@Headword:Mitchell, John S., D.D]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born on Block Island, R.I. in 1800. In his twenty-third year he entered the Genesee. Conference; from 1837 to 1842 was agent of the American Bible Society in Maryland; in 1850 was transferred to the New York East Conference, in which he took prominent appointments as. pastor and presiding elder; in 1864 was secretary of the Freedmen's Relief Association, and finally superintendent of missions in Virginia and North Carolina. He died at Newburgh, N.Y., September 16, 1882. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1883, page 93.

## Mitchell, John Thomas[[@Headword:Mitchell, John Thomas]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born near the village of Salem, Roanoke County, Virginia, August 20,1810, and enjoyed the advantages of a good common-school education. In 1817 the family moved to Illinois, and settled near Belleville, St. Clair County. At a conference campmeeting he was converted, and shortly after united with the Church, but afterwards became careless and indifferent. In 1830 he commenced teaching school. About the same time he was appointed assistant superintendent of the Sabbath-school, and becoming deeply impressed with a clear sense of duty, he entered the ministry, April 13, 1831, at Hillsborough. In 1832 he set out for Indianapolis, Indiana; in 1837 preached at Jacksonville Station, and in 1838-39 at Springfield. In 1840 he was transferred to Rock River Conference, and by the General Conference of 1344 was elected assistant book-agent of the Western Book Concern. He died May 30, 1851. Mr. Mitchell possessed great and growing powers, combining in a very marked manner social, intellectual, and moral qualities. He was well read in theology, and had an excellent knowledge of philosophy, mathematics, and the classic languages. See Annual Minutes of the N.E. Church, 1863, page 144.

## Mitchell, Jonathan[[@Headword:Mitchell, Jonathan]]

             a Presbyterian divine of note, was born in England in 1624. He came to this country in 1635. Jonathan was afforded all the advantages of education within reach. After due preparation, he was entered at Harvard College, and graduated in 1647. He was ordained at Cambridge, August 21, 1650, and settled as minister in that place. Soon after this president Dunstar embraced the principles of the Baptists. This was a peculiar trial to Mitchell; but, though he felt it to be his duty to combat the principles of his former tutor, he did it with such meekness of wisdom as not to lose his friendship. Mitchell's controversy resulted in the removal of president Dunstar from the college. In 1662 he was a member of the synod which  met in Boston to discuss and settle a question concerning Church- membership and Church discipline, and the report was chiefly written by him. The determination of the question relating to the baptism of the children of those who did not approach the Lord's table, and the support thus given to what is called the half-way covenant, was more owing to him than to any other man. SEE HALF-WAY COVENANT. Time has shown that the views which this good man labored so hard to establish on this point cannot be sustained without ruining the purity of the churches. Jonathan Mitchell was eminent for piety, wisdom, humility, and love. He possessed a retentive memory, and was a fervent and energetic preacher. He died July 9,1668. He published several letters and sermons, for which consult Justin Winsor's Catalogue of the Prince Library (Boston, 1870, royal 8vo). One Life, by C. Mather; Magnalia, 3:158-185; Hist. Soc. 7:23 27, 47-52. (J.H.W.)

## Mitchell, Orin[[@Headword:Mitchell, Orin]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Granville, Licking County, Ohio, January 18, 1809; was converted in 1829; licensed to preach in 1833; received on trial in the Ohio Annual Conference in 1834, and appointed to Danville Circuit. He travelled on Plymouth, Grand River, and Lapier circuits, in Michigan. In Ohio he received appointments to the station of Maumee and Perrysburgh; to the circuits of Portland, Mexico, Bucyrus, Norwich. Frederick, Clarksfield, Amity, Jeromeville, and Fairfield. In 1854 he took a superannuated relation, and died in August, 1869. Orin Mitchell excelled as a pastor, and his labors resulted in much good for the Christian cause.

## Mitchell, Samuel C[[@Headword:Mitchell, Samuel C]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Overton County, East Tennessee, April 20, 1806. He received a careful Christian training, early united with the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, and was soon after elected ruling elder. He subsequently left Tennessee and settled in Indiana, and, becoming deeply impressed with a call to the ministry, in 1841 he placed himself under the care of the Wabash Presbytery, and immediately commenced preparation for the ministry. He was licensed to preach in 1843, and ordained at Limestone, Indiana, in 1846. He died August 6, 1862. Mr. Mitchell was a plain, earnest, and impressive preacher. See Wilson, Presb Hist. Almanac, 1863, page 415.

## Mitchell, Thomas W[[@Headword:Mitchell, Thomas W]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, who labored as a missionary among the North American Indians, was born in Indiana April 15, 1816. His father removed to East Tennessee when Thomas was but two years old. Here he was educated. He professed religion in his eleventh year; joined the Methodist Episcopal Church; removed to Missouri, with his parents, in 1835; was licensed to preach in 18S7; admitted into the Missouri Conference the same year, and filled the following appointments: New Madrid Circuit in 1837, and Weberville Circuit in 1838. In 1840 he was located; removed to the Cherokee Nation in 1845, and taught a public school until 1846, when he was readmitted into the Indian Mission Conference. From that time to 1851 he filled different appointments, and was then appointed to preside. over the Creek District. In 1855 he was appointed superintendent of Fort Coffee and New Hope seminaries, and continued until 1858. Then he was transferred to the St. Louis Conference, where he labored until 1862. During the war-storm he retreated to Texas, and, after the opening of brighter days, in 1866 he entered the Trinity Conference, where he labored until 1869, when he took a superannuated relation. In 1871 he obtained a transfer and removed to the Indian Mission Conference, and was appointed presiding elder of the Creek District. He died in the midst of his work, March 17, 1872, in Ocmulgee, Creek Nation. See Minutes of Conferences, 1872, page 745.

## Mitchell, William B[[@Headword:Mitchell, William B]]

             a minister of the Methodist-Episcopal Church, was born in 1815. He was converted in 1843, and, though engaged in a lucrative business, turned aside to the ministry, to which he felt called of God. In 1845 he was licensed to preach; in 1846 was stationed at the Delaware Mission, Delaware County, N.Y., under his presiding cider; in 1847 joined the New York Conference, and was successively appointed to Windham, Lexington, Jefferson, Prattsville, and Kortright circuits, and subsequently to Coxsackie and Hyde Park stations. He died October 27, 1858. “His life was useful and consistent; his zeal for the interests of the Church untiring; his anxiety for the salvation of souls earnest and abiding.” See Smith, Sacred Memories (N.Y. 1870), page 99 sq.

## Mitchell, William H., D.D[[@Headword:Mitchell, William H., D.D]]

             an American divine and educator of the Presbyterian communion, was born September 7, 1812, at Monoghan, Ireland. His early training he received in his native town, and even then distinguished himself by superior abilities and unwearied application. In his early manhood he was a practitioner in law. In his twenty-seventh year, a little more than a year after his marriage, he came to this country, and settled at Montgomery, Alabama. For a number of years after this he was engaged as teacher. In 1843 he was licensed to preach by the presbytery of East Alabama, and shortly after he was installed pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Wetumpka, Alabama. Possessing abilities of a high order, and being in all respects exemplary and pious, faithful, untiring, and devoted to his ministerial and pastoral duties, he enjoyed the confidence and esteem of all who knew him. In August, 1850, Mitchell removed to Florence, Alabama, and became the pastor of the church in that place. He remained in this pulpit till June 1871, when the onerous and accumulating duties and cares of the Synodical Female College of that place, of which he had become president, in connection with his pastoral responsibilities, rendered it necessary that he should devote himself more entirely to the care and interests of the college. He died October 3, 1872, after having held the presidency of the synodical college for over sixteen years. Personally, Dr. Mitchell was a finelooking man, rather low of stature, pleasing in his address, and courteous and dignified in his deportment; sometimes grave and serious, and at other times humorous and entertaining. When among his most intimate acquaintances and friends, he was free and unreserved, and abounded in anecdote and wit. In ecclesiastical bodies he was usually a calm and quiet listener, speaking but seldom, and modest and diffident in advancing his opinions, but always wise, prudent, and conservative, yet decided and firm in his convictions. His sermons were written with care, and preached almost always from his manuscript; but his delivery was fluent and easy, and his oratory, without very much action, was earnest, solemn, tender, and impressive. See Memphis Presbyterian, November 9, 1872. (J.H.W.)

## Mitchell, William Luther[[@Headword:Mitchell, William Luther]]

             a Presbyterian minister. was born in Maury County, Tennesee, July 11, 1828; was converted at the age of twelve; graduated in 1854, with honor, at Jefferson College, Pennsylvania, and in 1857 at Princeton Theological Seminary; was licensed in 1857 by the presbytery of Lafayette, Missouri; in  1857 and 1858 supplied the First Presbyterian Church, Burlington, Iowa; and in 1859 was ordained and installed pastor of the church at Hillsborough, Illinois, where he died, February 23, 1864. Mr. Mitchell was a minister of more than ordinary ability and attainments. As a Christian, his life was religion exemplified; as a preacher, he was earnest and instructive, and often eloquent and impressive. His sermons were doctrinal, and at the same time intensely practical. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1864, page 102.

## Mitchell, William W[[@Headword:Mitchell, William W]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Virginia February 16, 1815. He was educated with a view to the legal profession, and was afforded the best advantages within reach. While a student at Yale he was converted, and he became convinced that his place was in the pulpit. After much opposition at home, he joined the Illinois Conference in 1834, and was appointed to Lebanon Circuit, where he continued about six months, and was then removed to Vandalia Station. He afterwards filled many important appointments on circuits, stations, and districts, all in Illinois, except one year in Kentucky. William W. Mitchell was a good rather than a great preacher. His last appointment was to Edwardsville Station. During his second year in this station he became severely afflicted, so as to disqualify him for pulpit labors. He consequently resigned his charge and removed to Richview, Illinois, where, after severe suffering for almost a year, he died, March 7, 1869. See Minutes of Conferences, 1869, page 204.

## Mite[[@Headword:Mite]]

             is the rendering in the Auth. Vers. (Luk 12:59; Luk 21:2; Mar 12:42) of the Greek term λεπτόν (thin, like a scale), a minute coin (Alciphr. 1:9; Pollux, On. 9:92), of bronze or copper (see Smith's Dict. of Class. Antiq. s.v. AEs), two of which made a quadrans (Mar 12:42), and which was, therefore, the eighth part of the Roman as, i.e., equal originally to a little over one mill, but in the time of Christ about half a mill. At Athens it was reckoned as one seventh of the χαλκοῦς (Suidas, s.v.). From Mark's explanation, “two mites, which make a farthing” (λεπτὰ δύο, ὅ ἐστι κοδράντης, Mar 12:42), it may perhaps be inferred that the κοδράντης or “ farthing” was the commoner coin, for it can scarcely be supposed to be  there spoken of as a money of account, though this might be the case in another passage (Mat 5:26). SEE FARTHING.

Cavedoni (Bibl. Num. 1:76) has supposed that Mark meant to say “one lepton was of the value of one quadrans,” for had he intended to express that two of the small pieces of money were equal to a quadrans, then he must have writtenἄ ἐστι instead of ὅ ἐστι κοδράντης; and the Vulg. has also translated quod est, but not quce sunt. This argument, however, is too minute to be of much force. Another argument adduced is that the words of our Lord in the parallel passages of Matthew (5:26) and Luke (Luk 12:59) prove that the quadrans is the same as the lepton. In the former passage the words are ἔσχατον κοδράντην, and in the latterἔσχατον λεπτόν. This argument, again, hardly merits an observation, for we might as well assume that because we say such a thing is not worth a penny, or not worth a farthing, therefore the penny and the farthing are the same coin. A third argument, deemed by Cavedoni to be conclusive, assumes that the quadrans only weighed 30 grains, and that if the quadrans equalled two lepta, there would be coins existing at the time of our Savior of the weight of 15.44 grains. This argument is sufficiently answered by the fact that there are coins of the ethnarch Archelaus and of the emperor Augustus struck by the procurators weighing so low as 18 to 15 grains, and by comparing them with others of the same period a result can be obtained proving the existence in Judaea of three denominations of coinage — the semis, the quadrans, and the lepton. There is no doubt that the lepton was rarely struck at the time of the evangelists. yet it must have been a common coin from the time of Alexander II to the accession of Antigontis (B.C. 69-B.C. 40), and its circulation must have continued long in use. The extreme vicissitudes of the period may only have allowed these small copper coins to be struck. They were formerly attributed to Alexander Jannseus, but are now given to Alexander II. They average in weight from 20 to 15 grains. SEE MONEY.

It may be as well to notice that Schleusner (Lex. N.T. s.v. κοδράντης), after Fischer, considers the quadrans of the N.T., of which the lepton was the half, not to have equalled the Roman quadrans, but to have been the fourth of the Jewish as. The Jewish as is made to correspond with the half of the half-ounce Roman as, and as, according to Jewish writers, the פרקטהor פרוטהwas the eighth part of the assar, or Jewish as (Buxtorf, Lex. Talm. s.v. אסיר), and as the evangelists have understood this word  פרוטהto be the lepton, it follows that the quadrans equalledδύο λεπτά. This theory, however, is quite out of the question, and a comparison of the coins of Judaea with those struck at Rome clearly proves that the quadrans in Judesa was the same as the quadrans in Rome. Moreover, as the Romans ordered that only Roman coins, weights, and measures should be used in all the provinces of the Roman empire (Dion. Cass. 52:20), it is certain that there can have been no Jewish as or Jewish quadrans, and that all the coins issued by the Jewish princes, and under the procurators, were struck upon a Roman standard (F.W. Madden, Hist. of Jewish Coinage and of Money in O.T. and N.T. pages 296-302),

## Mitelli, Giuseppi-Maria[[@Headword:Mitelli, Giuseppi-Maria]]

             a noted Italian painter, was born at Bologna in 1634. He received instruction from his father, who was an eminent fresco painter of Bologna, and afterwards entered the school of Flaminio Torre. He painted a number of works for the churches of Bologna, among which may be mentioned St. Reniero healing the sick, in S. Maria della Vita, a Pieta, in the Nunziato, and Christ taken in the Garden, at the Cappuccini, He was more distinguished as an engraver, and etched a number of plates of the most celebrated masters, as well as many of his own designs — among the latter the set of twenty-six plates illustrating the Twenty-four. Hours of Human Felicity. Bartsch has credited him with one hundred and sixty-two prints, but Nagler increases the list. He died in 1718. See Lanzi's History of Painters, transl. by Roscoe (Lond. 1847, 3 volumes, 8vo), 3:138; Spooner, Biog. History of the Fine Arts (N.Y. 1865, 2 volumes, 8vo), 2:569.

## Mithcah[[@Headword:Mithcah]]

             (Heb. Mithkah', מַתְקָה, sweetness, prob. of the water found there; Sept. Μαθεκκά), the twentyninth station of the Israelites in the desert, between Tarah and Hashmonah (Num 33:28-29); perhaps at the intersection of Waly el-Ghamr with Wady el-Jerafeh. SEE EXODE.

## Mithnite[[@Headword:Mithnite]]

             (Heb. Mithni', מַתְנַי, patronymic or gentile apparently from מֶתֶן, Me'then, firmness; Sept. Μαθθανί v.r. Βαιθανί, Vulg. Mathanites, as if from מִתָּן, Mat'tan), an epithet of Joshaphat, one of David's body-guard (1Ch 11:43); either from his ancestor or native place, of neither of  which, however, is there any other mention, or further means of determination.

## Mithra or Mithras[[@Headword:Mithra or Mithras]]

             (Greek Μίθρας; Sanscrit Mitra or Mitras), the highest of the twenty-eight second-class divinities of the ancient Persian Pantheon, is generally regarded as the chief of the Izeds (Zend. Yazata), the ruler of the universe. He is spoken of as the god of the sun; but he is more properly the god of day, and, in a higher and more extended sense, the god of light, presiding over the movements and influence of the principal heavenly bodies, including the five planets of the sun and moon. The primary signification of the word Mitra is a friend, and Mithra would therefore convey the representation of light as the friend of mankind, and as the mediator (μεσίτης) between heaven and earth. Protector and supporter of man in this life, he watches over his soul in the next, defending it against the impure spirits, and transferring it to the realms of eternal bliss. He is all- seeing and allhearing, and, armed with a club-his weapon against Ahriman and the evil Devs — he unceasingly “runs his course” between heaven and earth. In this character of mediator, as well as in some other respects, he would seem to approach the character of Agni.

From Persia the cultus of Mithra and the mysteries were imported into Asia Minor, Syria, Palestine, etc., and it is not unlikely that in some parts human sacrifices were connected with this worship. In the days of the emperors the worship of Mithra found its way into Rome, and thence into the different parts of the Roman empire, and the mysteries of. Mithra (Hierocoracica, Coracica Sacra), which fell in the spring equinox, became famous seven among the many Roman festivals. The ceremonies observed in the initiation to these ministries — symbolical of the struggle between Ahriman and Ormuzd (the Good and the Evil) — were of the most extraordinary and, to a certain degree, even dangerous character. Baptism and the partaking of a mystical liquid, consisting of flour and water, to be drunk with the utterance of sacred formulas, were among the inaugurative acts. The seven degrees — according to the number of the planets — were, 1, Soldiers;, 2, Lions (in the case of men) or Hyenas (in that of women); 3, Ravens; 4, Degree of Perses; 5, of Orominios; 6, of Helios; 7, of Fathers — the highest who were also called Eagles and Hawks. At first of a merry  character — thus the king of Persia was allowed to get drunk only on the Feast of the Mysteries — the solemnities gradually assumed a severe and rigorous aspect. Through Rome, where this worship, after many vain endeavors, was finally suppressed in A.D. 378, it may be presumed that it found its way into the west and north of Europe; and many tokens of its former existence in Germany are still to be found, for instance, such as the Mithra monuments at Heidenheim, near Frankfort-on-the-Main, and at other places.

Among the Persians Mithra is pictured as a young man, clothed with a tunic and a Persian cloak, and having on his head a Persian bonnet or tiara. He kneels upon a prostrate bull, and while holding it with the left hand by the nostrils, with the right he plunges into the shoulder a short sword or dagger. The bull is at the same time vigorously attacked by a dog, a serpent, and a scorpion. The ancient monuments represent him as a beautiful youth, dressed in Phrygian garb, kneeling upon an ox, into whose neck he plunges a knife; several minor, varying, allegorical emblems of the sun and his course surrounding the group. At times he is also represented as a lion, or the head of a lion. The most important of his many festivals was his birthday, celebrated on the 25th of December, the day subsequently fixed — against all evidence — as the birthday of Christ. In the early days of the Church it was not an uncommon occurrence to find an apologist of the inspired teacher laying undue stress on some points of resemblance between Mithraism and Christianity, and thus the triumphant march of the latter was much retarded. In modern times Christian writers have been again induced to look favorably upon the assertion that some of our ecclesiastical usages (e.g. the institution of the Christmas festival) originated in the cultus of Mithraism. Some writers, who ‘refuse to accept the Christian religion as of supernatural origin, have even gone so far as to institute a close comparison with the founder of Christianity; and Dupuis and others, going even beyond this, have not hesitated to pronounce the Gospel simply a branch of Mithraism. The ablest reply to these theories we have from Creuzer and Hardwick.

Among the chief authorities on this subject are Sainte-Croix, Recherches historiques et critiques sur les mysteres du paganisme, edited by Sylvestre de Sacy (Paris, 1817); Burnouf, Sur le Yaena, page 351 sq.; Lajard, Recherches sur le culte public et les mysteres de Mithra (Paris, 1847-8); O. Muiller, Denkmaler d. alten Kunst; Creuzer, Mythologie u. Symbolik (2d ed.), 1:238, 261, 341, 714 sq.; id. Das Mithreum (Heidelb. 1838);  Schwenk, Mythologie der Perser (Frankf. 1850); Seel, Die Mithrasgeheimnisse (Aarau, 1823); Hammer, Mithriaka (Vienna, 1834); Dupuis, Origine de tos le cultes, 1:37; Hardwick, Christ and other Masters, 2:431-438. SEE PARSEES; SEE ZENDAVESTA.

## Mithredath[[@Headword:Mithredath]]

             (Heb. Mithredath', מַתְרְדָת, from the Pers. given by Mithras, see Gesenius, Thesaur. Heb. page 832, and comp. the Gr. form of the name Μιθριδάτης, Lat. Mithridates; Sept. Μιθριδάτης and Μιθραδάτης), the name of two Persian officers after the exile.

1. The “treasurer” (גַּזְבָּר) of king Cyrus, commissioned by him to restore the sacred vessels of the Temple to Sheshbazzar, the Jewish chief (Ezr 1:8). B.C. 536.

2. One of the governors of Samaria, who wrote to king Artaxxerxes, or Smerdis, charging the Jews with rebellious designs in rebuilding Jerusalem (Ezr 4:7). B.C. 522.

## Mithridates[[@Headword:Mithridates]]

             (Μιθριδάτης or Μιθραδάτης), the Grecized form (a. 1Es 2:11; b. 1Es 2:16) of the Heb. name MITHREDATH SEE MITHREDATH (q.v.)

## Mithrion[[@Headword:Mithrion]]

             a temple of Mithras, the Persian sungod.

## Mitre[[@Headword:Mitre]]

             is the rendering in the Auth. Vers. of the Hebrew word מַצְנֶפֶת. (mitsne'pheth, something rolled around the head), spoken especially of the turban or head-dress of the high-priest (Exo 28:4; Exo 28:37; Exo 28:39; Exo 29:6; Exo 39:28; Exo 39:31; Lev 8:9; Lev 16:4; for its form, see Josephus, Ant. 3:7, 3; Braun, De Vestitu sacerd. Heb. page 624 sq.; Toppffer, De tiaris summi et ninorum sacerdotum,, Vitemb. 1722; Funcke, De tiara pontif. Ebr. Gies. 1728), once of a royal crown (“diadem,” Eze 21:26); also צָנַי(tsaniph', from the same root), spoken of a tiara or head-band, e.g. of men (Job 29:14, “diadem”), of women (Isa 3:23, “hood”), of the highpriest (Zec 3:5), and once of the king (Isa 62:3, “diadem,” where the text has צָנוֹ or צָנוּ). SEE BONNET; SEE CROWN; SEE PRIEST.  MITRE is the name given also to the head-dress worn in solemn Church services by the pope, the bishops, abbots, and certain other prelates of the Church of Rome. The name, as probably the ornament itself, is borrowed from the Orientals, although, in its present form, it is not in use in the Greek , Church, or in any other of the churches of the various E astern rites. The Western mitre is a tall, tongue-shaped cap, terminating in a twofold point, which is supposed to symbolize the “cloven tongues,” in the form of which the Holy Ghost was imparted to the apostles, and is furnished with two flaps, which fall behind over the shoulders.

Opinion is much divided as to the date at which the mitre first came into use. Eusebius, Gregory of Nazianzum, Epiphanius, and others speak of an ornamented head-dress worn in the church; but there is no very early monument or pictorial representation which exhibits any head-covering at all resembling the modern mitre. A statue of St. Peter, said to have been erected in the seventh century, bears this mark of distinction in the shape of a round, high, and pyramidal mitre, such as those which the popes have since worn, and offers, perhaps, one of the earliest instances of its usage in churches. The most ancient mitres were very low: and simple, being not more than from three to six inches in elevation, and they thus continued till the end of the thirteenth century. Since the 9th century the mitre is found to have been in use quite extensively. From the time of Leo IX until Innocent IV the mitre was worn by cardinals, and instances are recorded in which the popes granted permission to certain bishops to wear the mitre; as, for example, Leo IV to Anschar, bishop of Hamburg, in the ninth century. In the fourteenth century, when the mitre-had come into general use, they gradually increased in height to a foot or more, and became more superbly enriched; their outlines also presented a degree of convexity by which they were distinguished from the older mitres..

The mitre, as an ornament, seems to have descended in the earliest times from bishop to bishop. Among the Cottonian MSS. is an order, dated July 1, 4 Henry VI, for the delivery to archbishop Chichely of the mitre which had been worn by his predecessor. It was in some cases a very costly ornament. Archbishop Pecheham's new mitre, in 1288, cost £173 4s. 1d. The material used in the manufacture of the mitre is very various, often consisting of the most costly stuffs, studded with gold and precious stones. The color and material differ according to the festival or the service in which the mitre is used, and there is a special prayer in the consecration service of bishops, used in investing the new bishop with his mitre.. The  mitre of the pope is of peculiar form, and is generally called by the name of tiara (q.v.). There are four different mitres which are now used by the pope. These are more or less richly adorned, according to the nature of the festivals on which they are to beworn. The two horns of the mitre are generally taken to be an allusion to the cloven tongues of fire which rested on each of the apostles on the day of Pentecost.

At first the mitre was by special favor conferred on certain bishops; gradually it became the common right of every bishop to wear the mitre, and later its use was also permitted by special privilege to certain abbots, to provosts of some distinguished cathedral chapters, and to a few other dignitaries. (Compare Walcott, Archceology, p. 383 sq.; Binterim, Denkwiirdigkeiten der Kirche, 1, part. 2, page 348).

In some of the Lutheran churches (as in Sweden) the mitre is worn; but in the Church of England, since the Reformation, the mitre is no longer a part of the episcopal costume; it is simply placed over the shield of an archbishop or bishop instead of a crest. The mitre of a bishop has its lower rim surrounded with a fillet of gold; but the archbishops of Canterbury and York are in the practice of encircling theirs with a ducal coronet, a usage of late date and doubtful propriety. The bishop of Durham surrounds his mitre with an earl's coronet, in consequence of being titular count palatine of Durham and earl of Sedburgh. Before the custom was introduced of bishops impaling the insignia of their sees with their family arms, they sometimes differenced their paternal coat by the addition of a mitre.

## Mittarelli, Nicolas-Jacques[[@Headword:Mittarelli, Nicolas-Jacques]]

             (also known as JEANBENOIT) an Italian theologian and bibliographer, and a learned historian, was born at Venice September 2, 1707. At an early age he entered the order of the Camaldulcs, and prosecuted his theological studies at Florence and at Rome, where he secured the friendship of the cardinal Rezzonico, subsequently Clement XIV. Appointed to the professorship of philosophy, and afterwards to that of theology, in the convent of Saint-Michel, at Murano, near Venice, Mittarelli banished from his teaching the scholastic method, and all the idle questions to which it gives rise. Nine years later he was sent to Treviso as confessor to the monastery of Saint-Parisio; here he was occupied in arranging the archives of that house, acquired a taste for ecclesiastical antiquities, and gave himself to researches in this direction. His nomination in 1747 to the office of chancellor of his order gave him the opportunity of visiting the libraries  and archives of a great number of convents. He then conceived the idea of writing a history of his congregation. The renown. which this well- executed enterprise gained for him caused his election in 1760 as abbot of the convent of Saint-Michel at Murano. and in 1765 as general of his order. In 1770 he resumed the government of the monastery of Saint- Michel, which he kept until his death. He died August 14, 1777. Endowed with a prodigious memory and a nice critical sense, Mittarelli acquired a thorough knowledge of Italian ecclesiastical history. To all the virtues he united an exemplary modesty, which manly times caused him to refuse the honors offered him. From his pen we have Memnoie della vida di S.Parisio, monaco Camaldolesee del monastero de SS.-Cristina e Parisio di Treviso (Venice, 1748, 8vo): —Memorie del monastero delta S.- Trinita di Faenza (Faenza, 1749, 8vo): — Annales Camaldulenses, quibus plura inseruntur tumn cceteras Italico-monzasticas res, tum historiam ecclesiasticam remque diplomaticam illustrantia (Venice, 1755-1773, 9 volumes, fol.); this important work, drawn up after the model of the Annales ordinis. S.-Benedicti of Mabillon, extends to the year 1764: — Ad Scriptores rerum Italicarum Cl. Muratorii accessiones historiae Faventinae (Venice, 1771, fol.): De Litteratura Faventinorum (Venice, 1775, fol.): Bibliotheca codicum manuscriptorum monasterii S. Michaelis de Muriano Venetiarum, cum appendiae librorum impressorum saeculi xv (Venice, 1769, fol.). See Fabroni, Vitae Italorum; Tipaldo, Biographia degli Italiani illustri, 10:140; Jagemann, Magazin der italianischen Literatur, volume 4; Hirsching, Histor.-liter. Handbuch.

## Mitternacht, Johann Sebastian[[@Headword:Mitternacht, Johann Sebastian]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Hardesleben, in Thuringia, March 30, 1613. He studied at Jena and Wittenberg, and was in 1638  pastor at Teutleben, Thuringia. In 1642 he was rector at Naumburg, in 1646 at Gera, and died February 25, 1679. He wrote, Gramnmatica Ebraea: — De Nativitatis Domini Anno, Mense ac Die: — Nota Philologicae, Theologicae, Chronologicae et Historicae in Fabricii Historiam Sacram: — De Abrahami Nomine et Patria Ur: — De Tempore et loco Effusionis Spiritus Sancti ad Actor. 2:1. — Explicatio Philologica Dicti ex Pro 22:15 : — Διάσκεψις Philologica Jobi 23:11, 12: — Item in Loacum ad Hebraceos cap. 13:7. See Witte, Diarium; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Mitylene[[@Headword:Mitylene]]

             (Μιτυλήνη, Act 20:14; written also Mytile'ne, Μυτιλήνη, which is the older and more accurate form [see Tzchucke, ad Mel. II, 2:484 ; of uncertain etymology), the capital of the isle of Lesbos (Ptolemy, 4:2, 29), in the AEgean Sea, about seven and a half miles from the opposite point on the coast of Asia Minor. It was a well-built town, with two harbors, but unwholesomely situated (Vitruvius, De Architect. 1:6). It was the native place of Pittacus, Theophanes, Theophrastus, Sappho, Alcaeus, and Diophanes, and was liberally supplied with literary advantages (Strabo, 13:617; Senec. Helv. 9; Pliny, 5:37; comp. Veil. Paten. 2:18). The town was celebrated for the beauty of its buildings (“ Mitlene pulchra,” Horace, Epist. I, 11:17; see Cicero, Rull. 2:16). It had the privileges of a free city  (Pliny, N.H. 5:39). The apostle Pal touched at Mitylene overnight between Assos and Chios, during his third apostolical journey, on the way from Corinth to Judaea (Act 20:14). It may be gathered from the circumstances of this voyage that the wind was blowing from the N.W. , and it is worth while to notice that in the harbor or in the roadstead of Mitylene the ship would be sheltered from that wind. Moreover, it appears that Paul was there at the time of dark moon, and this was a sufficient reason for passing the night there before going through the intricate passages to the southward (see Conybeare and Howson's Life of St. Paul, 2:210). It does not appear that any Christian Church was established at this place in the apostolic age. No mention is made of it in ecclesiastical history until a late period; and in the 2d century heathenism was so rife in Mitylene that a man was annually sacrificed to Dionysus. In the 5th, 6th, 7th, and 8th centuries, however, we find bishops of Mitylene present at several councils (Magdeburg, Hist. Eccles. Cent. 2:195; 5:6; 6:6; 7:4, 253, 254; 8:6). Mitylene still exists, under the designation of Metelin, and has given its name, in the form of Miftilni, to the whole island; but it is now a place of no importance (Tournefort, Trav. 2:115; Olivier, Voyage, 2:93; Sonnini, Travels in Greece, page 366). The town contains about 700 Greek houses, and 400 Turkish; its streets are narrow and filthy (Turner, Tours the Levant, 3:299). See, generally, Pauly's Realencyklop. 5:372 sq.; Anthon's Class. Dict. s.v.; Smith's Dict. of Class. Geography, s.v.; M'Culloch's Gazetteer, s.v.

## Mixed Marriages[[@Headword:Mixed Marriages]]

             i.e., marriages between Jews and Gentiles, were strictly prohibited by the Mosaic law. The New Testament, if it be thought to contain no positive prohibition of the intermarriage of Christians and heathens, yet, to say the least, strongly represents such a proceeding as inconsistent with a Christian profession (1Co 7:39; 2Co 6:14). The early fathers denounced the practice as dangerous and even criminal (Tertullian, Ad. Uxor. lib. 2:c. 2-9; De Coron. Mil. c. 13; Cyprian, Ad Quirin, lib. 3:c. 62; Ambrolius, De Abrahanmo, lib. 1:c. 9; Ep. lib. 9, ep. 70; De Fide et Oper. c. 19; Jerome, In Jovin. lib. 1:c. 10); and it was afterwards positively prohibited by the decrees of councils and the laws of the empire (Conc. Chalced. c. 14; Arelat. 1.c. 11; Illiberit. 15,16,17; Aurelian, 2, c. 18; Cod. Justin. lib.i, tit. 9, 1, 6; Cod. Theodos. lib. 3, tit. 7,1, 2; lib. 9, tit. 7, 1, 5; lib. 16, tit. 8, 1, 6). These prohibitions extended to the marriage of Christians with Jews, Pagans, Mohammedans, and certain heretics, namely  those whose baptism was not admitted as valid by the Church. The first interdiction of marriage with heretics on record is one which was made about the middle of the fourth century (Cone. Laodic. c. 10, 31; see also Conc. Agath. c. 67; Chalced. c. 14). It does not appear that such marriages, although prohibited, were declared null and void whenever they had actually taken place; and we read of some illustrious examples of the breach of the rule, as in the case of Monica, the mother of Augustine (Augustine, Confess. lib. 9, c. 9), and Clotildis, the. queen of Clovis (Gregorius Turon. His. Fraanc. lib. 2, c. 28), who became instrumental in the conversion of their respective husbands to Christianity. See Riddle, Christ. Antiquities, pages 745-749. SEE DIVORCE; SEE MARRIAGE.

## Mixed Multitude[[@Headword:Mixed Multitude]]

             (עֵרֶב, e'aeb;' Sept. ἐπίμικτος, Vulg. promiscuum), the designation of a certain class who went with the Israelites as they journeyed from Rameses to Succoth, the first stage of the exodus from Egypt (Exo 12:38). In the Targum the phrase is vaguely rendered “many foreigners,” and Jarchi explains it as “a medley of outlandish people.” Aben-Ezra goes further, and says it signifies “the Egyptians who were mixed with them, and they are the ‘mixed multitude' (אֲסִפְסוּ, Num 11:4) who were gathered to them.” Jarchi, on the latter passage, also identifies the “mixed multitude” of Numbers and Exodus. During their residence in Egypt marriages were naturally contracted between the Israelites and the natives, and. the son of such a marriage between an Israelitish woman and an Egyptian is especially mentioned as being stoned for blasphemy (Lev 24:11), the same law holding good for the resident or naturalized foreigner as for the native Israelite (Jos 8:35). This hybrid race is evidently alluded to by Jarchi and Aben-Ezra, and is most probably that to which reference is made in Exodus. Knobel understands by the “mixed multitude” the remains of the Hyksos who left Egypt with the Hebrews. Dr. Kalisch (Comm. on Exo 12:38) interprets it of the native Egyptians who were involved in the same oppression with the Hebrews by the new dynasty, which invaded and subdued Lower Egypt; and Kurtz (Hist. of Old Cov. 2:312, Eng. tr.), while he supposes the “mixed multitude” to have been Egyptians of the lower classes, attributes their emigration to their having “endured .the same oppression as the Israelites from the proud spirit of caste which prevailed in Egypt,” in consequence of which they attached themselves to the Hebrews, “and served henceforth as hewers of wood and drawers of  water.” That the “mixed multitude” is a general term including all those who were not of pure Israelitish blood is evident; more than this cannot be positively asserted. In Exodus and Numbers it probably denotes' the miscellaneous hangers-on of the Hebrew camp, whether they were the issue of spurious marriages with Egyptians, or were themselves Egyptians or belonging to other nations. The same happened on the return from Babylon, and in Neh 13:3 a slight clew is given by which the meaning of the “mixed multitude” may be more definitely ascertained. Upon reading in the law “that the Ammonite and the Moabite should not come into the congregation of God forever,” it is said “they separated from Israel all the mixed multitude.” The remainder of the chapter relates the expulsion of Tobiah the Ammonite from the Temple, of the merchants and men of Tyre from the city, and of the foreign wives of Ashdod, of Ammon, and of Moab, with whom the Jews had intermarried. All of these were included in the “mixed multitude,” and Nehemiah adds, “Thus cleansed I them from all foreigners.” The Targ. Jon. on Num 11:4 explains the “mixed multitude” as proselytes, and this view is apparently adopted by Ewald, but there does not seem to be any foundation for it. SEE MINGLED PEOPLE.

## Mizar[[@Headword:Mizar]]

             (Heb. Mi tsar', מַצְעָר, smallness, i.e., a little of anything, as in Gen 19:20, etc.; Sept. μικρός,Vulg. modicus, Auth. Vers. margin “little”), apparently the name of a summit on the eastern ridge of Lebanon or come contiguous chain, not far from which David lay after escaping from the rebellion of Absalom (Psa 42:7). Others (with the versions above) understand it merely as an appellation, “the small mountain;” but this is a more harsh construction, and mention is made in the context of the trans- Jordanic region of Hermon, not very far from which was Mahanaim, whither David retired (see Tholuck's Comment. ad oc.; who nevertheless renders “the little hill”). If any particular spot is intended, it must doubtless be sought in some eminence of the southern part of this general range, perhaps in the present Jebel Ajlun, which may have properly been so styled (i. q. “the little”) in contrast with the greater elevation of Lebanon, Hermon, and Gilead.

## Mizpah[[@Headword:Mizpah]]

             (Heb. Mitspah', מַצְפָּה, Genesis 36:49; Jos 11:3; Jdg 10:17; Jdg 11:11; Jdg 11:34; Jdg 20:1; Jdg 20:5; Jdg 20:8; 1Sa 7:6; 1Sa 7:11-12; 1Sa 7:16; 1Sa 10:17; 1Ki 15:22; 2Ki 25:23; 2Ki 25:25 : 2Ch 16:6; Neh 3:7; Neh 3:15; Neh 3:19; Jer 40:6-15; Jer 41:1; Jer 41:3; Jer 41:6; Jeremiah 10, 14, 16; Hos 5:1; always [except in Hos 5:1] with the art.הִמַּצְפָה; Sept. Μασσηφά,Vulg. Maspha; but in Gen 31:49, Sept. ὅρασις,Vulg. omits; 1Sa 7:5-13; Vulg. Masphath; 1Ki 15:22, Sept. σκοπιά; 2Ch 16:6, Μασφά; Neh 3:19, Μασφέ v.r. Μασφαί; Hos 5:1, σκοπιά, speculatio), or Miz'peh (Heb. MitsSehb', מַצְפֶּה, Jos 11:8; Jdg 11:29; 1Sa 6:5-7; 1Sa 22:3; with the art. Jos 15:38; Jos 18:26; 2Ch 20:24; Sept. Μασσηφά, but σκοπιά in Jdg 11:29; Μασσηφάθ in 1Sa 22:3; Vulg. Maspha, but Masphe in Jos 11:8; Mesphe in Jos 18:-26), the name of several places (the Auth. Vers. “Mizpah” in Gen 31:49; 1Ki 15:22; 2Ki 25:23; 2Ki 25:25; 2Ch 16:6; Neh 3:7; Neh 3:15; Neh 3:19; Jeremiah 40, 41; Hos 5:1; elsewhere “Mizpeh”), signifying properly a beacon or watch-tower (as in Isa 21:8); hence also a lofty place, whence one can see far and wide over the country, whether furnished with a castle or not (as in 2Ch 20:24). (Mizpeh becomes Mizpah “in pause.”)

1. A place in Gilead, so named (in addition to its other names, GALEED and JEGAR-SAHADUTHA, both signifying the “heap of witness”) in commemoration of the compact formed by Jacob with Laban, who overtook him at this spot on his return to Palestine (Gen 31:49, where the word הִמִּצֵּבָהhas apparently fallen out of the text by reason of its similarity to the name itself, so that we should read “and he called the obelisk Mizpah” [see Gesenius, Thes. page 1179]. It would seem that the whole of Gen 31:49 is the language of Jacob, for it contains a play upon the Heb. [יַצֶ, yitseph] basis of the name Mizpeh, and also appeals to Jehovah; whereas Laban spoke Aramsean, and his language is resumed with Gen 31:50). This cannot be the Mizpeh of Gilead (see below), for it lay north of Mahanaim, on Jacob's route, which was southward towards the Jabbok (32, 2, 22). We are therefore to look for it in some of the eminences of that vicinity. It probably never became an inhabited locality.

2. Another place east of Jordan, called MIZPAH OF GILEAD (Auth. Vers. “Mizpeh”), where Jephthah assumed his victorious command of the assembled Israelites (Jdg 10:17; Jdg 11:11), and where he resided (Jdg 11:34), is probably the same with the RABIATH-MIZPEH of Gad (Jos 13:26), and may be identified with RAMATH-GILEAD SEE RAMATH-GILEAD (q.v.). Eusebius names it as a Levitical city in the tribe of Gad (Onomast. s.v. Μασφά).

3. Another place in Gilead, apparently a district inhabited by a branch of the Hivites, at the foot of Mount Hermon (Jos 11:3), and so named from a valley gast of Misrephoth-main and opposite Zidon (Jos 11:8); possibly the tract immediately west of Jebel Heish (see Keil, Comment. ad loc.). The idolatries practiced in this vicinity are alluded to in Hos 5:1 (see Schwarz, Palest. page 60). Pressel (in Herzog's Real- Encyklop. s.v.), ingeniously conjecturing that Mizpah (the fem. Heb. form of the name) is properly the country in general, and Mizpeh (the masc.) an individual place or town, understands in this case the land to be the entire plain of Paneas or Csesarea Philippi, now called the Ard el Huleh, and the valley to be that of the eastern source of the Jordan from Jebel Heish. Not much different is the view of Knobel and others in their commentaries, thinking of the country from Hasbeiya southward, and westward from Tell el-Kady, the ancient Dan. They refer in confirmation of their views to Robinson's account (Researches, 3:373) of a Druse village, built on a hill which rises 200 feet above the level of the plain, and commands a noble view of the great basin of the Hlleh; it bears the name of Mutulleh or Metelleh, an Arabic word of the same meaning as Mizpah, and employed to render it in Gen 31:49 by Saadias. Comp. Seetzen, Reisen dur-ch Syrien (Berl. 1857-59), 1:393 sq.; Ritter, Die Sinai-Halbinsel, Paldstina u. Syrien (Berl. 1850-51), volume 2, part 1, page 1121 sq.

4. A city of Benjamin (Jos 18:26), where the people were wont to convene on national emergencies (Jdg 20:1; Jdg 20:3; Jdg 21:1; Jdg 21:5; Jdg 21:8; 1Sa 7:5-16; 1Sa 10:17 sq.). It was afterwards fortified by Asa, to protect the borders against the kingdom of Israel (1Ki 15:22; 2Ch 16:6). In later times it became the residence of the governor under the Chaldeeans (2Ki 25:23; 2Ki 25:25; Jer 40:6 sq.; Jer 41:1), and was inhabited after the captivity (Neh 3:7; Neh 3:15; Neh 3:19). In the Jewish traditions it was for some time the residence of the ark (see Jerome, Qu. Hebr. on 1Sa 7:2; Reland. Antiq. 1:6); but this is possibly an inference from the expression “before Jehovah” in Jdg 20:1.  Josephus frequently mentions it (Μασφάτη, Ant. 6:2, 1; Μασφαθά, 6:4, 4; 10:9, 2, 4, 5), once identifying it with Ramah (Μασφά, 8,13,4). From the account in 1Sa 7:5-16, it appears to have been near Gibeah, and it could not have been far from Ramah, since king Asa fortified it with materials taken from that place; and that it was situated on an elevated spot is clear from its name. On these grounds Dr. Robinson (Researches, 2:144) inclines to regard the modern village of Neby Samwil (“the prophet Samuel”) as the probable site of Mizpah, especially as in 1Ma 3:46 it is described as “over against Jerusalem,” implying that it was visible from that city. This place is now a poor village, seated upon the summit of a ridge, about 600 feet above the plain of Gibeon, being the most conspicuous object in all the vicinity. It contains a mosque, now in a state' of decay, which, on the ground of the apparently erroneous identification with Ramah, is regarded by Jews, Christians, and Moslems as the tomb of Samuel (see Schwarz, Palest. page 127).

The mosque was once a Latin church, built in the form of a cross, upon older foundations, and probably of the time of the Crusaders. There are many traces of former dwellings. The modern hamlet clusters at the eastern side of the mosque. The houses, about twelve in number, are either ancient or composed of ancient materials. Their walls are in places formed of the living rock hewn into shape, and some of the little courts are excavated to the depth of several feet.. There is thus an air of departed greatness and high antiquity about the place, which, added to its commanding situation, gives it an inexpressible charm (Porter, Hand-book, page 216; comp. Tobler, Zwei Biicher Topgraphie von Jerusalem- u. seine Unmgebungen [Berl. 1853,1854], 2:874 sq.). Mr. Williams (in Smith's Dict. of Greek and Roman Geog. s.v.) doubts this location, urging that Jer 41:5-6 appears to require a position more directly on the great route from Jerusalem to Samaria; but Neby Samwil is exactly on the route by which Johanan overtook the murderer of Gedaliah (Jer 41:12; comp. 2Sa 2:13). He suggests the modern village Shaphat, lying upon the ridge anciently called Scopus, as more likely to have been Mizpah; and Stanley (Sinai and Palestine, page 222) argues for a similar identity on the ground of the common signification of .these latter (i.q. look-out). This last place, however, is described by Josephus (Ant. 11:8, 5) in very: different terms from Mizpah (ut sup.), and Jerusalem is not visible from Shaphat (for which Dr. Bonar likewise contends, Land of Promise, Append. 8). SEE RAMAH.

5. A town in the plains of Judahb (Jos 15:38). Eusebius and Jerome identify it with a place which in their time bore the name of Alaspha (Onomast. s.v. Μασφά), on the borders of Eleutheropolis, northward, on the road to Jerusalem; perhaps the present Tell es-Safieh (Schwarz, Palest. page 103), the Alba Specula of the Crusaders (Robinson, Researches, 2:362-367), which was probably the GATH SEE GATH (q.v.) of later Biblical times.

6. A town of Moab to which David took his parents, lest they might be involved in Saul's persecution of himself (1Sa 22:3). His placing them there under the protection of the Moabitish king implies that it was the chief city, or royal-residence of the Moabites; and under that view we may, perhaps identify it as an appellative (i.q. the acropolis or stronghold of Moab) with KIR-MOAB SEE KIR-MOAB (q.v.) or Kerak.

## Mizpar[[@Headword:Mizpar]]

             (Heb. Mispar', מַסְפָּר, number, as often'; Sept. Μασφάρ), one of the leading Israelites who accompanied Zerubbabel on the return from Babylon (Ezr 1:2), in the parallel passage (Neh 7:7) called by the equivalent name MISPERETH. B.C. 536.

Mizpeh.

SEE MIZPAH; SEE RAMATH-MIZPEH.

## Mizpeh Of Benjamin[[@Headword:Mizpeh Of Benjamin]]

             Respecting this place Lieut. Conder remarks (Tent Work, 2:117): "There are plenty of Mizpehs in Palestine, but in positions quite inapplicable, whereas, in the right direction there is no name of the kind (so far as has yet been discovered), for Sh'afat is not apparently derived from Mizpeh, but is a name very like that of Jehosaphat, and the natives of the place say that it was called after a Jewish king. In crusading times the town seems to be also mentioned under the title Jehosaphat.

"The early Christians placed Mizpeh in quite another direction, and Nob at Belt Ntba, which is famous in the history of Richard Lion- Heart. Their site for Mizpeh was near Soba, west of Jerusalem, and here we found a ruin with the title Shffa, which in meaning is equivalent to the Hebrew Mizpeh; but this place cannot be described as over against Jerusalem, and its recovery is thus a matter of minor interest.

"There is one other site which has been proposed for Mizpeh, though it is merely a conjecture, and not a name which might lead to the identification: this site is the remarkable hill called Neby Samwil, north of Jerusalem. The place is conspicuous from the tall minaret which crowns the old crusading church on the summit, and within the church is. the cenotaph now revered by the Moslems as the tomb of Samuel a modern monument covered with a green cloth.

"The crusaders, with their usual contempt for facts, fixed on this hill as the ancient Shiloh; they also called it Ramah, and added  besides a title of their own. 'Two miles from Jerusalem,' says Sir John Maundeville, 'is Mount Joy, a very fair and delicious place. There Samuel the prophet lies in a fair tomb, and it is called Mount Joy because it gives joy to pilgrims' hearts, for from that place men first see Jerusalem.'

"The tradition which places Samuel's tomb here seems, however, to be only recent. Rabbi, Benjamin of Tudela, who is a tolerably safe guide as regards Jewish sacred sites, discredits the story and speaks of a change of site. When the Christians took Ramleh, which is Ranmah, from the Mohammedans,' says the rabbi, 'they discovered the sepulchre of Samuel the Ramnathi near the Jewish synagogue, and removed his remains to Shiloh, where they erected a large place of worship over them, called St. Samuel of Shiloh to the present day.'"

Neby Samwil is fully described in the Memoirs to the Ordnance Survey, 3:12, 149.

## Mizraim[[@Headword:Mizraim]]

             (Heb. Mitsra'yim, מַצְרִיַם, if of Heb. origin, meaning two mounds or fortresses, SEE MAZOR, but the word is, perhaps, of foreign [Egyptian or even Arabic] derivation; Sept. Μεσραϊvν; but usually in all the versions, “Egypt” or “Egyptians”), the name by which the Hebrews generally designated Egypt, apparently' from its having been peopled by Mizraim, the second son of Ham (Gen 10:6; Gen 10:13). B.C. post 2513. SEE ABEL- MIZRAIM. The name is in the dual form, double Egypt, and seems to have originally among the Hebrews at least, denoted lower and upper Egypt by zeugma, as we now say the two Sicilies, for Sicily and Naples (Gen 45:20; Gen 46:34; Gen 47:6; Gen 47:13). This origin appears to have been afterwards left out of view, and the dual form is sometimes so employed as not to include Pathros or Upper Egypt (Isa 11:11; Jer 44:15). Some writers ineptly refer the dual form of Mizraim to the two parts of Egypt as  divided by the Nile. Lower Egypt appears to have been designated by the name Mazor (2Ki 19:24; Isa 37:25). The ancient Hebrew name Mizraim is still preserved in the abbreviated form Aluzr, the existing Arabic name of Egypt. SEE EGYPT.

## Mizzah[[@Headword:Mizzah]]

             (Heb. Mizzah', מַזָּה, despair; Sept. Μοζέ, in Chronicles Μοχέ), the last named of the four sons of Reuel, the son of Esau by Bashemath (Gen 36:13; 1Ch 1:37), and a petty chieftain of the Edomites (Gen 36:17). B.C. considerably post 1927. The settlements of his descendants are believed by Mr. Forster (Hist. Geog. of Arab. 2:55) to be indicated in the μεσανίτης κόλπος, or Phrat-Misan, at the head of the Persian Gulf.

## Mnason[[@Headword:Mnason]]

             (Μυάσων, perh. reminding), a Christian with whom Paul lodged during his last visit at Jerusalem (Act 21:16). A.D. 55. He seems to have been a native of Cyprus, but an inhabitant of Jerusalem, like Barnabas (comp. Act 11:19-20). He was well known to the Christians at Casarea, and may have been a friend of Barnabas (Act 4:36), but appears not to have been before this acquainted with Paul. Some think that he was converted by Paul and Barnabas while at Cyprus (Act 13:9); but the designation “an old disciple” (ἀρχαῖος μαθητής) has more generally induced the conclusion that he was converted by Jesus himself, and was perhaps one of the seventy (see Kuinbl, Comment. ad loc.).

## Moab, Plains Of[[@Headword:Moab, Plains Of]]

             (עִרְבוֹת מוֹאָב, Arboth' Moab', Deserts of Moab), a plain east of the Jordan, opposite Jericho (Num 22:1; Num 26:13; Jos 13:32), where the Israelites under Moses pitched their encampment on their way into ‘Canaan (Num 31:12; Num 33:48 sq.; Deu 1:1; Deu 1:5), in the vicinity of Nebo (Deu 34:1; Deu 34:8). It is the level spot in the  great depression of the Ghar into which Wady Hesban opens, between Wadys Kefrein and Jerifeh, a part of it being called the Valley of Shettim (q.v.). It then belonged to the Amorites (Num 21:22 sq.), but earlier to the Moabites; whence it had its name. In the division of the country it fell to the Gadites and Reubenites (Num 32:33 sq.; Jos 13:32). SEE AMOABITE.

## Moabite[[@Headword:Moabite]]

             (Heb. Moibi', מוֹאָבַי, a Gentile from Moab, Deu 23:24; Neh 13:1; femr. מוֹאָבַית, 2Ch 24:26; or מוֹאָבַיָּה, Rth 1:22, etc.; plur. מוֹאָבַיּוֹת, Rth 1:4; 1Ki 11:1, a Moabitess, or “woman of Moab;” once rendered “Moabitish,” Rth 2:6), the designation of a tribe endescede from Moab the son of Lot, and consequently related to the Hebrews (Gen 19:37). In the following account of them we treat the subject at large.

I. Locality and ‘Early History. — Zoar was the cradle of the race of Lot. Although the exact position of this town has not been determined, there is no doubt that it was situated on the south-eastern border of the Dead Sea. From this centre the brother-tribes spread themselves. Ammon (q.v.), whose disposition seems throughout to have been more roving and unsettled, went to the northeast and took possession of the pastures and waste tracts which lay outside the district of the mountains; that which in earlier times seems to have been known as Ham, and inhabited by the Zuzim or Zamzummim (Gen 14:5; Deu 2:20). The Moabites, whose habits were more settled and peaceful, remained nearer their original seat. The rich highlands which crown the eastern side of the chasm of the Dead Sea, and extend northwards as far as the foot of the mountains of Gilead, appear at that early date to have borne a name, which in its Hebrew form is presented to us as Shaveh-Kiriathaimn, and to have been inhabited by a branch of the great race of the Rephaim. Like the Horim before the descendants of Esau, the Avim before the Philistines, or the indigenous races of the New World before the settlers from the West, this ancient people, the Emim, gradually became extinct before the Moabites, who thus obtained possession of the whole of the rich elevated tract referred to a district forty or fifty miles in length by ten or twelve in width, the celebrated Belka and Kerak of the modern Arabs, the most fertile on that side of Jordan, no less eminently fitted for pastoral pursuits  than the maritime plains of Philistia and Sharon, on the west of Palestine, are for agriculture. With the highlands they occupied also the lowlands at their feet, the plain which intervenes between the slopes of the mountains and the one perennial stream of Palestine, and through which they were enabled to gain access at pleasure to the fords of the river, and thus to the country ‘beyond it.' Of ‘the valuable district of the highlands they were not allowed to retain entire possession. The warlike Amorites — either forced from their original seats on the west, or perhaps lured over by the increasing prosperity of the young nation — crossed the Jordan and overran the richer portion of the territory on the north, driving Moab back to his original position behind the natural bulwark of the Arnon. The plain of the Jordan valley, the hot and humid atmosphere of which had perhaps no attraction for the Amoritish mountaineers, appears to have remained in the power of Moab. When Israel reached the boundary of the country, this contest had only very recently occurred. Sihon, the Amoritish king under whose command Heshbon had been taken, was still reigning there the ballads commemorating the event were still fresh in the popular mouth (Num 21:27-30).

Of these events, which extended over a period, according to the received Bible chronology, of not less than 500 years, from the destruction of Sodom to the arrival of Israel on the borders of the Promised Land, we obtain the above outline only from the fragments of ancient documents, which are found embedded in the records of Numbers and Deuteronomy (Num 21:26-30; Deu 2:10-11).

The position into which the Moabites were driven by the incursion of the Amorites was a very circumscribed one, in extent not so much as half that which they, had lost. But on the other hand its position was much more secure, and it was well suited for the occupation of a people whose disposition was not so warlike as that of their neighbors. It occupied the southern half of the high table-lands which rise above the eastern side of the Dead Sea. On every side it was strongly fortified by nature. On the north was the tremendous chasm of the Arnon. On the west it was limited by the precipices, or more accurately the cliffs, which descend almost perpendicularly to the shore of the lake, and are intersected only by one or two steep and narrow passes. Lastly, on the south and east it was protected by a halfcircle of hills, which open only to allow the passage of a branch of the Arnon and another of the torrents which descend to the Dead Sea.  It will be seen from the foregoing description that the territory occupied by Moab at the period of its greatest extent, before the invasion of the Amorites, divided itself naturally into three distinct and independent portions. Each of these portions appears to have had its name, by which it is almost invariably designated.

(1) The enclosed “corner” or canton south of the Arnon was the “field of Moab” (Rth 1:1-2; Rth 1:6, etc.).

(2) The more open rolling country north of the Arnon, opposite Jericho, and up to the hills of Gilead, was the “land of Moab” (Deu 1:5; Deu 32:49, etc.).

(3) The sunk district in the tropical depths of the Jordan valley, taking its name from that of the great valley itself — the Arabah — was the Arboth- Moab, the dry regions in the A.V. very incorrectly rendered the “plains of Moab” (Num 22:1 etc.).

II. Connection with the Israelites. — Outside of the hills, which enclosed the “field of Moab,” or Moab proper. on the south-east, and which are at present called the Jebel Uru-Karaiyeh and Jebel el-Tarfuyeh, lay the vast pasture-grounds of the waste, uncultivated country, or “Midbar,” which is described as “facing Moab” on the east (Num 21:11). Through this latter district Israel appears to have approached the Promised Land. Some communication had evidently taken place, though of what nature it is impossible clearly to ascertain. For while in Deu 2:28-29 the attitude of the Moabites is mentioned as friendly, this seems to be contradicted by the statement of Deu 23:4; while in Jdg 11:17, again, Israel is said to have sent from Kadesh asking permission to pass through Moab — a permission which, like Edom, Moab refused. At any rate, the attitude perpetuated by the provisions of Deu 23:3 — a provision maintained in full force by the latest of the Old- Testament reformers (Neh 13:2; Neh 13:23) — is one of hostility. See Noldeke, Die Amalekiten, etc. (Gitt. 1864), page 3. 1. But whatever the communication may have been, the result was that Israel did not traverse Moab, but, turning to the right, passed outside the mountains through the “wilderness,” by the east side of the territory above described (Deu 2:8; Jdg 11:18), and finally took up a position in the country north of the Arnon, from which Moab had so lately been ejected. Here the headquarters of the nation remained for a considerable  time while the conquest of Bashan was taking effect. It was during this period that the visit of Balaam took place.

The whole of the country east of the Jordan, with the exception of the one little corner occupied by Moab, was in possession of the invaders, and although at the period in question the main body had descended from the upper level to the plains of Shittim, the Arboth-Moab, in the Jordan valley, yet a great number must have remained on the upper level, and the towns up to the very edge of the ravine of the Arnon were still occupied by their settlements (Num 21:24; Jdg 11:26). It was a situation full of alarm for a nation which had already suffered so severely. In his extremity the Moabitish king, Balak — whose father Zippor was doubtless the chieftain who had lost his life in the encounter with Sihon (Num 21:26) appealed to the Midianites for aid (Num 22:2-4). With a metaphor highly appropriate both to his mouth and to the ear of the pastoral tribe he was addressing, he exclaims that “this people will lick up all round about us as the ox licketh up the grass of the field.” What relation existed between Moab and Midian we do not know, but there are various indications that it was a closer one than would arise. merely from their common descent from Terah. The tradition of the Jews (Targum Pseudo-Jonathan on Numbers 22:45 is that up to this time the two had been one nation, with kings taken alternately from each, and that Balak was a Midianite. This, however, is in contradiction to the statements of Genesis as to the origin of each people. The whole story of Balaam's visit and of the subsequent events, both in the original narrative of Numbers and in the remarkable statement of Jephthah- whose words as addressed to Ammonites must be accepted as literally accurate bears out the inference already drawn from the earlier history as to the pacific character of Moab.

The account of the whole of these transactions in the book of Numbers, familiar as we are with its phrases, perhaps hardly conveys an adequate idea of the extremity in which Balak found himself in his unexpected encounter with the new nation and their mighty Divinity. We may realize it better (and certainly with gratitude for the opportunity) if we consider what that last dreadful agony was in which a successor of Balak was placed, when, all hope of escape for himself and his people being cut off, the unhappy Mesha immolated his own son on the wall of Kir-haraseth; and then remember that Balak in his distress actually proposed the same awful sacrifice — “his first-born for his transgression, the fruit of his body for the sin of his soul” (Mic 6:7) — a sacrifice from which he was  restrained only by the wise, the almost Christian (Mat 9:13; Mat 12:7) counsels of Balaam. This catastrophe will be noticed in its proper place.

The connection of Moab with Midian, and the comparatively inoffensive character of the former, are shown in the narrative of the events which followed the departure of Balaam. The women of Moab are indeed said (Num 25:1) to have commenced the idolatrous fornication which proved so destructive to Israel, but it is plain that their share in it was insignificant compared with that of Midian. It was a Midianitish woman whose shameless act brought down the plague on the camp, the Midianitish women were especially devoted to destruction by Moses (Num 25:16-18; Num 31:16), and it was upon Midian that the vengeance was taken. Except in the passage already mentioned, Moab is not once named in the whole transaction. The latest date at which the two names appear in conjunction is found in the notice of the defeat of Midian “in the field of Moab” by the Edomitish king Hadad ben-Bedad, which occurred five generations before the establishment of the monarchy of Israel (Gen 36:35; 1Ch 1:46). By the Jewish interpreters — e.g. Solomon Jarchi in his commentary on the passage — this is treated as implying, not alliance, but war between Moab and Midian (comp, 1Ch 4:22).

It is remarkable that Moses should have taken his view of the Promised Land from a Moabitish sanctuary, and been buried in the land of Moab. It is singular, too, that his resting-place is marked in the Hebrew records only by its proximity to the sanctuary of that deity to whom in his lifetime he had been such an enemy. He lies in a ravine in the land of Moab, facing BethPeor, i.e., the abode of Baal-Peor (Deu 34:6).

2. After the conquest of Canaan the relations of Moab with Israel were of a mixed character. With the tribe of Benjamin, whose possessions at their eastern end were separated from those of Moab only by the Jordan, they had at least one severe struggle, in union with their kindred the Ammonites, and also, for this time only, the wild Amalekites from the south (Jdg 3:12-30). The Moabitish king, Eglon, actually ruled and received tribute in Jericho for eighteen years, but at the end of that time he was killed by the Benjamitish hero Ehud, and the return of the Moabites being intercepted at the fords, a large number were slaughtered, and a stop put to such incursions on their part for the future. A trace of this invasion is visible in the name of Chephar-ha Ammonai, the “hamlet of the Ammonites,” one of the Benjamitish towns; and another is possibly  preserved even. to the present day in the name of Mukhmas, the modern representative of Michmash, which is by some scholars believed to have received its name from Chemosh, the Moabitish deity. The feud continued with true Oriental pertinacity to the time of Saul. Of his slaughter of the Ammonites we have full details in 1 Samuel 11, and among his other conquests Moab is especially mentioned (1Sa 14:47).

There is not, however, as we should expect, any record of it during Ishbosheth's residence at Mahanaim, on the east of Jordan. But while such were their relations to the tribe of Benjamin, the story of Ruth, on the other hand, testifies to the existence of a friendly intercourse between Moab and Bethlehem, one of the towns of Judah. Jewish tradition (Targumn Jonathan on Rth 1:4) ascribes the death of Mahlon and Chilion to punishment for having broken the commandment of Deu 23:3, but no trace of any feeling of the kind is visible in the book of Ruth itself- which not only seems to imply a considerable intercourse between the two nations, but also a complete ignorance or disregard of the precept in question, which was broken in the most flagrant manner when Ruth became the wife of Boaz. By his descent from Ruth, David may be said to have had Moabitish blood in his veins. The relationship was sufficient, especially when combined with the blood-feud between Moab and Benjamin, already alluded to, to warrant his visiting the land of his ancestress, and committing his parents to the protection of the king of Moab, when hard pressed by Saul (1Sa 23:3-4). But here all friendly relation stops forever. The next time the name is mentioned is in the account of David's war, at least twenty years after the last-mentioned event (2Sa 8:2; 1Ch 18:2). The abrupt manner in which this war is introduced into the history is no less remarkable than the brief and passing terms in which its horrors are recorded. The account occupies but a few words in either Samuel or Chronicles, and yet it must have been for the time little short of a virtual extirpation of the nation. Two thirds of the people were put to death, while the remainder became bondmen, and were subjected to a regular tribute. An incident of this war is probably recorded in 2Sa 23:20, and 1Ch 11:22. The spoils taken from the Moabitish cities and sanctuaries went to swell the treasure acquired from the enemies of Jehovah, which David was amassing for the future Temple (2Sa 8:11-12; 1Ch 18:11). It was the first time that the prophecy of Balaam had been fulfilled — “Out of Jacob shall come he that shall have dominion, and shall destroy him that remaineth of Ar,” that is of Moab. So signal a vengeance can only have  been occasioned by some act of perfidy or insult, like that which brought down a similar treatment on the Ammonites (2 Samuel 10). But as to any such act the narrative is absolutely silent. It has been conjectured that the king of Moab betrayed the trust which David reposed in him, and either himself killed Jesse and his wife, or surrendered them to Saul.' But this, though not improbable, is nothing more than conjecture.

It must have been a considerable time before Moab recovered from so severe a blow. Of this we have evidence in the fact of its not being mentioned in the account of the campaign in which the Ammonites were subdued, when it is not probable they would have refrained from assisting their relatives had they been in a condition to do so. Throughout the reign of Solomon they no doubt shared in the universal peace which surrounded Israel; and the only mention of the name occurs in the statement that there were Moabites among the foreign women in the royal harem, and, as a natural consequence, that the Moabitish worship was tolerated, or perhaps encouraged (1Ki 11:1; 1Ki 11:7; 1Ki 11:33). The high place for Chemosh, “the abomination of Moab,” was consecrated “on the mount facing Jerusalem,” where it remained till its “defilement” by Josiah (2Ki 23:13), nearly four centuries afterwards.

3. At the disruption of the kingdom, Moab seems to have fallen to the northern realm, probably for the same reason that has been already remarked in the case of Eglon and Ehud-that the fords of Jordan lay within the territory of Benjamin, who for some time after the separation clung to its ancient ally, the house of Ephraim. But, be this as it may, at the death of Ahab, eighty years later, we find Moab paying him the enormous tribute, apparently annual, of 100,000 rams, and the same number of wethers with their fleeces; an amount which testifies at once to the severity of the terms imposed by Israel, and to the remarkable vigor of character and wealth of natural resources which could enable a little country to raise year by year this enormous impost, and, at the same time support its own people in prosperity and affluence. This affluence is shown by the treasures which they left on the field of Berachoth (2Ch 20:25), no less than by the general condition of the country, indicated in the narrative of Joram's invasion; and in the passages of Isaiah and Jeremiah which are cited further on in this article. It is not surprising that the Moabites should have seized the moment of Ahab's death to throw off so burdensome a yoke but it is surprising that, notwithstanding such a drain on their resources, they were ready to incur the risk and expense of a war with a state in every respect  far their superior.

Their first step, after asserting their independence, was to attack the kingdom of Judah in company with their kindred the Ammonites, and, as seems probable, the Mehunim, a roving semi- Edomitish people from the mountains in the south-east of Palestine (2 Chronicles 20). The army was a huge, heterogeneous horde of ill-assorted elements. The route chosen for the invasion was round the southern end of the Dead Sea, thence along the beach; and by the pass of En-gedi to the level of the upper country. But the expedition contained within itself the elements of its own destruction. Before they reached the enemy dissensions arose between the heathen strangers and the children of Lot; distrust followed, and finally panic; and when the army of Jehoshaphat came in sight of them they found that they had nothing to do but to watch the extermination of one half the huge host by the other half, and to seize the prodigious booty which was left on the field. Disastrous as was this proceeding, that which followed was even still more so.

As a natural consequence of the late events, Israel, Judah, and Edom united in an attack on Moab. For reasons which are not stated, but one of which we may reasonably conjecture was to avoid the passage of the savage Edomites through Judah, the three confederate armies approached, not, as usual, by the north, but round the southern end of the Dead Sea, through the parched valleys of Upper Edom. As the host came near, the king of Moab, doubtless the same Mesha who threw off the yoke of Ahab, assembled the whole of his people, from the youngest who were of age to bear the sword-girdle (2Ki 3:21), on the boundary of his territory, probably on- the outer slopes of the line of hills which encircles the lower portion of Moab, overlooking the waste which extended below them towards the east (comp. Num 21:11 — “towards the sun-rising”). There they remained all night on the watch. With the approach of morning the sun rose suddenly above the horizon of the rolling plain, and as his level beams burst through the night-mists they revealed no masses of the enemy, but shone with a blood-red glare on a multitude of pools in the bed of the wady at their feet. They did not know that these pools had been sunk during the night by the order of a mighty prophet who was with the host of Israel, and that they had been filled by the sudden flow of water rushing from the distant highlands of Edom. To them the conclusion was inevitable: the army had, like their own on the late occasion, fallen out in the night; these red pools were the blood of the slain; those who were not killed had fled, and nothing stood between them and the pillage of the camp. The cry of “Moab to the spoil!” was raised. Down the slopes they rushed in headlong  disorder. But not, as they expected, to empty tents; they found an enemy ready prepared to reap the result of his ingenious stratagem.

Then occurred one of those scenes of carnage which can happen but once or twice in the existence of a nation. The Moabites fled back in confusion, followed and cut down at every step by their enemies. Far inwards did the pursuit reach, among the cities and farms and orchards of that rich district; nor when the slaughter was over was the horrid work of destruction done. The towns' both fortified and unfortified, were demolished, and the stones strewed over the carefully-tilled fields. The fountains of water, the life of an Eastern land, were choked, and all timber of any size or goodness felled. Nowhere else do we hear of such sweeping desolation; the very besom of destruction passed over the land. At last the struggle collected itself at Kir-haraseth, apparently a newly-constructed fortress, which, if the modern Kerak — and there is every probability that they are identical — may well have resisted all the efforts of the allied kings in its native impregnability. Here Mesha took refuge with his family and with the remnants of his army. The heights around, by which the town is entirely commanded, were covered with slingers, who armed partly with the ancient weapon of David and of the Benjamites, partly perhaps with the newly-invented machines shortly to be famous in Jerusalem (2Ch 26:15) — discharged their volleys of stones on the town. At length the annoyance could be borne no longer. Then Mesha, collecting round him a forlorn hope of 700 of his best warriors, made a desperate sally, with the intention of cutting his way through to his special foe, the king of Edom. But the enemy were too strong for him, and he was driven back. And then came a fitting crown to a tragedy already so terrible. An awful spectacle amazed and horrified the besiegers. The king and his eldest son, the heir to the throne, mounted the wall, and, in the sight of the thousands who covered the sides of that vast amphitheatre, the father killed and burned his child as a propitiatory sacrifice to the cruel gods of his country. It was the same dreadful act to which, as we have seen, Balak had been so nearly tempted in his extremity. But the danger, though perhaps not really greater than his, was more imminent; and Mesha had no one like Balaam at hand to counsel patience and submission to a mightier Power than Chemosh or Baal-Peor. SEE MESHA.

Hitherto, though able and ready to fight when necessary, the Moabites do not appear to have been a fighting people; perhaps, as suggested elsewhere, the Ammonites were the warriors of the nation of Lot. But this  disaster seems to have altered their disposition, at any rate for a time. Shortly after these events we hear of “bands” — that is, pillaging, marauding parties — of the Moabites making their incursions into Israel in the spring, as if to spoil the early corn before it was fit to cut (2Ki 13:20). With Edom there must have been many a contest. One of these marked by savage vengeance — recalling in some degree the tragedy of Kir-haraseth — is alluded to by Amos (Amo 2:1), where a king of Edom seems to have been killed and burned by Moab. This may have been one of the incidents of the battle of Kir-haraseth itself, occurring perhaps after the Edomites had parted from Israel, and were overtaken on their road home by the furious king' of Moab (Gesenius, Jesaia, 1:504); or, according to the Jewish tradition (Jerome, on Amo 2:1), it was a vengeance still more savage because more protracted, and lasting even beyond the death of the king, whose remains were torn from his tomb, and thus consumed.

In the “Burden of Moab” pronounced by Isaiah (chapters 15, 16) we possess a document full of interesting details as to the condition of the nation at the time of the death of Ahaz, king of Judah, B.C. 726. More than a. century and a half had elapsed since the great calamity to which we have just referred. In that interval Moab has regained all, and more than all, of his former prosperity, and has besides extended himself over the district which he originally occupied in the youth of the nation, and which was left vacant when the removal of Reuben to Assyria, which had been begun by Pul in B.C. 770, was completed by Tiglath-pileser about the year 740 (1Ch 5:25-26). This passage of Isaiah cannot be considered apart from that of Jeremiah, ch. 48. The latter was. pronounced more than a century later, about the year B.C. 600, ten or twelve years before the invasion of Nebuchadnezzar, by which Jerusalem was destroyed. In ‘many- respects it is identical with that of Isaiah, and both are believed by the best modern scholars, on account of the archaisms and other peculiarities of language which they contain, to be adopted from a common source-the work of some much more ancient prophet. Isaiah ends his denunciation by a prediction — in his own words — that within three years Moab should be greatly reduced. This was probably with a view to Shalmaneser, who destroyed Samaria, and no doubt over ran the other side of the Jordan in B.C. 725, and again in 723 (2Ki 17:3; 2Ki 18:9). The only event of which we have a record to which it would seem possible that the passage, as originally uttered by the older prophet, applied, is the above invasion of  Pul, who, in commencing the deportation of Reuben, very probably at the same time molested Moab. The difficulty of so many of the towns of Reuben being mentioned as at that early day already in the possession of Moab may perhaps be explained by remembering that the idolatry of the neighboring nations — and therefore of Moab — had been adopted by the trans-Jordanic tribes for some time previously to the final deportation by Tigiath-pileser (see 1Ch 5:25), and that many of the sanctuaries were probably, even at the date of the original delivery of the denunciation, in the hands of the priests of Chemosh and Milcom. If, as Ewald (Geseh. 3:588) with much probability infers, the Moabites, no less than the Ammonites, were under the protection of the powerful Uzziah (2Ch 26:8), then the obscure expressions of the ancient seer as given in Isa 16:1-5, referring to a tribute of lambs (comp. 2Ki 3:4) sent from the wild pasture-grounds south of Moab to Zion, and to protection and relief from oppression afforded by the throne of David to the fugitives and outcasts of Moab, acquire an intelligible sense. On the other hand, the calamities which Jeremiah describes may, have been inflicted in any one of the numerous visitations from the Assyrian army, under which these unhappy countries suffered at the period of his prophecy in rapid succession.

But the uncertainty of the exact dates referred to in these several denunciations does not in the least affect the interest or the value of the allusions they contain to the condition of Moab. They bear the evident stamp of portraiture by artists who knew their subject thoroughly. The nation appears in them as high-spirited, wealthy, populous, and even to a certain extent civilized, enjoying a wide reputation and popularity. With a metaphor which well expresses at once the pastoral wealth of the country and its commanding, almost regal position, but which cannot be conveyed in a translation, Moab is depicted as the strong sceptre (Isa 16:6; Jer 48:29), the beautiful staff, whose fracture will be bewailed by all about him, and by all who know him. In his cities we discern a “great multitude” of people living in “glory,” and in the enjoyment of great “treasure,” crowding the public squares, the housetops, and the ascents and descents of the numerous high places and sanctuaries where the “priests and princes” of Chemosh or Baal-Peor minister to the anxious devotees. Outside the town lie the “plentiful fields,” luxuriant as the renowned Carmel-the vineyards, and gardens of “summer fruits” — the harvest is in course of reaping, and the “hay is stored in its abundance,” the vineyards  and the presses are crowded with peasants, gathering and treading the grapes, the land resounds with the clamor of the vintagers. These characteristics contrast very favorably with any traits recorded of Ammon, Edom, Midian, Amalek, the Philistines, or the Canaanitish tribes. And since the descriptions we are considering are adopted by certainly two, and probably three prophets — Jeremiah, Isaiah, and the older seer extending over a period of nearly 200 years, we may safely conclude that they are not merely temporary circumstances, but were the enduring characteristics of the people. In this case there can be no doubt that among the pastoral people of Syria, Moab stood next to Israel in all matters of material wealth and civilization.

It is very interesting to remark the feeling which actuates the prophets in these denunciations of a people who, though the enemies of Jehovah, were the blood relations of Israel. Half the allusions of Isaiah and Jeremiah in the passages referred to must forever remain obscure. We shall never know who the “lords of the heathen” were who, in that terrible night, laid waste and brought to silence the prosperous Ar-Moab and KirMoab; nor the occasion of that flight over the Arnon, when the Moabitish women were huddled together at the ford, like a flock of young birds, pressing to cross to the safe side of the stream — when the dwellers in Aroer stood by the side of the high-road which passed their town, and eagerly questioning the fugitives as they hurried up, “What is done?” — received but one answer from all alike — “All is lost! Moab is confounded and broken down!” Many expressions also, such as the “weeping of Jazer,” the “heifer of three years old,” the “shadow of Heshbon,” the “lions,” must remain obscure. But nothing can obscure or render obsolete the tone of tenderness and affection which makes itself felt in a hundred expressions throughout these precious documents. Ardently as the prophesying for the destruction of the enemy of his country and of Jehovah, and earnestly as he curses the man “that doeth the work of Jehovah deceitfully, that keepeth back his sword from blood,” yet he is constrained to bemoan and lament such dreadful calamities to a people so near him both in blood and locality. His heart mourns — it sounds like pipes — for the men of Kir-heres; his heart cries out, it sounds like a harp for Moab. Isaiah recurs to the subject in another passage of extraordinary force, and of fiercer character than before, viz. 25:10-12. Here the extermination, the utter annihilation of Moab is contemplated by the prophet with triumph, as one of the first results of the re-establishment of Jehovah on Mount Zion: “In this mountain shall the  hand of Jehovah rest, and Moab shall be trodden down under him, even as straw-the straw of his own threshing-floors at Madmenaah is trodden down for the dunghill. And he shall spread forth his hands in the midst of them namely, of the Moabites — as one that swimmeth spreads forth his hands to swim, buffet following buffet, right and left, with terrible rapidity, as the strong swimmer urges his way forward; and he shall bring down their pride together with the spoils of their hands. “And the fortress of Misgab-thy walls shall he bring down, lay low, and bring to the ground, to the dust.” If, according to the custom of interpreters, this and the preceding chapter (24) are understood as referring to the destruction of Babylon, then this sudden burst of indignation towards Moab is extremely puzzling. But, if the passage is examined with that view, it will perhaps be found to contain some expressions which suggest the possibility of Moab having been at least within the ken of the prophet, even though not in the foreground of his vision, during a great part of the passage. The Hebrew words rendered “city” in 25:2 two entirely distinct terms are positively, with a slight variation, the names of the two chief Moabitish strongholds, the same which are mentioned in 15:1, and one of which is in the Pentateuch a synonym for the entire nation of Moab. In this light Jer 48:2 may be read as follows: “For thou, hast made of Ar a heap; of Kir the defenced a ruin; a palace of strangers no longer is Ar, it shall never be rebuilt.” The same words are found in Jer 48:10; Jer 48:12 of the preceding chapter, in company with chutsoth (A.Vers. “streets”), which we know from Num 22:39 to have been the name of a Moabite town. SEE KIRJATH-HUZOTH.

A distinct echo of them is again heard in Num 25:3-4; and, finally, in Num 26:1; Num 26:5 there seems to be yet another reference to the same two towns, acquiring new force from the denunciation which closes the preceding chapter: “Moab shall be brought down, the fortress and the walls of Misgab shall be laid low; but in the land of Judah this song shall be sung, ‘Our Ar, our city, is strong... Trust in the Lord Jehovah, who bringeth down those that dwell on high: the lofty Kir, he layeth it low,'” etc. It is perhaps an additional corroboration of this view to notice that the remarkable expressions in Num 24:17, “Fear, and the pit, and the snare,” etc., actually occur in Jeremiah (Jer 48:43), in his denunciation of Moab, embedded in the old prophecies out of which, like Isaiah 15:16 this passage is compiled, and the rest of which had certainly, as originally uttered, a direct and even exclusive reference to Moab.  Between the time of Isaiah's denunciation and the destruction of Jerusalem we have hardly a reference to Moab. Zephaniah, writing in the reign of Josiah, reproaches them (Zep 2:8-10) for their taunts against the people of Jehovah, but no acts of hostility are recorded either on the one side or the other. From one passage in Jeremiah (Jer 25:9-11), delivered in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, just before the first appearance of Nebuchadnezzar, it is apparent that it was the belief of the prophet that the nations surrounding Israel — and Moab among the rest — were on the eve of devastation by the Chaldaeans, and of a captivity for seventy years (see Jer 25:11), from which, however, they should eventually be restored to their own country (Jer 25:12, and Jer 48:47). From another record of the events of the same period, or of one just subsequent (2Ki 24:2), it would appear, however, that Moab made terms with the Chaldaeans, and for a time acted in concert with them in harassing and plundering the kingdom of Jehoiakim.

Four or five years later, in the first year of Zedekiah (Jer 27:1), these hostilities must have ceased, for there was then a regular intercourse between Moab and the court at Jerusalem (Jer 27:3), possibly, as Bunsen suggests (Bibelwerk, Propheten, page 536), negotiating a combined resistance to the common enemy. The brunt of the storm must have fallen on Judah and Jerusalem. The neighboring nations, including Moab, when the danger actually arrived, probably adopted the advice of Jeremiah (Jer 27:11), and thus escaped, though not without much damage, yet without being carried away as the Jews were. That these nations did not suffer to the same extent as Judsea is evident.from the. fact that many of the Jews took refuge there when their own land was laid waste (Jer 40:11). Jeremiah expressly testifies that those who submitted themselves to the king of Babylon, though they would have to bear a severe yoke — so severe that their very wild. animals would be enslaved yet: by such submission should purchase the privilege of remaining in their own country. The removal from home, so dreadful to the Shemitic mind, was to be the fate only of those who resisted (Jer 27:10-11; Jer 28:14). This is also supported by the allusion of Ezekiel, a few years later, to the cities of Moab, cities formerly belonging to the Israelites, which, at the time when the prophet is speaking, were still flourishing, “the glory of the country,” destined to become at a future day a prey to the Bene-kedem, the “men of the East”-the Bedouins of the great desert of the Euphrates (Eze 25:8-11).  III. Later History. — After the return from the captivity, it was a Moabite, Sanballat of Horonaim, who took the chief part in annoying and endeavoring to hinder the operations of the rebuilders of Jerusalem (Neh 2:19; Neh 4:1; Neh 6:1; etc.). He confined himself, however, to the same weapons of ridicule and scurrility which we have already noticed Zephaniah resenting. From Sanballat's words (Neh 2:19) we should infer that he and his country were subject to “the king,” that is the king of Babylon. During the interval since the return of the first caravan from Babylon the illegal practice of marriages between the Jews and the other people around, Moab among the rest, had become frequent. So far had this gone that the son of the high-priest was married to an Ammonitish woman. Even among the families of Israel who returned from the captivity was one bearing the name of PAHATH-MOAB (Ezr 2:6; Ezr 8:4; Neh 3:11; etc.), a name which must certainly denote a Moabitish connection, though to the nature of the connection no clue seems to have been yet discovered. By Ezra and Nehemiah the practice of foreign marriages was strongly repressed, and we never hear of it again becoming prevalent.

In the book of Judith, the date of which is laid shortly after the return from the captivity (4:3), Moabites and Ammonites are represented as dwelling in their ancient seats, and as obeying the call of the Assyrian general. Their “princes” (ἄρχοντες) and “governors” (ἡγούμενοι) are mentioned (5:2; 7:8). The Maccabees, much as they ravaged the country of the Ammonites, do not appear to have molested Moab proper, nor is the name either of Moab or of any of the towns south of the Arnon mentioned throughout those books. Josephus not only speaks of the district in which Heshbon was situated as “Moabitis” (Ant. 13:15, 4; also War, 4:8, 2), but expressly says that even at the time he wrote they were a “very great nation” (Ant. 1:11, 5). (See 5 Macc. 29:19.) Noldeke, in his recent work, Ueber die Amalekiter und einige andere nachbar Silker der Israeliten (Gottingen, 1864), page 3, insists that the final extinction of Ammonites and Moabites dates from the appearance of the Yemen tribes Salib and Gassan in the eastern districts of the Jordan. This would bring them down to about A.D. 200.

In the time of Eusebius (Onomast. Μωάβ), i.e., cir. A.D. 380, the name appears to have been attached to the district, as well as to the town of Rabbath-both of which were called Moab. It also lingered for some time in the name of the ancient Kir-Moab, which, as Charakmoba, is mentioned by  Ptolemy (Reland, Palest. page 463), and as late as the Council of Jerusalem, A.D. 536, formed the see of a bishop under the same title (ibid. page 533). Since that time the modern name Kerak has superseded the older one, and no trace of Moab has been found either in records or in the country itself.

IV. Geography and Characteristics. — Like the other countries east of Jordan, Moab has until recently been very little visited by Europeans, and beyond its general characteristics hardly anything is known of it. Of the character of the face of the country travellers only give slight reports, and among these there is considerable variation even when the same district is referred to. Thus between Kerak and Rabba, Irby (page 141 a) found “a fine country,” of great natural fertility, with “reapers at work and the corn luxuriant in all directions;” and the same district is described by Burckhardt as “very fertile, and large tracts cultivated” (Syr. July 15); while De Saulcy, on the other hand, pronounces that “from Shihan (six miles north of Rabba) to the Wady Kerak the country is perfectly bare, not a tree or .a bush to be, seen” (Voyage, 1:353); which, again, is contradicted by Seetzen, who not only found the soil very good, but encumbered with wormwood and other shrubs (Seetzen, 1:410). These discrepancies are no doubt partly due to difference in the time of year and other temporary causes, but they are not essentially contradictory; for while the whole region has been denuded of all habitations and larger forms of vegetation, it is still a rich pasture-ground for the Bedouins who roam in every direction over it, and who likewise till its extensive fields of wheat and barley. In one thing all writers agree-the extraordinary number of ruins which are scattered over the country, and which, whatever the present condition of the soil, are a sure token of its wealth in former ages (Seetzen, 1:412). Some of the most remarkable of these have recently been described by Tristram. The whole country is undulating, aid, after the general level of the plateau is reached, without any serious inequalities; and in this and the absence of conspicuous vegetation has a certain resemblance to the downs of the southern counties of England.

Of the language of the Moabites we know nothing. or next to nothing. In the few communications recorded as taking place between them and the Israelites no interpreter is mentioned (see Ruth; 1Sa 22:3-4; etc;). From the origin of the nation and other considerations we may perhaps conjecture that their language was more a dialect of Hebrew than a different tongue. This, indeed, would follow from the connection of Lot,  their founder, with Abraham. It is likewise confirmed by the remarkable inscription recently discovered. SEE MESHA.

The narrative of Numbers 22-24 must be founded on a Moabitish chronicle, though in its present condition doubtless much altered from what it originally was before it came into the hands of the author of the book of Numbers. No attempt seems yet to have been made to execute the difficult but interesting task of examining the record with the view of restoring it to its pristine form. The following are the names of Moabitish persons preserved in the Bible-probably Hebraized in their adoption into the Bible records; of such a transition we seem to have a trace in Shomer and Shimrith (see below): Zippor, Balak, Eglon, Ruth, Orpah (עָרְפָּה), Mesha (מֵישִׁע), Ithmah (1Ch 11:46), Shomer (2Ki 12:21), or Shimrith (2Ch 24:26), Sanballat. Add to these-Emim, the name by which they called the Rephaim who originally inhabited their country, and whom the Ammonites called Zamzummim or Zuzim; Chemosh, or Chemish (Jer 48:7), the deity of the nation. Of names of places the following may be mentioned: Moab, with its compounds, Sedd-Moab; the fields of Moab (A.V. “the country of Moab”); Arboth Moab, the deserts (A.V. “the plains”) of Moab, that is, the part of the Arabah occupied by the Moabites; ham Mishor, the high undulating country of Moab proper (A.V. “the plain”); Ar, or Ar- Moab (עָי) — this Gesenius conjectures to be a Moabitish form of the word which in Hebrew appears as Ir (עַיר, a city); Arnon the river (ארני); Bamoth Baal, Beer Elim, Beth-diblathaim, Dibon or Dimon, Eglaim, or perhaps Eglath Shelishiyba (Isa 15:5), Horonaim, Kiriathaim, Kirjath: huzoth (Num 33:39; comp. Isa 24:11), Kirharaseth, - haresh, -heres; Kir-Moab, Luhith, Medeba, Nimrim, or Nimrah, Nobah, or Nophah (Num 21:30), hap-Pisgah, hap-Peor, Shaveh-Kariathaim (?), Zophim, Zoar. It should be noticed how large a proportion of these names end in im.

For the religion of the Moabites, SEE CHEMOSH; SEE MOLECHI; SEE PEOR.

Of their habits and customs we have hardly a trace. The gesture employed by Balak when he found that Balaam's interference was fruitless — “he smote his hands together” — is not mentioned again in the Bible, but it may not on that account have been peculiar to the Moabites. Their mode of mourning, viz., cutting off the hair at the back of the head and cropping the beard (Jer 48:37), is one which they followed in common with the  other non-Israelitish nations, and which was forbidden to the Israelites (Lev 21:5), who indeed seem to have been accustomed rather to leave their hair and beard disordered and untrimmed when in grief (see 2Sa 19:24; 2Sa 14:2).

V. Literature. — As above remarked, through fear of the predatory and mischievous Arabs that people it, few of the numerous travellers in Palestine have ventured to explore it (see Busching's Asia, pages 507, 508). Seetzen, who, in February and March, 1806, not without danger of losing his life, undertook a tour from Damascus down to the south of the Jordan and the Dead Sea, and thence to Jerusalem, was the first to shed a new and altogether unexpected light upon the topography of this region. He found a multitude of places, or at least of ruins of places, still bearing the old names, and thus has set bounds to the perfectly arbitrary designations of them on the old charts (see U.I. Seetzen's Reisen, etc., von Prof. Kruse, etc., 1:405-26; 2:320-77; also the editor's notes thereon in volume 4). From June to September 1812, Burckhardt made the same tour from Damascus beyond the Jordan down to Kerak; whence he advanced over Wady Mousa, or the ancient Petra (which he was the first European traveller to visit), to the bay of Aila, and thence went to Cairo (Travels in the Holy Land and Syria, Lond. 1822; see also the notes of Gesenius to the German translation EWeimar, 1824], 2:1061-64). A party of English gentlemen — captains Irby and Mangles, Mr. Bankes and Mr. Legh — passed through the land of Moab in returning from Petra in 1818 (Travels in Egypt, etc. [1822, 8vo; 1847, 12mo], chapter 8; see also Legh's Supplement to Dr. Macmichael's Journey from Moscow to Constantinople [1819]). The northern parts of the country were visited by Mr. Buckingham, and more lately by Mr. George Robinson and by lord Lindsay (see also the plates to Laborde's new work, Voyage en Orient). Kerak, the capital of the country, was penetrated by the party in command of Lieut. Lynch (Expedition to the Dead Sea [1849]); and the region was. partially examined by M. De Saulcy, January 1851 (Voyage autour de la Mer Morte, Paris, 1853; also translated into English, Lond. and N. York, 1853). Tristram, however, was the first who really explored it accurately (Land of Moab, Lond. and N. York, 1873), and the American engineers of the Palestine Exploration Society have triangulated the northern portion of it. Several parties of tourists have also traversed it in various directions lately. See generally Gesenius, Comment. on Isa. 15:16 Introduct. translated by V.S. Tyler, with Notes by Moses Stuart, in Biblical Repos. for 1836,  7:107-124; Keith, Evidence from Prophecy, pages 153-165; and Land of Israel, pages 279-295; Kitto, Pictorial Bible, Notes to Deu 2:2; Isaiah 16, 17; Jeremiah 43; H. Scharban, Parerga philol. theol. (Lubeck, 1723 sq.), part 3 and 4; G. Kohlreiff, Gesch. d. Philist. u. Moab, (atzeb. 1738). See also the Quarterly Rev. October 1873, art. 6; Brit. and For. Ev. Rev. January 1874. page 195; Meth. Qu. Rev. January 1874, page 174; Luth. Ev. Rev. January 1874, page 140. For a singular endeavor to identify the Moabites with the Druses, see Sir G.H. Rose's pamphlet, The Afghans the Ten Tribes, etc. (Lond. 1852); especially the statement therein of Mr. Wood, late British consul at Damascus (pages 154-157).

## Moabitess[[@Headword:Moabitess]]

             (Heb. Moabiyah', מוֹאבַיָּה, fem. of Moabite; Sept. Μοαβῖτις), a Moabitish woman (Rth 1:22; Rth 2:2; Rth 2:21; Rth 4:5; Rth 4:19;. 2Ch 24:26). SEE MOABITE.

## Moabitic Stone[[@Headword:Moabitic Stone]]

             SEE MESHA.

## Moadiah[[@Headword:Moadiah]]

             (Neh 13:17). SEE MAADIAH.

## Mobab[[@Headword:Mobab]]

             what may be either done or omitted, according to the law of Mohammed, as being indifferent.

## Mobaiedians[[@Headword:Mobaiedians]]

             a name given to the followers of the famous Mohammedan impostor Borkai or Mokanna (q.v.). They made an insurrection in the province of Khorassan against the caliph Mahadi, who, however, at length defeated them. Their name is derived from an Arabic word signifying white, the color of their dress, by which they were distinguished from the adherents of the caliph, who were clothed in black garments.

## Mobeds[[@Headword:Mobeds]]

             are the officiating priests among the Parsees of India. They read the holy books in the temples, and superintend all the religious ceremonies, but being themselves unlearned, they seldom understand the meaning of what they read, or the prayers they recite. The mobeds are distinct from the  dusters, who are doctors and expounders of the law. There is. also an. inferior. order of clergy among the Parsees, called hirbeds, who have immediate charge of the sacred fire, and sweep and take care of the temple. The priests receive their office by inheritance, and have no fixed salary, but are paid for their services. Many of them follow secular employments.

## Moberley, George, D.D., D.C.L[[@Headword:Moberley, George, D.D., D.C.L]]

             an English prelate, was born in St. Petersburg in 1803. He was educated at Winchester School, and graduated from Balliol College, Oxford, in 1825; was for some years tutor and fellow there; in 1835 was appointed head- master of Winchester School; in 1866 rector of Brixton, in the Isle of Wight; in 1868 a canon of Chester; in 1869 bishop of Salisbury, and died July 7, 1885. Dr. Moberley was the author of numerous sermons and essays, also one of the five clergyman who published revised versions of several parts of the New Test.

## Moberly, George, D.D[[@Headword:Moberly, George, D.D]]

             a prelate of the Church of England, was born in St. Petersburg, Russia; October 10, 1803. He was educated at Baliol College, Oxford, graduating in 1825; was fellow and tutor in his college; public examiner in the University in 1830, 1833-35; select preacher, 1833, 1858, 1863; head master of Winchester College, 1835-66; rector of Brightstone, Isle of Wight, 1866-69; fellow of Winchester College, 1866-70; Bampton lecturer, 1868; canon of Chester, 1868-69; consecrated bishop in 1869, and died July 6, 1885. He was the author of a number of volumes of sermons, and a member of the New Testament Revision Committee.

## Mobius[[@Headword:Mobius]]

             SEE MOEBIUS.

## Mobley, William H[[@Headword:Mobley, William H]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Kentucky in 1830; removed to Missouri in 1852; was licensed to preach in 1854, and shortly after joined the St. Louis Conference; continued to travel and preach regularly till 1861, when the troubles of war compelled his removal to Arkansas, where he remained till 1865. He then returned to Kentucky, his native state, and died in Hickman Gdunty, July 27, 1865. Mr. Mobley was a good man and an efficient preacher. See Minautes of the M.E. Church, South, 1866. s.v.

## Mocetto, Girolamo[[@Headword:Mocetto, Girolamo]]

             a painter and engraver of the Venetian school, and sometimes called Hieronymus Mocetus, was a native of Verona, according to Lanzi, or of Brescia, according to Vasari, and was probably an early disciple of Bellini. Lanzi mentions an altar-piece in the church of S. Nazario-e-Celso bearing his name, and dated 1493. Mocetto was chiefly known, however, as an engraver, and his works in this line are extremely scarce and valuable. Among others may be mentioned engravings of the Resurrection; the Sacrifice, with many figures; the Virgin and Child, with St. John the  Baptist and another saint, which is now in the British Museum; the Virgin and Child seated on a Throne, and a wood-cut of the Entry of Christ into Jerusalem. He died about 1500. See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts (N.Y. 1865, 2 volumes, 8vo), 2:590; Lanzi, Hist. of Painting, transl. by Roscoe (Lond. 1847, 3 volumes, 8vo), 2:107; Revue des Beaux Arts, June 15, 1859.

## Mocha Of Tiberias, Or Palestine[[@Headword:Mocha Of Tiberias, Or Palestine]]

             a noted rabbi, who flourished shortly after the middle of the 8th century, is said to have been one of the world's greatest savans. Unfortunately but little is known of his personal history. He established, or at least amplified, the interlineary system of vocalization, called the Tiberian, or Palestinian, which has for centuries been generally adopted both by Jew and Gentile in pointed editions of the O.-T. Scriptures, to the exclusion of the superlineary system, called the Babylonian, or Assyrian, which was invented or extended by Acha of Trak (in the first half of the 6th century). Like his predecessor R. Acha, the author of the opposite system, R. Mocha also compiled a large and small Masorah, in which are discussed the writing of words with or without the vowel letters (מלא וחסר), the affixing of certain accents (נגונות), accented syllables, Dagesh and Raphe, rare forms; archaic words, homonymes, etc., as is evident from an ancient MS. of the Pentateuch by Firkowitzsch. where the following Masoretic gloss frequently occurs: “Rabbi Mocha writes this with and that without the vowel letters.” These Masoretic glosses he wrote in Aramaic, and in the Tiberian dialect — the language of the Palestinian Jews — in order to make his labors both accessible and intelligible to all his people. Not unfrequently, however, these Masoretic glosses are intermixed with notes written in Hebrew. See Pinsker, Likuti Kadmonijot (Vienna, 1860), page 62, Appendix; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 5:552; First, Gesch. des Karaertthums, 1:15 sq., 134 sq.

## Mochmur, The Brook[[@Headword:Mochmur, The Brook]]

             (ὁ χειμάῤῥος Μρχμούρ; Alex. omits Μοχ.; Vulg. omits), a torrent, i.e., a wady. the word “brook” conveys an entirely false impression — mentioned only in Jdt 7:18; and there as specifying the position of Ekrebel — “Near unto Chusi, and upon the brook Mochmur.” Ekrebel has been identifled, with great probability, by Mr. Van de Velde in Akrabeh, a ruined site in the mountains of Central Palestine, equidistant from Nablus  and Seilunl, south-east of the former and north-east of the latter; and the torrent Mochmur may be either the Wady Makfuriyeh, on the northern slopes of which Akrabeh stands, or the Wady Ahmar, which is the continuation of the former eastwards. The reading of the Syriac (Nachol de-Peor) possibly points to the existence of a sanctuary of Baal Peor. in this neighborhood, but is more probably a corruption of the original name, which was apparently מִחְמוּר (Simon, Onomasticon N.T. page 111).

## Modalism[[@Headword:Modalism]]

             is a term applied to the heretical views regarding the Trinity first espoused by Sabellius, a presbyter of Ptolemais, who flourished about the middle of the 3d century. Adopting the notions of the earlier Monarchians, he maintained, in opposition to the doctrine propounded by Origen and his school, that the appellations of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost were only so many different manifestations and names of one and the same divine being. He thus converted the objective and real distinction of persons (a trinity of essence) into a merely subjective and modalistic view (the trinity of manifestation). SEE MONARCHIANS; SEE SABELLIANISM. Compare also the articles SEE HYPOSTASIS and SEE TRINITY.

## Modality[[@Headword:Modality]]

             (from Lat. modus), a philosophical term applied by Kant, who, in treating of our judgments, reduced them to the four heads of quantity, quality, relation, and modality. In reference to modality, he teaches, they are either problematic, or assertory, or apodictical. Hence the category of modality includes possibility and impossibility, existence and non-existence, necessity or contingency. But existence and non-existence should have no place; the contingent and the necessary: are not different from being. Kant was not, however, the first to use the term modality. Aristotle may not have used it himself in the four modal propositions which he defined and opposed (Περὶ ἑρμηνεαίς, c. 12-14), but it is to be found among his commentators and the scholastic philosophers. See Krauth's Fleming, Vocabulary of Philos. (N.Y., Sheldon & Co.) pages 320, 321; Dict. des Sciences Philosoph. s.v.

## Modena[[@Headword:Modena]]

             formerly a sovereign duchy of Upper Italy, and now a part of the united kingdom, is situated between Parma, Lombardy, Venice, the Papal States,  Tuscany, and the Adriatic Ocean. and covers an area of about 966 square miles, with 273,231 inhabitants in 1885).

The ancient history of Modena affords evidence that it enjoyed at an early period a considerable degree of prosperity; the splendor, wealth, and arts of its capital. of like name, being mentioned by Cicero, Pliny, and Strabo. In modern times Modena has shared, more or less, the various vicissitudes. which befell Italy, and participated in the great internecine feuds of the country. In 960 a member of the great, house of Este was proclaimed marquis of Modena, and in 1452 the then reigning marquis was created duke by the emperor Frederick III. In 1797 Modena formed part of the Cisalpine Republic, but was restored in 1814 by .the congress of Vienna to the reigning family. The duchy had at that time an area of 2310 square miles, and a population of 586,000. In 1848 the duke of Modena was temporarily deprived of his rights; and in 1859 the. population definitively expelled their unpopular ruler, who carried off all the property and valuables within his reach, including the silver handles of the palace doors. In the beginning of March, 1860, a plebiscitum declared in favor of annexation to the kingdom of Sardinia, which is now included in Italy as a united kingdom.

In ecclesiastical history, Modena figures quite prominently during the Reformatory movement of the 16th century. The learned Sicilian, Paola Ricci, labored there successfully in 1540, and the Roman bishop of the diocese, cardinal Morone, at one time gave the country up as Lutheran. The duchess herself, Renata de Ferrraa, a sister of Francis I of France, greatly distinguished herself as a promoter of the new doctrines. But the Inquisition came, and from its introduction dates the wane of Protestantism in Modena. SEE INQUISITION; SEE ITALY.

## Modena, Barnaba da[[@Headword:Modena, Barnaba da]]

             an esteemed Italian painter of the school of Modena, who flourished in the 14th century, was among the first artists who obtained any reputation in Piedmont. Two pictures exist in the Conventuals of Pisa by this master, one in the church and the other in the convent; both portray the Virgin. In the second the coronation is represented, and the Virgin is seen surrounded by St. Francis and other saints of his order. Della Valle speaks in high terms of a third picture of the Virgin, remaining in the possession of the Conventuals of Alba, which he says is in a grander style than any contemporary works; and he states that it bears the date 1357. Morrona  extols the beauty of his heads and the delicacy of his coloring, and prefers him to Giotto. Hardly anything is known of his personal history. See Lanzi, Hist. of Painting, transl. by Roscoe (Lond. 1847, 3 volumes, 8vo), 2:345; 3:292; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts (N.Y. 1865, 2 volumes, 8vo), 2:370.

## Modena, Leon da[[@Headword:Modena, Leon da]]

             SEE LEON.

## Modena, Niccoletto da[[@Headword:Modena, Niccoletto da]]

             an old Italian painter and engraver, flourished at Modena about the beginning of the 16th century. He is principally known as one of the first engravers of Italy. His plates are well designed, but are rudely executed. The principal productions are, The Adoration of the Shepherds; St. Sebastian, with Niccoletto on a tablet; St. Jerome; St. George; a full- length figure of Christ; St. Sebastian, with his arms tied over his head to a column, and his body pierced with six arrows. Another St. Sebastian, larger than the preceding, and pierced with three arrows. David with the head of Goliath; St. Anthony; The vestal Lucca carrying water in a sieve to prove her virginity; St. Catharine, and a Saint bearing a large bag on his back. The date of his death is unknown. See Jameson and Eastlake, Hist. of our Lord (Lond. 1864, 2 volumes, 8vo), 2:57; Lanzi, Hist. of Painting, transl. by Roscoe (Lond. 1847, 3 volumes, 8vo), 1:107; 2:346; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts (N. Y. 1865, 2 volumes, 8vo), 2:571.

## Modena, Pellegrino da[[@Headword:Modena, Pellegrino da]]

             an Italian painter, the most eminent of the Modena school, was born about the middle of the 15th century. He is often called Pelleffrino Munasi, and sometimes Aretusi, but is commonly known by the title prefixed to this notice. According to Lanzi, he first studied with his father, who was also an artist of considerable repute, and in 1509 painted an altar-piece for the church of St. Giovanni at Modena, which gained him no little reputation. At this time the fame of Raphael reached Modena, and Pellegrino at once journeyed to Rome, and placed himself under the instruction of that sublime master, who, perceiving the remarkable talent of his pupil, employed him as assistant in the famous works in the Vatican. At first Pellegrino painted in the open galleries, but afterwards executed from the designs of Raphael the History of Jacob and the History of Solomon in the  Vatican, which Lanzi says were painted entirely after the manner of his master, and in a style almost incomparable. After the death of Raphael he continued to paint at Rome from his own designs, and executed some admirable works for the different churches, particularly a work in fresco in the church of St. Giacomo, entitled the History of St. James. After its completion he returned to Modena. Here he painted his most celebrated picture of the Nativity of our Lord, in the church of St. Paolo, which is characterized by Lanzi as “breathing in every part the graces of him of Urbino.” Pellegrino met with a tragic death at the hands of some Modenese, who turned their fury against him because his son had slain an antagonist in a quarrel, in 1523. See Lanzi, Hist. of Painting, transl. by Roscoe (Lond. 1847, 3 volumes, 8vo), 1:397; 2:350; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts (N.Y. 1865, 2 volumes, 8vo), 2:570.

## Moderate[[@Headword:Moderate]]

             To moderate a call, in the Church of Scotland, is, under the presidency of one of the clergy, to publicly announce and give in an invitation to a minister or licentiate to take the charge of a parish; which announcement or invitation, thus given in' the hearing of the assembled parishioners, is regarded as the first legal step towards a settlement.

## Moderates[[@Headword:Moderates]]

             is a name applied to those theologians of the Church of Scotland who favor patronage (prohibited by the Parliament of 1692, and in the Books of Discipline) and a moderate orthodoxy, i.e., a mitigation of the strictness of the old confessions. The first Moderates flourished in the middle of the last century, under the Robertsonian administration (1752-82). As early as 1720, however, the Moderate party had its influence in the Church, as is apparent from the five propositions which were condemned in a council held at that time to suppress Antinomianism, see MARROW CONTROVERSY; and the session of 1734 was no doubt provoked by the ascendancy of the Neonomians, afterwards leaders in the party of the Moderates. In many respects the Moderates are the “Latitudinarians” of the Church of Scotland. Many of them adopted the ethical principles of Francis Hutcheson (q.v.). The leading pulpit orator among the Moderates- Dr. Hugh Blairdeficient in evangelical thought and feeling, actually defended Hume against the Assembly; and well he might, for had not his party declared (in 1720) that holiness is not necessary to salvation? There  were, however, many Moderates of an evangelical spirit, and these prepared the way for the Free-church movement. SEE SCOTLAND, CHURCH OF. (J.H.W.)

Moderation imports a proper government of passion and pleasure, preventing extremes of any kind. The presence of moderation is manifest in the exhibition of a calm and temperate frame of mind. “Moderation,” says Blair, “ought to take place in our wishes, pursuits, expectations, pleasures, and passions.”

(1.) We should be moderate in our wishes. The active mind of man is seldom or never satisfied with its present condition, how prosperous soever. Originally formed for a wider range of objects, for a higher sphere of enjoyments, it finds itself, in every situation of fortune, straitened and confined. Sensible of deficiency in its state, it is ever sending forth the fond desire, the aspiring wish after something beyond what is enjoyed at present. Assuredly there is nothing unlawful in our wishing to be freed from whatever is disagreeable, and to obtain a fuller enjoyment of the comforts of life. But when these wishes are not tempered by reason they are in danger of precipitating us into extravagance and folly. If we suffer our fancy to create to itself worlds of ideal happiness; if we feed our imagination with plans of opulence and splendor far beyond our rank; if we fix to our wishes certain stages of high advancement, or certain degrees of uncommon reputation or distinction, as the sole stations of felicity, the assured consequence will be that we shall become unhappy in our present state, unfit for acting the part and discharging the duties that belong to it; we shall discompose the peace and order of our minds, and foment many hurtful passions. Here, then, let moderation begin its reign, by bringing within reasonable bounds the wishes that we form. As soon as they become extravagant, let us check them by proper reflections on the fallacious nature of those objects which the world hangs out to allure desire.

(2.) We should be moderate in our pursuits. When the active pursuits in which we engage rise beyond moderation, they fill the world with great disorders often with flagrant crimes. Yet all ambition is not to be condemned, nor ought high purposes on every occasion to be checked. Some men are formed by nature for rising into conspicuous stations of life. In following the impulse of their minds, and properly exerting the talents with which God has blessed them, there is room for ambition to act in a laudable sphere, and to become the instrument of much public good. But  this may safely be pronounced, that the bulk of men are ready to overrate their own abilities, and to imagine themselves equal to higher things than they were ever designed for by nature. We should therefore be sober in fixing our aims and planning our destined pursuits. We should beware of being led aside from the plain path of sound and moderate conduct by those false lights which self-flattery is always ready to hang out. By aiming at a mark too high we may fall short of what it was in our power to have reached. Instead of attaining to eminence, we may not only expose ourselves to derision, but bring upon our heads, manifold disasters.

(3.) We should be moderate in our expectations. When our state is flourishing, and the course of events proceeds according to our wish, we ought not to suffer our minds to be vainly lifted up. We ought not to flatter ourselves with high prospects of the increasing favors of the world and the continuing applause of men. By want of moderation in our hopes we not only increase dejection when disappointment comes, but we accelerate disappointment; we bring forward with greater speed disagreeable changes in our state. For the natural consequence of presumptuous expectation is rashness in conduct. He who indulges in confident Security of course neglects due precautions against the dangers that threaten him; and his fall will be foreseen and predicted. He not only exposes himself unguarded to dangers, but he multiplies them against himself. By presumption and vanity he either provokes enmity or incurs contempt. A temperate spirit and moderate expectations are the best safeguard of the mind in this uncertain and. changing state. They enable us to pass through the world with most comfort. When we rise in the world they contribute to our elevation, and if we fall they render our fall the lighter.

(4.) We should be moderate in our pleasures. It is an invariable law of our present condition that every pleasure which is pursued to excess converts itself into poison. What was intended for the cordial and refreshment of human life, through want of moderation, we turn to its bane. No sooner do we pass the line which temperance has drawn than pernicious effects succeed. Could the monuments of death be laid open to our view, they would read a lecture in favor of moderation much more powerful than any that the most eloquent preacher can give. We should behold the graves peopled with the victims of intemperance; we should behold those chambers of darkness hung round on every side with the trophies of luxury. drunkenness, and sensuality. So numerous should we find those martyrs of  iniquity that it may safely be asserted where war or pestilence has slain its thousands intemperate pleasure has slain its ten thousands.

(5.) We should be moderate in all our passions. This exercise of moderation is the more requisite because every passion in human nature has of itself a tendency to run into excess. All passion implies a violent emotion of mind. Of course it is apt to derange the regular course of our ideas, and to produce confusion within. Of some passions. such as anger and resentment, the excess is so obviously dangerous as loudly to call for moderation. He who gives himself up to the impetuosity of such passions without restraint is universally condemned. Of the insidious growth of passion, therefore, we have great reason to beware. Let us be persuaded that moments of passion are always moments of delusion; that nothing truly is what it then seems to be; that all the opinions which we then form are erroneous; and that all the judgments which we then pass are extravagant. Let moderation accustom us to wait till the fumes of passion are spent till the mist which it has raised begins to be dissipated. On no occasion let us imagine that strength of mind is shown by violence of passion. It is the strength of one who is in the delirium of a fever, or under the disease of madness. True strength of mind is shown in governing and resisting passion, and acting on the most trying occasions according to the dictates of conscience and right reason. See Blair, Sermons, volume 2, sermon 42.

## Moderator[[@Headword:Moderator]]

             is the name of an ecclesiastical officer in the Presbyterian churches. His duty is to preside over a meeting or an assembly of ministers, to regulate their proceedings in session, and to declare the vote (see Presbyt. Confession, page 366 sq.). To moderate in a call is to preside over the election of a minister. When the attempt was made to introduce episcopacy into Scotland, one plan was to have perpetual moderators for presbyteries- a bishop or his vicar to be chosen to the office.

## Moderatus Of Gades[[@Headword:Moderatus Of Gades]]

             (loderatus Gaditanus), a distinguished exponent of the neo-Pythagorean school of philosophy, surnamed after his native place, flourished during the reign of the emperor Nero (A.D. 54-68). He collected all the MSS. extant on the philosophical views of Pythagoras, and embodied them in his works: Lib. 11:De placitis sectce Pythagoricae; Lib. 5, Scholarum  Pythagoricarun, which are unfortunately no longer extant. (Simply a fragment of his is preserved by Stobaeus, Eclog. page 3.) According to Porphyry (Vita Pythag. § 32 et 53), Moderatus sought to justify the incorporation into Pythagoreanism of Platolnc and not theological doctrines, through the hypothesis that the ancient Pythagoreans themselves intentionally expressed the highest truths in signs, and for that purpose made use of numbers. The number one was the symbol of unity and equality, and of the cause of the harmony and duration of all things, while two was the symbol of difference and inequality, of division and change, etc. SEE NEO-PYTHAGOREANISM. Moderatus is reputed to have been a man of considerable eloquence, and not only to have been popular in his day, but to have found an imitator, to some extent, in Iamblichus (q.v.). See Schoell, Histoire de la litterature Graeque, 6:54; Ueberweg, Hist. Philos. 1:232 sq. (J.H.W.)

## Modern Question[[@Headword:Modern Question]]

             is a term used by some to designate a controversy on the doctrine of salvation. The question raised is, “Whether it be the duty of all to whom the Gospel is preached to repent and believe in Christ?” It is called the Modern question because it is supposed never to have been agitated before the early part of the last century. The following is an abstract of Dr. Ryland's history of the controversy, which he considers as having originated in Northamptonshire, England, in the Baptist churches in which Mr. Davis, of Rothwell, preached; though it does not appear that the latter took an active part in it. Mr. Maurice, his successor, even strenuously opposed the negative side of the question, which had been maintained by some of Mr. Davis's admirers, particularly by Mr. Lewis Wevman, of Kimbolton, to whom Mr. Maurice wrote a reply, which, Mr. Maurice dying before it was completed, was published by the celebrated Mr. Bradbury This was between 1737 and 1739. Mr. Gutteridge, of Oundle, also took the affirmative side; and in 1743 Mr Brine the negative; as did also the learned Dr. Gill, though he did not write expressly on the subject. The question thus started agitated the Baptists down to the time of Andrew Fuller, who very ably supported the positive side, viz., that “faith is the duty of all men, although, through the depravity of human nature, men will not believe till regenerated by the Holy Spirit.” On the other side it was contended that “faith was not a duty, but a grace,” the exercise of which was not required till it was bestowed.

Mr. Fuller, holding that it is both, published The Gospel worthy of all Acceptation, or the Duty of all Men to  believe in Jesus Christ. “The leading design of this performance (say Mr. Morris) is to prove that men are under indispensable obligations to believe ‘whatever God says, and to do whatever he commands; and a Saviour being revealed in the Gospel, the law in effect requires those to whom he is made known to believe in him, seeing it insist upon obedience to the whole will of God; that the inability of man to comply with the divine requirements is wholly of a moral nature, and consists in the prevalence of an evil disposition, which, being voluntary, is in the highest degree criminal.” On this subject Mr. Fuller was attacked by Mr. Button, a supralapsarian, on the one hand, and by Mr. Daniel Taylor, an Arminian on the other; to whom he replied by A Defence of his former tract, and this ended the controversy. The late Mr. Robinson shrewdly remarks that those ministers who will not use applications, lest they should rob the Holy Spirit of the honor of applying the Word, should, for the same reason, not use explications, lest they should deprive him of the honor of illustrating it. See Ryland, Life of Fuller, pages 6-11; Morris, Life of Fuller, chapter 2; Wilson, Dissenting Churches, 2:572; Ivimey, English Baptists, 3:262. SEE SALVATION.

## Modestus (1), St[[@Headword:Modestus (1), St]]

             an apostle of the Church in Carinthia, flourished in the 8th century. He was one of six whom bishop Vigilius of Salzburg sent to Carinthia to preach the glad tidings. Modestus lived but a short time after his arrival in Carinthia, but the success of his mission is manifest in the conversion of the princes of the country, who are said to have espoused the cause of Christianity at this time. SEE CARINTHIA. Modestus is commemorated in the Latin Church as a saint.

(2.) Another Modestus flourished in the 7th century (616-626) as patriarch of the Church of Jerusalem. He is reputed as the restorer of the holy church at Jerusalem. which was destroyed by the Persians under Chosroes II in 614.

## Modesty[[@Headword:Modesty]]

             (Lat. modestia, from maodus, a measure) is sometimes used to denote humility, and sometimes to express chastity. The Greek word kosmios signifies neat, or well arranged. It suggests the idea of simple elegance. Modesty, therefore, consists in purity of sentiment and manners, inclining us to abhor the least appearance of vice and indecency, and to fear doing anything which will justly incur censure. All excess of modesty is called bashfulness or diffidence, and the want of it impertinence or impudence. There is also a false or vicious modesty, which influences a man to do anything that is ill or indiscreet; such as, through fear of offending his companions, he runs into their follies or excesses; or it is a false modesty Which restrains a man from doing what is good or laudable, such as being ashamed to speak of religion, and to be seen in the exercises of piety and devotion.

## Modi Or Mode[[@Headword:Modi Or Mode]]

             (i.e. courageous, from a root cognate with the Danish mod, and the German muth “courage”) is in northern mythology the name of a son of Thor, who, the legend goes, is to survive the destruction of the world at Ragnarock, and in the renovated world will share with Mogni the possession of their father's hammer, and engage in the extermination of all strife. See Thorpe, Northern Mythology, volume 1; Keyes, Religion of the Northmen.

## Modigliana, Francisco[[@Headword:Modigliana, Francisco]]

             a Bolognese painter; flourished about the beginning of the 17th century. Lamnzi says he “was not remarkably powerful, nor always consistent with himself, but very graceful and beautiful, and deserving a place in our lexica.” His works at Urbino, where he is known under the name of Francisco da Forli, are a picture of Christ taken down from the Cross, in oil, at St. Croce, and some Angels, in fresco, at St. Lucia. His finest works, however, are in the churches at Forli and Rimini, among which are A dam driven from Eden, the Deluge, and the Tower of Babel. He died suddenly, leaving his work imperfect,' but it was afterwards continued by Arrigoni, who painted the Death of Abel in the same place. See Lanzi's Hist. of Painting, transl. by Roscoe (Lond. 1847, 3 volume, 8vo), 3:57.

## Modin[[@Headword:Modin]]

             (Μωδεϊvν v.r. Μωδεείμ, Μωδιείμ, Μωδαείμ, and in chapter 2 Μωδεείν; Josephus, Μωδιείμ, and once Μωδεείν; Vulg. Modin: the Jewish form is, in the Mishna, המודיעיםin Joseph ben-Gorion, chapter 20 המודעית; the Syriac version of Maccabees agrees with the Mishna, except in the absence of the article, and is the usual substitution of r for d, Mora'im), a place not mentioned in either the Old or New Testament, though rendered immortal by its connection with the history of the Jews in the interval between the two. It was the native city of the Maccabnean family (1Ma 13:25), and as a necessary consequence contained their ancestral sepulchre (τάφος) (2:70; 9:19). Hither Mattathias removed from Jerusalem, where up to that time he seems to have been residing, at the commencement of the Antiochian persecution (2:1). It was here that he struck the first blow of resistance, by slaying on the heathen altar which had been erected in the place both the commissioner of Antiochus and a recreant Jew whom he had induced to sacrifice, and then demolishing the altar. Mattathias himself, and subsequently his sons Judas and Jonathan, were buried in the family tomb, and over them Simon erected a structure which is minutely described in the book of Maccabees (13:25-30), and, with less detail, by Josephus (Ant. 13:6, 6), but the restoration of which has hitherto proved as difficult a puzzle as that of the mausoleum of Artemisia.

At Modin the Maccabsean armies encamped on the eves of two of their most memorable victories — that of Judas over Antiochus Eupator (2Ma 13:14), and that of Simon over Cendebaus (1Ma 14:4) — the  last battle of the venerable chief before his assassination. The only indication of the position of the place to be gathered from the above notices is contained in the last, from which we may infer that it was near “the plain” (τὸ πεδίον), i.e., the great maritime lowland of Philistia (1Ma 14:5). By Eusebius and Jerome.(Onomast, Μηδεείμ, Modim) it is specified as near Diospolis, i.e., Lydda; while the notice in the Mishna (Pesachim, 9:2), and the comments of Bartenora and Maimonides, state that it was fifteen (Roman) miles from Jerusalem. At the same time the description of the monument seems to imply (though for this see below) that the spot was so lofty as to be visible from the sea, and so near that even the details of the sculpture were discernible therefrom. All these conditions, except the last, are tolerably fulfilled in either of the two sites called Latrin and Kubbab. The former of these is, by the shortest road — that through Wady All- exactly fifteen Roman miles from Jerusalem; it is about eight English miles from Lydd, fifteen from the Mediterranean, and nine or ten from the River Rubin, on which it is probable that Cedron — the position of Cendebbeus in Simon's battle-stood. Kubab is a couple of miles farther from Jerusalem, and therefore nearer to Lydd and to the sea, on the most westerly spur of the hills of Benjamin. Both are lofty, and both apparently — Latrun certainly — command a view of the Mediterranean. In favor of Latrun are the extensive ancient remains with which the top of the hill is said to be covered (Robinson, Bib. Res. 3:151; Tobler, Dritte Wand. page 186), though of their date and particulars we have at present no accurate information. The foundations of the fortress appear to be of the Roman age, or perhaps earlier, though the upper parts exhibit pointed arches and light architecture of a much later date. The view from the summit is commanding, and embraces the whole plain to Joppa and the Mediterranean beyond. The name Latron appears to have arisen in the 16th century, from the legend which made this the birthplace of the penitent thief —“Castrum boni Latronis” (Quaresmius, 2:12; Porter, Hand-book, page 285; Reland, page 901; Thomson, Land and Book, 2:308).

Kubab appears to possess no ruins, but, on the other hand, its name may retain a trace of the monument. Ewald (Gesch. 4:350, note) suggests that the name Modin may be still surviving in Deir Ma'in. But this is questionable on philological grounds; and the position of Deir Ma'in is less in accordance with the facts than that of the two named in the text. The mediaeval and modern tradition (see Robinson, 2:7) places Modin at Soba, and eminence south of Kuriet el-Enab; but this being not more than seven miles from Jerusalem, while it is as much as twenty-five from Lydda and thirty from  the sea, and also far removed from the plain of Philistia, is at variance with every one of the conditions implied in the records. It has found advocates in our own day in M. de Saulcy (L'Art Judaique, etc., page 377 sq.) and M. Salzmann (Jerusalem, Etude, etc., pages 37, 38; where the lively account would be more satisfactory if it were less encumbered with mistakes), the latter of whom explored chambers there which may have been tombs, though he admits that there was nothing to prove it. A suggestive fact, which Dr. Robinson first pointed out, is the want of unanimity in the accounts of the mediaeval travellers, some of whom, as William of Tyre (8:1), place Modin in a position near Emmaus — Nicopolis, Nob, and Lydda. M. Mislin also usually so vehement in favor of the traditional sites has recommended further investigation. If it should turn out that the expression of the book of Maccabees as to the monument being visible from the sea has been misinterpreted, then one impediment to the reception of Soba will be removed; but it is difficult to account for the origin of the tradition in the teeth of those which remain.

The descriptions of the tomb by the author of the book of Maccabees and Josephus, who had both apparently seen it, will be most conveniently compared by being printed together:

1 Macc. 23:27-30.

"And Simon made a building over the sepulchre of his father and his brethren, and raised it aloft to view with polished" stone behind and before. And he set up upon it seven pyramids, one against another, for his father and his mother and his four brethren. And on these he made engines of war, and set great pillars round about, and on the pillars he made suits of armour for a perpetual memory; and by the suits of armour ships carved, so that they might be seen by all that sail on the sea.

This sepulchre he made at Modin, and it stands unto this day."Josephus, Ant. 13:6, 6.

"And Simon built a very large monument to his father and his brethren of white and polished stone. And he raised it up to a great and conspicuous height, and threw cloisters around, and set up pillars of a single stone, the work wonderful to behold : and near to these he built seven pyramids to his parents and his brothers, one for each, terrible to behold both for size and beauty.

And these things are preserved even to this day"The monuments are said by Eusebius (ut sup.) to have been still shown when he wrote — A.D. cir. 320. Any restoration of the structure from so imperfect an account as the above can never be anything more than conjecture. Something has been already attempted under SEE MACCABEES (q.v.). But in its absence one or two questions present themselves.

(1.) The “ships” (πλοῖα, naves). The sea and its pursuits were so alien to the ancient Jews, and the life of the Maccabaean heroes who preceded Simon was — if we except their casual relations with Joppa and Jamnia and the battle-field of the maritime plain — so unconnected therewith, that it is difficult not to suppose that the word is corrupted from what it originally was. This was the view of J.D. Michaelis, but he does not propose any satisfactory word in substitution for πλοῖα (see his suggestion in Grimm, ad loc.). True, Simon appears to, have been to a certain extent alive to the importance of commerce to his country, and he is especially commemorated for having acquired the harbor of Joppa, and thus opened an inlet for the isles of the sea (1Ma 14:5). But it is difficult to see the connection between this and the placing of ships on a monument to his father and brothers, whose memorable deeds had been of a different description. It is perhaps more feasible to suppose that the sculptures were intended to be symbolical of the departed heroes. In this case it seems not. improbable that during Simon's intercourse with the Romans he had seen and been struck with their war-galleys, no inapt symbols of the fierce and rapid career of Judas. How far such symbolical representation was likely to occur: to. a Jew of that period is another question..

(2.) The distance at which the “ships” were to be seen.. Here again, when the necessary distance of Modin from the sea — Latr'in, fifteen miles; Kubab, thirteen; Lydda itself, ten — and the limited size of the sculptures are considered, the doubt inevitably arises whether the Greek text of the book of Maccabees accurately represents the original. De Saulcy (L'Art Judaique, page 377) ingeniously suggests that the true meaning is, not that the sculptures could be discerned from the vessels in the Mediterranean. but that they were worthy to be inspected by those who were sailors by  profession. Hitzig (Gesch. des Volkes. Israels, page 449) insists upon it (1869) that Modin is recognised in the modern little village el-Burjh (comp. Robinson, 3:272), but the exact location is by recent excavations determined to be in el-Mediyeh, two and a quarter hours. east of Lydda (Quar. Statement of “Palestine Exploration Fund,” 1870, page 245 sq.; 1874, page 58 sq.).

## Modin. El-Medieh[[@Headword:Modin. El-Medieh]]

             the modern representative of this place, famous in the Maccabean history, is fully described in the Memoirs accompanying the Ordnance Survey, 2:341 sq. (See illustration on page 731.)

## Modius[[@Headword:Modius]]

             SEE BUSHEL.

## Modius [[@Headword:Modius ]]

             (from Greek μόδιος, a measure) designates, in the language of archaeological sculpture, a kind of basket frequently found in representations of heathen divinities. It was placed on their heads in imitation of the practice prevailing among the ancients, among whom the women carried in baskets on their heads sacrifices for the gods.

## Modoin, Or Mautwin[[@Headword:Modoin, Or Mautwin]]

             a noted early French ecclesiastic, was born towards the latter part of the 8th century. In his early manhood he was a priest connected with St. George's church at Lyons. Later he was bishop of Autun. The first mention of his name in the Church records of Autun occurs in 815. Soon afterwards he was recognised as one of the leading prelates in the empire. Louis “le Debonnaire,” in his disgrace and adversity, had no adherent more faithful than Modoin, whose credit at the court of Charles the Bald was equally high. When Pepin was driven out of Aquitaine, Charles the Bald divided that kingdom into three governments, the designated capitals of which were, respectively, Limoges, Clermont, and Angouleme. The ecclesiastical district of Clermont was then assigned to bishop Modoin. Later, after the deposition of Agobard, archbishop of Lyons, Modoin took an active part in the administration of the archiepiscopal see. Florus reproaches him with undue firmness in his treatment of the Lyonnese clergy. The reverend Rouvier mentions Modoin as being numbered among the abbes of Moutier- Saint-Jean, in the diocese of Langres. In the 9th century it was not uncommon to meet bishops engaged in the same pursuits with abbes. When Theodulfe, bishop of Orleans, was in prison at Angers, he sent a poetical composition to Modoin, begging him to interfere in his favor. Modoin, in reply, indited a short poem, his only literary work extant. He died about  842. See Gallia Christ. volume 4, col. 359; Hist. Litter. de la France, 4:547.

## Modus[[@Headword:Modus]]

             in ecclesiastical law, signifies an exemption from the payment of tithes, and is of two kinds: first, a partial exemption, when it is called a modus decimandi; secondly, a total exemption, when it is called a modus de non decimando. There is a third species of exemption, called a real composition, where an agreement is made between the owner of lands and the parson or vicar, with the consent of the patron and ordinary, that the lands specified shall be exempt from tithes on such considerations as are contained in the stipulation, such as land or other real recompense given in lieu and satisfaction of the tithes to be relinquished. The modus decimandi is that which is generally meant when the term modus is used. It is defined to be a custom of tithing in a particular manner, different from that which the general law prescribes; and the custom must have existed from time immemorial. The modes of tithing established by these customs are exceedingly various: sometimes it is a compensation in work and labor, as that the incumbent shall have only the twelfth cock of hay, and not the tenth, in consideration of the landowner making it for him; sometimes it is a less quantity of tithe in a more perfect, in lieu of a larger quantity in a crude and imperfect state, as a couple of fowls in lieu of tithe eggs; sometimes, and more frequently, it consists in a pecuniary compensation, as twopence an acre for the tithe of land.

The modus de non decimando is an absolute exemption from tithes. It exists in four cases:

1. The ruler may prescribe that he and his progenitors have never paid tithes for ancient crown lands, and this prescription will be good.

2. One Church officer does not pay tithes to another officer his superior, nor the superior to the inferior, according to the rule that ecclesia ecclesiae decimos solvere non debet.

3. An ecclesiastical person, as a bishop, may prescribe to be exempt from paying tithes on the ground that the lands belong to the bishopric, and that neither he nor his predecessors have ever paid them.

4. The abbeys and monasteries at the time of their dissolution were possessed of large estates of land, a great part of which was held tithe-free,  either by prescription or by unity of possession, which was, in fact, no more than prescription, or by the pope's bull of exemption, or by a real composition. Thus in ‘England, for example, the statute of 31 Henry VIII, c. 13, which dissolved the larger abbeys, enacted that all persons who should come to the possession of the lands of an abbey then dissolved should hold them tithe-free, in as ample a manner as the abbeys themselves had formerly hell them. The lands which belonged to the Order of the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem and to the Order of the Cistercians are within the protection of this statute; and those of them, consequently, which were tithe-free before they came into the hands of the king still continue tithe-free, in whosesoever hands they may now be. Some lands have been made tithe free by special legislative acts. See Blackstone, Comnmentaries, 2:28; Selden, History of Tithes, chapter 13; Burton, Conmpendium of the Law of Real Property, page 367 sq.

## Moebius (Or Mobius), Georg[[@Headword:Moebius (Or Mobius), Georg]]

             a Lutheran divine, was born at Laucha, Thuringia, December 18, 1616; studied at Jena and Leipsic; became rector of the gymnasium at Mercersburg in 1647; professor and doctor of theology at Leipsic in 1668; and died November 28, 1697. He edited and enlarged Cruusius's Grammatica Graeca, and was the author of numerous essays in Latin on Biblical and theological topics, which were afterwards published in a collective edition (Leips. 1699, 4to). See Jocher, Gelehrten Lexikon. s.v.

## Moed[[@Headword:Moed]]

             SEE TALMUD.

## Moedsognir[[@Headword:Moedsognir]]

             in Norse mythology, is the name of the highest class of pigmies who dwell in stones.

## Moehler[[@Headword:Moehler]]

             SEE MUHLER.

## Moelart, Jacob[[@Headword:Moelart, Jacob]]

             a Dutch painter, was born at Dort in the year 1649. He was a pupil of Nicholas Maas, and gained an enviable reputation as a historical painter,  though he is better known by. his portraits. Spooner mentions two religious works by this artist — Pharaoh and his Host drowned in the Red Sea, and Moses striking the Rock. He died in 1727.

## Moeller[[@Headword:Moeller]]

             SEE MOLLER.