## Moeso Gothic Version[[@Headword:Moeso Gothic Version]]

             SEE GOTHIC VERSION.

## Moeth[[@Headword:Moeth]]

             (Μωἐθ, Vulg. Medics), a Levite, “son of Sabban,” who aided Ezra in conveying the bullion from Babylon (1Es 8:63); evidently the NOADIAH SEE NOADIAH (q.v.) “son of Binnui” of the Heb. text (Ezr 8:33).

## Moffat, Nicol de[[@Headword:Moffat, Nicol de]]

             a Scotch prelate, was elected bishop of the see of Glasgow in 1268. He died at Tinningham, in East-Lothian. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 241.

## Moffat, Robert, D.D[[@Headword:Moffat, Robert, D.D]]

             an eminent English missionary, was born at Inverkeithing, Fifeshire, Scotland, December 21, 1795. He was originally a gardener, and was brought up within the fold of the Secession Church, to which his parents belonged. In 1816, having resolved to become a missionary to the heathen, he offered his services to the London Missionary Society, and arriving at Cape Town in 1817, immediately proceeded beyond the boundaries of  Cape Colony to Namaqualand, where he entered upon his labors at the kraal of Africaner, a chief whose name had long been a terror to the people of the neighboring districts of the colony, but who had lately become a convert to Christianity. Here Moffat labored for three or four years with great success, Christianity and civilization advancing together. But the situation being unsuitable for a principal mission-station, he travelled and labored at several stations in succession in the countries to the north and north-east of Cape Colony.

His remarkable personal adventures and hairbreadth escapes in these journeys are graphically described in his work, Missionary Labors and Scenes in Southern Africa (Lond. 1842, 8vo), which he wrote and published during a visit of several years to Britain, rendered necessary by the state of his health. In America also Mr. Moffat's book made many friends for the African, and our missionary labors in that field were largely inspired by his appeals. During his stay in England Moffat also carried through the press, at the expense of the British and Foreign Evangelical Society, a version of the New Test. and the Psalms in the Bechuana language. In 1842 he returned to his labors in Africa, and continued his work there, with great success, till 1870, when he returned to Scotland. In 1873 he received a public gratuity of £5800 as a testimonial of his missionary services. He died near London, August 9, 1883. Besides the publication already mentioned, we have from him the Becuana Hymn-book (Lond. Relig. Tract Soc. 1843, 18mo). Moffat's Farewell Services were edited by Dr. Campbell, and published in 1843 (8vo). Moffat's daughter was the wife of the celebrated missionary and traveller, the late Dr. Livingstone. See Yonge, Pioneers and Founders (Lond. 1872, 12mo); Bayard: Taylor, Cyclop. of Mod. Travel (N.Y. 1856), page 561 sq.; Miss. Cyclop. (ibid. 1873, 8vo), s.v.; Christian at Work, August 16, 1883; Life and Labors (N.Y. 1883); (Lond.) Cong. Year-book, 1884, page 311.

## Moffatt, Josiah[[@Headword:Moffatt, Josiah]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Chester County, S.C., May 1836. His parents were godly people, and reared their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. He prosecuted his classical studies privately' for two years, entered Erskine College, Due West, S.C., in 1852, and graduated with honor in 1859. The next two years he spent in general reading at the libraries of his alma mater. He was received by the Second Presbytery as a student of theology in April 1861; licensed in 1864; and subsequently preached in congregations in the First and Second Presbyteries, making Due West his home. In 1865 he returned to his former home in Chester County, where he remained until his death, March 18, 1867. Mr. Moffatt was a man of solid intellect. His writings were excellent specimens of composition, and full of the marrow of divinity. Benevolence and humility were prominent features of his character. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1868, page 393.

## Mogila(s), Peter[[@Headword:Mogila(s), Peter]]

             a distinguished Russian prelate, was born in Moldavia very near the close of the 16th century (about 1597). He studied at the University of Paris and other high schools, afterwards entered the Polish army, and greatly distinguished himself. Becoming sober-minded, he decided to devote  himself to the service of the Church, was made a monk at Kief in 1625, and rapidly rose in favor. In 1629 he was elected archimandrite of his monastery, and in 1633 was elevated to the rank of metropolitan of Kief, Galicia, and Little Russia. Mogila was the first to introduce in the study of theology at Kief the developments which it had acquired in the European universities. Indeed, Mogila is today honored annually by a panegyrical oration at the Academy of Kief, in recognition of his services to that institution of learning. He arranged and improved the courses of study in every particular; established, among. other advantages, three classes in philosophy and theology in the Latin and Polish languages; obtained from the Polish government permission to erect a printing-press, invited many learned men to the academy, and settled upon them sources of revenue which had formerly gone to the metropolitan; and, besides affording all these advantages, gave them his own library, which was considered a very rare and valuable collection of books. He died December 31, 1646.

To confirm the views and feelings of the Oriental Church in opposition to the encroachments of Roman and Protestant elements, Mogila wrote a Confession of Faith (Ο᾿ρθόδοξος ὁμολογία τῆς καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἀνατολικῆς), which occupies an important place in the history of the Russian Church. In this the doctrines of the Church are presented in the simple manner and style of the ancient Church, but in accordance also with the latest developments they had gradually attained; and as the exception of the work was ranked among the three cardinal theological virtues it has become prominent in the practical system of the Church (Hase, Ch. Hist. page 481). “The Eastern churches,” says M. Boulgakof, bishop of Vinitzi, “had heretofore no symbolic books of their own in which they could find,' on matters of faith, sufficient authoritative information and direction; no systematic exposition and apology of their dogmas; they had to be satisfied with short definitions, given by oecumenical and local councils, and with the rules of the fathers named in the council in Trullo. For anything further they had to refer to the other writings of the fathers, which did not possess the same authority. The Confession of Faith of Peter Mogila, examined and approved by two councils — that of Kief in 1640, and that of Jassy in 1643 — and further endorsed by the four oecumenical patriarchs, and by the Russian patriarchs Joachim and Adrian, became the first symbolic book of the Eastern Church.” This work, which remains to this day the text-book of the Russo Greek Church in dogmatic theology, went through numerous editions in Russian, was translated into Greek (Amst. 1662), Latin (Leips. 1695), and  German (Berlin, 1727, and Breslau, 1751), and has furnished the basis for several catechisms in different Greek churches. SEE CONFESSIONS OF FAITH.

Mogila published also a Catechism (Kief, 1645), and some pamphlets. A work containing biographical sketches of the saints, in the Slavonic language, he undertook, but did not bring to completion. But Mogila gained some distinction also as a poet, and made dramas, which were acted by the pupils of his academy; one of them, on the Nativity of Christ, was for a long time very popular. See Hist. de la Hierarchie Russe, 3:735; Dictionnaire des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques Russes, s.v.; Otto, Hist. of Russian Literature (Oxf. 1839, 8vo), p. 321 sq.;' Brihl, Russische Studiem zur Theologie u. Gesch. (Minst. 1857-58); Gerebtz of, Essai sur l'Histoire de la Civilisation en Russie; Haag, Hist. des Dogmes Chretiens, 1:458; Kimmel, Libri symbolici ecclesiae Orientalis (Jena, 1843, 8vo), page 56. SEE GREEK CHURCH; SEE RUSSIA. (J.W.)

## Mogon[[@Headword:Mogon]]

             a pagan deity, mentioned by Camden in his Britannia as having been worshipped anciently by the Cadeni, who inhabited that part of England now called Northumberland. In the year 1607 two altars were found in that district, bearing inscriptions declaring them to have been dedicated to that god.

## Mogtasilah[[@Headword:Mogtasilah]]

             (i.e., those who wash themselves) is a name which mediaeval Arabic writers gave to a sect of Christians' said to have flourished on the eastern shore of the Dead Sea. Recent investigations render it probable that they were the Zabians (from צבע= טבע, βαπτίζειν, to wash), or Mendceans (q.v.) of the present day.

## Mogul, Great[[@Headword:Mogul, Great]]

             the popular designation of the emperor of Delhi, as the impersonation of the powerful empire established in Hindustan by the Mongols, who were called Moguls by the Persians. The first Great Mogul was Baber, the great- grandson of Timur, who founded the Mongul empire in Hindustan in 1526. In 1803 the Great Mogul was deprived of his throne; in 1827, of even the appearance of authority, becoming a mere pensioner of the British; and in 1858, Mohammed Bahadur, the last of the dynasty, was condemned, and transported for complicity in the Indian mutiny. SEE MONGOLS.

## Mohammed Abd-el-Wahab[[@Headword:Mohammed Abd-el-Wahab]]

             the founder of the Mohammedan sect named after him Wahabites, was born in Nejed or Nejd, Central Arabia, about the close of the 17th century, in the tribe of Temim, and claimed descent from Mohammed the prophet. Like his prototype, the great Mohammed, he spent the early part of his life in trading expeditions to Bassora, Bagdad, and Damascus. Tradition even claims for extensive journeys, reaching to India on the east, and Constantinople on the west. He was a prudent and sagacious young man, and greatly devoted to his studies in the law and the Koran, and, like a faithful Moslem, he made a pilgrimage to Mecca and Medina. There he  became tired with such an ascetic fanaticism that on his return he was compelled to quit his native village for Deraijeh, in the central highlands of Arabia, soon to become the capital of the new theocracy. Like the prophet of the crescent, when he looked abroad over the degenerate state of his countrymen, Abd-el-Wahab saw that his co-religionists had fallen away from the purity of life and belief which made Islam master of all the civilized world save a corner of Europe, and he resolved to bring them back to the truth. He scouted the traditions which had buried the pure Koran under their mass, he condemned the idolatry which regarded Mohammed as more than a mere man inspired by the one God, and he enforced with a fanatical earnestness fasting, alms-giving, prayer, and the pilgrimage to Mecca, while he forbade the gratification of all vice and luxury, whether drinking, gambling, smoking, debauchery, usury, false witnesses, fine dresses, or grand tombs. Being a man of talent and eloquence, he soon gained followers. At first his progress was slow, but gradually his doctrines became popular, and he ultimately succeeded in spreading them widely, and in establishing his power likewise. He died near the close of the 18th century; but the Wahabites have continued to grow in strength and numbers all over Asia, particularly Inda, until there is now scarcely a city of any size in Northern India in which followers of his are not to be found. For the last ten years the Wahabites have been subject to rigorous searching on the part of the British government, and it would now appear that they have joined to their religious a political creed which is dangerous to the welfare of Western society in the East. SEE MOHAMMEDAN SECTS; SEE WAHABEES. (J.H.W.)

## Mohammed Aben-Kerram[[@Headword:Mohammed Aben-Kerram]]

             founder of a Mohammedan sect, was born at Serenj about A.D. 820. After teaching in his native city, he came to Khorassan, where he met a celebrated hermit, Ahmed ben-Harb, who induced him to visit the Kaaba. On his return to Khorassan, after a five years' sojourn to Mecca, he taught his new doctrines in Nichapur. He was imprisoned by Mohammed ben- Thaher, but finally escaped and found refuge in Jerusalem. He is the founder of the Anthropomorphites, or Mochebites. He died in Jerusalem in 868.

## Mohammed Hakim Ispahani[[@Headword:Mohammed Hakim Ispahani]]

             (Haft), a Parsee doctor, was born at Ispahan about 1790. He was the mollah of a religious sect known as the Rasmians, or old orthodox Parsees. His writings reveal interesting facts concerning what is left at Bombay of the Par-sees, or fire-worshippers. For the good of his sect, Mohammed wrote, in Persian and in English, Kathib fi bilan Asbat al-Kabisek, or "Selections of Mohammed from History, forming a perfect Illustration of the present Theological Discussions of the Parsecs" (Bombay, fol. 1827), in which he aims to prove that the old Persian intercalary aera is of the remotest antiquity, and, in fact, originated in the days of Zoroaster. The believers of other Parsee sects, however, such as the Chahinchahmians, Kodmians. and Churigarians, would have it date only from Yezdegerd III, the last of the Sassanide kings. In answer to certain books written by his opponents on religious matters, Mohammed wrote Dafakh al-IIazl, being a refutation of mollah Firuz's work, entitled Ressana Moussumal badallah, etc. (Bombay, 1832, 4to). Mohammed Hakim Ispahani died at Bombay about 1846. See Zenker, Bibl. Orient. u. v.; Spiegel, Chrestomathia Persica. — Hoefer, Nouc. Biog. Generale, 35, 759.

## Mohammed al-Darazi[[@Headword:Mohammed al-Darazi]]

             one of the founders of the sect of the Druses, was born near Bokhara about A.D. 960. In 1010 he came to Egypt, where he was converted to the doctrines of Hakim al-Mokanna. This doctrine admitted incarcations consecutive with divinity in different persons. He was the first to regard Hakim al-Mokanna, then ruling in Egypt as the last of these incarnates. He published a book in which he set forth the seccessions of inarnations since Adam. The caliph Hakim was so influenced by him as to intrust to him virtually all the management of all government affairs. Darazi, having published his work, read it in a mosque at Cairo, whereupon the people, greatly displeased with his innovations, attempted to slay him. Hakim appeared to disapprove of the conduct of Darazi, but secretly furnished him with money to quietly advance his cause, and advised him to preach his doctrines in the mountains of Syria, where he successfully taught his dogmas, permitting his followers the use of wine, fornication, and incest. Mohammed afterwards returned to Egypt, where he set himself up as the true imam, brought about a revolt against authority, and in the conflict lost his life in 1019. See works referred to in the article SEE DRUSES; SEE ISMAELITES.

## Mohammed or Mahomet[[@Headword:Mohammed or Mahomet]]

             (written also Mahonsmed or Mahommet, and Mtuhamed or Muhamet, an Arabic word meaning the predicted Messiah; applied to him in allusion to Hag 2:7; but formerly called, according to a tradition quoted by Halabi, Kothanm) was a great Arabian legislator, who not only completely changed the face of the world in his own age, but still continues to exercise  a powerful influence in the civilization of the Eastern world, being best known as the founder of a religious system which has spread extensively among men, and is denominated Islam, or, more properly, after its founder, Mohammedanism (q.v.).

Sources for his Life. — Arabian literature is very rich in sources for a biography of Mohammed. Besides the Koran, which records the most important events of his' life, there exist numerous collections of traditions in which the expressed views of the Arabian prophet on. various incidents and relations of life are introduced; then there are biographies proper, some of which extend as far back as the first century of the Mohammedan era. They are, it is true, written with a religious prejudice, and more or less spiced with legends, but in most cases the historical part worthy of credit is easily discerned. It must not be believed that these biographies were allowed too free a rein to fancy, or were permitted to distort facts or pass them over in perfect silence; for they had to fear being convicted of mendacity and negligence by no less an authority than the Koran itself, already collected by the contemporaries of the prophet. Still another circumstance helps the historian in determining truth, namely that. the Mohammedans rarely try to conceal the frailties of their founder, for their judgment is guided by a standard different from that of non-Mohammedans — they praise some of his deeds and words as virtuous which we brand as infamous. They even proceed generally on the principle that Mohammed, as a privileged individual, was exempt from the common laws.' Hence, notwithstanding the abundance of historical accounts on the rise of Islam (the proper name for the religion established by Mohammed, while its professors are called Moslems), and the continued lively intercourse between Mohammedans and Christians in Syria and Palestine, as well as in Egypt and Spain, the most perverted opinions on Mohammedanism and its author came to prevail among the non Mohammedans, even in the Occident. He was represented either as a sorcerer or as an idol; some believed him the Antichrist, others a renegade cardinal. And in proportion as the later Mohammedans — especially the Persians, greedy of miracles and mysteries — rendered the historical Mohammed of the ancient Arabians scarcely recognisable by over-much adoration and proximity to the supernatural, and the more Mohammedanism spread in the Occident and threatened to become dangerous to Christianity, hatred and fear exerted themselves to disfigure Mohammed and his creed by ridiculous and absurd calumnies. Even in modern times, after several translations of  Arabian biographies of Mohammed had been published, his true character was little understood. As late as 1829 a work appeared in London demonstrating, or rather aiming to demonstrate, that Mohammed was. foreshadowed by the little horn which issued from the fourth monster described by the prophet Daniel. In ‘a still later publication, the author endeavors, at a great' expense of learning, to prove that Mohammed was an; instrument of the devil's device and handling. But, as observed in Weil's work, Mohammed der Prophet, the advance of knowledge in these days requires the historical characters handed down to us from remote periods to be re-examined by the light of new and of better classified authorities, and to be recast upon a surer and more truthful basis. See Meth. Review, January 1889.

Among characters of world-wide celebrity, there is none other that calls more loudly for a reinvestigation of the “original sources” than that of Mohammed. Born in an obscure age, among a people whose antecedents are dimly shadowed out to us, in a country of all famous regions the least explored, his own career was a series of marvels and contradictions. While searching earnestly for truth, he taught millions of men to believe a gigantic fable; and. while tormented with doubts agonizing to his own breast, he inspired others with an invincible faith: in his infallibility. With too little energy or too little ambition to support himself, except by the despised employment of a shepherd, he withstood for years the ridicule, the malice, and the furious opposition of the leaders of his own family and of the nation, and finally vaquished all their efforts. Over this extraordinary and seemingly unfathomable character the disciples and the opponents of his doctrines have alike combined to draw an additional veil of uncertainty. The first Mohammedans piously encompassed their prophet with a cloud of miracles — “the mythology,” as Dr. Sprenger calls it, of Islam... Romish prelates foolishly distorted history to calumniate him; and philosophers, more impartial but equally unjust, endowed him with crimes of their own invention, such as they thought congenial to the character of an impostor. Thus, while Khadijah beheld him shaded by angels on his journey to Syria, Prideaux accuses him of robbing orphans of their patrimony, and Voltaire depicts him as yielding to the indulgence of his passions on his triumphal return to Mecca — a triumph of which the greatest glory was his clemency and forbearance. Of those who have pretended to describe this singular being, one party has studiously disguised or perverted what they knew, and another has sedulously invented what they did but suspect or hope. In fact,  the great difficulty of the Arabic language, and the rarity and inaccessibility of the MSS. of early Mohammedan writers, were sufficient of themselves, if not to deter Europeans from undertaking the biography of the apostle of Islam, at least to cover the attempt, until a comparatively recent date, with the disgrace of failure. The earliest and most authentic chronicles of the rise of Mohammedahism were not known, even by name, to those who aspired to guide the opinions of Europe on that great event. Gibbon, for example, appeals to Gagnier's translation of Abulfeda, a prince who wrote in the fourteenth century, as his “best and most authentic, guide.” But to consider so late a historian as Abulfeda an authority at all would convict an Orientalist of the most culpable ignorance in Arabic literature. Yet before we can turn from the Mohammed as pictured by enthusiastic Musselmen, or the monks of the Middle Ages and their successors among modern writers, to the true historical Mohammed, as he comes before us after a profound and unprejudiced study of the original documents, it is necessary that we take a hasty glance at the condition of Arabia, the country that, claims him as her own, at the time and previous to the birth of Mohammed.

State of Arabia previous to the Introduction of Islam. — From time immemorial the aboriginal inhabitants of the peninsula had been divided into a great number of free and wandering clans, limited communities, and petty states, whose peculiarities of character, mode of life, and political institutions, as they were mostly dependent upon local circumstances, were for centuries stamped with the same unalterable features, and had been preserved almost unchanged even from the time of the patriarchs ‘of the. book of Genesis. The mountainous table-land of central Arabia, abounding in rich pasturage and fertile valleys, but at the same time intersected and- .skirted with dreary wastes and sandy plains, was occupied by those roving tribes who, in opposition to the settled inhabitants, are proud of the name of Bedouin, or people of the plains. Most of them were addicted to a wandering pastoral life, but from being strongly. disposed to war and chivalrous adventures, their peaceable occupations were interrupted, either by conducting a caravan of merchants, or still oftener by assailing and robbing their fellow-tribes. Every tribe was governed by the most aged or worthy sheik of that family which had been exalted above its brethren by fortune and heroic deeds, or even by eloquence and poetry. For as the heroic bards were at once the historians and moralists by whom the vices and virtues of their countrymen were impartially censured or praised, a noble enthusiasm for poetry animated those Arabs, and at an annual fair at  Okhad thirty days were consecrated to poetical emulation, after which the successful poem was written in-letters of gold and suspended in the .temple of Mecca. These meetings, however, formed but a very. feeble bond of union among the independent and hostile tribes, who only occasionally, and in times of danger and warfare, submitted to a supreme chief, or emir of emirs, and had never yet been united into one body. And the tie was still less binding on those inhabitants who, being collected in flourishing towns and cities on the coasts of the peninsula, and mostly employed in trade and agriculture, were regarded with supreme contempt by the free Bedouin as a weak and degenerate race of slaves.

Concerning the religious condition of the Arabs before, the promulgation of Mohammed's doctrines, we have. but scanty information. The Mohammedans themselves disdained inquiry into the idolatrous worship of their ancestors.. For what we. do know about it we are indebted, to accidental notices of some of their deities mentioned in the Koran (q.v.), and to sundry not always trustworthy accounts diffused through the more. ancient works, and not to any connected treatise upon the pagan religions of Arabia. The scanty notices of the Greeks and Romans concerning this topic are very uncertain. We must not, however, fail to mention the genealogical records, to which the Arabs attribute great importance, as auxiliary sources for the religious faith of the ancient Arabians. From these genealogical tablets we learn the names of some of their idols and the distribution of their worship; for many personal names relate to the worshipped deities or the places where they were worshipped. Thus we are not altogether without some clew respecting Arabian polytheism, and secure the information that no one religious system prevailed throughout all Arabia, or at any given time.

Their religious worship, it would appear, consisted chiefly in the adoration of the heavenly luminaries which were considered as so many tutelar deities of the different tribes; and among these, after the sun and moon, the planet Venus had acquired such peculiar preeminence that even to the pious Moslem Friday ever after remained the sacred day of the week. These deities, with many other images of the personified powers of nature, rudely represented by idols of every variety of shape, were principally gathered round the ancient Kaaba — the Pantheon of Arabian idolatry; and their worship was accompanied, not only with the most horrid rites and shocking ceremonies of a degraded paganism, but even with human sacrifices and cruelties of every description. Even children were immolated  by some of the ruder: clans to the idols, while others, as the Kendites, buried their daughters alive (Sur. 6:137; 16:58; 81:8); and we need scarcely remark that, except a vague belief of the soul becoming transformed. into an owl, and hovering round the grave, there is no indication that the Arabian idolaters believed in a future life and final retribution. (Comp. Pococke, Specimen Historie Arabun, ed. White, 1806.)

Arabian idolatry centered in Mecca, whither annual pilgrimages were made by all Arabians. SEE MECCA. Its temple, which tradition claimed to have been founded by Abraham and Ishmael, was, so to speak, the hotel (khan), where the most diverse idols of the various Arabian tribes were lodged. It was the object of high veneration for the whole Arabian peninsula. Every tribe had its particular deity represented here, as well as its own chief. SEE KAABA.

But there were also many Arabs who acknowledged a supreme being, and regarded all idols as subordinate to this principal being. Some were even converts to Judaism or to Christianity, especially those who had much intercourse with Jews and Christians. As a rule, however, religious life occupied but little the minds of the Bedouin, so much engrossed with their material wants and affairs, and to this day religious fanaticism is rarely found among the children of the desert. The particular wishes of the votaries were brought before the idols and their priests. and their advice was desired; but if expectation were disappointed, the idols were broken to pieces and their priests insulted and maltreated. Besides the idolaters, in a literal sense of the word, there lived in Arabia single tribes, who worshipped the sun, moon, and other celestial bodies, or inclined to the religion of the Magi and vestiges of hero-worship, and worship of trees and stones are also traceable.

Among the foreign settlers in Arabia, we pass over in silence the few adherents of Zoroaster, scattered along the Persian Gulf, and the Sabeans, on the southern coast of the peninsula, who, even from the time of David and Solomon, stored their rich emporiums of Ophir, Saba, and afterwards Aden, with Indian-merchandise, and who, as is clear from many good arguments, were undoubtedly of Hindu origin. The Christian religion had long been established in several parts of Arabia, but the Christianity of the Oriental Church at that time almost resembled paganism, being associated with monachism, and with the worship of martyrs, relics, and images. Among the heretical sectaries who, absorbed in their monophysitical and other abstruse dogmatical controversies, looked upon each other with the utmost hatred, we find particularly mentioned the Nestorians, Jacobites,  Marcionites, and Manichaeans, besides some other obscure sects, such as the Collyridians, who, deifying the mother of Christ, and adoring her as. the third person in the Trinity, probably gave rise to the Christian tritheism so often dwelt on by the author of the Koran. The Jews were at this time in Arabia in great numbers. After the destruction of Jerusalem many of them had retired hither, where, owing to the loose connection and the jealousy of the aboriginal tribes, they had gained considerable power. Some of them, adopting the fierce manners of the desert, chose a wandering life, connected with all its dangers and adventurous strife, and a poem composed by a Jewish Bedouin has been: preserved in the Hamasa, which breathes the true spirit of Arabian chivalry (Hamasa, page 49, ed. Freytag). But in general the Jews were peacefully settled in towns and fortified castles, principally along the coast, or dispersed among the inhabitants of large cities. Comp. Krehl, Vorislamitische Religionen [Leips. 1863]; Zeitschrift d. deutsch. Morgenl. Gesellsch. 10:61 sq.; 19:262; 20:284; Malcom, History of Persia, 1:168 sq., 180 sq.) SEE ARABIA.

Early Life. — Since Mohammed was by birth anything but a prince, nothing certain is known about its time, and even the oldest sources do not agree as to the date. According to the most probable reckoning, he was born in April, A.D. 571, at Mecca. This city was at that time a considerable commercial centre, where caravans from Southern Arabia, Abyssinia, Persia, and India crossed those from Egypt, Syria, and Mesopotamia, and exchanged their agricultural and industrial products. This happened particularly at the time of the pilgrimage. By descent Mohammed belonged to the aristocracy of Mecca, but the branch of which he was an offspring was very much impoverished. His mother, Aminah, possessed, it is said, a peculiarly nervous temperament, and used to fancy, while between sleeping and waking, that she was visited by spirits. It is probable that Mohammed inherited from her his constitutional tendency to epilepsy, as well as his most remarkable mental peculiarities. Mohammedan authors have labored to endow the birth of their prophet with miraculous events, and in consequence many marvellous stories are told. It is related, among other things, that his mother experienced none of the pangs of travail. As soon as her child was born, he raised his eyes to heaven, exclaiming, “There is no God but God, and I am his prophet!” That same night, it is related, also with the same inclination to extravagance, that the fire of Zoroaster, which, guarded by the Magi, had burned uninterruptedly for more than a thousand years, was suddenly extinguished, and all the idols in the world fell down.  When only two months old, Mohammed's father died (according to some accounts, he died two months before the birth of Mohammed). Aminah for a short time nursed the infant herself; but sorrow soon dried the fountains of her breast, and the young child, after much exertion to meet this extra expenditure, was committed to the care of a nurse, with whom he remained about five years. It is related by Mohammedans that when the nurse, who was a shepherd's wife, showed the child to a celebrated soothsayer, who was an idolater, the latter exclaimed, “Kill this child!” Halimah snatched away her precious charge and fled. Afterwards the soothsayer explained to the excited multitude: “I swear by all the gods that this child will kill those who belong to your faith; he will destroy your gods, and he will be victorious over you.” When Mohammed was six years old he lost his mother, and the poor orphaned child fell to the care of relatives. He was taken charge of by his grandfather, Abdul Mutalib, who was then the chief priest of the Kaaba. Upon his decease the care of the child fell to his uncle, Abu-Talib; but he was so indigent that he could not long afford to keep his nephew, and Mohammed was obliged to earn his livelihood as a shepherd — an occupation to which only the lower class of the population resorted, while the more opulent engaged in trade. Later (in his twenty-fifth year) he entered the service of a rich widow (Kadijah), attended to her affairs in Southern Arabia, according to some accounts also in Syria, where he is said to have become conversant with monks, who gave him information regarding Christianity. Mohammed soon gained Kadijah's confidence to such a degree that she offered him her hand in matrimony, which he accepted, though she was much his senior — she was forty years old.

Preparation for his Mission. — Placed in affluent circumstances by marriage, Mohammed gradually abandoned commercial enterprises and. gave himself up to religious contemplation, to which he may have been induced by a cousin of his consort, who, like many Arabs of his time, had relinquished idolatry, and had been converted first to Judaism, then to Christianity, but had failed to find satisfaction in either. Mohammed was no scholar — it is even doubtful whether he acquired reading and writing in later years — his education had certainly been neglected in his earlier years by reason of circumstances. Chirography had only been introduced into Arabia a short time previously, though poetry was highly cultivated — for this, however, in spite of his oratorical talent, he had little aptitude. On the whole, his visionary character and piety formed a great contrast to the sober and robust Arabs of his time, who indulged in wine, gambling, and  sensuality as the main objects of life; while he, though not insensible to terrestrial enjoyments, was more disposed to religious reflection. Retired in solitude, he made God, the future life, and revelation the themes of his thoughts, and reviewed the various systems of religion known to him by oral tradition, in order to form from them a new religion adapted to Arabia. There were at this time Ebionitish Christians in the country the Rakuisi and the Hanifs.

To the first belonged, according to Sprenger's conjecture (Leben u. Lehre des Mohammed, 1:43 sq.), Koss, who preached at Mecca the unity of God and the resurrection of the dead, and for this purpose also visited the fair at Okhad, where Mohammed had heard him. The Hanifs were (as Sprenger will have it) Essenes, who had lost nearly all knowledge of the Bible, and had submitted to various foreign influences, but professed a rigid monotheism. Their religious book was called the “Roll of Abraham.” In the time of Mohammed several members of this sect were living at Mecca and Medina, and Mohammed himself, who originally had worshipped the gods of his people, became a Hanif. The doctrine of the Hanifs was “Islam” — i.e., submission to the one God; they were themselves “Moslem” — i.e., men characterized by such submission. Besides his knowledge from such connections, Mohammed enjoyed the instruction' of Jewish scholars, among whom are particularly mentioned a celebrated rabbi, Abdallah Iba-Salaam, and Waraka, the nephew of his wife. (Comp. Abrah. Geiger, Was hat Mohammed aus dem Judenthumne aufgenommen, Bonn, 1833.) The Arabs, Mohammed knew, were ready for a new faith, and he desired the establishment of a religious system which should embody the essentials of all that his countrymen were acquainted with. Idolatry was already on the wane. The idols were considered by the poets and other intelligent Arabs as powerless beings, at most as mediators between the supreme God (Allah) and mankind; and there were some who even accepted the belief in a future life, as entertained among the Jews and Christians of Arabia. The greatest opposition he had reason to fear was from religious indifference, scepticism, and selfishness. According to the Koran, from which alone we can correctly gather Mohammed's religious views, he laid down the following fundamental doctrines: The existence of a monotheistic divinity, a being superior to all; a revelation, but only by special inspiration (by which alone the. prophets were distinguished, while in all other respects on an equality with the rest of mankind); and, finally, a life hereafter, in which the virtuous were to be rewarded and the vicious punished. In his opinion, this was the religion of Abraham, who, as the Koran says, was neither Jew nor Christian, but a pious, God-fearing man.  Moses and Christ were prophets; but their revelation had been distorted by Jews and Christians. He there, fore,, determined that some of the laws and ordinances of the Old Testament, not suitable for Arabia, should be set aside; and of the New, many dogmas, which were looked upon by him and his contemporaries as bordering on idolatry, should be revoked, in order to successfully convert his people to monotheism.

Mohammed having arrived at these results by reflection and tradition, notwithstanding the prejudices of his time, from which he was by no means himself free, and endowed with a nervous constitution and a lively imagination, it was not at all unnatural for him to come, after a time, to regard himself as actually called of God to build up his people ii a new faith. Mohammed, as we gather from the oldest and most trustworthy narratives, was an epileptic, and as such was considered to be possessed of evil spirits. At first he believed the same; but gradually he came to the conclusion, confirmed by his friends, that daemons had no power over so pure and pious a man as he was, and he conceived the idea that he was not controlled by evil spirits, but that he was visited by angels, whom he, disposed to hallucinations of vision and audition, and afflicted with a morbid state of body and mind, saw in dreams, or even while awake conceived he saw. What seemed to him good and true, after such epileptic attacks, he esteemed revelation, in which he, at least in the first stage of his prophetic course, firmly believed, and which imparted to his pensive, variable character the necessary courage and endurance to brave all mortifications and perils.

Mohammed as a Religious Teacher. — Mohammed .was, according to Mohammedan reports, forty years of age when he began to act the part of a prophet, and this he did first among his nearest relatives and friends. He claimed to have been “moved” to teach a new faith by a special “divine” communication which he had received in the solitude of the mountain Hira, near Mecca. Gabriel, he asserted, had appeared to him, and in the name of God commanded him to “read” — i.e., to preach the true religion, and to spread it abroad by committing it to writing (Sur. 96). In three years he made only fourteen converts; but among these were the high-spirited, devoted, and indomitable Ali, who was afterwards surnamed the “ever- victorious Lion of God,” and Abu-Bekr, whose character for good-sense, benevolence, and straightforward integrity contributed not a little to the respectability and ultimate success of the new religion. In the fourth year of his mission, in .obedience, as he alleges, to an express command from  heaven, he resolved to make a public declaration of his faith. He addressed himself to the Koreish and others, asking them, “If I were to tell you that there is an army on the other side of that mountain, would you believe me?” “Yes,” they answered “for we do not consider thee to be a liar.” He then said, “I come to warn you; and if you do not believe me, a great punishment will befall you;” he told them they must renounce idolatry, and make a profession of the one true God; that unless they did so they could have no true happiness in this life nor salvation in the life to come.

The people listened to the precepts of the moralist, and though they were enraptured by the force of his eloquence, very few were yet inclined to desert their hereditary and long-cherished ceremonies, and to adopt a spiritual faith the internal evidence of which they were unable to comprehend. Mohammed was repeatedly urged by them to confirm his: divine mission by miracles, but he prudently appealed to the internal truth of his doctrine, and expressly declared that wonders and signs would depreciate the merit of faith and aggravate the guilt of infidelity. The only miraculous act which Mohammed professed to have accomplished, and which has been greatly exaggerated by his credulous adherents, is a nocturnal journey from the temple of Mecca to Jerusalem, and thence through the heavens, which he pretended to have performed on an imaginary animal like an ass, called Borak (lightning); but we need scarcely remark that the simple words of the Koran (Sur. 17) may as well be taken in the allegorical sense of vision. The few converts he made were of the lowest class, the aristocracy in the mean time growing more decided in their opposition to the enthusiast and innovator. Hitherto they had contented themselves by mocking him and deriding him as a sorcerer and demoniac, but as the number of converts was gradually increasing, and there seemed danger that the sacredness of Mecca might be disturbed by the new religionists, and thus the city be deprived of her chief glory and the aristocracy of the ample revenues of the pilgrimages, they rose in fierce opposition against the new prophet and his adherents, who dared to call their ancient gods idols, and their ancestors fools. Many of the converted slaves and freedmen had to undergo terrible punishments, and others suffered so much at the hands of their own relatives that they were fain to revoke their creed; so that the prophet himself advised his followers to emigrate to Abyssinia. Mohammed himself, now belonging to the aristocracy, and further protected by the strong arm of Abu-Talib, had of course nothing, personal to fear; but yet he became so low-spirited and  fearful lest his attempt should fail altogether that he decided to appeal once more to the prejudices of the aristocracy, and he even went so far as to raise the idols, which hitherto he had represented as naught. to intermediate beings between God and man — a dictum, however, which he soon revoked, as an inspiration of Satan, thereby increasing the hatred of his adversaries, at whose head stood two members of the family of Machzum, Al-Walid and Abulhakam Amr (called by Mohammed “Father of Foolishness”), and who in every way tried to throw ridicule on him.

Several years elapsed in this unsettled state, Mohammed all the while actively engaged in the propagation of his new doctrines. Apparently but little progress had been made, when he suddenly received vigorous support by the conversion of several of the noblest citizens, such as Abu-Obeida, Hamza, an uncle of Mohammed, Othman, and the stern and inflexible' Omar, who were successively gained by the moderation and influence of Abu-Bekr, with whom, by marrying his only daughter Ayesha, the prophet had become more nearly allied after the death of his wife Kadijah. With this revival of the new faith hostility against its author became more decided, and the jealous leaders of the Koreishites, directing their animosity and violence against the whole line of Hashem, now demanded that Mohammed should be delivered into their hands for punishment; and when compliance with this request was refused them, they finally pronounced excommunication against the whole tribe of the Hashemites. The feud thus kindled between the different parties also obliged the few adherents of the prophet who had thus far remained to quit Mecca, and the new religionists spread through the country. Mohammed's enemies now came forth in open revolt, and it was formally and publicly resolved that he should be slain. In order to baffle the vengeance of the Hashemites, and to divide the guilt of his death,, it was agreed that one man from every family should at the same moment plunge his sword into the heart of their victim. Nothing now remained for Mohammed but death or instant flight. At the dead of night, accompanied by his faithful. friend Abu-Bekr, he took his flight to Yatreb, afterwards known by the name of Medina (Medinat al-nabi), or the City of the Prophet.

About a league from Mecca, at the cave of Thor, the fugitives halted, and there they remained hiding for three days from their Meccan pursuers. According to one account, these, after exploring every hiding-place in the vicinity, came to the mouth of the cave. But a spider having providentially spread her web over the entrance, the Koreishites, deeming it impossible  that Mohammed could have entered there, turned back from their pursuit. Perhaps a more probable explanation is that as the Koreishites knew Medina to be the destination of the fugitives, they never suspected that they could be concealed in the cave of Thor, which lay in an opposite direction. While they were in the cave, the legend goes, Abu-Bekr, contrasting their weakness with the strength of their enemies, said, trembling, “We are but two.” “No,” replied Mohammed, “there is a third: it is God himself.” On the fourth night the prophet and his companion left their hiding-place, and, riding on camels which the servant of Abu-Bekr had brought, arrived safely at Medina sixteen days after their flight from Mecca..

Mohammed's reason for turning his face towards Medina may be found in the sympathy which the Medinans had frequently manifested towards the prophet. They had been moved to this by various causes. Mohammed's mother was a Medinan, on account of which her clansmen considered themselves under obligation to take sides with him. There was another motive still: the Medinans, jealous of the authority of Mecca as a place of pilgrimage, might have hoped to attain the ascendency over Mecca by the aid. of Mohammed and his followers. There were, moreover, many adherents to the new cause among the inhabitants of Medina, who had paid homage to the prophet while he was yet at Mecca. There were some who looked to him as perchance the Messiah expected by the Jews. Accordingly a considerable part of Medina was enthusiastic in the new cause, and when Mohammed's approach was made known to them, hundreds of its citizens advanced in procession to meet the coming prophet, welcoming him with loud acclamations; and he who a few days before had left his native city as a fugitive, with a price upon his head, now entered Medina more like a king returning victorious from battle than an exile seeking a place of refuge. This separation or flight of Mohammed from the city of his nativity, called in Arabic Hejrah, oranglicized Hegira (q.v.), formed not only an auspicious turning-point in the prophet's own life, but became the point of departure in the Mohammedan movement.

His earliest attention after his arrival at Medina was given towards the consolidation of the new worship and the minor arrangements in the congregation of his flock. At this time Mohammed endeavored, by various concessions, to gain the Jews over to his faith. He selected Jerusalem as the point of direction in prayer, appointed the tenth day of the first month as a day of fasting, and allowed the new converts to celebrate their  Sabbath. But when the Jews, notwithstanding these advances, would not acknowledge him as prophet, ridiculed his pretension to be the Messiah, and enraged him by their constant taunts, he soon abrogated his concessions, became their bitterest enemy, sought closer alliance with the heathenish Arabs, and substituted practices likely to please them. In prayer the worshipper was now directed to turn towards Mecca, the month Ramadan was henceforth fixed upon as a fasting-time, and Friday as the day of rest.

Gradually Mohammed now appears in a new character. His internal arrangements perfected, his followers increased, and his allies concluding to yield him armed assistance, he was no longer content to convert his adversaries by words; he was no longer come to give peace, but to make war; where the warnings of the prophet had failed to convince, the strong arm of the conqueror must compel, and the persecuted apostle appears suddenly transformed into the triumphant soldier. He who had formerly insisted upon liberty of conscience for himself, and had opposed religious violence, now. maintained that Islam should, if necessary, be defended and propagated by the sword. “The sword,” said he, “is the key of heaven and of hell: a drop of blood shed in the cause of God, or a night spent in arms, is of more avail than two months of fasting and prayer; whoever falls in battle, his sins are forgiven him, and at the day of judgment the loss of his limbs shall be supplied by the wings of cherubim.” This was a sort of manifesto, directed mainly against the Meccans, and he was not long in carrying his new principles into practice. Not powerful enough to warrant an open fight with his enemies, he determined to weaken their strength by attacks and pillage upon the caravans of the Meccans, which on their commercial expeditions to Syria passed in the neighborhood of Medina, and erelong plunder and robbery were sanctioned, even during the sacred months yea, many an, assassination, consequent upon these attacks, was instigated by Mohammed himself.

Henceforth Mohammed ceases to be a religious leader in the eyes of the impartial biographer; he cannot possibly have, at this time, fancied himself inspired of God, and as acting according to divine pleasure; for, aside from the circumstance that some pretended revelations concerned only his own advantage, or even sometimes solely the gratification of his lust, he frequently withheld them, and waited for the temper of his adherents to manifest itself before he dared to proclaim them. Thus, to mention one instance of his irresolution and trickery, he commanded one of his votaries  to waylay a caravan which he was cognizant could be reached only in a sacred month; and when the order had been complied with, and great dissatisfaction prevailed on account of this desecration of the holy month, he maintained not to have arranged the same, for he had given the order in so ambiguous a manner that he could clear himself of the responsibility of an act execrated by all Arabia.

Mohammed as an Impostor. — While at Mecca the prophet had. kept unflinchingly in his path through mockery and persecution. No threats,-no injuries, had hindered him from preaching to his people the unity and the righteousness of God, and exhorting to a far purer and better morality than had ever been set before them. He had claimed no temporal power, no spiritual domination; he had asked but for simple toleration, for free permission to win men by persuasion into the way of truth. He claimed to be sent neither to compel conviction by miracles, nor to constrain outward profession by the sword. He was but a preacher, sent to warn men that there is one God, and that there is no other; that all that He requires is that men should do justice and love mercy, and walk humbly with their God, and as the sanction of all, that there will be a resurrection of the dead, as well of the just as of the unjust. Such had been his teachings at Mecca, and in his own person he had fulfilled the duties urged upon others-a thoroughly good and righteous man, according to his light, with nothing to be alleged against his life, even if judged by a higher morality than that of the Koran. His virtues may have been hypocrisy, his mission may have been imposture, but as a resident of Mecca all his actions outwardly had created a presumption in his favor. With his arrival at Medina, however, the scene shifts, and with the days of power and victory of the. propagandist opens a dark and bloody page in the history of the East. From the moment when the formerly despised “madman and impostor” was raised to the position of highest judge, lawgiver, and ruler of Medina, and of the two most powerful Arabic tribes — thus opening a vast theater to the enthusiasm and ambition of Mohammed — his revelations assumed a much higher claim. He now inculcated as a matter of religion and of faith the waging of war against the infidels; and the sword once drawn at the command of heaven, from that time remained unsheathed until the tribes of all Arabia and the adjacent countries had joined in the profession that there is no God but Allah, and that Mohammed is his apostle.

Acts of such character, Mohammed, even if not endowed with a very delicate ethic sense, must have known to be wrong, and could have  approved solely for a selfish end. Even before his emigration to Medina he had, in several instances, deviated from the truth, where it seemed to answer his purpose best. Thus he had related the whole history of the Old and New Testament prophets, spiced by Jewish and Christian. traditions, and had claimed them as communicated to him by the angel. Gabriel — an assertion which was of course discredited by the Meccans. who guessed rightly that he owed this knowledge to his conversations with foreign scriptural scholars. Revelations also concerning his Own person, and which he can certainly not have believed himself, abound in the Koran. Thus he had restricted the number of legitimate wives to four, but exempted himself from that restraint, and after the death of his first wife married twelve others. Another time he fell in love with a female slave, and when his consorts expressed their displeasure he swore that he would forsake her. A few months subsequently he had himself released from his oath by some verses of the Koran, and threatened his women with divorce if they should continue to stand in the way of his voluptuousness. His relation to Zeineb or Zaid, the spouse of his former slave and later adopted son, throws a still worse light on his revelations. Zaid, observing that Mohammed paid undue attention to his wife, caused himself to be divorced from her. ‘ Mohammed took her in matrimony. But when this marriage was found very reprehensible, because he had shown so little regard to Zaid's feelings, and because an adopted son with the Arabs was deemed equal to a son german, wherefore matrimony contracted with his wife, even after divorce, was considered illegal, Mohammed, in the name of God, branded as absurd, first, the usage hitherto in vogue calling an adopted male child a son, and in future declared such procedure even sinful, by actual proof drawn from the Koran, and announced that, far from having advised Zaid. to separate himself from his wife, he had rather tried to dissuade Zaid from such a course; and, in the second place, that he (Mohammed), even after the separation, afraid of men's judgment, had hesitated to marry, her, until God commanded him, in order to demonstrate that he who acted according to the Lord's will need not care for the talk of men, and in order that he might add, by the force of his own example, more vigor to the law respecting adopted sons.

But to return to the external history of Mohammed and. his votaries. First of all our attention is claimed by the first battle proper, fought near Badr, situated between Mecca and Medina, which, though insignificant as to the numbers of the combatants, was of material consequence. The original  object was the pillage of a Meccan caravan. The Meccans, having been advised of this intention, despatched succor to their people, and, as was supposed, were thus prepared to meet the Hashemites and Medinans. Yet, the Meccans, although superior in number, were nevertheless defeated by Mohammed's adherents. Some Moslem writers will have it that 3000 angelic warriors, on white and black steeds, guided and assisted the faithful. The prophet himself, during the fight, was engaged in prayer. In most of the later wars, also, Mohammed generally kept at a distance from the melee. He obtained many a victory, to be sure, by skilful disposition of his forces, but he distinguished himself by no means as a brave warrior. This is especially manifest in the expedition immediately following, and undertaken by the Meccans to take revenge for the defeat, by which they had suffered not only severe loss of lives and property, but had added booty, glory, and increase to the new religionists. Mohammed, namely, when the Meccans, a few thousand strong, advanced against Medina, wanted to retire to the city and to confine himself to its defence, and only when his disciples declared this plan dishonorable, he unwillingly turned out against the enemy, and was vanquished near Mount Ohod. Many of the faithful covered the battle-field with their corpses. Mohammed himself was wounded slightly; he wore a double coat of mail and a closed helmet, so that the Meccans did not recognize him, and his companions promptly secured his safety. When the Meccans advanced a second time with a superior force, Mohammed's advice to his own to fortify themselves in the city as promptly complied with, and the Meccans, inexperienced in siege operations, and by Mohammed's intrigues having fallen cut with their confederates, were obliged after a few weeks to retire without accomplishing anything.

We pass over the wars waged by Mohammed against the Jews in Medina and in other parts of Arabia, all of which were marked by great cruelty on his side also the conflicts which he waged against several Arabian tribes allied with the Meccans, and remark only that, in spite of many a failure, in the sixth year of the Hegira (A.D. 628) he felt sufficiently confident to venture at the head of his votaries on a pilgrimage to Mecca. Yet, though he exhorted to this pilgrimage in the name of God, it was not participated in to the degree expected, and nothing remained to him but the hope that the Meccans would be afraid to shed. blood in the holy month, though he himself had violated it long ago by robbery and murder. When he arrived at the boundary of the Meccan territory, he was bidden to stop, and  threatened with force in case he should attempt to penetrate into the city. After protracted negotiations, however, many Meccans being desirous of peace on account of their commercial interests, concluded it, and, among other terms, it was fixed that Mohammed should be allowed to partake of the pilgrim celebration the ensuing year. This treaty of peace, by which Mohammed was recognised as an equal power, increased his authority, and permitted him to despatch his emissaries to all parts of Arabia, to make proselytes and enter into alliances. Soon he felt strong enough to avail himself of an opportune pretext to break the peace, and on a sudden surprised Mecca, without, any formal declaration of war, at the head of 10,000 men. The chief magistrates of the city were obliged (A.D. 630) to make their submission, and acknowledged him not only as secular ruler, but as a plenipotentiary of the Deity. SEE KOREISH. With this the victory of the new religion was secured in all Arabia. While, however, employed in destroying all traces of idolatry in the besieged city, and fixing the minor laws and ceremonies of the true faith, Mohammed heard of new armies which several warlike Arabic tribes had sent against him, and which were concentrated near Taif (630). He went forth to encounter the enemy, was again victorious, and his dominion and creed extended further and further every day. From all parts flocked the deputations to do homage to him in the name of the various tribes, either as the messenger of God, or at least as the Prince of Arabia, and the year 8 of the Hegira: was therefore called the year of the Deputations.

Even before the capture of Mecca, Mohammed had been bold enough to summon the princes of the countries antiguous to Arabia — Chosroes (of Persia), the emperor Heraclius (of Constantinople), the king of Abyssinia, and several Byzantine and Persian provincial governors — to be converted to his faith. His letter to the king of Abyssinia has been discovered on a leaf of parchment, which served as a cover to a manuscript, in a Coptic monastery in Upper Egypt, and accords tolerably with what we know from Arabian biographers. It reads as follows: “In the name of God, the all- gracious and all-merciful, from Mohammed, the servant and ambassador of God, to Almucaucas, the prefect of the Copts. Hail to him who follows the divine guidance! I summon thee to confess the Islam. If thou compliest with this summons, thy salvation is secured, and God will give thee a double reward for thy devotion. ‘But if thou refusest, the guilt of the Copts rests on thee. Oh, ye men of the Scriptures! approach and become our. equals by professing that we adore only Allah, unassociated with terrestrial  beings, and own as Lord none beside him. If you will not agree to this, testify that we are God-resigned and faithful.” The governor of Egypt was no more converted than Heraclius and Chosroes. He, however, received the delegates of Mohammed hospitably, and sent him, besides other valuable presents, two Abyssinian female slaves, one of whom (Mariam or Maria) charmed the prophet to such a degree that he neglected his other wives on her account.

The execution of one of Mohammed's emissaries by Amru, the chief of the Christian Arabs on the Syrian frontier, occasioned the first war between Mohammed and the Byzantines, terminating unfavorably to the former. Nor had a second campaign the desired Success, for he did not secure the wished-for participation of the pagan allies, and he had to be satisfied with the homage of a few minor princes on his way to the frontiers, and returned without having carried out his intention.

Towards the end of the 10th year of the Hegira he undertook, at the head of at least 40,000 Moslems, his last solemn pilgrimage to Mecca, and there (on the Mount Arafat) instructed them in all the important laws and ordinances, chiefly of the pilgrimage; and the ceremonies observed by him on, that occasion were recorded in the Koran and fixed for all time. He again solemnly exhorted. his believers to righteousness and piety, and chiefly recommended them to protect the weak, the poor, and the women, and to abstain from usury. Among the most important of his ordinances at this time are to be noticed the abolishment of the leap-year, which the Arabs, in common with the Jews, had been accustomed to observe, and in its place introduced the pure lunar year, by which alone the sacred months as well as the pilgrimage and the month of fasting were fixed. Another very important commandment which he gave at this time was that thenceforth the sacred city of Mecca was to be entered only by Mohammedans, and that even outside of it idolaters were to be entirely exterminated. Jews and Christians were to be tolerated, if they would humbly submit and pay a capitation tax. His caliph-Omaradded to the commandment, in order to humiliate those of another faith, several oppressive restrictions for the nations conquered by him, and the succeeding caliphs, according to the degree of tolerance or fanaticism actuating them, mitigated or aggravated the same. Non-Mohammedans, in order to be easily recognized as infidels, were obliged to distinguish themselves by the color of their turbans, the Jews being enjoined to wear black, the Christians blue ones. They were forbidden to carry arms, were ordered to ride on asses (not on horses), on  the streets to yield the way to the Mohammedans, and in public assemblies to rise before them. Their houses must not be higher than those of the faithful; nor were they permitted to hold public processions nor ring bells, nor make proselytes, nor keep any Moslem slaves, nor acquire any captives or other military persons, nor possess any seal with Arabic letters, nor have any intimacy with Moslem females. Jews and Christians should not bet employed in offices of chancery — an interdiction enacted by Omar, but rarely observed because of the ignorance of the primitive Arabians as well as later Turks, who, for want of knowledge of state affairs, found the services of Jews and Christians in various administrative. branches indispensable.

After his return from Mecca, Mohammed busily applied himself to the fitting-out of a new expedition against the Byzantines. In the very midst of his warlike preparations he was suddenly taken dangerously ill with fever. One night, while severely suffering, we are told by Mohammedan chroniclers, Mohammed went to the cemetery of Medina, and prayed and wept upon the tombs, praising the dead, and wishing that he himself might soon be delivered from the storms of this world. For a few more days he went about; at last, too weak further to visit his wives, he chose the house of Avesha, situated near a mosque, as his abode during his sickness. He continued to take part in the public prayers as long as he could; until at last, feeling that his hour had come, he once more preached to the people, recommending Abu-Bekr and Usama, the son of Zaid, as the generals whom he had chosen for the army. He then asked, like Samuel: whether he had wronged anyone, and read to them passages from the Koran, preparing the minds of his hearers for his death, and exhorting them to peace among themselves, and to strict obedience to the tenets of the faith. A few days afterwards he asked for writing materials, probably in order to fix a successor to his office as chief of the faithful; but Omar, fearing he might choose Ali, while he himself inclined to Abu-Bekr, would not allow him to be furnished with them. In his last wanderings he only spoke of angels and heaven. He died in the lap of Ayesha, about noon of Monday, the 12th (11th) of the third month, in the year 11 of the Hegira (June 8, 632). Mohammedan biographers maintain that their prophet died of the consequences of eating roast mutton poisoned by a Jewess, who is said to have sought the revenge of a brother whom the Islamites killed in the campaign of Cheibar. But, as this campaign took place four years previous to Mohammed's death, it might have been a difficult task to the  contemporary Arabian physicians to prove it, even if the attempt at poisoning were verified. It is much more probable (what also occurred in the case of Abu-Bekr, the later caliph) that such a story was concocted to have him die a martyr's death; for the Arabs regard as martyrs those who perish in a holy war, i.e., in a war carried on against infidels.

Many fictions were resorted to in the first century of the Mohammedan era to glorify their deceased prophet. Fanatic Moslems represent him to have enjoyed special favors from on high from the day of his birth. We recur to the exclamation he is said to have uttered as he made his appearance in the world; as a man, we are told the desert was covered with shade-trees as he wandered through the same, and even rocks saluted him as the apostle of the Lord. A man created before all created beings, as tradition has it (at whose birth there were supernatural manifestations), must not die of a common illness: he must perish at least as a martyr. It is difficult to decide how much Mohammed himself has contributed to these legends; certain it is that he frequently, in order to attain his ends, did not despise any means of imposture and delusion, and made the angel Gabriel play a part as bearer of divine revelations in which he did not himself believe. He probably feared the destruction of his whole work — a work which, after naive credulity and religious enthusiasm had been succeeded by sober sense, he cannot possibly have considered salutary for his people, certainly not if his new doctrines were to be forced upon them by the sword and persecution. The inconsistency of his course is certainly marvellous, for he introduced those very measures against which he had himself declaimed so loudly until suddenly transformed from the subject to the ruler. It may be granted even that he frequently played the deceiver for the good of a cause which he believed just and worthy of his best strength, and for which he judged his people ill prepared unless he could claim the authority of a divine messenger; but it is to be regretted that if Mohammed actually strove to elevate his people, as we believe he did at first, he continued the deceiver after he had attained power sufficient to enforce his dicta, and that he not unfrequently did so to further his own personal purposes, often only for a transient accommodation, as, for instance, when he represented God as commanding that nobody should enter his house unless invited, and to retire immediately after taking a meal.

“The Prophet hesitates to dismiss you, even if you are tedious; but God does not hesitate to tell you the truth.”  As much as his public life and his appearance as prophet and legislator may be liable to censure, his private life, excepting his sensuality, if his biographers report the truth, was exemplary. He was affable, conversed with everybody, was plain in dress and diet, and so little pretentious as to forbid external reverence from his companions, and to refuse from his slaves a service which he could perform himself. He was often seen in the market buying provisions, and at home milking goats and mending clothes. He visited the sick, and was in sympathy with sufferers; he was generous and forbearing, if policy did not dictate a contrary course. His benevolence and liberality were especially makred; and indeed they must have been great, for he left no riches, though the war-booty which he shared, and the presents which flowed to him from all sides, must have placed large means at his command. Upon the whole, it cannot be denied that Mohammed improved and elevated the political and religious condition of Arabia. He united the dispersed, mutually inimical, idolatrous Arabian tribes into a great nation, allied by a faith in God and a belief in a future life. In place of bloody vengeance for murder and of rude force, he instituted an inviolable code, which, in spite of deficiencies, still forms the fundemental law of the Islamitic kingdoms. On the women he bestowed, in spite of some restrictions, many rights which they had not enjoyed before him. He mitigated the lot of slaves, as far as the spirit of his age permitted, and declared emancipation to be a work agreeable to the Deity. He cared like a father for the poor, the widows, and orphans; condemned the vices which degrade humanity and have a disturbing influence on social life, and exhorted to the virtues recommending in the Old and New Testaments. This, in brief outline, is the history of Mohammed's career. We have not been able to dwell, as we could wish, at any length, either on the peculiar circumstances of his inner lief, which preceded and accompanied his “prophetic” course, nor on the part which idolatry, Judaism, Christianity, and his own reflection; nor have we been able to trace the process by which his “mission” grew upon him, as it were, and he, from a simple admonisher of his family, became the founder of a faith to which above 130,000,000 are said to adhere.

Personal Characteristics. — In appearance, Mohammed was of middling size, had broad shoulders, a wide chest, and large bones; and he was fleshy, but not stout. The immoderate size of his head was party disguised by long locks of hair, which in slight curls came nearly down to the lobes of his ears. His oval face, though tawny, was rather fair for an Arab, but neither  pale nor high-colored. The forehead was broad, and his fine and long but narrow eyebrows were separated by a vein, which you could see throbbing if he was angry. Under long eyelashes sparkled bloodshot black eyes through wide slit eyelids. His nose was large, prominent, and slightly hooked, and the tip of it seemed to be turned up, but was not so in reality. The mouth was wide; he had a good set of teeth, and the fore-teeth were asunder. His beard rose from the cheek-bones, and came down to the collarbone; he clipped his mustaches, but did not shave them. He stooped, and was slightly hump-backed. His gait was careless, and he walked fast but heavily, as if he were ascending a hill; and if he looke dback, he turned round his whole body. The mildness of his countenance gained him the confidence of every one; but he could not look straight into a man's face: he turned his eyes usually outwards. On his back he had a round fleshy tumor of the size of a pigeon's egg; its furrowed surface was covered with hair, and its base was surrounded by black moles. This was considered as the seal of his prophetic mission, at least during the latter part of his career, by his followers, who were so devout that they found a cure for their ailings in drinking the waters in which he had bathed; and it must have been very refreshing, for he perspired profusely, and his skin exhaled a strong smell. He bestowed considerable care on his person, and more particularly on his teeth, which he rubbed so frequently with a piece of wood that a Shiah author was induced to consider it as one of the signs of his prophetic mission. He bathed frequently, washed several times a day, and oiled his head profusely after washing it. At times he dyed his hair and beard red with henna, in imitation of his grandfather, who imported this habit from Yemen. Though he did not comb himself regularly, he did it now and then. At first he wore his hair like the Jews and Christians; for he said, “In all instance in which God has not given me an order to the contrary, I like to follow their example;” but subsequently he divided it, like most of his countrymen. Every evening he applied antimony to his eyes; and though he had not many gray hairs even when he died, he concealed them by dyeing or oiling them, in order to please his wives, many of whom were young and inclined to be giddy, and whose numbers he increased in proportion as he became more decrepit.

The prophet was usually dressed in a white cotton shirt, or blouse, with pockets, and sleeves which reached to his wrists. He had a skull-cap and a turban on his head, the extremities hanging down the back; and sandals, with two leather straps over the instep, on his feet. In the house he wore merely a piece of cloth tied around his temles, leaving the crown of his head uncovered. Sometime he wore, instead of the shirt, a  “suit of clothes,” which consisted of an apron — that is to say, a piece of cloth tied round the waist and hanging in folds down to the legs, like a woman's petticoat — and a sheet, or square shawl, which was thrown over the left shoulder and wrapped round the body under the right arm. Sometimes he wrapped himself in a blanket. In temperament, Mohammed was melancholic, and in the highest degree nervous. He was generally low- spirited, thinking, and restless; and he spoke little, and never without necessity. His eyes were mostly cast to the ground, and he seldom raised them towards heaven. The excitement under which he composed the more poetical Surahs of the Koran was so great that he said that they had caused him gray hair; his lips were quivering and his hands shaking while he received the inspiration. Any offensive smell made him so uncomfortable that he forbade persons who had eaten garlic or onions to come into his place of worship. In a man of semi-barbarous habits this is remarkable. He had a wollen garment, and was obliged to throw it away when it began to smell from persipiration, “on account of his delicate consitution.” When he was taken ill, he sobbed like a woman in hysterics; or, as Ayesha says, he roared like a camel; and his friends reproached him for his unmanly bearing. During the battle of Badr his nervous excitement seems to have bordered on frenzy. The faculties of his mind were extremely unequally developed; he was unfit for the common duties of life, and even after his mission he was led in all practical questions by his friends. But he had a vivid imagination, the greatest elevation of mind, refined sentiments, and a taste for the sublime.

The articles KORAN SEE KORAN and MOHAMMEDANISM SEE MOHAMMEDANISM contain some further details on his doctrine and its history.

## Mohammedan Sects[[@Headword:Mohammedan Sects]]

             “My community,” the Prophet of Islam is reported to have said, “will separate itself into seventy-three sects; one only will be saved all the others shall perish.” This prophecy, if it were ever made, has in a large measure been fulfilled. The Mohammedans are divided into fifty-five orthodox and eighteen liberal sects. Probably the prophecy was made after the division had taken place. (A very important and instructive treatise on this subject was presented by Silvestre de Sacy to the Institute of France. It is based on the writings of the Mohammedan writer Sheristani, and also on Macrisi.) But, be this as it may, differences of opinion arose among the Prophet's followers even during his own lifetime, and multiplied rapidly after his death. A perusal of the articles KORAN SEE KORAN and MOHAMMEDANISM SEE MOHAMMEDANISM will reveal clearly that the fundamentals of Islam were by no means unequivocal, and hence a great variety of interpretation of the Koran has resulted. To add to the poetical uncertainty of the Koranic principles, a vast number of oral traditions accumulated in Islam, and were circulated as an expansive corollary of the Koran. Political causes soon came to assist the confusion and contest, and religion was made the pretext for faction-fights, which in reality had their origin in the ambition of certain men of influence. Thus “sects” increased in far larger numbers even than the Prophet is said to have foretold, and though their existence was but short-lived in most instances, they yet deserve attention, were it only as signs and tokens of the ever-fresh life of the human spirit, which, though fettered a thousand times by narrow and hard formulas, will break these fetters as often, and prove its everlasting right to freedom of thought and action. The bewildering mass of these currents of controversy has by the Arabic historians been brought under four chief heads or fundamental bases. The first of these relates to the divine attributes and unity. Which of these attributes are essential or eternal? Is the omnipotence of God absolute? If not, what are its limits? Further, as to the doctrine of God's predestination and man's liberty — a question of no small purport, and one which has been controverted in nearly all religions. How far is God's decree influenced by man's own will? How far can God countenance evil? and questions of a similar kind belonging to this province. The third is, perhaps, the most comprehensive “basis,” and the one that bears most directly upon practical doctrines — viz., the promises and threats, and the names of God, together with various other questions chiefly relating to faith, repentance, infidelity,  and error. The fourth is the one that concerns itself with the influence of reason and history upon the transcendental realm of faith. To this chapter belong the mission of prophets, the office of Imam, or head of the Church, and such intricate subtleties as to what constitutes goodness and badness; how far actions are to be condemned on the ground of reason or the “law,” etc.

I. One broad line, however, came to be drawn, in the course of time, among these innumerable religious divisions — a line that separated them all into orthodox sects and heterodox sects; orthodox being those only who adopted the oral traditions, or Sunna (q.v.). Of these Sunnites, i.e., traditionists, or believers in the Sunna, there are four divisions, which, though at issue on most points, are yet acknowledged by each other as faithful, and capable of salvation. They are severally designated by the name of the men who in leadership attained to greatest authority. Each of these guides also to this day continues the expounder of the sect by a manual which each left to his adherents as a compend of theology and jurisprudence.

1. The first of these sects are the Hanefites, founded by Abu Hanefa, who died 150 years after the Hegira. They are emphatically called “the followers of reason,” while the other three are guided exclusively by tradition. They allow reason to have a principal share on decisions in their legal and other points. To this sect belong chiefly the Turks and Tartars.

2. The second sect are the Malekites, founded by Malek Ibn Ans, who died about 180 of the Hegira at Medina. As one of the chief proofs of his piety and humility, it is recorded that when asked for his decision on forty-eight questions, he would only decide on sixteen, freely confessing his ignorance on the others. In Barbary and other portions of Africa the greatest part of his adherents are found.

3. Mohammed al-Shafei, born in Palestine in 150 of the Hegira, but educated in Mecca, is the founder of the third sect, Shafiites. He was a great enemy to the scholastic divines, and seems altogether to have been of an original cast of mind. He never swore by God, and always took time to consider whether he should at all answer any given questions or hold his peace. The most characteristic saying recorded of him is, “Whosoever pretends to love both the work and the Creator at the same time is a liar.” He is accounted of such importance that, according to his contemporaries,  “he was as the sun, to the world, and as health to the body;” and all the relations of the traditions of Mohammed were said to have been asleep until he came and awoke them. He appears to have been the first who reduced Moslem jurisprudence to a method, and thus made it, from a number of vague sayings, a science. His followers are now chiefly found in Arabia and Persia.

4. Ahmed Ibn Hanbal founded the fourth sect, the Hanbalites. He was born in 164 of the Hegira, and was a most intimate friend of Shafei. His knowledge of the traditions (of which he could repeat no less than a million) was no less famed than was his piety. He taught that the Koran was not created, but everlastingly subsisted in the essence of God-a doctrine for which he was severely punished by caliph Al-Motasena. On the day of his death, the Mohammedans would have us believe, no less than 20,000 unbelievers (Jews, Christians, and Magians) embraced the Mohammedan faith. Once very numerous, the Hanbalites are now but very rarely met with outside of Arabia.

5. In recent times a new orthodox Mohammedan sect has sprung up, called Wahabis or Wahabites, after their founder, Mohammed Abd-el-Wahab (q.v.). They are intent upon restoring the primitive and vigorous Mohammedanism which they claim does not now exist under the Turks and Persians, whom they call idolatrous. The Wahabis are a sort of Puritanic Iconoclasts, and their power is fast spreading. But their recent history is so mystified that we defer them for consideration under the heading WAHABITES SEE WAHABITES .

II. Much more numerous than the orthodox divisions are the heterodox ones. Immediately after Mohammed's death, and during the early conquests, the contest was chiefly confined to the question of the Imamat. But no sooner were the first days of warfare over than thinking minds began to direct themselves to a closer examination of the faith itself, for which and through which the world was to be conquered, and to the book which preached it, the Koran. The earliest germs of a religious dissension are found in the revolt of the Kharegites against Ali, in the thirty-seventh year of the Hegira (see Ockley, Hist. of the Saracens, 2:50); and several doctors shortly afterwards broached heterodox opinions about predestination and the good and evil to be ascribed to God. These new doctrines were boldly, and in a very advanced form, openly preached by Wasil Ibn Ata; who, for uttering a moderate opinion in the matter of the  “sinner,” had been expelled from the rigorous school of Basrah. He then formed a school of his own — that of the Separatists or Motazilites, who, together with a number of other “heretical” groups, are variously counted as one, four, or seven sects.

1. The first of these heretical groups, the Motazilites -also called Hoattalites, i.e., those who divest God of his attributes; and Kadarija, i.e., “those who hold. that man has a free will, and deny the strict doctrine of predestination” — is traced back even to Mabad, who, in the time of Mohammed himself, already began to question predestination, by pointing out how kings carry on unjust wars, kill men, and steal their goods, and all the while pretend to be merely executing God's decrees. The real founder of the sect, as such, however, is, as we have already indicated, Wasil Ibn Ata. He denied God's “qualities” — such as knowledge, power, will, life — as leading to, if not directly implying, polytheism. As to predestination itself, this he only allowed to exist with regard to the outward good or evil that befalls man, such as illness or recovery, death or life, but man's actions he held to be entirely in his own hands. God, he said, had given commandments to mankind, and it was not to be supposed that he had, at the same time, preordained that some should disobey these commandments, and that, further, they should be punished for it. Man alone was the agent in his good or evil actions, in his belief or unbelief, obedience or disobedience, and he is rewarded according to his deeds.

(a) These doctrines were further developed by his disciple, Abul-Hudail, who did not deny so absolutely God's “qualities,” but modified their meaning in the manner of the Greek philosophers, viz. that every quality was also God's essence. The attributes are thus not without, but within him, and, so far from being a multiplicity, they merely designate the various ways of the manifestations of the Godhead. God's will he declared to be a peculiar kind of knowledge, through which God did what he foresaw to be salutary in the end. Man's freedom' of action is only possible in this world. In the next all will be according to necessary laws immutably preordained. The righteous will enjoy everlasting bliss; and for the wicked everlasting punishment will be decreed. Another very dangerous doctrine of his system was the assumption that before the Koran had been revealed man had already come to the conclusion of right and wrong. By his inner intellect, he held, everybody must and does know — even without the aid of the divinely given commandments — whether the thing he is doing be right or wrong, just or unjust, true or false. He is further supposed to have held  that, unless a man be killed by violent means, his life would neither be prolonged nor shortened by “supernatural” agencies, His belief in the traditions was also by no means an absolute one. There was no special security, he said, in a long, unbroken chain of witnesses, considering that one fallible man among them could corrupt the whole truth.

(b) Many were the branches of these Motazilites. There were, apart from the disciples of Abul-Hudail, the Jobbaiasns, who adopted Abu Ali al- Wahhab's (Al-Jobbai's) opinion, to the effect that the knowledge ascribed to God was not an “attribute;” nor was his knowledge “necessary;” nor did sin prove anything as to the belief or unbelief of him who committed it, who would anyhow be subjected to eternal punishment if he died in it, etc.

(c) Besides these, there were the disciples of Abu Hashem — the Hashemites — who held that an infidel was not the creation of God, who could not produce evil.

(d) Another branch were the disciples of Ahmed Ibn Hayet, who held that Christ was the eternal Word incarnate, and assumed a real body; that there were two gods, or creators, one eternal. viz. the Most High God, and the other not eternal, viz. Christ — not unlike the Socinian and Arian theories on this subject; that there is a successive transmigration of the soul from one body into another, and that the last body will enjoy the reward or suffer the punishments due to each soul; and that God will be seen at the resurrection with the eyes of the understanding, not of the body.

(e) Four more divisions of this sect are mentioned, viz. the Jahedhians, whose master's notion about the Koran was that it was “a body that might grow into a man, and sometimes into a beast, or to have, as others put it, two faces — one human, the other that of an animal, according to the different interpretations.” He further taught them that the damned would become fire, and thus be attracted by hell; also, that the mere belief in God and the Prophet constituted a “faithful.”

(f) Of rather different tendencies was Al-Mozdar, the founder of the branch of the Mozdarians. He not only held the Koran to be uncreated and eternal, but, so far from denying God the power of doing evil, he declared it to be possible for God to be a liar and unjust.

(g) Another branch was formed by the Pasharians, who, while they carried man's free agency rather to excess, yet held that God might doom even an  infant to eternal punishment all the while granting that he would be unjust in so doing.

(h) The last of these Motazilite sectarians we shall mention are the Thamamians, who held, after their master, Thamama, that sinners would undergo eternal damnation and punishment; that free actions have- no producing author; and that, at the resurrection, all infidels, atheists, Jews, Christians, Magians, and heretics should be returned to dust.

We cannot in this place enlarge upon the different schools founded by the Motazilites, nor upon their subsequent fate (see for details, Steiner, Mutaziliten; Weil, Gesch. d. Islam. Wiker, and his Gesch. d. Khalifen). The vast cyclopedic development, however, which their doctrines begot, and which resulted in the encyclopedic labors called “The Treatises of the Sincere Brethren and True Friends,” will be considered in the article SINCERE BRETHREN SEE SINCERE BRETHREN (q.v.).

2. We now come to the second great heretical group, the Sefatians, or attributionists, who held a precisely contrary view to that of the- Motazilites. With them God's attributes, whether essential or operative, or what they in more recent times have called declarative or historical, i.e. used in historical narration (eyes, face, hand), anthropomorphisms, in fact, were considered eternal. But here, again, lay the germs for more dissensions, and more sects in their own midst. Some, taking this notion of God's attributes in a strictly literal sense, assumed a likeness between God and created things; others gave it a more allegorical interpretation, without, however, entering into any particulars beyond the reiterated doctrine that God had no companion or similitude.

(a) The different sects into which they split were, first, the Asharians, so called from Abul Hasan al-Ashari, who, at first a Motazilite, disagreed with his masters on the point of God's being bound to do always that which is best. He became the founder of a new school, which held (1) that God's attributes are to be held distinct from his essence, and that any literal understanding of the words that stand for God's limbs in the Koran is reprehensible. (2) That predestination must be taken in its most literal meaning, i.e., that God preordains everything. The opinions on this point of man's free will are, however, much divided, as indeed to combine a predestination which ordains every act with man's free choice is not easy; and the old authors hold that it is well not to inquire too minutely into  these things, lest all precepts, both positive and negative, be argued away. The middle path, adopted by the greater number of the doctors, is expressed in this formula: There is neither compulsion nor free liberty, but the way lies between the two; the power and will being both created by God, though the merit or guilt be imputed to man. Regarding mortal sin, it was held by this sect that if a believer die guilty of it without repentance, he will not, for all that, always remain a denizen of hell. God will either pardon him, or the Prophet will intercede on his behalf, as he says in the Koran: “My intercession shall be employed for those among my people who shall have been guilty of grievous crimes;” and further, that he in whose heart there is faith but of the weight of an ant shall be delivered from hell-fire.

(b) From this more philosophical opinion, however, departed a number of other Sefatian sects, who, taking the Koranic words more literally, transformed God's attributes into grossly corporeal things, like the Mosshabehites, or assimilators, who conceived God to be a figure composed of limbs like those of created beings, either of a bodily or spiritual nature, capable of local motion, ascent or descent, etc. The notions of some actually went so far as to declare God to be “hollow from the crown of the head to the breast, and solid from the breast downward; he also had black curled hair.”

(c) Another subdivision of this sect were the Jabians, who deny to man all free agency, and make all his deeds dependent on God. Their name indicates their religious tendency sufficiently, meaning “Necessitarians.”

III. The third principal division of “heretical sects” is formed by the Kharegites, or “rebels” from the lawful prince — i.e., Ali — the first of whom were the 12,000 men who fell away from him after having fought under him at the battle of Seffein, taking offence at his submitting the decision of his right to the caliphate (against Moawiyyah) to arbitration. Their “heresy” consisted, first, in their holding that any man might be called to the Imamat though he did not belong to the Koreish, nor was even a freeman, provided he was a just and pious man, and fit in every other respect. It also followed that an unrighteous imam might be deposed, or even put to death; and further, that there was no absolute necessity for any imam in the world.

IV. The fourth principal sect are the Shiites, or sectaries, so called by the Sunnites, or orthodox Moslems, because of their heretical tendencies. The Shiites, as they are now generally called, were originated by Ali Ibn Abi Taleb, and prefer to call themselves Al-Adeliat, Sect of the Just Ones, or familiarly, “Followers of Ali,” because they believe that the Imamat, or supreme rule, both spiritual and temporal, over all Mohammedans was originally vested in him whom they acknowledge as their founder, and that the Imamat now of right belongs to his descendants. In the opinion of the Shiites, the vicarship of the Prophet, was not to be, like an earthly kingdom, the mere prize of craft or of valor. It was the inalienable heritage of the sacred descendants of the Prophet himself. They therefore consider the caliphs Abu Bekr, Omar, and Othman, the first three incumbents of the caliphate after Mohammed, unrighteous pretenders and usurpers of the sovereign power, which properly ought to have gone to Ali direct from the Prophet. For the same reason the Shiites abominate the memory of the Ommayad caliph who executed Hossein, a son of Ali, and still mourn his death at its anniversary. (This most pathetic story is perhaps generally remembered from the pages of Gibbon; it should be read in its full detail in those of Ockley and Price.) The Shiites likewise reject the Abbasside caliphs, notwithstanding their descent from Mohammed, because they did not belong to Ali's line. SEE KALIPH.

The Shiites have special observances, ceremonies, and rites, as well as particular dogmas of their own. They believe in metempsychosis and the descent of God upon his creatures, inasmuch as he, omnipresent, sometimes appears in some individual person, such as their imams. They are subdivided into five sects, to one of which, that of Haidar, the Persians belong — the present dynasty of Persia deriving its descent from Haidar. Their five subdivisions they compare to five trees, with seventy branches: for their minor divisions of opinions, on matters of comparatively unimportant points of dogma, are endless. The Shiites and Sunnites are, then, represented respectively by the two great Mohammedan powers, the former being upheld by the Persian dynasty, the latter by the Ottomans. This division between Turk and Persian on doctrine dates chiefly from the caliphate of Mothi Lilla, the Abbasside, in 363 of the Hegira, when political dissensions, which ended in the destruction of Bagdad and the loss.. of the caliphate of the Moslems, assumed the character of a religious war. But it may be stated here also that the Shiites are by no means confined to Persia. They have indeed, in greater or lesser numbers, been dispersed, throughout  all ‘the countries of the empire of the Mussulmans. They have possessed several kingdoms both in Asia and Africa. They are now dominant, outside of Persia, in half the territory ruled over by the princes of the Uzbecks, and situated beyond the river Gihon; and there are some Mohammedan kings of the Indies who make profession of the Shiite faith. Mohammed's life, as represented by Shiite tradition,, has been furnished in an English dress by the Reverend James L. Merrick (Bost. 1850).

V. It remains now only to mention a few of the more prominent of the many pseudo-prophets who have arisen in the bosom of Islam, drawing a certain number of adherents around them, and, as it would appear to us “outsiders,” threatening by this decentralization the very life of Mohammedanism, but by the Moslems themselves alleged as a sign of the purity of their creed. Christianity, they say, an improvement on Judaism, can boast of more sects than Judaism; Islam, an improvement on Christianity, can boast of more sects than Christianity.

The pseudo-prophets who have arisen have invariably either declared themselves the great Prophet's legal successors, or, utterly renouncing his doctrines, have sought to build up on the ruins of Islam. The first and most prominent among these was Mosaylima (i.e., little Moslem), who was a rival of the Prophet in his lifetime. Mosaylima belonged to the. clan Dul, a division of the tribe of the Bani Hanifah, of Yamama in Nejed. The traditions about his life and age appear to be extremely legendary. It is, however, tolerably clear that he had risen to a certain eminence in his tribe as a religious teacher before Mohammed assumed his prophetical office. The name he was known by among his friends was Rahman, the Benignant or Merciful; a term which Mohammed adopted as a designation of God' himself. This word, which is Aramaic, was a common divine epithet among the Jews, from whom Mohammed took it, together with a vast bulk' of dogmas and ceremonies and legends. If, however, as is supposed by some, Mosaylima assumed that name in the meaning of Messiah Saviour, it would prove that he had anticipated Mohammed in the apostleship, which is commonly denied. It was in the ninth year of the Hegira that, at the head of an embassy sent by his tribe, he appeared before Mohammed, in order to settle certain points of dispute, The traditions are very contradictory on the circumstance whether or not Mosaylima was then already the reeognised spiritual leader of his tribe. When they were introduced to Mohammed in the mosque, they greeted him with the orthodox salutation of Moslems,  “Salam alayk” (Peace upon thee), and, after a brief parley, recited the confession of faith. Shortly after this event, Mosaylima openly professed himself to be a prophet, like Mohammed. The latter sent a messenger to him, as soon as he heard of this, to request him to reiterate publicly his profession of Islam. Mosaylima's answer was a request that Mohammed should share his power with him. “From Mosaylima, the apostle of God,” he wrote, according to Abulfeda, “to Mohammed, the apostle of God. Now let the earth be half mine, and half thine.” Mohammed speedily replied “From Mohammed, the apostle of God, to Mosaylima, the liar.

The earth is God's: he giveth the same for inheritance unto such of his servants as he pleases, and the happy issue shall attend those who fear him.” Yet notwithstanding these testimonies, of probably late dates, it seems, on the other hand, quite certain that Mohammed made very great concessions to his rival-concessions that point to his having secretly nominated Mosaylima his successor, and that he by this means bought Mosaylima's open allegiance during his lifetime. It was not a question of dogmas, though they each had special revelations, but a question of supremacy, which was thus settled amicably. “Mohammed,” Mosaylima said, “is appointed by God to settle the principal points of faith, and I to supplement them.” He further had a revelation, in accordance with Mohammed's: “We have sent to every nation its own prophet,” to the effect: “We have given unto thee [Mosaylima] a number of people; keep them to thyself, and advance. But be cautious, and desire not too much; and do not enter into rival fights.” When Mohammed was at the point of death, he desired to write his will. Whatever he may have wished to ordain is uncertain; it is well known, at all events, that his friends did not obey his order, and refused to furnish him with writing materials, very probably because they did not like' to be bound by his last injunctions. Sprenger supposes that he wished formally .to appoint Mosaylima his successor, and that it was just this which his surrounding relations feared. Mosaylima then openly declared against Islam, and many parodies of the Koran sprang up in the Nejed, ascribed to him. In the eleventh year of the Hegira it at last came to an open breach between the two rival powers. Abu Bekr, the caliph, sent Khalid, “the Sword of the Faith,” with a number of choice troops, to compel Mosaylinma to submission. Mosavlima awaited the enemy at Rowdah, a village in the Wadi Hanifah. So formidable indeed was Mosaylima's force that Khalid is said to have hesitated for a whole day and night before he undertook an assault unanimously disapproved of by his council. On the second morning, however, he advanced, and, in a battle which lasted until  the evening, contrived, with fearful losses of his own, to gain the victory. Mosaylima fell by the hands of a negro slave, and his head was cut off by the conqueror, and placed at the head of a spear, to convince both friends and foes of his death. Khalid then advanced to the slain prophet's birthplace, in order to slay all its inhabitants. They, however, by a clever stratagem, contrived to conclude an honorable peace, and embraced Islam. The Mosayliman “heresy” was thus stamped out, and only a few scattered remnants of the new faith contrived to escape to Hasa and Basrah, where they may have laid the foundation of the later Karmathian creed. SEE KARMATHIANS.

It is extremely difficult to come to any clear notion of Mosaylima's real doctrines, as all the accounts that have survived of them come from victorious adversaries — adversaries who have not hesitated to invent the most scandalous stories about him. Thus a love-adventure between Mosaylima and the prophetess Sajah, the wife of a soothsayer of Yamima, who is supposed to have staved three days in his tent, is told with great minuteness, even to the obscene conversation that is supposed to have taken place between them during that time; the fact being that this story, which is still told with much relish by the natives, is without the slightest foundation. From the same source we learn that Mosaylima tried to deceive his followers by conjuring tricks. It seems, on the contrary, that he was of much higher moral standing than Mohammed himself. For it is said that Mosaylima enjoined the highest chastity even among married people: unless there were hope of begetting children, there should be restriction of conjugal duty. Even the nickname “Little Moslem” given to him seems to indicate that he, too, preached the unity of God, or Islam as the fundamental doctrine of faith. How far his religion had a socialistic tendency, and offered less show of dignity and outward morality to its followers, or whether it rejected fatalism, contained an idea of incarnation, and invested its preachers and teachers with a semi-mediatorial character, as the latest explorer of the Nejed, Mr. Palgrave tells us, we have no means of judging. But we must receive these conclusions, probably drawn from the information of the natives, with all the greater caution, as that story of the prophetess Sajah, whom he reports, after his informants, not only to have been properly married to Mosaylima, but to have become, after his death, a devout partisan of Islam, and to have entered an “orthodox alliance,” does not, as we have said before, according to the best European authorities on Mohammedanism, deserve the slightest credence.  Next to Mosaylima figures prominently Al-Aswad, originally called Aihala, of the tribe of Ans, of which, as well as of that of a number of other tribes, he was governor. He pretended to receive certain revelations from two angels, Sohaik and Shoraik. Certain feats of legerdemain and a natural eloquence procured him a number of followers, by whose aid he made himself master of several provinces. A counter-revolution, however, broke out the night before Mohammed's death, and Al-Aswad's head was cut off; whereby an end was put to a rebellion of exactly four months' duration, but already assuming large proportions.

In the same year (11 of the Hegira), but after Mohammed's death, a man named Toleiha set up as a prophet, but with very little success. He, his tribe, and followers were met in open battle by Khalid, at the head of the troops of the Faithful, and, being beaten, had all finally to submit to Islam.

A few words ought also to be said regarding the “Veiled Prophet,” Al- Mokanna, or Borkai, whose real name was Hakem Ibn Hashem, at the time of Al-Mohdi, the third Abbasside caliph. He used to hide the deformity of his face (he had also but one eye) by a gilded mask, a circumstance which his followers explained by the splendor of his countenance being too brilliant (like that of Moses) to be borne by ordinary mortals. Being a proficient in jugglery besides, which went for the power of working miracles, he soon drew many disciples and followers around him. At last he arrogated the office of the Deity itself, which, by continual transmigrations from Adam downwards, had at last resided in the body of Abu Moslem, the governor of Khorassan, whose secretary this new prophet had been. The caliph, finding him growing more and more formidable every day, sent a force against him, which finally drove him back into one of his strongest fortresses, where he first poisoned and then burned all his family; after which he threw himself into the flames, which consumed him completely, except his hair. He had left a message however, to the effect that he would reappear in the shape of a gray man riding on a gray beast, and many of his followers for many years after expected his reappearance. They wore as a distinguishing mark nothing but white garments. He died about the middle' of the 2d century of the Hegira. SEE MOKANNA.

Of the Karmathians and the Ismaelians we have spoken under their respective headings. We can scarcely enumerate among the prophets Abul Teyeb Ahmed al-Motanebbi, one of the most celebrated Arabic poets, who mistook, or pretended to mistake, his poetical inspiration for the divine  afflatus, and caused several tribes to style him prophet, as his surname indicates, and to acknowledge his mission. The governor of his province, Lilui, took prompt steps to stifle any such pretensions in the bud by imprisoning him, and making him formally renounce all absurd pretensions to a prophetical office. The poet did so with all speed. He was richly rewarded by the court and many princes for his minstrelsy, to which thenceforth he clung exclusively; but the riches he thus accumulated became the cause of his death. Robbers attacked him while he was returning to his home in Kufa, there to live upon the treasure bestowed upon him by Adado'ddawla, sultan of Persia.

The last of the new prophets to be mentioned is Baba, who appeared in Amasia, in Natolia, in 1221 of the Hegira, and who had immense success, chiefly with the Turcomans, his own nation, so that at last he found himself at the head of nearly a million men, horse and foot. Their war-cry was, God is God, and Baba — not Mohammed — is his prophet. It was not until both Christians and Mohammedans combined for the purpose of self- defence that this new and most formidable power was annihilated, its armies being routed and put to the sword, while the two chiefs were decapitated by the executioner. SEE BABISTS. See Weil; Geschichte der Khalifen; and his Geschichte des Mohammedanismus; Taylor, History of Mohammedanism; and the works referred to in the article SEE MOHAMMEDANISM.

## Mohammedanism[[@Headword:Mohammedanism]]

             called by its professors Islam, meaning "resignation" or "entire submission" (i.e. to the will of God), in accordance with the Koran, which, as we have already seen in the article under that heading, is the Bible of the Mohammedan, and in the days of the Prophet was the only sacred book in use, the sole exponent of duty and privilege to the Moslem, as the Mohammedan calls himself. The Koran, however, being a miscellaneous collection of hymns,, prayers, dogmas, sermons, occasional speeches, narratives, legends, laws, orders for the time in which they were given, without any chronological arrangement, and full of repetitions anti contradictions, owing to the manner of its collection, which took place subsequent to Mohammed's death, soon proved too disconnected to be continued, even by the most ardent disciple of Islam, as the sole guide of authority. Neither dogmas nor laws are here reduced to a system; they had been inserted by piecemeal just as they had been written down, or even afterwards discovered in the reminiscences of Mohammed's companions. But, aside from these imperfections of contradictions, repetitions, and the want of system, it was manifest also that the Koran was lacking in instruction on many important theological questions, in which light the Mohammedan is accustomed to regard all ritual, dogmatic, and juridical matters.

The Moslem therefore resorted, in the first place, to oral tradition, and by the aid of reported expressions of the Prophet, and examples in his public and private life (Hadith and Sunnah), supplemented the deficiencies and elucidated the obscure passages of the Koran (q.v.). When this resource failed to meet all wants, the decrees of the imams, i.e. of the caliphs as spiritual heads, were raised to the authority of divine laws and doctrines. Thus a religious structure, extended by analogy and Induction, supported by the Koran, by tradition, and by decrees of the imams, comprising juridical, ritualistic, and dogmatic doctrines, was gradually completed into a systematic whole, sufficient for all purposes as a guide to the Moslem. But we need hardly add that into such a peculiar construction contradictions in theory and practice have found their way, according to the different traditions and decisions of the imams or expounders of the law, besides the various interpretations put upon the Koran itself within the pale of the different Mohammedan sects that have arisen since the days of the Prophet. SEE MOHAMMEDAN SECTS. For the historical and ethical circumstances that conduced to the Origin and progress of Mohammedanism, SEE MOHAMMED.  Moslemism consists of a dogmatical or theoretical part, called "Iman" (i.e. faith), and a practical part, called "Din" (i.e. religion.) (See Vambery, Der Islam im neunzehnten Jahrhundert [Leips. 1875]).

I. Dogmas. — The doctrines of Islam, as originally instituted upon its foundation, may be reduced to three leading propositions, viz.:

(1) the doctrine of one Deity,

(2) of the revelation or prophetic vision of Mohammed, and

(3) the immortality of the soul,

the latter being closely interlinked with the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, of paradise, and of hell, the day of judgment, and the rewarding of the good and faithful, as well as the punishment of the wicked and of infidels. Though these doctrines are plain and simple, they became, nevertheless, even in the first century of the Mohammedan aera, subjects of the most violent polemics. A man like Mohammed, in whom not the least trace of scholarly education is to be found, was unable to set up a systematic structure of doctrines. True, we find in sundry passages of the Koran that God is the creator and preserver of the world; that. he is One, omniscient, omnipotent, eternal, just, and gracious. But the Arabs, after becoming acquainted with Persian religions and ideas, and with Grecian philosophy, would not be satisfied with such simplicity. Their desire for knowledge led them to further inquiries, for which they found no solution in the Koran, and which therefore gave occasion to dissensions, the more irremediable as they were in part connected with political differences. At the very earliest epoch reflective minds among the faithful took offence and exception to many dogmas, particularly on the essence of the Deity and its relation to mankind, as well' as to the irrational doctrines concerning the Koran itself. Thus the orthodox taught that the divine attributes existed, so to speak, by the side of Deity; while the Motazelites, i.e. the Separatists, considered the Deity itself as the essence of wisdom, beneficence, power, and other qualities. The doctrine of the justice of God led the latter (i.e. the dissenters) further to accept the dogma of human free will, while the orthodox inclined more or less to the Augustinian doctrine of predestination and grace. This same doctrine induced the liberal Mohammedans to assume a gradation of sin and punishment; while, according to the opinion of the strictly orthodox, every Moslem who commits only one sin, and departs this life without repentance, is consigned to eternal punishment. (See below.) Thus also the absolute unity of the  Deity induced the Separatists to maintain that the Koran was created, since otherwise two (things) beings must have existed from eternity; the orthodox, on the contrary, regard the Koran as something uncreated, lest, God being immutable, it be viewed as not belonging to his being, and thereby the whole doctrine of revelation become undermined. The latter dogma was fiercely disputed under the caliph Mamun, who instituted a formal inquisition, .and persecuted to the utmost the adherents of the doctrine of the eternity of the Koran.

Much controversy arose also concerning the dogma of divine foreordination, and both contending parties found no difficulty in bringing proof from the Koran, which is especially rich in contradictions on this point. In one passage it reads: "To him who wants this world we give directly according to our pleasure; but he will be rejected and derided in the future state, and burned in hell." In another passage it is said: "Follow the most beautiful sent to you from your Lord, before punishment befalls you, and you find no more assistance; before the soul exclaims, Woe to me ! I have sinned and was of the mockers; or, If God would have guided me, I Would have feared him; or, Could I return to the earth, I would practice the good. Not so; my signs (the verses of the Koran) have come to thee, thou hast declared them lies, thou wast haughty and unbelieving.". While these and similar passages, as well as the continual threats and promises, speak clearly in favor of a dogma of human free will. there are others which make the acts of man dependent on the divine will, and render man, as to virtue and vice, a blind instrument of divine arbitrariness. Thus we read: "For those who are unbelievers, it is the same whether thou (God is speaking to Mohammed) admonishest them or not; they believe not. God has sealed their hearts, and over their eyes and ears there is a covering." And further: "The infidels say, Why does God not send any miracles to him (Mohammed)? Say, The Lord leaves in error whom he chooses, and guides those who turn to him who believe, and whose hearts find rest at the thought of Divinity." Very frequently we meet in the Koran with the phrase: "God guides whom he pleases, and leaves in error whom he pleases." These and similar verses, however, if we survey the whole without any bias, can be interpreted as meaning that God in his wisdom appoints at what time and which people he will bless by his revelation, and that he strengthens by faith the men who desire the good and true in their aspirations, while he abandons those in whom the propensity for evil predominates, to their more and more increasing corruption, and thus  measurably hardens their hearts. Again: if the doctrine of predestination is stiffly adopted, not to come in conflict with divine justice, the doctrine of original sin — i.e. of an internal corruption of mankind in consequence of the Sin of Adam — must also be assumed. But such a dogma is not mooted in the Koran; on the contrary, in several places the idea of accountability for the sins of others is controverted. There is, to be sure, in the Koran, as in the Old Testament, the narrative of the first human couple residing in paradise, of their disobedience against God's interdiction, and of their expulsion from it; however, when Adam repented of his sin, God pardoned him, and said to him: "Leave the paradise, but my guide (revelation) will come to you; he who follows it has nothing to fear and never will know sorrow, but the infidels who declare our signs lies will be eternal inmates of hell." Thus it is evidently taught that the curse which rested on the human race by Adam's sin is averted; divine grace manifests itself by revelation, and every prophet from Adam to Mohammed, who designated himself as the last one for the seal of prophecy, is a Saviour for every one who believes in revelation, and acts according to its precepts, era further grace to purify mankind from original sin, and enable them to regain the beatitude of paradise, no mention is made, consequently the idea of being predestined to damnation would not be compatible with divine justice.

The history of the prophets also occupies a very large space in the Koran. Besides the Old Testament, several other prophets are named, who are said to have been sent to the extinct tribes of Arabia. The history of all these so- called divine messengers is embellished with many legends, partly to be found in the Talmud and in the Midrash, but by Mohammed fashioned to suit his purpose, in order to inspire his antagonists with fear and his votaries with consolation. He likes to identify. himself with the Biblical prophets, puts into their mouth such words as he addressed the Meccans, represents also those messengers of God's as disregarded by their contemporaries, and that hence God's wrath is inflamed, and infidels are caused to perish with ignominy, until finally, however, truth tries to prevail, and the persecuted prophet triumphs, surrounded by the few who believed in him previous to the divine punishment. In pursuance of this system, Mohammed, to be consistent, cannot accept the crucifixion of Christ; for no man ought to atone for the sins of others, nor ought a prophet to be forsaken by God. Therefore the Koran teaches it was not Christ who was crucified, but an infidel Jew whom God invested with the form of Christ,  whom the Jews crucified in his stead. "Verily, Christ Jesus, the son of Mary, is the apostle of God, and his word, which he conveyed unto Mary, and a spirit proceeding from him, honorable in this world and in the world to come; and one of those who approach near to the presence of God. Yet Jesus was a mere mortal, and not the son of God; his enemies conspired against his life, but a phantom was substituted for him on the cross, while he was translated to heaven" (Sur. 3:54; 4:156,159). There is also other mention and estimate expressed in the Koran concerning Christ. He is called the living Word and Spirit of God. The miraculous birth of Christ has nothing offensive to Mohammed, for Adam had also been created by the breath of God.

Neither does he hesitate to receive all miracles related in the Gospels, since similar ones had been performed by Abraham and Moses. Even the ascension is to him neither new nor incredible, as the same is reported of Elijah and Enoch. Besides the crucifixion, he abhors in the Christian dogmas the supposition that a prophet with his mother are placed next to the Deity, and declares the Trinitarian view to be an impious fiction of the priests. The Mohammedan doctrine of God's nature and attributes coincides with the Christian, in as much as he is by both taught to be the creator of all things in heaven and earth, who rules and preserves all things, without beginning, omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent, and full of mercy. Yet, according to the Mohammedan belief, he has no offspring: "He begetteth not, nor is he begotten." Nor is Jesus called anything but a prophet and an apostle although Mohammed goes so far as to say that the birth of Christ was due to a miraculous divine operation. But after all it is taught that, as the Koran superseded the Gospel, so Mohammed supersedes Christ, and he is declared to be by far the most illustrious apostle (Sur. 23:40). Of particular importance for Mohammed is the annunciation of a Paraclete, which he applied to himself, either pretending or even actually believing it to be himself. Of equal significance for him, and therefore treated by him with great predilection, is Abraham, first, because of his simple doctrines, to which Mohammed himself adhered in the early period of his prophetic mission; and, secondly, on account of the sacred places and relics in Mecca of which he (Abraham) is called the thunder; and, thirdly and finally, because he was the father of Ishmael, from whom Mohammed and his race claim descent. The Sunnites look in quite a different light upon the prophets. They regard them, as a class, as the simple carriers of revelation, but in all other respects declare them to be common men, liable to human infirmities; while the Shiites pronounce them perfectly pure and sinless, like the angels, instruments of God who only  execute and always have executed his orders, except Iblis, who on account of his disobedience Was rejected, and, as Satan, tries to seduce men. An impor-tant dogma with the Shiites is that of the Imamat, or hereditary succession of descendants of the Prophet by his daughter Fatima, consort of Ali — a doctrine which the Sunnites do not acknowledge. Many of them see in the caliphate merely a political institution, which ought to have the welfare of the nations for its foundation and supreme end.

A prominent dogma in Islam is the belief in angels, whom they thus picture: Created of fire, and endowed with a kind of uncorporeal body, they stand between God and man, adoring or waiting upon the former, or interceding for and guarding the latter. The four chief angels are "The Holy Spirit," or "Angel of Revelations" — Gabriel; the special protector and guardian of the Jews — Michael; the "Angel of Death" — Azrael (Raphael, in the apocryphal gospel of Barnabas), and Isra-fil — Uriel, whose office it will be to sound the trumpet at the resurrection. It will hardly be necessary, after what we have said under MOHAMMED, to point out, in every individual instance, how most of his 6, religious,, notions were taken almost bodily from the Jewish legends; this angelology, however, the Jews had themselves borrowed from the Persians. only altering the names, and, in a few cases, the offices of the chief angelic dignitaries. Besides angels, there are' good and evil genii, the chief of the latter being Iblis (Despair), once called Azazil, who, refusing to pay homage to Adam, was rejected by God. These Jin are of a grosset fabric than angels, and subject to death. They, too, have different names and offices (Peri, Fairies; Div, Giants; Takvins.. Fates, etc.), and are, in almost every respect, like the Shedim in the Talmud and Midrash. A further point of belief is that of certain God- given Scriptures, revealed successively to the different prophets. Four only of the original one hundred and four sacred books, viz. the Pentateuch, the Psalms, the Gospel, and the Koran, are said to have survived; the three former, however, in a mutilated and falsified condition. Besides these, a certain apocryphal gospel, attributed to St. Barnabas, and the writings of Daniel, together with those of a few other prophets, are taken notice of by the Moslems, but not as canonical books. The number of prophets, sent at various times, is stated variously at between two and three hundred thousand, among whom 313 were apostles, and six were specially commissioned to proclaim new laws and dispensations, which abrogated the preceding ones. These were Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, Jesus, and  Mohammed the last the greatest of them all, and the propagator of the final dispensation.

The belief in the resurrection and the final judgment is another important article of faith. The dead are received in their graves by an angel announcing the coming of the two examiners, Monker and Nakir, Who put questions to the corpse respecting his belief in God and Mohammed, and who, in accordance with the answers. either torture or comfort him. This, again, is the Jewish "Chibbut hak-keber," the Beating of the Grave, a hyperbolical description of the sufferings during the intermediate state after death. The soul, awaiting the general resurrection, enters according to its rank, either immediately into paradise (prophets), or partakes, in the shape of a green bird, of the delights of the abode of bliss (martyrs), or — in the Case of common believers is supposed either to stay near the grave, or to be with Adam in the lowest heaven, or to remain either in the well of Zem- Zem, or in the trumpet of the resurrection. According to others, it rests in the shape of a white bird under the throne of God. The souls of the infidels dwell in a certain well in the province of Hadramaut (Heb. Courts of Death), or, being first offered to heaven, then offered to earth, and rejected by either, become subject to unspeakable tortures until the day of resurrection.

Mohammedan theologians are very much divided in regard to the doctrine of the resurrection. Mohammed himself seems to have held that both soul and body will be raised, and the "Bone Luz" of the Jewish Haggadah was by him transformed into the bone A1-Ajb, the rump-bone, which will remain uncorrupted until the last day, and from which the whole body will spring anew, after a forty-days' rain. Among the signs by which the approach of the last day may be known — nearly all taken from the legendary part of the Talmud and Midrash, where the. signs of the coming of the Messiah are enumerated-are the decay of faith among men, the advancing of the meanest persons to highest dignities, wars, seditions, and tumults, and consequent dire distress, so that a man passing another's grave shall say: "Would to God I were in his place!" Certain provinces shall revolt, and the buildings of Medina shall reach to Yahab. Again: the sun will. rise in the west; the Beast will appear; Constantinople will be taken by the descendants of Isaac; the Antichrist will come, and be killed by Jesus at Lud. There will further take place a war with the Jews, Gog and Magog's (Jajug and Ma-juj's) eruption, a great smoke, an eclipse, the Mohammedans will return to idolatry, a great treasure will be found in the Euphrates, the  Kaaba will be destroyed by the Ethiopians, beasts and inanimate things will speak, and, finally, a wind will sweep away the souls of those who have faith, even if equal only to a grain of mustard seed, so that the world shall be left in ignorance.

The time of the resurrection even Mohammed could not learn from Gabriel: iris a mystery. Three blasts will announce it: that of consternation, of such terrible powers that mothers shall neglect the babes on their breasts, and that heaven and earth will melt; that of exanimation, which will annihilate all things and beings, even the angel of death, save paradise and hell, and their inhabitants; and, forty years later, that of resurrection, when all men, Mohammed first, shall have their souls breathed into their restored bodies, and will sleep in their sepulchres until the final doom has been passed upon them. The day of judgment, lasting from one to fifty thousand years, will call up angels, genii, men, and animals. The trial over, the righteous will enter paradise, to the right hand, and the wicked will pass to the left, into hell; both, however, have first to go over the bridge Al-Sirat, laid over the midst of hell, being finer than a hair. and sharper than the edge of a sword, and beset with thorns on either side. The right, eous will proceed on their path with ease and swiftness, but the wicked will fall down headlong to hell below. Paradise is divided from hell by a partition (Orf), in which a certain number of half-saints will find place. The blessed, destined for the abodes of eternal delight (Jannat-Aden; Heb. Gan-Eden) — of which it. is, however, not quite certain whether it is already created — will first drink of the Pond of the Prophet, which is supplied from the rivers of paradise, whiter than milk, trod more odoriferous than musk. Arrived at one of the eight gates, they will be met by beautiful youths and angels; and their degree of righteousness (prophets, religious teachers, martyrs, believers) will procure for them the corresponding degree of happiness. It may, however, not be superfluous to add that, according to the Mohammedan doctrine, it is not a person's good works or merits which gain his admittance, but solely God's mercy; also that the poor will enter paradise five hundred years before the rich; and that the majority of the inhabitants of hell are women.

As to the various felicities which await the pious (and of which there are about a hundred degrees), they are a wild conglomeration of Jewish, Christian, Magian, and other fancies on the subject, to which the Prophet's own exceedingly sensual imagination has added very considerably. Feasting in the most gorgeous and delicious variety, the most costly and brilliant  garments, odors and music of the most ravishing nature, and, above all, the enjoyment of the Hur-Al-Oyun, the black-eyed daughters of paradise, created of pure musk, and free from all the bodily weaknesses of the female sex, are held out as a reward to the commonest inhabitants of paradise, who will always remain in the full vigor of their youth and manhood. For those deserving a higher degree of recompense, rewards will be prepared of a purely spiritual kind — i, e. the "beholding of God's face" (Shechinah) by night and by day. A separate abode of happiness will also be reserved for women; but there is considerable doubt as to the manner of their enjoyment. That they are not of a prominently spiritual nature is clear from the story of the Prophet and the old woman. The latter solicited Mohammed to intercede with God that she might be admitted into paradise, whereupon he replied that old women were not allowed in paradise; which dictum — causing her to weep — he further explained by saying that they would first be made young again.

Regarding the punishment of the wicked, the Moslem has received detailed information from the Prophet. According to him, hell is divided into seven stories or apartments, one below another, designed for the reception of as many distinct classes of the damned. The first, which is called Jehenam, is the receptacle of those who acknowledged one God, that is, the wicked Mohammedans, who, after having been punished according to their demerits, will at length be released; the second, named Ladha, they assign to the Jews; the third, named al-Hotama, to the Christians; the fourth, named al-Sair, to the Sabians; the fifth, named Sakar, to the Magians; the sixth, named al-Jahin, to the idolaters; and the seventh, which is the lowest and worst of all, and is called al-Hawyat, to the hypocrites, or those who outwardly professed some religion, but in their hearts were of none. Over each of these apartments they believe there will be set a guard of angels, nineteen in number, to whom the damned will confess the just judgment of God, and beg them to intercede with him for some alleviation of their pain, or that they may be delivered by being annihilated. Mohammed has, in his Koran and traditions, been very exact in describing the various torments of hell, which, according to him, the wicked will suffer both from intense heat and excessive cold. We shall, however, enter into no detail of them here; but only observe that the degrees of' these pains will also vary in proportion to the crimes of the sufferer, and the apartment he is condemned to; and that he who is punished the most lightly of all will be shod with shoes of fire, the fervor of which will cause his skull to boil like  a caldron. The condition of these unhappy wretches, it is taught, cannot be properly called either life or death; and their misery will be greatly increased by their despair of being ever delivered from that place, since, according to that frequent expression in the Koran, "they must remain therein forever." It must be remarked, however, that the infidels alone will be liable to eternity of damnation; for the Moslems, or those who have embraced the true religion, and have been guilty of heinous sins, will be delivered thence after they shall have expiated their crimes by their sufferings. The time which these believers shall be detained there, according to a tradition handed down from their Prophet, will not be less than nine hundred years, nor more than seven thousand. As to the manner of their deliver-ante, they say that they shall be distinguished by the marks of prostration on those parts of their bodies with which they used to touch the ground in prayer, and over which the fire will therefore have no power; and that, being known by this characteristic, they will be released by the mercy of God. at the intercession of Mohammed and the blessed; whereupon those who shall have been dead will be restored to life, as has been said; and those whose bodies shall have contracted any sootiness or filth from the flames and smoke of hell will be immersed in one of the rivers of paradise, called the River of Life, which will wash them whiter than pearls.

II. Practical Duties. — Our consideration is next required for an examination of. that part of Islam called the "Din," or practical part, which Mohammedan jurists 'and theologians divide into two principal sections:

(a) the religious or ceremonial law (parts of which, however, according to our Western notions, belong to the category of state rights); and

(b) the civil law, including police and special laws.

(a) The ceremonial law, or Ritual of Islam, contains

(1) the various regulations concerning purification, which is to precede, especially, prayer and other religious obligations, or the approach to or touch of sacred things. Here is taught what is to be considered as impure, and requires a purification after touching; what kind of water is to be used for ablution, or how. in want of water, sand is to be applied; what parts of the body are to be washed; what conditions of body require a second ablution; how women, after parturition or during menstruation, have to  conduct themselves. Religious purifications are of two kinds: the Ghusl, or total immersion of the body, required as a religious ceremony on some special occasions; and the Wudu, a partial ablution, to be performed immediately before the prayer. This is of primary importance, and consists of the washing of hands, face, ears, and feet up to the ankles — a proceeding generally accompanied at each stage by corresponding pious sentences, and concluded by the recital of the 97th chapter of the Koran. "The practice of religion being founded on cleanliness, it is not sufficient that the believer himself should be purified, but even the ground or the carpet upon which he prays must be clean; hence the use of a special prayer-carpet" (Segaddeh).

(2) The precepts which have for their object the performance of prayers" the key of paradise." They refer to the time at which the five daily devotions are to be held; to the prayers on Fridays and festival days; at eclipses of the sun and moon, or in seasons of drought; and to the position of the body in prayer. They treat further of the prayer of women, of things which invalidate prayer, of the abbreviation of prayer during travel or in peril of' life, of the direction while praying, and the places where prayers must not be said. In this section the Shafiites adduce the prohibition for men to wear silk clothing, or gold and silver ornaments, as well as the various ceremonies to be observed at funerals: how the corpse is to be washed, dressed, and placed in the grave; how the dead is to be prayed for; how the tomb is to be constructed; how the deceased is to be lamented for, the family of the departed to be comforted, etc.

The prayers (Salah) performed by every Mohammedan five times daily consist partly of extracts from the Revealed Book, the Koran (Fard), partly of pieces ordained by the Prophet, without allegation of a divine order (Sunnah). The first time of prayer commences at the Maghrib, or about sunset; the second at the Eshe, or nightfall; the third at Subh, or daybreak; the fourth at the Duhr, or about noon; the fifth at the Asr, or afternoon. The believers are not to commence their prayers exactly at sunrise, or noon, or sunset, lest they might be confounded with the infidel sun- worshippers. These several times of prayer are announced by the muezzins (q.v.) from the minarets or madnehs of the mosques. Their chant, sung to a very simple but solemn melody, sounds harmoniously and sonorously down the height of tile mosque, through the mid-day din and roar of the cities; but its impression is one of the most strikingly poetical in the stillness of night; so much so that. even many Europeans cannot help congratulating  the Prophet on his preferring the human voice to either the Jewish trumpet- call of the time of the Temple, or the Christian church-bells. The day-call (the Adan) consists chiefly of the confession of faith (God is most great; Mohammed is God's apostle; come to prayer; come to security), repeated several times; the night, calls (Ula, the first; Ebed, the second), destined for per, sons who desire to perform supererogatory acts of devotion, are much longer. The believer often changes his posture during his prayers; and a certain number of such inclinations of head and knees, prostrations, etc., is called a Rekah. It is also necessary that the face of the worshipper should be turned towards the Keblah (q.v.), that direction being marked in the exterior wall of the mosque by a niche (Mehrab). All sumptuous and pompous apparel is laid aside before the believer approaches the sacred place; and the extreme solemnity and decorum, the unaffected humility, the real and all-absorbing devotion which pervade it, have been unanimously held up as an example to other creeds. The Moslems, it may be remarked here, do not pray to Mohammed, but simply implore his intercession, as they do that of the numerous saints, the relatives of the Prophet, and the first propagators of Islam. For the particulars of the service in the mosque, the reader is referred to that heading. It may be remarked in passing that Mohammedanism has no clergy in our sense of the word, the civil and religious law being bound up in one. SEE MOLLAH; SEE MUFTI.

(3) Instructions about the taxes of property to be paid to the state, and the manner of their application. Taxable articles are fruits of the field, domestic animals, silver, gold, and merchandise, lying with the owner a year. The taxes (the varying amounts we pass by) are to be used to aid the poor, for the conversion of infidels, for the redemption 'of slaves and prisoners, for the payment of the debts of the indigent, for the aid of travellers in distress, and in general for purposes pleasing to God; as, for instance, the erection of mosques, schools, hospitals, and the like.

(4) The precepts about fasting, particularly in the month of Ramadan. Here is specified what is commanded and forbidden to the one who fasts, how fasting is interrupted, who is entitled to be dispensed from fasting, and what must be done in expiation for not fasting. In this section are mentioned also the various regulations for an individual who during the Ramadan wishes to retire from the world and pass his time in devotion in the mosque, and thus to lead a kind of monastic life. It was Mohammed's special and express desire that no one should fast who is not quite equal to it, lest it might prove injurious to health. But there are very few Moslems  who do not keep the Ramadan the Mohammedan Lent — even if they neglect their other religious duties; at all events, they all pretend to keep it, most strictly, fasting being considered "one fourth part of the faith." nay," the gate of religion."

(5) The precepts concerning the pilgrimage, an obligation which a Moslem has to meet at least once in his life. He who neglects to perform this duty "might as well die a Jew or a Christian." Various preparations are necessary for pilgrimage. Certain holy places are to be visited, mostly such as were sacred even before Mohammed, and are connected with legends about Abraham and Hagar; certain prayers and ceremonies are to be performed, and sacrifices to be slaughtered, the meat of which is in part to be distributed among the poor. It is forbidden to wear sewed dresses during the journey. Men are not allowed to cover their heads nor women their faces; the nails of the fingers and toes are not to be cut; the hair is not to be combed nor shorn; the use of unguents and perfumes is forbidden; the contracting of marriage is forbidden, as well as the gratification of sexual passion. Finally, it is explained how the pilgrimage is considered interrupted, or as not performed, and how the transgression of any prohibition is to be atoned for.

(6) There are various regulations referring to food. Wine and intoxicating beverages are not allowed; also the drinking of the blood even of clean animals is inter-dieted. Quadrupeds and birds must be killed according to certain fixed rules, God being invoked before the slaughter; but game shot by a hunter may be eaten. The eating of carnivorous animals of prey, quadrupeds as well as birds, is prohibited; and particularly the flesh of swine, dogs, cats, mice, etc. Of fish, such as have no scales, and those resembling serpents, are forbidden. As the same laws are in force also among the Jews, a Moslem may partake of a Jew's meal; with Christians he can dine only if he know that he conforms to the laws of Islam; but with pagans he must not eat at all, even when the food has been prepared in a proper manner, because it has been prepared without the religious ceremonies that make it fit for the believer's table.

(7) Among the "positive" ordinances of Islam may also be reckoned the "Saghir," or minor, and the "Kebir," or great festivals. The first (Al-Fetr, or breaking the fast), following immediately upon tile Ramadan, begins on the 1st day of the month of Shawfal, and lasts three days. The second (Eed A1-Kurban, or sacrifice) begins on the 10th of Dsu'l Heggeh, when the  pilgrims perform their sacrifice, and lasts three or four days. Yet, although intended to be the most important of the two, the people have in most places changed the order, and, by way of compensation for the previous fast, they make the lesser festival which follows the Ramadan the most joyful and the longest of the two. The day set aside for the weekly day of rest is Friday — not, as is generally supposed, because both the Jewish Sabbath and the Christian Sunday were to be avoided, but because, from times long before Mohammed, the people used to hold public assemblies for civil as well as religious purposes on that day. The celebration of the Moslem days of religious solemnity is far less strict than is the custom with the other Shemitic religions. Service being over, the people are allowed to return to their worldly affairs, if they cannot afford to give themselves up entirely to pleasure or devotion for the rest of the sacred period.

(8) One of not the least important duties laid upon the Moslem by the Koran is that of giving alms. These are twofold — legal (Zekah) and voluntary (Sadakah; Heb. Zedekah, piety, righteousness); but the former (Sur. ii, 3), once collected by the sovereign and applied to pious uses, has now been practically abrogated. The Sadakah is, according to the law, to be given once every year, of cattle, money, corn, fruits, and wares sold, at about the rate of two and a half up to twenty per cent. Besides these, it is usual to bestow a measure of provisions upon the poor at the end of the sacred month of Ramadan.

(9) Before we quit this department of Mohammedan law, it may not be inappropriate to mention the procedure against apostates. To prevent the faithful from ever falling' back into idolatry, the laws relating to images and pictures have been made very stringent. Whoever makes an imitation of any living being in stone, wood, or any other material, shall on the day .of judgment be asked to endow his creation with life and soul, and on his protesting his inability to do so, shall undergo the punishment of hell for a certain period.

(b) The civil law of the Mohammedans comprises the following main sections:

(1) Commercial relations, including rules to govern relations of commerce, of various contracts, of pawn and mortgage, of power of attorney, of debt obligations, and other property rights; excepting, however, hereditary and matrimonial claims. We cannot, of course, enter into details here, but we  may remark that the law of trade contains many restrictions very burdensome for modern conditions of society. Thus, for instance, it is not permitted to make a difference whether the price is paid immediately or only in installments. The re-sale of articles not yet in possession of the purchaser is invalid; nor can objects of value which are not the undivided property of single persons be subjects of trade. Further, trade in things whose use is forbidden to the Moslem, e.g. liquors and unclean animals, is prohibited. A bargain concluded on a Friday, at the time of the noon prayer, is void. The buying up of merchandise, especially of victuals, in order to produce a rise of prices, is unlawful. In lending money, it is forbidden to receive interest. In case of insolvency, or refusal to pay a debt, the Creditor can require the arrest of the debtor's person. A pledge is not, as according to European law, a means of security for the payment of debt, but only a proof that such a debt exists. Only when a pledge has been given in a condition of decided insolvency does the creditor acquire the right to secure redemption of the pledge.

(2) The law of inheritance and the testament. We pass over the details of the first, and only observe that the law of primogeniture does not exist in the Mohammedan code, and that, as a rule, brothers or sons, and male heirs generally, enjoy many advantages over females. A testament, in order to be valid, must not contain allusions to any articles prohibited by law, such as swine, blood, wine, and the like. A legacy in favor of strangers, if persons able to succeed legal inheritance exist, must not go beyond the amount of one third; among the relatives themselves the division is at picasure. A testament, Whether written or oral, must be executed before two witnesses of the male sex. A testament in favor of minors, bondmen, and infidels is not valid in law.

(3) The marriage law. A man is allowed to see but the hands and the face of the maiden or widow whom he intends to wed; then follows the courting in person or by proxy; a marriage-contract is concluded, in which the nuptial gift is fixed, i.e. what is allotted to the wife in case the husband dies or has himself divorced; and the ecclesiastic consecrates the marriage. A free man can marry four free women; a female slave he is only allowed to marry if he have not the means to contract marriage with a free person. Polygamy is allowed among Mohammedans, we see, then, surrounded by a number of restrictions. Hear the Koran on this point: "Take in marriage of the women who please you, two, three, or four; but if ye fear that ye cannot act equitably, one, or those whom your right hand has acquired" —  i, e. slaves (Sur. iv, 3). Minor girls can be forced by their father or grandfather to enter into matrimony as long as they are single; if widows, they have their own choice. Marriage of near relatives, among which niece, nurse, and milk-sister are enumerated, is prohibited. A Moslem may, if urged by excessive love, or if unable to obtain a wife of his own creed, marry a Christian woman or a Jewess, but a Mohammedan woman is not. under any circumstances, to marry an unbeliever. In all cases, however, the child born of a Moslem, whatever the mother's faith, is a Moslem; nor does the wife, who is an unbeliever, inherit at her husband's death. See MARRIAGE.

Matrimony is annulled by insanity, apostasy from islam, impotence of the male, or corporeal disability for sexual intercourse of the female. SEE DIVORCE.

The husband is to treat his wives equally; only newly-married women are privileged for a few days. The Shiites sanction also temporary marriage. The free man can give a divorce to his wife twice and retake her, even without her consent, if three menstruations or three months have not elapsed, and then only if in the mean while she had contracted another marriage which has been dissolved by death or divorce, on this point the Mohammedan law differs from the Mosaic law, by which a divorced woman who has contracted another marriage is forever forbidden to the first husband. According to the Mosaic law, the marriage between uncle and niece is permitted, but not between aunt and nephew. Pregnant women are allowed to remarry only after their confinement; if not

pregnant, after four months and ten days. If a man accuses his wife of adultery, he must either bring .witnesses to confirm his statement, or he must himself swear four times in the mosque before a number of men that he speaks the truth, adding, "The curse of God may strike me if I speak false." The woman is then considered an adulteress, the marriage is dissolved, and can never be renewed. But if the woman afterwards swear four times against the accusation, declaring at the same time that God's wrath may strike her if her husband have spoken true, the marriage is annulled, but the woman is not considered an adulteress. Children of divorced wives must be cared for by the mother to the seventh year; later, the child can choose whether it will live with the father or the mother. The woman has a right to ask for divorce if the husband cannot support her.

(4) The penal law and procedure. An intentional murder is punished by death; the relatives of the murdered, however, possessing the right to avenge his blood, may take a ransom instead. (Modern practices in Turkey deviating from these laws are in harmony with those of Christian  countries.) Manslaughter not intentional is expiated by a ransom, estimated according to the intent of the slayer to injure the slain. For the murder of a woman only half price is paid; for that of a Jew or a Christian, a third; for that of a pagan, a fifteenth part. In case of mutilation, revenge or ransom may satisfy. Adultery is punished by death, if the marriage between adulterer and adulteress be forbidden on account of consanguinity; or if the adulterer marry the adulteress without having previously atoned for his crime according to precepts'; or if a non-Moslem is the criminal. Other cases of adultery are punished by one hundred lashes and one year of banishment. He who charges another with adultery without being able to prove his accusation is punished by eighty lashes. Drinking wine is punished by forty lashes. Pederasty amid sodomy are punishable with death, like adultery. He who steals for the first time is to have his right hand cut off; for the second time, his left; for the third time, his right foot; for the fourth time, the left foot. (The Turkish government has substituted the ordinary punishments of imprisonment, hard labor, and the bastinado.) Highway robbers, if they have committed a murder, are to be crucified; if they only threatened to murder, they are to receive corporeal punishment and to be. imprisoned. A Moslem apostatizing from his faith, and persevering in his apostasy, or denying only one of the obligations of Islam, is to be punished with death.

Of the Mohammedan procedure, we mention only the peculiarity as regards witnesses. In civil suits the testimony of two men, or of one man and two women, or of one man in conjunction with the plaintiff, is required. In affairs of tutelage, as testament, divorce, guardianship, and the like, the testimony of two men only is accepted. In affairs which concern only women, as, for instance, birth, female infirmities, nurses, the testimony of four women is necessary. In crimes of sodomy and pederasty and adultery, four male witnesses are required; in other crimes, as theft, partaking of forbidden food and drink, apostasy from the faith, the testimony of two men is sufficient. Non-Moslems, or Moslems known as hardened sinners, are not admitted as witnesses.

(5) War on Infidels. — The Koran abounds in contradictions respecting the right and duty of the faithful to make war on infidels; for Mohammed, while he was the weaker party, showed himself very tolerant, and commanded to convert only by the power of the word; but later, when he became more potent, he issued severer ordinances against those who would not submit to his faith. His successors, therefore, have established  the following doctrines, and declared null and void the passages of' the Koran adverse to them. Every major Moslem fit for military service is in duty bound to participate in holy wars against infidels who will not submit to the dominion of Moslems, and against the faithful who refuse obedience to the legitimate prince, or adhere to dogmas contrary to the faith. In a war against Moslemite rebels or heretics it is not allowed to kill prisoners of war, nor to attack the wounded or pillage property. As for infidel prisoners of war, who do not adopt the Islam before their capture, women and children are made slaves; men can, according to the pleasure of the prince or political exigency, either be killed, ransomed, or exchanged for Moslem prisoners; or even, as circumstances may dictate, be released or be made slaves. Children of infidels will be educated as Moslems, if their father or mother have been converted to Islam, if they have been captured without parents, or if they are found on Islamitic territory.

We omit the direction for the distribution of booty and conquered lands, as we have already alluded to the treatment to be accorded to Jews and Christians. We only remark that, in accordance with the letter of the Koran, as well as the principles of the early imams, war against non-Mohammedans is declared permanent; if it is carried on against pagans, to extinction; against Christians, to subjection; and that, therefore, in earlier times, when the Islamitic powers decided to discontinue hostilities, they simply concluded a truce. In the precepts of this kind, the Moslems come to realize that their sacred scripture contains laws and ordinances not applicable and practicable for all times and circumstances, nor to all countries and people; for the most orthodox ulemas cannot think of urging the sultan to declare war against Russia or Austria, or to forbid Europeans living in Constantinople to ride on horseback or dwell in palaces surpassing in height the houses of the Moslems. Again, in spite of Koran and Sunnah, the idolaters and fire-worshippers were no more exterminated than the Christians were humbled and made to pay capitation tax. Many fire- worshippers in Persia retained not only their lives, but preserved in several places also their pyres. It even occurred that the Mohammedan government corrected ecclesiastics because they wished to transform temples of the Guebers into mosques. The strict execution of the religious precept would have compelled them to massacre all, since their character is very tenacious a proceeding which would prove of great injury to the Islamitic state, and apparently be regarded as too cruel even for execution by bloodthirsty Arabs. The government was not unmerciful against those who remained true to their faith, but it knew no bounds against those converted to the  Islam who, abhorring it in their heart, conspired secretly against the Islam and the State, and tried to undermine the first by old Parsee doctrines and philosophic speculation, and the latter by the revival of Persian nationality.

(6) Slave Laws. According to the fundamental doctrines of Islam, only captives of war made in an infidel country are slaves; in all Moslem countries, however, negroes and Abyssinian slaves also are kept in bondage by ruse or force. If slaves of an infidel become converts to Islam, the master is obliged to sell them to a Moslem for a price customary in the country. The Koran enunciates distinctly their equality with the freemen before God; and a tradition worthy of credit says: "He who manumits a faithful slave is delivered from the torments of hell." Female slaves, by whom their master has begotten children, at his death obtain their liberty, provided one of the children is alive; the children are born free, and even over the mother the master has a restricted control; he is not permitted to sell or marry her to another. There are in the Koran still other precepts favorable to the slaves.

III. Ethics. — The moral law of the Koran may be considered as the most perfect part of this remarkable book. The ethics of the Koran, an element of Islam which (because not to be circumscribed and defined by doctors) has undergone the least change in the course of time, most distinctly reveals the mind of its author. It is, to be sure, as disconnected and unsystematically arranged as other matters, but the most beautiful moral principles and precepts permeate like a thread of gold this whole texture Of religion, enthusiasm, superstition, and delusion. Injustice, falsehood, pride, revenge, calumny, mockery, avarice, prodigality, debauchery, mistrust, and suspicion are inveighed against as ungodly and wicked; while benevolence, liberality, modesty, forbearance, patience and endurance, frugality, sincerity, straightforwardness, decency, love of peace and truth, and, above all, trusting in God, and submitting to his will, are considered as the pillars of true piety, and the principal signs of a true believer. Thus, e.g. the Koran contains passages like the following, which is in a sort of dialogue form: "Speak (thus God addressed Mohammed): Approach ! I will read to thee what God has forbidden thee. Thou shalt not associate with him any other being; thou shalt honor father and mother; thou shalt not kill thy children for fear of poverty, for we feed thee and them; thou shalt not live unchaste, neither privately nor publicly; thou shalt not kill any being which Allah has commanded to hold sacred, unless thou art (legally) empowered to do so;  further, thou shalt not stretch out thy hand after the property of orphans, unless it be for their benefit, till they are of age; thou shalt give good measure and weight; thou shalt not lay on anybody a burden heavier than he can perform.

If thou give judgment, be just even if the person concerned be a relation, and hold fast to the covenant of God." By the prohibition of gambling and drinking wine and other intoxicating beverages, many an excess and vice is of course prevented, and quarrel and enmity avoided. Particularly mockery, haughtiness, and slanderous talk are warned against: "O ye faithful (says the Koran), deride not one another; for it might happen that those on whom ye look contemptuously are better than yourself. Do not insult each other, and do not give each other ignominious bynames! Such words are abominable in the mouth of the faithful. He who does not correct this habit is counted with malefactors. 0 ye faithful! beware of too great suspiciousness, for many a suspicion is sinful. Be not eavesdroppers, and do not speak ill of each other. Would ye fain eat the flesh of your brother, if he be dead ? As ye abhor this, do not soil his honor to his back! O ye people, we have created you of one wife and one man, and divided you in different nations and tribes (think of that!), that yon may know that only the most pious is the most notable before God" In another passage it is said: "Do not strut this earth in self-conceit! Thou canst not perforate the earth, nor attain the height of the mountains (i.e. the lifeless earth extends farther in depth and in height than thou)." In conclusion we read: "Piety does not consist in turning your face towards the east or west; but he is pious who believes in the Deity, in the day of judgment, in the angels, in the scripture and the prophets; who, though fond of property, disposes of the same to relatives, the poor, orphans, travellers, and other indigent persons, or uses it for the delivery of slaves and prisoners; who prays to God and pays his poor-tax (alms); who complies with every bargain entered into, and bears patiently distress, oppression., and all kinds of war- calamities: these are the really pious, these are the God-fearing." Mohammed was, to a certain extent, obliged to proclaim equality and fraternity of all believers as a religions principle; for he himself, as already mentioned, belonged not to the ruling party in Mecca, and his first adherents were for the most part of the lower class, so that the Meccans retorted on him: "If God had pleased to send a prophet, he would have selected him from a more prominent family."

Mohammed was frequently censured for being surrounded by slaves, freedmen, and a promiscuous crowd. It is, therefore, natural that he combated with all his might prejudices of birth and rank of every description. If, on the other hand,  Mohammed is reported to have said: "He who was of the nobility in paganism remains so in Islam, if he bow before true wisdom ;" this sentence is probably to be placed in that time when he was inclined to all sorts of concessions, in order to make proselytes also among the higher classes. At any rate, he revoked it when the Meccan nobility persisted in their opposition against his doctrine; as he retracted, for a similar reason, his opinion which represented the idols as mediators between God and man, and in a measure representatives of spirits or angels, and branded it even as a sentiment of Satan. But however decidedly Mohammed pronounced in favor of equality of all men, i.e. all the faithful, he failed in the attempt to abolish slavery altogether, though he mitigated its lot in many respects. Nor was he more successful in emancipating woman, albeit he protected her against the arbitrariness of man, and granted her many rights which she had not enjoyed in Arabia before his time. While he prescribed to the faithful to take not more than four women, and allowed intercourse with female slaves only to the unmarried, he proclaimed revelations by which God relieved him of restrictions binding upon others. He had the right to request every faith-rid to divorce his wife, if he desired marrying her himself. He claimed to contract for himself and others any matrimonial connection, without the consent of the girl or her protector. He was permitted to marry as many women as he pleased, and he indeed increased their number to thirteen, and felt not bound to treat them alike.

The excessive jealousy of the legislator had the most grievous consequences for the women. It extended so far that his women not only remained excluded from all intercourse with other men during his life, but were also prohibited remarrying after his death, Later, all other faithful women were also ordered to wear a close veil, leaving only the eyes free, when going out, and even in the house not to show themselves unveiled except to their nearest relatives. Thus women who, with pagan Arabs, were the spice of public and social life, were by Mohammed's jealousy confined entirely to the home and the family circle. The fair sex, with the Bedouins as well as with the mediaeval knights of the Occident objects of veneration and worship, was changed by the Islam into a subject of pity and mistrust. The place of their abode was, it is true, called Harem i.e. sanctuary but it was understood to be a sanctuary requiring veil and curtain, and finally lock and bolt and eunuchs to protect it against violation.

This system of close confinement had, of course, the saddest consequences for the male sex. The husband found only sensual, but no cordial and mental enjoyment in his harem, and fell more and more into rudeness and  unnatural vices. Mohammed, by his own life and by his ordinances concerning women, has impressed the character of transitoriness and human weakness on himself and his revelations, Here is manifest in the "reformer" himself the want of a strictly moral sentiment, and in his precepts sanctioning polygamy and seclusion of woman he has left a legacy which prevents the professors of his faith making any considerable progress in civilization, and raising themselves by a sound family life to a prosperous life of state. The Jews, on the other hand, to whom the Mosaic law allows a plurality of wives, have found a rabbi from whom they have accepted monogamy as a law, even in countries where polygamy is not forbidden. The Moslem may soon also, like the Jew of our times, learn to make a distinction between eternal truths and laws and ordinances enacted for transient external circumstances. The Moslem in general is not so firmly attached to his faith as the Jew. We observe this in those Arabs and Turks who have lived a few years in Christian countries, and have participated in European civilization. Should the political independence of the Moslems, which owes its existence only to the mutual jealousies of the European powers, cease, their religion, as it is founded on illusion, spread by the sword, and leaning on secular force, will not long survive it. The professors of Islam will then suffer great change. There will be some who will relapse into former indifferentism to religion, while others will adopt the faith of their conquerors, and probably the larger number. For a revival of the caliphate, i.e. a Mohammedan empire ruled by a head of a supremacy at once spiritual and secular, the necessary elements are lacking unity of faith and nationality. Shiites and Sunnites are still as hostile towards each other as they were a thousand years ago; and to the old incompatibility of the Arabian and Persian element a third one is added, semi-Mongolian the Osmanic — considerably increasing the rupture. A new universal blaze of fanaticism, even if it could prevail against rifled cannon and iron-plated frigates, is no more to be apprehended.

IV. Mohammedanism and Christianity. — The friends and advocates of Mohammedanism have repeatedly, especially in our day of comparative religious research, urged upon the Christian world a consideration of the claims Islam has in the advance of humanitarian principles and the propagation of civilizing influences. Islamism, it is declared, started as the outspoken foe of all creature-worship; with emphasis proclaimed the superiority and sublimity of God; and, like the Jew and the Christian, the Moslem based his faith upon the revealed book known as the Bible. It is  further urged in defence of the Arabian religion that its successes and rapid spread over a vast portion of the then known world would stamp the religion of Moslem with the approval of the Most High. As a matter of history, we have to record that scarcely a century had elapsed after Mohammed's death when 'Islam reigned supreme over Arabia, Syria, Persia, Egypt, the whole of the northern coast of Africa, even as far as Spain; and, notwithstanding the subsequent strifes and divisions in the interior of this gigantic realm, it grew, and grew outwardly, until the Crescent was made to gleam from the spires of St. Sophia at Constantinople, and the cry "Allah il Allah" resounded before the gates of Vienna, and that but for the successful opposition of Charles Martel, the Moslems might not only have caused the downfall of the Romish hierarchy, but even extirpated Christianity itself. SEE SARACENS.

If, however, we inquire into the causes of these successes of the Crescent, we find that Mohammed's law was artfully and marvellously adapted to the corrupt nature of man; and, in a most particular manner, to the manners and opinions of the Eastern nations, and the vices to which they were naturally addicted: for the articles of the faith which it proposed were few in number, and extremely simple; and the duties it required were neither many nor difficult, nor such as were incompatible with the empire of appetites and passions. It is to be observed, further, that the gross ignorance under which the Arabians, Syrians, Persians, and the greatest part of the Eastern rations labored at this time rendered many an easy prey to the artifice and eloquence of this bold adventurer. To these causes of the progress of Mohammedanism we may add that these victories of the Crescent were secured, not by the spread of the Koran, but by armies in hostile array, invading peaceful countries for spoil and devastation. It is an error even to place the first conquests and the rapid spread of Islam to the credit of Arabian religious fanaticism. We must reflect that military glory and booty to the Bedouins, who formed ,he flower of the first Arabian armies, were not less enticing than the pleasure-gardens with everblooming virgins, SEE HOURIS, vouchsafed to the faithful. Nor must it be forgotten that the state of the countries and nations conquered by the Arabs was decayed and rotten, falling to pieces at the first touch. In Persia and Syria, as well as in Egypt, in Barbary, in Sicily and in Spain, the Arabs were victorious because the population was dissatisfied with their governments, and often in secret understanding with the enemy. Persia was weakened by long wars with Byzantium, and divided by the nobility ruling the court; while, besides, many of its inhabitants of Arabian origin, especially in the Western  provinces, sympathized with the kindred troops. A similar condition of things prevailed in Syria, where also the Shemitic population predominated, looking upon the Byzantines as their oppressors.

In Egypt, to the antipathy between Copts and Greeks was added an ecclesiastical pressure against the Monophvsites by the Byzantine court, which held to the doctrine of the double nature of Christ; or the subjugation of Sicily the Saracens were mostly indebted to the traitor Euphemius, and count Julian made way for the Arabs in the conquest of Spain, the more rapidly accomplished since a part of the maltreated people were indifferent spectators of the struggle, while another part even aided the enemy. Thus it is explained how the Islam, within a short century, victoriously raised its standard from the Guadalquivir to the Indus. But thus rapidly it also went to decline, when the caliphs became effeminate, and were controlled by foreign mercenaries; when rude force obstructed every scientific elevation; and internal feuds, in consequence of no appointed succession by Mohammed, consumed its best energies. If undisputed legitimate foundation was formerly wanting to strengthen monarchy, because the adherents of Ali believed only his descendants worthy of succession, this difficulty is still greater under the Osmanlis, who are not looked upon as legitimate dynasts even by the Sunnites, and hence it has happened twice in our day that Christian bayonets have had to defend the sultan against an Arabian army commanded by an ambitious Turk (Ali and Ibrahim Pasha). How long European diplomacy will succeed in nursing the sick empire cannot be predicted; but it is certain that if no other reforms than those hitherto introduced, and these mostly on paper, impart a fresh, vigorous spirit to the Mohammedan states and the Islam faith, both Will verge on ruin.

The Christian must, moreover, refuse all credit to Islam as a civilizing influence, because it has failed to prove itself such after a trial of centuries. In the East, as we have already conceded, it has done some good. But let it not be forgotten that it scarcely accomplished as much as Judaism could have secured. Had Mohammedanism been confined to the limits of Arabia, it would have accomplished a mission, an appointment — possibly even divine — for it would have fitted that country for Christianity as such, as the Mosaic institutions fit for the higher laws of Christianity. And, as has been well said, “were it not for the all-important fact that Christianity had been preached in the interval, the mission of Mohammed would appear exactly analogous to that of Moses. If the religion of Mohammed was  imperfect, so was that of Moses; if the civil precepts of Mohammed were adapted only to a single nation, so were those of Moses also. Indeed, in some respects, Mohammedanism is a clear advance upon Judaism. It more distinctly represents God as the God of the whole world, and not of one nation only; it preaches with more clearness the doctrines of God's general providence, of a resurrection, and of a final judgment... In short, had Mohammedanism only preceded Christianity, it might have been accepted as another step towards it; the mosque might have been an appropriate and friendly halting-place between the synagogue and the church. As it is. Mohammedanism, coming after Christianity, has proved its deadliest enemy. Its claim to be to Christianity what Christianity was to Judaism is belied by the fact that this supposed reformed and developed Christianity is in fact a retrogression, denying nearly all those points in which Christianity is a reformed and developed Judaism... Mohammed saw that many Christians of his time were practical idolaters, and be too hastily confounded the worship of Christ with the worship of his mother and his servants. Christianity was distracted and confounded by unintelligible disputes as to the divine nature and attributes of Christ; Mohammed hastily cast them all aside as alike violations of the divine unity. Too many Christians had made themselves many mediators; Mohammed too hastily rejected the one true Mediator, and represented Jesus as a mere preacher like himself (Freeman, Saracens, page 60 sq.).

The effects of the Mohammedan conquests on the religion of the conquered have been very various. In Christian countries where the Moslem power has not been lasting, as in Spain, Sicily, and those parts of Eastern Europe conquered by the Turks, no trace of them is left except buildings, and some popular customs and superstitions. But where their dominion has endured, as in Western Asia and Northern Africa, Christianity, once supreme, has now almost perished. This has been caused partially by individual conversions — for no Christian population, except perhaps that of Crete, has ever in a body apostatized — but mainly by the substitution of a Moslem for a Christian population. Baptism and the teaching of Christianity were forbidden; Christian women were forced into the harems of Mohammedans; Christian children were forcibly brought up as Moslems; indignities, burdensome taxes, and personal duties were imposed on Christians; from time to time violent persecutions took place. Moreover, in many countries heresy largely prevailed, which is unable to furnish any firm ground of faith. Heretics frequently invited or combined  with Mohammedans for the sake of overthrowing their orthodox rivals (comp. on Egypt, Lane, 2:276; Gibbon, 6:332, 428; Syria and North Africa, Finlay, Byzantine Empire, 1:159; Asia Minor, ib. 1:198).

One remarkable effect of the Mohammedan spirit of conquest must be noticed. Since it attacked Christianity as a religion, at first defence, and subsequently reprisals, on the part of the Church became a religious duty. The unwarlike spirit of the early Church entirely passed away, and in its stead appeared that military Christianity which is so conspicuous in the history of the Crusades (see Milman, Latin Christianity, 2:220-222; Lecky, Hist. of European Morals, 2:262-268). In heathen countries the inhabitants usually embraced, after a longer or shorter time, the Moslem faith. Persia, since its first conquest, has undergone many vicissitudes between heathenism (under the Mongols), Sunnism and Shiism, the last of which is now the national faith, and has become in many points assimilated to the ancient Magianism. In India, during the Moslem dominion, Islam was confined to the ruling classes at the various courts, and found little acceptance with the natives. The emperor Akbar discarded Mohammedan peculiarities, and was a simple deist. In many points Islam has approximated to Brahminism. Persecution has done its work here also, even in modern times, especially by Tippu Saib of Mysore (Dollinger, page l5,16). The sword and persecution have ever been the means of propagating Islam; no missionary organization has at any time existed, and individual efforts for voluntary conversion have been rare and accidental. Yet instances are frequent — the Turks (11th century), the Mongols (13th century) — of whole heathen nations, brought in contact with Mohammedans, having voluntarily accepted Islam. Astonishing progress was thus made in Central Africa; while in China and the Asiatic islands also it made many converts (Dollinger, Mohammed's Religion, etc., pages 16- 20; Mohler, Ueber das Verhaltniss,. etc., 1:386).

The causes of the success and rapid extension of Islam may be thus summarized:

(1) The great power over nomadic and Eastern races — as were the Saracens and Turks — of Mohammed's personal character and religion. Even in his faults he nearly corresponds with their ideal; and his religion suits their habits and ways of thought.

(2) Extension by the sword, as a religious principle, together with the intense and burning religious zeal of the Mohammedans, fanned by hopes of immediate bliss — sensual or spiritual, to suit different temperaments — to those who died fighting for the faith.

(3) Want of religious depth and earnestness among the Christians to whom Islam was opposed. In early times this was in great measure the result of widespread heresy, which weakened faith, caused indifference through weariness of controversy, and created numerous divisions and discords; in later times, of discords between the Roman and Eastern churches and Protestants. Christendom was divided; Mohammedanism was, at the time of its successes, absolute unity, spiritual and temporal.

(4) The outward character presented by Mohammedanism. The permission in this life, and promise in the next, of sensuality influenced low and coarse minds; asceticism in the long and strict fast, regular prayers and ablutions, almsgiving, abstinence from intoxicating liquors, and other burdensome precepts, and a generally austere and scrupulous spirit, suited higher characters (see Hallam. Middle Ages [ed. 1872], 2:117).

(5) The inward truth in the religion, namely, the intense acknowledgment of God's sole supremacy, hatred of idolatry, and of everything that trenched upon his prerogatives.

(6) The military skill and wise policy of both Saracens and Turks in dealing with Christians, and the consequent strength of their government as opposed to the weakness and discords among Christian powers.

The cause of Mohammedan decline is mainly that Islam is especially designed for nomad and half-nomad races; hence when they settle they lose the strength which arises from their nomadic life, and their religion loses its purity and power. They degenerate, become luxurious and inactive; internal dissensions and divisions arise; the same doctrine (e.g. fatalism) that strengthened them in their success weakens them in their depression. Moreover, the opposition to progress innate in Islam tends to keep Mohammedan nations stationary, while Christian powers advance in strength and wealth. Says Mr. Palgrave, who has given the latest and best account of Mohammedanism in Central and Southern Arabia: Islam is in its essence stationary and was framed thus to remain. Sterile like its God, lifeless like its First Principle and Supreme Original, in all that constitutes true life — for life is love, participation, and progress, and of these the  Koranic Deity has none — it justly repudiates all change, all advance, all development. To borrow the forcible words of lord Houghton, the ‘written book' is the ‘dead man's hand,' stiff and motionless, and whatever savors of vitality is by that alone convicted of heresy and defection. But Christianity, with its living and loving God, begetter and begotten, spirit and movement; nay, more — a Creator made creature, the Maker and made existing in one; a Divinity communicating itself by uninterrupted graduation and degree from the intimate union far off to the faintest irradiation, through all it has made for love and governs in love; One who calls his creatures, not slaves, not servants, but friends nay, sons-nay, gods; to sum up, a religion in whose real secret ‘God in man is one with man in God' must also be necessarily a religion of vitality, of progress, of advancement. The contrast between it and Islam is that of movement with fixedness, of participation with sterility, of development with barrenness, of life with petrifaction. The first vital principle and the animating spirit of its birth must, indeed, abide ever the same; but the outer form must change with the changing days, and new offshoots of fresh sap and greenness be continually thrown out as witnesses to the vitality within; else were the vine withered and the branches dead. I have no intention here — it would be extremely out of place — of entering on the maze of controversy, or discussing whether any dogmatic attempt to reproduce the religious phase of a former age is likely to succeed. I only say that life supposes movement and growth, and both imply change; that to censure a living thing for growing and changing is absurd; and that to attempt to hinder it from so doing, by pinning it down on a written label, or nailing it to a Procrustean framework is tantamount to killing it altogether. Now Christianity is living, must grow, must advance, must change, and was meant to do so; onwards and forwards is a condition of its very. existence; and I cannot but think that those who do not recognise this show themselves so far ignorant of its true nature and essence. On the other hand, Islam is lifeless; and, because lifeless, cannot grow, cannot advance, cannot change, and was never intended so to do.”

The effects of Mohammedanism, as shown in life and character, must be briefly noticed. The minuteness of the ritual and social rules, together with the hardness and coldness of the morality taught, produces a great amount of formalism. The name of God and pious ejaculations are constantly on the lips, even in the midst of the most indecent conversation. Mohammedans often say the “ Bismillah” before committing a crime  (Sprenger, 2:206). Hence the most scrupulous observance of outward duties is not unfrequently united with ‘the grossest habitual immorality and crime (Dollinger, pages 26-29); religion and morality seem completely sundered. Another great evil results from the minuteness of the laws concerning marriage and divorce. Many volumes have been written to explain them, entering into the closest and most disgusting details, forming “ a mass of corruption, poisoning the mind and morals of every Mohammedan student” (Muir, 3:302), and utterly defiling the very language. Hence arises the prevalence not only of the most indecent language and conduct, but also of extreme profligacy among both sexes. Unnatural vice is fearfully common. The pictures of the joys of paradise contribute in some degree to this profligacy; these come to be the object of their thoughts, and are anticipated, as far as possible, on earth. The doctrine of predestination, or, rather, fatalism, produces extreme apathy and want of energy in action; while the notion that all Mohammedans are God's chosen in a special sense, though causing a deep brotherly feeling among themselves, which is fostered by the precepts and almsgiving, leads them to a bitter contempt and hatred of all other religions.

It remains to sum up the good and evil sides of Mohammedanism. On the one hand, it is a rigid foe to idolatry, as it teaches the unity, perfection, providence, and government of God, and hence submission and resignation to his will, together with the great doctrine of a judgment and eternal retribution. It inculcates, moreover, brotherly love and union with fellow- believers, and many social virtues; with almsgiving, temperance, and a certain standard of morality. On the other hand, it perpetuates the great evils of the East-polygamy, slavery, and absolute despotism; it opposes all political and social progress; while the semi-civilized, arbitrary character of its law and justice renders property insecure. Its doctrine of propagation by the sword leads to constant wars and rebellions, with an utter contempt for human life. It is in fact a semi-barbarous religion. On its religious side it fails to satisfy the natural longing for some mediator between God and man, while yet it bows before God as an irresistible power; its morality, in itself defective, is dry, cold, hard, lifeless, without any amiable traits; and, finally, as substituting Mohammed for Christ, it is essentially anti-Christian. While it may be an advance on heathenism, it is an advance which almost excludes the further advance of Christianity, missionary efforts being well- nigh without result.  Christian and Mohammedan Polemics. The contest of Christianity with Islam, so far as it has been a struggle of argument and not of the sword, SEE SARACENS, offers few remarkable points. In the first sweep of Mohammedan conquest, when the Christians succumbed not only in the East but even in the West, there was no field for a question of truth. But among nations which were removed from the peril, and yet sufficiently in contact to entertain the question of the claims of the Mohammedan religion, a consideration of its nature, regarded as a system of doctrine, naturally enough arose. Accordingly in Constantinople, and in Spain and the other parts of Western Europe which came into connection with the Moors, works of this character appeared. The history may be conveniently arranged in three periods, each of which is marked by works of defence, some called forth by danger, a real demand, but subsiding into or connected with inquiries prompted only by literary tastes. The first is from the 12th to the middle of the 16th century; the second during the 17th and 18th; the third during the present century.

1. A notice of the Mohammedan religion exists in a work of John of Damascus (q.v.), who flourished in the 8th century; and Euthymius Zigabenus (q.v.), a Byzantine writer of the 12th: but the first important treatise written directly against it was prepared in 1210 — Richardi Confutatio, edited in 1543 by Bibliander from a Greek copy. The refutation of Averroes by Aquinas, about 1250, can hardly be quoted as an instance of a work against the Mohammedan religion, being rather against its philosophy. The ablest Christian polemic who waged war against Islam in the 13th century was, however, the well-known Raymond Lully (q.v.), whose zeal could not. fail to, stir up many laborers for the mission-field, especially that branch of it aiming at the conversion of Mohammedans. Thus we read of a monk who penetrated the great mosque at Cairo in 1345 to require the sultan himself to become a follower of Christ crucified; and so powerful was his appeal that a renegade who had lapsed into Islam returned into the bosom of the Church. Then we find Ethier, the father confessor of the infants of Aragonia, preaching. Christ to the Moslems in 1370; and his example followed in 1439 by the papal legate Albert of Larzana and two assistants, etc.

But if we return to works aimed to defend Christianity against Mohammedanism, we meet with a treatise by John Cantacuzene, written a little after 1350, which is to be explained probably by the circumstance that the danger from Mohammedan powers in the East directed the attention of  a literary man to the religion and institutions which they professed. Thus far the works were called forth by a real demand. A series of treatises, however, commences about the time of the expulsion of the Moors from Spain, the cause of the existence of which is not so easy. of explanation. Such are those in Spain by Alphonso de Spina, 1487, and by Turrecremata (see Eichhorn, Gesch der Lit. volume 6); by Nicholas de Cuza, published in 1543; in Italy about 1500 by Ludovicus Vives, and Volterranus; one by Philip Melancthon in reference to the reading of the Koran; and a collection of treatises, including those of Richardus, Cantacuzene, Vives, and Melancthon, published by Bibliander in 1543. Probably the first two of this list may have been a relic of the crusade of Christianity against the Moorish religion; the next two possibly were called forth by the interest excited in reference to Mohammedans by reason of their conquests, or, less probably, by the influence of their philosophy at Padua. The last two are hardly to be explained, except by supposing them to be an offshoot of the Renaissance, and called forth by the largeness of literary taste and inquiry excited by that event.

2. When we pass into the 17th century we find a series of treatises on the same subject, which must be explained by the cause just named-the newly acquired interest in Arabic and other Eastern tongues. We meet, however, with others, called forth by the missionary exertions which had brought the Christians into contact with Mohammedans in the East.

The treatise by Bleda (Defensio Fidei Christianae, 1610) stands alone, unconnected with any cause. It was partly a defence of the conduct of Christians towards the Mohammedans. A real interest, however, belongs to the work of Guadagnoli, in 1631. A Catholic missionary, Hieronymo Xavier, had composed in 1596 a treatise in Persian against Mohammedanism, in which the general principle of theism was laid down as opposed to the Mohammedan doctrine of absorption; next, the peculiar doctrines of Christianity was stated; and, lastly, a contrast was drawn between the two religions. (See Lee's Tracts on Christianity and Mohammedanism, Pref. page 5 sq.) This work was answered in 1621 by a Persian nobleman named Ahmed ibn-Zain Elebidin. The line adopted by him was —

(1) to show that the coming of Mohammed was predicted in the O.T. (Hab 3:3);

(2) to argue that Mohammed's teaching was not more opposed to Christ's than his was to that of Moses, and that therefore both ought to be admitted, or both rejected;

(3) to point out critically the discrepancies in the Gospels;

(4) to attack the doctrines of the Trinity and Christ's deity (Lee, Pref page 41 sq.).

It was written in golden characters, and sent to pope Urban VIII, with a challenge to refute its contents. A person competent to deal with it was carefully selected, and the work was ably answered (1631) by a treatise in Latin by Philippo Guadagnoli, dedicated to pope Urban VIII. It is divided into four parts:

(1) respecting the objections about the Trinity;

(2) the Incarnation;

(3) the authority of Scripture;

(4) the claims of the Koran and of Mohammed (Lee, Pref. p. 108 sq.; who also gives references [page 113] to a few other writers, chiefly in the 17th century).

The further works of defence produced in this century arose, as it were, accidentally. The lengthy summary of the Mohammedan controversy in Hoornbeek's Summa Controversiarum (1653, page 75 sq.) was either introduced merely to give completeness to the work as a treatise on polemics, or was called forth by considerations connected with missions, as is made probable by his work De Conversione Gentilium et Indorum. Le Moyne's publication on the subject in the Varia Sacra (1685, volume 1) arose from the accidental discovery of an old treatise, Bartholomcei Edess. Confutatio Hagareni. A third work of this kind, Maraccio's Criticism on the Koran (1698), arose from the circumstance that the pope would not allow the publication of an edition of the Koran without an accompanying refutation of each part of it. This effort remains to our day the chef d'aeuvre in Christian polemics against the Koran. The work of Hottinger (Hist. Orient. book 1), Pfeiffer's Theol. Judaica et Mahom., and Kortholt's De Relig. Mahom. (1663), form the transition into an independent literary investigation; which is seen in the literary inquiries concerning the life of Mohammed, as well as his doctrine, in Pocock,  Prideaux (1697), Reland (1707), Boulainvilliers (1730), and the translation of the Koran by Sale (1734). A slightly controversial tone pervades some of them. The materials collected by them were occasionally used by deist and infidel writers (e.g. by Chubb) for instituting an unfavorable comparison between Christ and Mohammed. The great literary historians of that period give lists of the previous writers connected with the investigation. (See J.A. Fabricius. Bibliotheca Graeca, ed. 1715, 7:136; Walch, Biblioth. Theol. Sel. volume 1, chapter 5, § 9.) A summary of the arguments used in the controversy is given in J. Fabricius, Delectus Argumentorum, page 41 sq.; and Stapfer's Inst. Theol. Polem. 3:289 sq.

3. In the present century the literature in reference to Mohammedanism is, as in the former instances, twofold in kind. Part of it has been called forth by missionary contests in the East; part by literary or historic tastes, and the modern love of carrying the comparative method of study into every part of history. The first class is illustrated by the discussions at Shiraz, in 1811, between the saintly Henry Martyr. (q.v.) and some Persian mollahs. The controversy was opened by a tract, sophistical but acute, written by Mirza Ibrahim (Lee, pages 1-39), the object of which was to show the superiority of the standing miracle seen, in the excellence of the Koran over the ancient miracles of Christianity. Martyn replied to this in a series of tracts (Lee, pages 80 sq.), and was again met by Mohammed Ruza of Hamadan in a much more elaborate work, in which, among other arguments, the writer attempts to show predictions of Mohammed in the Old Testament and in the New, applying to him the promise of the Paraclete (Lee, pages 161-450). These tracts were translated in 1824, with an elaborate preface containing an account of the preceding controversy of Guadagnoli, by Professor S. Lee, of Cambridge (Controversial Tracts on Christianity and Mohammedanism, which is the work so frequently cited above). To complete the history, it is necessary to add that a discussion was held a few years ago between an accomplished Mohammedan and Mr. French, a learned missionary at Agra. Since then a very able defence of Christianity and an attack on Mohammedanism was published by Dr. Pfander, “a highly respected missionary of the English Church Missionary Society” (1864), which, though forbidden, found its way to Constantinople and to Mohammedan families, and was replied to by several Moslems.

 In 1865 a Moslem doctor of India, Syud Ahmed Khan, and P. Scudder Amin, actually brought out a bilingual commentary on the Holy Bible in English and Urdu, placing the Bible and Koran upon the same footing, and equally  binding on the Moslems. The Reverend J.T. Gracey, in a review of this work, sent from Bareilly, India, September 26, 1866, and published in the Methodist, says: “A resume of the relative bearings of this book might be interesting; but, as nothing is more baffling than the study of contemporaneous history, I dislike to venture my speculations about what is indicated in such a publication, or the probable influence it will exert.

1. Its bearings on the Mohammedan controversy with Christianity are important. The Mohammedan mind is thoroughly impregnated with the belief that the Jewish and Christian Scriptures have been corrupted, and hence are unworthy of credit. Accordingly, when we have urged that, since Mohammed based his claims on the Jewish and Christian Scriptures, Mohammedans were under obligation to regard these, and reconcile with them the Koran, they have always assented to the proposition abstractly, but have charged that interpolations of the Jewish and Christian Scriptures were the cause of the discrepancies in doctrine which appear. Mohammedanism has, however, it is claimed, always had a philosophical school, which ignored, many popular beliefs. Syud Ahmed is of this class, and, after examining the Colenso controversy, asserts essential integrity for the record. His book is among the first attempts to popularize this belief, however esoterically it may have been held, by a school; and as the book has had considerable circulation among the most influential persons in the various communities, it can scarcely fail in time to materially modify the. popular notion of the lack of authenticity of the Scriptures.

2. In comparison with the Hindu, the Mohammedan mind of India has been roused but little from its wonted apathy by its contact with -Western civilization. A heavy prize offered in Calcutta recently for the best essay on a subject familiar to the Mohammedan mind called forth less than half a dozen monographs, none of which merited the prize. A like offer to Hindus would have met a very different fate. But this book is, I hope, a harbinger of a better state of affairs, and may do much to induce it, notwithstanding the fact, which the author assures me in personal correspondence, that the limited sale of this second volume does not justify his completing the series, though he has the matter prepared. It is to be hoped that in this he may prove to be in error.

3. This volume clearly supports the opinion expressed in advance by me, that those who talked of this commentary as being about to furnish a refutation of Colenso were simply guilty of idle gossip. It contains on the Noachian deluge a respectable compilation, from archdeacon Pratt mainly, of certain arguments in favor of a partial deluge; but there is not an original respectable argument in it, so far as I know,  bearing on the controversy with Colenso and the Reviewers. Nor is anyone who knew the Mohammedan mind disappointed in this, simply because none such expected it to be otherwise than it is. It contains, true to the Mohammedan mind, an amount of mere puerilities, amid a mass of matter that shows a keen appreciation of nice points in a controversy. It adds nothing to European, though it does add much to Asiatic Biblical criticism.”

The literary aspect of the subject — not, however, wholly free from controversy — was opened by White in the Bampton Lectures: for 1784, and abundant sources have lately been furnished. Among them are a new translation of the Koran by the Reverend J.M. Rodwell, where the Suras are arranged chronologically. The following ought also to be added: Dr. Macbride's Mohammedan Religion Explained (1857); Arnold. Koran and Bible (1st edit. 1859; 2d edit. 1866); Tholuck, Vermischte Schriften, 1:1- 27; Die Wunder Mohammed's und der Charakter des Religionstifters; Dr. Stanley's Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church (lecture 8, and the references there given); Maurice, Religions of the World; Renan, Etudes d'Histoire Religieuse, ess. 4. The modern study has been directed more especially to attain a greater knowledge of Mohammed's life, character, and writings, the antecedent religious condition of Arabia, and the characteristics of Mohammedanism when put into comparison with other creeds, and when viewed psychologically in relation to the human mind. The materials also for a study of the Mohammedan form of philosophy, both in itself and in its relation to the religion, have been furnished by Aug. Schmoelders, Essai sur les coles Philosophiques chez les Arabes (1842). See also Ritter's Christliche Philosophie, 3:665 sq.; 4:1-181.

V. Statistics. — It remains for us to consider the number of Islam's adherents in our day, and the countries that contain them. There are believed to be over 185,000,000 of Mohammedans in the world, and there are a number of countries, outside of Turkey and Egypt, in which Mohammedanism is the predominant religion, or at least a great power. Europe contains only 6,500,000 of the Crescent's adherents, but Asia is the home of nearly 80,000,000 Mohammedans, and Africa is asserted to have even many more. Islamism is still the predominant religion of the entire north of Africa, and its rule extends far down eastward, and into the centre of the continent; and it is believed that fully one half, or about 100,000,000 souls, may be set down as Mohammedans. It. is a remarkable  circumstance, however, that by far the most powerful Mohammedan ruler of the globe — the sultan of Turkey — resides in Europe, where the Islam has only a population of about 4,500,000 in the Turkish and 2,000,000 in the Russian dominions. Even the sultan himself has in the European division of his empire more Christian subjects than Mohammedan. In Asia, Mohammedanism strongly predominates in Asiatic Turkey, which has a Mohammedan population of at least 13,000,000. Persia, with its 5,000,000, is an almost exclusively Mohammedan country. The same is the case with Afghanistan, Beloochistan, and the khanates of Independent Tartary. In China the Mohammedans constitute a compact body, both in the north-west and in the south-western provinces. In both places they have endeavored to establish their independence. In the north-west they have so far succeeded that the new Mohammedan empire of Yakoob Kushbegi has for several years successfully maintained its independence, and is still extending its boundaries. On the other hand, the Mohammedan rebels in the south-west, the so-called Panthay, have during the present year succumbed to the victorious Chinese armies.

The death of their sultan and the destruction of their capital, Talifu, and their other principal places, seem for the present to have put an end, not only to their rule in those regions, but even to their political influence. In the vast British empire of India the Mohammedan population is estimated at about 40,000,000, and predominates in a number of the native states which are British dependencies. The Mohammedans also constitute a majority of the population of the large and important island of Java, where they are rapidly increasing; and on the island of Sumatra they control, among others, the kingdom of Achin, which has recently attracted attention by its, conflict with the Netherlands. Russia has in its Asiatic possessions a Mohammedan population of about 4,500,000. In Africa, Mohammedanism has, since the beginning of the present century, made great progress in the negro states, and has in particular become the controlling power of Central Africa, and advanced westward as far as Liberia. Morocco, Algeria, Tunis,. Tripoli, Egypt, Zanzibar, are all Mohammedan states; in the south and south-west they do not anywhere predominate, although they are found everywhere in increasing numbers. But although Mohammedanism, since the beginning of the present century, has been making these advances in Central Africa, the number of real and thorough believers is infinitely small; and since it has left off conquering, it has lost also that energy and elasticity which promises great things. Its future fate will depend chiefly, we should say, on  the progress of European conquest in the East, and the amount of Western civilization which this will, for good or evil, import into those parts.

Mohammedanism may be said, even in its most successful field — Africa — to be everywhere in a condition of steadily, progressing decay. The most intelligent travellers of modern times show. a remarkable agreement with regard to this point. H. von Maltzahn, who visited, in the disguise of a Mohammedan pilgrim, all the countries from Timbuctoo to Mecca, and the Hungarian, Vambery, who in the same disguise travelled from Teheran to Samarcand; Henry Barth, who penetrated into Central Africa as far as Timbuctoo; and Palgrave, who in 1862 visited Central and Eastern Arabia, and in particular the empire of the Wahabites, all bear witness to this decay of the Islam. The baron of Maltzahn. in his book of the Pilgrimage to Mecca, which he joined in 1860, under the name of Sidi Abd'er Rahman ben Mohammed es-Shikdi, says: “The Islam has long been undermined, but now it appears to be on the eve of a general collapse; all that formerly constituted its glory — science, scholarship, art, industry — has long left it; its political power has become a laughing-stock, its commerce has been reduced to zero; one thing only seems to stay for a time the impending collapse-religious fanaticism. A remarkable instance of this decline of Mohammedanism is shown in the decrease of the population of the' large cities. Thus Bagdad, which at the time of the caliphate had 2,000,000 inhabitants, has now only 100,000; the population of Basrah has been reduced from 200,000 to 80,000; that of Aleppo from 200,000 to 90,000; that of Samarcand from 180,000 to 20,000; that of Katsena, which in the 17th century was the first city of Central Soudan, from 100,000 to 8000. Even the population of the holy city of Mecca, the most licentious city of the East, has been reduced from 100,000 to 45,000. The only country of the Mohammecian world which, during. the last twenty years, has made real and important progress is Egypt; but its progress is clearly traceable to the influence of Christian countries. Most of the rulers of the house of Mehemet Ali have shown their appreciation of the superiority of Western civilization, and made earnest efforts to elevate Egypt to a level with it. All the sons of the present khedive have received a European education: one has been instructed in Paris, a second one in England, and a third one is to enter the Prussian army. Industrial departments have been created, as in the constitutional monarchies of Europe, and a council of state has been created to advise the khedive in all the important affairs of the state.

The most influential among the Egyptian ministers, and for many years the chief  adviser of the khedive, is an Armenian Christian, Nubar Pasha. Even an assembly of deputies meets annually since 1866, which, as it is officially expressed, is to control the administration and to fix the budget. Sweeping reforms have, in particular, been effected in the department of public education. Since 1868 public schools have been established by the government in all the important places of the country. They numbered in 1870 about 4000 pupils, who received from the government not only gratuitous instruction, but their entire support, inclusive of clothing. These schools embrace both the primary and the secondary instruction. The former embraced Arabic reading and writing, arithmetic, drawing, French, or, according to the location of the place, some other foreign language. From the elementary school the pupils pass into the preparatory department of the secondary school. The course lasts three years, and embraces the study of the Arabic, Turkish, French, and English languages; mathematics, drawing, history, and geography. After completing this preparatory course, the pupil enters one of the special schools which are to finish his education for the service of the state. These special schools are:

1. The Polytechnic School, the course of which lasts four years. As in France, its pupils are permitted to choose between the civil and the military career. In the former case the pupil enters for two years the School of Administration, and afterwards the service of the state; in the latter case he enters the Military Academy of the Abbassieh at Cairo. The Polytechnical School had in 1871 seventy-one pupils.

2. The Law School. The students study the law of the Islam, especially that of Egypt, which is now in the course of a radical transformation, and also the Roman law and the present laws of the European countries.

3. The Philological School.

4 The School of Arts and Industry, founded at Bulak by Mehemet Ali, and greatly perfected by Ismail Pasha.

5. The Medical School, with which is connected a School of Midwifery, the only one which exists in the East.

6. The Naval School in Alexandria.

Quite recently the Egyptian government has called the celebrated German Orientalist, H. Brugsch, of Gottingen, to Cairo, in order to organize there  an academy for archaeology, and, in particular, Egyptological studies. All these reforms are making wide breaches into the walls by which Mohammedan fanaticism has so long tried to isolate itself from the remainder of the world. Still more is this the case with the construction of the canal of Suez, which opens to the civilization of the Christian countries a new and wide road to the intellects and minds of the Egyptian Mohammedans, which, it is believed, no obstruction will ever be able again to block up. The results of this contact between Egypt and Christian Europe and America are already apparent. The fanatical customs which the Mohammedans, like those of other countries, used to indulge in with regard to Christians begin to disappear one by one. The growth of some of the Egyptian cities is marvellous. Alexandria, which at the close of the 18th century had only 6000, in 1820 only 15,000 inhabitants, has now over 200,000. The rule of the khedive has been extended far southward into Central Africa and on the coasts of the Red Sea, and it appears to be highly probable that his ambitious scheme of building up a vast civilized African empire has good prospects of being realized.” Detailed accounts of the several national branches of Mohammedans are given under the articles treating of the respective countries. In an article under SEE SARACENS we. will consider the political history of the Moslems since the days of their great Prophet to the present, especially their conquests in the Western world and the sacred places of the East.

VI. Literature. —

(1) Among the Mohammedan biographies of the Prophet, those of Wackidi, Hishani, and Tabari are perhaps the most important. Dr. Ferdinand Wustenfeld has edited and brought out in a European dress The Life of Muhammed, based on Muhammed Ibn Ishak, by Abd el-Malik Ibn Hisham (Lond. 1869, 8vo, page 1026), and the Reverend James L. Merrick has brought out in English The Life and Religion of Mohammed, as contained in the Shiite traditions of the Hyal-Ul-Kuloob (Bost. 1850, 8vo). Abulfeda's work, formerly considered an authority, is now ignored (see art. MOHAMMED, page 397). Among European and American biographies of the Prophet of Islam are those of Maraccius (Padua, 1688); Gagnier (Gibbon's chief dependence; Amsterdam, 1732); Rampoldi (Rome, 1822); Bush (N.Y. 1832); Vergers (Paris, 1833); Hammer Purgstall (Leips. 1837); Green (N.Y. 1840); Weil (Stuttgard, 1843); Caussin de Perceval (1847); Washington Irving (N.Y. 1852). But the three  lives which probably present the greatest research are those by Sir William Muir (Lond. 1858), by Dr. Sprenger (Berlin, 1869 et sq., 6 volumes, 8vo), and by Noldeke (Lond. 1863). The last of these is popular in character, but rests substantially on original investigation, though the labors of Weil, Caussin, Muir, and Sprenger have been used. These works suggested a series of essays to M. Barthdlemy St. Hilaire, Mahomet et le Coran (Paris, 1865), which are considered valuable. But none of these, though liberal in their judgments, are satisfactory to the Syud Ahmed, who has published some essays in English (Lond. 1870) on Mohammed and subjects subsidiary thereto, and who explains in his preface the reasons why he prefers some contemporary accounts that Europeans have less valued, and he writes with the express purpose of counteracting the effect of Muir upon young Mohammedan students of English. The fiftieth chapter of Gibbon's Decline and Fall (reprinted separately also) is probably the strongest vindication that Mohammed has received from a European. Carlyle, in his Heroes and Hero-worship, has also taken the palliative side, and he is followed by Kingsley in his Alexandria and her Schools, who assents to Carlyle's “true and just description of a much-calumniated man.”

(2) Of the different works treating on Mohammedanism and its founder, or only the former, one of the oldest European works, by White (Bampton Lectures, 1784), treats of this faith in the usual derogatory way. Price's work (Lond. 1811-21, 4 volumes, 4to), compiled from original Persian authorities, and tracing the history from the death of Mohammed to 1556, is generally commended. So also is Mill's Hist. of Mohammedanism (Lond. 1812), and likewise Sale's English version of the Koran, prefixed by a dissertation, regarded as “one of the best of the descriptive and historical surveys.” De Tassy's works — Doctrines et Devoirs de la Religion Musulmane, tires du Coran, and his Memoire sur des Particularites de la Religion Musulmane dans l'Inde — are valuable. Neale's Islamism, its Rise and Progress, is an ordinary compilation simply, and,Taylor, Hist. of Mohammedanism, treats mainly of the sects; but indispensable to every student of Mohammedanism is Von Hammer-Purgstall's Gesch. des Osmanischen Reiches (Pesth, 1827-35, 10 volumes, 8vo). One of the best treatises is by Dollinger — Muhammed's Religion nach ihrer innern Entwickelung u. ihrem Einflusse auf das Leben der Volker (Ratisbon, 1838). Useful are Renan's Mah. et les origines de l'Islamisme (Par. 1857,7th rev. ed. 1864), and Arnold's Koran and Bible (Lond. 1866; rewritten and published in 1874, entitled Islam, its History, Character, and  Relation to Christianity). The Islamisme of the learned Dr. Dozy, of Leyden, is a superior work, and deserves an English dress. It is full in its account of the historical circumstances and preparations out of which Mohammedanism sprang, and gives a well-compiled account of its subsequent influence on the world, and of its sects and actual position at the present day. A very interesting and valuable contribution is the work by Kremer — Geschichte der herrschenden Ideen des Islams (Leips. 1868, 8vo). Worth mentioning are also the Lectures on Mohammedanism by Freeman (Oxf. and Lond. 1870, 18mo), by Smith (Lond. 1874, 8vo), and Brown, Mohammedanism, its present Condition and Influence in India (Lond. 1873, 12mo). See also Hardwick, Christ and other Masters; Clarke, Ten great Religions, chapter 11; Milman, Hist. of Latin Christianity, 2:108 sq.; Stanley, Hist. of the Eastern Church, lecture 8; Wright, Early Christianity in Arabia, page 152 sq.; Neander, Church History, 3:84 sq.; Cox, Latin and Teutonic Christendom; D'Herbelot, Bibliotheque Orientale; Malcor, Hist. of Persia (2 volumes, 4to); Cazenove, Mohammedanism (Lond. 1855; reprinted from the Christian Remembrancer, January 1855); Deutsch, Literary Remains (Lond. and N.Y. 1874; containing articles reprinted from the Quarterly Review, Lond. 1869, 1870). In many travels, especially those in Arabia, the condition and history of Mohammedanism are dwelt upon, as in Burckhardt; and Warburton gives a chapter to it in his Crescent and the Cross. See also Wellsted, Travels to the City of the Caliphs (Load. 1840, 2 volumes, 8vo); Lane, The Moslem Egyptians (5th edition, Lond. 1871); Zincke, Egypt of the Pharaohs and the Khedive; General Daumas, La vie Arabe et la Societe Musulmane. See also Harper's Monthly, 14:1 sq.; Christian Examiner, 1830, 4:360 sq.; North Amer. Rev. 1831, page 257; North Brit. Rev. 1850. page 101 sq.; Jan. and August 1855; Christian Remembrancer, Jan. 1855, art. 3; Free-will Baptist Qu. January 1855, art. 1; Edinburgh Rev. October 1857; July 1866; Nat. Qu. Rev. March 1861, art. 6; September art. 5; Jahrb. deutscher Theologie, 10:166; 1862, page 385; Revue des deux Mondes, September 1865; Prospect. Rev. 2:159; Journal of Sacred Lit. volumes 21 and 24; (Lond.) Quarterly Rev. 127:293 sq.; October 1869, page 160; Bibliotheca Sacra, April 1870; Meth. Qu. Rev. 1864, page 141; 1865, page 283; 1866, page 602; 1871, page 62; Westm. Rev. 1868, page 245; January 1873, page 124; July, page 115 sq.; Brit. Qu. Rev. January 1872, page 100 sq. On Mohammedan law are works by Muradgea, D'Ohsson, Knijzer, Von Tornaw, and Perron. See Osborn, Islam (Lond. 1878, 2 volumes).

## Moharram[[@Headword:Moharram]]

             any thing sacred or forbidden by the Mussulman law. It is likewise the name of the first month of the Arabic year, before the time of Mohammedanism, and was so called because the ancient Arabs were forbidden to make war against one another during this month. The first ten days of the month Moharram are called by the Mohammedans Aiam al- madulat, that is, the reckoned days, because they believe that during these ten days the Koran was sent down from heaven to be communicated to men. The last of these ten days is called Ashziur. See Broughton, Biblioth. Histor. Sacra, 2:116.

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

             The Mohawk was spoken by the Indian tribes west of the falls of the Niagara. For the benefit of these peoples the British and Foreign Bible Society published Isaiah and the gospels of Luke and John in the vernacular of the Mohawk Indians, while the Pentateuch and Psalms are translated but not yet published. See Bible of Every Land, page 456. (B.P.)

## Mohdi[[@Headword:Mohdi]]

             (i.e. the Director) is the title among the Mohammedans for that descendant of Mohammed whose coming is to be one of the signs of the general resurrection. Concerning this person, Mohammed prophesied that the  world should not have an end till one of his own family should govern the Arabians, whose name should be like his own name, and whose father's name should also be like that of his own father. The Mohdi is to fill the earth with Righteousness. The Shiites (q.v.) believe the Mohdi to be now alive, and concealed in some secret place till the proper time of his manifestation; and they suppose him to be none other than the last of the twelve imams, named Mohammed Abulkasem, and the son of Hassan al- Askeri, the eleventh of that succession. See Broughton, Biblioth. Histor. Sacra, 2:116. SEE MOHAMMEDANISM.

## Mohl, Julius Von[[@Headword:Mohl, Julius Von]]

             an eminent German Oriental scholar, was born at Stuttgard in 1800. After having studied at the gymnasium in that city, he entered the Protestant seminary in the University of Tubingen in 1818, received his diploma as doctor of philosophy in 1820, and won the prize in theology in 1822. His taste for Oriental languages, which he had pursued diligently amid all the duties of his college life, induced him to remove to Paris, where he studied under Sylvestre de Sacy and Remusat. In 1826 he was appointed professor of Oriental literature at Tubingen, but he never occupied that chair, preferring to continue his studies, which he pursued in 1826-7 and 1830-1 at London and Oxford. In 1840 he became assistant secretary of the Asiatic Society; in 1844 succeeded Burnouf, sen., as a member of the Academy of Inscriptions; the same year was installed professor of the Persian language and literature at the College of France; and in 1852 succeeded Burnouf, jun., as inspector of Oriental typography at the imperial printing-house. He died in 1874. Mohl constantly sought to improve the standard of Oriental philology. His philosophic views on the subject, together with his warm enthusiasm, have contributed not a little to facilitate and extend recent investigations in that science. His principal works are: Fragments relatis a la religion de Zoroaster (Paris, 1829, 8vo), published anonymously: — Confucii Chi-King, ex Latino P. Lacharme interpret. (Stuttgard, 1830, 8vo): — Y.-King, antiquissimus Sinarum liber, ex Latina interpret. P. Regis (ibid. 1834-9, 2 volumes, 8vo): — Livre des Rois, par Abdoul Kasim Firdousi (Paris, 1836-55, fol.): — Firdousi's Schahnameh (ib. 1838-66, 5 volumes, 8vo); and many contributions of great value to different Oriental societies in France, England, and Germany, of which he had the honor to be a member. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 35, s.v.;  Brockhaus, Conversations Lexikon, s.v.; Vapereau, Diet. des Contemporains, s.v. (J.H.W.)

## Mohler, Johann Adam[[@Headword:Mohler, Johann Adam]]

             one of Germany's most distinguished Roman Catholic theologians — the Schleiermacher, as he has aptly been called, of his branch of the Christian Church — was born of humble parentage, May 6, 1796, at Igersheim, near Mergentheim, in Wurtemberg. He received his preparatory training at the gymnasium in Mergentheim, and in his seventeenth year removed to Ellwangen and there studied at the lyceum until, in 1815, the faculty was transferred to Tubingen, and he repaired to that well-known highschool to continue his theological studies. He completed his course at the episcopal seminary in Rottenburg, and in 1819 was made priest, and became vicar of Riedlingen. He continued, however, but a short time in the pastorate. In 1820 he returned to Tibingen University, and there lectured and studied. Proffered a permanent position in the university, he decided, in order to fit himself the more thoroughly for it, to spend some time in making himself acquainted with the routine of the theological courses of other universities- as Gottingen, Berlin, Prague, Vienna, etc.; and in consequence of this thorough preparation, so successfully met his engagement that in 1826, though still very young, he was made extraordinary professor, and only two years later, shortly after receiving his doctorate in divinity, was honored with the full or ordinary professorship in Church history and patrology.

This position afforded him a controlling influence over the Roman Catholic young men studying with a view to the priesthood, and he aimed to awaken among them, by the description of great ecclesiastical characters of the early Catholic Church, such as Athanasius and Anselm, a spirit of speculative inquiry in the sphere of faith and in connection with ecclesiastical fellowship; and he also renewed the old confessional controversy on the principles of the Protestant and Roman Catholic creeds by the publication of a work on Symbolism, in which the Reformation, though much of the Protestants' labors are recognised as relatively justifiable and worthy, is stamped, in contrast with an ideal Roman Catholicity, as a mistake. This book came not only to be regarded as a remarkable work, but actually fixed the attention of the whole theological world upon him; and it has been well said that “his reputation, both posthumous and among his own contemporaries, rests mainly on his Symbolik” (in English entitled Symbolism; or the Doctrinal Differences  between Catholics and Protestants, as represented by their Public Confessions of Faith, translated by J.R. Robertson, 2 volumes, London, 1843; New York, 1844; and since republished). D'Aubigne pronounced it “one of the most important writings produced by Rome since the time of Bossuet” (History of the Ref. 4:326). It was first published in 1832, passed through five large editions in the next six years, was translated into all the leading European languages, and drew forth numerous criticisms and rejoinders from the Protestant world, of which the most important are: Bauer, Gegensatz des Katholicismus u. Protestantismus, nach den Principien u. Hauptdogmen der beiden Lehrbegriffe (Tub. 1834, 8vo); Nitzsch, Prot. Beantwortung der Symbolik Mohlers (in Studien u. Kritiken, 1834-35, and later separately reprinted); Marheineke, Recension der Mohlerschen Symbolik (in Jahrbuchfur wissenschaftliche Kritik, Berlin, 1833).

To these-particularly, however, the attack by Bauer-Mohler replied in his Neue Untersuchungen der Lehrgegensltze (Mayence, 1834; 2d edit. 1835). The polemical bitterness evoked by these controversies made it desirable that Mohler should leave Tubingen, where Bauer then also lectured; and after refusing various positions proffered him by different celebrated German universities, he accepted in 1835 a professorship at Munich, then in the first flush of its efficiency under king Louis. Mohler's first appointment was nominally the chair of Biblical exegesis, but he really devoted himself to the department of Church history, in which his opening course was eminently successful. His uninterrupted and severe labors, however, had taxed him to the utmost, and, after refusing to accept a renewed and very tempting offer from Bonn, he reluctantly consented to change his place at the university for the deanery of Wurzburg, which the king had urged upon him.. Shortly after appointment to this new position he was completely prostrated, and died of consumption April 12, 1838. Mohler is not only generally acknowledged to have been a good and pious man, but is universally recognized also as the greatest theologian the Roman Catholic Church has produced. since Bellarmine and Bossuet.

He was certainly the most acute and the most philosophical of the modern. controversialists of his Church. He helped Romanism: again to self- consciousness, and breathed into it a new polemic zeal against Protestantism; although he betrayed the influence which the study of Protestant theology, especially that of Schleiermacher, and of modern culture generally, had exercised on his own idealistic apprehension and defence of the Roman dogmas and usages. He did not, indeed, write a Church history, or discuss the scriptural or traditional evidences of the  peculiar doctrines of Roman Catholicism, but rather devoted himself to the exposition of the points and thee grounds of the doctrinal differences of modern sects; yet all his writings have more or less to do with the historical sphere, particularly with the history of doctrines, and are remarkable for their freshness of spirit: and a vigorous and animated style. Says Hagenbach. (Ch. Hist. of the 18th and 19th Cent. 2:446), “Whatever vigorous vitality is possessed by the most recent Catholic theological science is due to the labors of this man, who was cut off early in the midst of his work.” “He sent rays of his spirit,” says Kurtz (Ch. Hist. from the Reformation, page 391), “deep into the hearts and minds of hundreds of his enthusiastic pupils by his writings, addresses, and by his intercourse with them; and what the Roman Catholic Church of the present possesses of living scientific impulse and feeling was implanted, or at least revived and excited by him... His ‘Symbolik' combats Protestant doctrines with the weapons of Protestant science, and silently ennobles and sublimates those of the Roman Catholic Church. Did the Protestants up to this time generally despise or ignore the contributions of Roman Catholic theologians, here a scientific power of the highest significance approached them, to despise which would have been a sign of weakness. In fact, long as was the opposition which existed between both churches, no work from the camp of the Roman Catholics produced as much agitation and excitement in the camp of the Protestants as this.” Yet no work produced by a Romanist has been of greater service than this polemic. Written after a thorough study of the subject, it has gathered a mass of material invaluable to the Protestant student, and in this Cyclopsedia we have not unfrequently referred to Mohler's “Symbolik” with great pleasure. The other principal works from Mohler's pen are: Die Einheit in der Kirche oder das Princip des Katholicismus (Tubing. 1825, 8vo; translated into French by Ph. Bernard): — Athanasius d. Grosse u. d. Kirche seiner Zeit im Kampfe mit den Arianismus (Mayence, 1827; 2d ed. 1844, 8vo; translated into French, Paris, 1841, 3 volumes, 8vo): — Patrologie oder christliche Literaturgeschichte (Ratisb. 1839,2 volumes, 8vo; translated into French by Cohen, Paris, 1842, 2 volumes, 8vo). His Nachgelassene Schriften were published by Dollinger (Ratisb. 1839-40), and his Patrologie oder Christl. Literaturgesch. by Reithmayer (Regensb. 1869). See Beda Weber, Charakterbilder (Frankf. 1853); D. F. Strauss, Kleine Schriften, etc. (Leips. 1862); Hare, Vindication of Luther, pages 167-169; Schaff, Hist. of the Apostol. Ch. page 60; Ffoulkes, Divisions in Christendom, volume 1, § 53; Hase, Protestantische Polemnik; Werner,Gesch. d. Katholicismus; and  particularly the biographical sketch preceding the 5th edition of the “Symbolik.” See also Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 35:734; Herzog, Real Encyklop. 9:662; Bibl. Sacra, January 1850, page 61; English Rev 2:7; Christian Examiner, 37:119; Brit. and For. Ev. Review, July 1868, page 591.

## Mohnike, Gottlieb Christian Friedrich[[@Headword:Mohnike, Gottlieb Christian Friedrich]]

             a German divine of note. was born at Grimmen, in Pomerania, in 1781; studied theology at Greifswalde and Jena; in 1811 became rector of the city school at Greifswalde; in 1813 entered the pastorate, and gained a name universally honored and revered. He was made councillor of the Consistory after having removed to Stralsund about 1830, and died July 6, 1841. Besides several secular publications, we have from his pen Ulrich Hutten's Jugendleben (Greifsw. 1816): — Hymnologische Forschungen (ibid. 1831-32, 2 volumes).

## Moib[[@Headword:Moib]]

             (Heb. Modb', מוֹאָב, water [i.e., seed] of her father, with allusion to his incestuous origin [see below]; Sept. Μωάβ), the son of Lot and his eldest daughter, and founder of the Moabitish people (Gen 19:30-38). B.C. 2063. Moab is also used for the country or territory of the Moabites (Jer 48:4); and also for the people of Moab (Num 22:3-14; Jdg 3:30; 2Sa 8:2; 2Ki 1:1; Jer 48:11; Jer 48:13). The “Plains of Moal,” near Jericho, was the last station of the Hebrews in their journey to Canaan (Num 21:33; Num 22:1; Num 33:48). The proper territory of the Moabites, more fully called the field of Moab (Rth 1:1-2; Rth 1:6; Rth 2:6; Rth 4:3), lay on the east of the Dead Sea and the Jordan, strictly on the south of the torrent Arnon (Num 21:13; Num 21:26; Jdg 11:18);  but in a wider sense it included also the region anciently occupied by the Amorites over against Jericho, usually called the plains (deserts) of Moab (Num 22:1; Num 24:3; Num 31:12; Num 33:49-50; Num 35:1; Deu 34:1); or elsewhere simply the land of Moab (Deu 1:5; Deu 32:49; Deu 34:5); which latter region was afterwards assigned to the Reubenites, but during the captivity was again occupied by the Moabites (see Isaiah 15, 16; Jeremiah 48). It is now called the district of Kerak, from the city of that name, anciently Kir-Moab. SEE MOABITE; SEE PAHATH-MOAB.

As to the etymology of the name, various explanations have been proposed.

(1.) The Sept. inserts the words λέγουσα ἐκ τοῦ πατρός μου, saying ‘from my father,' as if מֵאָבThis is followed by the old interpreters; as Josephus (Ant. 1:11, 5), Jerome's Quaest. Hebr. in Genesim, the gloss of the Pseudo-Jon. Targum; and in modern times by De Wette (Bibel), Tuch (Genesis page 370), and J.D. Michaelis (B. fiur Ungelehrten).

(2.) By Hiller (Ozom. page 414) and Simon (Onom. page 479) it is derived from מוֹבָא אָב‘ingressus, i.e., coitus, patris.'

(3.) Rosenmuller (see Schumann, Genesis, page 302) ‘proposes to treat מוֹas equivalent for מִיַם, water, in accordance with the figure employed by Balaam in Num 24:7 (as above adopted). This is countenanced by Jerome — ‘aqua paterna' (Comm. in Mic 6:8) — and has the great authority of Gesenius in its favor (Thesp. 775 a); also of First (Handwb. page 70) and Bunsen (Bibelweork).

(4.) A derivation, probably more correct etymologically than either of the above, is that suggested by Maurer from the root יָאִב, ‘to desire' — 'the desirable land' — with reference to the extreme fertility of the region occupied by Moab (see also Furst, Hwb. page 707 b). No hint, however, has yet been discovered in the Bible records of such an origin of the name.”

## Moine, Etienne Le[[@Headword:Moine, Etienne Le]]

             a very learned French Protestant minister, was born at Caen, in October, 1624, and became well skilled in the Oriental and classical languages, besides attaining great distinction as a theologian even while yet a student at the Protestant seminary in Sedan and the University of Leyden. After his graduation he was appointed pastor at Rouen, and rapidly rose in favor with his brethren. For political reasons he was imprisoned for a short time, and upon his release negotiated for an appointment at his Dutch alma mater, where he was finally appointed a professor, and successfully taught for some time. He was honored with the rectorate, and in various other ways, and his learning was acknowledged even in England. Oxford University conferred the doctorate of divinity on him in 1677. He died at Leyden April 4,1689. Several dissertations of his are printed together, and entitled Varia Sacra (Leyden, 1685, 1694, 2 volumes, 4to). He also wrote other works, but none of them are now of any value. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Genesis s.v.

## Moira[[@Headword:Moira]]

             (Μοῖρα, a share), the classical personification of that mysterious yet irresistible power whose invisible sceptre controls and directs human events, and assigns to each individual his fate or share. Homer, with a single exception (b. 24:29), speaks of but one Moira, a personification of  fate, whom he represents as spinning the thread of each man's life, and though counselling with the other gods, yet as having supreme authority in directing and controlling the fate of each individual, and yielding obeisance only to Zeus. Hesiod living a little later, distinguishes three Moirae, and names them as Clotho, or the spinning fate; Lachesis, or the one who assigns man his fate; and Atropos, or the fate that cannot be avoided. These he calls the daughters of Zeus and Thermis, a genealogy from which late; writers differ. Other mythographers picture Clotho as holding the distaff, and ever furnishing the present; Lachesis, twirling the spindle, lays out the future; and Atropos severs the past by cutting the thread with her fatal. scissors. The representations of the character and nature of the Moirae, as varied as they are numerous, may, for our purpose, be classed in two divisions: 1st, those in which the Moirae are but allegorical representations of the duration of human life; 2d, those in which the Moirae are considered strictly as divinities of fate. As used in the first sense, it is supposed the Greeks originally conceived of but one Moira, but on further consideration of her nature and attributes adopted the idea of two, representing life's two boundaries of birth and death. Ultimately the number became three, and personified past, present, and future. Considering the Moirae as strictly divinities of fate, they are viewed as independent, meting out individual destinies in accordance with eternal laws which know, no variations or exceptions. The gods as well as mortals are subject to their authority, and even Zeus is sometimes represented as powerless to annul their decrees.

Oftener, however, Zeus is pictured as in the background, weighing out power to them, and interfering with their decrees when disposed to save his favorites or destroy those with whom he is angry. This twofold view of the Moirae, considering them sometimes as possessed of supreme power, and issuing irrevocable decrees, and at other times as interfered with and overruled by Zeus, is easily accounted for in the vain attempts of uninspired man to harmonize the seemingly inconsistent meting out of fate. By this means the ancients were enabled to interpret, satisfactorily to themselves, the varying freaks of fickle fortune, and account for apparent favoritism and injustice. It proved a magic key to open the mysteries of the dealings of Providence, and shifted the burden of human complaints from the shoulders of their beloved Zeus to those of the hated Moirse, while all the praise for sudden prosperity or escape from danger and death was givens to Zeus for his kindly interference with the will of the fates.

Without the aid of this double view of the relationship existing between Zeus and the Moirae, the Greeks could see in the strange events of national and  personal history naught but the workings of an imperfect divinity; but with this explanatory means they were enabled to clothe Zeus with a robe interwoven with threads both of justice and mercy. For the sake of conceiving a blameless divinity, they were willing even to admit the occasional absence of supreme authority. Like the Erinyes, with whom they are often confounded, the Moirae differ singularly from all the other gods in that they have no sympathy whatever for man, their iron sceptres never being wielded by the hands of mercy. Yet they were worshipped in many parts of Greece, and had sanctuaries at Corinth, Sparta, Olympia, and Thebes. The ancient artists and poets give us many fanciful pictures of the Moire. The earliest of the former represent them as goddesses holding staffs or sceptres in their hands as emblematic of their dominion. In later works of art they form a triplet of grave though beautiful maidens: Clotho holding a spindle or a roll (the book of fate); Lachesis pointing with her staff to the globe; while Atropos holds a pair of scales, a sun-dial, or some cutting instrument. By the poets they are sometimes pictured as aged and decrepit women, typical of the slow and often sorrowful march of fated events, and the various epithets applied to them are not so much the outburstings of human hate as poetical pencillings of the severity, inflexibility, and sternness of fate. See Vollmer, Mythol. Worterbuch, s.v.; Smith, Dict. Greek and Roman Biog. and Mythol. s.v.; Dwight, Classical Mythol. s.v.; Grote, Hist. of Greece, 4:197 sq. (H.W.T.)

## Moise, Francois Xavier[[@Headword:Moise, Francois Xavier]]

             a French theologian, was born at Gras, in Frainche-Comte, in 1742. He was professor of theology at Dole when the Revolution broke out; and, taking the oath of loyalty to the civil constitution, in 1791 was elected bishop for the Jura district. During the reign of terror he had to conceal himself in the mountains. But being a learned canonist, and conversant with theology and the Levantine languages, his country needed his services, and he was called out to take a prominent part in the discussions which marked the national councils held in Paris during the years 1797 and 1801. At the expiration of the latter year he resigned his sacerdotal functions, together with abbe Gregoire, with whom he was intimately acquainted, left Paris soon thereafter, and retired to his farm at Morteau. Bishop Lecoz then bestowed upon him the title of honorary canon of Besanoon. Moise died at Morteau in 1813. He wrote: Reponses critiques a plasieurs questions proposees par les incredules modernes sur divers endroits des Livres  Saints (Paris, 1783, 18mo): — De l'Opinion de M. Grefjoire daus le proces de Louis XVI (1801); together with some articles in the Annales de la Religion, La Chronique Religieuse, etc.

## Mokanna[[@Headword:Mokanna]]

             (i.e. the Concealed) is the name of a Mohammedan prophet who flourished about A.D. 778. He was so called because, as the Mohammedans say, “he shrouded from his followers the excessive glory of his human face divine with a golden mask.” He was the first who introduced into Islamism the doctrine of the transmigration of souls. Mokanna taught that God had assumed a human form, had commanded the angels to adore the first man, and from that time the divine nature had descended from prophet to prophet to Abu Moslem, the founder of the Abassides, and finally to himself. He -afterwards added the Indian dogma of the incarnation of the human and divine nature, as well as the metempsychosis adopted by the Ghullats. See Madden, Hist. of the Turkish Empire, 2:169. SEE MOHAMMEDAN SECTS.

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

             SEE ATHA BEN-HAKEM.

## Moket, Richard[[@Headword:Moket, Richard]]

             an English theologian, was born in Dorsetshire in 1578, and was educated at Oxford University, of which he finally became fellow and doctor, distinctions that opened to him several prominent positions, of which he finally accepted that of provost of All-Souls' College, Oxford. He was also appointed. one of the royal commissioners to supervise ecclesiastical affairs. He translated into Latin the Liturgy, sundry catechisms, the constitution, and several other instruments and documents relative to the Anglican Church, in order to distribute them as models worthy of imitation by foreign Church establishments. The collection was printed at London (1616, folio). But it had hardly been given to the public when theologians and schoolmen raised such a hue and cry against the work as finally consigned it to the fire. According to Heylin (Life of Laud, page 70), this proscription was due solely to the unintentional omission on the part of the hapless translator of one of the prerogatives of the English Church. The whole edition of his work was utterly destroyed. One of the treatises which it contained — De Polita Ecclesiae Anglicanae — was reprinted at London, 1683, 8vo. Moket died at Oxford in 1618. See Wood, Athenae Oxon.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of British and American Authors, s.v.

## Mokissos[[@Headword:Mokissos]]

             an order of deities of the negroes of Congo, Angola, etc., in Africa. They are a kind of genii or spirits, and are in subordination to a superior. being, called by the natives Zamban-Pongo. Their idols are composed either of wood or stone; a few. are erected in temples or chapels, but the much greater part in the public streets and highways. Some are in the form of four-footed beasts, others are like birds. To these the negroes bow, and offer sacrifices to appease their anger, or to obtain their favor.

## Mokludjye[[@Headword:Mokludjye]]

             a sect of the Ansarians (q.v.).

## Mol, Peter Van[[@Headword:Mol, Peter Van]]

             a Flemish painter, was born in Antwerp in 1590. He was a pupil of Rubens, and painted, in the style of his master, many noted works for the churches of Flanders and Brabant. In the cathedral of Antwerp is his Adoration of the Magi, which is a superior work. Another remarkable work by him was in the gallery of the Louvre, representing Christ after the Crucifixion, with the Marys, Joseph of Arimathaea, and John. The time of his death is unknown. See Spooner, Biographical Hist. of the Fine Arts, 2:574.

## Mola[[@Headword:Mola]]

             a term derived from the. sacramental immolation of Christ, alludes to the middle of an altar, signed with the dedication cross,- and covering the sepulchre of relics.

## Mola, Giovanni Battista[[@Headword:Mola, Giovanni Battista]]

             a French painter of the Bolognese school, was born about 1620, and was a scholar of Albano. He copied a vast work of Paul Veronese for cardinal Bichi. Lanzi gives but one example of his works from the collection of the marches Rinuccini, at Florence, the Repose in Egypt. Mrs. Jameson mentions a fine Holy Family by him in the Louvre, in which the Virgin watches with upturned eyes while Joseph and the Child sleep. Mola died in 1661. See Lanzi, Hist. of Painting. transl. by Roscoe, 3:92; Mrs. Jameson, Legends of the Madonna, page 241.

## Mola, Pietro Francesco[[@Headword:Mola, Pietro Francesco]]

             an eminent Italian painter and architect, was born in the diocese of Como in 1612. He studied successively under Giuseppe Albano and Guercino. In his earlier life the works of the latter master were greatly admired by him, but subsequently he went to Venice, where he devoted himself to Titian and Veronese. From the result of this course of study he formed a style peculiar to himself, combining parts of all those from whom he had studied, and his fame spread throughout all Italy. He went to Rome in the pontificate of Innocent X, by whom he was immediately employed in executing numerous works, among which are St. Peter delivered from Prison by the Angel and the Conversion of St. Paul, in the chapel of the church Del Gesu. He was also patronized by pope Alexander VII, for whom he painted, in the pontifical palace of Monte Cavallo, his most  celebrated work, Joseph making himself known to his Brethren. At Milan are two of his most admired productions, in the church of S. Maria della Vita, St. John in the Wilderness and St. Paul the Hermit. Mrs. Jameson mentions several works by this artist, among which are Jacob wrestling with the Angel, the Meeting, of Jacob and Rachel and the Baptism of Christ, in which an angel is disrobing the Savior. Mola died suddenly at Rome in 1668, while preparing to set out for Paris, whither he had been invited by the king of France, who had appointed him court-painter, with a liberal pension. See Lanzi, Hist. of Painting, transl. by Roscoe, 1:462; 2:535; 3:92; Spooner, Biographical Hist. of the Fine Arts, 2:574; Jameson and Eastlake, History of our Lord, 1:151, 153, 297.

## Moladah[[@Headword:Moladah]]

             (Heb. Moladah', מוֹלָדָה[in Nehemiah , מֹלָדָה], birth; Sept. Μωλαδά v.r. Μωδαδά, etc.), a city in the southern part of the tribe of Judah towards the Edomitish border (Jos 15:26), which fell within the portion set off to Simeon (Jos 19:2; 1Ch 4:28). It was also occupied after the exile (Neh 11:26). Reland (Palaest. page 901) thinks it was the Malatha (Μάλαθα) mentioned by Josephus (Ant. 18:6, 2) as a castle of Idurmaea, to which Agrippa retired in chagrin after his return from Rome. Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. s.v. Α᾿ραμά) allude to it (Μαλαθί) as a place four Roman miles distant from Arad, which latter they describe as an ancient city of the Amorites situated in the wilderness of Kadesh, and twenty miles from Hebron, on the road to Aila (see Reland, Palaest. page 885). At a later period Malatha became a Roman colony (Reland, p. 231). Dr. Robinson (Researches, 2:621) finds the locality in the present el-Milh, first observed by Schubert (Reise, 2:454), consisting of extensive ruins with a well, situated at the required distance from the site of Arad (comp. Schwarz, Palest. page 100). The present name, signifying “salt,” has little affinity with the Heb. appellation, but may be a corruption of it (Wilson, Lands of the Bible, 1:346; Van de Velde, Memoir, page 335 ; Ritter, Pal. und Syr. 1:124; Tristram, Land of Israel, page 369 sq.; Stewart, Tent and Khan, page 217).

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

             Khurbet el-Milh, the probable representative of this locality, is seven miles and three quarters southwest of Tell Araad, and thirteen and a quarter, east of Beersheba. It is briefly described in the Memoirs accompanying the Ordnance Survey (3:415), and more fully by Tristram, Bible Places (page 19), as follows:

"The two wells are in the shallow valley, very finely built of marble, about seventy feet deep, their sides scored with the ropes of the water-drawers of many centuries. The ground around is strewn with records of the Roman occupation. Fragments of shafts and capitals, probably the support of roofs that covered the wells, and eight large marble water-troughs, lie around the mouths. There are traces of pavement. Just to the south of the wells stands a small isolated 'tell' or hill, covered with ruins, and now used as a burying-  ground of the Dhunlam tribe. This hill was the fortress of the city below, spoken of by Josephus; and we could :clearly trace the circuit of the wall that once surrounded it, nearly square in shape, and still in places three or four feet high. The traces of buildings and fragments of walls cover an extensive area both south and north of the citadel: and near its foot, on the south-east, are the outlines of a building, probably a Byzantine church. The other ruins seem to belong to an earlier and ruder period, and are perhaps the remains of the town of Simeon."

## Molans, Philibert De[[@Headword:Molans, Philibert De]]

             founder of the Order of St. George, was born at Molans, France, and flourished m the 14th century. He belonged to one of the oldest families in the country. The duke of Burgundy, Philip the Bold, took him into his  service as equerry. Molans followed his master to the Holy Land, and was very useful to him. In return for his efficiency, the. duke appointed him general inspector of the ducal arsenals. Molans afterwards went again to Palestine, and is said to have brought back the remains of one St. George, presenting these relics to the church at Rougemont, which instituted special services in honor of them. In 1390 Molans established an order under the inspiration of the alleged martyr. In order to become a member of this association one had to be a native of the duchy or county of Burgundy, and show not less than sixteen quarterings on his shield. Each chevalier of St. George had to take a vow to devote his life and fortune to the vindication of the Roman Catholic religion, and the protection of the oppressed, the virgins, and the orphans. The distinctive badge of the order was a gold image, suspended from a blue ribbon, and representing St. George smiting a dragon to the ground. Although this society had a purely moral aim, the Besanon Parliament persistently declined to legalize it. The Order of St. George continued in France until the Revolution. Historians are riot agreed as to the place and date of Molans's death. The latter part of his life was shrouded in obscurity. Great Britain, Bavaria, Spain, and Russia have each, in turn, created an Order of St. George. See Thomas Varin, Etat de l'illustre Confrerie de Saint-Georges en 1663; Pointier de Gouhelans, Statuts de l'Ordre de Saint-Georges, avec la liste des Chevaliers depuis 1390 (Besangon, 1768, 8vo); John Milner, Historical and Critical Inquiry into the Existence and Character of St. George; Heylin, History of St. George.

## Molanus (Vermeulen), John[[@Headword:Molanus (Vermeulen), John]]

             a Belgian theologian of some note, was born at Lille in 1533. He was educated at Louvain, and there obtained the doctorate in 1570, and then taught theology for several years. By different publications he called attention to his learning, and gradually gained favor at the court and at Rome. He was made a canon of the church of St. Peter, and director of a seminary then founded at Louvain. He died September 18, 1585. Baronius pays him great homage in the preface to his Martyrologe Romain. Molanus published: De Picturis et Imaginibus sacris (Louvain, 1570, 1574, 1595, 8vo): — De Historia sacrarum Imaginum et Picturarum, lib. 4; Theologie des peintres, sculpteurs, et dessinateurs (Paris, 1765, 12mo): — Annales urbis Louvaniensis ac obsidionis illius historia (Louvain, 1572, 4to): — Calendarium Ecclesiasticum (Anvers, 1574,12mo): — Defide haereticis servanda, lib. 3; quartus item defide rebellibus servanda, et quintus defide ac Juramento quae a tyrannis exiquantur (Cologne, 1584): — De piis Testamentis (Cologne, 1584,1661, 8vo): — Theologiae practicae  Compendium (Cologne, 1585, 1590, 8vo): — Orationes III de agnis Dei, de decimis dandis et de decimis recipiendis (Cologne, 1587, 8vo): — De Canonicis, lib. 3 (Cologne, 1587, 8vo): — Militia sacra Ducum ac Princium Brabantiae cum annotat. Petri Lourvii (Anvers, 1592, 8vo): — Medicorum ecclesiasticum Diarium (Louvain, 1595, 8vo): — Bibliotheca materiarum Theologica quae a quibus auctoribus, quum antiquis, tum recentioribus, sint pertractae (Cologne, 1618, 4to).

## Molanus, Gerhard Walther[[@Headword:Molanus, Gerhard Walther]]

             a German Lutheran theologian, was born at Hamen, on the Weser, November 1, 1633. He studied at the University of Helmstadt under Calixtus (q.v.). In 1659 he became professor of mathematics in the University of Rinteln, but in 1664 was made extraordinary, and soon after ordinary professor of theology in the same university, which position he retained until 1677. In the mean time he published various works, partly mathematical, partly theological. Among the latter we notice. De communicatione et praedicationae idiomatum, qua inter alia ostenditur humanam Christi naturam extrinsecus omnipotentema appellariposse (Rinteln, 1665), quite in the manner and method of Calixtus. In 1674 duke John Frederick of Hanover appointed him director of the consistory for that province, and in 1677 he became abbot of the convent of Loccum. He  was very active in promoting union conferences with the Reformed and Roman Catholic theologians, and, although without success, he acquired the well-earned reputation of a peace-maker. This was especially shown in his efforts in behalf of the French Reformed, whom the revocation of the Edict of Nantes had driven to seek refuge in Germany. Duke John Frederick, who had himself returned to Romanism, wished to induce Molanus. to follow his example, but the latter withstood all his offers. Having, in his efforts for a union with the Romish Church, come in contact with Bossuet, Molanus conceded that the Eucharist “quodammodo proprie dici sacrificium;” also that “de conciliis cecumenicis legitime celebratis dico: Christus nunquam permittet ut ecclesia universalis in concilio aliquid fidei contrarium pronuntiet,” etc. Yet he would not recognise as “legitime celebratum” the Council of Trent, which had condemned the Protestants without a hearing, and which was not universally recognised, for instance, in Germany. Molanus was accused of having gone over to Romanism, and therefore published in his defence Migae venales s. refutat. calumniar. etc. (1698). He died September 7, 1722. See J.v. Esinem, Leben G.W. Molani (Magdeb. 1724, 8vo); Kapp, Sammlung einige Briefe uber d. Vereinigung d. luth. u. ref. Theol. (Leips. 1745, 8vo); Schlegel, Kirchengesch. d. 18ten Jahrh. 1:559 sq.; 2:213 sq.; Schrockh, Kirchengesch. 7:83, 103 sq.: (J.N.P.)

## Molay, Jacques De[[@Headword:Molay, Jacques De]]

             the last grand-master of the Knights Templars, was born about the year 1244 in Burgundy, of the families of Longvic and Raon. He was admitted to his order at Baune, in the diocese of Autun. Of his subsequent history but little is known until he was promoted to the grand-mastership about the year 1298. Pierre Dupuy, a French writer, insinuates that he did not obtain his election by his own merits, but through the intrigues of the nobility of France. If this were true it might account for the suspicions and fears which animated Philip IV. against the establishment of the Order of the Temple in France just at this time, when monarchy was endeavoring to rear itself on the political abasement of the Church and the feudal lordships. But there is nothing to prove this assertion, for it is difficult to conceive how the nobility of France could influence an election contested at such a distance. The affairs of Christianity in the East were at this time in a grievous condition. Several important towns had fallen into the hands of the Mohammedans. Many of the last defenders of the Cross had perished. One of the most illustrious grand-masters of the order had recently died. Syria was lost to the Christian arms, and the Templars and Hospitallers had taken refuge in Cyprus and Tortosa, whence they invoked the aid of the Holy See, the princes and people of Europe.

All Europe being engaged in great internal contests — monarchy and feudalism and the Church arrayed against each other — help was looked for in vain by the poor Christians of the East. Besides, the Cross had not fallen in Palestine without embittering numbers against the cause, leading many to say that men should not persist in a contest which God himself had abandoned. Jacques de Molay, however, had no sooner been put at the helm than he went forward with his task. He did not wait for succor from Europe, but endeavored to derive some benefit from the projects, of the Mogul Tartars of Persia against Egypt and Syria; so that in the spring of 1299, when the grand khan assembled a powerful force, Jacques de Molay commanded one of the  wings of the Tartar army. With the troops confided to him he invaded Syria, and subsequently, under the conduct of the Tartar general, recovered Jerusalem from the infidels. This unexpected event was received with delight by the Christian world. The Mogul Tartars, counselled doubtless by some of the Christian chiefs, sent messengers to Europe, to the pope and the kings of France and England, urging them to engage in a new crusade, which should strike a final blow at the Mohammedan power in the East. But the Tartar messengers had scarcely returned before reverses and treason had destroyed the army of the grand khan.

Jerusalem was lost in 1300, and the Templars under Jacques de Molay were obliged to retire to the island of Tortosa, near Tripoli, whence they could simply watch and harass the movements of the enemy. But in 1302 they were finally surprised and defeated, and the grand-master, with those that remained of the order, took refuge in Cyprus, now and then renewing the contest by sudden incursions upon the Mohammedans. The brother and successor of the grand khan still looked for aid from Europe, and even approached the pope, but the replies were evasive. Philip IV, in his attempt to check the feudal power and all ecclesiastical control, feared that the papacy might recover, in an institution like that of the Temple, the military force it needed to defend its theocracy. He dreaded leaving to the nobility an order so entirely filled with its members and benefits, and an organized constitution as a means of rallying and defence; for the Templars had become in almost every kingdom of the West a formidable republic, governed by their own laws, animated by the closest corporate spirit, under the severest internal discipline, and an all-pervading organization; independent alike of the civil power and of the spiritual hierarchy; possessing fifteen thousand of the bravest and best-trained soldiers in the world, armed and accoutred in the most splendid fashion of the time, ready at the summons of the grand-master to embark on any service, their one aim being the aggrandizement of the order. Philip, fearing the strength and the wealth of the order, claiming allegiance only to the pope, as the supreme head of the Church, and greatly desirous of possessing their lands, munitions, arms, ships, and treasures, determined upon its destruction; but, lest his influence might be overpowered in an open contest, he resolved to make the pope his instrument.

A new crusade, he saw clearly, would only revive religious passions favorable to the Holy See, and render necessary, inviolable, more important, and more powerful still, these soldier-monks; consequently Philip promptly opposed the opening of a new crusade. June 6, 1306, Clement V summoned the grand-masters of the Templars and  Hospitallers to Europe, under pretext of consulting them in regard to the proposed crusade, and some previously advanced plans for uniting the two orders of Templars and Hospitallers. Promptly Molay returned to Europe, but the manner in which he came was not of a nature to stifle the ambitious designs of his enemies. With sixty of the most distinguished knights of the order and a vast amount of treasure, he made an ostentatious entry into Paris, August 1306, where he was received by the king with great courtesy. If De Molay had been of a less generous and unsuspicious character, he would have understood that every motive that influenced Philip was concentrated in great intensity against his order.

The grand- master, lulled into security by the apparent kindness of the French king, proceeded to Poitiers to pay his allegiance to the pope, and to present two memorials drawn up by himself, relative to the state of affairs in the East, and the projected union of the different existent military orders, which he opposed on the ground that by such act their power would only be augmented, and thus consequently provoke greater envy, of which even now there was more than enough; and, so far from suppressing prevailing jealousies among the knights, it would only embitter the strife among the brethren, and cause more frequent collisions. He begged the pope to examine into the sinister rumors which had spread abroad concerning the faith, morals. and secret mysteries of the order; for they had been accused of treachery, murder, idolatry, Islamism, and many other villainies; and demanded a rigid investigation, in order that if proved innocent, they might receive public absolution; if culpable, suffer condemnation. Under these pretexts, Philip strongly urged the pope to proceed against the Temple, and the latter, finally yielding to the king's importunity and threats, inaugurated the investigation, and sent to Philip for all possible information. Philip affected to take the request for information as a permission to proceed against the order himself.

Accordingly, on October 13, 1307, every Templar in the realm was made a prisoner. Jacques de Molay was seized in the house of the Temple, and summoned before the Inquisition of France, October 24, 1307. According to the report of his interrogatory, he made full confession of having denied Christ, and of having been guilty of other crimes. Confession was bribed out of some by offers of indulgence; wrung from others by the dread of torture, or by actual torture. The pope, enraged by the king's liberty, suspended the powers of the inquisitor, and forbade the bishops to continue their proceedings against the Temple. Philip IV simulated ready and complete submission; but at the same time he urged all the princes of Europe to  follow his example, endeavored to embitter the French against the Templars, and finally invented a circular letter from the grand-master to all the brethren and subjects in prison, advising them to acknowledge the crimes he himself had confessed. August 20, 1308, Jacques de Molay himself was subjected to a second examination by a special commission of cardinals and agents of the king; but as the commission proved very treacherous in their conduct towards him, he finally tired of the proceedings, and demanded that he be brought before the Roman pontiff; “for,” said he, “to the pope alone belongs the power of judging the grand- master of the order, and to his judgment I refer.” March 2, 1310, he was again summoned by the papal commission, but persisted in his determination to be judged by the pope only.

While the papal commission was still in session, Philip IV, tiring of their slow progress, and fearing that the power of the Temple was not yet crushed, summoned fifty-four more of the Templars before a council at Paris, and caused them to be burned the same day, May 11, 1310. The pope now became anxious for his own authority, appointed a new commission to hasten a decision in the case of Jacques de Molay, and he was by it condemned to death. Just as the fatal sentence was about to be pronounced, De Molay arose, and in a calm, clear voice thus addressed his judges: “Before heaven and earth, on the verge. of death, where the least falsehood bears like an intolerable weight upon the soul, I protest that we have richly deserved death, not on account of any heresy or sin of which we ourselves or our order have been guilty, but because we have yielded, to save our lives, to the seductive words of the pope and of the king; and so by our confessions brought shame and ruin on our blameless, holy, and orthodox brotherhood.” The cardinals stood confounded, the people could not repress a profound sympathy, and the assembly was hastily broken up to meet another day. But the king, who had been informed of all, ordered the grand-master to be burned immediately. He was led forth to the flames, a feeble old man, loaded with fetters, bent and whitened by age and captivity. He sustained his sufferings with perfect firmness and resolution, protesting to the end in favor of the innocence of his order. and perishing bravely — the last champion of Christianity against the Orient, the last liberator of Jerusalem, the last grand-master of the Temple. See Porter, History of the Knights of Malta, 1:180, 190 sq.; Sutherland, Achievements of the Knights of Malta, volume 1, chapter 9; Milman, History of Latin Christianity, volume 6, book 12, chapter 1 and 2; Hase, Church History, page 319; and especially the excellent article in Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 35:79 sq, (J.P.L.)

## Molcho, Solomon, Or Diogo Pires[[@Headword:Molcho, Solomon, Or Diogo Pires]]

             as he was called when a Marrano or Neo-Christian, was born about A.D. 1501 in Portugal. He not only received a liberal education, which enabled him to hold a state office as “escrivao aos ouvidores na casa da supplicanao,” but was probably also made acquainted in his childhood with Hebrew and Talmudic lore, as he is the author of a Hebrew work and a synagogal poem written in the Aramaic language (comp. Zunz, Literaturgesch. d. synagog. Poesie, page 534). About this time a man named David Rueben appeared in the court of the king of Portugal. He announced that he had come from India, and was sent by his brother, the king of the Jews, to propose an alliance in order to recover the Holy Land from the sultan Solyman. Many of the Neo-Christians believed in him. He passed through Spain, where he made many proselytes; into France to Avignon, and into Italy. He inscribed banners with the holy name of God. In many cities — Bologna, Ferrara, Mantuianumbers believed that he was commissioned to be the leader of the army of Israel. He even had an interview with pope Clement VII. Coming to Portugal, Molcho sought his acquaintance in order to find out whether his visionary revelations, which had all Messianic background, were in harmony with, Reuben's commission. The latter treated Molcho very coolly, and told him that his military commission had nothing to do with his cabalistic mysticism, being himself no adept in this branch of science. Molcho, however, misunderstood Reuben, believing as he did that this prince and would be Messiah would have nothing to do with him Since he had not the seal of the covenant, and he thus apostatized to Judaism, performing the rite of circumcision himself, which operation became to him the cause of a severe sickness. When Reuben was acquainted with this fact he was very angry, and feared that he might be suspected as the author of Molcho's apostasy. The Jews relate that Molcho was utterly ignorant while he was a Christian; but immediately on his circumcision “the Lord gave him wisdom, and he became wiser than all men in a very short time, and many wondered at him.” His preaching was of such an inspiring eloquence that the Jews believed it to be dictated by angels. He preached Judaism before kings; even pope Clement VII admitted him to an audience, and gave him the privilege to dwell wherever he would. Solomon Molcho seems to have been permitted to pour out his apocalyptic rhapsodies (pages of them may be read in the Chronicles of R. Joseph ben-Joshua ben-Meir, the Sephardi, 2:152-189) without restraint. Bishops and princes the bishop of Ancona  and the duke of Urbino, Francesco Maria della Rovere I from credulity, curiosity, or compassion, protected him against his enemies.

Two of his prophecies, inundations of the Tiber in Rome and earthquakes in Lisbon, could hardly fail of accomplishment (the former took place October 8, 1530; the latter, January 26, 1531). But he came to a woeful end. He attempted to convert the emperor Charles V. at Ratisbon; but Charles was hard-hearted, and ordered him to be put in prison with his friend Reubeni, whom he met after he was obliged to leave Rome. When peace was restored with Solyman the Turk, the emperor betook himself to Italy, and both prisoners were conveyed to Mantua. Molcho, who was an object rather for a lunatic asylum than the stake, was condemned to be burned as an apostate Christian. “With a bridle on his jaw-bones to prevent his speaking to the people,” as the Jewish chronicle relates, “they brought him out, and all the city was moved about him, and the fire burned before him. And one of the nobles of the emperor said, ‘Take the bridle from between his teeth, for I have a message unto him from the king;' and they did so. And he said unto him, “The emperor hath sent me unto thee, saying,” If thou turn from thy ways, shalt thou not be accepted and live?' And he will maintain thee, and thou shalt be before him; and if not, evil is determined against thee.' But he answered like a saint, like an angel of God, and said, ‘Because I walked in that religion, my heart is bitter and grieved; and now what is good in your sight do, and my soul shall return unto the Father's house as in its youth, for then it will be better with it than now.' He was cast into the fire and the Lord smelled the sweet savor, and took to him his spotless soul, and is with him as one brought up with him, rejoicing always before him.” Molcho died in November or December 1532; yet there were Jews who believed that the fire had no power over him, and that he departed — God only knows whither. Comp. Basnage, Histoire des Juifs (Engl. translation), page 722; Lindo, History of the Jews in Spain and Portugal, page 361 sq.; Milman, History of the Jews, 3:367 sq.; The Chronicles of Rabbi Joseph ben-Joshua ben-Meir, the Sephardi (transl. from the Hebrew into English by C.H.F. Bialloblotzky, London, 1836), 2:150-192; Jost, Geschichte d. Judenthums u. s. Sekten, 3:125; Kayserling, Geschichte der Juden in Portugal, page 176 sq., 192 sq.; Cassel, Leitfadenfur judische Geschichte und Literatur (Berlin, 1872), page 92 sq.; Finrst, Biblioth. Judaica, 2:387 Gratz, Geschichte der Juden, 9:264-285; the same in Frankel's Monatsschrift (1856), pages 205, 241, 260 sq. (B.P.)

## Moldavia and Wallachia[[@Headword:Moldavia and Wallachia]]

             two states forming the so-called Danubian Principalities, but since December 23, 1861, united under one prince and administration, are now officially bearing the name Roumania. We treat them unitedly in this article, as this is the custom generally among geographers.

1. MOLDAVIA (Ger. Moldau, Turk. Bogdan or KeraIslak) is bounded on the N. and E. by Russia, on the S. by Wallachia and the Danube, and on the W. by the Austrian empire. Greatest length from north-west to south-east, 280 miles; greatest breadth, 128 miles; area, 20,118 square miles; population about 1,300,000. The country forms, geographically, part of the great undulating pastoral plains or steppes of South Russia, except towards the ‘west, where spurs from the Carpathians give it a somewhat mountainous character. It is watered by the Pruth, the Sereth, and the Danube, and is almost everywhere fertile. The forests of Moldavia are also of great extent and importance. But the riches of the country consist mainly in its cattle and horses, of which immense numbers are reared on its splendid and far-stretching pastures. Swine and sheep are also numerous; and the rearing of bees, owing to the multitude of lime-trees, is extensively carried on. The great plagues of the land are locusts and earthquakes. Minerals and precious metals are said to be abundant, but they have not as yet been worked. The capital is Jassy, but the great centre of trade is Galatz. The principal exports are wool, lambskins, hides, feathers, maize, tar;: tallow, honey, leeches, cattle, and salt (in blocks); the imports are chiefly the manufactured products of Western Europe.

2. WALLACHIA, the larger of the united Danubian Principalities, is bounded on the N. by the Austrian empire and Moldavia, on the E. and S. by the Danube; and on the W. by. the Austrian empire and the Danube. Length from the western frontier to Cape Kaliakra on the Black Sea, 305 miles; greatest breadth, 130 miles; area, 27,930 square miles; population about 4.000,000. The greater part of Wallachia is quite flat; but in the north, where it borders on Hungary and Transylvania, it gradually rises up into a great mountain-wall, impassable save in five places. It is destitute of wood throughout almost its whole extent, and (especially along the banks of the Danube) is covered with marshy swamps miles upon miles in breadth. The principal river flowing through the country is the Aluta; which joins the Danube at Nikopol. The climate is extreme; the summer heats are intense, while in winter the land lies under deep snow for four  months. The soil is rich, and would leave nothing to be desired, were it not for the ravages of locusts and the calamitous summer droughts. The principal products are corn, maize, millet, wine, flax, tobacco, and olive- oil. The vast treeless heaths afford sustenance to great herds of cattle, sheep, and horses. As in Moldavia, agriculture is an important branch of industry. In minerals — especially gold, silver, copper, and rock-salt — the soil is rich, but only the last of these is extensively worked. The imports and exports are the same as in Moldavia. In both countries they might be more than doubled, as scarcely one half of the soil, which is said to be everywhere good, is under cultivation.

3. History. — In ancient times what now constitutes Roumania formed an important part of Dacia. At the period of the migration of nations, and in the following centuries, it was the scene of the struggles between the Gothic, Hunnic, Bulgarian, and Slavic races. who left their traces among the Romanized Dacian inhabitants, and helped to form that composite people, the modern Wallachs, who in the 11th century were converted to the Christianity of the Eastern or Greek Church. Their incursions, however, frightfully devastated the country. In the 11th century the Kumans, a Turkish race, established in Moldavia a kingdom of their own. Two centuries later the great storm of Mongols broke over the land. It now fell into the hands of the Nogai Tartars, who left it utterly wasted, so that only in the forests and mountains was any trace left of the native Wallachian population. In the latter half of the 13th century a petty Wallach chief of Transylvania, Radu Negru of Fogarasch, entered Wallachia, took possession of a portion of the country, divided it among his nobles, founded a senate of twelve members and an elective monarchy, and gradually conquered the whole of Wallachia. Rather less than a century later (1354) a similar attempt, also successful, was made by a Wallach chief of the Hungarian Marmarosh, of the name of Bogdan, to repeople Moldavia. In the beginning of the 16th century both principalities placed themselves under the protection of the porte, and gradually the nobles or bovars lost the right of electing their own ruler, whose office was bought in Constantinople. After 1711 the Turks governed the countries by Fanariot princes, who in reality only farmed the revenues, enriched themselves, and impoverished the land. In 1802 the Russians wrested from Turkey the right of surveillance over the principalities. A great number of the nobles, through family marriages with the Fanariots, were now of Greek descent, the court tongue was Greek, and the religious and political sympathies of  the country were the same: hence the effort of the principalities in 1821 to emancipate themselves from Turkish authority, which was only the prelude to the greater and more successful struggle in Greece itself. In 1822 Russia forced Turkey to choose the princes or hospodars of Wallachia and Moldavia from natives, and not from the corrupt Greeks of Constantinople, and after 1829 to allow them to hold their dignity for life. The principalities were united, as has been already mentioned, under one ruler in 1858, and under one administration in 1861. In 1866 the Wallachians refused to endorse the reign of Cusa, and, with the consent of Turkey and the great Powers, prince Charles of Hohenzollern was called to govern the united principalities. He was the first to call the country Roumania. To this day (1875) he remains its ruler.

4. Social Condition. — The Roumanians, claiming to be the descendants of the ancient Dacians, betray that origin largely in their language, which is a Latin dialect, three fourths of the words being Latin (the Dacian has disappeared), the other fourth being made up of words indicating a Grecian, Gothic, Slavic, or Turkish origin. A Grammatica Daco-Romana was published by Johann. Alexi (Vienna, 1826), and a Historia Linguae Daco-Romance by Laurianus (Vienna, 1849). A large Latin-Romanic- Hungarian Dictionary was carefully executed by the bishop of Fogarasch, Joh. Bob (Klausenburg, 1839, 3 volumes). The nobles of the land generally speak French, and indeed — French ideas and customs are in favor with the Roumanians, particularly the young. There is no middle class. The common people, though very poor, are on the whole good-humored, frugal, sober, and cleanly; murder and larceny are almost unknown. Their dwellings, however, are, as may be supposed, of the most wretched description; composed chiefly of interlaced willow-withes, covered with mud, cane, and straw; and often, even in the large towns, they are only of mud; a cloak serves for a bed, and the whole house-furniture is comprised in a few kitchen utensils. The education of the country is not in a very forward condition, but promises under the present administration to take advanced ground. The trade of the country is largely in the hands of foreigners, especially Jews, who fare badly. Gypsy communities are an important element in the population; upwards of 150,000 of this mysterious race are serfs belonging to the rich boyars and the monasteries. In 1844 about 30,000 were emancipated, and settled in colonies in different parts of the land; they are ruled by a Bataf, or king, of their own choice, of  which every gypsy village has one: they call themselves Romnitschel or Romni.

5. Religion. —

(1) Ecclesiastical Status. — The established religion of “Roumania” is that of the Greek Church, but all forms of Christianity are tolerated, and their professors enjoy equal political rights. At the head of the Greek clergy stands a metropolitan archbishop chosen by the general assembly of the different estates, confirmed in his office by the prince, and serving 4,275,000 members. Every bishop is assisted by a council of clergy, and has a seminary for priests; the superintendent of the preaching clergy is the Proto-papa of the diocese. In Moldavia there are 1795 churches, 3268 priests, and 491 deacons; also 7622 married secular clergy and 60 monasteries, of which the richest is. that of Niamtz, with 1300 monks. In Wallachia there are 4171 churches (of which 2587 are wooden), 36,638 persons belonging to the families of married priests, 10,749 deacons, 9500 monks and nuns, and 202 monasteries and nunneries. The property belonging to the priesthood of the principalities is immense, and at present (1875) efforts are being made by the government to have it secularized. The Roumanians are very superstitious, and care little for human life. The catechism of their morals contains scarcely anything more than fasting and hospitality. They hate all foreigners except the Latin races, and are especially severe against the Jews, who are there in large numbers, and are invaluable for the commercial interests of the country. They number over 400,000. Public persecutions against Jews have continued until very recently, and in consequence the great powers have threatened armed intervention. The United States has pursued a humane policy in selecting a Jewish representative.

(2) Evangelism. — Christianity must have early made its way to these parts, and been strengthened during Gothic invasion. St. Nicetas, who flourished about 400, is regarded as the apostle of Roumania. The barbarians in part removed Christian influences, and in 861 Cyril attempted anew the Christianizing of the people, especially the Bulgarians. In consequence the Slavonian language secured a foothold, and in the conflict between Constantinople and Rome this Danubian country sided with the Eastern Church. Rome made repeated efforts to regain her hold, but ineffectually. For political reasons princes now and then favored Rome, but in the 15th century, when it became a dependency of the Turks, the Greek  Church gained absolute adherence. In the days of the Reformation Wallachia remained unmoved, but in Moldavia — John Heraclides (Jacob Basilius), an adventurer who had gained the throne, favored Protestantism (1561-63). Twenty years later the prince was again Protestant-Janked Sass, “the Lutheran” (1584). From that time but little was heard for Protestantism, and even today, though ruled by a Prussian prince, there is only 1 Protestant for 6 Armenians, 50 Romanists, 1450. Greek Catholics, and 280 Jews. Protestant societies exist at Bucharest (one Lutheran and one Reformed), at Crajona, in Wallachia, and at Jassy and Galatz, in Moldavia. Besides these, Protestants live scattered in different places. See Michel de Koyalmtchan, Histoire de la Valachie, de la Moldavie, et des Valaques Transdanubiens; the Reports of the Gustavus Adolphus Society, St. John, in Lond. Acad. August 15, 1874, page 181; Prof. Wells, in Meth. Qu, Rev. January 1873, art. 1; Stanley, East. Ch. page 104.

## Moldenhawer, Johann Heinrich Daniel[[@Headword:Moldenhawer, Johann Heinrich Daniel]]

             a German theologian, was born at Halle, October 29, 1709. He was educated at the “Collegium Fridericianum,” and later at the University of Konigsberg, where he was a diligent student in ancient languages, especially the Greek and Hebrew. He was appointed in 1733 deacon at Kreuzburg, and in 1737 to the Sackheinsche Kirche at Konigsberg, but had very many difficulties in this new position, and did not live in harmony with his colleagues. He therefore gladly accepted a call to the University of Konigsberg as professor of divinity in 1744. He published there in 1745 his Introductio in libros sacros Veteris et Novi Testamenti, of which Horne says that few treatises of the kind are more useful than this. He shows the canonical authority of the Bible in general, and treats of the author, time of writing, argument, scope, chronology, etc., of each book in particular. He was appointed in 1756 ecclesiastical counsellor, and also librarian of the Wallenrodsche library. He received a call in 1765 as minister to Hamburg, where he died, April 8,1790. Besides several contributions to journals, he published Diss. I et II Acta apostoli Pauli chronologiae digesta (Konigsberg, 1744, 4to): — Einleitung in die Alterthumer der Egypten, Juden, Griechen, und Romer (ibid. 1754, 8vo): — Grundliche Erlauterungen der schweren Stellen der heiligen Bucher des neuen Testaments (Leipzig und Konigsberg, 1763-70, 4 volumes): — Betrachtungen uber das Vaterunser (Hamburg, 1765, 8vo): — Huptinhalt der Betrachtungen uber die Heilswahrheiten, welche in den Montags-  Betstunden in der Domkurche 1766-68 vorgetragen worden sind (Hamburg, 1768, 8vo): — Der Brief Pauli an die Romer, nach dem Grundtext ubersetzt, nebst Eriklarungen und Amerkungen (ibid. 1770, gr. 8vo). He also translated and wrote commentaries on all the most important books of the New Testament. He was likewise the author of Ausfuhrliche Prufung des funften Fragments aus der Wolfenbittelschen Bibliothek von der Auferstehung Jesu durch welche zugleich die Auferstehungsgeschichte Christi bestatigt und erlautert wird (Hamburg, 1779, 8vo): Ausfuhrliche Prufung des dritten Fragments aus desr Wolfenbuttelschen Bibliothek. von dem Durchgange der Israeliten durch's rothe Meer (ibid. 1779, 8vo): — Ausfuhrliche Prufung des zweiten Fragments aus der Wolfenbiittelschen Bibliothek von der Unmoglichkeit einer Offenbarung, die alle Menschen auf eine gegrindete Art glauben konnen (ibid. 1782, gr. 8vo): — Der Hauptzweck des Leidens und Sterbens Jesu (Kothen, 1787, 8vo). See Doring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands, 2:557-62.

## Mole[[@Headword:Mole]]

             is the rendering in the Auth. Vers. of the Heb. תַּנְשֶׁמֶת, tinshe'meth, in Lev 11:30, where, however, it probably signifies some species of the lizard tribe; but in Lev 11:18; Deu 14:16, it is rendered “swan,” where it evidently refers to some kind of bird. It thus appears to denote two very different kinds of animal, but in neither case the mole. SEE CHAMELEON; SEE SWAN. The mole is thought to be represented by the Heb. חֹלֶד, cho'led, rendered “weasel” in Lev 11:29. This is an animal very abundant in Palestine. SEE WEASEL. The word elsewhere occurs only in the difficult expression, Isa 2:20, לִחְפֹּר פֵּרוֹת, lachphor' peroth' (if regarded as two words, perhaps, to the hole of the rats or burrowers, Sept. τοῖς ματαίοις,Vulg. talpas, Auth. Vers. “to the moles”), which Gesenius (Comment. ad loc.) thinks should be pointed as one word, לִחֲפִרְפֵּרוֹה, lachapharperoth', indicating an animal, חֲפִרְפֵּרָה, chapharperah', so called from digging into the walls of houses, probably the rat, a creature common in every habitable part of the world.

Many scholars “consider the ἀσπάλαξ of the Greeks to be the creature intended by at least the first of the above Hebrew words. Whether this was what modern zoologists would call a mole is, however, rather doubtful  Aristotle, in his history of the aspalax, evidently derived from personal and careful examination, describes it as absolutely blind. Now the eyes of our common mole (Talpa Europea), though they are very minute, and so imbedded in the fur as to be readily overlooked by a cursory examiner, are distinctly open, and could not escape the detection of so accurate a physiologist as Aristotle Hence it has been supposed that the aspalax could not have been a Talpa; and another animal has been found to inhabit the east of Europe and west of Asia, which, while possessing much of the form, and even the peculiar structure of the moles, together with their burrowing powers, is absolutely and totally void of sight, the eyes, which are rudimentary specks, being completely covered by the skin of the face, which is quite imperforate. For a while it seemed certain that this was the creature intended; and accordingly the genus was technically named Aspalax by Olivier, the species receiving the appellation of typhlus..

But still more recently a species of true mole, now called Talpa cceca, has been discovered inhabiting Greece, in which the eves are as minute, and as useless, because as completely covered by the skin, as in the aspalax. As the aspalax is larger and more conspicuous than the blind talpa, which, moreover, appears to be rare, on the assumption that the former is the tinshemeth we here devote a few words to its appearance and habits. It belongs to the family Muridce among the Rodents, and is in fact a rat under the guise of a mole. Hence it has been called the mole-rat. The animal is from eight inches to a foot in length, with a great round head, no external ears or eyes, the nostrils opening beneath, the limbs very short, with strong nails formed for digging; the body clothed with a short, thick, soft fur of an ashy hue, and the naked skin of the muzzle, white. It is particularly abundant in the south of Russia, excavating the surface of the vast steppes or level plains, and forming long burrows beneath the turf, with many lateral ramifications. The object of its pursuit is not earthworms or subterraneous larvae, which form. the prey of the true mole; for the mole- rat is exclusively a vegetable feeder, and it drives its runs solely for bulbs and roots, especially for the fleshy root of an umbelliferous plant, the chorophyllum. At frequent intervals the burrow comes to the surface of the soil, and here hillocks are cast up a couple of yards in circumference, and of proportionate height. Altogether its work closely imitates that of the mole, but on a somewhat larger scale. It is said to work energetically and rapidly, and on the approach of an enemy, of which it is warned probably by an acute sense of smell, it instantly turns downward and penetrates the earth perpendicularly.

It is said to devour corn, and to gather large  quantities, which it lays up in its deeper galleries for winter supply, in this respect agreeing with many other of the Muridce. Like the mole, it can proceed forward or backward in its burrow with equal celerity. During the early hours of the day a pair may often be seen near the entrance of a hole, basking in the sun, but instantly disappearing on alarm. The least noise excites it; though it cannot see, it lifts its head to listen, in a menacing attitude, and if its retreat is cut off, it becomes animated with rage and ferocity, snorting and gnashing its teeth, and biting severely, yet uttering no cry, even when wounded. The superstitious peasants of the Ukraine believe that miraculous healing powers are communicated to the hand which has suffocated one of these creatures. The specimens which have been brought from Syria are smaller, and may possibly possess specific distinctness. Hasselquist testifies to their abundance on the plains of Sharon. He had never seen any ground so cast up by moles as in the region between Ramah and Jaffa. The molehills were scarcely a yard apart (Trav., page 120).

“The other term, chaphorperoth, rendered ‘moles' in Isa 2:20, is rather a descriptive periphrase than an appellative. It might be literally rendered ‘the digholes.' The Sept. has adopted a different construction: ‘his idols... which he had made for the purpose of bowing down to the vanities, to the bats.' Perhaps the words may be taken generically, of any creatures which burrow in ruined and desolate places. Travellers describe the ruins of Babylon ‘as perforated throughout with cavities which are inhabited by doleful creatures.' Buckingham speaks of the ‘dens of wild beasts,' the ‘quantities of porcupine quills' in the cavities, and the numbers of bats and owls (Trav. 2:30). ‘These souterrains,' observes Sir Robert Ker Porter, ‘are now the refuge of jackals and other savage animals' (Trav. 2:342). ‘The mound,' says major Keppel, ‘was full of large holes... strewed with the carcasses and skeletons of animals recently killed' (Nar. 1:180). The total and final degradation of idols, and their removal out of sight and remembrance, we may understand by the phrases employed.”

## Mole, Francois Rene[[@Headword:Mole, Francois Rene]]

             a French comedian, demands our notice for his impious conduct during the great French Revolution. Mole, who was born at Paris in 1734, had made his debut on the stage in 1754, and gained great notoriety as an actor after 1760. He had a kind heart and lovely disposition, and therefore became a favorite with all who knew him. But he was as blasphemous as he was kind-hearted; and, without a hope of a hereafter, he sought openly to bring  reproach upon the cause of God. During the progress of the Revolution he became an associate of the Jacobins, and impiously officiated in the church of St. Roch as the priest of the goddess of Reason. He died in 1802.

## Molech[[@Headword:Molech]]

             (Heb. Mo'lek, מֹלֶךְ, king, always with the art. הִמֹּלֶךְ, except in 1Ki 11:7; Sept. ἄρχων in Lev 18:21; Lev 20:2-4; Μελχών v.r. βασιλεύς in 1Ki 11:7; Μολὸχ ὁ βασιλεύς in Jer 32:35; and simply Μολόχ in 2Ki 23:10, as Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion everywhere render; Vulg. aMoloch), called also MOLOCH (Amo 5:25; Act 7:43), MILCOU (1Ki 1:5; 1Ki 1:33; 2Ki 23:13), MALCHAM (Zep 1:5), and MELCOMI (marg. Jer 49:1; Jer 49:3, text “their king”), is chiefly found in the Old Testament as the national god of the Ammonites, to whom children were sacrificed by fire.

1. The Name. — The root of the word Molech is the same as that of מֶלֶךְ, me'lek, or “king,” and hence he is identified with Malcham (“ their king”) in 2Sa 12:30; Zep 1:5, the title by which he was known to the Israelites, as being invested with regal honors in his character as a tutelary deity, the lord and master of his people. Our translators have recognised this identity in their rendering of Amo 5:26 (where “your Moloch” is literally “your king,” as it is given in the margin), following the Greek in the speech of Stephen, in Act 7:43. Dr. Geiger, in accordance with his theory that the worship of Molech was far more widely spread among the Israelites than appears at first sight from the Old Testament, and that many traces are obscured in the text, refers “the king,” in Isa 30:33, to that deity: “For Tophet is ordained of old; yea, for the king it is prepared.” Again, of the Israelitish nation, personified as an adulteress, it is said,” Thou wentest to the king with oil” (Isa 57:9); Amaziah, the priest of Bethel, forbade Amos to prophesy there, “for it is the king's chapel” (Amo 7:13); and in both these instances Dr. Geiger would find a disguised reference to the worship of Molech (Urschrift, etc., pages 299- 308).

Traces of the root from which Molech is derived are to be found in the Milichus, Aialica, and Malcander of the Phoenicians; with the last mentioned may be compared Adrammelech, the fire-god of Sepharvaim. The fire-god Molech, as the tutelary deity of the children of Ammon, was  essentially identical with the Moabitish Chemosh. The Hebrew form, as an undoubted proper name, likewise occurs with some variety, as seen above. Solomon had in his harem many women of the Ammonitish race, who “turned away his heart after other gods,” and, as a consequence of their influence, high places to Molech, “the abomination of the children of Ammon,” were built on “the mount that is facing Jerusalem” — one of the summits of Olivet (1Ki 11:7). Two verses before, the same deity is called MILCOM, and from the circumstance of the two names being distinguished in 2Ki 23:10; 2Ki 23:13, it has been inferred by Movers, Ewald, and others, that the two deities were essentially distinct. Movers (Phonicier. 1:358) is probably correct in regarding the latter as merely an Aramaic pronunciation. It is true that in the later history of the Israelites the worship of Molech is connected with the valley of Hinnom, while the high place of Milcom was on the Mount of Olives, and that no mention is made of human sacrifices to the latter. But it seems impossible to resist the conclusion that in 1 Kings 11, Milcom the abomination of the Ammonites,” in 1Ki 11:5, is the same as “Molech the abomination of the children of Ammon,” in 1Ki 11:7.

To avoid this Movers contends, not very convincingly, that the latter verse is by a different hand. Be this as it may, in the reformation carried out by Josiah, the high place of Milcom, on the right hand of the mount of corruption, and Tophet in the valley of the children of Hinnom were defiled, that “no man might make his son or his daughter to pass through the fire to Molech” (2Ki 23:10; 2Ki 23:13). In the narrative of Chronicles these are included under the general term “Baalim,” and the apostasy of Solomon is not once alluded to. Tophet soon appears to have been restored to its original uses, for we find it again alluded to, in the reign of Zedekiah, as the scene of child-slaughter and sacrifice to Molech (Jer 32:35). Kimchi, following the Targum, takes the word Milcom as an appellative, and not as a proper name, while with regard to sikkuth (סכּוּת, A.V. “tabernacle”) he holds the opposite opinion. His note is as follows: “Sikkuth is the name of an idol; and (as for) malkekem he speaks of a star which was made an idol by its name, and he calls it ‘king,' because they thought it a king over them, or because it was a great star in the host of heaven, which was as a king over his host; and so ‘to burn incense to the queen of heaven,' as I have explained in the book of Jeremiah.” Gesenius compares with the “tabernacle” of Molech the sacred tent of the Carthaginians mentioned by Diodorus (20:65). Rosenmiller, and after him Ewald, understood by sikkuth a pole or stake on which the figure of the idol was placed. It was more probably a kind of palanquin in which  the image was carried in processions, a custom which is alluded to in Isa 46:1; Epist. of Jeremiah 4 (Selden, De Dis Syr. synt. 1, c. 6).

There remains to be noticed one passage (2Sa 12:31) in which the Hebrew written text has מִלְכֵּן, malken, while the marginal reading is מִלְבֵּן, malben, which is adopted by our translators in their rendering “brick-kiln.” Kimchi explains malken as “the place of Molech,” where sacrifices were offered to him, and the children of Ammon made their sons to pass through the fire. Milcom and Malken, he says, are one. On the other hand, Movers, rejecting the points, reads מִלְכָּן, malkan, “our king,” which he explains as the title by which he was known to the Ammonites.

2. Biblical Account of this Deity. — There is some difficulty in ascertaining at what period the Israelites became acquainted with this idolatry; yet four reasons render it probable that it' was before the time of Solomon, the date usually assigned for its introduction. First, Molech appears — if not under that name, yet under the notion that we attach to it — to have been a principal god of the Phoenicians and Canaanites, whose other idolatries the Israelites confessedly adopted very early. Secondly, there are some arguments which tend to connect Molech with Baal, and, if they be tenable, the worship of Molech might be essentially as old as that of the latter. Thirdly, if we assume, as there is much apparent ground for doing, that, wherever human sacrifices are mentioned in the Old Testament, we are to understand them as being offered to Molech — the apparent exception of the gods of Sepharvaim being only a strong evidence of their identity with him — then the remarkable passage in Eze 20:26 (comp. Eze 20:31) clearly shows that the Israelites sacrificed their firstborn by fire when they were in the wilderness. Fourthly, the rebuke contained in Amo 5:26, as quoted in Act 7:43, appears to imply that some idol similar to this was secretly worshipped as early as the exodus. SEE CHIUN.

Moreover, those who ascribe the Pentateuch to Moses will recognise both the early existence of the worship of this god and the apprehension of its contagion in that express prohibition of his bloody rites which is found in the Mosaic law. The offender who devoted his offspring to Molech was to be put to death by stoning; and in case the people of the land refused to inflict upon him this judgment, Jehovah would himself execute it, and cut him off from among his people (Lev 18:21; Lev 20:2-5).  Nevertheless, it is for the first time directly stated that Solomon erected a high place for Molech on the Mount of Olives (1Ki 11:7); and from that period his worship continued uninterruptedly there, or in Tophet, in the valley of Hinnom, until Josiah defiled both places (2Ki 23:10; 2Ki 23:13). Jehoahaz, however, the son and successor of Josiah, again “did what was evil in the sight of Jehovah, according to all that his fathers had done” (2Ki 23:32). The same broad condemnation is made against the succeeding kings, Jehoiakim, Jehoiachin, and Zedekiah; and Ezekiel, writing during the captivity, says, “Do ye, by offering your gifts, and by making your sons pass through the fire, pollute yourselves with all your idols until this day, and shall I be inquired of by you?” (20:31). After the restoration, all traces of this idolatry disappear.

Molech, “the king,” was the lord and master of the Ammonites; their country was his possession (Jer 49:1), as Moab was the heritage of Chemosh; the princes of the land were the princes of Malcham (Jer 49:3; Amo 1:15). His priests were men of rank (Jer 49:3), taking precedence of the princes. So the priest of Hercules at Tyre was second to the king (Justin, 18:4, § 5), and like Molech, the god himself, Baal Chamman, is Melkart, “the king of the city.” The priests of Molech, like those of other idols, were called Chemarim (2Ki 23:5; Hos 10:5; Zep 1:4).

Most of the Jewish interpreters, Jarchi (on Leviticus 17:21), Kimchi, and Maimonides (Mor. Neb. 3:38) among the number, say that in the worship of Molech the children were not burned, but made to pass between two burning pyres, as a purificatory rite. But the allusions to the actual slaughter are too plain to be mistaken, and Aben Ezra, in his note on Lev 18:21, says that “to cause to pass through” is the same as “to burn.” “They sacrificed their sons and their daughters unto devils, and shed innocent blood, the blood of their sons and of their daughters, whom they sacrificed unto the idols of Canaan” (Psa 106:37-38). In Jer 7:31, the reference to the worship of Molech by human sacrifice is still more distinct: “They have built the high places of Tophet... to burn their sons and their daughters in the fire,” as “burnt-offerings unto Baal,” the sun-god of Tyre, with whom, or in whose character, Molech was worshipped (Jer 19:5). Compare the statements in Deu 12:31; Eze 16:20-21; Eze 23:37; the last two of which may also be adduced to show that the victims were slaughtered before they were burned. But the most remarkable passage is that in 2Ch 28:3, in which the wickedness of Ahaz is described: “Moreover, he burned incense in the valley of the son of Hinnom, and burned (וִיִּבְעֵר) his children in the fire, after the abominations of the nations whom Jehovah had driven out before the children of Israel.” Now, in the parallel narrative of 2Ki 16:3, instead of וִיִּבְעֵר, “and he burned,” the reading is הֶעֵַביר, “he made to pass through,” and Dr. Geiger suggests that the former may be the true reading, of which the latter is an easy modification, serving as a euphemistic expression to disguise the horrible nature of the sacrificial rites. But it is more natural to suppose that it is an exceptional instance, and that the true reading is וִיִּעֲבֵרthan to assume that the other passages have been intentionally altered. We may infer from the expression, “after the abominations of the nations whom Jehovah had driven out before the children of Israel,” that the character of the Molech-worship of the time of Ahaz was essentially the same. as that of the old Canaanites, although Movers maintains the contrary.

The sacrifice of children is said by Movers to have been not so much an expiatory as a purificatory rite, by which the victims were purged from the dross of the body and attained union with the deity. In support of this he quotes the myth of Baaltis or Isis, whom Malcander, king of Byblus, employed as nurse for his child. Isis suckled the infant with her finger, and each night burned whatever was mortal in its body. When Astarte, the mother, saw this she uttered a cry of terror, and the child. was thus deprived of immortality (Plutarch, Is. and Os. chapter 16). But the sacrifice of Mesha, king of Moab, when, in despair at failing to cut his way through the overwhelming forces of Judah, Israel, and Edom, he offered up his eldest son a burnt-offering, probably to Chemosh, his national divinity, has, more of the character of an expiatory rite to appease an angry deity than of a ceremonial purification. Besides, the passage from Plutarch bears evident traces of Egyptian, if not of Indian influence.

The worship of Molech is evidently alluded to, though not expressly mentioned, in connection with star-worship and the worship of Baal in 2Ki 17:16-17; 2Ki 21:5-6, which seems to show that Molech, the flame god, and Baal, the sun-god, whatever their distinctive attributes, and whether or not the latter is a general appellation including the former, were worshipped with the same rites. Another argument might be drawn from Jer 3:24, in which Hab-bosheth, “the shame,” is said to have devoured their flocks and herds, their sons and daughters. Now, as  Bosheth is found, in the names Ishbosheth and Jerubbesheth, to alternate with Baal, as if it were only a contemptuous perversion of it, it would appear that human sacrifices are here again ascribed to Baal. Further, whereas Baal is the chief name under which we find the principal god of the Phoenicians in the Old Testament, and whereas only the two above- cited passages mention the human victims of Baal, it is remarkable that the Greek and Latin authors give abundant testimony to the human sacrifices which the Phoenicians and their colonies offered to their principal god, in whom the classical writers have almost always recognised their own Κρόνος and Saturn. Thus we are again brought to the difficulty, SEE BAAL, of reconciling Molech as Saturn with Baal as the sun and Jupiter. In reality, however, this difficulty is in part created by our association of classical with Shemitic mythology. When regarded apart from such foreign affinities, Molech and Baal may appear as the personifications of the two powers that give and destroy life, which early religions regarded as not incompatible phases of the same God of nature.

3. Information from other Sources. — Fire-gods appear to have been common to all the Canaanitish, Syrian, and other tribes, who worshipped the destructive element under an outward symbol, with the most inhuman rites. Among these were human sacrifices, purifications, and ordeals by fire, devoting of the first-born, mutilation, and vows of perpetual celibacy and. virginity. To this class of divinities belonged the old Canaanitish Molech, as well as Chemosh, the fire-god of Moab, Urotal, Dusares, Sair. and Thyandrites, of the Edomites and neighboring Arab tribes, and the Greek Dionysus, who were worshipped under the symbol of a rising flame of fire, which was imitated in the stone pillars erected in their honor (Movers, Phon. 1, c. 9). Tradition refers the origin of the fire-worship to Chaldaea. Abraham and his ancestors are said to have been fire- worshippers, and the Assyrian and Chaldaean armies took with them the sacred fire accompanied by the magi.

As the accounts of this idol and his worship found in the Old Testament are very scanty, the more detailed notices which Greek and Latin writers give of the bloody rites of the Phoenician colonies acquire peculiar value. Minter, has collected these testimonies with great completeness in his Religion der Karthager. Many of these notices, however, only describe late developments of the primitive rites. Thus the description of the image of Molech as a brazen statue, which was heated red hot, and in the outstretched arms of which the child was laid, so that it fell down into the  flaming furnace beneath — an account which is first found in Diodorus Siculus, as referring to the Carthaginian Κρόνος, but which was subsequently adopted by Jarchi and others — is not admitted by Movers to apply to the Molech of the Old Testament.

According to Jewish tradition, from what source we know not, the image of Molech was of brass, hollow within, and was situated without Jerusalem. Kimchi (on 2Ki 23:10) describes it as “set within seven chapels, and whoso offered fine flour, they open to him one of them; (whoso offered) turtle-doves or young pigeons, they open to him two: a lamb, they open to him three; a ram, they open to him four; a calf, they open to him five; an ox, they open to him six; and to whoever offered his son, they open to him seven. And his face was (that) of a calf, and his hands stretched forth like a man who opens his hands to receive (something) of his neighbor. And they kindled it with fire, and the priests took the babe and put it into the hands of Molech, and the babe gave up the ghost. And why was it called Tophet and Hinnom? Because they used to make a noise with drums (tophim), that the father might not hear the cry of his child and have pity upon him, and return to him. Hinnom, because the babe wailed (מגהם, menahem), and the noise of his wailing went up.” Another opinion (is that it was called) Hinnom, because the priests used to say — “May it profit (יהגה) thee! may it be sweet to thee! may it be of sweet savor to thee!”

All this detail is probably as fictitious as the etymologies are unsound, but we have nothing to supply its place. Selden conjectures that the idea of the seven chapels may have been borrowed from the worship of Mithra, who had seven gates corresponding to the seven planets, and to whom men and women were sacrificed (De Dis Syr. synt. 1, c. 6). Benjamin of Tudela describes the remains of an ancient Ammonitish temple which he saw at Gebal, containing a stone image richly gilt seated on a throne. On either side sat two female figures, and before it was an altar on which the Ammonites anciently burned incense and offered sacrifice (Early Travels in Palestine, page 79, Bohn). By these chapels Lightfoot explains the allusion in Amo 5:26; Act 7:43, to “the tabernacle of Molech;” “these seven chapels (if there be truth, in the thing) help us to understand what is meant by Molech's tabernacle, and seem to give some reason why in the prophet he is called Sikkuth, or the Covert God, because he was retired within so many Cancelli (for that word Kimchi useth) before one could come at him” (Comm. on Act 7:43). It was more probably a shrine or ark in which the figure of the god was  carried in processions, or which contained, as Movers conjectures, the bones of children who had been sacrificed, and were used for magical purposes. The crown of Malcham, taken by David at Rabbah, is said to have had in it a precious stone (a magnet, according to Kimchi), which is described by Cyril on Amos as transparent and like the day-star, whence Molech has groundlessly been identified with the planet Venus (Vossius, De Orig. Idol. 2, c. 5, page 331). A legend is told in Jerome's Quaestiones Hebraicae (1Ch 20:2) that, as it was unlawful for a Hebrew to touch anything of gold or silver belonging to an idol, Ittai the Gittite, who was a Philistine, snatched the crown from the head of Milcom, and gave it to David, who thus avoided the pollution.

Many instances of human sacrifices are found in ancient writers; which may be compared with the descriptions in the Old Testament of the manner in which Molech was worshipped. The Carthaginians, according to Augustine (De Civit. Dei, 7:19), offered children to Saturn, and by the Gauls even grown-up person? were sacrificed, under the idea that of all seeds the best is the human kind. Eusebius (Prcep. Ev. 4:16) collected from Porphyry numerous examples to the same effect, from which the following are selected. Among the Rhodians, a man was offered to Kronos on the 6th of July; afterwards a criminal condemned to death was substituted. The same custom prevailed in Salamis, but was abrogated by Duphilus, king of Cyprus, who substituted an ox. According to Manetho, Amosis abolished the same practice in Egypt at Heliopolis sacred to Juno. Sanchoniatho relates that the Phoenicians, on the occasion of any great calamity, sacrificed to Saturn one of their relatives. Istrus says the same of the Curetes, but the custom was abolished, according to Pallas, in the reign of Hadrian. At Laodicea a virgin was sacrificed yearly to Athene, and the Dumatii, a people ,of Arabia, buried a boy alive beneath the altar each year. Diodorus Siculus (20:14) relates that the Carthaginians, when besieged by Agathocles, tyrant of Sicily, offered in public sacrifice to Saturn 200 of their noblest children, while others voluntarily devoted themselves to the number of 300. His description of the statue of the god differs but slightly from that of Molech, which has been quoted. The image was of brass, with its hands outstretched towards the ground in such a manner that the child, when placed upon them, fell into a pit full of fire.

4. Literature.— E.F. Rivinus, De τεκνοθυσίᾷ Judaeorum (Lips. 1735); M. F. Cramer, De Molocho (Viteb. 1720); N.W. Schroeder, De tabernac. Molochi et stella dei Remphan (Marb. 1745); P. Viret, Des sacrifices  d'enfans faits ὰ Moloch (in his Vraye et fausse religion, 1682, page 599); H. Witsius, De cultu Molochi (in his Miscell. sacr. 1:485); J. Braun, Selecta Sacra, page 449 sq.; Deyling, Observ. sacr. 2:444 sq.; Dietzsch and Ziegra, in Ugolini Thesaur. volume 23; Movers, Phonic. page 65 et al.; Creuzer, Symbol. 2:431 sq.; Buttmann, Mythol. 2:28 sq.; Buddei Histor. eccl. V.T. 1:609; Hug, in the Freib. Zeitschr. 7:82 sq.; Gesenius, Thes. Heb. page 794; J.G. Kotch, Molocholatria Judaeorum (Lips. 1689); C.T. Zieger De immolatione liberorum (Viteb. 1684); Schwab, De Moloch et Remphan (Viteb. 1667; also in the Thes. Theol. Philol. 2:444 sq.). SEE SATURN.

## Molesworth, Sir William[[@Headword:Molesworth, Sir William]]

             an English statesman and celebrated writer on philosophy and political economy, was born in Surrey is 1810. He was at an early age ready for college and sent to Cambridge University, where, however, he failed to complete his course of study, because of a quarrel in which he engaged with one of his tutors, whom he even challenged to a duel. He finally continued his studies at the University of Edinburgh, and subsequently went abroad, and studied for some time in the high-schools of Germany. In 1831 he became prominent in the political affairs of his native country, and soon rose to distinction hi English parliamentary society. He also largely identified himself with literary labors, and in 1834 founded the London Review, shortly after merged into the Westminster Review, of which he was for many years an editorial associate with the late John Stuart Mill (q.v.). Sir William was also the intimate friend of James Mill and of Bentham, and was generally regarded as the parliamentary representative of the “philosophical Radicals.” He is, however, of particular interest to us as the student of Hobbes, whom Sir William greatly admired. He accumulated materials' for a life of the “Philosopher of Malmesbury,” which remain in MS. uncompleted. He was more successful in the publication of an edition of Hobbes's works — which he commenced in 1839, and carried to completion at a cost of many thousand pounds — consisting of a reprint of the entire miscellaneous and voluminous writings of Hobbes (Lond. 1842- 45, 11 volumes, 8vo), and constituting a valuable contribution to the republic of letters.

By Sir William's munificence the works of Hobbes were placed in most of the university and provincial public libraries. The publication, however, did him great disservice in public life, his opponents endeavoring to identify him with the freethinking opinions of Hobbes in  religion, as well as with the great philosopher's conclusions in favor of despotic government; yet he continued a parliamentary career of the greatest energy and usefulness. Indeed, even for his political connections he deserves our notice. He was the first to call attention to the evils connected with the transportation of criminals, and as chairman of a parliamentary committee brought to light all the horrors of the convict system, and by untiring labors remedied this abuse, as well as the disorders generally in colonial administration. In 1855 he became secretary of state for the colonies, and no doubt would have greatly distinguished himself by his wholesome measures, but he died soon after, October 22, 1855. The London Times called him the “liberator and regenerator of the colonial empire of Great Britain.” See English Cyclop. s.v.; Fraser's Magazine, 17:338; Lond. Gentleman's Magazine, 1845, part 2, page 645; Blackwood's Magazine, 38:506; 43:519; 44:625. SEE HOBBES. (J.H.W.)

## Molesworth, William Nassau[[@Headword:Molesworth, William Nassau]]

             a clergyman of the Church of England, was born at Millbrook, November 8, 1816. Graduating from Cambridge University in 1839, he took orders and was a rector the rest of his life. He died December 19, 1890. Among his works are, Religious Importance of Secular Instruction (1857): — Plain Lectures on Astronomy, England and France (1860): — History of the Reform Bill (1864): — System of Moral Philosophy (1867): — History of England (1871-73): — History of the Church of England (1882).

## Molhedites[[@Headword:Molhedites]]

             a name sometimes applied to the ASSASSINS SEE ASSASSINS (q.v.).

## Moli[[@Headword:Moli]]

             (Μοολί, Vulg. Moholi), given (1Es 8:47) instead of MALI SEE MALI (q.v.), the son of Levi (Ezr 8:18).

## Molid[[@Headword:Molid]]

             (Heb. Molid', מוֹלַיד., begetter; Sept. Μωλήδ v.r. Μωλάδ, Μωλίδ, and Μωήλ), the last named of the two sons of Abishur, of the tribe of Judah, by Abihail (1Ch 2:29). B.C. long after 1612.

## Molieres, Joseph Privat De[[@Headword:Molieres, Joseph Privat De]]

             a French philosophical writer of some note, was born at Tarascon in 1677. He became a member of the Congregation of the Oratory; but, having embraced the philosophical doctrines ,of Malebranche, he quitted the society after the death of Malebranche to devote himself wholly to physics and mathematics. He was made professor of philosophy at the royal college, and became a zealous advocate of the Cartesian views. He died May 12, 1742. His works range within the departments of mathematics, physical science, and philosophy. In the last-named field he published Philosophical Lectures (Paris, 1732, 4 volumes, 8vo). See Saveriens, Hist. des Philosophes Modernes, 5:217 sq.; Revue Chretienne, 1869, page 725.

## Molin, Laurent[[@Headword:Molin, Laurent]]

             a Swedish theologian, who flourished towards the close of the 17th century as a professor at Upsala, was born in 1657, and died Sept. 19, 1724. He published De Clavibus Veterum (Upsala, 1684, 4to): — De Origine Lucorum (ibid. 1689): — a translation of the Bible in the Swedish language (Stockholm, 1720, 12mo).

## Molina, Antonio de[[@Headword:Molina, Antonio de]]

             a Spanish theologian, was born at Villa-Nueva-de-los-Infantes, Castile, about the middle of the 16th century. He became a member of the Order of the Augustines, among whom he taught theology, and was promoted to the position of superior. The desire to lead a still more retired life led him to forsake his official connection, and take refuge in a small convent at Miraflores, where he died, September 21, 1612. He wrote many works which have a considerable reputation; among others, Instruccion de sacerdotes (Barcelona and Madrid). This book had already passed through seven editions when it was translated into Latin by P. Nicolas Jassenboy (Anvers, 1618, 8vo). There existed also a French (1639), an English (1652), and an Italian version: — Exercicios espirituales de las excelencias provecho (Burgos, 1615, 4to; Madrid, 1653); also translated into Italian.

## Molina, Luis[[@Headword:Molina, Luis]]

             a distinguished Spanish theologian, was born at Cuenga, in New Castile, in 1535. In 1553 he entered the Order of the Society of Jesus, studied at Coimbra, and afterwards served for twenty years as professor of theology in the University of Evora, in Portugal. He died at Madrid, October 12, 1601. In his writings, which treat especially of grace and free-will, he propounded a system of doctrine which has since been called Molinism, after him. It was while writing a commentary on Thomas Aquinas (published at Cuenca, 1593, 2 volumes, fol.) that he was led to attempt the old Pelagian Controversy by a conciliation of free-will in man with the divine foreknowledge, and with predestination, and he finally advocated his system in his De liberi arbitrii concordia cum gratiae donis, Divina Praescientia, Providentia, Praedestinatione, et, Reprobatione (Lisbon, 1588, 4to). This book, dedicated to the grand Inquisition of Portugal, at once gave rise to a violent controversy. Molina rejects the sufficiency of  grace, asserting that grace is sometimes sufficient, sometimes insufficient, according as the will is cooperating with or resisting it. According to his theory, the efficacy of grace is the result of the consent of the human will; not that this consent gives it any strength, but because this consent is requisite in order that grace should be efficient. He therefore says that man requires grace in order to do good, but that God never fails to grant this grace to those who ask it with fervor; he also asserts that man has it in his power to answer or not to the calling of grace. These opinions, which had found many followers, were first attacked by the Spanish Dominicans as being of a Pelagianizing tendency, while they themselves were firmly attached to the doctrine of Thomas Aquinas, and came hence to be named Thomists (q.v.).

The innovation was afterwards attacked also by the Calvinists as opposing the theology of Augustine, and also by the Jansenists. Indeed, so much opposition had been encountered by the Molinists, as the propagators of this peculiar doctrine were called, that it was thought wise in 1594 to bring the matter to the consideration of pope Clement VIII, who enjoined silence on both parties, and promised to commit the decision of the dispute to a congregation of theologians. Upon this the Dominicans used their influence with Philip II to induce the pope to reopen the question at once; and, the king's persuasion prevailing, the pope in 1597 organized for that special purpose a congregation called De Auxiliis, consisting of a president, cardinal Malnici, the bishop of Trent, of three other bishops, and seven theologians of different fraternities. It was made their task to inquire into the nature of the assistance derived from grace, and its mode of operation. On January 16, 1598, the opinions of Molina were thus summarized:

(1) A reason or ground of God's predestination is to be found in man's right use of his freewill.

(2) In order that the grace which God bestows to enable men to persevere in religion may become the gift of perseverance, it is necessary that they may be foreseen as consenting and cooperating with the divine assistance offered them, which is a thing within their power.

(3) There is a mediate prescience which is neither the free nor the natural knowledge of God, and by which he knows future contingent events before he forms his decree.\*

(4) Predestination may be considered as either general (relating to whole classes of persons), or particular (relating to individual persons). In general predestination there is no reason or ground for it beyond the good pleasure of God, or none on the part of persons predestinated; but in particular predestination (or that of individuals) there is a cause or ground in the foreseen good use of free-will. In 1601, finally, the decision of the congregation was rendered. It pronounced in favor of the Thomistic opinions. But notwithstanding this decision, the Jesuits, who were almost en masse with the Molinists, succeeded in prevailing on Clement VIII to reopen the case; and a new congregation was appointed, consisting of fifteen cardinals, five bishops, and nine doctors, over whom the pope himself presided on seventy-eight different occasions between March 20, 1602, and January 22, 1605; but when about to pronounce sentence he died, and the congregation's sittings had to be continued under his successor, Paul V, from September 1605, until March 1606. Yet even after the expiration of such a long period of deliberation, covering over two hundred sittings, a settlement of the question seemed less likely than ever; and pope Paul, not wishing to condemn or to approve either party, public policy requiring that the pope should not make an enemy of France by deciding against the Jesuits, nor of Spain by deciding against the Dominicans, quietly concluded to discontinue the sittings, simply announcing that he reserved to himself the right of giving his verdict when he should see fit.

Only in dismissing the contending parties, in 1607, he forbade their publishing anything more on the subject. This command, however, was but little regarded, and the Scientia media of Molina came to be substantially adopted by Jesuit theologians, while all his adversaries,. the upholders of “efficacious grace,” have protested against this system as semi-Pelagianism. Jansenius, for instance, accuses Molina of disregarding St. Augustine, and of misrepresenting his opinions, etc. Bossuet says, in answer to this reproach of semi-Pelagianism (see his answer to Jurieu, Avertissement aux Protestants), “As for M. Jurieu's objection of our Molinists being semi-Pelagials, if he had only opened their books he would have seen that they recognised in all the elect a gratuitous preference on the part of divine grace — a grace ever predisposing, ever necessary for all pious deeds. This we never find among the semi-Pelagians. Going further, or making grace to be preceded by some purely human acts with which it is then connected, I do not hesitate to assert that no Roman Catholic will contradict me when I say that this would be a fearful mistake, which would take away the very foundation of humility, and that the Church would  never tolerate it, after having so often decided, and lately in the Council of Trent, that everything good, even to the first disposition of the sinner to be converted, comes from an impelling and predisposing grace, which is preceded by no merit.” Molina wrote also De Justitia et Jure (Cuenca, 1592, 6 volumes, fol.; Mayence, 1659). See Antonio, Nova Bibliotheca Hispano; Alegambe, De Script. Soc. Jesu, page 314 sq.; Abrgeu de Hist. de la Congregation de Auxiliis; Bossuet, Avertissement aux Protestants; Encycl. des Gens du Monde; Fleury, Eccl. Hist. 183:4; Le Clerc, Bibl. Univ. et Hist. volume 14; Aug. le Blanc, Hist. Congreg. de Auxil. Gratiae Divin. (Domin.); Meyer, Hist. Controv. de Divin. Gratia Auxil. (Jesuit); Kuhn Kathol. Dogmatik, 1:291 sq.; Ranke, Hist. of the Papacy, 1:587 sq.; 2:90 sq.; Nicolini, Hist. of the Jesuits, page 231, 232; Walch, Religiose Streitigkeiten ausser d. luther. Kirche, 1:269 sq.; Schrockh, Kirchengeschichte s.d. Ref. 4:295 sq.; Hagenbach, Hist. Doctrines, 2:202, 278, 280, 288; Bickersteth, Christian Student, section 4, page 233; Wetzer u. Welte (Roman Catholic), Kirchen-Lexikon, 7:199 sq.

\*In Molina's theology the “natural” knowledge of God is that of what he effects by his direct power or by second causes. His “free” knowledge is that of what he purposes of his own free-Will. His mediate “knowledge” (“scientia media”) is that of what will depend on the freewill of his creatures, whose actions he foresees by a knowledge of all the forces by which those actions will be brought about and controlled.

## Molinari, Antonio[[@Headword:Molinari, Antonio]]

             a Venetian painter, who flourished in the early part of the 18th century, was a pupil of Antonio Zanchi, whose maxims he afterwards renounced, creating a style of his own. Molinari painted some excellent works for several of the Venetian churches, but his pictures were very unequal in merit. Lanzi says that in his best works, “as the History of Hosea, in the Corpus Domini at Venice, he displays a style no less solid than pleasing, which equally satisfies the Jdgment and the eye. There is a study of both design and expression, ample beauty of forms, richness of drapery, with a taste and harmony of coloring not surpassed by any artist of the time.” See  Lanzi, Hist. of Painting, transl. by Roscoe, 2:295; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, 2:575.

## Molinari, Giovanni[[@Headword:Molinari, Giovanni]]

             an eminent painter of the school of Piedmont, was horn at Savigliano in 1721. He was a pupil of Cavaliere-Beaumont, and executed a number of works of art for the various churches at Turin and adjacent cities. A picture in the church of S. Bernardo di Vercelli, representing, a number of saints, is, according to Lanzi, “well disposed, with good action, and conducted with great care.” In Turin there is an Addolorata by him at the Regio Albergo della Virtu; in other places in the state are numerous religious works, among which a St. John. the Baptist, in the abbey of S. Benigno, is worthy of mention. His character was naturally timid, reserved, and modest; and Lanzi says he did not paint history as much as he should. Lanzi does not give the date of his decease, but Spooner places his death in 1793. See Lanzi, Hist. of Painting, transl. by Roscoe, 3:315; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, 2:575.

## Molinasus[[@Headword:Molinasus]]

             SEE MOULIN, DE.

## Molinet, Claue Du[[@Headword:Molinet, Claue Du]]

             a French ecclesiastical antiquary, was born at Chalons-sur-Marne in 1620, and dairing the greater part of his life occupied the position of canon regular and procurator general of the Congregation of St. Genevieve, Paris. He was the author of several works, based mainly upon his researches in ecclesiastical antiquities, the most prominent of which are an edition of The Epistles of Stephen, Bishop of Tournay, with notes, and The History of the principal Popes, as taken from Medals. The latter work extends from Martin V to Innocent XI, and includes a description of medals from 1417 to 1678. In addition to his labors in numismatics, he collected a great many rare curiosities and relics, and some very remarkable Greek and Oriental MSS. The library of St. Genevieve owes much to him for its present renown on account of its great collection and careful preservation of antiquities, which have not only proved of public interest, but of great historical value. He died September 2, 1687. (H.W.T.)

## Molinier, Etienne[[@Headword:Molinier, Etienne]]

             a French Roman Catholic, born at Toulouse about the latter part of the 16th century, began life with the study of law, and became counsellor to  the parliament of his native city; but subsequently took orders, and became doctor of theology and of civil and canon law. He preached with great success in the principal churches of Provence and Paris, and even preached before Louis XIII. when that monarch was crowned in 1610. He died in 1650. Molinier wrote Sermons pour les dimanches de Pannee (Toulouse, 1631, 2 vols. 8vo): — Id. sur le mystere de la Croix (1635, 8vo): — Id. pour I Octave de Saint Sacrement (Toulouse, 1640, 8vo): — Id. sur. le symbole de la Croix (Rouen, 1650, 8vo). These sermons evince much depth of thought as well as vast erudition. See Biographie Toulousaine; Dictionnaire portat des Predicateurs.

## Molinier, Jean-Baptiste[[@Headword:Molinier, Jean-Baptiste]]

             a French divine, was born at Arles in 1675, began his studies in his own country, and continued them at Pezenas, under the fathers of the Oratory; he then entered the army, but finally quitted the sword to take holy orders. He taught theology at Aries, and entered the Congregation of the Oratory in 1700. He was subsequently sent to the seminary of Saint-Magloire of Paris, and to Macon and Grenoble. He evinced remarkable talent for preaching, and was very successful at Toulouse, Lyons, Orleans, and at Paris. Massillon, hearing him, was impressed by his eloquence, but at the same time surprised at the inequality of his talent, which sometimes rose to the sublime, and again sank heavily to the obscure and commonplace. Biographers say that when Molinier devoted much labor to his discourses, he equalled the most celebrated French orators; but he relied too much upon his talent, and did not sufficiently moderate the impetuosity of his imagination. His discourses are the production of a happy genius, which expresses itself with much fire, energy, force, dignity, and ease. He only lacked taste; his style is incorrect, unequal, and marred by common phrases, which form a strange contrast to many parts full of life and grandeur. Molinier left the Oratory in 1720, and retired to the diocese of Sens, whence he returned to Paris to resume his preaching, but was prohibited from doing so by M. de Vintimille. No longer permitted to preach, Molinier wrote. He left the following works: Traduction nouvelle of the Imitation de Jesus-Christ (Paris, 1725, 12mo): Sermons Choisis (1732-34, 3 volumes, 12mo); the sermon Du Ciel is considered his principal production: Panegyriques (1732-34, 3 volumes, 12mo): — Discours sur la verite de la religion Chretienne (1732-34, 2 volumes, 12mo): — Instructions et Prieres prores a soutenir les dimes dans les  voies de la penitence, etc. (12mo); a sequel to the Directeur des ames penitentes of Vauge: — Exerciae du penitent, with an Office de la penitence (18mo): — Les Psalmes, translated into French, with some Notes littgrales et morales. (12mo): — Paraphrase du psaume Miserere: — Sur l'Arianisme (1718, 4to); very rare. He retired from public life but a short time before his death, which occurred in Paris, March 15, 1745. See Bougerel, Histoire des Hommes illustres de Provence; Chaudont and Delandine, Dict. hist. s.v.

## Molinism[[@Headword:Molinism]]

             the name given to the system of grace and election taught by Louis Molina (q.v.). The kind of prescience denominated in the Romish schools Scientia media is that foreknowledge of future contingencies which arises from an acquaintance with the nature and faculties of rational beings, of the circumstances ‘in which they shall be placed, of the objects that shall be presented to them, and of the influence which their circumstances and objects must have on their actions. This system has been commonly taught in the Jesuit schools; but a modification of it was introduced by the celebrated Spanish divine, Suarez (q.v.), in order to save the doctrine of special election. Suarez held that although God gives to all men grace absolutely sufficient for their salvation, yet he gives to the elect a grace which is not alone in itself sufficient, but which is so attempered to their disposition, their opportunities, and other circumstances, that they infallibly, although yet quite freely, yield to its influence. This modification of Molina's system is called CONGRUISM. Molinism must not be confounded either with Pelagianism or semi-Pelagianism, inasmuch as Molinism distinctly supposes the inability of man to do any supernatural act without grace (q.v.). SEE THOMISTS; SEE WILL, FREE.

## Molinos, Miguel De[[@Headword:Molinos, Miguel De]]

             a Spanish theologian, founder of the Quietists, was born of noble parentage near Saragossa, December 21, 1627. He studied at Pampeluna, and, after finishing his studies at the University of Coimbra, took holy orders, and in 1669 went to Rome, where his pious conduct and the purity of his life caused many to choose him for their spiritual director. He acquired great reputation, but steadily refused all ecclesiastical preferment. In 1675 he published his Way or Guide to what the Mystics call a spiritual or contemplative life. This book, written in Spanish, was supported by the  recommendations of some of the greatest and most respectable men. In 1681 it was published at Rome in Italian, though it had appeared in that language some time before in other places. Afterwards it was translated into the Dutch, French, and Latin languages; and was very often printed in Holland, France, and Italy. The Latin translation, under the title of Manuductio spiritualis, was published by A.H. Franke (Halle, 1687, 12mo). In Italian it bore the title of Guida Spirituale. But though the work added greatly to Molinos's celebrity, it also became the subject of bitter opposition. It was soon attacked. There were not wanting many who in the specious but visionary principles of this work discovered the seeds of a dangerous and seductive error. Among these the celebrated preacher Segneri was the first who ventured publicly to call its. orthodoxy into question; but his strictures were by Molinos's friends ascribed to jealousy of the influence which Molinos had acquired with the people. By degrees, however, reports unfavorable to the practical results of this teaching, and even to the personal conduct and character of its author, or of his followers, began to find circulation; and eventually the Jesuits took decided ground against him, and he was accused of heresy. The substance of his system, which his friends interpret in one way and his opponents in another, amounted to this: Christian perfection consists in the peace of the soul, in renouncement of all external and temporal things, in the pure love of God, free from all considerations of interest or hope of reward. Thus a soul which desires the supreme good must renounce not only all sensual pleasures, but also all material and sensual things; silence every impulse of its mind and will, and concentrate and absorb itself in God. Molinos's enemies accused him and some of his disciples of reviving the abuses of the Gnostics, and of teaching, both by their precepts and their example, the most objectionable principles of Quietism. According to the propositions which were condemned by the Inquisition, he pushed to such an extreme the contemplative repose which is the common characteristic of Quietism as to teach the utter indifference of the soul, in a state of perfect contemplation, to all external things, and its entire independence of the outer world, even of the actions of the very body which it animates; insomuch that this internal perfection is compatible with the worst external excesses, since these are of no importance so long as the soul remains in communion with God. SEE QUIETISM.

It is very probable that the opposition to him, especially that of the Jesuits and others who watched over the interests of the Romish cause, was provoked because they perceived that Molinos's system tacitly accused the Romish Church of a  departure from true religion. Molinos, though he had a vast number of friends, and though the pontiff himself, Innocent XI, was partial to him, was in 1685 cited before the Inquisition, and submitted to close imprisonment and examination. In addition to the opinions contained in his book, a prodigious mass of papers and letters, to the number, it is said, of 20,000, found in his house, were produced against him, and he was himself rigorously examined as to his opinions. The trial lasted two years; and in 1687 sixtyeight propositions contained in his book were solemnly condemned. By a decree of August 28, 1687, he was declared to have taught false and dangerous dogmas, contrary to the doctrine of the Church and to Christian piety. On September 3 following he was brought out in a yellow scapular, with a red cross before and behind, made to kneel on a scaffold in-front of the church of the Dominicans, and there compelled to recant all he had taught in his books; after which he was compelled to pass the remainder of his life in prison. A bull of Innocent XII, of November 19, confirmed the action of the Inquisition, and condemned, in globo, the sixty-eight propositions. A refutation of Molinos's doctrine is to be found in Fenelon's works (Versailles, 1820), and in Bossuet, Etats d'Oraison. See Moreri, Dict. histor.; Pluquet, Diction. des heresies; Recueil de diverses pieces concernant le Quietisme et les Quietistes, ou Molinos, ses sentimens et ses disciples (Amsterd. 1688, 8vo); — Lettres ecrits de Rome touchanit le Quietisme; ou Molinos, ses sentiments, etc. (Amsterd. 1688); Herzog, Real-Encyklopidie, 9:698; Mosheim, Ecclesiastes Hist. 3:339 sq.; Bergier, Dict. de Theologie, 4:420; Wetzer u.Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, 7:213 sq.; Scharling, in Niedner's Zeitschrift, 1854, page 325 sq., 489 sq.; 1855, page 3 sq.; Baumgarten-Crusius, Compend. d. Dogmen Gesch. 1:407 sq.; Hodgson; Reformers and Martyrs; Heinroth, Gesch. u. Kritik d. Mysticismus, part 3, chapter 3; Walch, Religiois Streitigkeiten ausser der luther. Kirche, 1:293 sq.; 2:982 sq.; Schrockh, Kirchengeschichte s. d. Ref. 7:453 sq. SEE MYSTICISM.

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

             a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, was born August 24, 1819, at Zweibrucken. He first practiced law, but in 1849 betook himself to the study of theology at Bonn, received holy orders in 1851 at Spires, was in 1857 cathedral dean and in 1864 doctor of theology, a distinction conferred on him by pope Pius IX. In 1868 the same pope called him to Rome as consulter to the Vatican council. Molitor died January 1, 1880, at Spires. He published, Ueber kanonisches Gerichtsverfahren gegen Kleriker (Mayence, 1856): — Die Immunitat des Domes zu Speyer (ibid. 1859): — Fastenpredigten (1871): — Predigten auf die Sonn- und Festtafe des katholischen Kirchenjahres (3 volumes); also, in connection with Hiiskamp, Papst Pius IX in seinem Leben und Wirken (3d. ed. 1873). (B.P.)

## Molkenbuhr, Marcellin[[@Headword:Molkenbuhr, Marcellin]]

             a German Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Munster, September 1, 1741, and was educated in the convents of the Rhenish country. In 1758 he entered the Order of St. Francis at Hanau, but was ordained to holy orders October 27, 1764, and for nine years taught philosophy and mathematics, and for twelve years divinity and moral theology at Paderborn. He then retired to the convent of St. Francis at Munster; but in 1811, when it was  abolished, he lived for a while privately. In 1815 he re-entered monastic life in the convent of St. Francis at Paderborn, and died there in 1831. Some of his most important works are: Das Zeitalter der Vernunft herausgegeben von Thomas Paine, widerlegt, etc. (Paderborn, 1797, 2d edition; Minster, 1802): — Neue Auslegungsart des alten Testaments von Wecklein, Prof. zu Muinster, widerlegt (Dorsten, 1806): — Neue der Gottheit Jesu nachtheilige Auslegung des I Capitel des Evangel. Joh. von Muth, Prof. in Erfurt, widerlegt (ibid. 1807): — Wo ist die alteste und vornehmrste bischofliche Kirchs in der ganzen Christenheit? Bei den Griechen oder bei den Lateinern? (Paderborn, 1815): — Ueber die Ankunft des hl. Apostel Petrus nach Romn mund Antiochia, und einige vorgebliche alte Streitigkeiten mehrerer Bischofe wider die Pdpste (ibid. 1816): — Anmerkungen uber die neuen deutschen Uebersetzungen des N.T. durch Carl und Leander van Esz, auch besonders iber den bestraften Cephas (ibid. 1817): — Historia religionis Christianae in compendia et ordine chronico exhibita, tom. 1, ab anno 1-326 (ibid. 1818). See Waitzenegger, Gelehrten- und Schriftsteller Lexikon der deutschen katholischen Gistlichkeit, 2:18 sq,

## Moll, Carl Bernhard[[@Headword:Moll, Carl Bernhard]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born at Wolgast, Pomerania, November 20, 1806. He studied at Berlin and Greifswalde, and entered the ministry in 1830 at Naugard. In 1834 he was called to LSknitz, near Stettin, in 1845 to Stettin, in 1850 as professor of theology to Halle, and was made, in 1860, general superintendent of the province of Prussia. He died August 17, 1878, at Konigsberg, learing, Die gegenwartige Noth der evangelischen Kirche Preussens (Pasewalk, 1843): — Das Heil in Christo in Predigten (Halle, 1852): — Das System der praktischen Theologie im Grundrisse dargestellt (1853): — Christologia in Epistola ad Hebraeos (1854-55): — De Justo Attributorum Dei Discrimine (1855):  — Zeugnisse vom Leben in Christo in Predigten (1856). For Lange's Bibelwerk he wrote the commentary on the Psalms and on the Epistle to the Hebrews. See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:892 sq. (B.P.)

## Moll, Willem[[@Headword:Moll, Willem]]

             a Dutch theologian, was born February 28, 1812, at Dort. He studied at Leyden, was in 1837 pastor at De Vuursche, in the province of Utrecht, in 1844 at Arniheim, in 1846 professor of theology at Amsterdam, and died August 16, 1879. He is the author of, Kerk geschiedenis van Nederland voor de Hervorming: (Utrecht, 1864-71, 6 volumes): — Geschiedenis van het kerkelijke Leven der Christenen gedurende de zes eerste Eeuwen (Amsterdam, 1844-46, 2 volumes; 2d ed. Leyden, 1855, 1857): — Angelus Merula, De hervormer en Martelaar des Geloofs (1851): — Johannes Brugmann en het godsdienstig Leven onzer Vadenren in de vijfiende Eeuw (1854). Moll founded the society which from 1856 to 1863 published the Kalender voor de Potestanten in Nederland. See Acquoy, Levensbericht van Willem Moll, in Jaarbek van de Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, 1879, pages 66-137; Rogge, Willem Moll, in Mannen van Beteekenis in onze Dagen, 1879; Nippold, Die romischkatholische Kirche in Konigreich der Niederlande (Leipsic, 1877), pages 486-489; PlittHerzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Lichtenberger, Enzcyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Mollah[[@Headword:Mollah]]

             (Arab. maula, Turk. meula, i.e., ruler) is the name of a Turkish superior judge, who is an expounder of civil and criminal law, and of the religion of the state; he is therefore, necessarily both a lawyer and an ecclesiastic. Under him is the cadi or judge, who administers the law, and superior to him are: the kadhiasker and the mufti (q.v.). They all are, however, subject to the Sheik al-Islam, or supreme mufti. In Persia, the office of mollah is similar to what it is in Turkey; but his superior there is the “sadr,” or chief of the mollahs. In the states of Turkestan, the mollahs have the whole government in their hands. SEE MULLAH.

## Moller, Arnold[[@Headword:Moller, Arnold]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born October 9, 1791, at Duisburg. In 1817 he was military preacher at Munster, in 1829 pastor at Minden, and died in 1858. He published, Fur christliche Erbauung (Ratisbon, 1832, 2. volumes): — Biblisches Schatzkastlein zur taglichen Erbauung christlicher Pilger (1831): — Tabor und Sinai (Munster, 1834): — Der Tisch des Herrn (2d ed. 1852): — Das Evangelium fur Kinder (1839): — Friedrich Adolph Krummacher und seine Freunde (Bremen, 1849, 2 volumes): — Der liturgische Theil des evangelischen Gottesdienstes in den preussischenz Landen (Bielefeld, 1850): — Hulsfsbuch fur den litusrgischen Theil (3 parts, 1851-52). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:893 sq.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:544; 2:255, 270, 287, 310, 333, 337, 368, 392, 396. (B.P.)

## Moller, Heinrich[[@Headword:Moller, Heinrich]]

             popularly known as Henry von Ziitphen, one of the early Protestant martyrs, was born in 1488, in the county of Zutphen, in the Netherlands. In 1504 he joined the Augustinians, and in 1511 went to the then newly- established University of Wittenberg. Here he became intimate with Luther. In 1516, on his return home, he was, notwithstanding his youth, made prior of the Augustinian convent of Dort but was finally obliged to leave it in 1520 on account of his reformatory opinions, went to Antwerp, and there  became sub-prior of the Augustinian convent. This place also he was obliged to leave in December 1520 his favorable opinion of the Reformers having made him many enemies in the body, and in March 1521, we find him back at Wittenberg, occupied in studies. But when, in consequence of the Edict of Worms, the evangelical party began to be persecuted in the Netherlands, he returned, in 1522, to Dort and to Antwerp, and there by his example encouraged the Augustinians to spread the principles of the Reformation. The Inquisition quickly recognised in him a leading spirit, and he was marked as one whose head should fall. On September 29 he was arrested, but the people rallied and released him. Satisfied that safety could be found only in flight, he then bade adieu to his Christian friends, and went successively to Amsterdam and Ziitphen, with the expectation of making his way back to Wittenberg. But he was stopped in Bremen, and entreated by the people to stay there and preach the new doctrines. Consenting, after much urgent solicitation, he was made pastor, and by his preaching soon gained the greater portion of the people to the cause of the Reformation. In November 1524, when his friends felt satisfied that the cause had been so efficiently served as to make a falling away to Romanism well-nigh impossible, he left for Meldorf, in Denmark, where he was desired to introduce the Reformation. He encountered great opposition, and, though the authorities of the place were in his favor, he was seized on the 10th of December by the Roman Catholic clergy and their dupes, and burned the next day as a heretic. The news as it reached the different German Reformers caused great sorrow. The loss sustained seemed irreparable. Melancthon wrote a hymn of praise over him, Luther a letter of sympathy to the Christians of Bremen and an account of his martyrdom. In the cemetery of Meldorf, where Moller's remains had been deposited after a severe struggle with the drunken rowdies who, fired by religious fanaticism, had caused his death, a monument was erected to his memory, June 25, 1830. See Luther, Vom Bruder Heinrich, etc., in Werke, volume 26 (Erlangen edition); Heckel, Die Masrtyrer in d. evaznel. Kirche, edited by Wichern (Hamb. 1845 and 1849); Rudelbach, Christliche Biographie (Leips. 1849); Fliedner, Buch. d. Martyrer, volume 2; Schlegel, Kirchen u.Reformations gesch. v. Norddeutschland, volume 2; Ranke, Deutsche Gesch; im Zeitalter d. Reform. volumes 1 and 2; Hist. of the Reformation (Austin's transl. Phila. 1844, 8vo), book 1; Motley, John of Barneveld (N.Y. 1874), 1:283 sq.; Zeitschr of. hist. theol. 1868, page 485; Pierer, Universal-Lexikon, 11:367; Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 9:704. (J.H.W.)

## Moller, Henry[[@Headword:Moller, Henry]]

             a Lutheran minister, noted for his valuable labors in the Lutheran interests in the United States, was born in Hamburg, Germany, in 1749. When only a youth of fourteen he migrated to this country, and went to Philadelphia. There he was one day, shortly after his arrival, met in the street by the celebrated Dr. Muhlenberg, who had known his people, and who recognized in the young man so striking a family resemblance as to induce him to stop and inquire his name. Identified by the doctor, Henry was at once given a place in his own house, and everything was done-to promote his welfare. The doctor also gave him an appointment as assistant in a school in which he himself was then teaching, while Moller's leisure hours were devoted to the study of theology, under the direction of his patron. Moller was licensed to preach the Gospel by the Synod of Pennsylvania, and was willing to share the privations and sufferings incident to those early days, when the members of churches were scattered through the wilderness, like sheep without a shepherd. He engaged in preaching the Gospel to the poor, in collecting congregations and rearing churches, in extending the principles of the Lutheran faith, and promoting the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom. During the Revolutionary War he was chaplain of a German regiment in the army commanded by general Washington. Moller's first regular pastoral charge was Reading, Pa. Thence he removed to Philadelphia, and later settled at Albany, N.Y., where he built the first Lutheran church, and promoted the interests of his sect. In 1788 he received and accepted a call to New Holland, Pa., and labored there until, in 1795, he was induced to take the Lutheran flock at Harrisburg, and he served them most acceptably for seven years. In 1802 Moller returned to Albany, and for six years more served the people to whom he had in his first connection so greatly endeared himself. He next accepted a call to the united churches of Sharon and New Rhinebeck, N.Y., where he labored until physical infirmities rendered him unable to attend to the active duties of his profession. Cheered by domestic affection and Christian hope, the last six years he lived were spent in retirement, “although,” says a contemporary, “his whole life was devoted to the interests of his divine Master. Until the end he sought opportunity to do good, and to make himself useful to those around him.” He died as he had lived, full of faith, calm and confident in the great truths of that blessed religion which he had faithfully preached, Sept. 16,1829. As a preacher, Miller's talents were not brilliant, yet he accomplished greater things than  the more highly gifted. As a man, his whole life was marked by integrity, truthfulness, and a contempt of everything mean or dishonorable. See (Lutheran) Evangel. Qu. Rev. (memoirs of deceased ministers), 1865, page 273 sq.; Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, volume 9 (Lutherans). (J.H.W.)

## Moller, Jens[[@Headword:Moller, Jens]]

             a Danish theologian, was born in 1779, and died November 25, 1833, doctor and professor of theology at Copenhagen. He published, Theologisk Bibliothek (Copenhagen, 1811-21, 20 volumes): — Nuie theol. Biblioth. — (1821 sq. 20 volumes): — Tidsskrift for Kerke og Theolog. (1832, 1833, 4 volumes): — Compendium theologiae symbol. eccles. Lutheranae. See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:12, 338. . (B.P.)

## Moller, Johann Friedrich[[@Headword:Moller, Johann Friedrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Erfurt, November 13, 1789. He studied at Gottinngen, was in 1814 professor at the teachers' seminary in his native city, in 1815 deacon, in 1829 pastor, in 1831 senior of the Evangelical ministerium, and in 1832 member of consistory. In 1843 Miller was called as general superintendent to Magdeburg, and died April 20, 1861. He wrote, Commentatio in verba Christi, Mat 7:12-14 (Erfurt, 1835): — Handreichung der Kirche an die Schule (2d ed. Magdeburg, 1852): — Kritisch-evangelische Unterweisung (ibid. 1855): besides, he published a number of sermons. See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:895 sq.; Plitt Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v. (B.P.)

## Moller, Martin[[@Headword:Moller, Martin]]

             a Lutheran hymn-writer of Germany, was born November 11, 1547, at Leissnitz, Saxony. In 1572 he was called to the ministry at Kesselsdorf, and in 1575 to Sprottau, Lower Silesia. In 1600 he was appointed pastor primarius at GSrlitz, in Upper Lausatia, and died March 2, 1606. Besides his Praxis Evangeliorum, a practical exposition on the gospels, of the Christian year (1601, 4 volumes), he wrote several hymns, some of which are translated into English, as Nimm von uns Herr, du treuer Gott (in Jacobi, Psalmodia Germanica, 1:123, "Remove from us, O faithful God"), O Jesu, suss wer dein gedenkt (ibid. 1:130 sq., "When thought brings Jesus to, my sense"), Ach Gott, wie manches Herzeleid (Chorale Book for England, No. 136, "Ah God, my days are dark indeed"). See Koch, Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes, 2:211 sq.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrtenz-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Mollius or Mollio, Giovanni[[@Headword:Mollius or Mollio, Giovanni]]

             a distinguished Italian martyr in the Protestant cause, was a native of Montalcino, in the territory of Siena, and the descendant of a very respectable family. He was born near the opening of the 16th century. When only twelve years of age he was placed in the monastery of Gray Friars, where he made rapid progress in arts, sciences, and languages. He entered the order of Minorites while yet a youth, and took priest's orders when only eighteen. Every minute was improved in study of polite letters and theology, and he came soon to be noted for his learning and industry. After having pursued his studies six years longer at Ferrara, he was made theological lecturer in the university of that city. He subsequently lectured at the universities of Brescia, Milan, and Pavia, and was appointed professor of theology in the University of Bologna about 1533. There, on reading several treatises of the Reformers, he became at heart a zealous Protestant, and began to expound in its purity the Epistle' to the Romans. Immense crowds soon attended his lectures, and, the report coming to Rome, he was seized by order of the pope, and, being denied a public trial, gave an account of his opinions in writing, confirming them by scriptural authority. Mollius defended himself with such ability and address that the judges appointed by Paul III to try the case were forced to acquit him, in the way of declaring that the sentiments which he had maintained were true, although they were such as could not be publicly taught at that time without prejudice to the apostolical see. He was therefore sent back to Bologna, with an admonition to abstain for the future from explaining the same doctrine (i.e., justification by faith). But continuing to expound the epistles of Paul as formerly, and with still greater applause from his hearers — even the monks of different convents, many of the nobility, and individuals of episcopal orders, attending them — cardinal Campeggio procured an order from the pope to remove him from the university (Pontaleon, Rerum in Eccl. Gest. lib. 9, fol. 263). Mollius did not remain idle when relieved of his duties at the university, but continued his studies, and grew in strength among his fellows, He finally became lecturer to the  monastery of St. Lorenzo at Naples. But even here he was persecuted; and in 1542 the opposition grew so decided that he was frequently in great danger.

He was several times imprisoned, but always escaped until the time of the accession of pope Julius III, when he was hunted down at Ravenna, and transported to Rome. On September 5, 1553, a public assembly of the Inquisition was held with great pomp, and Mollius was brought before that body, attended by six cardinals and their episcopal assessors. All the prisoners brought forward in this session recanted and performed penance except Mollius and another, a native of Perugio named Tisserano, who refused to do violence to their conscience. When the articles of accusation against Mollius were ready, permission was given him to speak. He defended the doctrines which he had taught respecting justification, the merit of good works, auricular confession, and the sacraments; pronounced the power claimed by the pope and his clergy to be usurped and antichristian; and addressed his judges in a strain of bold and fervid invective, which silenced and chained them to their seats, at the same time that it cut them to the quick; and when he had finished his address, he threw the flaming torch which he held in his hand on the ground and extinguished it, thus showing to his accusers that he would rather extinguish life than suffer them to force a lie from him. Of course mercy to such a criminal was not within the gift of Rome, and he was consequently condemned, together with his companion, to instant death. They were at once conveyed to the place of execution, first hung, and then burned to ashes. See Hist. des Martyrs, pages 264, 265; Gerdesius, Ital. Reform. pages 103; M'Crie, Ref: in Italy, pages 95, 124, 261; Young, Life of Paleario, 2:113 sq. Fox, Book of Martyrs, page 184, gives Mollius's history inaccurately. (J.H.W.)

## Molloy, Francis[[@Headword:Molloy, Francis]]

             an Irish divine of some celebrity, flourished in the College of St. Isidor at Rome, Italy, in the second half of the 17th century, as professor of theology. He wrote Sacra Theologia (Rome, 1666, 8vo): — Lucerna Fidelium (1676, 8vo), a Roman Catholic Catechism in Irish: — Grammatica Latino-Hibernica compendiata (1677,12mo). Shingel, who gives an abstract of the last work in his Archeaological Britannica, says that it was the most complete Irish grammar then extant, although imperfect as to syntax, etc. See Ware, Writers of Ireland, volume 2.

## Moloch[[@Headword:Moloch]]

             (Heb. Me'lek, מֶלֶךְ, king, as often; Sept. and N.T. Μολόχ), the name of an Ammonitish idol (Amos 4:26; Act 7:43); usually called MOLECH SEE MOLECH (q.v.).

## Molokans[[@Headword:Molokans]]

             SEE MALAKANS.

## Molten Image[[@Headword:Molten Image]]

             SEE IDOL.

## Molten Sea[[@Headword:Molten Sea]]

             SEE SEA, MOLTEN.

## Moluccas[[@Headword:Moluccas]]

             (or ROYAL or SPICE ISLANDS), a number of islands of the Malay Archipelago, in the Indian Ocean. The term comprehends, in its most extensive sense, all the islands between Celebes and New Guinea, situated to the east of the Molucca passage, in long. 1260, particularly those of Gilolo; but, in a more limited sense, it is usually restricted to the Dutch Spice Islands:

(1) Ternate, the most important, lies in 0° 48' N. lat. and 127° 8' E. long., and is 25 miles in circumference. It has a population of 9000, of whom only about 400 are Europeans. Its natives are mainly Mohammedans. It was formerly the residence of sultans, who ruled over large territories, and could call out 100,000 fighting-men. The island is fertile and well watered. Rice, cotton, tobacco, etc., are cultivated, and a trade is supported with the adjacent islands.

(2) Tidore, south of Ternate, in 0040' N. lat. and 1270 25' E. long., is 18 miles in circumference, and rises towards the interior.

Of its population of 8000, the natives are less gentle but more industrious than those of Ternate, and diligently cultivate the soil, weave, and fish. They are also Mohammedans, and have many mosques. The sultans of Ternate and Tidore are subsidized by and subject to the Netherlands, being  appointed by the governor of the Moluccas, and exercising their authority under the surveillance of the resident.

(3) Makian, in 0° 18' 30!' N. lat. and 1270 30' E. long., is very fertile yields much sago, rice, tobacco, canary-oil, etc., and has important fishings.

(4) Farther north is the island of Motir, which is uninhabited, but formerly yielded a considerable quantity of cloves, and later sent much earthenware to all the Spice Islands.

(5) Batjan, the only remaining Royal Island, situated between 0° 13'00 55' S. lat. and 1270 22'-1280 E. long., is 50 miles in length and 18 in breadth, and has many mountain-peaks from 1500 to 4000 feet in height, the sources of numerous rivers. The greatest part of this beautiful island is covered with ebony, satin-wood, and other valuable timber-trees, which give shelter to numerous delicately plumaged birds, deer, wild hogs, and reptiles. Sago, rice, cocoa-nuts, cloves, fish, and fowls are plentiful, and a little coffee is cultivated. Coal is abundant; gold and copper are found in small quantities. The inhabitants, who are lazy and sensual, are a mixed race of Portuguese, Spaniards, Dutch, and natives. All the abovenamed islands are volcanic, Ternate being a mountain, sloping upwards to 7000 feet, to which Tidore bears a striking resemblance. Makian is an active volcano, and, so late as December 1861, threw forth immense quantities of lava and ashes, by which 326 lives were lost, and 15 villages in part or in whole destroyed. Motir is a trachyte mountain, 2296 feet in height; and Batjan a chain with lofty peaks. The total population of the Moluccas proper is 23,500.

(6) To the southwest of Batjan lie the Obi group, consisting of Obi Major, Obi Minor, Typha, Gonoma, Pisang, and Mava. Obi Major, in 1° 35' S. lat. and from 1270 to 1280 E. long., is by far the largest of these, it having an area of 598 square miles. It is hilly and fertile, being covered, like the smaller islands of the group, with sago and nutmeg trees. The Obi group are uninhabited, and serve simply as lurking-places for pirates and escaped convicts. In 1671 the Dutch built a block-house, called the Bril; and a few years later the sultan of Batjan sold them the group, but the unhealthy climate caused its abandonment in 1738.

The Moluccas, or Spice Islands, in the broad use of the term, lie to the east of Celebes, scattered over nearly eleven degrees of latitude and longitude,  between 30 S.80 N. lat. and 1260-1350 E. long., including all the territories formerly ruled over by the sultans of Ternate and Tidore. They are now tributary to Holland, and are virtually under the jurisdiction of the governors appointed by the Dutch, and are divided into the residencies of Amboyna, Banda, and Ternate; a fourth residency, under the governor of the Moluccas, being Menado. Over the northern groups of the Spice Islands the Netherlands exercise an indirect government, the sultans of Ternate and Tidore requiring to have all their appointments of native officials ratified by the resident. The southern groups are directly under European rule. The residency of Amboyna contains that island- sometimes called Ley-Timor, or Hitu, from the two peninsulas of which it is formed- Buru, the Hiassers group. and the west part of Ceram. That of Banda includes the Banda, Keffing, Key, Arru, and other islands; also the eastern part of Ceram. Under the residency of Ternate are placed the Moluccas proper, Gilolo, the neighboring islands, and the north-west of Papua. The population ruled over by the governor of the Moluccas is 767,000. Amboyna, the Banda ‘and Uliasser islands, chiefly supply the cloves, nutmegs, and mace which form the staple exports.

The Banda Islands are Neira, or Banda-Neira, Great Banda, Ay or Way, Rhun, Rozingain, and Goenong-Api, containing an area of 588 square miles. ‘Of the population, which is about 6000, 400 are Europeans; in the whole residency, the inhabitants number about 110,000, including the eastern part of Ceram. The principal island of the group is Neira, south-east from Amboyna, in 40 33' S. lat. and 1300 E. long., separated by narrow straits from Goenong- Api on the west, and Great Banda on the east. The coast is steep, and surmounted by several forts and batteries, which command the straits and roadstead. The town of Neira, on the south side of the island, is the capital of the ,Dutch residency of Banda. It has a Protestant church, school, and hospital. The Banda Islands have a rich soil, and are planted with nutmeg- trees, producing upwards of a million pounds of nuts and over a quarter of a million pounds of mace. Pineapples, the vine, banana, cocoa-nut, and other fruit-trees thrive, and are abundant. Ay is the prettiest and most productive of the group. Goenong-Api is a lofty volcano. The climate is not particularly healthy. The east monsoon begins in May, and the west in December, and both are accompanied with rain and storms. The Uliassers, which, with Amboyna, produce the cloves of commerce, are Saparoua, Oma or Haroukou, and Nousa-Laut. They lie to the east of Amboyna, in 30 40' S. lat. and 1280 33' E. long., and have an area of 1071 square miles. Saparoua is the largest, and is formed of two mountainous  peninsulas, joined in the middle by a narrow strip of undulating, grassy land. The population amounts to 11,655, of whom 7340 are Christians, having twelve schools, with a very large attendance of scholars. Oma, separated from Saparoua by a strait of a league in width, has eleven villages, of which Harouka and Oma are the chief. It is mountainous in the south, and has several rivers and sulphurous springs. The beautiful village of Harouka, on the west coast, is the residence of the Dutch postholder, who is president of the council of chiefs. Here is the head office of the clove produce. There are two forts on Oma, several churches, and six schools, with 700 pupils. Population 7188; one half Christians, the other Mohammedans. Nousa-Laut lies to the south-east of Saparoua. It is planted with clovetrees, which in 1853 produced 120,283 pounds. There are upwards of 30,000 cocoa-nut-trees. The inhabitants, who were formerly pirates and cannibals, amount to 3479 souls, are all Christians, and have schools in every village — in 1859 they were attended by 870 pupils.

The Spice Islands generally are healthy both for Europeans and Asiatics; and, though the plains are sometimes very hot, mountains are always near, where it is pleasantly cool in the mornings and evenings. Besides the spice- trees, the bread-fruit, sago, cocoa-nut, baanana, orange, guava, papaw, also ebony, iron-wood, and other valuable timber-trees, are abundant.

The natives of some of the islands are Alfoers; of others, Malays on the coasts, and Alfoers in the interior. In Ceram are also Papuan negroes, brought originally from Bali and Papua as slaves. These are harshly treated and poorly fed. The governor of the Moluccas has a salary of $8500, gold, and, with the secretary and other officials, resides in the city of Amboyna, the streets of which are broad, planted with rows of beautiful trees, and cut each other at right angles. There are two Protestant churches, a town- house, orphanage, hospital, and theatre, besides a useful institution for training native teachers, with which is connected a printing-press.

History, etc. — The Moluccas were first discovered by Europeans in 1511, when the Portuguese, under Antonio de Abreu and Francisco Serrao, landed there. They found, however, that the Arabians had already been there, and had made converts of the natives along the coast — the Malavs. In the mountains they found the Papuans (q.v.), but these Oriental negroes were savages, and in a large measure remain so to this day. The king of Portugal claimed the island, and held undisputed sway until 1599, when the  Netherlanders took Tidore. In 1623 they drove out the English from these islands, of which they had taken possession, and in 1663 the Netherlanders alone remained to lord it over the Moluccas. Though for a time the British got a hold in the island, the Dutch finally became its possessors. The islanders have frequently attempted to throw off the Dutch yoke, but have failed thus far. The wars with the Alfoers of Ceram, in 1859 and 1860, have brought them more fully under Dutch rule. Recently new sultans of Ternate and Tidore have been appointed, with less power than their predecessors. The natives along the coast speak a dialect of the Malay tongue, mixed with many foreign words; but the ancient Molucca or Tirnata language appeared to the eminent Asiatic linguist, Dr. Leyden, to have been an original tongue. They have adopted many of the tenets, or rather observances, of the Brahminical system; but many of them, named Sherifs, boast of their descent from Mohammed. and are held in great respect, especially if they have performed the pilgrimage to Mecca. The Papuans have been rapidly decreasing, and have wholly disappeared in most of the smaller islands. But they still exist in many of the more eastern islands, and hold undisturbed possession of New Guinea. The houses on these islands are generally raised on pillars eight or ten feet high, on account of the moisture, and are entered by means of a ladder, which is afterwards drawn up. The color of the natives is a deep mixture of black and yellow, and their dispositions uncivil. They subsist chiefly on sago. The men wear little covering, except a hat of leaves, and a piece of cloth round the middle; and the women are dressed in a large wide garment like a sack, with a remarkably broad hat on their heads. Their arms are a kind of light tough wood, arrows of reeds, pointed with hard wood, and bucklers of black hard wood, ornamented with designs in relieve, made with beautiful white shells. The Moluccans have themselves but little intercourse with natives of civilized countries; indeed they know considerably less of them than others in the archipelago. They seldom see a European vessel.

Missionary Labors. — The native tribes of the mountains remain very largely in heathen ignorance. Many of the Moluccans were made converts to Mohammedanism even before the appearance of Christians on the soil, and Islamism is gaining new adherents daily. Christianity, on the other hand, has thus far secured but few in number, as the first impression made by the Portuguese did not result very favorably. The Inquisition at Goa extended its power to these parts, and tried hard to carry the Moluccans into the Christian fold, but failed utterly.  The exchange of ownership imported the Protestant doctrines, but the natives have failed to see much difference between Romanism and the Reformed faith, and Islam is still ahead. All efforts until 1815 made by Protestants are hardly worth mentioning. In that year Jos. Kasse, in the employ of the Rotterdam Missionary Society (Zenddinggenootschap), inaugurated successful efforts for the conversion of the Moluccans, and for eighteen years apostolic labors were performed there. In 1819 missionary Jungmichel inaugurated successful labors at Ternate and in the Sangur Islands\* At the same time valuable enterprises were inaugurated also at Timor and Amboyna.

To the former Lebrun went. He settled at Cupang, the seat of the Dutch governor, on the south coast of Timor. For twenty years there had been no Christian minister among the natives there, who profess Christianity. With so much greater eagerness did they now crowd to the missionary's preaching; and in the very first year ninety pagans were admitted to the Church, which already consisted of 3000 professed Christians. Moreover, the rajah of Rotti submitted himself to Christ crucified; and in 1823 Lebrun baptized in Little Timor, Kissor, Letti, and Moa, 496 persons. The Friendly Society which he established was subscribed to every by some of the pagan princes. He everywhere formed schools, and to the remote churches he addressed pastoral letters, after the manner of the apostles, of the good effect of which there are very pleasing testimonies. A few years before his death, which took place in 1829, eight missionaries more arrived, who distributed themselves among various stations, and made it one part of their business to establish more fundamentally in Christianity the churches and congregations that had been gained to it. Their work, indeed, is often exceedingly harassing and fatiguing. The centre, however, of missionary labors in the archipelago is, and always has been, Amboyna. Its inhabitants have since 1850 been regarded as Christians. The Rotterdam Society has a number of stations there, and a seminary for the education of native teachers. These stations are now subject to the Church at Batavia, and it is anticipated that the Dutch government will recognise the missionaries as stationed pastors, and contribute for their support. See Sonnerat, Voyage to the Spice Islands; Forrest, Voyage to New Guinea; Crawfurd, Hist. of the Indian Archipelago, 1:18 sq.; Earl, Native Races of the Indian Archipelago, chapter 6; Daniel, Handbuch der Geographie, 1:323 sq.; Grundemann, Missions-Atlas, part 2, No. 6; Newcomb, Cyclop. of Missions, page 485 sq.

## Molungon[[@Headword:Molungon]]

             the name given to the Supreme Being by some of the tribes of Central Africa.

## Molybdomancy[[@Headword:Molybdomancy]]

             (from μόλυβδος, lead, and μαντεία, divination), a species of divination among the ancient heathen, in which they drew conjectures concerning future events from the motions and figures presented by melted lead.

## Molyneux, William[[@Headword:Molyneux, William]]

             an Irish mathematician and philosopher, who was born at Dublin April 17, 1656, was educated at the university of his native place, and afterwards studied law, is noted as one of the founders of the “Dublin Philosophical Society,” of which he was first secretary (1683), and then president, and as the author of twenty-seven papers on miscellaneous subjects inserted in the “Philosophical Transactions” between 1684 and 1716, and of a Translation of the six Metaphysical Dissertations of Descartes, together with the Objections against them by Thomas Bobbes (Lond. 1671). Molyneux was a devoted Protestant, and during the political disturbances was obliged to seek refuge in England in 1688. After the battle of the Boyne he returned again to Ireland. Among the many persons of literary eminence with whom Molyneux maintained a correspondence, Locke was held by him in particular esteem, and in the last year of his life he went to England for the purpose of visiting that philosopher. Molyneux died in Dublin October 11, 1698. (J.H.W.)

## Momdis[[@Headword:Momdis]]

             (Μομδείς v.r. Μόμδιος), given (1Es 2:4) in place of MAADAI SEE MAADAI (q.v.) of the Heb. (Ezr 10:34).

## Moment[[@Headword:Moment]]

             (רֶגִע, re'ga, the wink of an eye, i.e., an instant; στιγμή, a point of time, Luk 4:5).

## Momiers or Mummers[[@Headword:Momiers or Mummers]]

             (from the French word monzerie-mummery, hypocrisy) is a name of contempt given to a sect of Calvinistic Methodists in French Switzerland. In the first part of the present century we find in Switzerland, as in Germany, a conflict between the old confessional faith and Rationalism. The Genevan school had broken loose from rigid Calvinism, and the heresies of Arianism and Socinianism were taught and believed. But after the great political events of the years 1813-15 we see the old evangelical faith beginning once more to assert itself, young theologians in Geneva and the canton Vaud declaring in favor of orthodox preaching, and avowing the then almost forgotten doctrines of Christ's divinity and of total human depravity. Their preaching caused great bitterness of feeling. Empaytaz,  generally recognised as the first preacher of the Momiers at that time, was in 1816 obliged to quit Geneva, and in 1817 the “Venrable Compagnie des Pasteurs” (i.e., the Presbytery of Geneva) issued a formal prohibition against preaching on those doctrines which had ever been held as the fundamental doctrines of the Reformed Church. This arbitrary action led to an open rupture between the evangelical and rationalistic parties. A number of preachers-among them, Malan (q.v.), Empaytaz, Gaussen, Bost, Galland, and Drummond (a British Methodist) refused to obey, and actually separated from the state Church, organizing their own independent evangelical congregations. Their adherents were all more or less influenced by Methodist tendencies, and inclined to a sombre view of life. They were called by the people “Momiers,” as if to say hypocrites, and exposed to the insults of the populace. Many vexatious occurrences took place; they were much disturbed in their worship, particularly at Geneva, where they had erected a church by funds secured in England; but they were at last officially tolerated. In the canton Vaud, however, where they had spread considerably, their assemblies were entirely forbidden by the authorities by special act (May 20, 1824), and in consequence the pastors Scheler, Olivier, Chavannes, Professor Monnard, and others, were obliged to leave their flocks or suffer heavy penalties. But the old experience that persecution only strengthens a persecuted cause proved true here also. The sect gladly took to itself the name given in reproach, and the “Momiers,” in spite of interdict, continued to increase, and finally caused the formation of an independent Church (Eglise separe). In 1834 the right of assembling together. and free exercise of their religious convictions, was granted them by the state, and they spread now more than ever. They found adherents also in German Switzerland. Thus in Berne a Wiirtemberger named Mehrli, and a physician from Weimar named Valenti, actively proselyted for the new doctrines. In Neuenburg also, and in other Protestant cantons of the little European republic, this peculiar “Methodism” spread and flourished. A paper was also started, the Gazette Evangelique, and it rapidly gained a large circulation. While the Evangelical Society of Geneva [see the articles SEE MALAN and SEE HALDANE brothers] owes its origin and strength largely to the influence and zealous co-operation of this sect, the great results of this schism are embodied in a free evangelical Church union, called the “‘Iglise libre,” which was organized by the different nonconforming congregations in 1848. See Malan, Swiss Tracts, 1:20 sq.; Les Proces du Methodisme en Geneve (1835); Hagenbach, Ch. Hist. 18th and 19th Cent. 2:406 sq.; Hist. veritable des Momiers de Geneve (Paris,  1824); Schweizer, Die kirchl. Zerwurfiisse im Kanton Waadt; Mestral, Mission de l'Eglise libre (1848); Bost, Defense des fidbles de l'Elise de Geneve (Paris, 1825); Von Goltz, Die reform. Kirche Genfs im 19: Jahrah. (Basle and Gel. 1862); Cheneviere, Quelques mots sur la Geneve religieuse du baron de Goltz (Genesis 1863); Aschbach, Kirchen-Lex. 4:259.

## Mon(t)serrat[[@Headword:Mon(t)serrat]]

             one of the smallest of the West India Islands, belonging to Great Britain, situated 43 miles N.W. of Guadeloupe, and at a similar distance from Antigua and St. Kitts, about 11 miles in length and 7 in breadth, contains an area of 47 English square miles, with a population of a little over 8500, the females exceeding the males by 735. About two thirds of the surface is mountainous and barren; the rest is well cultivated. The chief products are sugar, rum, and molasses; but cotton, arrow-root, and tamarinds are also exported. The island forms a portion of the government of the Leeward Isles, and is directly ruled by a president, aided by a council and house of assembly. The chief town is Plymouth, on the south coast. The revenue of Montserrat in 1860 amounted to £3333, and the expenditure to £3243. In  the same year 203 vessels of 7825 tons entered, and 194 vessels of 7450 tons cleared its port; and the total values of imports and exports were respectively £20,060 and £17,043. The religion of the country is Christian, Protestants predominating now; though many Roman Catholics have sprung from those Irish settlers who entered the island in 1632, and the French, who owned it from 1712 till 1746.

## Mona[[@Headword:Mona]]

             (μόνη) is a term applied to females who assumed the monastic life. The common name applied to female recluses is nunas, from nonna; Gr. νάννη, aunt. SEE NUNS.

## Monacensis, Codex[[@Headword:Monacensis, Codex]]

             SEE MUNICH MS.

## Monachism[[@Headword:Monachism]]

             SEE MONASTICISM.

## Monaco, Francisco-Maria del[[@Headword:Monaco, Francisco-Maria del]]

             an Italian theologian, a native of Sicily, was born in 1593. In 1618 he entered holy orders, but, instead of preaching, devoted himself to pedagogy. He taught for a time at Padua, and was subsequently employed in different offices. In 1644 he came to France, welcomed by cardinal Mazarin, who appointed him his successor. He preached successfully before the court and in the churches of Paris. He was appointed, through the influence of the prime minister, archbishop of Rheims, but died shortly after at Paris (1651). He wrote Il Sole, panegirico (Venice, 1618, 4to): — La Penna, panegirico (1620, 4to): — Patrum Clericorum regularium XIV Elogia (Padua; Milan, 1621, 8vo): — In actores et spectatores comediarum nostri temporis Parcenesis (Padua, 1621, 4to): — Horae subcesivae (1625, 4to): — De Paupertate evangelica (Rome, 1644, folio); a work which his departure for France obliged him to leave unfinished: — De Fidei unitate, III, ad Carolum, Britanniarum regem. (Paris, 1648, folio): — In universam Aristotelis Philosophiam Commentaria (Paris, 1652, folio). Other works of his are preserved in manuscript at Palermo. See Silos, Hist Cleric. reg. part 3, book 8; L. Allatius, De Viris Illustr page 108; F.M. Maggi, De Vita Ursule Benincasae ; Mongitore, Bibl. sicula. 1:225; Domini illustri della Sicilia volume 4.

## Monaco, Lorenzo[[@Headword:Monaco, Lorenzo]]

             a Genoese painter, sometimes called the “Monk of the Isole d'Oro,” flourished in the 14th century. He was a favorite of the king and queen of Aragon, to whom he presented several illuminated missals. A beautiful Angel, with arms crossed over his bosom, and floating in the air, is credited to him in the Florence gallery; also The Flight into Egypt, in the Arena at Padua, in which picture Mary and Joseph are attended by Salome and three youths. But very little is known of this artist. He died, according to Lanzi, in 1408. See Lanzi's History of Painting, transl. by Roscoe (London, 1847, 3 volumes, 8vo), 3:233; Mrs. Jameson, Legends of the Madonna (ibid. 1857, 8vo), page 231; Sacred and Legendary Art (ibid. 1857, 2 volumes, 8vo), 1:120; 2:796.

## Monadology[[@Headword:Monadology]]

             (from Gr. μονάς, unity, and λόγος, discourse) is the term applied to the doctrine or science of Monads, which was filly developed by the German philosopher Leibnitz. “ He conceived the whole universe, bodies as well as minds, to be made up of monads, that is, simple substances; each of which is, by the Creator, in the beginning of its existence, endowed with certain active and perceptive powers. A monad, therefore, is an active substance, simple, without parts or figure, which has within itself the power to produce all the changes it undergoes from the beginning of its existence to eternity. The changes which the monad undergoes, of what kind soever, though they may seem to us the effect of causes operating from without, are oily the gradual and successive evolutions of its own internal powers, which would have produced all the same changes and motions although there had been no other being in the universe” (Reid, Intell. Powers, essay 2, chapter 15). “Monadology,” says Cousin, “ rests upon this axiom: every substance is at the same time a cause, and, every substance being a cause, has therefore in itself the principle of its own development; such is the monad — it is a simple force. Each monad has relation to all others; it corresponds with the plan of the universe; it is the universe abridged; it is, as Leibnitz says, a living mirror which reflects the entire universe under its own point of view. But every monad being simple, there is no immediate action of one monad upon another; there is, however, a natural relation of their respective development, which makes their apparent communication; this natural relation, this harmony, which has its reason in the wisdom of the supreme Director, is pre-established harmony” (Hist. of Mod. Philos.  2:86). See Ueberweg, Hist. Philos. 2:92 sq., 107 sq.; also pages 27, 54, 130, 145, 312, 316, 336, 507. SEE LEIBNITZ; SEE NEO-PLATONISM.

## Monarchee[[@Headword:Monarchee]]

             was the title occasionally bestowed in the Christian churches, especially in those of the East, instead of the more familiar metropolitan (q.v.). In the 6th canon of the Council of Sardica, which was held in 344, we find metropolitans distinguished by the title princeps provincic (ἔξαρχος τῆς ἐπαρχίας);'but elsewhere, in references of those days, they are entitled monarchae. See Riddle, Christian Antiquities, page 224.

## Monarchia[[@Headword:Monarchia]]

             is the term by which is designated the leading or opening statement in the orderly enunciation of the doctrine of-the Trinity (q.v.), i.e., the doctrine that there is one and only one Α᾿ρχή, principle or fountain of Divinity, God the Father, the first person in the Trinity, who only is Αὐτόθεος, “God of and from himself” (Pearson [Expos. of the Creed (1741, fol.), page 39] is very particular on the form of this statement, and takes exception to Bull, who uses the word “ from” — “of and from himself,” which Pearson considers a contradiction). The doctrine of the Trinity assumes that. the Son and the Holy Ghost derive their divinity from the Father is the one Α᾿ρχή. The scriptural and only true idea of God involves in its development the idea of the trinity; and the doctrine of the Monarchia may be approached either from the side of the unity of God or from the side of the trinity of persons. Coming to it on the side of the unity, there is presented to the mind, first, the existence of God, then the unity of God, then the underived nature — that is, his self-existence. Coming to the doctrine on the side of the trinity of persons, Scripture reveals God the Son, who is θεὸς ἐκ θεοῦ by an eternal generation; and God the Holy Ghost, who is θεὶς ἐκ θεοῦ by an eternal procession. This refers us to the first person of the Trinity, as him from whom the second and third persons derive their divinity.

The doctrine of the Monarchia, flowing as it does directly from the unity of God, in its expression guards that unity; while at the same time it renders it possible that the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost God, by a derivation of Godhead; the full doctrine of the Godhead of the second and third persons being maintained by the further doctrine of the perichoresis. It is to be remarked that as ἀρχή has the meaning of “beginning” with reference to time, as well as the meaning of “principle” with reference to  origin, so with regard to the former meaning the Son and the Holy Spirit are ἄναρχοι as well as the Father. Αἰτία, cause, is also used in the enunciation of this doctrine: the Father himself, αἰτία, is ἀναίτιος; the Son and the Holy Spirit are αἰτιατός and αἰτιατόν. Scripture and the Church avoid the appearance of tritheism by tracing back (if we may so say) the infinite perfection of the Son and Spirit to him whose Son and Spirit they are. They are, so to express it, but the new manifestation and repetition of the Father; there being no room for numeration or comparison between them, nor any resting-place for the contemplating mind, till they are referred to him in whom they centre. On the other hand, in naming the Father, we imply the Son and Spirit, whether they be named or not. This is the key to much of the language of holy Scripture which is otherwise difficult to understand, as, e.g. 1Jn 5:20; 1Co 12:4-31; Joh 14:16-18 (Newman's Arians, page 192). Viewing this doctrine on the side of the second and third persons of the Trinity, it becomes the doctrine of their subordination to the Father. In nature, in perfection of substance, equal to the Father; in authority, in origin, the Son and Holy Spirit are subordinate. Bull expresses it thus: “ Pater igitur minor est Filius κατ᾿ αἰτίαν. AEqualis vero est Patri Filius κατὰ φύσιν. Deus ac Dominus est Filius aeque ac Pater; et in hoc solo discrepat a Patre Filius, quod Deus et Dominus sit a Patre Deo ac Domino; hoc est, Deus licet de Deo sit, de vero tamen Deo Deus verus est, ut definivit synodus ipsi Nicaena” (Bull's Works, Burton's ed., 6:707). The like things may be said of the Holy Spirit. This subordination, and the ministrations of the Son and of the Holy Spirit in executing the counsels of the individual society of the Godhead, is styled the economy of the Holy Trinity. SEE PROCESSION.

## Monarchians[[@Headword:Monarchians]]

             is a name given to those Christians of the early Church who denied the distinction of persons in the divine nature. They insisted on the divine. unity, which they thought was infringed by the common and orthodox doctrine of the Trinity. “Monarchiam tenemus” was their frequent assertion when comparing themselves with the orthodox fathers, whom they accordingly charged with Tritheism. Yet it is apparent that the Monarchians did not properly use the term μοναρχία — at least not in the catholic sense, as maintaining that there is only one ἀρχή, source or fountain of Deity, the Father, which sense implies the existence of the Begotten Son and Proceeding Spirit as distinct Persons; nor in the sense of  unity, for unity can only be asserted when there is plurality (in which lies the misuse of the term by the Unitarians); nor, again, in the sense of God's sole government, which affirms nothing concerning the existence or non- existence of a distinction of Persons in the Godhead; but they used it .in the sense of simple oneness, from which oneness they argued that the Godhead is so simple a being as to be μονοπρόσωπος — a solitary, single Hypostasis. That this was the meaning in which they used the term μοναρχία is apparent on the very face of the controversy. Thus Tertullian goes on to assert that monarchia means nothing else than “singulare et unicum imperium.”

The Monarchians are generally credited as the adherents of Praxeas, a writer of the Grecian school. They were sometimes called Patripassians, because their views led to the conclusion that, if the union between God the Father and his Son Jesus were so intimate as they affirmed, then the former must be supposed to have suffered with the latter all the afflictions of his life and death. Praxeas held that the Word of God (Jesus Christ) meant nothing more than the word of his mouth — the emissions of his voice, to which distinct agency had been metaphorically ascribed. These heretics considered that the doctrine of the Church with respect to the personality of the Son was a disparaging representation of Christ, whom they held to be the supreme God himself, and who, in a way he had never (done besides, had revealed himself in human nature, and had appeared in a human body. They taught that God was to be considered in two different relations: 1, the hidden Being, as he was before the Creation — the Father; and, 2, in so far as he revealed himself, the Son of the Logos; and it was only in virtue of these considerations that Christ, as the most perfect revelation of God the Father, was called the Son of God. They maintained that this doctrine was most eminently calculated to dignify Christ. (See, however, below.) The Monarchians received both the Old and New Testaments, and held doctrines somewhat resembling modern Unitarianism.

This general class, however, comprehended many who differed more from each other than they did even from those reputed orthodox, and who, indeed, had nothing in common but a great zeal for Monotheism, and a fear lest the unity of God should be endangered by the hvpostases of the Alexandrian fathers. Thus Theodotus, Artemon, and Paul of Samosata were placed by the side of Praxeas, Noetus, Beryllus of Bostra, and Sabellius, between whom and themselves, on every essential point of Christian doctrine, there was an unmistakable opposition.  Monarchianism is generally supposed to have originated about the end of the 2d century. It seems to us, however, that this heresy may be traced to the very earliest times of Christianity. Justin Martyr expressly denounces it, and his notice guides us to its source. for he finds the heresy to exist both among Jews and Christians. He condemns the Jews for thinking that, when God was said to have appeared to the patriarchs, it was God the Father who appeared. Such, he says, are justly convicted of knowing neither the Father nor the Son; for they who say that the Son is the Father are convicted of neither understanding the Father nor of knowing that the Father of the universe has a Son, who, being the first-born Logos of God, is likewise God (First Apol. chapter 63). In the Dialogue with Trypho he handles the same topic, and extends the charge to Christians. “I am aware that there are some who wish to meet this by saving that the power which appeared from the Father of the universe to Moses, or Abraham, or Jacob, is called an Angel in his coming among men, since by this the will of the Father is made known to men; he is also called Glory, since he is sometimes seen in an unsubstantial appearance; sometimes he is called a Man, since he appears under such forms as the Father pleases; and they call him the Word, since he is also the bearer of messages from the Father to men. But they say that this power is unseparated and undivided from the Father, in the same manner that the light of the sun when on earth is unseparated and undivided from the sun in heaven, and when the sun sets the light is removed with it; so the Father, they say, when he wishes, makes his power go forth, and when he wishes he brings it back again to himself” (Dial. c. Tryph. cc. 127, 128).

It appears, then, there were persons in Justin's time who called themselves Christians, but who believed that the Son was merely an unsubstantial energy or operation of the Father (see Bull, Def. Fid. Nic. Song of Solomon 2, qu. 4, 4; Burton, Bampt. Lect. note 103). Now in this the Jews had deserted the better teachings of their earlier rabbins; for these ascribed a divine personality to the angel of the Presence, and the doctrine of the holy and undivided Trinity subsisted, though in a less developed form, in the synagogue of old (see Mill, Panth. Prin. part 2, page 92 sq.). The cause of this declension in doctrine was, that opposition to the Incarnate Word, when he really appeared, seemed to have predisposed them to accept a heathen philosophy, and to represent the Logos as Philo did as the manifest God not personally distinct from the concealed Deity. This error found its way into Christianity through the Gnostics, who were largely indebted to the Platonic school of Alexandria. It appears as the foundation of the system of Simon Magus, who taught  that the originating principle of all (which he asserted to be Fire, for “God is a consuming fire”) is of a twofold nature, having a secret part and a manifest part, corresponding, as Hippolytus remarks, to the potentiality and energy of Aristotle. If this be nothing else than Philo's representation of the Logos, there is some sure ground for the notion that Simon held the heresy afterwards called Sabellian.

Burton rejects the notion, inasmuch as the doctrine of emanations is not to be confounded with the theory of Sabellius; but Hippolytus (whom Burton did not possess) shows that the Logos, in Simon's theory, employed certain portions of the divine fulness, which portions he called AEons; and that the Logos, although Simon uses the word Begotten, is really the manifest God not personally distinct from the concealed Deity (see Burton, Bampton Lect. note 46). Although, therefore, the doctrine of emanations is not to be confounded with the doctrine of Sabellius, it had in its original form, as constructed by Simon, a foundation of Sabellianism. Traces of Sabellianism are found even in the later schools of Gnostics, and the later Sabellianism approached to an emanation theory. A resemblance has been noticed between the tenets of Valentinus and those of Sabellius (Peturius, Dogmz. Theol. II, 1:6; Wormius, Hist. Sabel. 2:3), and Neander is inclined to think that Marcion may have adopted some of the Patripassian doctrines in Asia Minor (Clhurch Hist. 1:796; Burton, Bampton Lect. note 103). The leading tenet of the Monarchians thus appears to have been introduced into Christianity principally through the Alexandrian Jews and the Gnostics. It may also have been derived immediately from heathen philosophers, as in the case of Noetus it is ascribed by Hippolytus immediately to Ieraclitus, SEE NOETIANS.

But whatever its origin in its development, Monarchianism must be carefully distinguished among two opposite classes claiming to be Monarchians: the rationalistic or dynamic Monarchians, who denied the divinity of Christ, or explained it as a mere power (Δύναμις); and the patripassian Monarchians, who identified the Son with the Father, and admitted at most only a modal trinity, a threefold mode of revelation. “The first form of this heresy,” says Schaff, “involved in the abstract Jewish monotheism, deistically sundered the divine and the human, and rose little above Ebionism. The second proceeded, at least in part, from pantheistic preconceptions, and approached the ground of Gnostic docetism. The one prejudiced the dignity of the Son, the other the dignity of the Father; yet  the latter was by far the more profound and Christian, and accordingly met with the greater acceptance.”

1. The Monarchians of the first class saw in Christ a mere man, filled with divine power; but conceived this divine power as operative in him, not from the baptism only, according to the Ebionitish view, but from the beginning; and admitted his supernatural generation by the Holy Ghost. To this class belong:

(1) The Alogians, a heretical sect in Asia Minor about A.D. 170, of which very little is known. SEE ALOGIANS.

(2) The Theodotians, so called from their founder, Theodotus, who flourished near the close of the 2d century. He denied Christ in a persecution, with the apology that he only denied a man; but still held him to be the supernaturally begotten Messiah. He taught that Jesus was born of the Virgin according to the will of the Father, and that at his baptism the higher Christ descended upon him. But this higher Christ Theodotus conceived as the Son of him who was at once the Supreme God and the Creator of the world, and not (with Cerinthus and other Gnostics) as the son of a deity superior to the God of the Jews. SEE THEODOTIANS.

(3) The Artemonites, or adherents of Artemon, who came out somewhat later at Rome with a similar opinion, declaring the doctrine of the divinity of Christ an innovation, and a relapse to heathen polytheism. They asserted that until the time of Victor, bishop of Rome, their doctrine was the reigning one in the Roman Church, and that it was first proscribed by Victor's successor, Zephyrinus (after A.D. 200). This was an unreasonable charge, but may have been made possible by the indefiniteness of the earliest formulas of the Christian Church. The Artemonites were charged with placing Euclid and Aristotle above Christ, and esteeming mathematics and dialectics above the Gospel. SEE ARTEMONITES.

(4) Paul of Samosata, bishop of Antioch in the second half of the 3d century, who denied the personality of the Logos and of the Holy Ghost, and considered them merely powers of God, like reason and mind in man; but granted that the Logos dwelt in Christ in larger measure than in any former messenger of God; and taught, like the Socinians in later times, a gradual elevation of Christ, determined by his own moral development, to divine dignity (a θεοποίησις ἐκ προκοπῆς). His overthrow by the emperor Aurelius in 272 decided the fall of the Monarchians, though they  still appear at the end of the 4th century as condemned heretics, under the name of Samlosatenians (q.v.), Paulianists (q.v.), and Sabellians (q.v.).

2. The second class of Monarchians, called by Tertullian Patripassians (as afterwards a branch of the Monophysites was called Theopaschites), together with their unitarian zeal, felt the deeper Christian impulse to hold fast the divinity of Christ; but they sacrificed to it his independent personality, which they merged in the essence of the Father.

(1) The first prominent advocate of this class of Monarchians, rather than the founder of Monarchianism, was Praxeas, of whom we have already spoken above. Noetus of Smyrna, who differed but little from Praxeas, is frequently recognised as the leader of a branch of this class; and Callistus (pope Calixtus I), who adopted and advocated the doctrines of Noetus, as the leader of a third branch. Those who strictly followed him were called Callistians, in distinction from the direct followers of Noetus, who were called Noetians (q.v.). Noetus taught (according to Hippolytus, Philos. 9:7 sq.) that the one God who created the world, though in- himself invisible, had yet from most ancient times appeared from time to time, according to his good pleasure, to righteous men; and that this same God had himself become also the Son, when it pleased him to submit to being born; he was consequently his own son, and in this identity of the Father and the Son consisted the “monarchia” of God. An associate and disciple of Noetus was Epigonus, who brought the doctrine he professed to Rome; and his pupil, again, was Cleomenes, who defended the doctrine of Noetus in the time of bishop Zephyrinus, the successor of Victor. With this Cleomenes, according to Hyppolytus, Callistus, the successor of Zephyrinus, was on terms of friendship, and was of like opinions. Callistus declared the Son to be merely the manifestation of the Father in human form; the Father animating the Son, as the spirit animates the body (Joh 14:11), and suffering with him on the cross. “The Father,” says he, “who was in the Son, took flesh and made it God, uniting it with himself, and made it one. Father and Son were therefore the name of the one God, and this one person (πρόσωπον) cannot be two; thus the Father suffered with the Son.” After the death of this pope, Patripassianism virtually disappeared from the Roman Church.

(2) The stepping-stone from simple Patripassianism to what we shall presently deal with as Sabellian modalism constitutes the doctrine advanced by Beryllus of Bostra, in Arabia. From him we have only a somewhat  obscure and very variously interpreted passage in Eusebius (H.E. 6:33). He denied the personal preexistence (Ι᾿δία οὐσίας περιγραφή, i.e., a circumscribed, limited, separate existence), and in general the independent divinity (Ι᾿δία θεότης) of Christ, but at the same time asserted the indwelling of the divinity of the Father ( ῾Η πατρικὴ θεότης) in him during his earthly life.

(3) The Sabellian modalism had its starting-point in the views evolved by Sabellius (q.v.), who flourished in the beginning of the 2d century. He differed from the orthodox standard mainly in denying the trinity of essence and the permanence of the trinity of manifestation; making the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost only temporary phenomena, which fulfil their mission and return into the abstract monad. He differed from the other Monarchians by embracing the Holy Ghost in his speculation, and thereby reached a trinity; not a simultaneous trinity of essence, however, but only a successive trinity of revelation. He starts from a distinction of the monad and the triad in the divine nature. His fundamental thought is that the unity of God, without distinction in itself, unfolds or extends itself ( ῾Η μονὰς πλατυνθεῖσα γέγονε τριάς) in the course of the world's development in three different forms and periods of revelation (Ο᾿νόματα, πρόσωπα — not in the orthodox sense of the term, however, but in the primary sense of mask, or part [in a play.]), and, after the completion of redemption, returns into unity. The Father reveals himself in the giving of the law or the Old- Testament economy (not in the creation also; this, in his view, precedes the trinitarian revelation); the Son, in the incarnation; the Holy Ghost, in inspiration. He illustrates the trinitarian relation by comparing the Father to the disk of the sun, the Son to its enlightening power, the Spirit to its warming influence. His view of the Logos, too, is peculiar. The Logos is not identical with the Son, but is the monad itself in its transition to triad; that is, God conceived as vital motion and creating principle — the speaking God (θεὸς λαλῶν), in distinction from the silent God (θεὸς σιωπῶν). Each πρόσωπον is another διαλέγεσθαι, and the three πρόσωπα together are only successive evolutions of the Logos or the worldward aspect of the divine nature. As the Logos proceeded from God, so he returns at last into him, and the process of trinitarian development (Διάλεξις) closes (comp. Baur. Gesch. d. Dreieinigkeitslehre, on this point). Athanasius traced the doctrine of Sabellius to the Stoic philosophy; and it must be confessed that in the Pythagorean system also, in the Gospel of the Egyptians, and even in the pseudo-Clementine homilies, there are  kindred ideas. But, notwithstanding these, it is now generally conceded that Sabellius was in all respects original in the propounding of his theory of the Trinitarian doctrine. Says Schaff (Ch. Hist. 1:293): “Sabellius is by far the most original, ingenious, and profound of the Monarchians. His system is known to us only from a. few fragments, and some of these not altogether consistent, in Athanasius and other fathers. It was very fully developed, and has been revived in modern times by Schleiermacher .(Ueber den Gegensatz. der Sabellianischen u. Athkanasianischen Vorstellung v.d. Trinitat) in a peculiarly modified form.” Since the writing of the above by Dr. Schaffthe general Monarchian view of the incarnation has been revived by the Reverend Henry Ward Beecher, who in his Life of Christ (N.Y. 1871, 8vo), volume 1, denies the union of the human and divine nature in Christ, and asserts that he was God dwelling in and subject to the infirmities and limitation of the human flesh — a view which he supports largely from chapter 2 of Hebrews. SEE ARIANS; SEE INCARNATION; SEE MONOPHYSITES; SEE PATRIPASSIANS; SEE SABELLIANS; SEE UNITARIANS.

From this cursory glance at the history of Monarchianism, there is apparent an endeavor to escape from the revolting tenet of Patripassianism, and to retain or supply that which the nature of man almost instinctively requires a superhuman mediation and atonement. The working of these two motives, as the Monarchian adopted either the Arian or the Patripassian alternative, is very remarkable; inasmuch as the return to catholicity appears to be much easier in the school which adopted the former alternative. Where Patripassianism was at once and decisively rejected, it was open to the Monarchian to satisfy the need for a mediator by magnifying the divine element in our Lord, which at first he considered to be only the highest degree of prophetic grace, and passing through stages of Arianism and semi-Arianism to approach nearer and nearer to the truth. Whereas, when Patripassianism had been adopted, and the need was felt for freeing the mind from-a tenet at which one shudders, it was only done by diminishing the divine nature in Christ, through the stages of supposing it to be a portion of the divine fulness, then an emanation from the Godhead. The result was a deliberate Psilanthropism. Regarding the heresy itself of pseudo-Monarchianism, the main points for consideration are the following: First, an eternal mind must needs have in it from eternity an ἔννοια or λόγος, a notion or conception of itself, which the schools term verbum mentis: nor can it be conceived without it. “This Word in God  cannot be. as it is in us, a transient, vanishing accident, for then the divine nature would indeed be compounded of substance. and accident, which would be repugnant to its simplicity; but it must be a substantial, subsisting Word” (Bull, Cath. Doct. concerning the blessed Trinity).

The Monarchians denied this (Τελειότατον καὶ ζῶντα καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ πρώτου νοῦ λόγον ἔμψυχον). Denying this, they denied also that substantial vinculum caritatis in which the Father and the Son are one ἑνότητι Πνεύματος. Secondly, thus is destroyed that αὐτάρκεια which we attribute to God, i.e., his self-sufficiency and most perfect bliss and happiness in himself alone, before and without all created beings. For this we: cannot well conceive without acknowledging a distinction of persons in the Godhead. The Monarchians, it is clear, denied this individual society of the Trinity (comp. Blunt, Dict. of Sects, Heresies, etc., page 332). See Mohler, Athanasius der Grosse (Mainz, 1827), book 1 (Der Glaube der Kirche der drei ersten Jahrh. in Betreff der Trinit. etc.), pages 1-116; Baur, Die christl. Lehre von der Dreieinigkeit u. Menschwerdung Gottes in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwickelung (Tub. 1841-43, 3 volumes), 1:129- 341; Meier, Die Lehre von der Trinitat in ihrer hist. Entwickelung (Hamb. 1844, 2 volumes), 1:45-134; Dorner, Entwickelungsgeschichte der Lehre von der Person Christi (1839; 2d. ed. Stuttg. u. Berl. 1845-56, 2 volumes), 1:122-747; Lange, Gesch. d. Lehrbegriffes der Unitarier vor der nicanischen Synode (Leips. 1831); Schleiermacher, Werke, 1:2, pages 485- 574; Vogt, Lehre des Athanasius von Alexandrius (Bremen, 1861); Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, 1:62 sq., 116 sq., 131 sq.; Mosheim, Comment. Ecclesiastes Hist. (see Index); Milman, Hist. of Christianity, and Latin Christianity, 1:70-73; Pressense, Early Years of Christianity, Heresy, and Christian Doctrine (N.Y. 1873, 12mo). chapter 5; Neander, Hist. Dogmas (see Index in volume 2), and Ch. Hist. volume 1; Ueberweg, Hist. Philos. 2:30611; Ebrard, Dogmengesch. volume 1; Hase, Ch. Hist. page 98 sq., 196, 704; Schaff, Ch. Hist. volume 1, § 81 and 83.

## Monarchy, Israelitish[[@Headword:Monarchy, Israelitish]]

             (see Kale, De potestate regia ingente Hebr. Havn. 1749). According to the sense of the Mosaic constitution, the Hebrews were erected into a kind of republic under, the immediate dominion of Jehovah, forming a strict theocracy (q.v.); the law of the kingdom (Deu 17:14-20) being partly expounded by the Pentateuch itself, which alludes to it as a future institution, and partly organized on a permanent basis by Solomon,  largely independent of the Mosaic law (see Staudlein in Bertholdt's Theol. Journ. 3:259, 361 sq.; Hengstenberg, Pentat. 2:246 sq.). It was inaugurated by Samuel in compliance with a general request of the people, which had grown out of the bitter experience of many years, rendering it an inevitable necessity sooner or later (Ewald, Israel. Gesch. 2:140 sq.), as the order of judges was but a temporary and precarious safeguard against total anarchy. The king, however, was only empowered to administer the theocratic government as a viceroy of Jehovah, the heavenly sovereign (Psa 2:2), and was bound to this law as the highest authority, so as to exclude the idea of an independent and absolute monarch. In particular cases the Urim and Thummimn, or a prophet, or some other medium of divine communication (1Sa 28:6; 1Sa 30:7 sq.; 2Sa 2:1; 1Ki 22:7 sq.; comp. Joh 11:51), might be referred to in order to direct and confirm the theocratic regent as to the will of Jehovah, so that in this way the monarchical administration still retained the character of a divine government, and the kings were-reminded of their dependency (see Kalkar, Over de Israel. Godesregering, in his Verhandling van het Haagsche Genootschap, etc., 2:3 sq.). But in practice the Israelitish kings assumed the right of declaring war and concluding peace (1Sa 11:5 sq.), as well as of exercising judicial functions in the highest cases (2Sa 15:2; 1Ki 3:16 sq.; comp. Jer 21:12), and of pronouncing amnesty (2 Samuel 14). The king was also the patron of the religious cults (1Ki 8:2; 1Ki 12:4 sq.; 1Ki 18:4 sq.), and in war he was likewise the ideal leader of his troops (1Sa 8:20). Despotism was held in check sometimes by a sort of coronation-oath a Magna Charta, as it were (1Sa 10:25; 2Sa 5:3; 1Ki 12:4 sq.; 2Ki 11:17; comp. Josephus, War, 2:1, 2) — and sometimes by a mass meeting of the tribes (1Ch 4:41 sq.; the heads of families formed a kind of popular representatives, 1Ch 29:1 sq.; comp. 1Ch 13:2);, and there even occurs an example of the direct intervention of the people (1Sa 14:45 sq.); but especially the prophets, who from the time of Samuel were set to guard the theocracy, and constituted a species of continually selfrenewing order, often made the most unshrinking opposition to the prince, either by introducing themselves officially into the royal cabinet (Nathan, Isaiah), or by demanding a special audience (1Ki 20:22 sq., 1Ki 20:38; 2Ki 1:15, etc.), and even went so far as open resistance, by their severe invectives at least, to unlawful measures of government (compare 1Sa 22:17 sq.). SEE PROPHET.

The regular succession was confined to the house of David. Usually the first-born son (even when a minor [2Ki 11:21] there is found no provision for a guardian or regent [yet see the Sept. at 1Ki 12:24]; the queen-dowager, however, seems to have a position as counsellor in such cases [Jer 13:18; comp. 2Ki 24:12]) appears to have as a matter of course assumed the reins of government, but occasionally the father is stated to have designated a particular son to the throne (1Ki 1:17; 1Ki 1:20; 2Ch 11:22); sometimes the people themselves interfered (2Ki 21:24; 2Ki 23:30), and even foreign powers at length imposed rulers as their own vassals upon the nation: (2Ki 23:34; 2Ki 24:17). In the kingdom of Israel the first king was inducted into office by a prophet (1Ki 11:31 sq.), and the succession was thenceforth hereditary (descending to the son, or, when the direct line failed, to the brother, 2Ki 3:1); but the brief dynasties followed each other with many interruptions through extinction, conspiracy, or deposition (1Ki 16:9; 1Ki 16:16; 1Ki 16:21), and several interregna occurred. An association in the throne, or rather viceroyship, of the successor in consequence of the disability of the ruling monarch is mentioned in 2 Chronicles 27:21; and numerous other instances are rendered probable by the discrepancies in the regnal years. SEE CHRONOLOGY.

In-the election of a king, ancient nations had great regard to personal size (1Sa 10:23) and beauty (1Sa 16:12; Eze 28:12; comp. Psa 40:3; Homer, II. 3:166 sq.; Herod. 3:20; Strabo, 15:699; 17:822; Athen. 12:566; Barhebr. Chronicles page 384; see also Dougtsei Analect. 1:131); and Hebrew kings were required to be native citizens (Deu 17:15). Those who instituted a new dynasty sought to strengthen their power by the extinction of the previous reigning family (1Ki 16:11; 2Ki 10:11; 2Ki 10:17; 2Ki 11:1; comp. Josephus. Ant. 15:7, 10), as is customary still in the East (Tavernier, Voyage, 1:253). The first kings, Saul (1Sa 9:16; 1Sa 10:1; 1Sa 15:1; 1Sa 15:17) and David (1Sa 16:12 sq.; 2Sa 2:4; 2Sa 5:3; 2Sa 12:7), also Solomon (1Ki 1:34; 1Ki 1:39; 1Ki 5:1 so likewise Absalom unlawfully, 2Sa 19:11), were regularly anointed by a prophet or the high- priest; but in later times this was done only in the case of Josiah, whom the priesthood restored to the throne in place of the usurping Athaliah (2Ki 11:12), and Jehoahaz his son, whom the people raised to the throne (2Ki 23:30), besides Jehu of the kingdom of Israel, who established a new dynasty (2Ki 9:1 sq.); the principle apparently being in these cases to supply the lack of the hereditary right. The Anointed of Jehovah (מְשַׁיחִ יְהוָֹה), or simply the Anointed, accordingly appears (in the sacred  style) as the official title of the regular sovereign (1Sa 2:10; 1Sa 2:35; 1Sa 16:6; 1Sa 24:6; 1Sa 26:16; 1Sa 26:23; 2Sa 19:22; 2Sa 22:51; Psa 2:2, Lam 4:20, etc.). No other ceremony of investiture seems to have been enjoined; although we occasionally find a popular assembly (1Sa 10:24; 1 Kings , 25,. 39; 2Ki 9:13; 2Ki 11:13; 2Ch 23:11; comp.. Josephus, War, 1:33, 9), a coronation (2Ki 11:12), music (1Ki 1:40), and thank-offerings (1Ki 1:24). The royal beast of burden is also mentioned (1Ki 1:38). See Fort. Scacchi Dissert. de inaugurat. regum Israel. in Ugolini: Thesaur. volume 32. Regal costumes, consisting of costly and elaborate garments, were also used (at least armlets, 2Sa 1:19; 1Ma 10:20; 1Ma 10:62; 1Ma 11:5; 1Ma 14:43), in accompaniment with the simple diadem (נֵזֶר, 2Sa 1:10; 2Ki 11:12), jewelled crown (עֲטָרָה, 2Sa 12:30; Son 2:11; comp. Eze 21:26; 1Ma 10:20), the sceptre (שֵׁבֶט), and the throne (כַּסֵּא). See each word. Later occurs the purple mantle (1Ma 6:15; 1Ma 10:20; 1Ma 10:62; 1Ma 14:43; comp. Act 12:21).

The income of the Israelitish kings, with which they defrayed the expenses of their court and administration, was derived from voluntary but (as still in the East; see Kimpfer, Amnon. page 95) valuable presents from their subjects in Palestine and the dependencies (1Sa 10:27; 1Sa 16:20; 2Sa 8:2; 2Sa 8:11; 1Ki 10:25; comp. Herod. 3:87, 97; Elian, V.H. 1:31; Heeren, Ideen, I, 1:225 sq., 483), from public domains and royal possessions, consisting of lands, vineyards, and olive-yards (1Sa 8:14; 1Ch 27:26 sq.; 2Ch 26:10; comp. Josephus, Ant. 6:13, 10; 14:10, 6), which sometimes fell to the crown by confiscation of private property (1Ki 21:16 sq.; comp. Eze 46:18; see Kampfer, ut sup. page 96), from monopolies (1Ki 10:11 sq., 1Ki 10:26 sq.; Amo 7:1), from public services (1Ki 5:13; 1Ki 9:21; comp. 1Sa 8:13), and from regular taxes in kind (comp. 1Sa 8:15; 1Sa 17:25), which were farmed by head collectors (Isa 16:1; Ecc 2:8). At times there is mention of an extraordinary levy upon personal property (2Ki 23:35); and the king also claimed a share of the booty obtained in war (2Sa 8:11 sq.). SEE ASSESSMENT.

Hence came the at times so considerable royal treasures (1Ki 10:21; 1Ki 14:26; 2Ki 14:14), the rich wardrobes (2Ki 10:22), the palaces and parks (1Ki 7:9; 1Ki 19:2; 2Ki 21:18; 2Ki 25:4; Jer 39:4; Jer 52:7; Son 8:11), the sumptuously served table (1Ki 4:22 sq.; comp. Dan 5:1 sq.; Est 1:3  sq.), to which it was esteemed a great distinction to be invited as a regular guest (2Sa 9:7; see Morier, Second Journey, page 148; Rosenmuller, Morgenl. 3:163; comp. 2Ki 25:29; Dan 1:5; Herod. 3:132; Heeren, Ideen, I, 1:217). An especial mark of royal luxury was a well-stocked harem (2Sa 5:13; 1Ki 11:1 sq.; 1Ki 20:3; comp. Quint. Curt. 3:3, 24; Athen. 12:514; Plutarch, Artax. c. 43), which was guarded by eunuchs, and descended to the succeeding king (2Sa 12:8; comp. Herod. 3:68; the regulation in Deu 17:17 was interpreted as a limit of eighteen wives, Schickard, Jus. reg. page 175). SEE HAREM.

To aspire to a connection with this was equivalent to being a pretender to the throne (2Sa 16:22; 1Ki 2:21 sq.; comp. Movers, Phonic. 1:491). SEE ABSALOM. Among the holidays, the day of the king's birth or ascension was prominent (Hos 7:5; Mat 14:6; comp. Gen 40:20; Herod. 1:133; 9:109; Josephus, A nt. 7:3, 1). Music at court and table is early mentioned (2Sa 19:35; Ecc 2:8). Kings expressed their favor by rich presents, especially of arms and apparel, SEE GIFT; and on royal festive days malefactors were pardoned or their punishment was postponed (1Sa 11:13; 2Sa 19:22 sq.; comp. Gen 40:20; see Philo, 2:529). It was, however, a still more distinguished honor when the king invited any one to sit at his right hand (1Ki 2:19; comp. Sueton. Nero, 13; Wetstein, N.T. 1:456). The reverence paid to the monarch was very great (Pro 24:21); persons fell prostrate in his presence, so as to touch the forehead to the earth (1Sa 24:9; 1Sa 25:23; 2Sa 9:6; 2Sa 19:18; even females of royal rank did the same, 1Ki 1:16), dismounted in the street on meeting him (1Sa 25:23), and greeted him with salvos in the streets and at audiences (Dan 2:4; Dan 3:9; comp. Josephus, War, 2:1, 1; see Rosenmuller, Morgenl. 4:350). A high notion was entertained of his sagacity (2Sa 14:17; 2Sa 19:27; comp. Rosenmuller, Morgenl. 3:142 sq.). His entrance into a city was signalized by pomp (2Ki 9:13; 1Sa 18:6 sq.; comp. Josephus, Ant. 11:2, 1). Of the rank of the early Hebrew kings of course nothing can be particularly said; but in later times those created by the Romans held the honor of the senatorial order (comp. Josephus, Ant. 14:10,6). Whether in their edicts the Israelitish monarchs, like the Persian (Ezr 4:18; Ezr 7:24), Syrian (1Ma 10:19; 1Ma 11:31; 1Ma 15:19), and Egyptian (3Ma 4:14; 3Ma 7:2), issued their edicts in the plural number (see Fromann, Opusc. 1:202 sq.), is uncertain (comp. Theodoret, Quaest. in Genes. 19). Any infringement of the regal majesty was followed by the death penalty (1Ki 21:10), or  if perpetrated by a member of the royal family, it incurred an ignominious expulsion from court (2Sa 14:24-25).

In general Hebrew kings were quite as popular as other Oriental monarchs (Est 1:14; Est 4:11; Herod 1:99; 3:140; Diod. Sic. 2:21; 3:47; Agatharch. ed. Hudson, 1:63; Strabo, 17:821; Harmer, 2:95; Ludecke, Beschr. d. turk. Reichs, page 276), often exhibited themselves in the midst of their subjects (2Sa 19:8; 1Ki 20:39; 1Ki 22:10; 2Ki 6:26; 2Ki 7:17; Jer 38:7), and were affable with them (1Ki 3:15; 2Ki 6:26 sq.; 2Ki 8:3 sq., etc.), even to the extent of personal intercourse (1Ki 21:2 sq.; for later indications, see the Mishna, Sanhedr. 2:2 sq.). After their death the kings were laid in royal sepulchres (those of Judah in Jerusalem) (1Ki 2:10; 1Ki 11:43; 1Ki 14:31, etc.), but the wicked ones were sometimes denied this honor (2Ch 28:27 [? 26:23]), which, nevertheless, does not argue the adoption of a death-tribunal on the Israelitish monarchs (Rosenmuller, Morgenl. 3:269 sq.), after the Egyptian custom (Diod. Sic. 1:22). The consorts of deceased kings remained in high honor, and even held the title of queen-mother (גְּבַירָה,' mistress, 1Ki 15:13; 2Ki 10:13; Jer 13:18; Jer 29:2). The title “king” was applied to the princes of the royal house as well (Jer 17:20; comp. 2Ch 32:4). Monarchs expressed their regard for each other by rich presents (1Ki 10:2) and diplomatic embassies, the latter to convey especially their well-wishes and compliments (2Sa 20:2; 2Ki 20:12 sq.; comp. Herod, 6:39). SEE SALUTATION. The following official courtiers are mentioned:

(1.) Chief major-domo or head palace-marshal (הִבִּיַת נָגַיד עִלor אֲשֶׁר עִל הִבִּיַת, 2Ki 4:6; 2Ki 18:3; 2Ki 23:18; 2 Kings 9; Isa 22:15), who directed the court state (Kampfer, page 78), but was also occupied with civil duties. Among his subordinates were the palace doorkeepers (שֹׁעֲרַים, 2Ki 7:11).

(2.) Chief bailim'(אֲשֶׁר עִל הִמִּס, 2Sa 20:24; 1Ki 4:6; 1Ki 12:18; comp. 1Ki 11:28).

(3.) Chief warder of the wardrobe (אֲשֶׁר עִל הִמֶּלְתָּהָה, 2Ki 10:22, or שִֹׁמֵר הִבְּגָדַים, 2Ki 22:14; 2Ch 34:22).

(4.) Superintendent of the exchequer and lands (שִֹׁמֵר הָרְכוּשׁ, 1Ch 27:25 sq.), who had the oversight of the royal herds and domains (perhaps ‘the ἐπίτροπος of Luk 8:3). Similar were the financial officers of Solomon in the twelve districts (נַצָּבַים, 1Ki 4:7 sq.). The chamberlains proper were usually eunuchs (2Ki 8:6; Jeremiah 53:25); among whom probably was the cup-bearer (מִשְׁקֶה, 1Ki 10:5; comp. Josephus, Ant. 15:17, 4, 14:11, 4; 16:8,1; see Kampfer, page 81 sq.). A kind of chamberlain or valet is apparently designated in Jer 52:25; 2Ki 25:19 (הִמֶּלֶךְ אֲנָשַׁים מֵרֹאֵי פְנֵי), unless the expression indicates generally the highest officers of the court and state. What official is denoted in Jer 51:60 (שִׂר מְנוּחָה) is doubtful; Hitzig has perhaps conjectured rightly, the field-marshal. Finally, here belong the royal life-guard, who had to keep watch of the castle or palace (2Ki 11:5), but also saw the royal mandates executed in cases of capital punishment (2Sa 15:1). SEE CHERETHITE.

See generally W. Schickard, Jus. regium Hebrceor. (Tubing. 1621, with notes by J.B. Carpzov, Lips. 1674; also in Ugolini Thesaur. volume 24); Carpzov, Appar. Crit. p. 52 sq.; Michaelis, Mos. Recht, 1:298 sq.; Jahn, Archaol. II, 2:218 sq.; Paulsen, Regier.' d. Morgenland. (Altona, 1755); Otho, Lex. Rubb. page 575. SEE KING.

## Monasteria[[@Headword:Monasteria]]

             is a term which was sometimes used in the early Church to designate the places of worship belonging to the Egyptian Therapeutse. Thus Eusebius (Hist. Ecclesiastes lib. 2, c. 177) uses it (Μοναστήριον). Afterwards, in the Middle Ages, it became usual to give this name (monasteria) to large parochial and cathedral churches; hence the word minster (q.v.). See Riddle, Christian Antiquities, page 705.

## Monastery[[@Headword:Monastery]]

             (Latin, Monasticum; Greek, Μοναστήριον; from μοναστήρ, equivalent to μοναστής, a solitary, a monk; from μονάζειν, to be alone, to live in solitude; from μόνος, alone) is the name of a residence of persons, male or female, who have bound themselves by monastic vows. We confine this article to Christian monasteries of the Western world. and refer for pre- Christian monasticism to the article SEE MONASTICISM; and for Oriental and Russian monasteries to the article SEE MONKS, EASTERN.

1. Monasteries received various distinctive appellations, derived from the names of the founders of the order; from that of the patron or guardian saint to whom they were dedicated; from the site which they occupied; from the peculiar design of the foundation or occupation of the monks; from the particular color of the habit worn within the walls, and other circumstances. SEE MONK.

To one or other of the four leading orders a monastery was usually referred:

(1) the Order of Basil, including all the Greek monks and Carmelites;

(2) the Order of Augustine, in its three classes — canons regular, monks, and hermits, together with the congregations of nuns;

(3) the Order of Benedict, with its various branches, male and female;

(4) the Order of Francis, with its numerous ramifications. The common appellation of monasteries are the following:

(1) Μοναστήριον, monastery, as being the residence of monasterium, μονάζοντες, μοναχοί, μοναχαί, μόναι,or religious solitaries.

(2) Claustrum or claustra, cloister; literally, a place of confinement. This was the prevailing name in the West, and the choice of the name indicates the strict seclusion which prevailed.

(3) Coenobium, a common dwelling-place.

(4) Laura, λαῦρα or λάβρα, which is the old name for the residence of the anchorites. It appears to denote a narrow, confined, and inconvenient abode. According to Epiphanius (Haeres. page 69), it was the name of a narrow, dirty street in Alexandria, whence it was applied to the wretched habitations of anchorites in the Thebaid, Palestine, and Syria. By Latin writers laura is usually employed in contradistinction from coenobia.

(5) Σεμνεῖον, which is the name applied by Philoto the abodes or places of resort of the Therapeutce, and hence it was sometimes given to monasteries. The Latins retained the word sunmniun (simnium, or scimnium).

(6) Α᾿σκητήριον, i.e., ἀσκητῶν καταγωγή, a place of religious exercise or contemplation. We find. various words of similar form to the Latin asceterium; such as archisterium, architerium, arcisterium, architium, etc.

(7) Φοντιστήριον is the same as ἀσκήτηριον, but with special reference to meditation and spiritual exercises. Monasteries retained this name chiefly on account of their schools.

(8) ῾Ησυχαστήριον, place of silence and repose. This term was applicable to those monasteries in which silence was, to a certain extent, imposed on the members.

(9) Conventus, a convent, in reference to the common life of the inmates.

(10) ῾Ηγουμενεῖον, denoting properly the residence of the president (ἡγούμενος or ἡγουμένη), was used for the whole building.

(11) Μάνδρα, a word which means a pen, or sheepfold, and refers to the residence of the anchorites in remote districts, or to their congregating together in flocks. Hence the president was sometimes-called archimandrite.

(12) Lastly, the Syrians and Arabians, almost without exception, used the word daira, dairon (Arab. deir), to denote a monastery. The word is derived from another which is especially applied to the tents and other habitations of the nomadic tribes (see Du Cange, in the Glossarium medice et infimce Latinitatis, under the respective words).

The word monastery, in a most strict acceptation, is confined, in its modern and Western application to the residences of monks, or of nuns of the cognate orders (as the Benedictine), and, as such, it comprises two great classes, the Abbey and the Priory. The former name vas given only to establishments of the highest rank, governed by an ‘abbot, who was commonly assisted by a prior, sub-prior, and other minor functionaries. An abbey always included a church, and the English word Minster, although it has now lost its specific application, has its origin in the Saxon and German Minster (Lat. monasterium). A Priory supposed a less extensive and less numerous community. It was governed by a prior, and was generally, although by no means uniformly, at least in later times, subject to the jurisdiction of an abbey. Many priories possessed extensive territorial domains, and of these not a few became entirely independent. The distinction of abbey and priory is found equally among the Benedictine  nuns. In the military orders, the name of Commandery and Preceptory corresponded with those of abbey and priory in the monastic orders. The establishments of the Mendicant, and, in general, of the modern orders, are sometimes, though less properly, called monasteries. Their more characteristic appellation is Friary or a Convent and they are commonly distinguished into Professes Houses (called also Residences), Novitiates, and Colleges or Scholastic Houses. The names of the superiors of such houses differ in the different orders. The common name is Rector, but in some orders the superior is called Guardian (as in the Franciscan), or Master, Major Father Superior, etc. The houses of females — except in the Benedictine or Cistercian orders — are called indifferently Convent and Nunnery, the head of which is styled Mother Superior or Reverend Mother. The name Cloister properly means the enclosure; but it is popularly used to designate, sometimes the arcaded ambulatory which runs around the inner court of the building, sometimes in the more general sense of the entire building, when it may be considered as synonymous with Convent.

2. During the persecutions in the early ages of Christianity many believers sought shelter in the mountains and deserts, where they gradually acquired a taste for solitude and devotion. In process of time disorders arose among the various monastic orders, and it was found expedient to collect the monks into large societies, living under a common government, and within the walls of separate buildings, appropriated to the purpose. In the year 340 Pachomius built a large mobium, or monastery, on an island of the Nile, and the example was soon extensively followed. In these establishments, which in some places were very large, the members lived in strict subordination to their superiors.

The monastery was divided into several parts, and directors were appointed over each. Ten monks were subject to one who was called decanus, or dean, from his presiding over ten; every hundred had another superior, called centenarius, from his presiding over one hundred. Above these were patres, or fathers of the monasteries, called also abbates, abbot, from the Hebraeo Greek word ἀββᾶ, a father; and hegumeni, presidents, and archinmandrites. from mandra, a sheepfold, they being, as it were, the keepers or rulers of these sacred folds in the Church. The business of the deans was to exact every man's daily task, and bring it to the conomus, or steward of the house, who himself gave a monthly account to the father of them all (Bingham, Origines Ecclesiasticce, book 7, chapter 3, § 11).  The rules and regulations of these houses varied according to the difference of the founders, and other circumstances. To give some impression of the routine of a conventual house, we recite the rule of St. Benedict as in operation: “The abbot represented Christ; called all his monks to council in important affairs, and adopted the advice he thought best: he required obedience without delay, silence, humility, patience, manifestation of secret faults, contentment with the meanest things and employments. Abbot selected by the whole society; his life and prudence to be the qualifications, and to be addressed dominus or pater. Prior appointed by the abbot; deposable for disobedience. A dean set over every ten monks in larger houses. The monks to observe general silence; no scurrility, idle words, or exciting to laughter; to keep head and eyes inclined downwards; to rise to church two hours after midnight; to leave the church together at a sign from the superior.

No property; distribution according to every one's necessities. To serve weekly, and by turns, at the kitchen and table. On leaving their weeks, both he that left it and he that began it to wash the feet of the others; and on Saturday to clean all the plates and the linen which wiped the others feet. To render the dishes clean and whole to the cellarer, who was to give them to the new hebdomary. ‘These officers to have drink and food above the common allowance, that they might serve cheerfully. Daily routine-Work from prime till near ten o'clock, from Easter to October; from ten till near twelve, reading. After refection at twelve, the meridian or sleep, unless any one preferred reading. After nones labor again till the evening. From October to Lent, reading till eight A.M., then tierce, and afterwards labor till nones; after refection, reading or psalmody. In Lent, reading till tierce; doing what was ordered till ten: delivery of books at this season made. Senior to go around the house, and see that the monks were not idle. On Sunday, all reading except the officers. Workmen in the house to labor for the common profit. If possible-to prevent evagation-water, a mill, garden, oven, and all other mechanical shops, to be within or attached to the house. Reflection in silence, and reading Scripture during meals: what was wanted to be asked for by a sign. Reader to be appointed for the week. Two different dishes at dinner, with fruit. One pound of bread a day for both dinner and supper. No meat but to the sick. Three quarters of a pint of wine per day. From Holyrood-day to Lent, dining at nones; in Lent, till Easter, at six o'clock; from Easter to Pentecost at six; and all summer, except on Wednesdays and Fridays, then at nones. Collation or spiritual lecture every night before compline (after supper); and compline finished, silence. SEE BREVIARY;  SEE COMPLINE.

Particular abstinence in Lent from meat, drink, and sleep, and especial gravity. Rule mitigated to children and the aged, who have liberty to anticipate the hour of eating. Dormitory, light to be burning in. To sleep clothed, with their girdles on, the young and old intermixed. Monks travelling to say the canonical hours wherever they happened to be. When staying out beyond a day, not to eat abroad without the abbot's leave. Before setting out on a journey to have the previous prayers of the house, and upon return to pray for pardon of excesses on the way. No letters or presents to be received without the abbot's permission. Precedence according to the time of profession. Elders to call the juniors brothers; the seniors to call the elders nonnos. When two monks met, the junior was to ask benediction from the senior; and when he passed by the junior was to rise and give him his seat, and not to sit down till he bade him. Impossible things ordered by the superior to be humbly represented to him; but if he persisted, the assistance of God to be relied on for the execution of them. Not to defend or excuse one another's faults. No blows or excommunication without the abbot's permission. Mutual obedience, but no preference of a private person's commands to those of the superiors. Prostration at the feet of the superiors as long as they -were angry. Strangers to be received with prayer, the kiss of peace, prostration, and washing their feet, as of Christ, whom they represented; then to be led to prayer; the Scripture read to them; after which the prior might break his fast (except on a high fast).

Abbot's kitchen and the visitors' separate, that guests coming in at unseasonable hours might not disturb the monks. Porter to be a wise. old man, able to give and receive an answer; who was to have a cell near the gate, and a junior for his companion. Church to be used only for .prayer. Admission-Novices to be tried by denials and hard usage before admission. A year of probation. Rule to be read to them in the interim every fourth month. Admitted by a petition laid upon the altar, and prostration at the feet of all the monks. Parents to offer their children by wrapping their hands in the pall of the altar; promising to leave nothing to them (that they might have no temptation to quit the house); and if they gave anything with them, to reserve the use of it during their lives. Priests requesting admission to be tried by delays; to sit near the abbot; not to exercise sacerdotal functions without leave, and conform to the rule. Discipline-Upon-successless admonition :and public reprehension, excommunication; and, in failure of this, corporal punishment. For light faults, the smaller excommunication, or eating alone after the others had done. For great faults, separation from the table, prayers, and society, and  neither himself nor his food to receive the benediction: those who joined him or spoke to him to be themselves excommunicated. The abbot to send seniors to persuade him to humility and making satisfaction. The whole congregation to pray for the incorrigible, and if unsuccessful, to proceed to expulsion. No person expelled to be received after the third expulsion. Children to be corrected with discretion, by fasting or whipping” (“Sanctorum Patrum Regulse Monasticoe,” in Fosbrooke's British Monachisnm page 109). By the strict law of the Church, called the law of cloister or enclosure, it is forbidden to all except members of the order to enter a monastery; and in almost all the orders admission of females to the monasteries of men is denied. Yet must they have been at times admitted, if we may believe the accusations brought against the chastity of monastics, especially since the Middle Ages. In the Greek Church the law of enclosure is far more rigidly enforced than in the West. Thus in the celebrated enclosure of Mount Athos, not only women, but all. animals of the female sex are rigorously excluded.

3. In the East monasteries are supposed to have existed about the time of Christ's stay on earth. SEE MONASTICISM. In the West the first monasteries were founded by St. Martin of Tours, about 360, at Liguge, near Poictiers, and at Marmoutier. The chiefs only of these monasteries were in orders, and women who entered the monasteries were permitted to relinquish the monastic state and marry down to the 6th century. SEE CELIBACY.

The regular life of the community was introduced by Eusebius of Vercelli about 350. Theodoret mentions a large number of monasteries, both in the East and West, some founded by St. Basil about 358, others by St. Augustine in Africa about 390, and some by St. Ambrose at Milan in 377. On British soil St. Patrick is supposed to have started the first monasteries near the opening of the 6th century, when he flourished as bishop of Ireland. During thirty-three years he worked at the conversion of the people to the Christian faith, and filled the island with schools and monasteries, the sites of which are still to be distinguished by the round towers that served as belfries for the conventual churches. The prefix “ kill” is the Latin l'cella, and marks the “religio loci” of innumerable localities in Ireland; and well has Macaulay said that “without these Christianizing institutions the population would have been made up of beasts of burden and beasts of prey.” A missionary spirit has always distinguished the Irish Church. Its monks, as hardy navigators, established themselves in the Hebrides, with Iona for their capital, and passed over to  the western districts of Britain; whence they settled upon the coasts of Brittany, together with the British population expelled by Saxon invasion in the 4th and 5th centuries. It was a province of Gaul that had remained comparatively free from Roman rule, and preserved old Celtic habits, while the rest of Gaul was Romanized. The missionary spirit of his race impelled Columban to settle in Gaul, and to found the monastery of Luxeuil, in Burgundy, the mother of numerous conventual establishments, and the capital of Monastic Gaul (Milman, Latin Christianity, 4:5). He has been termed the Irish Benedict, and various legends are connected with his name, which are only reproductions of Benedictine fable. Though he treated the Roman see with respect, he never sacrificed his own independence of opinion to its authority; and he gave to the see of Jerusalem precedence in point of honor (Ephesians 5, sec. 18). He also gave his monks a rule, but its excessive severity prevented its extended use; and it was superseded by the Benedictine rule, which finally became the universal law of monasticism. The County Down monastery, on the north-west coast of Ireland .and Clonfert were towns of monks rather than monasteries.

The former contained more than three thousand under religious vow in the time of Patricius. The founder having been accompanied by learned monks from Gaul and Lerin, these monasteries soon became renowned for their sound learning, as well as for a pure faith. In England all the most ancient sees have been established upon pre-existing monastic foundations. At the close of the 5th century Dubricius, bishop of Caerleon, founded Llandaff monastery. St. David, his successor at Caerleon, built the monastery at St. David's, a site indicated to him by St. Patrick, the wild promontory on which the cathedral now stands. He also rebuilt the convent at Glastonbury; and it was in honor of St. David that the privilege of asylum was indulged to sites in any way connected with his name — a privilege that may occasionally have secured innocence against oppression and wrong, but which became intolerable from abuse in later years. St. Asaph, in its origin, was a convent of nine hundred and sixty-five monks, founded at the end of the 6th century by Kentigern, himself a monk and missionary bishop among the southern Scots and Picts. Bangor, on the Dee, was founded by Ittud, a fellow-disciple with St. David at St. Germain of Auxerre. It contained within its “wide precincts” a whole army of monks. Yet it was only a little more than half the size of the Irish establishment of the same name. The diocese of Bangor owes its origin to the foundation of Daniel, a disciple of Dubricius, at the commencement of the 6th century. Winchester, first established as a monastery by Cenwalch, king of Wessex,  under a promise to his dying father, was made an episcopal see by the same king about the middle of the 7th century. Ripon was a monastery founded by Alfrid, king of Northumberland, having Wilfrid for its first abbot. He repaired and beautified the cathedral at York, of which see he became bishop, and built the priory of Hexham in the most elaborate style; the church was said to have been the most beautiful on this side of the Alps. Wilfrid was the first of a series of clerical and monastic architects who for several centuries made Anglican ecclesiastical buildings the glory of Europe. It is curious to find that the churchwarden's sovereign cure for all defects was also introduced by him: “Parietes lavans... alba calce, mirifice dealbavit” (Montalembert, 4:235). Ely was at first a double monastery for monks and nuns of the foundation of Ethelreda, queen of Northumberland: “virgo bis nupta.” Columba, like Pelagius, is the classical equivalent for a Celtic name. He is not to be confounded with Columban, the Celtic founder of Luxeull. Columba (born A.D. 521, died A.D. 597), after founding thirty-seven monasteries in Ireland, passed over to the Hebrides, selected Iona, the most desolate of those desolate islands, flat-lying and sandy, as the site of a monastery, and made it the “glory of the West,” and the cradle of the civilization of North Britain. SEE IONA.

From Iona, Aidan went forth as the apostle and bishop of the Northumbrians; and, having found a site as desolate and unattractive as Iona on Lindisfarne (since called Holy Island), there founded a monastery, which became the mother-church of all the provinces north of the Humber. The character of sanctity impressed upon it by St. Aidan long distinguished it; and its abbots, like himself, mostly became bishops of the northern provinces. His great and benevolent character has been nobly drawn by Bede (H.E. 3:3, 17). Hilda, foundress (A.D. 658) and abbess of Whitby, received the veil from him. The feminine love of whatever is beautiful in nature led to the selection of a most noble site for her abbey, and contrasts strongly with the masculine austerity and contempt for aesthetics that led the Celtic monks to choose Iona and Lindisfarne. The influence of Hilda was everywhere felt: kings and princes sought her counsel; she was a “mother” by endearment to the very poorest who received alms at the abbey gate. Bede (H.E. 4:23) speaks in enthusiastic terms of her tender care and administrative tact. A convent for monks as well as nuns was under her rule, and Bede notes that six prelates, eminent for their piety and learning, received their training at Whitby under her eye. To Hilda also we are indebted for having drawn the earliest Saxon poet, Caedmon, from his obscurity. He was a common herdsman, but at her persuasion became a  monk. He anticipated Milton in taking as a theme for poetic song the fall of Satan and the sin of our first parents. The foundation of Wearmouth Abbey by Benedict Biscop, a monk of Lindisfarne (A.D. 665), was remarkable for the introduction of painted glass. Workmen were brought from the Continent, who instructed the Saxon monks in the mystery of their craft (Milman, Latin Christianity, 4:4). The sister-foundation, Jarrow, endowed with a domain granted by Egfrid, was the monastery in which the venerable Bede had his cell. In South Britain the most ancient monastery was that founded by Augustine at Canterbury, and placed under Benedictine rule. The deed of gift whereby king Ethelbert conveyed the site (A.D. 605) is, according to Palgrave, the earliest existing document of the public records of England. Gregory followed up the mission with a colony of monks, who also imported all that could be required for the observance of the Romish ritual. Thus the subjugation of England to the see of Rome was the work of the Benedictine monks. One of their number, Mellitus, first bishop of London, founded Westminster Abbey. The first metropolitan recognised by all England was Theodore, an Oriental monk, a native of Tarsus, and placed in the see of Canterbury by pope Vitalianus, A.D. 668. The council held at Whitby on the subject of Easter (A.D. 664) showed that strong traces still remained of the Oriental tendencies of the British Church; and an African monk, Adrian, was sent with the bishop elect as a safeguard and trusty envoy: “ne quid ille contrarium veritati et fidei,. Gracorum more, in ecclesiam cui praecesset, introduceret” (Bede, H.E. 4:1). To him is due the creation of the parochial system, by persuading the territorial proprietors to build and endow churches, retaining the advowson in their own hands. The Church-rate is of coordinate date. Theodore was a laborious student, and, with the assistance of Adrian, he gradually made the monasteries of England schools of sound learning. The principal sees having sprung from monastic origin, the canons were naturally monks. After the Conquest disputes arose between the secular and the regular, i.e., between the parochial and monastic clergy; and an attempt was made by Walkelin, bishop of Winchester, to supersede the monastic chapter by a body of forty secular clergy, Lanfranc, however, vigorously opposed the change, and obtained from pope Alexander a constitution in confirmation of the capitular rights of the monasteries affected (Fleury, H.E. 61:53; comp. also Soames, Latin Ch. during the Anglo-Saxon Times [Lond. 1848, 12mo]; and Soames, The Anglo-Saxon- Ch. [Lond. 1856, 12mo, 4th ed.]).

4. In 550 the rule of St. Basil, followed by all Greek monasteries, was introduced at Rome; but St. Benedict gradually absorbed all other monks into his great rule. In 585 St. Columban's rule of prayer, reading, and manual labor was founded in Gaul. In 649 the Monothelite persecution in the East transferred many monks to the Western Church, and in the 8th century the Iconoclasts were the cause of a still larger assimilation. In the 13th century St. Dominic prevailed on women to observe a stricter rule. The first written rule — that of St. Basil, bishop of Caesarea in the 4th century, who embodied the traditional usages, was derived from that of Pachomius, and aimed at the combination of prayer and manual toil;' it was modified by St. Benedict, the patriarch of Western monks, but in the 11th century was still vigorous in Naples. Polydore Vergil says that in 373 St. Basil first enacted the triple vows 9f chastity, poverty, and obedience. In 410 Lerins was founded. The Benedictine rule spread rapidly in Italy before his death in 543. Maurus and Plaidus extended it in France and Sicily; others introduced it into Spain, where monasteries are said to have existed in 380; and in less than two centuries all the monastic orders in the West were affiliated to it. St. Columban built the first abbey in England in 563, as he had done in Ireland; in the latter instance it was preceded only by the St. Bridget's cell at Kildare, which was famous in 521, being established probably by a pupil of St. Patrick. In 802 the Council of Aix-la-Chapelle decreed that the Benedictine rule should be universally adopted. From the 10th century it put forth branches: Clugny in 910, under its abbots, embraced the rule; so did the Camaldolesi in 1020, from St. Romuald;-the Cistercians in 1098, from St. Robert; the Carthusians in 1080, from St. Bruno; the Valombrosans. in 1060, from John Gualberte; the Celestines in 1294, from Peter di Merona; and the Olivetans in 1319. At Bangor in 603 there was a monastery with seven portions, each consisting of three hundred monks. with their provosts or rectors. Benedict Biscop in 677 built the monasteries at Wearmouth and Yarrow of stone; and in 1035 Lanfranc united all the English abbeys into one congregation. St. Maur in 1621 was the last instance of its reform. The lands possessed by monasteries were held under the same tenure as all other land; and, till a comparatively late period, the abbots themselves led their quota of troops into the field. In the time of Charlemagne fourteen monasteries of the empire furnished their proportion of soldiers. In 982 the bishop of Augsburg and the abbot of Fulda were killed in the same battle. Charles Martel was opposed by troops collected and headed by an abbot of Fontenelle.  Monasteries were called ingenua if exempt from their foundation, or libera if the grant or privilege had been made subsequently. Those which were not exempt were compelled to render to the bishop obedience; annual fees called jus synodale, or circadas; procurations; or the provision of entertainment; solemn processions, and the right of celebrating mass in their minsters. All abbots, however, despite their repugnance, certainly after the 9th century, were compelled to make the profession of canonical obedience to the diocesan when receiving his benediction, and this implied his right to give holy orders, consecrate churches, altars, and cemeteries, and grant chrism and dismissory letters when the abbots travelled out of the diocese.

5. In their first institution, and in their subsequent uses, there can be no doubt that monasteries were among the most remarkable instances of Christian munificence, and they certainly were, in the so-called Dark Ages, among the beneficial adaptations of the talents of Christians to pious and charitable ends. The foundation of the monastery was the dictate of religious motives in the youth of the Church, but the reward of piety was temporal also; the estates of the founder were improved, the vassals educated, order introduced, the sick and aged tended, and handicraft and useful arts taught. “The services,” says Blunt, “that monasticism has rendered to civilization in the transition of society from ancient times to the Middle Ages have been most important. Monks were the skilled agriculturists of the period; and many terms in rural life, and in the fauna and botany of all Northern Europe, may be traced back through them to Greek and Latin terms; e.g. ‘hawky,' οἴκι, harvest-home; and ‘ranny,' aranea, a shrew-mouse; ‘chervil,' χηρόφυλλον. The belladonna, which is now found indigenous, was introduced first among the pharmaceutical herbs of the convent-gardens, for the monks were the physicians of the period. As men of letters also and energetic missionaries they kept the lamp of knowledge and civilization from expiring in the very darkest periods; and whatever was done in the way of educating the young was carried on within the walls of the monastery.” Monasteries, indeed, were the sole preservers of learning in the Dark Ages.

The Benedictines, bound by the rules of their order to mental as well as bodily labor, performed a work that has been of priceless value. That anything at all has come down to us from classical antiquity is owing in great part to their diligence as transcribers. Gerbert, an abbot, and afterwards pope Silvester II (999), speaks of his care in collecting books, and of the host of copiers that were found in  every town: “Tu sai con quanta premura io raccolga da ogni parte libri; tu sai quanti scrittirie nelle citta e nelle ville d'Italia in ogni luogo s'incontrino” (Muratori, Lit. It. III, 1:29). Desiderius, abbot of Monte Casino, and subsequently pope Victor III, employed many copyists, “ antiquarii,” as they were called (Muratori, Stor. IV, chapter 28; Mabillon, Act. Bened.). Three offsets from the Benedictine stock have also rendered invaluable services to literature: the Clugniac monks, dating from the early part of the 10th century; the Carthusians (1084); and the Cistercians (1090). They created a craving for the luxury of books, beautifully written and sumptuously illuminated; and libraries, gradually increasing in size, soon grew up from their labors. “It was their pride to collect, and their business to transcribe books” (Hallam, Literature of the Middle Ages, 1:82); and their collections were the “ germ whence a second and more glorious civilization” should in due time spring (Macaulay, Hist. of England, chapter 1). But the evils which grew out of these societies more than counterbalanced the good. Being often exempted from all civil or foreign ecclesiastical authority, they became hotbeds of insubordination to the state and of corruption to the Church. The temptations arising out of a state of celibacy, too often enforced in the first instance by improper means, and always bound upon the members of these societies by a religious vow, were. the occasion of great scandals. Moreover, the enormous wealth with which some of them were endowed brought with it a greater degree of pride and ostentation and luxury than was becoming in Christians; and still more in those who had vowed a life of religious asceticism. Thus it came that the intrigues of the friars, the accumulation of wealth, and the decay of discipline wrought the fall of the monasteries. SEE MONASTICISM; SEE MONK.

The monasteries of England were the first to feel the displeasure of the outside world. Corruption had become so apparent in the 8th century as to call for the founding of the Clugniac order on British soil. But this order, in turn, though beginning in the 10th century with a strict rule, sank into luxury in the 12th; the Cistercians then started to shame them, but soon lost all moral vigor; next the Franciscan mendicants appeared, but they degenerated more completely in the first quarter of a century after their introduction into England than other orders had in three or four centuries (comp. Matt. Paris. A.D. 1243; see Brakelond, Chronicles Abb. S. Ednmundi; Tho. Elmham. Hist. Mon. St. Aug. Cantuar.; Hugh de Poitiers, Monastere (ke Vezelai). No wonder, then, that an opposition found ready utterance and prompt organization, and, led successively by the greatest of Anglican scholars and divines, as  Wykeham, Fisher, Alcock, Chichely, Beckington, the countess of Salisbury, and cardinal Wolsey, claimed the monastic endowments for university foundations. “What, my lord,” said Oldham to Fox in 1513, “shall we build houses and provide livelihoods for a company of bussing monks, whose end and fall we may live to see?” SEE REFORMATION, ENGLISH.

Thus it was not reserved for the period of the Reformation to inaugurate opposition to monasteries. Their dissolution was commenced in England as early as 1312, when the Order of Templars was suppressed, and a portion of their possessions given to the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem. During the 15th century many other houses were dissolved, and their revenues transferred to the universities of Oxford and Cambridge. Henry VIII obtained an act of Parliament for the dissolution of the monasteries, and the transfer of their revenues to the crown. Rome itself had furnished a precedent for Henry's attack on the monastic institutions. About the year 1517 cardinal Wolsey was desirous of building and endowingi two splendid colleges — one at Ipswich, the place of his birth; the other at Oxford, the place of his academical education. For this purpose Clement VII granted him a bull, which empowered him to visit and suppress certain monasteries. A number of these, variously stated at from nineteen to forty, were consequently dissolved, and their revenues applied by Wolsey to the purpose contemplated.

The following calculation has been made as to the number and wealth of the religious houses in England dismantled and scattered at the period of the Reformation: “The number of houses and places suppressed from first to last in England, so far as any calculations appear to have been made, seems to be as follows: .

Of lesser monasteries, of which we have the valuation.................... 374

Of greater monasteries ............................. 186

Belonging to the Hospitallers....................... 48

Colleges ........................................ 90

Hospitals.......................................... 110

Chantries and free chapels ......................... 2374

Total......................................... 3182

These are in addition to the friars' houses, and those suppressed by Wolsey, and many small houses of which we have no particular account.  The sum total of the clear yearly revenue of the several houses at the time of their dissolution, of which we have any account, seems to be as follows:

Of the greater monasteries ..............£104,919 13 3

Of all those of the lesser monasteries of which we have the valuation. 29,702     1      10

Knights Hospitallers, head house in London 2,385     12    8

We have the valuation of only twenty-eight of their houses in the country 3,026   9      5

Friars' houses, of which we have the valuation 751   2     0

Total ............................£140,784     19    2

If proper allowances are made for the lesser monasteries and houses not included in this estimate, and for the plate, etc., which came into the hands of the king by the dissolution, and for the valuation of money at that time, Which was at least six times as much as at present, and also consider that the estimate of the lands was generally supposed to be much under the real worth, we must conclude their whole revenues to have been immense. It does not appear that any exact computation has been made of the number of persons contained in the religious houses.

Those of the lesser monasteries dissolved by 27

Henry VIII were reckoned at about ............ 10,000

If we suppose the colleges and hospitals to have contained a proportionable number, these will make about ..................................... 5,347

If we reckon the number in the greater monasteries according to the proportion of their revenues, they will be about 35,000; but as, probably, they had larger allowances in proportion to their number than those of the lesser monasteries, if we abate upon that account 5000, they will then be.. 30,000

One for each chantry and free chapel ............ 2,374

Total................................ . 47,721

But as there was probably more than one person to officiate in several of the free chapels, and there were other houses which are not included within this calculation, perhaps they may be computed in one general estimate at about 50,000. As there were pensions paid to almost all those of the greater monasteries, the king did not immediately come into the full enjoyment of their whole revenues; however, by means of what he did receive, he founded six new bishoprics — viz. those of Westminster (which was changed by queen Elizabeth into a deanery, with twelve prebends and a school), Peterborough, Chester, Gloucester, Bristol, and Oxford. And in eight other sees he founded deaneries and chapters, by converting the priors and monks into deans and prebendaries — viz. Canterbury, Winchester, Durham, Worcester, Rochester, Norwich, Ely, and Carlisle. He founded also the colleges of Christ Church in Oxford and Trinity in Cambridge, and finished King's College there. He likewise founded professorships of divinity, law, physic, and of the Hebrew and Greek tongues, in both the said universities. He gave the house of Gray Friars and St. Bartholomew's Hospital to the city of London, and a perpetual pension to the poor knights of Windsor, and laid out great sums in building and fortifying many ports in the channel” (Baxter, Hist. of the Church of England). Compare Hook, Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury, volume 1 (Lond. 1868, 8vo); Fuller, Church Hist. 1:115 sq.; Burnet, Hist. of the Reformation; Soames, Ref. Ch. of England, volume 1, especially the Introd; Fosbrooke, Brit. Monachism, chapter 1-5, and 52; Hill, English Monasticism, its Rise and Influence (Lond. 1867, 8vo), page 488 sq., 515 sq.

It is hardly necessary to state that all the Reformed churches in the 16th century discarded the practice of monachism, and suppressed monasteries as useless. In some of the German states, however, the temporalities of the suppressed monasteries were retained, and were granted at pleasure by the sovereign, to be enjoyed together with the titular dignity. In Roman Catholic countries also, as, e.g., France, Spain, Austria, and Italy, the suppression of monasteries has been more or less general in more recent times. SEE MONASTICISM.

But, as count Montalembert has well put it in his celebrated work on the A Monks of the West (Edinb. 1861-7, 5 volumes, 8vo), “this work of spoliation, which may be said to have fairly set in with the Reformation, is now proceeding with methodical gravity.” In the five years from 1830 to 1835 no less than “3000 monasteries have  disappeared from the soil of Europe.” In Portugal some 300 were destroyed, 200 in Poland, and the number annihilated by queen Christina of Spain, though it has never been estimated, was certainly not much smaller than in Poland. The destruction, however, has proved greatest in the recent reforms in France, and especially in Italy. The great monastery of Clairvaux, which once held St. Bernard and his five hundred monks, is now a prison with five hundred convicts in it. The celebrated abbey at Clugny, which figures so largely in the history of the Middle Ages, has been turned into stud-stables, and in 1844 the place of the high-altar was “the starting- post of the stallions.” The abbey of Le Bec, in Normandy, from which Lanfrane and Anselm came forth successively to fill the see of Canterbury, has been utilized in the same fashion, and horses fatten where monks once fasted and prayed. A china manufactory is carried on in the Chartreux of Seville, and swine have taken possession of the cells in the Cistercian abbey of Cadouin. Everywhere, as the count informs us, the- work of ruin proceeds. “Sometimes,” says he, “the spinning-mill is installed under the roof of the ancient sanctuary. Instead of echoing night and day the praises of God, these dishonored arches too often repeat only the blasphemies and obscene cries, mingling with the shrill voice of the machinery, the grinding of the saw, or the monotonous clank of the piston.”

Nor is this all. John Knox has been sometimes stigmatized as a barbarian for the encouragement which he is said to have given the populace in demolishing Christian edifices where the relics of idolatry were enshrined; yet even where the excited rabble did their worst, the ivied ruin still remains to tell of a grandeur which has passed away, and to mark, for the present and other generations, the spot where their fathers prayed. But in France, it appears, the work of demolition is done much more scientifically and thoroughly. They are not content there with confiscation, plunder, profanation; they overthrow, raze from the foundation, leave not a single stone standing on another. “The empire of the East,” says the count, “has not been ravaged by the Turks as France has been and still is by the band of insatiable destroyers who, after having purchased these vast constructions and immense dominions at the lowest rate, work them like quarries for sacrilegious profit. I have seen with my own -eyes the capitals and columns of an abbey-church which I could name employed as so much material for the neighboring road.” And again: “What remains of so many palaces raised in silence and solitude for the products of art, for the progress and pleasure of the mind, for disinterested labor? Masses of broken wall inhabited by owls and rats, shapeless remains, heaps of stones, and pools of  water.

Everywhere desolation, filth. and disorder” (Introduction, chapter 8). The young and free kingdom of Italy has not been slow to perceive that a sacerdotal class, with interests alien, if not antagonistic, to society and to the family, is necessarily and logically a foe to civil and political liberty. By a law enacted June 28, 1866, all monasteries and similar religious corporations in the kingdom of Italy were suppressed, their members pensioned, and their property sold and funded for the maintenance of public schools. Monte Casino and San Marco, of Florence, were alone exempted. The former is left as a venerable monument of the past; the latter is spared in honor of Savonarola and the beautiful frescos of Fra Angelico da Fiesole. This law has been executed with great rigor: and in spite of allocutions, excommunications, and all the brutumfulmen of the Vatican, the work of secularization is already finished. Some of the monks have gladly seized the opportunity of bettering their condition by marriage; others have returned to their homes or accepted the refuge offered by charity; but the great majority of these unfortunates, whose only crime consists in having been misplaced in chronology by being born several centuries too late, and whose habits are too fixed and inveterate to be easily changed, hire houses and live in clubs on the subsidies of the government. While in Italy and France, the two most Catholic nations, the monastic system is thus rapidly disappearing, the tendency to introduce similar institutions in Protestant countries, especially the effort of the Ritualists of the Anglican communion, under the pretence (more or less honest) of promoting Christian charities, can only be regarded as a fatal retrogression and dangerous degeneracy.

In 1870 revelations of corruption, bestiality, and cruelty in a Polish convent contributed more than all else to quicken the Protestant, and we may well say general dislike for monastic institutions. The story of Barbara Ubryk, the Polish nun, however exceptional, could not but raise a sense of horror throughout Europe, and it is not to be denied that the prejudice such an instance excites is in a great degree just. It is one thing to hear of. an exceptional instance of individual cruelty; it is another thing to know that such cruelty can be practiced in the name of religion, and in institutions which, under its shelter, claim peculiar immunities. There is great force in the plea that one such case substantiated justifies the public control of all similar establishments. In England, the famous trial of “Saurin v. Starr” revealed what spiritual tyranny and moral degradation might be concealed in conventual institutions under the most harmless exterior. The convent  which Miss Saurin entered was one of those for which the plea is advanced that they do practical service in the cause of education and charity. It is not difficult to imagine that a hotheaded Protestant might have been for the time confused if he had been taken to see Miss Saurin and her fellow- sisters patiently devoting themselves to the instruction of their scholars. Yet, whatever the technical result of the trial, it left all impartial readers with a most painful impression of the degrading and demoralizing atmosphere of the convent. And in consequence Parliament was moved to appoint, March 29, 1870, a select committee to make inquiries concerning conventual or monastic institutions in Great Britain.

The result of such investigation was unfavorable in that country, and has turned popular opinion against their existence. In Poland also the Russian government has in very recent times found itself faced with a most alarming spread of treason and corruption generated and fostered in monasteries, and the days of monasticism may be said to be numbered even there. As what is said of English Christianity is so well applicable to all other Protestant countries, we quote Mr. Blunt here in conclusion of this subject: “The day of monasticism has forever set... There is no longer any need for its existence, even if it could be set up again in its best condition. More than Benedictine learning sheds a ray of glory on our colleges. Our Poor-laws render unnecessary the alms for the' monastery wicket; and such doles would become a positive evil now as an encouragement to idleness and sloth. Our clergy are welcome visitors at the cottage fireside, where the monk of later days was not, with his contributions for the house. The glory of monasticism was the fidelity with which it discharged its earlier mission; the self-sacrifice with which it taught men to rise superior to the trials and calamities of life; the unfeigned piety with which the monk resigned every earthly advantage that he might win a heavenly reward. But it survived its reputation, and there is more hope of recovering to life the carcass around which the eagles have gathered than of renovated monkdom. The ribaldry of Boccaccio and Rabelais, the Ep. obscuror, vit., and the more measured terms of Piers Ploughman and Chaucer, were mainly instrumental in bringing about the downfall of monasticism; but this was after it had already been shorn of its splendor, and when scarcely a ray remained to it of its former glory” (comp. Murphy, Terra Incognita, or the Convents of the United Kingdom [Lond. 1873, 8vo; Pauli, Pictures of Old England [Lond. 1861, 12mo], chapter 3).

6. In architectural arrangement, monastic establishments, whether abbeys, priories, or other convents, followed nearly the same plan. The great enclosure (varying, of course, in extent with the wealth and importance of the monastery), generally with a stream running beside it, was surrounded by a wall, the principal entrance being through a gateway to the west or north-west. This gateway was a considerable building, and often contained a chapel, with its altar, besides the necessary accommodation for the porter. The almery, or place where alms were distributed, stood not far within the great gate, and generally a little to the right hand: there, too, was often a chapel with its altar. Proceeding onwards, the west entrance of the church appeared. The church itself was always, where it received its due development, in the form of a Latin cross; i.e., a cross of which the transepts are short in proportion to the nave. Moreover, in Norman churches, the eastern limb never approached the nave or western limb in length. Whether or not the reason of this preference of the Latin cross is found in the domestic arrangements of the monastic buildings, it was certainly best adapted to it; for the nave of the church, with one of the transepts, formed the whole of one side and part of another side of a quadrangle; and any other than a long nave would have involved a small quadrangle, while a long transept would leave too little of another side, or none at all, for other buildings. How the internal arrangements were affected by this adaptation of the nave to external requirements we have seen under the head CATHEDRAL, to which also we refer for the general description of the conventual church.

Southward of the church, and parallel with the south transept was carried the western range, of the monastic offices; but it will be more convenient to examine their arrangement within the court. We enter, then, by a door near the west end of the church, and passing though a vaulted passage, find ourselves in the cloister court, of which the nave of the church forms the northern side, the transept part of the eastern side, and other buildings, in the order to be presently described, complete the quadrangle. The cloisters themselves extended around the whole of the quadrangle, serving, among other purposes, as a covered way from every part of the convent to every other part. They were furnished, perhaps always, with lavatories, on the decoration and construction of which much cost was expended; and sometimes also with desks and closets of wainscot, which served the purpose of a scriptorium. Commencing the circuit of the cloisters at the north-west corner, and turning southward, we have first the dormitory or dorter, the use of which is sufficiently indicated by its name. This occupied the whole of the western side of the quadrangle,  and sometimes had a groined passage beneath its whole length, called' the ambulatory, a noble example of which, in perfect preservation, remains at Fountains. The south side of the quadrangle contained the refectory, with its correlative, the coquina or kitchen, which was sometimes at its side, and sometimes behind it. The refectory was furnished with a pulpit, for the reading of some portion of Scripture during meals. On this side of the quadrangle may also be found, in general, the locutorium or parlor, the latter word being, at least in etymology, the full equivalent of the former. The abbot's lodge commonly commenced at the south-east corner of the quadrangle; but, instead of conforming itself to its general direction, rather extended eastwards. with its own chapel, hall, parlor, kitchen, and other offices, in a line parallel with the choir or eastern limb of the church.

Turning northwards, still continuing within the cloisters, we come first to an open passage leading outwards, then to the chapter-house or its vestibule; then, after another open passage, to the south transept of the church. Immediately before us is an entrance into the church, and another occurs at the end of the west cloister. The parts of the establishment especially connected with sewerage were built over or close to the stream; and we may remark that both in drainage and in the supply of water great and laudable care was always taken. The stream also turned the abbey mill, at a small distance from the monastery. Other offices, such as stables, brewhouses, bakehouses, and the like, in the larger establishments usually occupied another court, and in the smaller were connected with the chief buildings in the olly quadrangle. It is needless to say that, in so general an account, we cannot enumerate exceptional cases. It may, however, be necessary to say that the greatest difference of all, that of placing the quadrangle at the north, instead of the south side of the church, is not unknown; it is so at Canterbury and at Lincoln, for instance (comp. Hook, Church Dict. pages 414, 415). This branch of the subject may be followed out in the several plans of monasteries scattered among topographical works, and especially in Parker, Glossary of Architecture, page 146 sq.

Literature. — The large number of works treating of Monasticism (q.v.) should be consulted by the student, especially the Church histories. See also Walcott, Sacred Archceol. S.v.; Blunt, Theol. Dict. s.v.; Eadie, Eccl. Dict. s.v.; Riddle, Christian Antiquities, pages 781-783. The best materials for a history of the series of confiscations that ensued in England are' in Three Chapters of Letters relating to the Suppression of Monasteries (Lond., Camden Society, 1843).

## Monasticism[[@Headword:Monasticism]]

             (Gr. μονάζειν, — to dwell apart in solitude; whence μοναχός, a monk), a state of religious retirement, more or less complete, accompanied by contemplation and by various devotional, ascetical, and penitential practices, is in truth Asceticism (q.v.), with the elements of religious solitude superadded. Monasticism, until the beginning of the study of comparative religion, was regarded as a strictly Christian institution, but recent researches reveal it as having entered into various religious systems. both ancient and modern. Indeed, it is now clearly apparent that the Western theory of the ascetic life travelled from the East to the West, but the question of the. time when it originated in the East is still clouded in mystery. “The origin of monasticism,” writes Mr. Johnson in his little work on the: Monks before Christ, “will always be enveloped in mystery. ‘Its history is shrouded in the same obscurity as the source of the mighty stream upon the banks of which the first ascetics commenced the practice of their austerities'“ (pages 51, 52).

The probability is that monachism is a strictly Asiatic institution, and originated among heathen nations. We certainly do not think that monasticism can prove a Christian or even Jewish origin; it is not heavenly, but earthly. Yet do we not desire to have our development theorists infer that we agree with them that it is one of the early religious forms of man. Says one, “The older the religion, the older its ascetic practices; for they were among the first forms assumed by the religious impulse, and not among the later and better ones. They belong to the religion of the passions and emotions, and not to the religion of reason;” and then he logically infers that therefore “monasticism is as old as religion itself; for it does not gain favor with the progress of new ideas, but is gradually falling in the estimation of all.” We are far from believing that monasticism is a primitive institution, and is forsaken by modern civilization.

Quite the contrary, we hold that ascetic practices prevail largely among semi-civilized or civilized nations, and only after a clear conception has been formed of man's dependence on a higher Being, and a desire is manifest for future existence. The inspired religion prepares the way for these, and from religious excesses or alienation spring the ascetic practices. In the far East the very notion of the supreme Lord faded for ages from the grasp of philosophy, and became too subtle and refined a conception for any to retain it in their knowledge; but the inherent evil of matter, of flesh, of sense, and of human life has remained to stimulate the curiosity, to exhaust the efforts of the melancholy victims of the grim  delusion, and to shape in various forms the fact that man's incumbent duty .has ever been to escape from the contamination, and rise above the conditions of the flesh. Indeed, we believe that ascetic tendencies in general, and monasticism in particular, are the outgrowth of a religious enthusiasm, seriousness, and ambition likely to be pursued only by those who have once believed in revealed religion and have retrograded, having. gone from the presence of their God to the idol they reared to represent him. But, whatever may be the differences of opinion as to the relation of the heathen religions to the revealed, it is generally conceded that monasticism cannot prove its heavenly origin, nor honestly identify itself with the Christian religion, as it is known to be much older than Christianity. In times far anterior to the Gospel, prophets and martyrs, “in sheepskins and goatskins,” wandered in the Oriental world over mountains and deserts; and dwelt in caves and dens of the earth, as have likewise evangelical monks.

I. Pagan Monachism. —

1. Its Monumental History. — In examining the inscriptions which have been discovered in South-western Asia and Egypt, we find an abundance of representations of priests and religious ceremonies. We learn from these that many of the priests shaved the head, and always wore a peculiar habit, which in historic times, we are told, was white. We learn furthermore that these priests taught that the body must be kept pure by fasting and other ascetic observances. No doubt, as our knowledge in hieroglyphics shall progress, our information on this subject will be greatly enriched. In Arabia and India thei modern traveller comes across numberless “rock-cut temples.” We now know that nearly 600 years B.C. the artificial caves of India were occupied by Buddhistical monks, and there is conclusive evidence that they had served the Brahmins for a like purpose long before that. (Comp. the occasional notices of the Indian gymnosophists in Strabo [lib. 15, c. 1, after accounts from the time of Alexander the Great], Arrian [Exped. Alex. lib. 7, c. 1-3; and Hist. Ind. c. 11.], Pliny [Hist. Nat. 7:2], Diodorus Siculus [lib. 2], Plutarch [Alex. c. 64, Porphyry [De abstinent. lib. 4], Lucian [Fugit. c. 7], Clemens Alex. [Strom. lib. 1 and 2], and Augustine [De civit. Dei, lib. 14, c. 17: “Per opacas Indiae solitudines, quum quidam nudi philosophentur, unde gymnosophistae nominantur; adhibent tamen genitalibus tegmina, quibus per eetera membrorum carent;” and lib. 15, c. 20, where he denies all merit to their celibacy, because it is  not “ secundum fidem summi boni, qui est Deus”]. With these ancient representations agree the narratives of Fon Koueki [about A.D. 400, transl. by M.A. Remusat, Paris, 1836], Marco Polo [1280], Bernier [1670], Hamilton [1700], Papi, Niebuhr, Qrlichn Sonnerat, and others.) The manner of the construction of these caves of India and Arabia leads to the Supposition that they were originally intended for monkish abodes, and, if so, the exceeding great antiquity of monasticism can no longer be doubted. These temples and caves are the oldest monuments of the countries in which they are found.

2. Earliest written History of Monachism. — If from these monuments we descend to an examination of the written books of the ancients, and search in “The Nabatean Agriculture,” which is believed to have been written about the time of Nebuchadnezzar (or B.C. 600) we find in this history of Chaldsea, reaching back several thousands of years before .the beginning of the Christian Vera, that in the very earliest history of which this work gives any account there flourished Azada, an apostle of Saturn, who “founded the religion of renunciation or asceticism,” and that “his partisans and followers were the subjects of persecution by the higher and cultivated classes; but that to the mass of the people, on the contrary, they were the objects of the highest veneration.” Another ascetic whom it mentions flourished about B.C. 2000. He is said to have inveighed against the godliness of those who believed it possible to preserve the human body from decay, after death, by the employment of certain natural agents. “Not by natural means,” warmly replies Dhagrit, “can man preserve his body from corruption and dissolution after death, but only through good deeds, religious exercises, and offering of sacrifices — by invoking the gods by their great and beautiful names — by prayers during the night, and fasts during the day.” Then Dhagrit goes on, in his monkish zeal, to give the names of various saints of Babylonian antiquity whose bodies had long been preserved, after death, from corruption and change, and says: “These men had distinguished themselves by piety, by abstemiousness, and by their manner of life, which resembled that of angels; and the gods, therefore, by their grace, had preserved the bodies of these men from corruption; whereby those of later times, in view of the same, were encouraged in piety, and in the imitation of those holy modes of life.” See Chwolson, Ueber die Ueberreste der altbabylonischen Literatur (St. Petersburg, 1859); M. le Baron de St. Croix, Recherches Historiques et Critiques sur les Mysteres du Paganisme (Paris, 1817).  Turning from these written sources, still the subjects of much discussion as to their authenticity, to the well established records of India, Persia, and China, the oldest written records in existence aside from the sacred Scriptures (viz. the Veda [q.v.] and the Laws of Manu [q.v.] — the sacred books of the Brahmins; the Zend Avesta [q.v.] — the sacred book of the Persians or Zoroastrians; and the Shu-King, SEE CONFUCIUS — the sacred book of China), we find the hoary parent of monastic rule dwelling in the far East, and gathering obedient millions, under her ample folds, long before the introduction of Christianity, even if we should trace Christian monasticism back to St. Bartholomew and St. Thomas.

Among the Hindus (q.v.), we learn from the Brahminical writings especially the Rig-Veda, portions of which are assigned to a period as far back as B.C. 2400, the Laws of Manu, which were certainly completed before the rise of Buddhism (that is, six or seven centuries before our sera), and the numerous other sacred books of the Indian religion — that there was enjoined by example and precept entire abstraction of thought, seclusion from the world, and a variety of penitential and meritorious acts of self-mortification, by which the devotee assumes a proud superiority over the vulgar herd of mortals, and is absorbed at last into the divine fountain of all being. Says Spence Hardy, “The practice of asceticism is so interwoven with Brahminism, under all the phases it has assumed, that we cannot realize its existence apart from the principles of the ascetic.” (Compare Wilson, Asiatic Researches, 16:38; Pavie, in Revue des deux Mondes, 1854; — Hardwick, Christ and other Masters, 1:315.)

3. Probable Origin of Eastern Monachism. — “At an early period of the present era of Brahminic manifestation,” the legend goes, in the Rig-Veda, “Dhruva, the son of Uttanapada, the son of Manu Swayambhuva, who was ‘born of and one with Brahma,' began to perform penance, as enjoined by the sages, on the banks of the Yamuna. While his mind was wholly absorbed in meditation, the mighty Hari, identical with all natures, took possession of his heart. Vishnu being thus present in his mind, the earth, the supporter of elemental life, could not sustain the weight of the ascetic. The celestials called Yamas, being excessively alarmed, then took counsel with Indra how they should interrupt the devout exercises of Dhruva; and the divine beings termed Kushmandas, in company with their king, commenced anxious efforts to distract his meditations. One, assuming the semblance of his mother, Suniti, stood weeping before him, and calling in tender accents, ‘My son, my son, desist from destroying thy strength by  this fearful penance!

What hast thou, a child but five years old, to do with rigorous penance? Desist from such fearful practices, that yield no beneficial fruit. First comes the season of youthful pastime, and when that is over it is the time for study; then succeeds the period of worldly enjoyments; and, lastly, that of austere devotion. This is thy season of pastime, my child. Hast thou engaged in these practices to put an end to existence? Thy chief duty is love for me; duties are according to time of life. Lose not thyself in bewildering error — desist from such unrighteous actions. If not, if thou wilt not desist from these austerities, I will terminate my life before thee.' But Dhruva, being wholly intent on seeing Vishnu, beheld not his mother weeping in his presence, and calling upon him; and the illusion, crying out, ‘Fly, fly, my child; the hideous spirits of ill are crowding into this terrible forest with uplifted weapons,' quickly disappeared. Then advanced frightful rakshasas, wielding terrible arms, and with countenances emitting fiery flame; and nocturnal fiends thronged around the prince, uttering fearful noises, and whirling and tossing their threatening weapons. Hundreds of jackals, from whose mouths gushed flame as they devoured their prey, were howling around to appall the boy, wholly engrossed by meditation.'

The goblins called out, ‘Kill him! kill him! — cut him to pieces! eat him! eat him!' and monsters, with the faces of camels and crocodiles and lions, roared and yelled with horrible cries to terrify the prince. But all these uncouth speeches, appalling cries, and threatening weapons made no impression upon his senses, whose mind was completely intent on Govinda. The son of the monarch of the earth, engrossed by one idea, beheld uninterruptedly Vishnu seated in his soul, and saw no other object.” How like the legends of Christian monachism are these pagan descriptions! The desert has always been the abode of asceticism, whose devotees, in their struggle against the flesh, peopled its sands with horrible monsters of every kind — with devils, hobgoblins, and giants, who (in the minds of the people) have held possession ever since. The Vedas also command that the tonsure be performed, but, so far as known, they prescribed no rules with regard to the monastic life. Their teachings seem to be confined solely to asceticism.

On the other hand, in the Laws of Manu rules are given for the conduct of monastics; and, as these rules were in the possession of the people of India long before they were committed to writing, it is no wonder that monasticism is believed to have been practiced for thousands of years before the time of Christ. Hardwick, by no means a superficial student, is led even, in the face of these conditions, to say that “India was the real birthplace of monasticism”  (Christ and other Masters, 1:351). A large portion of the Laws of Manu are taken up by regulations to be observed by those who wish to attain to the ultimate good by the practice of monastic observances. The rule of St. Benedict itself does not afford a more decided proof of the existence of the ascetic life. The work is divided into twelve books. The sixth book is entitled “Duties” of the Anchorite and of the Ascetic Devotee.” The subject of the eleventh book is “Penitences and Expiations.” The Dwijas, for whom these rules are principally laid down, are described as a sort of monks, who practiced tonsure, wore girdle, carried staff, asked alms, fasted, lacerated the body, and dwelt for the most part in the deserts and forests. We have space but for a few illustrations, which will suffice, however, to show the character of this work. From the sixth book, “Duties of the Anchorite and of the Ascetic Devotee,” we quote as follows:

“¶24. The' Dwija, who dwells. alone, should deliver himself to austerities, increasing constantly in their severity, that he may wither up his mortal substance.

“¶ 27. Let him receive from the Brahminical anchorites, who live in houses, such alms as may be necessary to support his existence.” (The case was similar in early Christian times: Simon the Stylite, and a host of others, were thus provided for.)

“¶ 49. Meditating with delight on the supreme soul, seated, wanting nothing, inaccessible to all. sensual desire, without other society than his own soul, let him live here below in the constant expectancy of the eternal beatitude.

“¶ 75. In subduing his organs, in accomplishing the pious duties prescribed by the Vedas, and in submitting one's self to the most austere practices, one is able to attain here below to the supreme end, which is to become identified with Brahma.” (“Their whole doctrine of spirit, of the supreme-Being, and the relation of man to God, must have made the Brahmins ascetics from the very first. So that, when the origin of this religion can be ascertained, we may say, without further examination, monasticism was there, and gave birth to it?' [Johnson Monks before Christ. page 70].)

“¶ 87. The novice, the marled man, the anchorite, and the ascetic devotee form four distinct orders, which derive the origin from the superior of the house.  “¶ 91. The Dwijas, who belong to these four orders, ought always to practice with. the greatest care the ten virtues which compose their dutiy.

“¶ 92. Resignation, the act of rendering good for evil, temperance, probity, purity, the subjugation of the senses, the knowledge of the Shastras, that of the supreme soul, veracity, and abstinence from choler — such are the ten virtues in which their duty consists.”

From the eleventh book, “Penitences and Expiations,” we make the following extracts:

“¶ 211. The Dwija, who undergoes the ordinary penitence called Prajapatya, ought to eat during three days only in the morning; during the next three days, only at night; during the following three days, he should partake only of such food as persons may give him voluntarily, without his begging for it; and, finally, let him fast three days entirely.

“¶' 214. A Brahmin, accomplishing the severe penitence (Taptakrichra), ought to swallow nothing but warm water, warm milk, cold clarified butter, and warm vapor employing each of them three days in succession.

“¶ 215. He who, master of his senses and perfectly attentive, supports a fast of twelve days, makes the penitence called Paroka, which expiates all of his faults.

“¶ 216. Let the penitent who desires to make the Chandrayana, having eaten fifteen mouthfulls on the day of the full moon, diminish his nourishment by one mouthful each day during the fifteen days of obscuration which follow, in such a manner that on the fourteenth day he shall eat but one mouthful, and then let him fast on the fifteenth, which is the day of the new moon; let him augment, on the contrary, his nourishment by one mouthful each day during the next fifteen days, commencing the first day with one mouthful.

“¶ 239. Great criminals, and all other men guilty of divers faults, are released from the consequences of their sins by austerities practiced with exactitude.  “¶ 251. By reciting the Hovichyantiya or the Natamanha sixteen times a day for a month, or by repeating inaudibly the hymn Porucha, he who has defiled the bed of his spiritual master is absolved from all fault.”

“The ascetic system,” says Schaff, “is essential alike to Brahminism, SEE HINDUISM, and Buddhism (q.v.); the two opposite and yet cognate branches of the Indian religion, which in many respects are similarly related to each other as Judaism is to Christianity, or as Romanism to Protestantism. Buddhism is a later reformation of Brahminism... But the two religions start from opposite principles. Brahminic asceticism proceeds from a pantheistic view of the world — the Buddhistic from an atheistic and nihilistic, yet very earnest view; the one is controlled by the idea of the absolute but abstract unity, and a feeling of contempt of the world — the other by the idea of the absolute but unreal variety, and a feeling of deep grief over the emptiness and nothingness of all existence; the one is predominantly objective, positive, and idealistic — the other more — subjective, negative, and realistic; the one aims at absorption into the universal spirit of Brahma — the other constantly at an absorption into nonentity.” “Brahminism,' says Wuttke, “looks back to the beginning, Buddhism to the end; the former loves cosmogony, the latter eschatology. Both reject the existing world; the Brahmin despises it because he contrasts it with the higher being of Brahma; the Buddhist bewails it because of its unrealness; the former sees God in all, the other emptiness in all” (Des Geistesleben der Chinesen, Japaner, und Indier, 1853, page 593, constituting part 2 of his History of Heathenism). “Yet,” adds Schaff, “as all extremes meet, the abstract all — entity of Brahminism and the equally abstract non-entity or vacuity of Buddhism come to the same thing in the end, and may lead to the same ascetic practices. The asceticism of Brahminism takes more the direction of anchoretism, while that of Buddhism exists generally in the social form of regular convent life.”

The Hindu monks, the Vanaprastha, or Gymnosophists (q.v.), as the Greeks called them, are Brahminical anchorites (q.v.), who live in woods or caves, on mountains or rocks, in. poverty, celibacy, abstinence, contemplation: sleeping on straw or the bare ground, crawling on the belly, macerating the body, standing all day on tiptoe, exposed to the, pouring rain or scorching sun with four fires kindled around them, presenting a savage and frightful appearance, yet greatly revered by the multitude, especially the women. As procreation of at least one child is strictly enjoined by Brahminism, some  take their wives along, but never have intercourse with them except at such times as they are most likely to conceive. They are reputed to perform miracles, and not unfrequently complete their austerities by suicide on the stake or in the waves of the Ganges. Thus they are described by the ancients and by modern travellers (see Dubois, Description of the Character, Manners, and Customs of the People of India [Philadelphia, 1818]).

The Buddhist monks are less fanatical and extravagant than the Hindu Yogis (q.v.) and Fakirs (q.v.). They depend mainly on fasting, prayer, psalmody, intense contemplation, and the use of the whip, to keep their rebellious flesh in subjection. SEE BUDDHISM; SEE GOTAMA.

They have a fully developed system of monasticism in connection with their priesthood, and a large number of convents; also nunneries for female devotees. The laws of Buddha, it is true, are often .purely moral, and they do: not profess to be the transcript of a higher than a human mind. Yet they aimed at reducing the entire company of the faithful to strictly monastic rule, to the mortification of all human passion, to the separation and isolation of the sexes, to mendicancy, and to the cessation and relinquishing of all personal and individual rights. Hence India, though she expelled Buddhistic rule, and princes and professors from her soil, yet shows at a hundred points the deep furrow which Buddhist monasticism has drawn across the more hoary superstitions and more agonizing asceticism of Hindu philosophy; and her monuments and literature bear witness to the brave, self-sacrificing devotion of these sons and daughters of Buddha, and to the fact that they went into all Eastern lands to preach the faith of their sires, to build monasteries, to organize worship, to multiply their sacred books, to perform pilgrimage to holy shrines of their faith, to adore the relics of saints and martyrs, and work miracles by their aid, and to adapt themselves to such varying populations as the cultivated philosophers of Nepaul, the ingenious and susceptible Japanese, the Cingalese, and Burmese, to say nothing of the pontifical empire of Tibet (q.v.), intentions, the young prince said, ‘Let us turn back: I must think how to accomplish deliverance.' A last meeting put an end to his hesitation. He was driving through the northern gate, on the way to his pleasure gardens, when he saw a mendicant, who appeared outwardly calm, subdued, looking downwards, wearing with an air of dignity his religious vestment, and carrying an alms-bowl. ‘Who is this man?' asked the prince. ‘Sir,' replied the coachman, ‘this man is one of those who are  called bikshus, or mendicants.

He has renounced all pleasures, all desires, and leads a life of austerity. He tries to conquer himself. He has become a devotee: without passion, without envy, he walks about asking for alms.' ‘This is good and well said,' replied the prince. ‘The life of a devotee has always been praised by the wise. It will be my refuge, and the refuge of other creatures: it will lead us to a real life, to happiness and immortality.' With these words, the young prince turned his chariot, and re-entered the city” (translated in Muller's Essays on the Science of Religion). Buddha then declared to his father and wife his determination to become a recluse, and soon after escaped from his palace in the night while the guards had fallen asleep. The religion which he established is now, after a lapse of 2000 years, professed by one third of the inhabitants of the entire globe. One king is said to have founded 84,000 monasteries for his order, that being the number of discourses which Buddha pronounced during his lifetime. The “Law” which he gave to his order is contained in the first of the three Pitakas, and was orally handed down until about B.C. 100, when it was committed to writing in the island of Ceylon. It is called the Winaya Pitaka. and contains rules for every conceivable monastic observance. It is composed of 42,250 stanzas. To alms-giving Buddha attached an extraordinary importance. He declares that “there is no reward either in this world or in the next that may not be received through almsgiving.” Ten centuries later, Chrysostom wrote, ‘“Hast thou a penny? purchase heaven.

Heaven is on sale, and in the market, and yet ye mind it not! Give a crust, and take back paradise; give the least, and receive the greatest; give the perishable, and receive the imperishable; give the corruptible, and receive the incorruptible. Alms are the redemption of the soul... Alms-giving, which is able to break the chain of thy sins... Alms-giving, the queen of virtues, and the readiest of all ways of getting into heaven, and the best advocated there” (comp. Taylor, Anc. Christianity). According to the Winaya Pitaka, “The wise priest never asks for anything; he disdains to beg: it is a proper object for which he carries the alms-bowl; and this is the only mode of solicitation.” Celibacy, poverty, the tonsure, a particular garb, confession of sins, etc., are made compulsory.

The vows, however, are not taken for life; and a monk may retire from the order if he finds it impossible to remain continent. A novitiate is provided for; and there are “nuns” or “sisters” who live in houses by themselves. The novice usually begins her connection with the order in the school, where she is sent while yet quite young. Foundlings were often given to the early Christian monasteries, by whom they were reared for the ascetic life. No Buddhist  can attain to Nirvana unless he has served a time as an ascetic. There are five modes of meditation specified by the Pitaka: 1, Maitri; 2, Mudita; 3, Karuna; 4, Upeksha; 5, Asubha. We read of a monk who was so profoundly sunk in contemplation that he did not wash his feet for thirty years; so that at last the divine beings called dervas could smell him a thousand miles off. The monk refrains from severely injuring his body, so that he may practice as long as possible his ascetic rites. Their mode of reasoning on this subject is illustrated by the following quotation from the Milinda-prasna, a work in Pali and Cingalese: “Milinda. Do the priests respect the body? — Nagasena. No. — Milinda. Then why do they take so much pains to preserve it? Do they not by this means say, ‘This is me, or mine?' —Nagasena. Were you ever wounded by an arrow in battle? — Milinda. Yes. — Nagasena. Was not the wound anointed? Was it not rubbed with oil? And was it not covered with a soft bandage? — Milinda. Yes. —Nagasena. Was this done because you respected the wound, or took delight in it? — Milinda. No; but that it might be healed. — Nagasena. In like manner, the priests do not preserve the body because they respect it, but that they may have the power required for the keeping of the precepts.”

(2.) Persian Monachism. — The Zend-Avesta, written, it is generally agreed, about B.C. 500, contains no allusion to ascetic rites; but this fact would go no further to disprove the existence of monastic life among the Persiais than the absence of such allusion from the N.T. would disprove the existence of Jewish monks. The Avesta is not of a historical character; and what was said about the Vedas is particularly true of it — prayers and hymns make up almost its entire contents. Zoroaster originally dwelt with the Brahminical or Sanscrit branch of the Aryan family; and we know that monasticism was rife among them before the separation took place. It is not likely that they ever shook off this institution, which is as universal as religion or intemperance. We are told that there was a class of “solitaries” among them. According to the Desatir, the Dobistan, and the old Iranian histories, “there was a great king of that branch of the Aryan people known as Kai-Khuero, who was a prophet and an ascetic. He had no children; and. after a ‘glorious reign of sixty years,' he abdicated in favor of a subordinate prince, also an ascetic, who, after a long reign, resigned his throne to his son Gushtasp. It was during the reign of Gushtasp that Zoroaster appeared. Gushtasp was succeeded by Bohman, his grandson.” These were not kings of Persia, but they reigned at Balkh, and lived many centuries before Persia  became an independent kingdom. This would place the origin of asceticism anterior to Zoroaster, who lived, the Greeks said, 5000 years before the Trojan war, or 6000 before Plato — an antiquity greater than that assigned to it by the “Nabatmean Agriculture.”

(3.) Chinese Monachism. — An examination of the Chou-King, the sacred book par excellence of China, is without fruit for our purpose. It is a significant fact, however, that the word “priest” is written in Chinese “Cha- men,” or “Sang-men,” which mean, respectively, one who exerts himself,\* or one who restrains himself. The Chou-King was transcribed by Confucius (Life and Teachings of Confucius, by James Legge, D.D. [Phila. 1867]) about B.C. 480, and to him we owe its preservation. It is only one out of a large number of books upon religious topics which must have existed in his time. Lao-Kiun, who lived several generations before Confucius, was a great ascetic, advocated perfect freedom from passion, and passed much of his time in the mountains. Of Confucius, it is known that he taught no new doctrines, but insisted upon a more faithful observation of the ancient law. He flourished in the 5th century B.C. (551-479). At nineteen years of age he divorced himself from his wife, after she had given birth to a son, to devote himself to study and meditation; and his last days were passed in a quiet valley, where he retired with a few of his followers. He fasted quite frequently, and advocated many other monkish observances: such as retirement, contemplation, and agricultural employment. (See Schott, Werke. des chinzesischen Weisen Kong-Ftu-Dsi [Halle, 1826]. Comp. also Meng Tseu, ed. Stanislaus Julien, lib. 1, c. 5, par. 29; c. 6, page 29; and article CONFUCIUS SEE CONFUCIUS.) Mencius, an apostle of Confucius, who flourished in the 3d. century B.C., says, “Though a man may be wicked, yet, if he adjust his thoughts, fast, and bathe, he may sacrifice to God.” (Compare Johnson, Monks before Christ, their Spirit and their History [Bost. 1870, 18mo], chapter 2).

\* There is a remarkable similarity between the derivation of this word and that of ascetic (from ἀσκεῖν, to exercise, or practice gymnastics).

(4.) Greek Monachism. — The Hellenic heathenism was less serious and contemplative, indeed, than the Oriental. The first monastic society of which we have any knowledge are the Pythagoreans (q.v.), who, no doubt, are an importation from Egyptian or even from Indian soil (see Clement Alexandrinus, Stromat. lib. 3; Ueberweg, list. Philos. 1:42 sq.) “The  mysteries of Bacchus and Ceres were copied after those of Osiris and Isis. These latter, in some respects, resembled Freemasonry more than they did monastic orders. They forbade, however, all sensuous enjoyment, enjoined contemplation, long-protracted silence, etc. Moreover, it is probable that Pythagoras found here many of those ascetic observances which he afterwards introduced into his own order” (Johnson, Monks before Christ, page 87). Bunsen says that the rules for the conduct of Egyptian priests, as described by Chaeremon and preserved by Porphyry, remind one of the Laws of Mann and the Vedas; so that if the conjectures of this Egyptologist be accepted, we are forced to conclude that Hellenic monasticism came from the Hindus through the Egyptians. unless the theory be accepted that the Greeks borrowed it directly from the Indians during their intercourse in the 5th and 6th centuries B.C. But whatever our opinion on this point, certain it is that more than 2000 years before Ignatius Loyola assembled the nucleus of his great “society” in a subterranean chapel, in the city of Paris there was founded at Crotona, in Greece, an order of monks whose principles, constitution, aims, method, and final end entitle them to be called the “Pagan Jesuits” (see Zeller, Pythagoras u. die Pythagora-Saga. in his Vortrige u. Abhandlungen [Leips. 1865]; Johnson, Monks before Christ, pages 87, 88). The extinction of Pythagoreanism (soon after B.C. 400) by no means did away with asceticism in Greece. The philosophical mantle of the Pythagoreans fell upon a new school, among whom Epimenides and Plato are usually reckoned; and the Platonic view of matter and of body not only lies at the bottom of the Gnostic and Manichsean asceticism, but had much to do with the ethics of Origen and the Alexandrian school.

(5.) Jewish Monachism. — The origin and extent of Jewish monasticism is shrouded in much uncertainty and doubt. Yet it is clearly manifest from the records that have come down to us that Judaism was not altogether alien to asceticism. As far back as the days of Moses, while the Israelites were yet in the wilderness, a special law was made for those who should seek an ascetic life; and the Nazarites (q.v.), though, they did not separate themselves from the other people, yet did set themselves apart for special divine worship (Num 6:1-21; Jdg 13:5; 1Sa 1:11; Luk 1:15). Later, in Palestine, the Jews had their Essenes (q.v.), and in Egypt their Therapeute (q.v.), though it must be confessed that these betray the intrusion of foreign elements into the Mosaic religion, and so receive no mention in the New Test., unless the allusion in Mat 19:12 refers to these ascetics, which is believed, however, by only a few Biblical scholars. (See, besides the works quoted in the article ESSENES SEE ESSENES , Zeller, Griech-Philos. volume 3, part 2, page 589; and Theol. Jahrb. 1856, 3:358; Keim, Der Geschichtliche Christus [Zurich, 1865], page 15; Langen, Das Judenthum in Palistina zur Zeit Christi [Freib. 1866], page 186.)

(6.) Mohanmmedan Monachism. — “The two most successful religious impostures,” says Cunningham, “which the world has yet seen are Buddhism and Mohammedanism. Each creed owed its origin to the enthusiasm of a single individual, and each was rapidly propagated by numbers of zealous followers. But here the parallel ends; for the Koran of Mohammed was addressed wholly to the ‘passions' of mankind, by the promised gratification of human desires both in this world and in the next; while the Dharma of Sakya Muni was addressed wholly to the ‘intellect,' and sought to wean mankind from the pleasures and vanities of this life by pointing to the transitoriness of all human enjoyment... The former propagated his religion by the merciless edge of the sword; the latter by the persuasive voice of the missionary. The sanguinary career of the Islamite was lighted by the lurid flames of burning cities; the peaceful progress of the Buddhist was illuminated by the cheerful faces of the sick in monastic hospitals [for the crippled, the deformed, the destitute], and by the happy smiles of travellers reposing in Dharmasalas by the road-side. The one was the personification of bodily activity and material enjoyment; the other was the genius of corporeal abstinence and intellectual contemplation” (Bhilsa Topes, pages 53, 54). These words of Cunningham may apply to the early history of the two religions, but they are hardly in place in their history of more modern times. It is true, indeed, that Mohammedanism was the religion of the sword, but, its conquests over, it has studied the religions of the world, and today Islam embodies much from every creed in the universe. Its founder had been especially careful to rigidly exclude monasticism, and himself declared “no monachism in Islam,” yet today the dervishes of the East are to be met almost wherever Islam has its adherents. SEE DERVISHES. Celibacy is not likely to get a great hold in Mohammedan nations, but ascetic practices, hermitage, and mendicancy prevail to a large extent among them. Mr. Ruffner, in his Fathers of the Desert (N.Y. 1850, 2 volumes, a work popular in form, and full of valuable and curious information), has furnished an extended description of Mohammedan monasticism, and goes so far as to assert that the Christians  derived it largely from them, who in turn, borrowed from the Buddhists (see volume 1, chapter 2-9); but such a view can hardly be reconciled with the great place of the phenomenon in history, and would, moreover, stamp as heretics many of the Christian fathers who were among the greatest and best representatives both East and West. (See below.) The probability is that monachism, so far as it exists in the Mohammedan world, was introduced either direct from the heathen world around it, or came from the Christians of the Post Nicene age, especially the churches of Africa, and Egypt in particular.

II. Christian Monachism. —

1. Origin of Monasticism in the Church. —The advocates of Christian monasticism claim for it an evangelical origin. They think they find at once its justification and primitive form in the Gospel exhortation to voluntary. poverty (the instance in which Christ charged the rich young man to sell all he had, that; as a follower of his, he should receive a hundred-fold more, “with persecution,” Mat 19:21). “But this monastic interpretation of primitive Christianity,” as Dr. Schaff has well said, “mistakes a few incidental points of outward resemblance for essential identity, measures the spirit of Christianity by some isolated passages, instead of explaining the latter from the former, and is upon the whole a miserable emaciation and caricature. The Gospel makes upon all men virtually the same moral demand, and knows no distinction of a religion for the masses and another for the few.” Monachism, in this light, is at variance with the pure spirit of Christianity, inasmuch as it impels men, instead of remaining as a salt to the corrupt world in which they live, outwardly to withdraw from it, and to bury the talent which otherwise they might use for the benefit of the many. “Jesus, the model for all believers, was neither a cenobite nor an anchoret, nor an ascetic of any kind, but the perfect pattern man for universal imitation. There is not a trace of monkish austerity and ascetic rigor in his life or precepts, but in all his acts and words a wonderful harmony of freedom and purity, of the most comprehensive charity and spotless holiness. He retired to the mountains and into solitude, but only temporarily and for the purpose of renewing his strength for active work. Amid the society of his disciples, of both sexes, with kindred and friends, in Cana and Bethany, at the table of publicans and sinners, and in intercourse with all classes of the people, he kept himself unspotted from the world, and transfigured the world into the kingdom of God. His poverty and  celibacy have nothing to do with asceticism, but represent, the one the condescension of his redeeming love, the other his ideal uniqueness and his absolutely peculiar relation ‘to the whole Church, which alone is fit or worthy to be his bride... The life of the apostles and primitive Christians in general was anything but a hermit life; else had not the Gospel spread so quickly to all the cities of the Roman world. Peter was married, and travelled with his wife as a missionary. Paul assumes one marriage of the clergy as a rule, and notwithstanding his personal and relative preference for celibacy in the then oppressed condition of the Church, he is the most zealous advocate of evangelical freedom, in opposition to all legal bondage and anxious asceticism.”

As little as we find in the life of Christ or his apostles any authority for the. monastic life, so little do we find it represented in the life of primitive Christians generally. It is true in the infant Church, for a time, all things were in common, but even in this community of life, certainly the oldest or, rather, earliest phase of Christianity, monasticism finds no authority; for if it had been intended to serve as such, it would have been perpetuated. It failed because it was a social impossibility. “It gives a beautiful picture of what Christianity might be, when all are of one mind and one spirit;” but it was incompatible with the general course of human affairs, and it ceased to be. While, therefore, not even the Christian primitive communism can have been the germ from which monachism in the Church started, the theory of the monastic institution may possibly have been thereby suggested. Not even the asceticism of the infant Church can be made to account for this institution. Severe asceticism, it is true, was the religion of thousands throughout the Christian world, but those who practiced it neither separated themselves from the world nor from its social and political duties. They were simply a standing memorial of the solemn nature of the Christian baptismal vow in the heart of the families of the people. The most rigid. monastic rule could have added neither severity to their self- discipline nor higher temper to their chastened spirit (see Neander, Ch. Hist. 2:223 sq.).

But though monasticism was not a form of life that sprang originally and purely out of Christianity, yet there can be no doubt that by Christianity a new spirit was infused into this foreign mode of life, whereby with many it became ennobled and converted into an instrument of effecting much which could not otherwise have been effected by any such mode of living. Unless this view is taken, it would, as Dr. Schaff has well said, “involve the  entire ancient Church, with its greatest and best representatives both East and West — its Athanasius, its Chrysostom, its Jerome, its Augustine in apostasy from the faith.” And, as he aptly adds, “no one will now hold that these men, who all admired and commended the monastic life, were antichristian errorists, and that the few and almost exclusively negative opponents of that asceticism, as Jovinian. Helvidius, and Vigilantius, were the sole representatives of pure Christianity in the Nicene and next following age” (comp. Kingsley, Hermits, pages 14, 15). We shall come to consider the good and evil influences in another part of this article. Here we have to deal simply with its origin and relation to primitive Christianity. In the article ASCETICISM SEE ASCETICISM it has been shown that a distinction must be made between it and the monastic life, which was not known until the 4th century. That class of ascetics known as Hermits flourished probably as early as the age succeeding Christ's stay on earth; indeed, it is barely possible that its origin may be traced to John the Baptist and his surroundings. There were, no doubt, many in the early Church who, with a view to more complete freedom from the cares, temptations, and business of the world, withdrew from the ordinary intercourse of life, and took up their abode in natural caverns or rudely formed huts in deserts, forests, mountains, and other solitary places.

The pagan depravation of manners must have in no small degree contributed to it. Then there must naturally have been multitudes of outwardly professing Christians, especially in large cities, who sickened the heart of those earnest souls whose spirit and disposition led to a nearness with Christ. Hence we find that hermits are generally spoken of as emanating from large cities, which were seats of corruption, thereby indicating clearly that in the primitive Church the ascetic desire was prompted by man's noblest impulses. In the writings of the Church fathers we can trace these germs of Christian monachism back to the middle of the 2d century. Thus writes Ricaut, when speaking of Mount Athos (Present State of the Greek and Armenian Churches [A.D. 1678], page 218): “Though St. Basil was the first author and founder of the order of Greek monks, so that before his time there could be none who professed the strict way of living in convents and religious societies — I mean in Greece — yet certainly, before his time, the convenience of the place, and the situation thereof, might invite Hermites, and persons delighting in solitary devotions, of which the world, in the first and second century, did abound” (comp. Origen, Ep. ad Rom. c. 3; Mohler, Gesch. d. Monchthums in sersten Entstehung, etc., in Vermzischte Schriften, 2:165 sq.). Yet it is as late as the middle of the. 3d century, in  which falls the Decian persecution (A.D. 249-251), that there are first brought to light numerous instances of a retirement of devoted Christians to the desert (comp. Sozomen, Hist. Ecclesiastes lib. 6 cap. 43). But even these hermits were not monastics in the modern sense of the word. They were accustomed to live singly, each according to his own inclination, without any specific form of union, and that within the precincts of the Church to which they severally belonged, unless personal safety required removal to more distant parts. It was reserved for the 4th century — the very age which gave state aid and perpetuity to Christianity — to develop that branch of asceticism which has ever since continued to flourish in a part of the Church, and to this day figures in the history of Christian civilization, sometimes to advantage, and oftentimes to great disadvantage.

2. Development of Monachism. — In what has preceded it is clearly foreshadowed that the historical development of the monastic institution was neither sudden nor rapid, but that it passed through several stages before it finally took the shape under which it is now known to us. Dr. Schaff distinguishes four stages — the first three complete in the 4th century; the remaining one reaches maturity in the Latin Church of the Middle Ages.

(a) The first stage covers the ascetic life, neither organized nor separated from the Church. It comes down from the ante-Nicene age, and is noticed in the article ASCETICISM SEE ASCETICISM (q.v.). In the 4th century it took the form, for the most part, of either hermit or cenobite life, and continued in the Church itself, especially among the clergy, who might be called halfmonks.

(b) The second stage, which is hermit-life or anchoretism, SEE ANACHOLRETS, arose in the beginning of the 4th century, gave asceticism a fixed and permanent shape, and pushed it even to external separation from the world. It took the prophets Elijah and John the Baptist for its models, and went beyond them (comp. Lond. Qu. Rev. April 1855, page 164). Not content with partial and temporary retirement from common life, which may be united with social intercourse and useful labors, the consistent anchoret secluded himself from all society, even from kindred ascetics, and came only exceptionally into contact with human affairs, either to receive the visits of admirers of every class, especially of the sick and the needy (which were very frequent in the case of the more celebrated monks), or to appear in the cities on some extraordinary  occasion, as a spirit from another world. His clothing was a hair shirt and a wild-beast's skin; his food bread and salt; his dwelling a cave; his employment prayer, affliction of the body, and conflict with satanic powers and wild images of fancy. They were, as Montalembert says, “nais comme des enfants, et Torts comme des greants;” though Villemain, forming a more unimpassioned estimate of monasticism and its results, says, “De cette rude ecole du desert ilsortait des grands hommes et des fous;” heroes and madmen (Melanges Elog. Chrat. page 356). The anchorets maintained from choice, after the cessation of the persecutions, the seclusion to which they had originally resorted as an expedient of security; and a later development of the same principle is found in the still more remarkable psychological phenomenon of the celebrated Pillar Saints (q.v.).

The founder of the anchoretic mode of life is supposed to have been one certain Paul of Thebes, but St. Anthony is generally looked upon as “the father of monasticism” (Neander, 2:229); and though this is perhaps going a little too far, he must certainly be regarded as the principal influence in the anchoretic movement. ‘Says Neander (Ch. Hist. 2:228, 229), “In the 4th century men were not agreed on the question as to who was to be considered the founder of monasticism, whether Paul or Anthony. If by this was to be understood the individual from whom the spread of this mode of life proceeded, the name was unquestionably due to the latter; for if Paul was the first Christian hermit, yet he must have remained unknown to the rest of the Christian world, and without the influence of Anthony would have found no followers. (Before Anthony, there may have been many who, by inclination or by peculiar outward circumstances, were led to adopt this mode of life; but they remained, at least, unknown.) ‘The' first whom tradition — which in this case, it must be confessed, is entitled to little confidence, and much distorted by fable cites by name is the above- mentioned Paul. He is said to have been moved by the Decian persecution, which no doubt raged with peculiar violence in his native land, the Thebaid, in Upper Egypt, to withdraw. himself, when a young man, to a grotto in a remote mountain. By degrees he became attached to the mode of life he had adopted at first out of necessity. Nourishment and clothing were supplied him by a palm-tree that had sprung up near the grotto. Whether everything in this legend, or, if not everything, what part of it, is historically true, it is impossible to determine. According to the tradition, Anthony (q.v.) having heard of Paul, visited him, and made him known to others. But as Athanasius, in his life of Anthony is wholly silent as to this  matter, which he certainly would have deemed an important circumstance — though he states that Anthony visited all ascetics who were experienced in the spiritual life — the story must be dismissed as unworthy of credit.”

It was really Anthony who gave to his age a pattern, which was seized with love and enthusiasm by many hearts that longed after Christian perfection, and which excited many to emulate it. Like Paul, Anthony was a native of Egypt, and being himself of a noble family, his influence was considerable, and he persuaded many members of the old Egyptian families to join him, and' spread his ascetic views and practices throughout all Egypt; even the deserts of this country, to the borders of Lybia, were sprinkled with numerous anachoretic societies. Hence the institution spread to Palestine and ‘Syria, and Anthony, indeed, was visited not only by Egyptian ascetics, but also by those coming from Jerusalem (see Palladii Lausiaca, c. 26, Biblioth patrum Parisiensis, t. 13, fol. 939). Thus it was that Anthony, “without any conscious design of his own” (Neander), became the founder of this new mode of Christian living; for it in truth happened of its own accord, without any special efforts of his, that persons of similar disposition attached themselves to him, and, building their cells around his, made him their spiritual guide and governor, and thus constituted the first societies of Anachorets, who lived scattered, in single cells or huts, united together under one superior — demonstrating, moreover, that in monasticism prevailed the same law as in every other intellectual movement. An idea exists long in a state of free solution, till the mastermind is revealed, destined to give it fixity and permanence; and from that time it becomes a nucleus around which system gathers and crystallizes. Thus the recluses of the desert continued to gain in strength and number until gathered by Anthony; the connecting tie being a triple vow of chastity, poverty, and manual labor for the common good. Thenceforth the attention of Christendom was attracted to the Thebaid; all who needed it found there an asylum. But it was. after all, only for the East, and not for the world. Christianity had proved itself adapted to the wants of all; this form of asceticism could prevail only where the climate favored a hermit's life. It was too eccentric and unpractical for the West, and hence less frequent there, especially in the rougher climates. To the female sex it was entirely unsuited. An order of widows, employed in charitable works, and supported from the offerings of the faithful, was apparently one of the primitive institutions of the apostles (Lea, Celibacy, page 100); yet they were not separated from the world, but moved in it.  SEE DEACONESSES. There was, to be sure, a class of hermits, the Sarabaites (q.v.) in Egypt, and the Rhemoboths (q.v.) in Syria; but their quarrelsomeness, occasional intemperance, and opposition to the clergy brought them into ill-repute.

(c) The third step in the progress of the monastic life brings us to Cenobitism or cloister life — monasticism in the ordinary sense of the word. The necessities of the religious life itself — as the attendance at public worship, the participation of the sacraments, the desire for mutual instruction and edification — naturally enough led gradually to modifications of the degree and of the nature of the solitude. First came the simplest form of common life, which sought to combine the personal seclusion of individuals with the common exercise of all the public duties; an aggregation of separate cells into the same district, called by the name Laura, with a common church, in which all assembled for prayer and public worship. From the union of the common life with personal solitude is derived the name conobite, i.e., common life, by which this class of monks is distinguished from the strict solitaries, as the anchorets or eremites. In this, too, is involved, in addition to the obligations of poverty and chastity, which were vowed by the anchorets, a third obligation of obedience to a superior, which, in conjunction with the two former, has ever been held to constitute the essence of the religious or monastic life. SEE MONASTERY.

Like all the other ascetic institutions, the monastic life also found its home in Egypt. The country was certainly favorable to the production and expansion of just such an institution. “The land where Oriental and Grecian literature, philosophy, and religion, Christian orthodoxy and Gnostic heresy, met both in friendship and in hostility,” was in every way adapted to be “the native land” of the monastic life. We may add also that “monasticism was favored and promoted here by climate and geographic features, by the oasislike seclusion of the country, by the bold contrast of barren deserts with the fertile valley of the Nile, by the superstition, the contemplative turn, and the passive endurance of the national character, by the example of the Therapeutae, and by the moral principles of the Alexandrian fathers; especially by Origen's theory of a higher and lower morality, and of the merit of voluntary poverty and celibacy.” Even back in the days of Elian we are told by him that the Egyptians bear the most exquisite torture without a murmur, and would rather be tormented to death than compromise truth. Such natures, once seized with religious enthusiasm, were certainly very eminently qualified for saints of the desert.  No wonder, then, that the monastic life soon gained general favor. Pachomius (292-348), a disciple of Anthony, is recognized as the founder of this peculiar, ascetic life. Palladius, himself a convert in these early days to this institution, furnishes an account of its progress in connection with an account of its author, which Neander thus presents: “Pachomius, at the beginning of the 4th century, when a young man, after having obtained his release from the military service, into which he had been forced, attached himself to an aged hermit, with whom he passed twelve years of his life. Here he felt the impulse of Christian love, which taught him that he ought not to live merely so as to promote his own growth to perfection, but .to seek also the salvation of his brethren.

He supposed unless this is a decoration of the legend — that in a vision he heard the voice of an angel giving utterance to the call in his own breast — it was the divine will that he should be an instrument for the good of his brethren, by reconciling them to God (Vita Pachom., § 15). On Tabennae, an island of the Nile, in Upper Egypt, betwixt the Nomes of Tenthyra and Thebes, he founded a society of monks, which during the lifetime of Pachonlius himself numbered three thousand, and afterwards seven thousand members; and thus went on increasing until, in the first half of the 5th century, it could reckon within its rules fifty thousand monks (Lauriaca, 6:1, c. 909; also c. 38, fol. 957; Hieronymi Profat. in regulan. Pachomii, § 7).” We are told that when Athanasius visited Pachomius three thousand monks passed before him in procession, chanting hymns, and exhibiting practical proofs of direct piety under the monastic rule. Nor was the new movement confined to the Tabenus region. The development in the Nitrian and Thebaid deserts was equally rapid; so that Rufinus (V. Patr. 2:7) affirms that the monastic population of Egypt equalled the inhabitants of the towns. In the single district of Nitria, we are told, there were no fewer than fifty monasteries (Sozomen, Ecclesiastes Hist. 6:31) and the civil authorities even found it expedient to place restrictions on their excessive multiplication. Neither was the movement confined to Egypt. Arabia, Syria, Palestine, and more especially the region of Mount Sinai, soon swarmed with recluses, and were thickly studded with monasteries. “We daily receive monks,” says Jerome (346-420), writing at Bethlehem, “from India, and Persia, and Ethiopia.” The entire Eastern Church gave this practice confidence, and the greatest teachers of the Church — as Gregory Nazianzen (329-389). Basil the Great (328-379), and the golden-tongued Chrysostom (342-407) became its enthusiastic admirers and promoters.

Nor did the desert remain the home of the new life. Monastic institutions  were soon transplanted to the towns, and in agitated times these places became safe houses of refuge from the troubles of the world. Indeed, it must be conceded by all honest students of early ecclesiastical history that the example of the monasticism of the early Eastern Church had a powerful influence in forwarding the progress of Christianity; although it is also certain that the admiration which it excited occasionally led to its natural consequence among the members, by eliciting a spirit of pride and ostentation, and by provoking, sometimes to fanatical excesses of austerity, sometimes to hypocritical simulations of rigor. The abuses which arose, even in the early stages of monachism, are deplored by the very fathers who are most eloquent in their praises of the institution itself. These abuses prevailed chiefly in a class of monks called Sarabaites (q.v.), who lived in small communities of three or four, and sometimes led a wandering and irregular life.. Yet though many took exception to any abuses growing out of the institution, but few were found, like Jovinian, to assail the principle. And even emperors, as, e.g., Valens and his successors, sought in vain to arrest the too rapid increase of monachism. A picture is drawn by Theodoret, in his Religious Histories, of the rigor and mortification practiced in some of the greater monasteries, which goes far to explain the assertion of Protestant writers that the monks were commonly zealots in religion; and that much of the bitterness of the religious controversies of the East was due to their unrestrained zeal; and that the opinions which led to these controversies originated for the most part among the theologians of the cloisters. (Most famous among these was an order called Acemetce [Gr. sleepless], from their maintaining the public services of the Church day and night without interruption. SEE IMAGE-WORSHIP; SEE MONOPHYSITES; SEE MONOTHELITES; SEE TORIANS.)

Under the growing influence of the Byzantine emperors, the Eastern Church, and with it Eastern monachism, lost all vitality and became petrified. No attempts were made to revive its declining vigor by creating new organizations, and though there have indeed been occasional examples of splendid benevolence in Oriental monachism, these are after all isolated instances. “As a general rule,” says Stanley, “there has arisen in the East no society like the Benedictines (see below), held in honor wherever literature or civilization has spread; no charitable orders, like the Sisters of Mercy, which carry light and peace in the darkest haunts of suffering humanity” (Eastern Church, page 114). Traditionally all the Eastern monks have followed up to the present day the so-called rule of Pachomius, or, as they  prefer, of St. Anthony.. They remain numerous in all the Eastern churches, and some of their establishments, as the convents of Mount Athos, are still celebrated for their literary treasures or political influence, SEE MONIS, EASTERN; but they have ceased to be powerful agencies of religious influence. This is of course easily to be accounted for on general-principles. The Eastern Church is by us of the West recognised as stationary and immutable, while our own motto is progress and flexibility. Hence active life is, on the strict Eastern theory, an abuse of the system. And while the monastic life, as we shall presently examine it in detail, in the Western world is characterized by literary and agricultural activity, the Eastern monks, whether in Egypt or Greece, have always passed a passive life, turning aside, and that only occasionally, simply to secure the necessaries for their subsistence. Some monks, it is true, devoted a portion of their time to mechanical trades, among which we find ship-building, and to agriculture; but all their occupations and rules were after all designed to overcome the desires of the body, and to make it a willing servant and instrument of the soul in its excessive religious aspirations. Annihilation of individualism was aimed at, in order to be wholly possessed and owned by God. The wildest individual excesses of a Bruno or a Dunstan seem poor beside the authorized national, we may almost say imperial, adoration of the pillar saints of the East. Thus also, e.g., amid all the controversies of the 5th century, on one religious subject the conflicting East maintained its unity — in the reverence of the hermit on the pillar. The West certainly has never had a Simeon Stylites (q.v.).

It is clearly apparent, then, to the careful student of ecclesiastical history that monasticism proper, in its first stage, was developed in the Eastern Church. But we shall see presently that monasticism was early transplanted to the West also. We will see it, however, in a modified form, really constituting the fourth and last stage of asceticism, or the second stage of monasticism proper. Before we pass to its consideration, it may not be amiss to regard here the third stage in its relation to the other two that preceded it. Pachomius himself, as we have seen, was originally a hermit. It will be found upon examination that all other ascetics who are marked as the most celebrated order — founders of later days were also originally hermits. Cloister life, indeed, is a regular organization of the ascetic life on a social basis, recognising as it does, at least in a measure, the social element of human nature, and representing it in a narrower sphere secluded from the larger world. Hence hermit life led to cloister life, and the cloister  life became not only a refuge for the spirit weary of the world, but also in many ways a school for practical life in the Church. We must certainly confess that it formed the transition from isolated to social Christianity; for it consists in an association of a number of anchorets of the same sex for mutual advancement in ascetic holiness. The coenobites, living somewhat according to the laws of civilization, under one roof, and under a superintendent or abbot, divide their time between common devotions and manual labor, and devote their surplus provisions to charity; except the mendicant monks, who themselves live by alms.

In this modified form monasticism became available to the female sex, to which the solitary desert life was utterly impracticable; and with the cloisters of monks there appear at once cloisters also of nuns. Anthony and Pachomius, we are told by their biographers, were tended by their sisters; Ammonius by his wife; and crowds of heroic women confided their honor to the wilderness rather than to the caprices of fortune in times of trouble. Hence this germ of nunneries developed their growth even as rapidly as the monasteries, and, though the cause no longer exists, cloisters for female ascetics abound to this day in the East and in the West. SEE NUNNERIES.

(d) Fourth Stage of Monasticism. — The same social impulse, finally, which produced monastic congregations, led afterwards to monastic orders, unions of a number of cloisters under one rule and a common government. In this, the fourth and last stage, monasticism. presents itself in the West, and played no little part, we gladly confess, for the diffusion of Christianity and .the advancement of learning, becoming in one sense even the cradle of the German Reformation (comp. Schaff, Ch. Hist. 2:158, 176).

We have seen above that Athanasius, one of the Western Church fathers, was in the East, and enjoyed a personal association with Anthony and Pachomius. When Athanasius returned to Rome (about A.D. 341), he determined to introduce the practice of the monastic life into the Western Church. He brought home with him some Egyptian monks for the purpose of initiating the Romans, and in order to exhibit to them living evidence of the sanctifying principles of the new “religion.” Their uncouth and savage appearance, however, excited disgust and ridicule, and for a time the effort failed. But Athanasius, in nowise disconcerted, published a biographical account of St. Anthony, which, being early translated into Latin, had great influence on the people. Besides, respectable bishops of the West, who had  been banished to the East during the Arian controversies, brought back with them, on their return, an enthusiasm for the monastic life. In Rome especially the feeling of ridicule gave way to enthusiastic admiration, and men and women of rank were impelled by the ascetic spirit which was spread by Jerome (346-420) during his residence in that city to retire from the great world, in which they had shone, and devote themselves to the. monastic life. Patricians, rich merchants, and men of letters adopted the distinctive dress of the anchorite, and with it the three self-denying vows of the ascetic life. Senators and matrons transformed their palaces and country-seats. Villas, bearing the names of Gracchus, Scipio, Camillus, and Marcellus, were converted by the representatives of these great names into monasteries (the ruins of the Anician palace, of vast extent, were still to be seen in the middle of the 8th century at the gate of Nursia [comp. Montalembert, 2:8]; and the family from whence it had its name is renowned in the annals of monasticism as the stock of which Benedict and Gregory the Great were descendants). From Rome the movement spread through the provinces, and established itself in the isles of the Mediterranean; chiefly through the energetic action of Eusebius of Vercelli who, like Athanasius, had obtained a temporary resting-place in the Thebaid when driven from his see. Men possessing such great influence as Ambrose of Milan, John Curianus, Martin of Tours, the presbyter Jerome (q.v.), also contributed subsequently, in the course of the 4th century, still further to awaken and diffuse this tendency of the Christian spirit in Italy and in Gaul.

Everywhere the institution now spread rapidly, in the same general forms in which the monasteries were built up in the East. Pachomius had started some of these and given them monastic shape, but it was reserved for Basil the Great (328-379) to give perfect organization to the vast army of monks, and to bind them by a formal vow of chastity, poverty (involving the duty of self-support by manual labor), and obedience to authority. But even Basil's work was vague and desultory, and St. Augustine was not a little tried in his endeavors to diffuse monasticism in North Africa and Italy. He condemned the idleness of the monks ever fearing the danger which would spring from affording too great freedom to men who had been accustomed to severe corporeal labor and to rigid restraint. Many there were who would be right well disposed to exchange a needy, sorrowful, and laborious life for one free from all care, exempt from labor, and at the same time enjoy the pleasure of being looked up to with universal respect .  Those who discarded the obligation to manual labor ventured, in defending their principles, to pervert many passages of the New Testament. When that precept of the apostle Paul in 2Th 3:12, was objected to them, they appealed, on the other hand, to those misconceived passages in the Sermon on the Mount in which all care for the wants of the morrow, hence all labor to, acquire the means of sustenance for the morrow, were forbidden. Christian perfection was made to consist in this-that men should expect, without laboring for their support, to be provided for by the hand of God, like the fowls of the air.

This precept of Christ, they contended, Paul could not mean to contradict; the laboring, accordingly, as well as the eating, in those words of Paul, must be understood not in the literal, but in a spiritual sense — as referring to the obligation of communicating the nourishment of the divine Word, which men had themselves received, to others also — an example of the perversion of Scripture worthy to be noticed. But not only Augustine other friends of monasticism soon came to apprehend the obstacles likely to face Christian activity, and a Church, Council, that of Chaledon (A.D. 451), found it necessary to pass canons for the regulation of monks. Yet these changes could affect only the East, the West having no part in its deliberations, and having as its representatives only four papal legates. Hence, while in the East some provisions. were made for the safety of Christian asceticism, in the: garb- of monasticism, the Western Church was constantly and considerably modifying the Eastern practices, until the relaxations of Western monastics threatened apostasy and heresy unlimited. The inmates of different cells under the same head varied in their observance, each recluse retaining his accustomed usage when admitted into the community. And, in truth, no rule could well be universal. In Gaul the monks declaimed against the severe rule of fasting imported from the East. A discipline that was practicable under a burning Syrian sun required modification to suit the colder latitude of Gaul. Discontent and laxity were taking hold everywhere, and monachism would perhaps have been unable to withstand the destructive influences which, in this and the following times, were spreading far and wide;, and the irregularities prevailing in the spiritual order would have become more widely diffused in Western monachism, which had a still laxer constitution, had not a remarkable man introduced into the monastic life a more settled order and a more rigid discipline, and given it the shaping and direction of a hierarchical religious order, by which it became so influential an instrument to Christianity, particularly for the conversion and the culture of rude nations (Neander, 2:259).

This  remarkable man was Benedict, an Italian monk of the early part of the 6th century. His religious rules were at first intended and framed merely for the government of the convent Monte Cassino (q.v.). over which he presided, but they afterwards were adopted by or forced upon a very great number of monasteries. His rule was founded on that of Pachomius, though in many respects it deviated from it. His great object seems to have been to render the discipline of the monks milder, their establishment more solid, and their manners more regular than those of other monastic establishments. “Benedict,” says Neander, “aimed to counteract the licentious life of the irregular monks who roamed about the country, and spread a corrupting influence, both on manners and on religion-by the introduction of a severer discipline and spirit of order.” The dominant principles of Benedict's rule are obedience and labor; being administrative rather than creative in its origin, and presupposing the existing rules of chastity and poverty. The founder speaks of his rule as merely a beginning, a tentative ordinance — “Hanc minimam inchoationis regulam,” etc. (c. 73). The principal of every establishment was enjoined to take counsel, either of the whole house in capitular assembly, or of the decanal body chosen from the different decades of the community. A candidate for the novitiate was long kept without the walls to try his constancy...

When admitted within, he was placed for two months under the tuition and surveillance of an experienced monk, and warned daily with respect to the hardships and discipline of the monastery. If the novice still wished to take the vow, the laws of the society were read over to him, and permission given him to return to the world if he so pleased. The same opportunity was three times repeated during the year of novitiate, at the expiration of which time he was admitted as a member of the community. The sixty- three heads under which the rule is arranged refer to the relative duties of the principal and subordinate members — divine worship, discipline, household economy, and various ordinances referring to hospitality, missions, nursing, etc. The prescribed dress was in all probability that which had always been adopted by recluses, for it is almost the .same. coarse garb as that which Columella (De Re Rustica, 11:1) recommends for the farm serf in all kinds of weather. The whole time of the monks of his order he .directed to be divided between prayer, reading, the education of youth, and other pious and learned labors. All who entered his order were obliged to promise when they were received as novitiates, and to repeat their promise when they were admitted as full members of the society, that they would in no respect and on no account attempt to change  or add to the rules which he had instituted. Doubtless aware that the ascetic severity of many of the monastic orders in the East was unsuited to the rude men of the West, and also to the more unfriendly climate, Benedict did not require of his monks many of the mortifications which were sometimes imposed upon those of the East, and allowed them several indulgences which were there sometimes forbidden. His rule was consequently embraced by nearly all the monks of the West. In some of the more isolated churches, as, for instance, that of Britain, it would seem that the reformations of St. Benedict were not introduced until a late period; and in the churches of that country, as well as those of Ireland, they were a subject of considerable controversy.

Benedict admitted both the learned and unlearned into his order; it was the duty of the first to assist at the choir, of the latter to attend to the household economy and temporal concerns of the monastery. At this period, it may be observed, the recitation of the divine office at the choir (as it is called by the Roman Catholics) was confined to the monks; afterwards it was established as the duty of all priests, deacons, and sub- deacons. The Benedictines at first admitted none into their order who were not well instructed how to perform it; but it was not necessary that they should be priests, or even in holy orders. Afterwards many were admitted who were ignorant of the duty of the choir; they were employed in menial duties: hence the introduction of Lay Brothers into the Benedictine order. When first introduced, they were not considered as a portion of the monastic establishment, but as merely attached and subordinate to it; but in course of time both the order and the Church acknowledged them to be, in the strictest sense of the word, professed religious. All other religious orders, both men and women, following the example of the Benedictines, have admitted lay brothers and sisters. In 1322 the Council of Vienna ordered all monks to enter into the order of priesthood. The monks of Vallombrosa, in Tuscany, are the first among whom lay brothers are found under that appellation. SEE LAY BROTHER; SEE PRIESTHOOD.

One of the most important modifications of monachism in the West, it will be noticed by the careful reader, regarded the nature of the occupation in which the monks were to be engaged during the times not directly devoted to prayer, meditation, or other spiritual exercises. In the East, manual labor formed the chief, if not the sole external occupation prescribed to the monks; it being held as a fundamental principle that for each individual the main business of life was the sanctification of his own soul. In the West,  besides the labor of the hands, mental occupation was also prescribed, not, it is true, for all, but for those for whom it was especially calculated. From an early period, therefore, the convents of the West became schools of learning, and training-houses for the clergy and the missionary. At a later period, most monasteries possessed a scriptoriun, or writing-room, in which the monks were employed in the transcription of MSS.; and though- much of the work so done was, as might naturally be expected, in the department of sacred learning, yet it is to the scholars of the cloister we owe the preservation of most of those masterpieces of ancient classic literature .which have reached our age (comp., however, Leckey, Hist. Europ. Morals, 2:220 sq.), Thence also went out those who became founders of Christianity in heathen countries. In this way Germany and Switzerland were converted. In these, as well as in the Slavic countries, it was not only by preaching, but still more by the establishment of convents. having the character of agricultural establishments, that conversion was advanced (comp. Maclean, Hist. of Christian Missions in the Middle Ages, page 406 sq.).

3. Degeneracy of Monachism, and its Extension. — The irruption of the Lombards into Italy and of the Saracens into Spain, and the civil wars in France after the death of Charlemagne, as well as the many favors received from the Church, which had come to regard recluses as a higher class of Christians, having facilitated the growth of moral corruption among the monastics, and having introduced great disorder also among the Benedictines, several attempts at reform were made, and for many centuries the history of monachism now comes to present a continual struggle of reformers with the laxity, indifference, or immorality obtaining in a larger or lesser number of the convents of those times. The first and most noted of the reformers was Benedict of Aniane (1821), whose commentary on the rule of Benedict of Nursia obtained later an equally authoritative character. Next in order stands Berno, the founder of the Clugny C'ongregation (q.v.), afterwards reformed by his- successor, St. Odo. Several monasteries adopted Odo's reforms; but it was Clugny alone that enjoyed the greatest privileges, and it was generally looked upon as the main pillar of the reformatory party. It controlled nearly all the important convents of Gaul and Italy. In the 11th century the Benedictine order again fell from its original purity and strictness. This gave rise to many attempts to restore it to its pristine form and object; hence arose the Carthusians, the Camaldules, the Celestines, the Cistercians, the monks of  Grammont the Congregation of St. Maur, and the celebrated monks of La Trappe.

In the 8th century a kind of middle order between the monks and the clergy had been formed, called the canons regular of St. Augustine. Their dwellings and table were in common, and they assembled at fixed hours for the divine service. In these respects they resembled the monks; but they differed from them in taking no vows, and they often officiated in churches committed to their care. Having degenerated in the 12th century, pope Nicholas II introduced a considerable reformation among them. At this period they seem to have divided into several branches of the original order; some formed themselves into communities, in which there was a common dwelling and table, but each monk, after contributing to the general stock, employed the fruits of his benefices as he deemed proper. At the head of another union was the bishop of Chartres. They adopted a more rigid and austere mode of life, renounced their worldly possessions, all private property, and lived exactly as the strictest order of monks did. This gave rise to the distinction between the secular and regular canons. The former observed the decree of pope Nicholas II; the latter followed the bishop of Chartres, and were called the regular canons of St. Augustine, because they were formed on the rules laid down by St. Augustine in his Epistles. They kept public schools for the instruction of youth, and exercised a variety of other employments useful to the Church. A reform was effected in the Augustines by St. Norbert; and, as he presided over a convent at Prinontre, in Picardy, those monks who adopted his rule were called Premonstratenses. They spread throughout Europe with great rapidity.

Other orders also arose, mainly devoted to special benevolent or religious purposes. Thus, e.g., the Order of St. Anthony (1095) and the Hospitallers (1078) devoted themselves to the nursing of the sick, the Order of Fontevraud (1094) to the correction of lewd women, and the Trinitarians (1198) to the redeeming of Christian prisoners. Even the warlike tendencies of those times sought a union with the monastic spirit by the establishment of several orders of knights, such as the Knights of St. John, the Templars, the Teutonic Knights, the orders of St. Jago, Calatrava, Alcantara, Avis, and St. Maurice. SEE KNIGHTHOOD.

During this period convents of nuns were also established, the institutes and regulations of which were similar to. those adopted by the Benedictines and Augustines, or to the reformed branches springing from those' two. great orders.  We see in all this that in the remarkable religious movement which characterized the Church of the 12th century the principle of monachism underwent considerable modification; and yet, however active and consistent these different orders might be, they were still too imperfectly adapted to the wants of the fast approaching 13th century. There was yet too much self-indulgence in the inhabitants of the cloister, and .too little for the general want in the semi-monastic orders of the knights. The latter were too much confined to special wants in life only; the former, as men who had renounced the business of this world to make themselves another in the cloisters where they lived and died, kept too far aloof from secular concerns; and even where they had been most assiduous in the duties of their convent, their attachment to it often indisposed them to stand forward and do battle with the numerous sects that threatened to subvert Christianity itself. Something ruder and more practical, less wedded to peculiar spots and less entangled by superfluous property, was needed if the Church was to repair its rigid and monastic form (comp. Hardwick, Ch. Hist M.A. page 230). The want was made peculiarly apparent when thee Albigenses began to lay unwonted stress on their own poverty and to decry the self indulgence of the monks; and the Church itself, fearing for its safety, declared against the further extension of the monastic power in the Lateran Council of 1215.

At this juncture arose the two mendicant orders, (1) the Minors or Franciscans (q.v.), and (2) the Preachers or Dominicans (q.v.), both destined for two centuries to play a leading part in all the fortunes of the Church. SEE MENDICANTS.

They aimed at being the best soldiers of the Church militant, and they had therefore a marked influence on subsequent Church history. They renounced every kind of worldly goods and founded what was termed an “order of penitence” (the third estate of friars), composed of the laity (especially the working classes), who, while pledged to do the bidding of the pope and to observe the general regulations of the institute, were not restricted by the vow of celibacy, nor compelled to take their leave entirely of the world. We thus see that the spiritual egotism, so to speak, of the early monachism, which in some sense limited the work of the cloister to the sanctification of the individual, gave place to the more comprehensive range of spiritual duty, and made the spiritual and even the temporal necessities of one's neighbor, equally with if not more than one's own, the object of the work of the cloister. But more than that. The mendicants thus created for themselves a numerous and influential party  among the laity by these territories, and the Church, prizing this hold on the community, stood ready to give place to such aids. They wandered over all Europe, instructing the people, both old and young, and exhibiting such an aspect of sanctity and self-denial that they speedily became objects of universal admiration. Their churches were crowded, while those of the regular parish priests were almost wholly deserted; all classes sought to receive the sacraments at their hands; their advice was eagerly courted in secular business, and even in the most intricate political affairs; so that in the 13th and two following centuries the mendicant orders generally, but more especially the Dominicans and Franciscans, were intrusted with the management of all matters both in Church and State. They also secured many of the chairs of the theological schools in spite of the secular clergy, and the most illustrious representatives of the 13th and 14th centuries (Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventura, Albertus Magnus, Alexander of Hales, etc.) were either Dominicans or Franciscans. Several of their number filled the highest ecclesiastical positions, even the papal chair. They certainly raised monachism to the zenith of its power, influence, and prosperity. Besides the Franciscans and the Dominicans, there were the Carmelites and the. ermits of St. Augustine, but both of these were much inferior in number, reputation, and influence to the Franciscans and Dominicans. Having thus become both important and powerful, the mendicants rapidly multiplied, and the most serious results were likely to arise, as they were generally independent of episcopal jurisdiction, and were rivals to bishops and priests. The high estimation, moreover, into which monachism had risen, more particularly through the wide-spread influence of the begging friars, awakened a spirit of bitter hostility, not simply in all orders of the clergy, but also in the universities. In England the University of Oxford, and in France the University of Paris, arduously labored to overthrow its now spreading power. Pope Gregory X, with a view to check the overgrown-evil, went so far even as to issue a decree prohibiting all the orders which had originated since the time of Innocent III (A.D. 1200), and reduced the mendicants to four orders — the Dominicans, Franciscans, Carmelites, and Augustinians. The Church of Rome, says Butler, “has acknowledged only these four orders to be mendicant,” and the reason given is that “an order is considered to be mendicant, in the proper import of that word, when it has no fixed income, and derives its whole subsistence from casual and uncertain bounty, obtained by personal mendicity. To that St. Francis did not wish his brethren, to have recourse till they had endeavored to earn a competent subsistence by labor, and  found their earnings insufficient. But soon after the decease of St. Francis, the exertions, equally incessant and laborious, of his disciples for the spiritual welfare of the faithful appeared, in the universal opinion of the Church, to be both incompatible with manual labor and much more than a compensation to the public for all they could possibly obtain from it by mendicity. This opinion was unequivocally expressed by St. Thomas' Aquinas, and sanctioned by a bull of pope Nicholas III; since that time the friars have not used manual labor as a means of subsistence, but resorted in the first instance to mendicity.” Mendicity seems to have made no part of the original rules of the Dominicans, Carmelites, or Hermits of Augustine; and, in consequence of the evils attendant on it, the Council of Trent confined mendicity to the Observantines and Capuchins, allowing the other Franciscan establishments, and almost all the establishments of the three other orders, to acquire permanent property.

In the 14th century, though partly checked by the mendicant orders, a general degeneracy of monachism commenced, and the corruption, from which hardly a single order kept itself entirely free, became so overwhelming that towards the close of the Middle Ages the name monk was often used by writers as synonymous with rudeness and ignorance. “The monks,” says Hardwick, “gorged with the ecclesiastical endowments, lost the moral elevation they had shown throughout the early periods of the Church, and with it forfeited their hold on the affections of the people. Except the Order of Carthusians, none of them adhered to the letter of their institute. Their intellectual vigor at the same time underwent a corresponding deterioration, insomuch that few if any works of merit, either in the field of science or in that of theology, proceeded in this age from the cloisters of the West” (Ch. Hist. M.A. page 343; comp. Gieseler, Ecclesiastes Hist. 3:85 sq., 286 sq.). The monks, like a swarm of locusts, covered all Europe, proclaiming everywhere the obedience due. to the holy mother Church, the reverence due to the saints (and more especially to the Virgin Mary), the efficacy of relics, the torments of purgatory, and the blessed advantages arising from indulgences. Reformatory attempts were vainly made in every century. Different new orders — as the Jesuits, Brigittines, Servites, Hieronymites, and others — were founded; but their influence was weak in comparison with that of their predecessors, and frequently, after an existence of fifty or one hundred years, they themselves were as far astray from the primitive standard of rigid asceticism. “The progress of monasticism,” says Cramp, “ was distinguished for several  centuries by unexampled prosperity and its ordinary attendant, corruption. Replenished with wealth, which the ignorant and superstitious people lavished upon them, thinking to gain favor with God thereby, the monks indulged in every kind of licentious excess, till they were as infamous for vice as their predecessors had been renowned for piety. Reformation was frequently attempted, and many new orders arose, professing at first great zeal for purity, and adopting the strictest modes of discipline, verging sometimes to the extremity of human endurance. But these also soon shared ‘the general fate, and sank to the same low level of shameless sensuality” (comp. Concil., Labbe et Cossart, ed. Mansi, tom. 18:270; Gieseler, Ecclesiastes Hist. 2:120). The councils of Constance (A.D. 1415) and Basle (A.D. 1431), in their endeavors to brace up monastic discipline afresh, devised reformatory measures; but they produced only transitory changes, and those only in few places. As a whole, it was daily more apparent that monasticism was growing almost incorrigible, and was ripening daily for the scythe. One of the strongest evidences of such a tendency was the formation of four spiritual associations to take the place of the monastic orders.

Thus flourished, in spite of the indiscriminate denunciation of pope and priest and persecution by the Inquisition, the Beguards or Beguines, who must be regarded as an offshoot of monasticism, though they exhibited a freer and less hierarchical spirit. They flourished mainly in Germany and the Netherlands; but other groups, in which the Beguard influence was apparent, began to spread rapidly throughout the West. They were religious brotherhoods and sisterhoods, distinguished for their zeal in visiting the sick, or, as in the case of those to whom the name of Lollards (q.v.) was popularly given, for singing at funerals, and for otherwise assisting in the burial of the dead. This associational principle was further developed by the Brethren of the Free Spirit, a confraternity which owed their origin to Gerhard Groot (middle of the 14th century), and who for some time seemed to be preparing the way for an entirely new phase of monachism. In their reformatory labors they frequently came into collision with the highest Church authorities, especially the Inquisition, though this did not prevent their spread. Their numerous societies were equally distinguished for their mysticism and their usefulness. Some of the brethren were engaged in instruction, others employed themselves in various kinds of handicraft for their livelihood. One of their chief objects was always to advance the religious education of the common people, and especially to raise up from them a pious clergy, so that they soon became fruitful nurseries for monks. This activity, and the  respect in which the brethren were held by the people, excited powerfully the envy of the mendicants, but they gradually slackened their opposition when they found their own numbers increasing through the labors of these Fratres communis vitae.

The most remarkable of the new orders established in this period was that of the Minimi. Their founder, Francis of Paula, a small town in Calabria, after having lived for a short time in an unreformed Franciscan convent, established himself as a hermit in the neighborhood of his native city, and from 1457 gathered around him a society of those who shared his views. The fame of his miraculous power soon extended his society, which was confirmed by Sixtus IV (1474), under the name of the Eremities. Francisci, first in Italy, and afterwards in France, where the superstitious Louis XI had summoned the founder of the order to his aid in the last extremity (1482); and at a later period in Spain. The order, distinguished always from the rest of the Franciscans b)v the observance of the vita quadragesimalis, received afterwards a rule from its founder, and, to distinguish themselves from the Fratres Minores, and to go one step beyond them, assumed the name of “Ordo minimorum fratrum eremitarumn Fratres Francisci de Paula.” SEE MINIMAS.

The Reformation of the 16th century may well be called the Revolutionary period in the history of monachism. The deep decline which this institution had suffered during and immediately following the Crusades, a period in which, as we have seen, even the knights and barons subjected their profession of warriors to the forms of monkish laws, had been, it is true, to a very great extent relieved by a period of spiritual activity, ushered in by the mendicants. At their commencement they undoubtedly contributed to the restoration of primitive simplicity, their avowed object, but gradually most of them also became disorderly and worldly; and a leading feature in the corruption of the Church was perceived to be in those very orders founded to promote apostolic simplicity in the Christian Church. The best and most influential men in the Church cordially joined in the demand for a thorough reformation; they willingly and frankly admitted that the crisis had been in part occasioned by the corruption of the clergy, secular as well as monastic, and they urged, in particular, the imperious necessity of a reformation of the religious orders (comp. Gieseler, Ecclesiastes Hist. 4:131-156). The protest of the Reformers met with a cordial response in the breasts of multitudes whose attachment to the Church of Rome. was warm and almost inextinguishable. In Italy attempts were made to renovate their youth; but on the Continent, especially in Germany and the  Netherlands, the people would be satisfied with nothing short of the dissolution of monkery (Ranke, Papacy, 1:129, 384): they were determined that no monasteries or convents should longer subsist. This opposition had been engendered partly by a gradual alienation of all monastics from the people, but even more by the attacks that had been made upon it by many of the leading Reformers, who sought reformation within the Church. Foremost among them was that declared foe of all superstition, the immortal Erasmus (q.v.).

In his early days he had tasted, by constraint, something of monkish life, and his natural abhorrence of it was made more intense by his bitter recollection, and by the trouble it cost him, after he had become famous, to release himself from the thraldom to which his former associates were inclined to call him back. He was very competent, therefore, to bear testimony for or against the monkish life, and when he became its opponent his opinions commanded the attention of all the thoughtful. And not only became he now an opponent, but a lifelong warfarer against the monks and their ideas and practices. His tongue and his pen also were used freely. His Praise of Folly, and, in particular, the Colloquies, in which the idleness, illiteracy, self-indulgence, and artificial and useless austerities of “the religious” were handled in the most diverting style, were read with infinite amusement by all who sympathized with the new studies, and by thousands who did not calculate the effect of this telling satire in abating popular reverence even for the Church establishment as a whole. It is not to be wondered, then, that popes, bishops, and councils urged upon the reformers within the religious orders to speed the day of transformation. Indeed, the internal history of nearly every order records, at this point of time, strong resolutions in favor of an enforcement of the rigorous primitive rules. “As early as 1520,” says Ranke, “and since, in proportion to the advances made by Protestantism in Germany, there arose in countries which had not yet been reached by' it, a feeling of the necessity of a new amelioration of the hierarchical order.

This feeling made its way even in the religious orders themselves; sometimes in one, sometimes in another of them.” Even the Order of the Camaldoli, secluded as they were, owned themselves implicated in the general corruption, and instituted reforms, by founding in 1522 a new congregation, that of Monte Corona (comp. Helyot, Hist. des ordres monastiques, 5:271). Its leader, Paul Giustiniani, held, in order to the attainment of Christian perfection, three things to be essential, viz. solitude, vows, and the separation of the monks into separate cells. Those small cells and oratories, such as are yet to be found here and there, on the highest  hills, in charming wilds, such as seem to conduct the soul at once to sublime flights and to more profound tranquillity, are spoken of by him in some of his letters with special satisfaction. The reforms of the hermits of Monte Corona extended to all parts of the world. But not only in the smaller orders did this spirit of reform bear fruit. In the most numerous and powerful order, that of the Franciscans, who had perhaps become the most profoundly corrupt of any, yet another new effort at reformation was attempted, in addition to the many that had been made before. The more rigorous party achieved a complete success over those inclined towards laxity, and several new reformed congregations branched off from them, among which the Capuchins were the most prominent. These friars contemplated the restoration of the regulations of their original founder- divine service at midnight, prayers at appointed hours, discipline, and silence; in short, the whole severe rule of life laid down in the original institution. One cannot but smile at the importance which they attached to things of no consequence; but, setting that aside, it must be acknowledged that they again behaved with great courage, as, for example, during the pestilence of 1528.

Besides the reformation of the old orders, the Church showed itself most prolific in producing new ones, and the character of the times is clearly apparent in many of these new organizations. The monastic institutions of former days had been, as religious communities, essentially contemplative; the new ones were predominantly operative, the mendicant orders forming, so to speak, a connecting link between the two. Preaching, teaching, visiting the sick and poor, and similar objects, formed the chief occupations of the new orders, to which the greatest energy was ‘directed. Thus arose the Theatines (q.v.) in 1524, started by Cajetan of Thiene; “a man,” says Ranke, “of a peaceful, quiet, and soft temper, of few words, and prone to indulge in the ecstasies of a spiritual enthusiasm; of whom it was said that he wanted to reform the world, but without its being known that he was. in the world” (Papacy, 2:131). The Theatines did not call themselves monks, but regular clergy; they were priests bound by monkish vows, but expressly declared that neither in life nor worship should any mere custom oblige the conscience. Their desire, no doubt, was to prevent the spread of reformatory opinions leading to alienation from the Church of Rome; and, themselves Italians, they sought, in the resumption of clerical duties under the monastic vow, to raise up a new supply for the priesthood free from the objections of the times. They became pretty numerous, not only in Italy,  but also in Spain, South Germany, and in France. Another of these orders was that of the Barnabites (q.v.), also founded in Italy in 1532, suggested at Milan by the ravages of war and the consequent sufferings of the people, which the order was intended to mitigate by active beneficence, as well as to remove the disorderly habits which it had brought in its train, by instruction, preaching, and good example. Somewhat later, St. Philip Neri, an active and remarkable devotee of the papacy at Florence, founded the order Fathers of the Oratory, which was confirmed by pope Gregory XIII in 1577, and spread not only in Italy, but to this day continues to flourish, especially in France.

But whatever might be accomplished by all these congregations in their own circles, either the limited extent of their object, as in the instance we have last mentioned, or that circumspection of their means, which was involved in the nature of the case, as on the part of the Theatines, hindered their exercising a general and thoroughly efficient influence. They are remarkable as signalizing, in the spontaneity of their origin, a powerful tendency, which contributed immensely to the restoration of Roman Catholicism; but other forces were requisite in order that the bold advance of Protestantism might be effectually withstood. These forces developed themselves in a similar, but in a very unlooked-for and extremely peculiar manner; and as heretofore, so even now, monasticism proved Rome's strongest ally, and the papacy once more leaned on the new-born babe of the monastic spirit. Leo X had died, leaving the fierce flame of insubordination untrammelled, and Paul III had vainly tried to subdue the indomitable will of that fierce monster, the Reformation, when suddenly there arose in the Iberian peninsula a semi-monastic organization, which, growing out of the Capuchin order, laid the foundation for the strongest religious society the world has ever known. The Society of Jesus, or Jesuits, as it is generally called, took a middle rank between monks and the secular clergy, approaching nearer to the regular canons than to any other order. They lived separate from the multitude, and were bound by religious vows; but they were exempt from stated hours of worship, and other strict observances, by which the monks were bound. In short, instead of spending their time in devotion and penance and fasting, they gave themselves to the active service of the Church. Their principal duty was to direct the education of youth and the consciences of the faithful, and to uphold the cause of the Church by their missions, and their pious and learned labors. They were divided into three classes, the first of which were  the professed members.

These, besides the ordinary vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, bound themselves to go, without murmur, inquiry, deliberation, or delay, wherever the pope should think fit to send them: they were monastics without property. The second class comprehended the scholars: these were possessed of large revenues; their duty was to teach in the colleges of the order. The third class comprehended the novices, who lived in the houses of probation. SEE JESUITS.

The constitution of the Jesuits was controlled, more than that of any other order before or after, by the principle of an absolute submission to the Church and the pope. The order was to be an instrument in the hands of the Church; the individual, therefore, was advised to become, with regard to the commands of his superior, as destitute of self-will “as a corpse,” or “as a cane in the hands of an old man.” No order ever carried out its fundamental principle more faithfully, and in subsequent battles of the Roman Catholic Church the Jesuits stood in the front rank. Other orders also were founded which proved more or less valuable supports of the papacy. There arose even several female orders among them the Elizabethines (q.v.), the Ursulines (q.v.), and the Sisters of Charity. SEE CHARITY, SISTERS OF. One of the strongest orders which arose in the 17th century was the Lazarist (q.v.).

The culture of literature, against which in the Middle Ages some founders of monastic orders had expressly warned their members, showed itself, after the 16th century, so great a necessity that it was practically observed by all orders, though but few gave it special attention. Among those orders which thus greatly distinguished themselves, the French Oratorians and the Benedictines of St. Maur hold by universal consent not only the most prominent position, but they are even assigned a distinguished place among the great literary societies of the world. Indeed the cause of education, especially the cause of primary instruction, became gradually a subject of more or less interest to all the religious orders. Many congregations, both male and female, were instituted for the special purpose of controlling primary instruction, especially in France, and a large number of schools have ever since been under the direction of monastics.

If the Romish Church sought to strengthen itself by the new measures adopted by monasticism in providing such education for the coming generations as the Church could endorse, another measure was still needed to give the Church strength abroad. Great loss of territory and numbers had been suffered in consequence of the reformation. This want also the monastics soon provided for. They became very extensively missionary  organizations. Instead of confining their labors; as was their wont to do, to the home work, they now directed their attention to the foreign missionary ‘cause. Most of the larger orders, especially the mendicants and the Jesuits, engaged in it with great zeal and emulation. The latter even took, besides the usual three vows, a fourth obligation, viz. to go without hesitation as missionaries to any country where it might please the pope to send them. In consequence, the extent of their missionary operations in Europe, Asia, Africa, and America excelled anything the Roman Catholic Church had done in this field before. SEE MISSIONS.

 Indeed, the great majority of the Roman Catholic missions in all pagan countries have ever since been conducted by the members of religious orders (see Harper's Monthly for February 1875).

4. Present Condition of Roman Catholic Monachism. — In the 17th century the attention of many monastics was more specially directed towards the necessity of bringing back their institutions, as far as possible, to the rules and laws of their order, and the monks of the Roman Catholic churches now became divided into the Reformed and the Unreformed, and some real effort to restore the monasteries and nunneries to their original state was attempted. But whatever necessity existed for these institutions in an age of barbarism and violence, it had now ceased. The printing-press was proving a more powerful preservative of the Bible and religious literature than the cells of the monks, and long experience had demonstrated that to shut one's self out from the world was but a sorry way to keep unspotted from it. Such a time was not likely to give life to new monastic institutions, and hence we find the productivity of the Church as regards monachism very greatly decreased. In the 18th century only one larger order, the Redemptorists, or the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer, founded by St. Alfonso di Liguori, sprang up. Most of the orders, indeed, in the second half of this century, relapsed either into torpor or corruption, and made but a very feeble resistance when the rationalistic views which became so prevalent among the educated classes in every European country, Catholic as well as Protestant, declared against them a war of destruction. Hence in many countries the state authorities interfered anew to destroy conventual life. In Austria, Joseph II suppressed as useless all convents of monks not occupied in education, pastoral duties, or the nursing of the sick; and many Roman Catholic writers demanded the extirpation of monasticism altogether, after stamping it as both an outgrowth and a promoter of fanaticism. Even the papacy was influenced,  and the incumbent of St. Peter's at Rome had no other alternative left him than to yield to the general pressure. The consequence was the abolishment of the most powerful of the orders, the Jesuits. The French Revolution threatened the very life of monachism, and had that movement proved successful the monastic institutions would have passed out of existence probably in all Europe.

The downfall of the Napoleonic rule gave brighter prospects to the friends of monasticism, and as an evidence of its revival may be cited the re- establishment of the Jesuits by Pius VII in 1114. These now rapidly rose again to considerable strength and influence wherever they were not forcibly suppressed. SEE JESUITS.

In the countries of the Latin races, both in Europe and America, the fate of monachism was closely allied with the political strife of the conservative and the liberal or progressive parties, the former patronizing it, together with all other ecclesiastical institutions; the latter subjecting it to prohibitive rules, or suppressing it altogether. In consequence of the successes of the liberals, monachism was greatly reduced in South America, and in Italy (in 1848, and again in 1859, 1860, 1866, and 1870, until it is now on the eve of complete suppression by law of the state, 1875). SEE MONASTERY.

It was also wellnigh extinguished in Spain (1835), and especially in Portugal (1834). In France alone the vicissitudes of political rule have thus far failed to affect monasticism — indeed, the rapid growth of monastic institutions in that country have not been in point of zeal, activity, and general prosperity behind what they had been during the golden sera of their existence. Under the Bourbons, and under Louis Philippe, the liberal party. occasionally demanded coercive measures against them; but since the establishment of the. republic in 1848 even the liberals, having given a wider interpretation to religious liberty than Americans have ever dared to give, have accustomed themselves no longer to refuse the free right of association to the members of religious orders. Nearly every one of the old orders established itself in France, and a number of new congregations were formed, and there is at present a greater variety of monastic institutions in that country than any state has possessed at any previous period. In July, 1860, M. Dupin, in a speech before the senate of France, stated that there were then in the country 4932 authorized and 2870 unauthorized establishments and since then their number has somewhat increased. Next to France, they are most numerous, wealthy, and influential in Belgium, where, as in France, public instruction is very largely under their control.  Among the Teutonic nations the monastic establishments have, throughout the British possessions, Holland, and North America (see below; see also Sisters of Charity), partaken more or less of the blessings of liberal institutions, and can hardly be accused of departure from their rules except in isolated, instances. Public opinion, however, has provided for one measure in their constitution not known elsewhere, viz. that any member wishing to leave their establishments shall have liberty to do so. Austria protected monasticism, but kept the inhabitants of convents under a bureaucratic guardianship until 1848, when it was changed into a zealous support and encouragement. Since 1866, however, the monasteries have been under a shadow, and it is more than likely that ere long monastic institutions will be done away with in that Roman Catholic country. In many of the other German countries, the revolution of 1848 has procured for monasticism a favorable position; and in lands where formerly it was either proscribed or but barely tolerated, it has since flourished. Even those states whose codes retain laws against their admission in general, as Saxony and the neighboring countries of Sweden and Denmark, have admitted the Sisters of Charity. SEE DEACONESSES and SEE SISTERHOODS. In Russia the monastics suffered severe losses, but in Turkey they have as missionaries done much to build up the Christian faith.

The number of monastic associations founded in our century is so considerably in advance of any former period of equal length, that to a superficial observer it would indicate a growth of the monastic spirit. This is, however, due solely to the concentration of Romanism in this direction, the papacy finding these its best and perhaps only never-failing support. A peculiar feature which characterizes. them as the offspring of the present age, and distinguishes them from the preceding orders, is easily discovered in all of them; the marks which externally distinguish them from the non- monastic world are less visible, and the social wants of ecclesiastical and civil society stand pre-eminently forth as the primary cause of their origin and the chief object of their labors. A large number of them are devoted to the instruction of youth. Such are several congregations of school-brothers and schoolsisters, Brothers and Sisters of St. Joseph, Brothers and Daughters of the Holy Cross, etc. Many others bind themselves to the service of the sick and the poor, as the Little Sisters of the Poor, the most numerous and popular among them. Not a few cultivate the mission field; either the foreign missions, as the Picpus Society, the Oblates, the Brothers  and Daughters of Zion (both for the conversion of the Jews, the latter consisting exclusively of converts), or the home missions, as the Paulists.

In the United States, monachism, because modified to suit the nature and exigencies of the times, is a flourishing and important institution, and serves as the great feeder of the Roman Catholic Church. Most of the Roman Catholic schools are more or less directly connected with these institutions, and under the care of “fathers” or “sisters.” The rigor which characterized the monasteries and nunneries when they were devoted wholly or chiefly to devotional uses is somewhat relaxed here, and they are simply working institutions. “In the schools connected with these monastic establishments, especially in those for girls,” says a contemporary, “secular branches are taught, but commingled with the Romish theology; and the pupils are brought under influences, both strong and subtle, upon the imagination and the feelings, in favor of the Romish communion; while the effect of the education (we speak of the result both of personal observation and of inquiry among pupils in these schools) is to divert the mind from the more solid to the more superficial branches-from mathematics and the sciences, to painting, drawing, music, and needle-work; and to base such studies as are taught rather upon authority than upon any habits of personal and individual investigation. It is impossible to obtain the statistics of these conventual schools, for they are carefully concealed; we have, however, instituted some inquiries upon this point, with the following results: There are in the United States today, at the very least, 300 nunneries and 128 monasteries, besides 112 schools for the education of girls,, and 400 for the education of boys. Of the nunneries and monasteries (as such) we have found it impossible to obtain any trustworthy information, either as to discipline or number of inmates; but the 112 girls' schools acknowledge the charge of 22,176 young women, and this we have excellent reasons for believing to be far below the real number, for the disposition to conceal the actual work done is so marked that even their own official organs admit the impossibility of obtaining statistics. Thus, there are known to be 400 Roman Catholic schools for boys: but there are only returns from 178 procurable. The archdiocese of Baltimore alone contains 21 convents — one of colored sisters — in all of which education is carried on. Besides these, there are in Baltimore at least a dozen colleges and young girls' seminaries under Roman Catholic spiritual direction; also 50 pay and free schools taught by the “brothers and sisters of Christian schools,” “Sisters of Notre Dame,” “Sisters of Mercy,” etc., who also have charge of 13  orphan asylums, and various other charitable and pious sodalities. And the archdiocese of Baltimore only represents what is done all over the country. These figures and they are far from complete — certainly underrate rather than overrate the work.” The Reverend Samuel W. Barnum, a learned and careful writer, and the latest Protestant author on Romanism in this country (Ronanisnm as it is, page 332), has brought together the scattered and incomplete statistics of monasticism in the United States of America, and comes to the conclusion that there are “about 30 religious orders and congregations for men, and about 50 for women, the whole numbering more than 2500 males (including Jesuits) and more than 8000 females, and having under their care considerably more than 200,000 children and youth in the process of education. More than one half of the male religious are priests, and more than 300 Jesuits.”

In a literary point of view monastics do not at present share the reputation of their predecessors in former centuries. though men like Lacordaire, Ravigna, Gratry, and Hyacinthe in France, Rosmini and Secchi in Italy, and Haneberg in Germany, occupy a high place in the annals of contemporaneous literature. In respect to their present moral condition, Roman Catholics admit the existence in some places, particularly in Central and South America, of considerable corruption and ignorance in many convents of the older orders. In some of them, also, the ancient constitutions have fallen more or less into disuse. The regular connection of the general superiors with their subordinates has been in great part interrupted, and the holding of general, assemblies has ceased. The present pontiff at the commencement of his reign proclaimed' it as one of his chief tasks to carry out a thorough reform of monastic orders; and in some orders, as the Dominicans, an extensive reformation has since taken place. The whole number of monastic institutions in the Roman Catholic Church throughout the world was estimated by the Catholic Almanac for 1870 to be 8000 establishments for males, with an aggregate of 117,500 members, and 10,000 for females, with an aggregate-membership of 189,000, making a grand total of 306,500 members. It is beyond the scope of this work to give in this place a list of all the monastic organizations; they are severally treated under their respective names. It may not be out of place, however, to call the reader's attention to the fact that the different monastic institutes of the West are almost all offshoots or modifications of the Benedictines (q.v.); of whom the most remarkable are the Cartlesians Cistercitus, Grammonites, Clugniacs, Praemonstratensians, and above all the  Maurists, or Benedictines of St. Maur (q.v.). Among the eremitical orders are the Hermits of St. Augustine, who trace their origin to the early father of that name, but are subdivided into several varieties, which had their rise in the 11th, 12th, and 13th centuries; also the Camaldolese, founded by St. Romuald in 1012; the Celestines, a branch of the Franciscans, established by Peter Murrone, afterwards pope Celestine V; the Hieronymites (q.v.), established first in Castile in the 14th century, and thence introduced into other parts of Spain and into Italy by Lope d'Olmeda in 1424; and the Paulites, so called from St. Paul, the first hermit, but an institute of the 13th century, which had its origin in Hungary, and attained to a wider extension and a greater popularity than perhaps any other among the eremitical orders.

5. Monasticism in the Protestant Church. — The Reformation of the 16th century rejected monachism, as supported by the papacy and the patriarchate, as being based on the false principle of the meritoriousness of good works. One small denomination, the Dunkers, have retained nearly the whole of the monastic organization. Solitary voices among the Protestant theologians of the 16th, 17th, 18th centuries, and even of our own more advanced age, have expressed a regret that, with the monachism of the old churches, the principle of forming religious communities of men and women for the more efficient fulfilment of the duties of charity had been altogether discarded. Since the beginning of this century both the “Evangelical” and “High Lutheran” schools of Germany have approved the establishment of houses of deacons (q.v.) and deaconesses (q.v.), also called brother-houses and sisterhouses, the inmates of which associate for the purpose of teaching, of attending the sick, of taking charge of public prisons, and for other works of Christian charity. Institutions of this kind are rapidly spreading in Germany and the adjacent countries. In the Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, sisterhoods (q.v.) have been formed at various times, and have recently greatly multiplied. There have also started in England, under the auspices of what is commonly called the High-Church party, several male monastic organizations, but they have not found favor generally, and are not likely to continue long in existence. The principal leader in this Protestant monastic establishment in Britain is Mr. Lyne, better known as Father Ignatius, who assumes the monkish dress, and, with shaven crown and sandalled feet, reminds one of the monastics of the Middle Ages (see St. James's Magazine, March, 1870).

6. Nature and Effect of Monasticism. — We have already indicated in some measure the character of monachism, as we have traced its origin and progress. It remains to consider briefly the spirit as well as the results of monasticism. In surveying monasticism as an institution coming down from the 4th century till the Reformation, we freely admit that, in the circumstances in which the world found itself placed during that period of time, it was far from being an unmitigated evil. In its origin, at least, it was a great human effort to remedy the moral disorder by which mankind in all ages are infected.

When children raise a ladder upon the hill-top with the: design that upon it they may climb upwards, and thus draw near to God, we cannot make light of their motives, even though we should smile at their plans ; and so every attempt of man to eradicate the selfishness of his nature, to turn back the tide of the world's corruption, and to elevate himself in the scale of morality, is so far praiseworthy, even though we have no faith that this is to be done by men and women entering voluntarily into a prison, shutting themselves up, and barring the world out. “It was the spirit of monachism,” says Neander, “which gave special prominence to that Christian point of view from which all men were regarded as originally equal in the sight of God; which opposed the consciousness of God's image in human nature, to the grades and distinctions flowing out of the relations of the state... The spirit of contempt for earthly show, the spirit of universal philanthropy, revealed itself in the pure appearances of monachism, and in much that proceeded from it” (2:251; comp. page 238). In the darkest of the ages, souls truly pious, there can be no doubt, often withdrew to such places that they might without distraction prepare for another world. In times of lawless force and bloodshed, every one knows that the monastery was an asylum where weak. and timorous spirits, ill able to cope with the rude society in which they found themselves, could retire for shelter and safety. The old monks, in their earliest and best days, before their indolence was fostered by wealth and luxury, were often the only examples of peaceful industry in a district, and taught their less skilful neighbors how to till the earth, and draw from the reluctant soil a more generous return for their labor. In their lonely cells they often spent their leisure in copying valuable manuscripts and. producing original works, which, though seldom. rising to the rank of classics, have preserved many valuable facts, and are true photographs of the bright and the dark, the comely and ungainly features of their times. “The cloisters, moreover,” says Neander, “were institutions of education, and, as such, were the more distinguished on account of the care they bestowed on religious and moral  culture, because education generally in this period had fallen into neglect” (2:252).

Perhaps it is not too much to say that in the deluge of barbarism that overflowed the civilization of Christendom in the early mediaeval ages, the Scriptures and the classics must have perished had it not been that they were deposited in those monastic edifices, for which the wildest pagans, in many instances, entertained a superstitious respect. Moreover, in cases without number, the monastery was a missionary training-school, planted within the limits of some heathen land, from which the monks went forth courageously and devotedly to propagate the religion of the age, such as it was, in the surrounding districts to be the pioneers of civilization and the advance-guard of Christianity among a rude and idolatrous population. The conversion of the pagan English, and particularly of the southern kingdoms, to the faith of Christ, was mainly due to the energy and sacrifice of the monks and bishops of Rome, and it was accompanied by a parallel conversion to the authority of St. Peter. It was at that time a vast and unspeakable blessing to England to be brought in this way into association with other people, and to become thus an integral part of the Christian commonwealth.

The ideal of the divine life which was set before the young and crude converts was impressive, and upon the whole beneficial, even though it lacked the freedom and naturalness of true life, and cramped and resisted the grace of God. Dean Milman tells us that the calm example of the domestic virtues in a more polished but often, as regards: sexual intercourse, more corrupt state of morals, is of inestimable value, as spreading around the parsonage an atmosphere of peace and happiness, and offering a living lesson on the blessings of conjugal fidelity. But such Christianity would have made no impression on a people who still retained something of their Teutonic severity of manners, and required, therefore, something more imposing-a sterner and more manifest self-denial — to keep up their religious veneration. The detachment of the clergy from all earthly ties left them at once more unremittingly devoted to their unsettled life as missionaries. It is probable that the isolation and the self-torture of the monks did produce a deep impression on those who had neither moral energy nor mental concentration equal to such a task. It is possible that the claims of a hierarchy were more rapidly introduced by these means, so that it became more easy to create new institutions, to organize Christian worship, to build vast ecclesiastical edifices, to promote literature, to divide the labor of Christian workmen, as soon as the available strength of young Christendom was all brought under severe drill, taught to monopolize the highest grace, and invested with preternatural powers. In  old feudal times. when the strong were so ready to domineer over the weak, and society had so little thought of providing for the unfortunate, in the monastery, spirits bruised and bleeding found advice, the sick found medicine, the hungry poor found bread, and the benighted and Storm- stayed traveller entertainment and rest. It would be uncandid not to admit, with very little exception indeed, the statement of count Montalembert that the monasteries “were for ten centuries and more the schools, the archives, the libraries, the hostelries, the studios, the penitentiaries, and the hospitals of Christian society.”

But while acknowledging the great services which the monks have rendered to the world in the mediaeval period, there is another view of the case to which we cannot close our eyes. Monasticism, instead of being “one of the greatest institutions of Christianity,” has no claim whatever to be divine in its origin; Christ and his apostles were not monks, neither did they enjoin upon their followers to renounce the society of their kind, and immure themselves in the solitude of a cloister. On the contrary, the leaven was to be put into the meal; the true religion was to come in contact with humanity, and strive to gain, to direct, to improve it. Asceticism is a mere human attempt to perform upon human nature a work which the Gospel has made ample provision for performing in a more effective way. “Monasticism,” says Schaff, “withdrew from society many useful forces; diffused an indifference for the family life, the civil and military service of the state, and all public practical operations; turned the channels of religion from the world into the desert, and so hastened the decline of Egypt, Syria, Palestine, and the whole Roman empire. It nourished religious fanaticism, often raised storms of popular agitation, and rushed passionately into the controversies of theological parties; generally, it is true, on the side of orthodoxy, but often, as at the Ephesian ‘council of robbers,' in favor of heresy, and especially in behalf of the crudest superstition. For the simple, divine way of salvation in the Gospel, it substituted an arbitrary, eccentric, ostentatious, and pretentious sanctity. It darkened the all-sufficient merits of Christ by the glitter of the over-meritorious works of man. It measured virtue by the quantity of outward exercises instead of the quality of the inward disposition, and disseminated self-righteousness and an anxious, legal, and mechanical religion. Monasticism, indeed, lowered the stands and of general morality in proportion as it set itself above it, and claimed a corresponding higher merit; and it exerted in general a demoralizing influence on the people, who came to consider themselves the pro fanum  vulgus mundi, and to live accordingly” (comp. Neander, 2:255-257). Grant that the cloister has often sheltered the helpless and unfortunate; it has often sheltered, too, the ignorant, the superstitious, the criminal, the polluted, the despot, the knave. Brigands have been known to use abbeys as the storehouse of their plunder, and kings have used their rich revenues for pensioning their mistresses, supporting their bastards, and rewarding the most unscrupulous of their tools. The education received in the cloisters was essentially of a narrow kind, dwarfing the intellect, and robbing it of that expansiveness and freedom essential to high culture and to real progress. If they opened their door to the feeble and innocent in days of oppression and danger, .it cannot be pretended that there is the same need for them now, when law and order are established, when society provides ample means for alleviating every want and woe that it is possible to relieve, when the printing-press has given a perpetuity to literature which neither Goth nor Vandal can destroy, and when the claims of the poor and the defenceless meet with favorable consideration from every government in Christendom.

It is not, however, monasticism, as such, which. has proved a blessing to the Church and the world; for the monasticism of India, which for three thousand years has pushed the practice of mortification to all the excesses of delirium, never saved a single soul, nor produced a single benefit to the race. It was Christianity in monasticism which has done all the good, and used this abnormal mode of life as a means for carrying forward its mission of love and peace. In proportion as monasticism was animated and controlled by the spirit of Christianity, it proved a blessing; while separated from it, it degenerated and became a fruitful source of evil. Monasticism, moreover, seems even to have lost its power of propagating Christianity in any type; there is no instance since the Reformation of any pagan nation being Christianized by monks. Indeed we cannot concede that it should be the aim of the Christian missionary to create a well-organized society under the dictation of one great ecclesiastical rule, such as monasticism, if it labored at all, would make its object and end. We indignantly repudiate the position that, in order to teach men to become Christians, to recommend the law of Christ, convert the untutored savage, stem the fierce passions of a pagan world, recreate the springs of national and social life, any such methods were necessary, or even peculiarly adapted to the purpose; as monasticism .employed in its missionary work. The Western monks accepted, as the Eastern monks had done before them, an antisocial theory  which strikes at the very heart of the providence of God, and which sprang first of all, and springs still, from a dualistic scepticism of the love of the supreme Father, from a jaundiced estimate of the world, from a grievous mistake as to the seat of evil and the nature of sin. They ennobled the theory; they consecrated it to higher issues than any of which paganism ever dreamed; they hallowed it as they hallowed other things, hiding its evil root with the influence of their virtues, but they did not change the character of the root. It always had led to spiritual pride, and fostered the very propensities it professed to hold in abeyance. True, it provided for ages an asylum for broken hearts; it stood in its corporate capacity and strength between forces of the state; it furnished opportunities for great intellectual and artistic feats; it quickened and subtilized the faculties of men to encounter the difficult problems of pure thought, and furnished various agencies of a civilizing character; .but it contained within itself the seeds of its own dissolution.

It perished finally, not from sacrilegious hands nor Protestant animosities, but from its own inherent vices.

M. de Montalembert, the latest and perhaps ablest defender of monachism, breaks ground with a vindication of monasteries from the charge of being the asylums of broken hearts; for weak, exhausted, and disappointed energies; for men. and women tired of the world, and unfit for the strife and battle of life; maintaining that they were peopled rather by the young and the brave, and by those who, as far as this world is concerned, had everything to lose in assuming monastic vows; by those who had a large surplusage of dauntless energy for the conquest of nature, for industrious grappling with the barrenness of the desert, or the riotous prodigality of the primaeval forest. He also asserts that these mysterious precursors of civilization and order, these men of prayer and faith, solved the mystery of life, and showed to a barbaric and selfish world the secret of real happiness; and urges that, so far from wishing to escape from their vows, or from the fellowship of the cloister, they conceived a passionate attachment for each other and to their self-imposed restraints; that their mutual affection was stronger than death; and, that, instead of morose and hopeless abnegation of humanity — benignitis, simplicitas, hilaritas — gayety and songs of joy transformed their exile from the world into the paradise of God. But “monasticism,” Dr. Schaff has well said, “M is not the nominal form of Christian piety. It is an abnormal phenomenon, a humanly devised service of God (comp. Col 2:16-23), and not rarely a sad enervation and  repulsive distortion of the Christianity of the Bible. It is to be-estimated, therefore, not by the extent of its self-denial, not by its outward acts of self-discipline” (which may all be found in heathenism, Judaism, and Mohammedanism as well), but by the Christian spirit of humility and love which animated it. For humility is the groundwork, and love the all-ruling principle of the Christian life, and the distinctive characteristic of the Christian religion. Without love to God and charity to man, the severest self-punishment and the utmost abandonment of the world are worthless before God (comp. 1Co 13:1-3)... Even in the most favorable case monasticism falls short of harmonious moral developments and of that symmetry of virtue which meets us in perfection in Christ, and next to him in the apostles. It lacks the finer and gentler traits of character, which are ordinarily brought out only in the school of daily family life and under the social ordinances of God. Its morality is rather negative than positive. There is more virtue in the temperate and thankful enjoyment of the gifts of God than in total abstinence; in charitable and well-seasoned speech than in total silence; in connubial chastity than in celibacy; in self-denying practical labor for the Church than in solitary asceticism, which only pleases self and profits no one else.” Believing this, we are constrained to maintain further that, although the monastic orders have done much to promote the good of man, the ideal which they have proposed to themselves is no more that of genuine sacrifice than a collection of probable statements is history. The highest forms of self-surrender are those of which the world knows nothing, and whose beauty is derived not from the halo of sacerdotal sentiment, but from the quiet discharge of unromantic and, it may be, irksome duties.

Montalembertalso makes light of the charges brought against monasticism, even in its decline, and repudiates the right of any layman to cast a stone at the accumulations of wealth and luxury under which at length it succumbed. In an introductory chapter on the decline of monastic institutions, he admits that their corruption and abuses were denounced by the monks themselves, that the shield which religion had thrown over them was pierced and shattered from within, and that the most effective instrument in their downfall was what he, terms the infamous “commende” by which the title of abbot was conferred on those who were ignorant of monastic institutions; albeit this step, so loathsome in his judgment, was the work of infallible popes and Catholic kings. Catholics have their own institutions and the great dignitaries of their own Church to blame for the  most conspicuous illustrations and examples of spoliation and robbery. The enormous wealth accumulated by these monasteries was too tempting a prize to be resisted, first by rapacious abbots, then by bishops hungering for temporal power as well as ecclesiastical influence, then by needy kings, and at last by unprincipled popes. They turned from one to the other for protection, and found the spoiler rather than the friend. The utter and ignominious fall of more than three thousand monasteries in Europe, and the ruthless destruction even of their ruins in countries which had never repudiated the authority of the Roman See, is a startling fact, which, although our author recounts, he fails to explain on his own theory of the supreme and God-given claims of the Church; while the jeremiad that he wails over the base uses to which these gorgeous buildings have returned is out of harmony with his vivid appreciation of modern ideas of progress. One might suppose that on the fall of the monastery the spirit of humanity, all care for the sick and dying, all science, art, and literature, all brave adventure, all subjugation and replenishing of the earth, and missionary enterprise had utterly vanished; while, on the contrary, the fact of the case is that the mighty spirit generated by the contact of Christianity with modern thought was too strong to be retained in the crisp and worn-out skins of monastic orders; and when these burst, neither the spirit nor the fragrance was lost. New life demanded new institutions, and it is too late in the day to prove that modern civilization is only a feeble parody on that which we readily allow took its origin in the cloister. Grand and even worthy attempts, to be sure, have been made at various times to recover the ancient prestige of monasticism, and there is a kind of work that none perhaps can do so well as the Society of Jesus; but the fuel which even now promotes the flame of monastic piety is that morbid view of the nature of the human will which is fostered by materialistic, science, that mischievous estimate of human life which proceeds from the scepticism of the Fatherhood of God, and that neo-Platonic or Gnostic repudiation of the true brotherhood of all mankind which is perpetual, dishonor to the word and spirit of Jesus Christ. We do not wonder that in the light of these truths a celebrated English savant writes. that the continued violation of the most distinctive attributes of human nature is the recorded secret of the failure of monachism. “Its principle of poverty has ever outraged man's original conception of property; as a celibate, it is directly opposed to the social nature of man; and its law of solitary striving for religious perfection is antagonistic to the first principle of Christian communion. and spiritual intercourse. The profession of poverty frequently ended in the most  insatiable avarice and cupidity, while vows of perpetual virginity resulted in unbounded licentiousness. That which began with a sincere desire for perfect purity, ended in the diffusion of licensed corruption.” For these reasons we do not feel justified in dissenting from the general opinion, which is that, “however serviceable the monastery may have been as an institution in the mediaeval ages, preserving, as in an ark, the treasures of religion and learning from the waves of barbarism which in rapid succession broke over Europe, it has lost to a great extent its beneficial power, and in the present state of society has no peculiar functions of a useful nature to discharge; and that the truly good of both sexes would better serve the end of their being by mixing in society, and trying to improve it, than by turning monks and nuns, and looking out on the world from behind the bars of a prison,; within which they have by their own consent submitted to be encaged” (Brit. and For. Rev. 1868, page 450).
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## Monboddo, James Burnet, Lord[[@Headword:Monboddo, James Burnet, Lord]]

             a Scotch writer, noted for his eccentric speculations of primitive history, was born at the family seat of Monboddo, in Kincardineshire, Scotland, in 1714. He was educated at the University of Aberdeen, and at Groningen, Holland. On his return to Scotland in 1737, he was admitted to the bar, and succeeded in gaining considerable practice. In 1767 he was promoted to the judicial bench, and became titled as Lord Monboddo. But he by no means confined himself to the legal profession. He employed his pen in various departments of speculative philosophy, in which he displayed a profound rather than a useful learning. He was thoroughly versed in Greek literature, of which he became such an enthusiastic admirer as almost to scorn modern learning. His great work, Origin and Progress of Languages, first appeared in 1773. In this he affirms, and endeavors to demonstrate, the superiority of his favorite ancients over their present degenerate posterity, and discourses. at large on the honor due the Greek language. This work met with no very marked success, being read more on account of its eccentricities than for its practical utility. Monboddo was in a certain sense, however, the forerunner of the now so well-known English naturalist, Charles Darwin. Like the latter, Monboddo expressed his belief in the theory that men were originally monkeys, and he went even. so far as to insist that a nation still exists possessed of tails. His peculiar views were  the subject of much merriment and ridicule by Dr. Johnson, who represents lord Monboddo as asking Sir Joseph Banks, who had made a visit to Botany Bay, whether he had met this strange race in his travels. On receiving a negative answer, he was much disappointed. Lord Moliboddo's pen furnished the public also with a work on Ancient Metaphysics, in 6 vols., the first part of which appeared in 1778. In this he endeavors to dissect the philosophy of Sir Isaac Newton; and, as in the former work, he shows an extravagant fondness for Grecian learning and philosophy. He seems to lack the ability of placing these ideas within the easy grasp of modern thought, though he shows his own thorough knowledge, of Aristotle particularly. In this work he further explains and supports his Darwinian ideas. Sir James Edward Smith draws a pen-picture of this eccentric genius, and represents him as “a plain, elderly man, wearing an ordinary gray coat, leather breeches, and coarse worsted stockings, conversing with great affability about various matters-lamenting the decline of classical learning, and claiming credit for having adopted the Norfolk husbandry.” Lord Monboddo resided in Edinburgh until his death, May 26, 1799. See Edinb, Review, 58:45; Cooper, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Alibone, Dict. of British and Anmerican Authors s.v.; Chambers, Cyclopaedia, s.v.; English Encyclop s.v.; Gentleman's Magazine, 1799; Tytler, Life of Lore Karnes. (H.W.T.)

## Moncada, Louis-Antoine De Belluga De[[@Headword:Moncada, Louis-Antoine De Belluga De]]

             a Spanish prelate, was born at Motril, in the kingdom of Granada November 30, 1662. He entered the Church, where his distinguished birth placed many ecclesiastical honors within his power, but. with pious modesty, he refused them all Philip V appointed him bishop of Carthagena and Murcia in 1705. Soon after the archduke, who disputed the crown with Philip, invaded Spain. Moncada remained faithful to his sovereign, and so strongly evinced his devotion that Philip rewarded him, with the titles of viceroy of Valencia and captain-general of Murcia in 1706. But, notwithstanding these royal favors, his zeal did not degenerate into servility, and he resisted the court when he thought the interests of the Church were compromised. Thus he obstinately opposed a duty placed on the property of the clergy. At the height of his quarrel with the king's party, he was included in a promotion of cardinals; but, believing in faithful submission to the administration of his country, though a prelate, he declared that he would not accept the purple without the king's consent.  This permission had only been delayed to test the bishop's constancy, and, according to Saint-Simon, “the affair ended with unequalled glory for Belluga.” “Subsequently,” adds Saint-Simon, “Belluga, who had more zeal than discretion, wished to institute some reforms, which the bishops of Spain could not permit. They opposed his plans with great success, and Belluga, not being able to procure for his country the advantages he proposed, became greatly disgusted, and entreated the king to release him from the bishopric of Murcia, and permit him to retire to Rome.” He was there; as in Murcia, a very faithful subject to his king, and still preserved an anxious interest in all his affairs. His virtue, which lifted him above all politics, acquired for him a veneration and consideration during the whole course of his long life. He died at Rome, February 22, 1743. See Moreri, Grand Dict. Histor. s.v.; Saint-Simon, leanoires, 11:197-199 (edit. Cheruel).

## Monceaux (Moncaeus), Francois De[[@Headword:Monceaux (Moncaeus), Francois De]]

             a French writer noted for his studies in comparative archaeology, was a native of Arras, and flourished in the second half of the 16th century. He took quite an active part in the political affairs of France and Italy, but nevertheless found time to write: De portis civitatis Judae et foi judiciorumque in iis exercendorum prisco ritu (Paris, 1587, 4to): — Bucolica Sacra, sive Cantici Canticorum poetica paraphrasis et in eamndem lucubrationum, lib. 2 (ibid. 1587, 4to; 1589, 8vo): — Apparitionum divinarum quae de Rubo et quae in Egypto revertenti in diversorio Mysifacta Historia (Arras, 1592,12mo; 1597, 4to): — In Psalmum 44 Paraphrasis poetica (Douai, 4to): — Aaron purgatus, seu de vitulo aureo, lib. 2 (Arras, 1606, 8vo; Leipsic, 1689, in Antiquitates Biblicae, and in volume 9 of Pearson's Critici Sacri. The Church of Rome expurgated it in 1609): — Responsio pro vitulo aureo non aureo (Paris, 1608, 8vo), a reply to Viseur's Destruction du “Deaurd orpurge” (ibid. 1608, 8vo). See Andre, Bibliotheca Belgica, s.v.

## Moncon, Jean De[[@Headword:Moncon, Jean De]]

             a Spanish theologian, who advanced heretical opinions on the doctrine of the immaculate conception, was born at Monteson, Aragon, about 1360. He joined the brotherhood of St. Dominic, taught theology at Valentia, and in 1383 went to Paris, where he received the degree of doctor four years later. Having in his theses advanced some propositions contrary to the belief of the immaculate conception of the Virgin, he saw them condemned by the faculty, and Pierre d'Orgemont, then bishop, forbade their maintenance under pain of excommunication. This quarrel led to great trouble in the university; those partisans of the Spanish monk who refused to retract were thrown into prison, and he himself was excluded from all the Dominican courts. Moneon thereupon appealed to Clement VII, schismatic pope, residing at Avignon; but, perceiving that the commissioners given him were not favorable, he took to flight (January, 1389), and was found in Aragon, where he was excommunicated. In order to revenge himself for the persecution, he entered the service of pope Urban IV, and wrote against Clement VII. Peace was not concluded until 1403,. and only by the intervention of many princes and of the pope of Avignon, Benedict XIII. In 1412 he was instructed by the duke Alfonso to sustain his right. to the crown of Aragon. His works have never been printed. See Echard and Quetif, Script. ord. Pacedicatorum.

## Monconys, Balthasar, Dr[[@Headword:Monconys, Balthasar, Dr]]

             a French traveller, noted for his Oriental studies, was born at Lyons near the opening of the 17th century. After receiving a liberal education at the University of Salamanca, he visited the East, for the purpose of tracing the remains of the philosophy of Trismegistus and Zoroaster; but returned without accomplishing the object of his mission, and died in 1665. His travels were published by his learned friend, Jean Berthet, of the Society of Jesus (Paris, 1665-6, 3 volumes, 4to; reprinted in Holland, 1696, 5 volumes, 12mo). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 35:952.

## Moncrief, Sir Henry Wellwood, D.D[[@Headword:Moncrief, Sir Henry Wellwood, D.D]]

             a Scotch minister, grandson of his namesake, the Reverend "Sir Harry," was born at Edinburgh in 1809. He graduated from Balliol College, Oxford, was ordained minister at Baldernock in 1836, transferred to East Kilbride in 1837, joined the Free Church in 1843, was transferred to Free St. Cuthbert's in 1852, appointed principal clerk to the Free General Assembly in 1855, and died at Edinburgh, November 4, 1883. He published several letters and addresses. See Fasti Eccles. Scoticanae, 2:291, 344.

## Moncrieff, Sir Henry, Bart., D.D[[@Headword:Moncrieff, Sir Henry, Bart., D.D]]

             a Scottish divine, son of the Rev. Sir William Moncrieff, was born in Blackford, Perthshire, February 6, 1750. After receiving an elementary education in his native place, he repaired to the University of Glasgow for the purpose of fitting himself for the pulpit. In the midst of his collegiate  course he had the misfortune to lose his father. The patrons of the charge thus left vacant, moved by a strong affection for Sir William, and a confidence in the more than ordinary talent displayed by his son, reserved the pastorate for “Sir Harry,” as he was familiarly called. He repaired to Edinburgh, and there entered upon a theological course, which he completed in August 1771; was then ordained a minister of the Church of Scotland, and installed as successor to his father. His talents were too remarkable to allow of his remaining long in this humble position, and the attention he attracted soon caused him to be called to Edinburgh, where, in 1775, he became the officiating minister of St. Cuthbert's, the largest parochial charge in the Scottish capital.

Though the numerical strength of his parish prevented him from coming into frequent personal contact with all, still he seems to have been dearly beloved as a pastor and friend. He had a commanding appearance, was gifted with a powerfully argumentative oratory, and was zealous as well as learned. In the pulpit his style was characterized by force more than by elegance. Avoiding flights of fancy and displays of rhetorical talent, he used his cultured intellectual strength to make truth strike the heart rather than please the brain. In his time the moderate party held the majority in the Scottish Church, but his hatred of intolerance and love of freedom led him to take a stand with the liberal and evangelical party, while his natural independence of character made his position one of boldness and prominence. The deliberations of the General Assembly, which met yearly at Edinburgh, were of a mixed political and religious nature. In these meetings Sir Harry took an active part, and his talents as a debater soon ranked him among the ablest of Scotland's platform orators.

In 1785 he was unanimously chosen as moderator of the Assembly, an honor which was conferred on him several times thereafter. In these religious discussions he showed great abhorrence of everything savoring of bigotry or intolerance, and was ever ready to listen to and engage in any argument which aimed at the discovery of truth. Yet his religious beliefs were tenaciously adhered to and boldly advocated. Politically also he was active, and, to use his own expression, as “a Whig of 1688.” He earnestly opposed all civil disabilities for religious creeds, and heartily supported “the constitution as founded upon the rock of lawful resistance by the patriots of the first James and Charles's time, and as finally purified by those of the Revolution.” Indeed, it has been truly said that “in him Scotland found a warm-hearted lover of mankind, a strong advocate of political and religious freedom, and a zealous party leader.” He continued to labor in this wide field of usefulness as pastor of St.  Cuthbert's and leader of the liberal party until the time of his death, June 14, 1827. In the latter part of his life he adopted the additional surname of WELLWOOD; but he is better known as “ Sir Harry,” he being in his day the only man of noble rank who ministered in the Church of Scotland. He published several treatises concerning the ecclesiastical discussions of his time, also Discourses on the Evidences of the Jewish and Christian Revelations (1815), and an Account of the Life and Writings of Dr, John Erskine (1818). His Sermons, with a memoir by his son, have also been published in three volumes (1829-31). “Those who read these sermons,” says a critic in the Edinb. Rev. (6:112), “will never be disturbed with the author's admiration of himself or his misconception of the subject; nor will their impatience be excited by anything puerile, declamatory, verbose, or inaccurate. They will find everywhere indications of a vigorous and independent understanding; and, though they may not always be gratified with flights of fancy or graces of composition, they can scarcely fail to be attracted by the unaffected: expression of goodness and sincerity which runs through the whole publication.” See Edinb. Rev. 47:242; Encyclop. Britannica, s.v.; Chambers, Biog. Dict. of Emninent Scotsmen, 4:456; Blackwood's Magazine, 22:530; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v. (H.W.T.)

## Mondari version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Mondari version Of The Scriptures]]

             The Mondari is spoken by the Koles of Chota Nagpore, Bengal Presidency. The Reverend N. Nottrott, of the German Missionary (Gosner's) Society, translated the gospel of Mark into the Monidari in 1875, which was printed in 1876 by the Calcutta Auxiliary. In 1879 the gospel of Luke was printed, and between 1881 and 1882 the gospels of John and: Matthew followed. The work of translation was done by the missionary already mentioned and the Reverend L. Beyer. Each translator revised the work of the other by the help of native assistants. (B.P.)

## Mondonville, Jeanne Juliard, Dame Turles De[[@Headword:Mondonville, Jeanne Juliard, Dame Turles De]]

             a French Roman Catholic woman, noted as the foundress of a pious order, was born at Toulouse in 1626. The daughter of a president of the Parliament of Toulouse, Jeanne Juliard was distinguished for her mind and her beauty. In 1646 she married Turles, lord of Mondonville, who left her a widow while still young, but endowed with a considerable fortune. Refusing many honorable offers of marriage, she determined to devote herself to, the instruction of the poor and the relief of the sick. In order the more completely to effect her object, she founded in 1652, with the approbation of Marca, archbishop of Toulouse, the congregation called Les Filles de l'Enfance. This institution was authorized in 1663 by pope Alexander VII, and approved by letters patent of eighteen bishops and many doctors in theology. The congregation was progressing finely, and already counted many chapels, when it was suddenly and violently attacked by the Jesuits, on the ground that the constitution of the new congregation contained maxims' dangerous to religion and morals. They obtained the nomination of commissioners to examine the criminated points, and exerted  themselves so effectively that the congregation of the Filles de l'Enfance was suppressed by a decree of council in 1686. Madame de Mondonville was imprisoned at the Hospitalieres of Coutances, where she died in 1703, after twenty years of the most rigorous confinement. The Jesuits did not wait for that event before they confiscated the. property of the dissolved congregation, and established in its stead seminaries and houses of their own order. An old Jesuit and lawyer, Reboulet, in his Histoire des Filles de la Congregation de l'Enfance (Avignon, 1734), accuses Madame de Mondonville, of having given an asylum to men of treasonable views towards the state, that she had furnished some of them with means of leaving the kingdom, and that she had printed in her house many libels on the conduct of the king and his council; and the Jesuits as an order fought these unfortunate women as if they had been redoubtable enemies, and very soon despoiled them of all their goods. But when, subsequently, circumstances changed, and the credit of the Jesuits declined rapidly, the Parliament of Toulouse, at the request of the abbe Juliard, a relation of Madame de Mondonville, condemned Reboulet's work to the flames as calumnious and false. See Necrologe des Amnis de la Verite.

## Mone, Franz Joseph[[@Headword:Mone, Franz Joseph]]

             a Roman Catholic writer of Germany, was born May 12, 1796, at Mingolsheim, near Bruchsal. He studied at Heidelberg, commenced his academical career there in 1817, was professor in 1819, and from 1826 also first librarian of the university. In 1827 he accepted a call to Louvain, but returned to Heidelberg in 1831. Mane died at Karlsruhe, March 12, 1871, leaving, Geschichte des Heidenthums im nodlichen Europa. (Heidelberg, 1822-23, 2 volumes): — Lateinische Hymnen des Mittelalters (Karlsruhe, 1855-57, 3 volumes): — Lateinische und griechische Messen aus dem 2. bis 6. Jahrhundert (1850), See Winer, Handbunch der theol. Lit. 1:514. (B.P.)

## Monegonde, Sainte[[@Headword:Monegonde, Sainte]]

             a French Roman Catholic woman, noted as the foundress of a religious order, was born at Chartres in the early part of the 6th century. She was the descendant of a noble family, and was married, contrary to her own wishes, in obedience to her parents' will, and had two daughters, who died at an early age. The period of mourning having passed, she withdrew to a narrow cell, with no other opening than a shutter, where she received a little barley-flour, which she kneaded into bread. This was her sole nourishment, and even in this she indulged only when pressed by extreme hunger. After a considerable period, Sainte Monegonde left the city of Chartres in order to continue the same kind of life at Tours, near the tomb of St. Martin. The sensation produced by the miracles attributed to her aroused her husband and many of her friends, who took her back to Chartres; but, convinced by her urgent solicitations, they permitted her to return to Tours, where she formed a small religious order of women, called Les Filles spirituelles, with whom she continued her austerities until her death. St. Gregory of Tours refers to her so-called miracles, and aided her in building a monastery, called Saint-Pierre-le-Puellier. This edifice became a collegiate church for secular canons. It was burned in 1562 by  the Calvinists, and Sainte Monegonde's body perished in the flames. She died at Tours, July 2, 570, and this day is still observed in her honor. See St. Gregoire, De Gloriae Confessorum; Martyrol. Rom. (July 2); Baillet, Vies des Saints, volume 2 (July 2); Richard and Giraud, Bibliotheque Sacree.

## Monergism[[@Headword:Monergism]]

             (from μόνος, sole, and ἔργον, work) is a term used to designate the doctrine that in regeneration there is but one efficient agent, viz. the Holy Spirit. It is held by monergists that “the will of sinful man has not the least inclination towards holiness, nor any power to act in a holy manner, until it has been acted upon by divine grace; and therefore it cannot be said with strictness to cooperate with the Holy Spirit, since it acts in conversion only after it is quickened by the Holy Spirit.” The doctrine is opposed to synergism, which teaches that there are two efficient agents in regeneration — the human soul and the divine Spirit cooperating together, a theory which accordingly holds that the soul has not lost all inclination towards holiness, nor all power to seek for it under the influence of ordinary motives. SEE SYNERGISM.

## Monestier, BLAISE[[@Headword:Monestier, BLAISE]]

             a French philosopher, who did great service in combating the evil influences of the infidel schools which abounded in France towards the close of the 18th century, was born April 18, 1717, at Antezat, diocese of Clermont. After belonging to the Jesuits for some time he abandoned that order to allow himself more liberty for the cultivation of his taste for study. He taught mathematics at Clermont-Ferrand and philosophy at Toulouse, where he died in 1776. He is the author of Dissertation sur la Nature et la Formation de la Grele (Bordeaux, 1752, 12mo), which won a prize at the Academy of Bordeaux: — Dissertations sur l'Analogie du Son et la Lumiere, et sur le Temps, which also drew a prize at the Academy of Nancy, and was printed in the collection of that company in 1754 Principes de la Piete Chretienne (Toulouse, 1756, 2 volumes, 12mo): — La vraie Philosophie, par l'Abbe M- (Bruxelles and Par. 1774, 8vo), a work directed against the philosophy of the Encyclopaedists, and particularly against Le Systeme de la Nature, and published by Needham. “In order to gain an idea of La vraie Philosophie,” says a reviewer, “we should not permit ourselves to be repelled by the violent declamations and bad taste  presented by each page, above all in the preface, nor by the indecision of the plan and the disorder in the succession of ideas which result from it. The doctrine which it contains is an experimental and eclectical spiritualism, equally distant from the theory of innate ideas and from the system of transformed sensation, but where Cartesianism occupies the greatest place.” After having placed sensations and sentiments in the heart, Monestier analyzes reason, which he divides into primitive ideas (ideas of unity, being, time, space, affirmation, negation, with the axioms of geometry and morals), the faculty of generalizing and abstracting, the idea of the infinite, and the faculties of induction and reasoning. The idea of the infinite, imprinted as it is on all nature's work, attests to ius the existence of God and the immortalitv of the soul, at the same time that it instructs us in regard to our own destiny. The author closes by a discussion of free will. See Diet. des Sciences philos. 4:289-291, s.v.

## Moneta[[@Headword:Moneta]]

             an Italian theologian and member of the order of the Dominicans at Cremona, flourished in the 13th century. He was, before entering the orders professor in the University of Bologna. He was noted for his sense and his zeal against the false teachers of his time. He died about 1240. Moneta left a Summa contra Catharos et Waldenses (Rome, 1643). He is also supposed to be the author of Compendiumn logicae propaer minus eruditos. See Arisius, Cremona literata; Echard, Bibliotheca Prcedicatorum (Paris, 1719-31, 2 volumes, fol.), 1:122.

## Money[[@Headword:Money]]

             (Heb. כֶּסֶŠ, ke'seph, silver, as often rendered, Chald. כְּסִŠ, kesaph', Gr. ἀργυρίον, silver, or a piece of silver, as often rendered; also κέρμα, coin, i.q. νόμισμα, lit. a standard of valuation; χαλκός, brass, as sometimes rendered: and χρῆμα, lit. whatever is used in exchange). In the present article we shall confine our attention to the consideration of the subject in general, leaving the discussion of particular coins for the special head of NUMINSATICS SEE NUMINSATICS .

The value of the coins is a relative thing, depending, with respect to the several pieces and kinds of metal, in part upon the ascertained weight (i.e., intrinsic value, for which SEE METROLOGY ), and in part upon the interchange of the mintage of various ages and countries prevalent in Palestine (i.e., current value; SEE COIN ); but, in point of fact. still more upon the depreciation of the  precious metals as a standard of value in comparison with purchasable articles, arising from the fluctuating balance of supply and demand (i.e., mercantile value). In the. following discussion we give a general view of this extensive subject, referring to other articles for subsidiary points.

I

. Non-metallic Currency. — Different commodities have been used as money in the primitive state of society in all countries. Those nations which subsist by the chase, such as the ancient Russians and the greater part of the North American Indians, use the skins of the animals killed in hunting as money (Storch. Traite d'Economie Politique, tome 1). In a pastoral state of society cattle are chiefly used as money.. Thus, according to Homer, the armor of Diomede cost nine oxen, and that of Glaucus one hundred (Iliad, 6:235). The etymology of the Latin word pecunia, signifying money, and of all its derivatives, affords sufficient evidence that cattle (pecus) were the first money of the Romans. They were also used as money by the Germans, whose laws fix the amount of penalties for particular offences to be paid in cattle (Storch, 1.c.). In agricultural countries corn would be used in remote ages as money, and even at the present day it is not unusual to stipulate for corn rents and wages. Various commodities have been and are still used in different countries. Smith mentions salt as the common money of Abyssinia (Wealth of Nations, 1:4). A species of cyprsea, called the cowry, gathered on the shores of the Maldive Islands, and of which 6400 constitute a rupee, is used in making small payments throughout India, and is the, only money of certain districts in Africa. Dried fish forms the money of Iceland and Newfoundland; sugar of some of the West India Islands; and among the first settlers in America corn and tobacco were used as money (Holmes's American Annals). Smith mentions that at the time of the publication of the Wealth of Nations there was a village in Scotland where it was customary for a workman to carry nails as money to the baker's shop or the alehouse (1:4).

II. Bullion as a Circulating Medium. —

1. A long period of time must have intervened between the first introduction of the precious metals into commerce and their becoming generally used as money. The peculiar qualities which so eminently fit them for this purpose would only be gradually discovered. They would probably be first introduced in their gross and unpurified state. A sheep, an ox, a certain quantity of corn, or any other article, would afterwards be bartered  or exchanged for pieces of gold or silver in bars or ingots, in the same way as they would formerly have been exchanged for iron, copper, cloth, or anything else. The merchants would soon begin to estimate their proper value, and, in effecting exchanges, would first agree upon the quality of the metal to be given, and then the quantity which its possessor had become bound to pay would be ascertained by weight. This. according to Aristotle and Pliny, was the manner in which the precious metals were originally exchanged in Greece and Italy. The same practice is still observed in different countries. In many parts of China and Abyssinia the value of gold and silver is always ascertained by weight (Goguet, De l'Origine des Loix, etc.). Iron was the first money of the Lacedeomnians, and copper of the Romans. SEE METAL.

In the many excavations which have been made in Egypt, Assyria, and Babylonia, no specimen of coined money has yet been discovered. Egyptian money was composed of rings of gold and silver; and in Assyria and Babylonia only clay tablets commemorating grants of money specified by weight have been found in considerable numbers; while in Phoenicia no pieces of an antiquity earlier than the Persian rule have ‘yet come to light (Rawlinson, Herod. 1:684). Nor, indeed, is coined money found in the time of Homer, but traffic was pursued either by simple barter (Iliad, 7:472; 23:702; Odyss. 1:430); or by means of masses of unwrought metal, like lumps of iron (Iliad, 23:826; Odyss. 1:184); or by quantities of gold and silver, especially of gold (Iliad, 9:122, 279; 19:247; 23:269; Odyss. 4:129; 8:393; 9:202, etc.), which latter metal, called by Homer τάλαντον χρυσοῦ, seems to be the only one measured by weight. Before the introduction of coined money into Greece by Pheidon, king of Argos, there was a currency of ὀβελίσκοι, “spits” or “skewers,” six of which were considered a handful (δραχμή). Colonel Leake thinks that they were small pyramidal pieces of silver (Num. Chronicles 17:203; Num. Hellen. page 1, appendix), but' it seems more probable that they were nails of iron or copper, capable of being used as spits in the Homeric fashion. This is likely, from the fact that six of them made a handful, and that they were therefore of a considerable size (Rawlinson, Herod. App. 1:688). SEE WEIGHTS.

It is well known that ancient nations which were without a coinage weighed the precious metals, a practice represented on the Egyptian monuments, on which gold and silver are shown to have been kept in the form of rings (see cut under the art. BALANCES SEE BALANCES ). The  gold rings found in the Celtic countries have been held to have had the same use. It has indeed been argued that this could not have been the case with the latter since they show no monetary system; yet it is evident from their weights that they all contain complete multiples or parts of a unit, so that we may fairly suppose that the Celts, before they used coins, had, like the ancient Egyptians, the practice of keeping money in rings, which they weighed when it was necessary to pay a fixed amount. We have no certain record of the use of ring-money or other uncoined money in antiquity excepting among the Egyptians. With them the practice mounts up to a remote age, and was probably as constant, and perhaps as regulated with respect to the weight of the rings, as a coinage. It can scarcely be doubted that the highly civilized rivals of the Egyptians — the Assyrians and Babylonians — adopted, if they did not originate, this custom, clay tablets having been found specifying grants of money by weight (Rawlinson, Herod. 1:684); and there is therefore every probability that obtained also in Palestine, although seemingly unknown in Greece in the time before coinage was there introduced. There is no trace in Egypt, however, of any different size in the rings represented, so that there is no reason for supposing that this further step was taken towards the invention of coinage.

2. The first notice in the Bible, after the flood, of uncoined money as a representative of property and medium of exchange, is when Abraham came up out of Egypt “very rich in cattle, in silver, and in gold” (Gen 13:2; Gen 24:35). In the further history of Abraham we read that Abimelech gave the patriarch “a thousand [pieces] of silver,” apparently to purchase veils for Sarah and her attendants; but the passage is extremely difficult (Gen 20:16). The Sept. understood shekels to be intended (χίλια δίδραχμα, 1.c. also Gen 20:14), and there can be no doubt that they were right, though the rendering is accidentally an unfortunate one, their equivalent being the name of a coin. We next find “money” used in commerce. In the purchase of the cave of Machpelah it is said, “And Abraham weighed (וִוַּשְׁקֹל) to Ephron the silver which he had named in the audience of the sons of Heth, four hundred shekels of silver current with the merchant” (עֹבֵר לִסֹּחֵר; Sept. δοκίμου ἐμπόροις, Gen 23:16). Here a currency is clearly indicated like that which the monuments of Egypt show to have been there used in a very remote age; for the weighing proves that this currency, like the Egyptian, .did not bear the stamp of authority, and was therefore weighed when employed in  commerce. A similar purchase is recorded of Jacob, who bought a parcel of a field at Shalem for a hundred kesitahs (Gen 23:18-19). The occurrence of a name different from shekel, and, unlike it, not distinctly applied in any other passage to a weight, favors the idea of coined money. But what is the kesitab (קְשַׂיטָה)?

The old interpreters supposed it to mean a lamb, and it has been imagined to have been a coin bearing the figure of a lamb. There is no known etymological ground for this meaning, the lost root, if we compare the Arabic kasat, “he or it divided equally,” being perhaps connected with the idea of division. Yet the sanction of the Sept., and the use of weights having the forms of lions, bulls, and geese, by the Egyptians, Assyrians, and probably Persians, must make us hesitate before we abandon a rendering so singularly confirmed by the relation of the Latin pecunia and pecus. Throughout the history of Joseph we find evidence of the constant use of money in preference to barter. This is clearly shown in the case of the famine, when it is related that all the money of Egypt and Canaan was paid for corn, and that then the Egyptians had recourse to barter (Gen 47:13-26). It would thence appear that money was not very plentiful. In the narrative of the visits of Joseph's brethren to Egypt, we find that they purchased corn with money, which was, as in Abraham's time, weighed silver, for it is spoken of by them as having been restored to their sacks in “its [full] weight” (Gen 43:21). At the time of the exodus money seems to have been still weighed, for the ransom ordered in the law is stated to be half a shekel for each man — “half a shekel after the shekel of the sanctuary, [of] twenty gerahs the shekel” (Exo 30:13). Here the shekel is evidently a weight, and of a special system of which the standard examples were probably kept by the priests. Throughout the law money is spoken of as in ordinary use; but only silver money, gold being mentioned as valuable, but not clearly as used in the same manner. This distinction appears at the time of the conquest of Canaan. When Jericho was taken, Achan embezzled from the spoils 200 shekels of silver, and a wedge (Heb. tongue) of gold (γλῶσσαν μίαν χρυσῆν) of 50 shekels' weight (Jos 7:21).

Throughout the period before the return from Babylon this distinction seems to obtain: whenever anything of the character of money is mentioned the usual metal is silver, and gold generally occurs as the material of ornaments and costly works. Thus silver, as a medium of commerce, may be met with among the nations of the Philistines (Gen 20:16; Jdg 16:5; Jdg 16:18; Jdg 17:2 sq.), the, Midianites (Gen 37:28), and the Syrians (2Ki 5:5; 2Ki 5:23). By the laws of Moses, the value of laborers and cattle (Lev 27:3 sq.;  Num 3:45 sq.), houses and fields (Lev 27:14 sq.), provisions (Deu 2:6; Deu 2:28; Deu 14:26), and all fines for offences (Exodus 21, 22), were determined by an estimate in money. The contributions to the Temple (Exo 30:13; Exo 38:26), the sacrifice of animals (Lev 5:15), the redemption of the first-born (Num 3:45 sq.; Num 18:15 sq.), the payment to the seer (1Sa 9:7 sq.) — in all these cases the payment is always represented as silver. It seems probable from many passages in the Bible that a system of jewel currency or ring- money was also adopted as a medium of exchange. The case of Rebekah, to whom the servant of Abraham gave “a golden ear-ring of half a shekel weight, and two bracelets for her hands of ten shekels' weight of gold” (Gen 24:22), proves that the ancients made their jewels of a specific weight, so as to know the value of the ornaments in employing them as money. That the Egyptians kept their bullion in jewels seems evident from the plate given by Sir Gardner Wilkinson, copied from the catacombs, where they are represented as weighing rings of silver and gold; and is further corroborated by the fact of the Israelites having, at their exodus from Egypt, borrowed “jewels of silver and jewels of gold,” and “spoiled the Egyptians” (Exo 12:35-36).

According to the ancient drawings, the Egyptian ring-money was composed of perfect rings. So, too, it would appear that the money used by the children of Jacob, when they went to purchase corn in Egypt, was also an annular currency (Gen 42:35). Their money is described as “bundles of money” (Sept. δέσμοι), and when returned to them, was found to be “of [full] weight” (Gen 43:21).

The account of the sale of Joseph by his brethren affords another instance of the employment of jewel ornaments as a medium of exchange (Gen 37:28); and that the Midianites carried the whole of their bullion wealth in the form of rings and jewels seems more than probable from the account in Numbers of the spoiling of the Midianites — “We have therefore brought an oblation for the Lord what every man hath gotten (Heb. found), of jewels of gold, chains, and bracelets, rings, ear-rings, and tablets, to make an atonement for our souls before the Lord. And Moses and Eleazar the priest took the gold of them, even all wrought jewels” (Gen 31:50-51). The friends of Job, when visiting him at the end of the time of his trial, each gave him a piece of money (קְשַׂיטָה) and an ear- ring of gold (נֶזֶם זָהָב; Sept. τετράδραχμον χρυσοῦ καὶ ἀσήμου), thus suggesting the employment of a ring-currency. (For this question, see W. B. Dickinson in the Num. Chron. volumes 6 to 16 pasaim). A passage in  Isaiah has indeed been supposed to show the use of gold coins in that prophet's time: speaking of the makers of idols, he says, “They lavish gold out of the' bag, and weigh silver in the balance” (Gen 46:6).

The mention of a bag is, however, a very insufficient reason for the supposition that the gold was coined money. Rings of gold may have been used for money in Palestine as early as this time, since they had long previously been so used in Egypt; but the passage probably refers to the people of Babylon, who may have had uncoined money in both metals like the Egyptians. Supposing that the above-quoted passages relative to a gold medium of exchange be not admitted, there is a passage recording a purchase made in gold in the time of David. The threshing-floor of Ornan was bought by David for 600 shekels of gold by weight (1Ch 21:25). Yet even this is rendered doubtful by the parallel passage mentioning the price paid as 50 shekels of silver (2Sa 24:24).

It seems then apparent, from the several authorities given above, that from the earliest time silver was used by the Hebrews as a medium of commerce, and that a fixed weight was assigned to single pieces, so as to make them suitable for the various articles presented in trade. Unless we suppose this to be the case, many of the above-quoted passages (especially Gen 23:16; comp. 2Ki 12:4 sq.) would be difficult to understand rightly. In this latter passage it is said that the priest Jehoiada “took a chest and bored a hole in the lid of it, and set it beside the altar,” and “the priests that kept the door put in all the money that was brought into the house of the Lord.” These passages not only presuppose pieces of metal of a definite weight, but also that they had been recognised as such, either in an unwrought form or from certain characters inscribed upon them. The system of weighing (though the Bible makes mention of a balance and weight of money in many places-Gen 23:16; Exo 22:17; 2Sa 18:12; 1Ki 20:39; Jer 32:9-10) is not likely to have been applied to every individual piece. In the large total of 603,550 half-shekels (Exo 38:26), accumulated by the contribution of each Israelite, each individual half-shekel could hardly have been weighed out, nor is it probable that the scales were continually employed for all the small silver pieces which men carried about with them. For instance, that there were divisions of the standard of calculation is evident from the passage in Exo 30:13, where the half-shekel is to be paid as the atonement money, and “the rich shall not give more, and the poor shall not give less” (Exo 30:15). The fourth part of the shekel must also have  been an actual piece, for it was all the silver that the servant of Saul had at hand to pay the seer (1Sa 9:8-9).

If a quantity of pieces of various weights were carried about by men in a purse or bag, as was the custom (2Ki 5:23; 2Ki 12:10; Gen 42:35), without having their weight marked in some manner upon them, what endless trouble there must have been in buying or selling, in paying or receiving. From these facts we may safely assume that the Israelites had already, before the exile, known silver pieces of a definite weight, and used them in trade. By this is not meant coins, for these are pieces of metal struck under an authority. A curious passage is that in Ezekiel (Eze 16:36), which has been supposed to speak of brass money. The Hebrew text has יִעִן הַשָּׁפֵךְ נְחֻשְׁתֵּךְ, which has been rendered by the Vulg. “ quia effusum est aes tuum,” and by the A.V. “because thy filthiness was poured out.” As brass was the latest metal introduced for money into Greece, it seems very unlikely that we should have brass money current at this period in Palestine: it has, however, been supposed that there was an independent copper. coinage in farther Asia before the introduction of silver money by the Seleucidae and the Greek kings of Bactriana. The terms רִצֵי כֶסֶŠ(Psa 68:30) and אֲגוֹרִת כֶּסֶŠ(1Sa 2:36) are merely expressive of any small denomination of money. SEE SILVER.

III. Coined Money. —

1. The Antiquity of Coinage. There are two generally received opinions as to who were the inventors of the coining of money. One is that Phidon, king of Argos, coined both gold and silver. money at Egina at the same time that he introduced a system of weights and measures (Ephor. ap. Strabo,. 8:376; Pollux, 9:83; AElian, Var. Hist. 12:10; Marm. Par.). The date of Phidon, according to the Parian marble, is B.C. 895, but Grote places him between 770 and 730, while Clinton, Bockh, and Miller place him between 783 and 744 (Grote, Hist. of Greece, 4:419, note). The other statement is that the Lydians “were the first nation to introduce the use of gold and silver coin” (Herod. 1:94). This latter assertion was also made, according to Pollux (9:6, 83), by Xenophalies of Colophon, and is repeated by Eustathius (ap. Dionys. Perieg. 5:840). The early coins of Egina and Lydia have a device on one side only, the reverse being an incuse square (quadratum incusunm). On the obverse of the AEginetan coins is a tortoise, and on those of the Lydian the head of a lion. The reverse, however, of the AEginetan coins soon shows the incuse square divided  into four parts by raised lines, the fourth quarter being again divided by a diagonal bar, thus forming four compartments. Apart, however, from the history relative to these respective coinages, which decidedly is in favor of a Lydian origin (Rawlinson, Herod. 1:683; Grotefend, Num. Chronicles 1:235) against the opinion of the late colonel Leake (Num. Hell. App.), the Lydian coins seem to be ruder than those of AEgina, and it is probable that while the idea of impress may be assigned to Lydia, the perfecting of the silver and adding a reverse type, thereby completing the art of coinage, may be given to AEgina (W.B. Dickinson, Num. Chronicles 2:128).

It may be remarked that Herodotus does not speak of the coins of Lydia when a kingdom, which coins have for their type the heads of a lion and bull facing, and which in all probability belong to Craesus, but of the electrum staters of Asia Minor. If we conclude that coinage commenced in European and Asiatic Greece about the same time, the next question is whether we can approximately determine the date. This is extremely difficult, since there are no coins of a known period before the time of the expedition of Xerxes. The pieces of that age are of so archaic a style that it is hard, at first sight, to believe that there was any length of time between them and the rudest, and therefore earliest, of the coins of AEgina or the Asiatic coast. It must, however, be recollected that in some conditions the growth or change of art is extremely slow, and that this was the case in the early period of Greek art seems evident from the results of the excavations on what we may believe to be the oldest sites in Greece. The lower limit obtained from the evidence of the coins of known date may perhaps be conjectured to be two, or at most three, centuries before their time; the- higher limit is as vaguely determined by the negative evidence of the Homeric writings, of which we cannot guess the age, excepting as being before the first Olympiad. On the whole, it seems reasonable to carry up Greek coinage to the 8th century B.C. Purely Asiatic coinage cannot be taken up to so early a date. The more archaic Persian coins seem to be of the time of Darius Hystaspis, or possibly of Cyrus, and certainly not much older. and there is no Asiatic money, unless of Greek cities, that can be reasonably assigned to an earlier period. Croesus and Cyrus probably originated this branch of the coinage, or else Darius Hystaspis followed the example of the Lydian king. Coined money may therefore have been known in Palestine as early as the fall of Samaria, but only through commerce with the Greeks, and we cannot suppose that it was then current there. The earliest coined money current in Palestine is supposed to be the Daric (see below).

2. The principal Monetary Systems of Antiquity. — This subject has already been ably treated by Mr. R. S. Poole (Encyclopcedia Britannica, s.v. Numismatics), and in the present article it will be sufficient for our purpose to mention briefly the different talents (q.v.).

(1.) The Attic talent was that employed in most Greek cities before the time of Alexander, who adopted it, and from that time it became almost universal in Greek coinage. Its drachm weighed about 67.5 grains Troy, and its tetradrachm 270 grains. In practice it rarely reached this standard in coins after the Punic War; at Alexander's time its tetradrachm weighed about 264 grains.

(2.) The AEginetan talent, which was used at as early a period as the Attic, was employed in Greece and in the islands. Its drachm had an average maximum weight of about 96 grains, and its didrachm about 192 grains. When abolished under Alexander, this weight had fallen to about 180 grains for the didrachm.

(3.) The Alexandrian or Ptolemaic talent, which may also be called the Earlier Phoenician, and also Macedonian, as it was used in the earlier coinage of the cities of Macedon, and by the Macedonian kings before Alexander the Great, was restored during the sway of the Ptolemies into the talent of Egypt. In the former case its drachm weighed about 112 grains, and its so-called tetradrachm about 224, but they gradually fell to much lower weights. In the latter case the. drachm weighs about 50 grains, and the tetradrachm about 220.

(4.) The later Phoenician or Carthaginian talent was in use among the Persians and Phoenicians. It was also employed in Africa by the Carthaginians. Its drachm (or hemidrachm) weighed, according to Mr. Burgon (Thomas, Sale Cat. Page 57), about 59 grains, and its tetradrachm (or didrachm) about 236.

(5.) The Euboic talent in Greek money had a didrachm of 129 grains; but its system of division, though coming very near the Attic, was evidently different. The weight of its didrachm was identical with that of the Daric, showing the Persian origin of the system. The order of origin may be thus tabulated:

Macedonian, 224 didrachms. AEginetan, 196 Attic-Solonian, 135 Enboic, 129. Later Phoenician, 236.

Respecting the Roman coinage, we may here state that the origin of the weights of its gold and silver money was undoubtedly Greek, and that the denarius, the chief coin of the latter metal, was under the early emperors equivalent to the Attic drachm, then greatly depreciated. The first Roman coinage took place, according to Pliny (Hist. Nat. 33:3), in the reign of Servius Tullius, about 550 years before Christ; but it was not until Alexander of Macedon had subdued the Persian monarchy, and Julius Caesar had consolidated the Roman empire, that the image of a living ruler was permitted to be stamped upon the coins. Previous to that period heroes and deities alone gave currency to the money of imperial Rome. In the British Museum there is a specimen of the original Roman as, the surface of which is nearly the size of a brick, with the figure of a bull impressed upon it.

3. Coined Money mentioned in the Bible. — The earliest mention of coined money in the Bible refers to the Persian coinage. In Ezra (Ezr 2:69) and Nehemiah (Nehemiah 8:70) the word דִּרְכְּמוֹניַםoccurs, and in Ezra (Ezr 8:27) and 1 Chronicles (1Ch 29:7) the word

אֲדִרְכּוֹנַים, both rendered in the Sept. by χρυσοῦς, and in the Vulg. by solidus and drachma. Many opinions have been put forward concerning the derivation of the words adarkon and darkemon; but a new suggestion has recently been made, which, though ingenious, will not, we think, meet with much support. Dr. Levy (Jild. Miinzen, page 19, note) thinks that the root-word is דָּרִךְ, “to stretch,” “tread,” “step forward,” from the forward  pacing of one foot, which a man does in bending the bow. and that from this word was formed a noun, דרכון, or with the Aleph prefixed אדרכון, “archer,” which is the type upon these coins, especially as the ancients called the old Persian coins τοξόται. That the more extended form דרכמוןcould have been formed from the simple דרכוןis very possible, as the Mem could easily have been inserted. All, however, agree that by these terms the Persian coin Daric is meant. This coin was a gold piece current in Palestine under Cyrus and Artaxerxes Longimanus. The ordinary Daric is not of uncommon occurrence; but Levy (l.c.) has given a representation of a double piece, thereby making the ordinarily received Daric a half-Daric. Of the double piece, he says, only three are known. In this he is mistaken, as Mr. Borrell, the coin-dealer, has a record of not less than eight specimens (F.W. Madden, Hist. of Jewish Coinage, etc., page 272, note 4). Besides these gold pieces, a silver coin also circulated in the Persian kingdom, named the siglos. SEE DARIC.

Mention is probably made of this coin in the Bible in those passages which treat of the Persian times (Neh 5:15; comp. 10:32). Of these pieces twenty went to one gold Daric (Mommsen, Geschichte des Romi. Aiiunzwesens, pages 13 and 855), which would give a ratio of gold to silver of one to thirteen (Herod. 3:95). These coins also have an archer on the obverse. As long, then, as the Jews lived under Persian domination, they made use of Persian coins. and had no struck coins of their own. In these coins also were probably paid the tributes (Herod. 3:89).

On the overthrow of the Persian monarchy in B.C. 333, by Alexander the Great, Palestine came under the dominion of the Greeks. During the lifetime of Alexander the country was governed by a vice-regent, and the high-priest was permitted to remain in power. Jaddua was at this time high- priest, and in high favor with Alexander (Josephus, Ant. 11:8, 5). At this period only Greek coins were struck in many cities of Palestine. The coinage consisted of gold, silver, and copper. The usual gold coins were staters, called by Pollux Αλεξάνδρειοι. The silver coins mostly in circulation were tetradrachms and drachms. There are two specimens of the tetradrachms struck at Scythopolis (the ancient Bethshan), preserved in the Gotha and Paris collections. There are also tetradrachms with the initials IOII struck at Joppa, which, being a town of considerable importance, no doubt supplied Jerusalem with money. Some of the coins bear the monograms of two cities sometimes at a great distance from each other, showing evidently some commercial intercourse between them. For  instance, Sycamina (Hepha) and Scythopolis (Bethshan), Ascalon and Philadelphia (Rabbath Ammon) (Muller, Numnismatiue d'Alexandre le Grand, 1464, pl. 20x).

Shortly after the death of Alexander the Great, in B.C. 324, Palestine fell into the hands of Ptolemy I Soter, the son of Lagus, from whom Antigonus wrested it for a short time, until, in B.C. 301, after the battle of Ipsus, it came again into his hands, and afterwards was under the government of the Ptolemies for nearly one hundred years.

The same system of coinage was continued under the Seleueidae and Lagide, and we find the same and other mints in Palestine. The history, from that time to B.C. 139, will be found under ANTIOCHUS SEE ANTIOCHUS , SEE MACCABEES, and other names, and would be out of place in an article which more especially treats only of money.

The next distinct allusion to coined money is in the Apocrypha, where it is narrated in the first book of Maccabees that Antiochus VII granted to Simon the Maccabee permission to coin money with his own stamp, as well as other privileges (Καὶ ἐπέτρεψά σοι ποιῆσαι κόμμα ἴδιον νόμισμα τῇ χώρᾷ σου. 15:6). This was in the fourth year of Simon's pontificate, B.C. 140. It must be noted that Demetrius II had in the first year of Simon, B.C. 143, made a most important decree granting freedom to the Jewish people, which gave occasion to the dating of their contracts and covenants — “In the first year of Simon, the great high-priest, the leader, and chief of the Jews” (13:34-42), a form which Josephus gives differently — “In the first year of Simon, benefactor of the Jews, and ethnarch” (Ant. 13:6). This passage has raised many opinions concerning the Jewish coinage, and among the most conspicuous is that of M. de Saulcy, whose classification of Jewish coins has been generally received and adopted. It has been fully treated upon by Mr. J. Evans in the Numismatic Chronicle (20:8 sq.). SEE NUMISMATICS. The Jews, being the worshippers of the one only true God, idolatry was strictly forbidden in their law; and therefore their shekel never bore a head, but was impressed simply with the almond rod and the pot of manna. Later shekels of copper bore likewise other devices. SEE SHEKEL.

4. Money in the New Testament. — The coins mentioned by the evangelists, and first those of silver, are the following: the stater is spoken of in the account of the miracle of the tribute money. The receivers of  didrachmns demanded the tribute, but Peter found in the fish a stater, which he paid for our Lord and himself (Mat 17:24-27). This stater was therefore a tetradrachm, and it is very noteworthy that at this period almost the only Greek imperial silver coin in the East was a tetradrachm, the didrachm being probably unknown, or very little coined.

The didrachnm is mentioned as a money of account in the passage above cited, as the equivalent of the Hebrew shekel.

The denarius, or Roman penny, as well as the Greek drachm, then of about the same weight, is spoken of as a current coin. There can be little doubt that the latter is merely employed as another name for the former. In the famous passages respecting the tribute to Caesar, the Roman denarius of the time is correctly described (Mat 22:15-21; .Luk 20:19-25). It bears the head of Tiberius, who has the title Caesar in the accompanying inscription, most later emperors having, after their accession, the title Augustus: here again therefore we have an evidence of the date of the Gospels. SEE DENARIUS; SEE DRACHM. copper coins the farthing and its half, the mite, are spoken of, and these probably formed the chief native currency. SEE FARTHING; SEE MITE.

From the time of Julius Caesar, who first struck a living portrait on his coins, the Roman coins run in a continued succession of so-called Caesars, their queens and crown-princes, from about B.C. 48 down to Romulus Augustulus, emperor of the West, who was dethroned by Odoacer about A.D. 475 (Quarterly Review, 72:358). SEE COIN.

## Money, Ecclesiastical[[@Headword:Money, Ecclesiastical]]

             SEE NUMISMATICS; SEE USURY.

## Money, Love Of[[@Headword:Money, Love Of]]

             (φιλαργυρία, 1Ti 6:10, avarice or cupidity). SEE COVETOUSNESS.

## Money, Piece Of[[@Headword:Money, Piece Of]]

             (קְשַׂיטָה, kesitah', Gen 33:19; Job 42:11; “piece of silver,” Jos 24:32; στατήρ, Mat 17:27). SEE KESITAH; SEE STATER.

## Money-Changer[[@Headword:Money-Changer]]

             (κολλυβιστής Mat 21:12; Mar 11:15; Joh 2:15). According to Exo 30:13-15, every Israelite, whether rich or poor, who had reached or passed the age of twenty, must pay into the sacred treasury, whenever the nation was numbered, a half-shekel as an offering to Jehovah. Maimonides (Sheeial. cap. 1) says that this was to be paid annually, and that even paupers were not exempt. The Talmud exempts priests and women. The tribute must in every case be paid in coin of the exact Hebrew halfshekel, about 151d. sterling of English money. The. premium for obtaining by exchange of other money the half-shekel of Hebrew coin, according to the Talmud, was a κόλλυβος (collybuis), and hence the money-broker who made the exchange was called κολλυβιστής. The collybus, according to the same authority, was equal in  value to a silver obolus, which has a weight of 12 grains, and its money value is about 11d. sterling. The moneychangers (κολλυβισταί) whom Christ, for their impiety, avarice, and fraudulent dealing, expelled from the Temple, were the dealers who supplied half-shekels, for such a premium as they might be able to exact, to the Jews: from all parts of the world, who assembled at Jerusalem during the great festivals, and were required to pay their tribute or ransom money in the Hebrew coin; and also for other purposes of exchange, such as would be necessary in so great a resort of foreign residents to the ecclesiastical metropolis. The word τραπεζίτης (trapezites),which we find in Mat 25:29, is a general term for banker or broker, so called from the table (τραπέζης) at which they were seated (like the modern “bank,” i.e., bench). SEE EXCHANGER.

Of this branch of business we find traces very early both in the Oriental and classical literature (comp. Mat 17:24-27 : see Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. on Mat 21:12; Buxtorf, Lex. Rabbin. col. 2032). — Smith. It is mentioned by Volney that in Syria, Egypt, and Turkey, when any considerable payments are to be made, an agent of exchange is sent for, who counts paras by thousands, rejects pieces of false money, and weighs all the sequins either separately or together. It has hence been suggested that the “current money with the merchant” mentioned in Scripture (Gen 23:16), might have been such as was approved of by competent judges, whose business it was to detect fraudulent money if offered' in payment. The Hebrew word סוֹחֵר, socher', signifies one who goes about from place to place, and is supposed to answer to the native exchange-agent or money-broker of the East, now called shroff. SEE MERCHANT.

It appears that there were bankers or money-changers in Judaea, who made a trade of receiving money in deposit and paying interest for it (Mat 25:27). In the Life of Aratus, by Plutarch, there is mention of a banker of Sicyon, a city of Peloponnesus, who lived 240 years before Christ, and whose whole business consisted in exchanging one species of money for another. SEE CHANGER OF MONEY.

## Money-stone[[@Headword:Money-stone]]

             Is, in ecclesiastical language, the upper slab of a tomb, on which payments were made by or to ecclesiastics. There is one at Carlisle, at York. and at Dundry, in England.

## Monfort, David, D.D[[@Headword:Monfort, David, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian divine, was born in Adams County, Pennsylvania, March 7, 1790. His ancestors were the Huguenot De Monforts of France, who were driven to Holland, and afterwards emigrated to this country about 1640. David Monfort was educated at Transylvania University, in Lexington, Ky., and graduated in the theological seminary at Princeton, N.J., in 1817; was licensed by Miami -Presbytery in 1818, and continued all his life a missionary preacher, acting at different times as the stated supply of Bethel Church, in Oxford Presbytery; Terre Haute Church, Indiana; Sharon Church, at Wilmington, Ohio; and a church in Franklin, Ind., where he labored for twenty years. In 1854 he became stated pastor of the church at Knightstown, Indiana; and in 1857 he removed to Macomb, Illinois, where he remained until his death, October 18, 1860. Dr. Monfort was a thoroughly trained minister, an able expositor, an excellent linguist, and an eloquent preacher. He published two sermons on Baptism and one on Justification, which appeared in a volume called Original Sermons by Presbyterian Divines in the Mississippi Valley. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1862, page 104.

## Monfort, Peter[[@Headword:Monfort, Peter]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Adams County, Pennsylvania, March 14,1784. He was, like the above, descended from the Huguenot De Monforts. He attained his education through great effort, pursuing his course with much difficulty for want of teacher and books. After several  years of private tuition in the classics and theology, he was licensed in thee spring of 1813, and ordained in 1814 by Miami Presbytery; was pastor four years at Yellow Springs, Ohio, and eleven years in Unity and Pisgah, near his early home; subsequently he undertook the work of a domestic missionary at Findlay, Ohio, where he labored for three years. In 1836 he transferred his relations from the Presbyterian to the Associate Reformed Church, and in that connection preached at Syracuse, in Hamilton County, Ohio; Jacksonburg, Quincy, and Middleburg, Ohio; and at College Corner. He died November 13, 1865. Mr. Monfort showed much ability as an expositor of the Scriptures, and as an advocate of sound doctrinal theology. He was a man of deep religious experience, uniform life, and lowliness of mind. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1867, page 361.

## Mongin, Edmonde[[@Headword:Mongin, Edmonde]]

             a French Roman Catholic preacher, noted for his pulpit oratory, was born in 1668 at Baroville, diocese of Langres. At the age of nineteen he gave proofs of his talent for the pulpit, and in after-years the French Academy successively awarded him three different prizes for eloquence. He was intrusted with the education of Louis-Henri de Bourbon and of Charles de Charolais, princes of the house of Conde. Elected a member of the Academy in the place of the abbe Gallois, he was received March 1, 1708, and it was in this capacity he pronounced in the chapel of the Louvre the funeral oration of Louis XIV. He was appointed in 1711 abbe of Saint- Martin d'Autun, and became bishop of Bazas September 24, 1724, devoting himself entirely to the administration of his diocese. In the midst of the unfortunate quarrels which troubled the Church of France he was as remarkable for his moderation as for his wisdom. “Believe me,” said he to an over-zealous prelate, “we should speak much and write little.” Mongin died at Bazas, May 6, 1746. He has left some sermons, some panegyrics, some funeral orations (among others, that of Henri de Bourbon, prince de Condle), and several different academical pieces, collected into one volume (Paris, 1745, 4to). D'Alembert says that “his works evince more taste than warmth, more thought than emotion, more wisdom than imagination; but there is found throughout all a noble and simple tone, a sweet sensibility, an elegant and pure diction, and that sound instruction which should be the basis of Christian eloquence” (Hist. des Membres de l'Academie 1'Francaise, volume 5).

## Mongitore, Antonino[[@Headword:Mongitore, Antonino]]

             an Italian ecclesiastic, noted mainly, however, for his literary labors, was born at Palermo, May 1, 1663, entered the priesthood, and was made dean of the cathedral of his native place, and finally became one of the papal counsellors. He died June 6, 1743. Besides his Bibliotheca Sicula (Palermo, 1708-14, 2 volumes, fol.), which contains a history of Sicily and its writers, secular and ecclesiastic, we should note Breve Compendio della Vita di S. Francisco di Sales (1695, 12mo): — Vite de due Santi Mnamiliani, arcivescovi di Palerno (1701, 4to); and the biographies of other celebrated ecclesiastics, and also a history of the Teutonic order of knighthood. See Du Pin, Biblioth. des Auteurs ecclesiast. du dix-huitieme siecle.

## Mongolia[[@Headword:Mongolia]]

             an Asiatic country, now a part of China, situated between lat. 35° and 52° N. and long. 82° and 123° E., is bounded by the Russian government of Irkutsk in Siberia, N.E. by Mantchuria, S. by the Chinese provinces of Chili and Shan-si and the Yellow River, S.W. by Kansu, and W. by Cobdo and Ili, and has an area of 1,400,000 square miles, with a population of 2,000,000. SEE CHINA.

Geographical Features. — It is chiefly a high plain, 3000 feet above the sea, almost destitute of wood and water. In the central part is the great sandy desert of Gobi, which stretches from N.E. to S.W., with an area estimated at 600,000 square miles. The chief mountain ranges of Mongolia are the Altai and its various subordinate chains, which extend eastward, under the names of Tangnu, Khangai, and Kenteh, as far as the Amur; and the Alashan and Inshan ranges, which commence in lat. 42° N. and long. 107° E., and run N.E. and N. to the Amur, in lat. 53° N. The rivers of Mongolia are chiefly in the north. The Selenga, Orkhon, and Tula unite their streams and flow into Lake Baikal. The Kerlon and Onon rise near each other, on opposite sides of the Kenteh range, and flow in a N.E. direction to the Amur. In the south, the Siramuren and its branches unite in the Lian River. Lakes are numerous, and some of them are large. South of the desert of Gobi are the Oling and Dzaring, and the Koko-nor or Blue Sea, which, according to the Chinese accounts, is 190 miles in length and 60 in breadth. In the N.W. part of the country lakes abound, the largest of which are. the Upsa-nor, Altai-nor, Alak-nor, and the Iki-ural. Mongolia is  divided into four principal regions: 1, Inner Mongolia, lying between the great wall and the desert of Gobi; 2, Outer Mongolia, between the desert and the Altai mountains, and reaching from the Inner Hingan to the Tien- shan; 3, the country about Koko-nor; 4, Uliassutai and its dependencies. Inner: Mongolia is divided into 6 corps and 24 tribes, which are again divided into 49 standards, each comprising about 2000 families and commanded by hereditary princes. The Kortchin and the Ortus are the principal tribes. Another large tribe, the Tsakhars, occupy the region immediately north of the great wall. Outer Mongolia is divided into 4 circles, each of which is governed by a khan, or prince, who claims descent from Genghis Khan. The Khalkas is the principal tribe, and their 4 khanates are divided into 86 standards, each of which is restricted to a particular territory, from which it is not allowed to wander. The country about Lake Koko-nor is occupied by Turguths, Hoshoits, Khalkas, and other tribes, arranged under 29 standards. Uliassutai is a town of 2000 houses, in the western part of Mongolia, and lies in a well-cultivated valley upon the River Iro. Its dependent territories comprise 11 tribes of Khalkas, divided into 31 standards (Amer. Cyclop.).

But little is accurately known of the natural history of Mongolia, except that its immense plains and gloomy forests are inhabited by multitudes of wild animals. The camel, double-humped or Bactrian, exists in both the wild and domesticated state. In the latter condition it is the cow and horse of that region. It gives milk excellent in quality, and from it butter and cheese are prepared, .and at the same time it is the camel which serves the Mongolian frequently as a beast of burden, etc. Very little of Mongolian soil is fit for cultivation, rain or snow rarely falling in sufficient quantities, except on the acclivities of the mountain ranges. It is noticed, however, that wherever agriculture has been attempted the climate has been more or less influenced, and changes have been wrought; as e.g. in Southern Mongolia, where the Chinese, far advanced beyond the Mongols proper in culture, introduced agriculture, with the cultivation of cereals, which formerly did not grow. As a rule, the winter lasts nine months, and is suddenly succeeded by three months of intense heat.

Inhabitants. — The natives of Mongolia are a part of the Mongolian race, a division of mankind numerous and widely spread — according to Prof. Dieterici's estimate, in 1859, counting as many as 528,000,000 souls, or about half the human race; the second in the classification of Blumenbach, and corresponding in almost every respect with the branch designated as  Turanian by more recent ethnologists. SEE ORIGIN OF MAN.

Under the designation of Mongolians are included not only the Mongols proper, but the Chinese and Indo-Chinese, Thibetans, Tartars of all kinds, Burmese, Siamese, Japanese, Esquimaux, Samoieds, Finns, Lapps, Turks, and even Magyars. Collectively, they are the great nomadic ,people of the earth, as distinguished from the Aryans, Shemites, and Hamites. The physical characteristics of the Mongolians in their primitive state are thus described by Dr. Latham in his Descriptive Ethnology: “The face of the Mongolian is broad and flat. This is because the nasal bones are depressed and the cheekbones stand out laterally; they are not merely projecting, for this they might be without giving much breadth to the face, inasmuch as they might stand forward... The distance between the eyes is great, the eyes themselves being oblique, and their caruncule being concealed. The eyebrows form a low and imperfect arch, black and scanty. The iris is dark; the cornea yellow. The complexion is tawny, the stature low. The ears are large, standing out from the head; the lips thick and fleshy rather than thin, the teeth somewhat oblique in their insertion, the forehead low and flat, and the hair lank and thin.” Of course, such a description as this cannot be understood as applying to the more civilized nations of Mongol origin, such as the Turks and Magyars, especially the latter, who in physical appearance differ but little, if at all, from other European nations.

The Mongols are, with a few exceptions, nomadic in their mode of life, living in tents and subsisting on animal food, the product of their flocks and herds. The Mongol tent, for about three feet from the ground, is cylindrical in form ; it then becomes conical, like a pointed hat. Its wood-work is composed below of a trellis-work of crossed bars, which fold up and expand at pleasure. Above these a circle of poles, fixed in the trellis-work, meets at the top, like the sticks of an umbrelia. Over the wood-work is stretched a thick covering of coarse felt. The door is low and narrow, and is crossed at the bottom by a beam which serves as a threshold. At the top of the tent is an opening to let out the smoke, which can at any time be closed by a piece of felt hanging above it, to which is attached a long string for the purpose.

The interior is divided into two compartments — that on the left being for the men, while that on the right is occupied by the women, and is also used as a kitchen, the utensils of which consist chiefly of large earthen vessels for holding water, wooden pails for milk, and a large bell-shaped iron kettle. A small sofa or couch, a small square press or chest of drawers (the top of which serves as all altar for an idol), and a  number of goats' horns fixed in the woodwork of the tent, on which hang various utensils, arms, and other articles, complete the furniture of this primitive habitation. The odor pervading the interior of the Mongol tent is, to those not accustomed to it, disgusting and almost insupportable. “This smell,” says M. Huc, “so potent sometimes that it seems to make one's heart rise to one's throat, is occasioned by the mutton-grease and butter with which everything on and about a Tartar is impregnated. It is on account of this habitual filth that they are called Tsao-Ta-Dze (‘stinking Tartars') by the Chinese, themselves not altogether inodorous, or by any means particular about cleanliness.” Household and family cares among the Mongols are assigned entirely to the women, who milk the cows, make the butter and cheese, draw water, gather fuel, tan skins, and make cloth and clothes. The occupation of the men consists chiefly in conducting the flocks and herds to pasture, which, as they are accustomed from infancy to horseback, is an amusement rather than a labor. They sometimes hunt wild animals for food or for their skins, but never for pleasure.

When not on horseback, the men pass their time in absolute idleness, sleeping all night and squatting all day in their tents, drinking tea or smoking. Their education is very limited. The only persons who learn to read are the lamas or priests, who are also. the painters, sculptors, architects, and physicians of the nation. The training of the men who are not intended for priests is confined to the use of the bow and the matchlock, and a thorough mastery of horsemanship. M. Huc says: “When a mere infant, the Mongol is weaned, and as soon as he is strong enough he is stuck upon a horse's back behind a man, the animal is put to a gallop, and the juvenile rider, in order not to fall off, has to cling with both hands to his teacher's jacket. The Tartars thus become accustomed from a very early age to the movement of the horse, and by degrees and the force of habit they identify themselves, as it were, with the animal. There is perhaps no spectacle more exciting than that of Mongol riders in chase of a wild horse. They are armed with a long, heavy pole, at the end of which is a running-knot. They gallop — they fly after the horse they are pursuing, down rugged ravines and up precipitous hills, in and out, twisting and turning in their rapid course, until they come up with their game. They then take the bridle of their own horse in their teeth, seize with both hands their heavy pole, and, bending forward, throw by a powerful effort the running-knot around the wild horse's neck. In this exercise the greatest vigor must be combined with the greatest dexterity, in order to enable them to stop short the powerful untamed animals with which they have to deal. It sometimes happens that the cord and pole are  broken; but as to a horseman being thrown, it is an occurrence we never saw or heard of. The Mongol is so accustomed to ride on horseback that he is like a fish out of water when he sets foot on the ground. His step is heavy and awkward; and his bowed legs, his chest bent forward, and his constant looking about him, all indicate a person who spends the greater portion of his time on the back of a horse or a camel. The Mongols marry very young, and their marriages are regulated entirely by their parents, who make the contract without consulting the young people at all. No dowry is given with the bride, but, on the contrary, the bridegroom's family pay a considerable price for the maiden.

A plurality of wives is permitted, but the first wife is always the mistress of the household. Divorce is very frequent, and is effected without the intervention of either the civil or the ecclesiastical authorities. The husband who wishes to repudiate his wife sends her back to her parents without any formality, except a message that he does not require her any longer. This proceeding does not give offence, as the family of the lady retain the cattle, horses, and other property given to them at the time of the marriage, and have an opportunity of selling her over again to a fresh purchaser. The women, however, are not oppressed, and are not kept in seclusion; they come and go at pleasure, ride on horseback, and visit from tent to tent. In their manners and appearance they are like the men — haughty, independent, and vigorous. The chiefs of the Mongol tribes and all their blood-relations form an aristocracy, who hold the common people in a mild species of patriarchal servitude. There is no distinction of manners nor of mode of living between these classes; and though the common people are not allowed to own lands, they frequently accumulate considerable property in herds and flocks. Those who become lamas are entirely free.”

History. — The Mongolians, as a race, are supposed to be the same who, in remote antiquity, founded what is called the “Median empire” in Lower Chaldaea-an empire, according to Rawlinson, that flourished and fell between 2458 and 2234 B.C., that is, before Nineveh became known as a great city. Thus early did some of these nomadic tribes, forsaking their original pastoral habits, assume the character of a nation. Another great offshoot from this stock founded an empire in China, the earliest date of which it is impossible to trace, but which certainly had reached a state of high civilization at least 2000 years B.C. In early Greek history they figure as Scythians, and in late Roman as Huns, carrying terror and desolation over the civilized world. In the Middle Ages they appear as Mongols,  Tartars, and Turks. In the beginning of the 13th century Genghis Khan, originally the chief of a small Mongol horde, conquered almost the whole of Central and Eastern Asia. His sons and grandsons were equally successful, and in 1240-41 the Mongol empire extended from the sea- board of China to the frontiers of Germany and Poland, including Russia and Hungary, and the whole of Asia, with the exception of Asia Minor, Arabia, India and the Indo-Chinese states, and Northern Siberia. This vast empire soon broke up into a number of independent kingdoms, from one of which, Turkestan, arose another tide of Mongol invasion, under the guidance of Timur or Tamerlane, who in the latter part of the 14th century reduced Turkestan, Persia, Hindustan, Asia Minor, and Georgia under his sway, and broke for a time the Turkish power. On the death of his son, shah Rokh, the Mongol empire was subdivided, and finally absorbed by the Persians and Usbeks; but an offshoot of Timur's family founded in the 16th century the great Mogul empire of Delhi. After the decline of Timlr's empire, the Turkish branch maintained the glory of the race, and spread terror to the very heart of Western Europe. In the 9th century the Magyars, a tribe of Ugrians, also of Mongol extraction, under their leader Arpad, established themselves in Hungary, where in process of time they became converted to Christianity, and founded a kingdom famous in European history. SEE GEORGIA; SEE HUNGARY; SEE TURKEY.

Religion. —

(a) heathenism. The primitive religion of the Mongolians was no doubt largely influenced by the inspired faith, if it did not to some extent prevail among them for some time. The earliest traces reveal them as mostly adherents to Shamanism (q.v.). There are, however, among them, according to the different countries in which they reside, and to the several names of which the reader has been referred, various other religions, as Buddhism, Confucianism, Taouism, fire-worship, paganism of different kinds, Mohammedanism, and Christianity. In Mongolia proper, that species of Buddhism known as Lamaism (q.v.) was introduced in the 13th century of the Christian era, and, like the Buddhists of Thibet, they recognise as their spiritual head the grand lama at Lassa. The people are very devout, and generous to a fault in their support of religious institutions, and hence the country abounds in well-endowed lamasaries, constructed of brick and stone with elegance and solidity, and ornamented with paintings, sculptures, and carvings. “The most famous of these monasteries is that of the great Kuren, on the banks of the river Tula, in the  country of the Kalkas. Thirty thousand lamas dwell in the lamasary, and the plain adjoining it is always covered with the tents of the pilgrims who resort thither from all parts of Tartary. In these lamasaries a strict monastic discipline is maintained, but each lama is at liberty to acquire property by practicing as physician, by casting horoscopes, or by working as sculptor or painter, or in any occupation not inconsistent with his priestly character. Almost all younger sons of the free Mongols are devoted from infancy to the priesthood, and this tendency to monasticism is encouraged by the Chinese government, in order to keep down the growth of population among the Mongols. Almost every lamasary of the first class possesses a living Buddha, who, like the grand lama of Thibet, is worshipped as an incarnation of the deity. The influence of these personages is very great; and the Chinese emperors, who are constantly in dread of the Mongols, watch the living Buddhas with constant care, and spare no pains to conciliate them and win over to their interest those who manage these deities.”

(b) Christianity. — The Nestorians (q.v.), who dwelt in large numbers among the Mongolians, seem to have exerted but little if any influence on this heathen people. What was by the early Christians regarded as an indication of their leaning towards the religion and culture of the Christian dispensation, proves to have been only a temporary accommodation. The Western or Roman Church has made repeated attempts to convert the Mongols. In the 13th century, when their invasion threatened to overthrow European society and civilization, the Western pontiff, Innocent IV (1245), sent two embassies, one to charge these sanguinary warriors to desist from their desolating inroads, the other to win them over to Christianity.

The first of these, consisting of Dominicans, headed by one named Ascelin (Neander, Kirchengeschichte, 7:66), approached the commander-in-chief of the Mongol forces in Persia, but was unsuccessful. The other, consisting of Franciscans, headed by an Italian, Johannes de Plano Carpini, a disciple and devoted friend of Francis d'Assisi, pushed quite to the Tartaric court, and approached the khan in person (1246); but though they secured a hearing before the Mongolian throne, they yet failed to accomplish more than that the Mongol chief, like Vladimir of Russia, gave a patient hearing to Romanist, Nestorian, Buddhist, and Mohammedan, who each in their turn sought his conversion and influence. In 1253 Louis IX, hearing of the Mongolian's tendency towards Christianity, despatched another Franciscan, — William de \*Aubruiquis (Neander, 7:69); but he reported  that the Mongolian chief listened patiently to Christian emissaries, “filled with the idea that the Mongol conquests would come to an end unless the gods of foreign countries were propitiated.” Only one Christian Church had been founded. Rubruiquis, however, succeeded in baptizing about sixty persons; yet, after all, Rubruiquis's success was not flattering, and he finally returned to Europe disheartened. The removal, five years later, of the capital of the Mongol empire to China (q.v.), further obstructed the progress of Christianity in Mongolia.

There developed, however, among its simple pastoral tribes an article of belief which promised much for the final establishment of Christianity, viz. the belief in the existence of one almighty Being. In their heathen views, of course, they could not content themselves with acknowledging an earthly ruler unless a supernatural origin could be assigned to him, and they made the khan the son of this one almighty Power. an earthly ruler whom all men were bound to obey. While thus there was room for the most comprehensive toleration, there was room also for every kind of superstition; and the desire to bring the one Supreme, living apart in awful isolation, into nearer communion with his feeble worshipper — to bridge over the awful chasm between them — predisposed the people to a composite religion of Buddhism and Lamaism (see Hardwick, Christ and other Masters, volume 2, Append. 2; 3:89; Middle Ages, page 235). Still, “the son of Heaven” entertained a respect for all religions, and not least for Christianity. Marco Polo, who had been sent there by Gregory X in 1274, reports Kublai Khan as saying: “There are four great prophets who are reverenced by the different classes of mankind. The Christians regard Jesus Christ as their God; the Saracens, Mohammed; the Jews, Moses; the idolators, Sakyamuni Buddha, the most eminent among their idols. I honor and respect all the four” (Travels, page 167, ed. Bohn, 1854). One of the most successful of the early Christian laborers from the West was John de Monte Corvino, who went to Pekin in 1292, and for eleven years kept alive the flickering spark of Christianity in the Tartar realm. He translated the Scriptures for its people, educated their youth, and trained a native ministry. Yet even his labors bore fruit only while he was on earth; for soon after the close of his life, in 1330, “every vestige of his work was obliterated” (Gieseler, Ecclesiastes Hist. 4:259, 260; Hardwick, Ch. Hist. M.A. pages 235, 237).

This was caused no doubt in a large measure by the termination of the Mongolian rule in China, and the accession of the Ming dynasty in 1370, which, fearing everything foreign, banished Christianity as dangerous to their interests. It remained for the Jesuits to plant Christianity anew. The missionary work performed  in Persia, and in the border lands of the Caspian Sea and in Middle Asia, was so insignificant that it is not even Worth mentioning. See Maclean, Hist. of Christian Missions in the M. A. (Lond. 1863, 12mo), pages 370- 77; Assemani, Bibl. Orient. 3:2 sq.; Hue, Journey through the Chinese Empire; Recollections of a Journey through Tartary and Thibet; Schmidt, Forschungen im Gebiete der alteren religiisen, politischen, u. literarischen Bildungsgeschichte der Mongolen u. Tibeter (St. Petersb. 1824); Tumerelli, Kazan, the ancient Capital of the Tartar Khans (Lond. 1854, 2 volumes, 12mo); Neumann, Die Voilker des sidlichen Russlands (Leipsic, 1847); Aboul Ghaze Bhadour Khan, Histoire des Mogols et des Tartares (St. Petersb. 1874), volume 2; Daniels, Handb. d. Geogr. 1:346 sq.; Am. Cyclop. s.v. SEE TARTARY.

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

             In the Mongolian there exist different versions:

I. The Burnia, or Northeran Mongolian, for the Buriats about lake Baikal, in Siberia, and for. the Kalka tribes of Mongolia. In 1824 the New Test. was printed at St. Petersburg, under the sunperintenence of Dr. Schmidt,  who, with the aid of two learned Buriats, had commenced the translation, but during the work one of the Buriats died. The surviving Buriat was afterwards associated with Messrs. Swan, Stallybrass, and Yuille, missionaries at Selilnginsk, in the translation of the Old Test. and the revision of the New Test. The Old Test. was translated from the Hebrew, with constant reference to such critical apparatus as could be obtained.

The style of writing adopted in this version holds a middle place between the vulgar colloquial language of the people, which varies in different districts, and the abstruse modes of expression employed in some of their books. It is above the common business dialect, but not so much higher as to place the subject beyond the reach of any one of common understanding. The Old Test. was completed at Khodon, in Siberia, in 1840, and during the same year Messrs. Swan and Stallybrass accomplished a fresh translation of the New Test. from the original Greek, based on the version previously made. An edition of this Testament was completed at press in 1846 at the expense of the British and Foreign Bible Society, while a reprint of it was undertaken in 1878 by the Academy of Sciences at St. Petersburg, under the editorship of Mr. Schiefiner in the Mongolian type instead of the Manchu character, reducing thereby the size of the book by two thirds. This edition was completed at press in 1880, under the editorship of Mr. Pozdnieff, professor of Mongolian, in the St. Petersburg University, who had taken the place of superintendent after the death of professor Schiefiner.

II. The Kalmuck. or Western Mongoliant, for the Kalmucks of the Don and Volga, in Russia, and Eleuths, Kalmucks, and Soungars, of Mongolia. In this dialect there exist translations of the gospels of Matthew and John and of the Acts of the Apostles, published between 1815 and 1822. Concerning these efforts of translation and the Kalmucks themselves we read the following in the annual report of the British and Foreign Bible Society for the year 1877: "The Kalmucks are a Molgoian tribe, inhabiting the great salt steppe of the province of Astrakhan, about whose mode of life and habits not much is known in Western Europe. While it is not likely that they, at the present time at least, in ally way answer to the description given of themselves to the patriarch Nicon by thirty of their chiefs, as recorded by Macarius, and quoted by dean Stanley in his Eastern Church — where, being brought into the. presence of the patriarch, they are represented as saying to him, ‘When we have conquered a man, we cut away his nose, and then carve him into pieces and eat him. Good Lord,  whenever you have any men deserving of death. do not trouble yourself about their guilt or punishment, but give them us to eat, and you will do us a great kindness' — they are certainly in a very low state of civilization, even though their chiefs are sometimes educated in Russian schools. Mission work was begun among them early in this present century, and by the preaching of the Gospel and circulation of the Scriptures, parts of which had been translated into Kalmuck by the missionary Conrad Neitz, and others, and subsequently revised by Dr. Schmidt, laboring under the auspices of the emperor Alexander I, and of the British and Foreign Bible Society, a, number of conversions took place.

But days of trouble and persecution fell upon the mission, and in a recent letter the pastor of the Moravian settlement of Sarepta, founded with the express purpose of evangelizing the Kalmucks, informs your agent that at present no thorough knowledge of Kalmuck is possessed by any of the brethren. A search made in the archives of the village revealed the presence of a few copies of the gospels of Matthew and John, besides a number of Kalmuck tracts. A copy of each of the gospels having been sent by your agent to London, specimen pages of a reduced, and convenient size have been printed by the photographic process. These were forwarded to Sarepta, and we now await the result of their critical examination by learned Kalmucks, if there be any, and to know the opinions of the brethren themselves. Should these be deemed satisfactory, and the committee otherwise see fit to proceed with the printing of the Scriptures in the vernacular of this tribe, future reports may contain something more interesting and instructive about the progress of Bible work among its members." From the report for the year 1880 we learn that the agent of, the British. and Foreign.

Bible Society at St. Petersburg has been authorized to employ M. Pozdiieff and archpriest Smirnoff to translate the gospel of Matthew. M. Pozdnieff, as an eminent Kalmuck scholar, will make the translation, and archpriest Smirnoff, who lives among the Kalmucks, will see that the words and idioms are suited to the people. On this plan there is reason to hope that an excellent translation will be produced, and the question of proceeding with the other books of the New Test. will depend on the manner in which the gospel of Matthew is received. In the report for 1884 we read the gratifying statement that the committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society have authorized the publication of an edition of two thousand copies of the New Test. prepared by professor Pozdnieff. New type has been cut at the expense of the above society and cast at the expense of the academy.

III. The Southern, or Kalkhas Colloquial. In this dialect, used in Chinese Mongolia, the gospel of Matthew has been translated by the Reverend J. Edkins: and Dr. J.J. Schereschewsky, aided by a native Lama, and was printed in 1872 under the care of the Reverend J. Edkins, of Peking. This is the only part now extant. See Bible of Every Land, page 337.

For the study of the language, see Schmidt, Grammatik der mongolischen Sprache (1831); Zwick, Grammatik der westmongolischen Sprache (1851); — Castren, Versuch einer bujalischen Sprdchlehre (1857). (B.P.)

## Mongul, Peter[[@Headword:Mongul, Peter]]

             SEE MONOPHYSITES.

## Monheim, Johannes[[@Headword:Monheim, Johannes]]

             a follower of the great Desiderius Erasmus, and a noted teacher of the 16th century, was born of humble parentage at Claussen, near Elberfeld, in 1509. His father was a linen-draper, and Monheim entered his business when quite young. But his superior mental endowments soon led him into a different course; and, though not privileged with the advantages of a careful training, he yet managed to acquire a good classical education. It is said that he studied with Erasmus, but Hamelmann's assertion that Monheim studied. at Minster and Cologne deserves more credit. When but twenty-three years old, he was elected rector of the school at Essen, and four years later he received a call to Cologne as rector of the schola metropolitanae ecclesiae Coloniensis. Here he enjoyed intimate connections with the leaders of Erasmianism, and in a short time became so popular as a teacher that he attracted students from every direction. In 1545 he received and accepted a very flattering call from duke Wilhelm of Cleve to take the rectorship of the newly founded institute at Dusseldorf, and only five years after his inauguration in this new position Monheim wrote to a friend that his scholars outnumbered most German universities, more than 2000 young men being just then matriculated (see Frid. Reiffenbergii e Soc. Jesus Presbyteri Hist. Societatis Jesu, 1:89).

Monheim, in opposition to other humanists, — insisted on a religious instruction, and published numerous catechisms, the best known of which  is his Catechismus in quo Christianae religionis elementa sincere simpliciterque explicantur (Dusseldorf, 1560, with an introduction; and, edited and revised, it was recently published by Dr. Sack, Bonn, 1847). Though, outwardly at least, Monheim belonged to the Church of Rome, his catechism proves beyond doubt that he taught and believed the evangelical doctrines as set forth in the teachings of Calvin. The book was severely attacked. The theological faculty of the University of Cologne issued a Censura et docta explicatio errorum Catechismi Johannis Monheimoii (Cologne, 1560); and a number of other essays, partly in defence, partly in opposition to Monheim, were published. Monheim, however, himself remained quiet; but Martin Chemnitz, enraged at the open and secret attacks of the Cologne Jesuits on the learned man, edited his Theologiae Jesuitarum praecipua capita, ex quadam nensum, guae Coloniae anno 1560 edita est (Lips. 1563), which, together with his Examen Concilii Tridentii, so embittered pope Paul IV that he requested duke William to depose and banish “that arch-heretic” Johannes Monheim. Monheim was cited before the duke, and obliged to sign an agreement in which he promised to abstain from teaching Protestant doctrines, either openly or secretly (see Zeitschrift d. bergischen Geschichtsvereins, 2:255). The pope, however, was not satisfied even with this. He insisted upon an open judgment on Monheim, especially as the pardoning of a heretic was not within the duke's jurisdiction — “nec princeps haeretico publico quicquam ignoscere potuit.” Further steps of the papal court were made unnecessary by Monheim's sudden decease, September 9, 1564. Monheim wrote a great number of learned books, but his most valued work is the above- mentioned catechism, which Theo. Strack calls Catechismum orthodoxum, in quo Reformatorum doctrina, quae hodie Luthero-Calvinini nomine odiose traducitur, accurate confirmatur. Monheim lacked strength of character to take a decided position in the great struggle of the Reformation. He preferred, although thoroughly Protestant in all his views, to remain in the Church of Rome. “He belonged,” said one, “to that class of actors on the stage of life who have always appeared as the harbingers of great social men gifted with the power to discern and the hardihood to proclaim truths of which they want the courage to encounter the infallible result.” See Mohler, Symbolik; Seek, Protestant. Beantwortung der Synzbolik Mohler's.

## Moniales[[@Headword:Moniales]]

             SEE NUNS.

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

             the mother of at. Augustine, “counted,” says Schaff, “among the most noble and pious women who adorn the temple of Church history,” was born, according to tradition, of Christian parents, in Africa, about the year 332. Having attained to the age of womanhood she was married to Patrice of Tagaste, a heathen of Numidia, by whom she had two sons and one daughter. She was instrumental in the conversion of her husband a year before his death, after having spent with him years in hardship and sore trial. He was of violent temperament, and unfaithful to her in conjugal duties, yet she met all his shortcomings by a Christian spirit of forgiveness and love. and thus at last conquered in the name of her Saviour, whom she adored and faithfully followed. “Her highest aim,” says Schaff, “ was to win him over to the faith — not so much by words as by a truly humble and godly conversation, and the most conscientious discharge of her household duties” (Life of St. Augustine, page 10). The same earnestness which she displayed for the conversion of her husband she manifested also for the spiritual safety of her children. She was especially anxious for her son Augustine, who in his youth was given to dissipation, having inherited from his father strong sensual passions, and who had embraced the Manichaean heresy, which she feared would ultimately ruin his spiritual life.

For thirty years she therefore uninterruptedly prayed for his conversion. “A son of so many prayers and tears,” says Schaff, “could not be lost, and the faithful mother, who travailed with him in spirit with greater pain than her body had in bringing him into the world (Augustine, Confess. 9, c. 8), was permitted, for the encouragement of future mothers, to receive, shortly before her death, an answer to her prayers and expectations, and was able to leave this world with joy without revisiting her earthly home.” Augustine had embraced Christianity at Milan, whither he had gone in 384. Hither his mother followed him, and together they worshipped under the ministration of St. Ambrose. In the spring of 387, shortly after his baptism, they had quitted Rome to return to Africa, and it was on this homeward journey that Monica died, in Ostia, at the mouth of the Tiber, in 387, in the arms of her son, after enjoying with him a glorious conversation that soared above the confines of space and time, and was a foretaste of the eternal Sabbath-rest of the saints. She regretted not to die,  aye, not even in a foreign land, because she was not far from God, who would raise her up at the last day. “Bury my body anywhere,” was her last request, “and trouble not yourselves for it: only this one thing I ask, that you remember me at the altar of my God, wherever you may be.” Augustine, in his Confessions, has erected to Monica the noblest monument, and it can never perish. The Roman Catholic Church keeps May 4 in commemoration of her. Pope Martin V gives an account of the translation of her remains to Rome in 1430. See St. Augustine, Confessions; Godescard, Vie des Saints; Braune, Monica u. Augustinus (1846); Petet, Histoire de Sainte-Monique (1848); Schaff, Life and Labors of St. Augustine (N.Y. 1854), chapters 1, 4, 8; Mrs. Jamieson, Legends (see Index); Schaff, Ch. Hist. 3:991, 992; Neander, Ch. Hist. 2:227. SEE AUGUSTINE. (J.H.W.)

## Moniglia, Tommaso-Vincenzo[[@Headword:Moniglia, Tommaso-Vincenzo]]

             an Italian theologian, was born August 18, 1686, in Florence. Having received his education at the University of Pisa, he returned to Florence. and entered the Order of St. Dominic. Very soon after he contracted a close friendship with the English ambassador, Henry Newton. Seduced by his promises, he fled from the convent and repaired to London. His pecuniary resources being exhausted, he was forced to support himself by teaching. After an absence of three years he succeeded, by the favor of the grand duke, in returning to his own country, where he was kindly received and his errors pardoned. From that time he devoted himself to preaching with indefatigable zeal, and taught theology at Florence and Pisa. Moniglia had an extensive knowledge of nearly all the sciences, and was well versed in sacred and profane literature. He was one of the first among the Italians to refute the opinions of Locke, of Hobbes, of Helvetius, and of Bayle, but not always to advantage. He died at Pisa, February 15, 1767. He is the author of De Origine sacrarunm precum rosarii B.M. Virginis (Rome, 1725, 8vo); which dissertation he composed by order of his superiors and to refute the Bollandists, who do not believe that St. Dominic is the author of these prayers: — De annis Jesu-Christi servatoris et de religione utriusque Philippi Augusti (Rome, 1741, 4to): — Contro i Fatalisti (Lucca, 1744, 2 parts, 8vo): — Contro Materialisti e altri increduli (Padua, 1750, 2 volumes, 8vo): — Osservazioni critico-filosofiche confro i materialisti (Lucca, 1760, 8vo): — La mente umana spirito immortale,  non materia pensante (Padua, 1766, 2 volumes, 8vo). See Fabroni, Vitae Italorun, volume 11.

## Monism[[@Headword:Monism]]

             SEE MONADS.

## Monita Secreta Societatis Jesu[[@Headword:Monita Secreta Societatis Jesu]]

             or secret instructions for the Jesuitic order, is a work which has been the cause of much dispute, both as to its authenticity and as to the veracity of its contents. In Europe the book has attracted some attention, and, in consequence, some controversy; but in America it has been the subject of a very animated discussion, and we are therefore warranted in giving a detailed history of the book, and the position of the acknowledged authorities in such difficulties.

I

. History of its Origin, Editions, etc. — The Monita was first printed in Latin, from the Spanish, at Cracow, the capital of Poland, with this title: Monita Privata Societatis Jesu, Notobirge, Anno 1612, by an unknown editor, with various “Testimonies of several Italian and Spanish Jesuits” confirmatory of the truth of the Monita. The “Constitutions of the Society,” though printed as early as 1558, had never been published. Everything connected with the rules of the order had been carefully concealed from the public eye. The Monita, therefore, was rapidly bought and everywhere circulated, not only in Poland; but in Germany, Italy, and France. It gratified an intense curiosity, and was generally recognized at once as a faithful portraiture of Jesuitism. Claude Acquaviva, “the ablest and most profound politician of his time,” and “the beau ideal of Jesuitism,” was the general of the order, exercising over it a complete control. The Monita was regarded then, as it has been since by Van Mastricht and many other judicious scholars, as the product of his pen. The book certainly does not misrepresent him. The tactics are his, and may well have derived their inspiration from his wily brain. It does not appear that he ever denied them. He took no steps to prove the publication a forgery. Down to the day of his death (January 31, 1615), nearly three years, the book passed unmolested, though the Jesuits were all-powerful in Poland. The circulation of the Monita finally occasioned the appointment of a commission, July 11, 1615, by Peter Tylick, bishop of Cracow. His confessor was a Jesuit, as was the king's. Tylick admitted that “nothing is  certainly known of its author; but,” he affirmed, “it is reported, and the presumption is, that it was edited by the venerable Jerome Zaorowski, pastor of Gozdziec.” The commission were instructed October 7th to inquire whether “at any time or place Zaorowski had been heard to speak approvingly of such a famous libel, or to affirm that the contents were true, or to say anything of the kind from which it can be gathered that he is the author, or, at least, an accomplice in the writing of this libel.” The papal nuncio, Diotallenius, a few weeks after (November 14), added his sanction to the investigation. Yet the author was not found, and there remained no other step for the Papists than the condemnation of the book to prevent its circulation. It was therefore put on the “Index” May 10, 1616, and a professor of Ingolstadt, the learned Gretser, commissioned to prepare a refutation of the Monita's disclosures. This refutation, entitled Libri Tres Apologetici contra Famosum Libellum, was published August 1, 1617, and a second decree was issued by the “Index” in 1621 to make sure of suppressing the circulation of the Monita.

Notwithstanding these efforts on the part of the Jesuits to disprove the authenticity of the work, their opponents continued to assert it genuine. Thus e.g. in 1633 Caspar Schoppe (Scioppius), a German scholar, himself a Roman Catholic, but a genuine hater of the Jesuits, published his Anatomia Societatis Jesu, in which, among other things, he presents a critique on a book that had come into his hands, which he calls “Instructio Secreta pro Superioribus Societatis Jesu.” His analysis of the book proves it to have been the same, with slight differences, as the Monifa Privata. But his copy could not have been of the 1612 edition, for he attributes the discovery of the work to the plundering of the Jesuit college at Paderborn, in Westphalia, by Christian, duke of Brunswick. That was in February 1622, ten years later. If his copy had been of the Cracow edition, he could not have made so gross a mistake. This, then, was another source, independent of the first, from which the book was derived. It was credibly reported that another copy had been found at the capture of Prague in 1631, only two years before. The Jesuit Lawrence Forer thereupon pointed out the apparent anachronism in his Anatomia Anatomice, but he failed to convince Schoppe, nor could he shake the popular belief. This position now seems reasonable indeed for there is in the British Museum Library a volume printed at Venice in 1596, and containing, at the end of the book, several manuscript leaves on which the whole of the Monita Secreta is inscribed, the writing being evidently of ancient date. The remote date  would rather lead to the conclusion that this work came from some convent, probably Jesuitical, in which the Monita had been introduced for service. The book had now attracted the attention of people everywhere; not only all over the Continent, but even in England the Monita was sought after, and so great was the demand that an edition appeared in England in Oliver's time (1658), On the Continent several editions were sent forth. A French version, entitled Secreta Monita, ou Advis Secrets de la Societe de Jesus, was published in 1661 at Paderborn, under the eaves of the Jesuit college. A second edition of Schoppe's Anatomia appeared in 1668. To aggravate the difficulty, the next year Henry Compton, canon of Christ Church, Oxford, and afterwards bishop successively of Oxford and London, published, in 9 sheets 4to, The Jesuits' Intrigues, with the Private Instructions of that Society to their Emnissaries.

The latter had been “lately found in MS. in a Jesuit's closet after his death, and sent, in a letter, from a gentleman at Paris to his friend in London.” This, too, was the Monita Secreta, entirely independent of the others.

At Strasburg, in 1713, Henri de St. Ignace, under the pseudonym of “Liberius Candidus,” a Flemish divine of the Carmelite order, published his Tuba Magra, addressed to the pope and all potentates, on the “necessity of reforming the Society of Jesus.” In the appendix the Monita Secreta is reproduced in full. In proof of its authenticity, he gives these three reasons: “1. Common fame. 2. The character of the document wholly Jesuitical. 3. Its exact conformity with their practices. Besides, its having been found in the Jesuit colleges.” The Jesuit, Alphonso Huylenbrock, published his “Vindications” of the society in the following year. De Ignace could not be shaken from his belief in the authenticity of the book, and issued a second edition in 1714, in which he says that “nothing, or next to nothing, is contained therein that the Jesuits have not reduced to practice.” A third edition of the Tuba Magna was published in 1717, and a fourth in 1760. In 1717 the Monita was published by John Schipper, at Amsterdam, from a copy purchased at Antwerp, with the significant title of Machiavelli Muus Jesuiticus. This was followed; in 1723, by an edition in Latin and English, published at London by John Walthoe, Jui., and dedicated to Sir Robert Walpole. A second edition was issued in 1749. Another edition in French (probably a reprint of the Paderborn edition of 1661) was issued at Cologne in 1727.  After the suppression of the. order in 1773, several MSS. of the work were found in Jesuitic haunts, particularly in their colleges. A MS. was even found in Rome which was printed in 1782 under the title Monita Secreta Patrum Societatis Jesu, “nunc primum typis expressa.” Evidently its editor had never heard of a published copy of the Monita. It contains numerous errors, such as are very likely to creep into a MS. The New York Union Theological Seminary possesses a copy of this printed edition. The early restoration of the order to power, in 1814, prevented the unearthing of copies direct from Jesuitichands.

II. Defenders of its Authenticity; recent Editors, etc. As far back as the 17th century, after the authenticity of the Monita had been a. matter of dispute for more than a hundred years, we find that astute Lutheran theologian Dr. Johann Gerhard, whose familiarity with polemic divinity was perfectly marvellous, make mention of Schoppe's Anatomia in his great work Confessio Catholica (Frankfort and Leipsic, 1679), and refer to the Monita Secreta as a work of undoubted authenticity. This opinion has been generally quoted and endorsed by ecclesiastical historians, especially of the Protestant Church, with only one exception (Gieseler, Kirchengesch. volume 3, part 2, page 656 sq.). In 1831, after “careful investigation,” an edition was published at Princeton, N.J., by the learned Dr. W.C. Brownlee, under the auspices of the “American Protestant Society,” containing the original, an English translation based upon that of Walthoe (1723), and a “Historical Sketch.” Dr. Hodge, in reviewing the case in the Biblical Repository (4:138), takes occasion to say that the authenticity of the work has never been disproved. “Attempts,” he says, “have been made to cry down this work as a forgery... We cannot imagine that these doubts can be seriously entertained by those who peruse the historical essay which is prefixed to it. Facts and authorities are there adduced which we cannot help thinking ought to satisfy every mind, not only of the authenticity of the work, but also of the entire justice of the representations which it gives of the society whose official instructions it professes to exhibit.” In 1843, shortly after an edition of the Monita had been issued by Seeley, Mr. Edward Dalton, the secretary of the “Protestant Association of Great Britain,” took occasion thus to comment on it in his The Jesuits; their Principles and Acts: “If we weigh well the evidence which has been handed down to us by historians; if we peruse the writings of the Jesuits themselves, and maturely consider the doctrines therein promulgated, and their practical tendency, we can scarcely fail to be convinced of the  authenticity of the Secreta Monita.”

In 1844 an edition was again published in the United States, this time under the auspices of the “American and Foreign Christian Union.” It then became the subject of considerable agitation, several Protestant writers of note taking the ground that the work had not a real basis in Jesuitism, and had been proved spurious. In consequence, the learned professor Henry M. Baird, of the New York University, contributed the following additional testimony: “In proof of the authenticity of the ‘Secret Instructions,' we have the testimony of a gentleman who as a historical investigator has scarcely a peer — certainly no superior. I refer to M. Louis Prosper Gachard, the ‘archivistegeneral' of the kingdom of Belgium, to whose rare sagacity, profound erudition, and indefatigable industry our own distinguished historians, Prescott and Motley, pay such frequent and deserved compliments; the. latter, in the preface to his Dutch Republic, remarking: ‘It is unnecessary to add that all the publications of M. Gachard — particularly the invaluable correspondence of Philip II and of William the Silent, as well as the “Archives et Correspondance” of the Orange Nassau family, edited by the learned and distinguished Groen van Prinsterer — have been my constant guides through the tortuous labyrinth of Spanish and Netherland politics.' In M. Gachard's Analectes Belgiques, a volume from which Mr. Prescott draws much of the material of the first chapter of his Philip the Second, I find a short article devoted to ‘The Secret Instructions of the Jesuits' (page 63). ‘When the Monita Secreta Societatis Jesu were published, a few years since,' says M. Gachard, ‘many persons disputed the authenticity of this book; others boldly maintained that it had been forged, with the design of injuring the society by ascribing to it principles which it did not possess. Here are facts that will dissipate all uncertainty in this respect: At the suppression of the order in the Low Countries in 1773, there were discovered in one of its houses, in the College of Ruremonde (everywhere else they had been carefully destroyed at the first tidings of the bull fulminated by Clement XIV), the most important and most secret-papers, such as the correspondence of the general with the provincial fathers, and the directions of which the latter alone could have had cognizance. Among these papers were the Monita Secreta. A translation of them was made, by order of the government, by the “substitut procureur-general” of Brabant, De Berg. It still exists in the archives of the kingdom, and I can vouch that it differs in nothing substantially (quant au fond) from that which has been rendered public.'”  In 1869 the Reverend Dr. Edwin F. Hatfield ably reviewed the case of the “Secret Instructions” in the New York Observer, and since that time but little has been advanced either pro or con. Prof. Schem, well known for his ecclesiastical learning, and himself educated at the Jesuitical college in Rome, but now a Protestant in theology, in the article JESUITS SEE JESUITS in this Cyclopaedia took ground against the authenticity of the Monita, and, as he is entitled to a hearing, we did not there dissent from his article. Our own judgment, however, is to accept the Moanita as a Jesuitical production, containing the instructions of the order. In the article “Jesuits” in the Encyclop. Britannica, Dr. Isaac Taylor, its author, states that thee Monita is “believed to be a spurious production,” but he by no means anywhere indicates that he himself believed it spurious; on the contrary, it is more than likely that he held it to be genuine.

## Monition[[@Headword:Monition]]

             a term in ecclesiastical law, used now only in the Church of Rome and the Church of England and its dependencies, and the Protestant Episcopal Church. It designates a formal notice from a bishop to one of the. subordinate clergy requiring the amendment of some ecclesiastical offence. The general admonition was anciently made publicly and solemnly, so that it could come to the knowledge of the person in fault, and when it expressed his name it was called “nominal.” Lindewood defines canonical monition as requiring three several proclamations, or one for all, with a proper interval of time allowed. The name of the person should be distinctly mentioned, where law or custom demands it; this is called monition “inspecie,” a general monition being known as “in genere.” A public monition in synod by the bishop is equivalent to three monitions otherwise given. If the offender did not comply after the third monition, he was formally subjected to excommunication; because the term, distinctly named, gave to the monition the character of an introductory sentence, and after its expiration no offer of explanation was admitted. No monition is required when the superior gives sentence of excommunication, or when an inferior does not submit to his superior in the discharge of his special right, as in the office of visitation; or, after he has been visited, when he refuses to pay procurations which are due, as these are cases of positive and manifest contumacy. But if the superior proceeds as judge, and punishes offences, past or present, monition is necessary before the fulmination of the ecclesiastical censure. Although three monitions were held to be fair,  yet one would suffice, provided a suitable delay elapsed between it and the sentence. Any incumbent or curate allowing unauthorized persons to officiate in his church is liable to be called before the bishop in person, and to be publicly or privately, monished.' When a living has been for one year sequestered, the person who holds it, if he neglect the bishop's monition to reside, is deprived; and so also for drunkenness or gross immorality, after monition. Sentence of monition ought not to be given without a previous admonition, unless where the offence is of such a nature as to require' immediate suspension and if in ordinary cases suspension should be given without monition, there may because of appeal. See Lea, Studies in Church History, pages 417, 443.

## Monitoire or Monitory[[@Headword:Monitoire or Monitory]]

             the technical term for ecclesiastical censure, explained under MONITION SEE MONITION , s.v.

## Monk[[@Headword:Monk]]

             (derived from the Latin nonachus, and that from the Greek μοναχός, i.e., solitary, which in its turn is derived from the word μόνος, Lat. solus, designating a person who lives sequestered from the company and conversation of the rest of the world) is a term: applied to those who dedicate themselves wholly to the service of religion, in some building set apart for such ascetics, and known as a monastery (q.v.) or religious house, and who are under tie direction of some particular statute or rule. Those of the female sex who lead such a life are denominated Nuns (q.v.).

Riddle (Christian Antiquities, page 777 sq.) furnishes the following as the chief names by which monks have been designated:

(1) Α᾿σκητής, i.e., ascetic. This name, borrowed from the Greek profane writers, was originally applied to athletes, or prize-fighters in the public games. In early ecclesiastical writers it is usually equivalent to ἐγκρατής, continent; and Tertullian renders both words alike by continens (in a technical sense). Sometimes they use ἀσκητής in the sense of ἄγαμος, cealebs, unmarried.

(2) Μοναχοί, or (more rarely) μονάζοντες, i.e., solitaries, is a term which denotes generally all who addict themselves to a retired or solitary life; and it was usually applied, not merely to such as retired to absolute solitude in  caves and deserts, but also to such as lived apart from the rest of the world in separate' societies. Since the 3d and 4th centuries this name has been almost universally employed as the common designation of religious solitaries, or members of religious societies, and has passed into various languages of Europe. The Syrians translate it byjechidoje (solitarii).

(3) The term ἀναχωρηταί, anachoretae or anachorite,: Engl. anchorite, is used in the rule of Benedict as synonymous with ἐρημῖται, eremitce, hermits. Other writers observe a distinction in conformity with the etymology of the two words, restricting the application of the term anachoretce to those persons who led a solitary life, without retirement to a desert, and of erenitce to those who actually retired to some remote or inhospitable region. The Syrians contracted the word anachoreta into nucherite; they translated eremitae into madberoje.

(4) The term cemnobitae, cenobites, is evidently derived from the Greek κοινὸς βίος (vita communis), and refers at once to the monastic custom of living together in one place, hence called κοινόβιον, cesnobium, and to that of possessing a community of property, and observing common rules of life. The term συνοδῖται, synoditae (Cod. Theodos. lib. 11, tit. 31, 1. 37), has the same signification, being derived froman σύνοδος; so that it may be rendered conventualis. The Syrians express the same by the words -dairoje and oumroje.

(5) In the rule of Benedict we find mention of gyrovagi, certain wandering monks, who are there charged with having occasioned great disorder.

(6) Στυλῖται, stylitee, pillarists, a kind of monk so called from their practice of living on a pillar. Simeon Stylites and a few others made themselves remarkable by this mode of severe life, but it was not generally adopted (Evagr. Hist. Eccl. lib. 1, c. 13; lib. 6, c. 23; Theodor. Lect. lib. 2).

(7) We find also a large number of other classes of monks and ascetics, which are worthy of remark only as furnishing a proof of the high esteem in which a monastic life was held in the early Church.: Such are: i. Σπουδαῖοι (studios!), a sect of ascetics who practiced uncommon austerities (Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. 6, c. 11; Epiphan. Expos. Fid. c. 22). ii. Ε᾿κλεκτοί, or ἐκλεκτῶν ἐκλεκτότεροι, the elect, or elect of the elect (Clem. Alex. Quis Dives Salv. n. 36). iii. Α᾿κοίμητοι, insomnes, the sleepless, or the watchers; a term applied especially to the members of a monastery (στούδιον) near Constantinople (Niceph. Hist. Eccl. lib. 15:c.  23; Baron. Annal. a. 459), iv. Βοσκοί, i.e., the grazers; so called because they professed to subsist on roots and herbs, like cattle (Sozomen, Hist. Eccl. lib. 6, c. 33; Evagr. Hist. Eccl. lib. 1, c. 21). v. ῾Ησυχασταί, quiescentes, or quietistce, quietists, monks who lived by themselves in perpetual silence (Justin. Novell. 5, c. 3; Suicer. Thesaur. Eccl. s.v. ἡσυχαστής). vi. Α᾿ποταξάμενοι, renunciantes, renouncers; so called from their formal renunciation of the world and secular enjoyments (Pallad. Hist. Laus. c. 15). vii. Culdai, Colidei, Keldei, Keiedei, certain ancient monks in Scotland and the Hebrides, supposed to have been so called as cultores Dei, worshippers of God, because they were wholly occupied in preaching the Gospel. Some suppose that they were priests; others regarded them as canons regular; others; again, that they constituted a secret society, and were the forerunners of the modern Freemasons. 8. Apostolici, apostolicals, monks in England and Ireland, before the arrival of the Benedictines, with Augustine, at the latter end of the 6th century.

There were the following orders of monks: 1, those of Basil-Greek monks and Carmelites; 2, those of Augustine, in three classes — canons regular, monks, and hermits; 3, those of Benedict; and, 4, those of St. Francis: all of which names may be consulted in their respective places. Monks are now distinguished by the color of their habits into black, white, gray, etc. The ancient dress was the colobium or lebitus, a linen sleeveless dress; a melotes or pera, a goatskin halit; a cowl, covering the head and shoulders; the maforta, a smaller cowl, cross-shaped over the shoulders; and a black pall. St. Benedict introduced during manual labor the lighter scapular, reaching from the shoulders down the back, and the cowl became a habit of ceremony, and worn in choir. Borrowing the language of the regular and secular canons, the monks at length, when in their common habits they attended choir, called it ordinary service days, “dies in cappis,” in distinction to “dies in allis,” “days in surplices or festivals,” the cope being black like the frock. There are different classes of monks: some are called monks of the choir, others professed monks, and others lay monks; which latter are destined for the service of the convents, and have neither clericate nor literature. Cloistered monks are those who actually reside in the house, in opposition to extra monks, who have benefices depending on the monastery. Monks are also distinguished into reformed, whom the civil and ecclesiastical authority have made masters of ancient convents, and enabled to retrieve the ancient discipline, which had been relaxed; and ancient, who remain in the convent, to livein it according to its establishment at the time  when they made their vows, without obliging themselves to any new reform.

Among the remarkable institutions of Christianity which have prevailed in the Roman Catholic and the Greek Church, there is none that makes a more conspicuous figure than the institution of monachism or monkery; and, if traced to its origin, it will be found strikingly to exemplify the truth of the maxim that, as some of the largest and loftiest trees spring from very small seeds, so the most extensive and wonderful effects sometimes arise from very inconsiderable causes. In times of persecution during the first ages of the Church, while “the heathen raged, and the rulers took counsel together against the Lord, and against his anointed,” many pious Christians, male and female, married and unmarried, justly accounting that no human felicity ought to come in competition with their fidelity to Christ, and diffident of their own ability to persevere in resisting the temptations with which they were incessantly harassed by their persecutors, took the resolution to abandon their professions and worldly prospects, and, while the storm lasted, to retire to unfrequented places far from the haunts of men (the married with or without their wives, as agreed between them), that they might enjoy in quietness their faith and hope, and, exempt from the temptations to apostasy, employ themselves principally in the worship and service of their Maker. The cause was reasonable and the motive praiseworthy, but the reasonableness arose solely from the circumstances. When the latter were changed the former vanished, and the motive could no longer be the same. When there was not the same danger in society, there was not the same occasion to seek security in solitude. .Accordingly, when persecution ceased, and the profession of Christianity was rendered perfectly safe, many returned without blame from their retirement and resumed their stations in society. Some, indeed, familiarized by time to a solitary life, at length preferred, through habit, what they had originally adopted through necessity. SEE ASCETICS; SEE HERMITS.

They did not, however, waste their time in idleness: they supported themselves by their labor, and gave the surplus in charity. But they never thought of flattering themselves by vows or engagements, because by so doing they must have exposed their souls to new temptations and perhaps greater dangers. It was, therefore, a very different thing from that system of monkery which afterwards became so prevalent, though in all probability it constituted the first step towards it.  Egypt, the fruitful parent of superstition, afforded the first. example, strictly speaking, of the monastic life. The first and most noted of the solitaries was Paul, a native of Thebes, who, in the time of Athanasius, distributed his patrimony, deserted his family and house, and took up his residence among the tombs and in a ruined tower. After a long and painful novitiate, he at length advanced three days' journey into the desert, to the eastward of the Nile, where, discovering a lonely spot which possessed the advantages of shade and water, he fixed his last abode. His example and his lessons infected others, whose curiosity pursued him to the desert; and before he quitted life, which was prolonged to the term of one hundred and five years, he beheld a numerous progeny imitating his original. The prolific colonies of monks multiplied with rapid increase on the sands of Lybia, upon the rocks of Thebais, and the cities of the Nile. But there were no bodies or communities of men embracing this life, nor any monasteries built, until Pachomius, who flourished in the peaceable reign of Constantine, caused some to be erected, SEE MONASTERY.

Once the custom established, they soon multiplied, and even to the present day the traveller may explore the ruins of fifty monasteries which were planted to the south of Alexandria by the disciples of Pachomius. Inflamed by this example, a Syrian youth, whose name was Hilarion, fixed his dreary abode on a sandy beach, between the sea and a morass, about seven miles from Gaza. The austere penance in which he persisted for forty-eight years diffused a similar enthusiasm, and innumerable monasteries were soon distributed over all Palestine. Not long after, Eustathius, bishop of Sebastia, brought monks into Armenia, Paphlagonia, and Pontus. While Macarius, the Egyptian, peopled the deserts of Scethis with monks, Gregory, the apostle of Armenia, did the like in that country. But St. Basil is generally considered as the great father and patriarch of the Eastern monks. It was he who reduced the monastic life to a fixed state of uniformity; who united the anchorets and coenobites, and obliged them to engage themselves by solemn vows. It was St. Basil who prescribed rules for the government and direction of the monasteries, to which most of the disciples of Anthony, Pachomius, Macarius, and the other ancient fathers of the deserts submitted; and to this day all the Greeks, Nestorians, Melchites, Georgians, Mingrelians, and Armenians follow the rule of St. Basil. In the West, Athanasius (about A.D. 340) taught the anchorets of Italy to live in societies; and a little later Martin of Tours, “a soldier, a hermit, a bishop, and a saint,” established the monasteries of Gaul, and the progress of monkery is said not to have been less rapid or less universal  than that of Christianity itself. Every province, and at last every city of the empire, was filled with their increasing multitudes. The disciples of Pachomius spread themselves wherever Christianity found a foothold. The Cpuncil of Saragossa, in Spain (A.D. 380), in condemning the practice of clergymen who affected to wear the monastical habits, affords proof that there were monks in that kingdom in the 4th century, before St. Donatus went thither out of Africa, with seventy disciples, and founded the Monastery of Sirbita. Augustine, sent into England by Gregory the Great, in the year 596, to preach the faith, at that time introduced the monastic state into British territory, and it made so great a progress there that, within the space of two hundred years, there were thirty kings and queens who preferred the religious habit to their crowns, and founded stately monasteries, where they ended their days in retirement and solitude. The monastery of Bangor, in Flintshire, a few miles south of Wrexham, contained above two thousand monks, and from thence a numerous colony was dispersed among the barbarians of Ireland, where St. Patrick is regarded as the founder of monasticism; and so readily did the monasteries multiply there that it was called “the Island of Saints.” Iona, also, one of the western isles of Scotland, which was planted by the Irish monks, diffused over all northern regions a ray of science and superstition.

The ancient monks were not, like the modern, distinguished into orders, and denominated from the founders of them ; but they had their names from the places which they inhabited, as the monks of Scethis, Tabennesus, Nitra, Canopus, in Egypt, etc., or else were distinguished by their different ways of living. Of these, the most remarkable were:

1. The anchorets, so called from their retiring from society and living in private cells in the wilderness.

2. The coenobites, so denominated from their living together in common. All monks were originally no more than laymen; nor could they well be otherwise, being confined by their own rules to solitary retreats, where there could be no room for the exercise of the clerical functions. Accordingly, St. Jerome tells us the office of monk is not to teach, but to mourn; and St. Anthony himself is reported to have said that “the wilderness is as natural to a monk as water to a fish, and therefore a monk in a city is quite out of his element, like a fish upon dry land.” Theodosius actually enacted that all who made profession of the monastic life should be obliged by the civil magistrate to betake themselves to the wilderness, as  their proper habitation. Justinian also made laws to the same purpose, forbidding the Eastern monks to appear in cities except to defend Christianity from heretics (as was done e.g. by Anthony to confute Arianism), and to despatch their secular affairs, if they had any, through their apocrisarii or responsales — that is, their proctors or syndics, which every monastic company was allowed for that purpose. The Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451) expressly distinguishes the monks from the clergy, and reckons them with the laymen. Gratian (A.D. 1150) himself, the noted- Benedictine writer, who is most interested for the moderns, owns it to be plain from ecclesiastical history that, to the time of popes Siricins (A.D. 324398) and Zosimus (died 418) the monks were only sinple monks, and not of the clergy. In some cases, however, the clerical and monastic life were capable of being conjoined — as, first, when a monastery happened to be at so great a distance from its proper church that the monks could not ordinarily resort thither for divine service, which was the case with the monasteries in Egypt and other parts of the East; in this case, some one or more of the monks were ordained for the performance of divine offices among them. Then it also happened that some of the clergy, and even bishops themselves, embraced the monastic life by a voluntary renunciation of property, and enjoyed all things in common. This was, however, as late as the middle of the 4th century; until that time it was generally understood that-not only should monks never enter the priesthood, but also that priests should never turn monastics. This appears clearly from the letters of St. Gregory [see below]. Eusebius of Vercillensis (A.D. 315-370) was the first who brought this way of living among the clergy of Hippo, and thus constituted what may be denominated the monastico-clerical condition.

The Church however, in her early days, recognised only one style of monastics, i.e., the coenobites, and for them alone were certain laws and rules of government specially provided. They were in substance that every one should not be allowed to turn monk at pleasure, because there were certain classes so conditioned that they could not enter that state without damaging the interests of others. Thus, e.g., the civil law forbade any of those officers called curiales to become monks, unless they parted with their estates to others, who might serve their country in their stead. For the same reason servants were not admitted into any monastery without their masters' leave. Justinian, however, afterwards abrogated this law by an edict of his own, which first set servants at liberty from their masters under pretence of betaking themselves to a monastic life. The same precautions  were observed in regard to married persons and children; the former were not to embrace the monastic life unless with the mutual consent of both parties. This precaution was afterwards set aside by Justinian, but the Church never approved of this innovation. As to children, the Council of Gangra (about the second half of the 4th century) decreed that if any such, under pretence of religion, forsook their parents, they should be anathematized; but Justinian enervated the force of this law likewise, forbidding parents to hinder their children from embracing the monastic or clerical life. And as children were not to turn monks without the consent of their parents, so neither could parents oblige their children to embrace a monastic life against their own consent — at least not until the fourth Council of Toledo: (A.D. 633), which set aside this precaution, and decreed that whether the devotion of their parents, or their profession, made them monks, both should be equally binding, and there should be no permission to return to secular life again.

The manner of admission to the monastic life was usually by some change of habit or dress, not to signify any religious mystery, but only to express gravity and a contempt of the world. Long hair was always thought an indecency in men, and savoring of secular vanity; and, therefore, they polled every monk at his admission, to distinguish him from seculars; but they never shaved any, for fear they should look too like the priests of Isis. This, therefore, was the ancient tonsure, in opposition to both these extremes. As to their habit and clothing, the rule was the same: they were to be decent and grave, as became their profession. The monks of Tabennesus, in Thebais, seem to have been the only monks, in those early days, who were confined to any particular habit. St. Jerome, who often speaks of the habit of the monks, intimates that it differed from others only in this, that it was a cheaper, coarser, and meaner raiment, expressing their humility and contempt of the world, without any singularity or affectation. That father is very severe against the practice of some who appeared in chains or sackcloth; and Cassian blames others who carried wooden crosses continually about their necks, which was only proper to excite the laughter of the spectators. In short, the Western monks used only a common habit, the philosophic pallium, as many other Christians did. Salvian seems to give an exact description of the habit and tonsure of the monks when, reflecting on the Africans for their treatment of them, he says, “they could scarce ever see a man with short hair, a pale face, and habited in a pallium, without reviling and bestowing some reproachful  language on him.” We read of no solemn vow or profession required at their admission; but they underwent a three years' probation, during which time they were inured to the exercises of the monastic life. If, after that time was expired, they chose to continue the same exercises, they were then admitted without any further ceremony into the community. This was the method prescribed by Pachomius. No direct promise of celibacy was at first made; nay, there appear to have been married monks.. Nor yet was there any vow of poverty, though, when men renounced the world, they generally sold their estates for charitable uses, or keeping them in their own hands, made a distribution regularly of all the proceeds. The Western monks did not always adhere to this rule, as appears from some imperial laws made to restrain their avarice. But the monks of Egypt were generally just to their pretensions, and would accept of no donations but for the use of the poor.

As the monasteries had no standing revenues, all the monks were obliged to exercise themselves in bodily labor to maintain themselves without being burdensome to others. Monks therefore labored with their own hands at a great variety of occupations, and their industry is often commended. “A laboring monk,” said they, “was tempted by one devil, but an idle monk by a legion.” The Church would tolerate no idle mendicants. Sozomen tells us that Serapion presided over a monastery of 10,000 monks, near Arsinoe, in Egypt, who all labored with their own hands, by which means they not only maintained themselves, but had enough to relieve the poor. To their bodily exercises they joined others that were spiritual, viz., penitence, fasting, and prayer — all supposed to be more extraordinary in intensity and frequency than could be practiced in the world. The most important of these was perpetual repentance, whence the expression of Jerome that the life of a monk is the life of a mourner. In allusion to this, the isle of Canopus, near Alexandria, formerly a place of great lewdness, was, upon the translation and settlement there of the monks of Tabennesus, called Insule Metanaeae, the Isle of Repentance. Next in importance they regarded fasting. The Egyptian monks kept every day a fast till three in the afternoon, excepting Saturdays, Sundays, and the fifty days of Pentecost. Some exercised themselves with very great austerities, fasting two, three, four, or five days together; but this practice was not generally approved. They did not think such excessive abstinence of any use, but rather a disservice to religion. Pachomius's rule, which was said to be given him by an angel, permitted every man to eat, drink, and labor according to his bodily strength. Thus  fasting was a discretionary thing, and matter of choice, not compulsion. Their fastings were accompanied with extraordinary and frequent returns of devotion. The monks of Palestine, Mesopotamia, and other parts of the East, had six or seven canonical hours of prayer; besides which they had their constant vigils, or nocturnal meetings. The monks of Egypt met only twice a day for public devotion; but in their private cells, while they were at work, they were always repeating psalms, and other parts of Scripture, and intermixing prayers with their bodily labor. St. Jerome's description of their devotion is very lively: “When they are assembled together,” says that father, “psalms are sung and. Scriptures read; then, prayers being ended, they all sit down, and the father begins a discourse to them, which they hear with the profoundest silence and veneration. His words make a deep impression on them; their eyes overflow with tears. and the speaker's commendation is the weeping of his hearers. Yet no one's grief expresses itself in an indecent strain. But when he comes to speak of the kingdom of heaven, of future happiness, and the glory of the world to come, then one may observe each of them, with a gentle sigh, and eyes lifted up to heaven, say within himself, ‘O that I had the wings of a dove, for then would I flee away and be at rest!' In some places they had the Scriptures read during their meals at table. This custom was first introduced in the monasteries of Cappadocia, to prevent idle discourses and contentions. But in Egypt they had no occasion for this remedy, for they were taught to eat their food in silence. Palladius mentions one instance more of their devotion, which was only occasional; namely, their psalmody at the reception of any brethren, or conducting them with singing of psalms to their habitation.

The laws forbade monks to participate in public affairs, either ecclesiastical or civil; and those who were called to any employment in the Church were obliged to quit their monasteries thereupon. Nor were they permitted to encroach upon the duties or rights and privileges of the secular clergy, unless the clerical and monastic life were united, as when the bishops took monastics for the service of the Church, which did not happen until the monasteries had become schools of learning. Such monastics when removed were by the Greeks styled ἱερομόναχοι, i.e., clergymonks. As the. monks of the ancient Church were under no solemn vow or profession, they were at liberty to betake themselves to a secular life again. Julian himself was once in the monastic habit. The same is observed of Constans, the son of Constantine, who usurped the empire in Britain. The rule of Pachomius, by which the Egyptian monks were governed, has nothing of  any vow at their entrance, nor any punishment for such as deserted their station afterwards. In process of time it was thought proper to inflict some punishment on such as returned to a secular life. The civil law excluded deserters from the privilege of ordination. Justinian added another punishment; which was that if they were possessed of any substance, it should be all forfeited to the monastery which they had deserted. The censures of the Church were likewise inflicted on deserting monks in the 5th century. Thus when a monk deserted and married, he was declared incapable ever after of holy orders. After the establishment of monasteries under the rule of St. Basil, the actions of a monk, his words, and even his thoughts, were determined by an inflexible rule and a capricious superior; the slightest offences were corrected by disgrace or confinement, extraordinary fasts or bloody flagellations; and disobedience, murmur, or delay were ranked in the catalogue of the most heinous sins. Whenever monastics were permitted to step beyond the precincts of the monastery, two jealous companions were the mutual guards and spies of each other's actions; and after their return they were condemned to forget, or at least to suppress, whatever they had seen or heard in the world. Strangers who professed the orthodox faith were hospitably entertained in a separate apartment; but their dangerous conversation was restricted to some chosen elders of approved discretion and fidelity. Except in their presence, the monastic slave might not receive the visits of his friends or kindred; and it was deemed highly meritorious if he afflicted a tender sister or an aged parent by the obstinate refusal of a word or look.

By their special addiction to an ascetic life, indicating superior sanctity and virtue, the monastics secured great favor with the multitude, and speedily acquired for themselves such popularity and influence that the clergy could not but find in them either powerful allies or formidable rivals. When they began to form large and regular establishments, it was needful that some members of their body should be ordained, in order to secure the regular performance of divine worship; and at length, not only was it usual for many members of a monastery to be in holy orders, but it came to be regarded as an advantage for the clergy to possess the additional character of monastics. From the 4th century, in the West, at the request of the people or their abbot, the monks very frequently took orders; and in the East at the instance of the bishops, the archimandrites being sometimes elevated to the episcopate, or acting as bishops' deputies at councils, and their monks ranking after priests and deacons, they frequently went to  study in the cloister. It was not until the 6th century that the coenobites left the desert for the suburbs of cities and towns, but as early as the close of that century they were known as monastics, having come to be distinguished from the populace, and, endowed with much opulence and many honorable privileges, found themselves in a condition to claim an eminent station among the pillars and supporters of the Christian community. The fame of their piety and sanctity was so great that bishops and presbyters were often chosen out of their order; and the passion for erecting edifices and convents, in which the monks and holy virgins might serve God in the most commodious manner, was at that time carried beyond all bounds. “So much was the world infatuated by the sanctimonious appearance of the recluses that men thought they could not more effectually purchase heaven to themselves than by beggaring their offspring, and giving all they had to erect or endow monasteries; that is, to supply with all the luxuries of life those who were bound to live in abstinence, and to enrich those who had solemnly sworn that they would be forever poor, and who professed to consider riches as the greatest impediment in the road to heaven. Large monasteries, both commodious and magnificent, more resembling the palaces of princes than the rude cells which the primitive monks chose for their abode, were erected and endowed. Legacies and bequests from time to time flowed in upon them. Mistaken piety often contributed to the evil, but oftener superstitious profligacy.

Oppression herself commonly judged that to devote her wealth at last, when it could be kept no longer, to a religious house, was full atonement for all the injustice and extortion by which it had been amassed. But what set in a stronger light the pitiable brutishness to which the people were reduced by the reigning superstition, was that men of rank and eminence, who had shown no partiality to anything monastical during their lives, gave express orders, when in the immediate view of death, that their friends should dress them out in monkish vestments, that in these they might die and be buried, thinking that the sanctity of their garb would prove a protection against a condemnatory sentence of the omniscient Judge” (Cramp, Text-book of Popery, page 323). Nevertheless, although many monastics greatly distinguished themselves, and established such a popular interest in monasticism as to cause eminent ecclesiastics to adopt the monastic life, yet it was not the custom to place monks, as such, on an equal footing with the clergy. They, indeed, were not then reckoned as sieculares, but were distinguished by the name of religiosi or regulares (canonici), and they were first regarded as part of the clerical body in the  10th century; but even then a distinction was carefully made between clerici smoculares, i.e., parish priests and all who were charged with the cure of souls, and clerici regulares, i.e., those belonging to monastic orders; and the former vehemently protested against the right of the latter to interfere with their own peculiar duties. In fact, no complete amalgamation of the two bodies ever took place; and all monasteries continued to include a certain number of lay brethren, or conversi, who, without discharging strictly spiritual functions, formed, as in the ancient Church, a middle order between the clergy and the laity. In the 9th century there existed ‘also the nonachi scculares, who were members of religious fraternities, living under a certain rule and presidency, but without submitting to the confinement of a cloister. They were the forerunners of the religious fraternities which arose in France, Italy, and Germany, and greatly multiplied and extended during the 15th and 16th centuries. The' members of these fraternities formed a class between the laity and clergy. However, their licentiousness, even in the 6th century, became a proverb; and they are said to have excited the most dreadful tumults and sedition in various places.

The monastic orders, as we have already indicated, were at first under the immediate jurisdiction of the bishops, but they were exempted from them by the Roman pontiff about the end of the 7th century (Boniface IV); and the monks, in turn, devoted themselves wholly to advancing the interests and to maintaining the dignity of the bishop of Rome. “The partiality of the popes for monastic orders,” says Cramp, “ is easily accounted for. They constitute a peculiar and distinct body, so estranged from society that they can give undivided attention and solicitude to any object that is presented to their notice. That object has uniformly been the aggrandizement of the Church-that is, the See of Rome. Incorporated by pontifical authority, exempted to a degree from episcopal jurisdiction, and endowed with many privileges and favors from which the rest of the faithful are excluded, they are bound in gratitude to make the pope's interest their own. History records that they have ever been ready to come forward in. support of the most glaring enormities of the papal system, and that to their indefatigable diligence and adroit management the triumphant progress of that system was mainly indebted. They formed a sort of local militia, stationed in every country in Europe, always prepared to uphold the cause to which they had attached themselves, by aggression, defence, or imposture, as the case might require” (Text-book of Popery, page 359). The immunity which the  monks thus obtained was a fruitful source of licentiousness and disorder, and largely occasioned the vices with which they were afterwards so justly charged. In the 8th century the monastic discipline was extremely relaxed, and all efforts to restore it were ineffectual. Nevertheless, this kind of institution was in the highest esteem; and nothing could equal, the veneration that was paid about the close of the 9th century to such as devoted themselves to the gloom and indolence of a convent. This veneration caused several kings and emperors to call monks to their courts, and to employ them in civil affairs of the greatest moment. -Their reformation was attempted by Louis the Meek, but the effect was of short duration.

In the 11th century they were exempted by the popes from the authority established; but this caused such laxity that in the Council of Lateran, in 1215, a decree was passed, by the advice of Innocent III, to prevent any new monastic institutions; and several were entirely suppressed in the 15th and 16th centuries, it appears, from the testimony of the best writers, that the monks were generally lazy, illiterate, profligate, and licentious epicures, whose views in life were confined to opulence, idleness, and pleasure. “Whenever a general council was assembled,” says Cramp, “the irregularities or usurpations of the monastic orders commonly occupied a large share of the proceedings. Canon after canon was issued, and still the interposition of ecclesiastical authority was constantly required. An abstract of the decree passed on this subject in the twenty- fifth session of the Council of Trent will place before the reader the then existing condition of that portion of the Roman Catholic Church. It was enacted that care should be taken to procure strict observance of the rules of the respective professions; that no regular should be allowed to possess any private property, but should surrender everything to his superior; that all monasteries, even those of the mendicants (the Capuchins and friars minor Observantines excepted at their own request), should be permitted to hold estates and other wealth; that no monk should be suffered to undertake any office whatever without his superior's consent, nor quit the convent without a written permission; that nunneries should be carefully closed, and egress be absolutely forbidden the nuns, under any pretense whatsoever, without episcopal license, on pain of excommunication- magistrates being enjoined under the same penalty to aid the bishop, if necessary, by employing force, and the latter being urged to their duty by the fear of the judgment of God and the eternal curse; that monastics should confess and receive the eucharist at least once a month; that if any public scandal should arise out of their conduct, they should be judged and  punished by the superior, or, in case of his failure, by the bishop; that no renunciation of property or pecuniary engagement should be valid unless made within two months of taking the vows of religious profession; that immediately after the novitiate, the novices should either be dismissed or take the vow, and that if they were dismissed, nothing should be received from them but a reasonable payment for their board, lodging, and clothing during the novitiate; that no females should take the veil without previous examination by the bishop; that whoever compelled females to enter convents against their will, from avaricious or other motives, or, on the other hand, hindered such as were desirous of the monastic life, should be excommunicated; that if any monk or nun pretended that they had taken the vows under the influence of force or fear, or before the age appointed by law, they should not be heard, except within five years after their profession — if they laid aside the habit of their own accord, they should not be permitted to make the complaint, but be compelled to return to the monastery, and be punished as apostates, being in the mean time deprived of all the privileges of their order. Finally, with regard to the general reformation of the corruptions and abuses which existed in convents, the council lamented the great difficulty of applying any effectual remedy, but hoped that the supreme pontiff would piously and prudently provide for the exigencies of the case as far as the times would bear” (Textbook of Popery, page 359). However, the Reformation had a manifest influence in restraining these excesses, and in rendering monastics more circumspect and cautious in their external conduct. SEE MONASTERY and SEE MONASTICISM; also SEE MONKS, EASTERN.

## Monk, George, Duke of Albemarle[[@Headword:Monk, George, Duke of Albemarle]]

             a noted British general of the days of the Commonwealth, celebrated for the services he rendered, first to the Protectorate and afterwards to the crown, causing the restoration of king Charles, was born in the parish of Merton, Devonshire, December 6, 1608. He devoted himself early to military life, and had acquired some experience in the wars on the Continent when the war broke out (1638) between Charles and the Scotch. Monk enlisted in the English service, and was made lieutenant-colonel. In 1641 he served against the Irish rebels; and in the following year, upon the outbreak of the war between Charles and Parliament, he obtained a full colonelcy. He was very popular with his soldiers, and to the last remained their idol. For a while his loyalty to the king was questioned; but he soon  regained the confidence of the throne, and was suffered to take the field. He rapidly acquired reputation as an able officer; but was made prisoner at Nantwich in January, 1644, l y the Roundheads, and confined in the Tower of London more than a year.

While himself immured, matters outside turned very much against the king, who was finally taken prisoner, thus terminating the civil war. Efforts were now made by Parliament to secure Monk's services. His known ability and favor with the soldiers made him a desirable acquisition. Clarendon insists upon it that Monk was bought by Parliament (7:382); but there is no proof for such an assertion, though his final acts in the scene of Restoration would point that way. In all probability Monk felt the king's cause lost, and was thus persuaded to serve Parliament. The silence which he ever after preserved would confirm such a belief. This seems reasonable also when it is considered that originally Monk must have been in sympathy with the people's cause, for he was suspected by the Royalists. Most likely, too, Monk was influenced by the condition of affairs. He liked to be with the winning side, and, though he had come to be an admirer of the splendor and attraction of court, he would yet fain resign all these rather than serve the minority. He finally in 1647 consented to take a commission in the Parliamentarian army. He first commanded for his new masters in Ireland, where he distinguished himself greatly. He afterwards acted as lieutenant-general under Cromwell in Scotland, where he aided much in gaining the victory of Dunbar. Cromwell finally left him with 6,000 men to complete the subjugation of Scotland, a work which Monk effectually performed. He was next employed as an admiral of the Commonwealth's fleet, and he shared in the perils and the glories of the desperate struggle with the Dutch navy, which Blake so successfully conducted. After being rewarded with many honors at the hand of Cromwell and the Parliament, Monk was sent back to his command in Scotland, where fresh troubles had broken out.

He was at this time in a very embarrassing position, and yet he discharged himself of his task with satisfaction to all. His own soldiers were the most restless and fanatical of the army. Besides, he had to contend with lord Middleton, with whom the Royalists had risen in the Highlands, and the people generally, who were discontented and ready for rebellion. His vigilance, activity, and good sense in this position were remarkable. “The country,” writes Guizot, “submitted; the army did not quit it till it had, by means of a certain number of garrisons, secured the payment of taxes, which the Highlanders had hitherto thought they could refuse with impunity; and order was established in those sanctuaries of plunder with such effect that the owner of a strayed  horse, it is said, recovered it in the country by means of a crier” (page 80). He was also instrumental in bringing about the union which was established under the Protectorate between England and Scotland; and thus likewise strengthened the Cromwellian efforts. Indeed, it is generally conceded that Monk was always attached to Cromwell from the moment he openly espoused' the popular cause, and was never suspected of disloyalty while the Protector lived. This is manifest also from Monk's prompt action when importuned by Charles for his cause. The king sent Monk a letter expressive of confidence, and, instead of reply, Monk turned the letter over to Cromwell.

In 1655 Monk was made one of the commissioners for the government of Scotland, and he largely, if not wholly, controlled the action of the council of state. That in this position also he pleased Cromwell is evident from the way in which he was remembered in the Protector's last hour. Cromwell on his death-bed is said to have recommended him to his son and successor, who as soon as installed likewise received Monk's support. But Richard's failure turned Monk away. Monk soon discovered the weakness of the new ruler, and determined to follow that policy by which he would both connect himself with the strongest party, and also lay that under the greatest possible obligation to him. He temporized for some months; listening to the advances of all sides, and saying little in return. He had, no doubt; made up his mind that the Royalist cause was the strongest, and that Richard was not fitted to give stability to the government; and though when circumstances compelled him to act he declared for the Parliament against the army and decided upon marching to London, there were many, even at the time when he thus declared himself, who altogether discredited his sincerity, and believed him to be at heart a Royalist, seeking to restore the king as soon as it might be done with safety; and there is reason to suppose that he even then was determined to promote the Restoration.

We give Mr. Hallam's opinion on this point: “I incline, upon the whole, to believe that Monk, not accustomed to respect the Rump Parliament, and incapable, both by his temperament and by the course of his life, of any enthusiasm for the name of liberty, had satisfied himself as to the expediency of the king's restoration from the time that the Cromwells had sunk below his power to assist them; though his projects were still subservient to his own security, which he was resolved not to forfeit by any premature declaration or unsuccessful enterprise” (Const. Hist. 2:384). When Monk arrived in London he was lodged in the apartments of the prince of Wales. He addressed the Parliament, was invited to occupy his place there, was made a member of the council of  state, and charged with the executive power.

With his usual address, he continued to use the power of his army as a means of awing Parliament, and the assertion of duty owed to the Parliament as a means of controlling his army. At length in 1660 the “Rump” became so unpopular, and the cries for a free Parliament so loud, that the city of London refused the payment of taxes. Monk obeyed an order from the Parliament to march into the city and subdue it; but his subservience to them did not last long. He sent them a harsh letter, ordering them immediately to fill up the vacant seats, fixing a time for their dissolution, and the 6th of May for the election of a new and free Parliament. The restored members appointed him general of the forces of England, Scotland, and Ireland; and the Republicans, as a last resource, listened to his continued protestations against the king, the House of Lords, and the bishops, and allied themselves to him. Every day his personal power increased; he was. offered the Protectorate, which he declined; continuing the line of conduct he had always followed — “that is to say, steadfast in varying his language according to the individual — he gave no handle to any definite opinions with respect to himself.” The expectation of the Restoration daily increased, and some indications in the conduct of Monk, who was gradually dismissing persons and removing objects that might prove obnoxious to the king, showed plainly that the event was not far distant. Moreover, the Presbyterians were in constant communication with Monk, and this of itself speaks volumes.

They were in favor of Charles's restoration, and in Monk they found a ready helper. He was warmly attached to them, and thus may have been easily persuaded to throw his influence in favor of the exiled king. That he preferred Presbyterianism to the Episcopal Church he had not feared to declare in one of his speeches in Parliament, when, after repeated declarations in favor of a republic, he yet dared to speak for Presbyterianism. Said he, “As to a government in the Church, moderate, not rigid, Presbyterianism appears at present to be the most indifferent and acceptable way to the Church's settlement” (Parl. Hist. 3:1580). At length the farce was brought to a close, and Monk openly declared for the king. It was on the 19th of March when the royal requests for his assistance came, and to royal promises of high reward he yielded, agreed to the king's return, and directed the manner in which he wished it to be brought about. The king, by Monk's advice, went from Brussels to Breda, and on the 1st of May sent letters to the new Parliament drawn up as, Monk desired, and the king was immediately acknowledged and proclaimed. On the 23d of May, Monk received him on the beach at Dover, was embraced by him, and addressed  with great affection. Monk obtained many offices and titles, of which the principal was the duke of Albemarle. As such he changed again to be an Episcopalian, after he had in turn worshipped as Independent and Presbyterian, and by this change forever set at rest all hopes for the disestablishment of the Episcopal Church. The failure of the Independent and Presbyterian cause may thus be truly laid to Monk, and he therefore figures in no inconsiderable way in the ecclesiastical as well as political history of England, and even of Great Britain.

From this time forth but little influence remained to him except as he wielded it through the king. He went to sea again in 1666, against his old enemies the Dutch, and maintained his reputation for courage and conduct. He died in 1670. “Monk,” says one of his biographers, “had strong nerves, strong common- sense, cold heart, an accommodating conscience, a careful tongue, an unchanging countenance, and an imperturbable temper. He showed considerable skill in civil government as well as in military affairs. He had shrewdness enough to see what was best for the nation's interest; and, if it also promoted his own, he had ability and vigor enough to bring it to pass. He was never unsettled by enthusiasm in determining his ends, and he was never checked by principle in choosing his means.” M. Guizot would hardly concede all this. He acknowledges that Monk “ was a man capable of great things,” but confesses that “he had no greatness of soul.” It certainly was not to England's interest to restore Charles, but he only brought him back because he was disappointed in Richard Cromwell, and dared not himself assume the reins of the government. See Clarendon, Hist. Rebellion and Civil Wars of England, 7:373 sq.; Skinner, Life of Monk; Guizot, Memoirs of Monk, ably edited by the late lord Wharncliffe; Maseres's Tracts; Pepys and Evelyn, Memoirs; Stoughton, Eccles. Hist. Church of England (Restoration), 1:44 sq.; Hallam, Const. Hist. pages 393-406; Macaulay, Hist. of England, 1:143-146, 296; Stephen, Hist. of the Church of Scotland, 2:350, 370, 376, 380; State Papers of Charles II (Lond. 1866); Retrospective Review, volumr 13 (1826). (J.H.W.)

## Monk, James Henry, D.D[[@Headword:Monk, James Henry, D.D]]

             an English prelate, was born at Huntingford, Herts, in the early part of 1784. His preparatory education was received at the Charterhouse, and he then entered Trinity College, Cambridge, where he became a fellow in 1805. Two years later he occupied the position of assistant tutor, and in 1808 succeeded Porson as regius professor of Greek. While in this chair he  applied himself faithfully to critical analyses of various Greek texts. He published, in conjunction with C.J. Bloomfield, D.D., The Posthumous Tracts of Richard Porson. During his professorship an exciting dispute arose concerning the occupancy of the chair of botany, and Sir James Edward Smith, president of the Linnaean Society, London; being disappointed :in not securing the position, made bitter use of his pen concerning it. In reply, Monk published A Vindication of the University of Cambridge (1818), which, from the prominence of both parties, caused considerable stir in literary circles (Lond. Quart. 19:434-446). In 1822 he resigned his professorship to accept the deanery of Peterborough, and eight years later was made bishop of Gloucester. During this year (1830) he published a Life of Richard Bentley, D.D. This work not only possesses literary excellence and biographical interest, but also comprises a large portion of the literary annals of the first half of the last century, besides valuable historical facts concerning the University of Cambridge. “The style is generally plain and masculine, and if sometimes negligent, and at others elaborate, its ordinary tone is that of a writer of strong sense and of elegant and scholarlike accomplishment” (Lond. Quart. 46:120). Many minor inaccuracies have been justly and severely criticised (Edinb. Rev. 51:321), but its general merit caused it to receive a hearty welcome by the literati. In 1836 Bristol was added to Gloucester, and he became the bishop of the united dioceses. This office he held until his death at Stapleton, near Bristol, June 6, 1856. See Stubbs, Registrum Socrum Anglicanum (Oxf. 1858, 8vo); Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Hallam, Hist. Lit. 2:275; and the Reviews quoted. (H.W.T.)

## Monkey-god[[@Headword:Monkey-god]]

             is a divinity of the Hindius, very common in the temples of the Deccan. He is said to have been a favorite general of the god Rama. and was named Hanuman, but, being an aboriginal, the Puranas transformed him into a monkey. See Trevor, India, its Natives and Missions, page 82.

## Monks, Eastern[[@Headword:Monks, Eastern]]

             The Oriental Church differs in many respects from the Latin or Western, but in no particular more than in its paucity of monastic orders. In the early ages of the Church, these flourished especially in the East; indeed, that part  of the world, as may be seen in the article MONASTICISM SEE MONASTICISM , was the home of Christian monks. But the downfall of the Roman empire despoiled the Church more or less, and the monastic institution became a part of the Western Church, while in the East it gradually degenerated and declined.

1. Oriental Monks. — The conflict with the Saracens contributed to the weakening of the monastic orders; and though there are remains of ancient monastic institutions in all the provinces of European Turkey and Greece, especially in Bulgaria, Thrace, Macedonia, Thessaly, the Morea, the islands of the Egean, and the sea-borders of Asia Minor, those used as such in our day are comparatively few.

Among the monasteries still existing, the most remarkable are those of Mount Athos, Metcora, Mount Sinai, and of the Princes Islands. The first of these is under the control of both the Oriental and the RussoGreek Church. The latter established a monastery on this mount, occupied by about twenty monks, during the reign of the empress Catharine. See below; compare also the article ATHOS SEE ATHOS.

Two of the existing monasteries, on the west side, were founded by a king of Servia in the 12th century, and are occupied by Bulgarian monks, using the Slavonic tongue. in religious worship. Most of the monasteries, however, were founded and richly endowed by the Greek emperors. There are about one hundred and twenty hermitages; and the number of chapels, oratories, and shrines, in a space not exceeding ten leagues in diameter, is estimated at nine hundred and thirty. The monasteries of Princes Islands were formerly the most flourishing in Turkey, but they are now nearly abandoned by monastics, and have become places of pleasure and recreation in the summer months. “The empty cloisters of one or two,” says a recent visitor “are trodden by a few pale and wretchedly poor monks, some deposed patriarchs and disgraced priors, or other subordinates of theirs, flitting through the sombre porches and. gliding along the deserted churches like the ghosts of the former inmates.” The nearly ruined monasteries of Metcora (seven in all), in Thessaly, are situated in the wildest part of Mount Pindus, many of them perched on the peaks of the mountain and on summits of precipitous rocks, the only access to which is by nets attached to ropes and pulleys, by means of which visitors are drawn up, or by ladders fixed to the rock. There are about sixty monks remaining in the ruins of those now dilapidated monasteries. The famous Greek monastery of Mount Sinai is exceedingly austere. It contains about one hundred monks, under a  superior styled archbishop and head of Mount Sinai. He is chosen by election, but receives investiture from the patriarch of Jerusalem. SEE SINAI.

The rule of the Oriental monks has continued to be that of Pachomius or of Basil. They are divided into two classes — cenobites, or ordinary communities, and anchorets (idiorithmes), who live separately, unless on certain festivals (in recent times) when they eat in common. Each monastery is governed by a prior (hegumenos), whose office is for life, or in his absence (or the non-existence of one) by a provider or steward (epitropos), elected annually by the community. The brethren are divided into ordinary monks (monachi) and consecrated monks (hieromonachi); the latter are the learned portion of the community — but these are few indeed. In 1545, when Belon visited Mount Athos (less than a century after the conquest), he found six thousand caloyers, or monks, in the different monasteries, and of that number, he states, "it would be difficult to find more than two or three in each monastery who can read or write." Recent travellers find no change. Madden says: "This was the state of things in all the monasteries I have visited in the Greek islands, in European Turkey, in Syria, and in Egypt. But among the few —the very small minority of monks who could read and write in the monasteries I visited — there was generally one monk, sometimes two of the brotherhood, who were addicted to study, were acquainted with the ancient Greek, had a knowledge of ecclesiastical history and of the writings of the Greek fathers, and some acquaintance with the principal works or rarest MSS. of their several libraries" (Turkish Empire, 2:83). The time of Oriental monastics is divided between religious duties and manual labor, providing food and other necessaries, tending cattle, and domestic affairs.

Down to the period of the Greek revolution and its termination in the Hellenic kingdom, but especially till 1821, the monasteries were unmolested by the Turks, and consequently the literary treasures remained uninjured, except by the ignorant members of their communities. But the successes of the Greeks in the Morea in 1821 led to irreparable mischief to the monastic libraries of several parts of Greece, and particularly of the, monasteries of Mount Athos, at the hands of the infuriated Turks, and vast numbers of rare books and still more valuable and irreplaceable MSS. were destroyed. It is to be hoped that ere long the treasures still remaining will be in the hands of European scholars, and their contents become the possession of the world of letters.

II. Russian Monks. — Russian monasticism is so unlike that of the other Christian countries in which the institution has gained a footing, that we devote a special section to its orders. In the consideration of this subject we must dismiss from our minds all the Western ideas of beneficence, learning, preaching, etc., such as we attribute to the Benedictines or Franciscans; of statecraft, subtlety, and policy, such as we ascribe to the Jesuits. In the dark forests of Muscovy is carried out the same rigid system, at least in outward form, that was born and nurtured in the burning desert of the Thebaid. There is no variety of monastic orders in Russia. The one name of the Black Clergy is applied to all alike; the one rule of St. Basil (q.v.) governs them all. For convenience' sake they might be divided into two classes-the Hermits and the Monks.

1. The Hermits. — Even at the present day the influence of a hermit in Russia is beyond what it is in any other part of the world, and in earlier times their sanctity had acquired the strongest hold over all who came within their reach. Anthony and Theodosius, in the caves of Kief, were known far and wide for their piety and asceticism, and their dried skeletons still attract pilgrims from the utmost bounds of Kamtchatka. The pillar- hermits never reached the West, but were to be found in the heart of Russia. Fletcher, in his Russian Commonwealth (page 117), describes them thus: “There are certain eremites who use to go stark naked, save a clout about their middle, with their hair hanging long and wildly about their shoulders, and many of them with an iron collar or chain about their necks or middles, even in the very extremity of winter. These they take as prophets and men of great holiness, giving them a liberty to speak what they list without any controlment, though it be of the very highest himself. So that if he reprove any openly, in what sort soever, they answer nothing but that it is 'Po Grecum' (for their sins). The people liketh very well of them, because they are as pasquils [pasquins] to note their great men's faults, that no man else dare speak of... Of this kind there are not many, because it is a very hard and cold profession to go naked in Russia, especially in winter." Of the numerous hermits; we mention Basil of Moscow, "that would take upon him to reprove the old emperor, the terrible Ivan, for all his cruelty and oppression done towards the people. His body they have translated into a sumptuous church near the emperor's house in Moscow, and have canonized him for a saint." That sumptuous church remains a monument of the mad hermit. It is the cathedral immediately outside the Kremlin walls, well termed "the dream of a  diseased imagination." Hundreds of artists were kidnapped from Liibeck to erect it, and of all the buildings in Moscow it makes the deepest impression.

2. Monks and Monasteries. — The Russian monasteries sprang mostly out of the neighborhood of hermitages, like their Egyptian prototypes. Russian monachism was a modification of the Eastern system. In Russia as in the East, the monks lived a solitary life, but in their own cells, which they themselves had built within the immediate surroundings of the monastery. With their own hands they worked for the means of subsistence, devoting the rest of their time to solitary spiritual exercises, and assembling only twice a day for common prayers. This solitary way of living was the original system of Russian monachism, while living together in convents was introduced in the 14th century only. It never was universally adopted, and both modes of living are practiced to this day. The Russian monasteries are controlled either by an archimandrite (q.v.) (i.e., abbot), a hegumen (i.e., prior), or a stroitel (i.e., superior). Convents with stroitels, or superiors, are usually under the care of a larger monastery. At 'first the monks elected their own superiors, but afterwards the bishop or regent nominated them. All monasteries were originally under the control of the bishop in whose diocese they were. This strict superintendence, however, soon became onerous; and already in early times, but especially in the 16th and 17th centuries, we find the more influential convents exempted from episcopal jurisdiction, and under the immediate care of the patriarch of Constantinople or of the Russian metropolitan.' Those monasteries which are exempt from episcopal jurisdiction, and which are nowadays under the superintendence of the Synod of St. Petersburg, are called lauropigia or laura; while those under episcopal jurisdiction are named cenobia, monasteria, or erorieka.

Monachism in Russia has three degrees. The first degree comprises the novitiate. The novice does not take any vow upon himself, but has to live according to the monastic regulations; his dress is a black rharso, or coat with a black cape. After a preparation of three years the novice enters the second degree, and becomes a monk. He takes the solemn vows before the archimandrite, changes his name, and receives the tonsure. Men are not allowed to take these vows until they are thirty years old, while women are not admitted until they have reached their fiftieth year. The third degree comprises the perfect ones. They are dressed in a long black coat, with a wide hood which conceals the face entirely. The peculiarities of this class  consist in very strict spiritual exercises, restraining of all bodily appetites for the purpose of mortifying the sensual nature, and allowing the spirit to be absorbed in the. contemplation of divine things only.

They are not allowed to leave the convent, and must renounce all and every connection with the world. They are very highly esteemed, exempt from episcopal jurisdiction, and stand under the immediate care of the Synod of St. Petersburg. Monks of this third degree are very rare. Different from Western monachism, priests and deacons are found among the Russian monks. Very many enter the monasteries, not for inclination's or piety's sake, but simply to gain clerical influence. and position. For the monks, although their learning is small, are looked up to as of superior education, and the monastery is therefore the only road in Russia to important clerical positions.

The income of the monasteries, which often was enormous, was at first under the care of the archimandrite. His administration, however, was subject to the inspection of the bishop. Ivan IV Vasilivitch was the first . regent who seized the property of the monasteries at Novgorod in 1500. Peter the Great obliged the monasteries to take care of the invalids and poor.. The empress Catharine I deprived the archimandrites of their ancient rights, and put the administration of monastic goods into the hands of a special committee (1725). This committee was subsequently abolished (1742), and the empress Elizabeth transferred the administration of monastic incomes to the holy synod. In 1762 Peter III tried to secularize all convents and monasteries; but the plan was not executed until 1764, when Catharine II secularized all monasteries with their pecuniary income and vassals, and thereby secured to the crown more than 900,000 peasants and enormous riches. The Russian monasteries at present are most of them very poor, and the monks live in apostolical poverty and simplicity. But though this be the rule, there are some remarkable exceptions. The St. Petersburg Gazette, late in 1871, furnished some interesting statistics as to the revenues of the most important monasteries in Russia, from which it is clearly apparent that some of the monasteries of Russia are well provided for in a temporal sense. The Gazette says that the receipts of the priors of the monasteries of the first class (lauras) vary from 40,000 to 60,000 rubles (£5000 to £7500), and of the other priors from 1000 to 10,000 rubles. The income of the monastery of Troilzki-Sergiev, near Moscow, which formerly contained about 100,000 persons, now amounts to 500,000 rubles (£62,500). That of the Kief monastery is even greater, as it derives a  considerable profit from the sale of wax-lights. The Alexander-Nevski monastery at St. Petersburg has a special source of revenue, besides its ordinary one, in the shape of a share of all the corn imported into the capital. How large this revenue is may be inferred from the fact that a short time ago the city wished to compound for it by a yearly payment of a million rubles, and that the monastery declined the offer. Next to the monasteries of the first class, the largest revenue possessed by a monastery in Russia is that of the Iversk chapel in Moscow (a branch of the Perevinsk monastery), whose yearly receipts are calculated on an average at 100,000 rubles. In the ecclesiastical district of Novgorod the wealthiest monastery is that. of Yuriev, whose bare capital alone is said to amount to 740,821 rubles.

The monasteries have really been a great help and advantage to the Russian nation, as all its bishops, artists, and scholars were educated in them. No schools or educational institutions were to be found outside of them until very recently. Their mission in Russian history was peculiar. Not only were they the nurseries of Christianity, transplanting with great struggles and dangers the benevolent doctrines of Christ among the heathen of the steppes and mountains, but, like the convent of Sinai and the convents of Greece, they are the refuges of national life, or "the monuments of victories won for an oppressed population against invaders and conquerors."

3. Russian nunneries existed in a very early period of that Church. The nuns are either virgins or widows. They adopt the rules of St. Basil. They mostly live together in a convent under the control of a hegumena, or prioress, elected by them. Their habit is a long black woollen dress, made after the Oriental fashion a long black tunic or mantle, and a black veil. Formerly monks and nuns sometimes lived together in the same monastery; but as this gave rise to great immorality and disorder, it was strictly prohibited by the council in 1503.

4. Monastery of Troitza. — There is no more celebrated monastery in Russia than this monastery of Troitza (i.e., the Holy Trinity). It was founded A.D. 1338, when during the Tartar dominion the clergy showed themselves the deliverers of their country. About sixty miles from Moscow, in the midst of a wild forest rises the immense pile of the ancient convent. Like the Kremlin, it combines the various institutions of monastery, university, palace, cathedral, and churches, planted within a circuit of walls. Hither from all parts of the empire stream innumerable pilgrims. No  emperor comes to Moscow without paying his devotions there. The office of archimandrite, or abbot, of it is so high that for many years it has never been given to any one but a metropolitan of Moscow; and the actual chief, the hegumen, is one of the highest dignitaries of Russia.

The founder of it was St. Sergius (A.D. 1315-1392), whose career is encircled with a halo of legend. When the heart of the grand-duke Demetrius failed in his advance against the Tartars, it was the remonstrance, the blessing, and the prayers of Sergius that supported him to the field of battle on the Don (1380). No historical picture or sculpture in Russia is more frequent than that which represents the youthful warrior receiving the benediction of the aged hermit.

See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 9:675 sq.; Aschbach, Kirchen-Lexikon, 4:251; Stanley, Eastern Church, page 440 sq.; King, Greek Church in Russia, page 24 sq. ; Mouravieff, History of the Russian Church, trans. by Blackmore (Oxford, 1842); Fletcher, Russian Commonwealth; Curzon, Ancient Monasteries of the East; Eckhart, Modern Russia (Lond. 1870, 8vo), page 210 sq.; Dixon, Free Russia (N.Y. 1870, 12mo), page 29 et al.; Montalembert, Monks of the West, 1:38-133.

## Monlezun, Jean-Justin[[@Headword:Monlezun, Jean-Justin]]

             a Swiss ecclesiastic and historian, was born at Saramon, near Auch, in 1800. He studied at the College of Aire, consecrated his first labors to the instruction of youth destined for the service of the altar, and was subsequently appointed to the parish of Castelnau d'Arbieu, near Lictoure, and in 1833 to that of Barran (canton of Auch). The archbishop of Auch appointed him in 1847 titular canon of his metropolitan see. He died in 1859. Besides numerous articles published in different journals and historical collections, Monlezun wrote, Histoire de la Gascoyne, depuis les temps lesplus reculsjusqua nosjours (Auch, 1846-50, 7 volumes, 8vo); this begins with the 3d century before the Christian nera, and closes at the end of the last century: — L'Eglise angelique, ou Histoire de l'Eglise de Notre-Dame du Puy, et des etablisements religieux qui l'entourent (Clermont, 1854, 18mo): — Notice historique sur la ville de Mirande (1856, 8vo): — Vies des saints Eveques de la metropole d'Auch (1857, 8vo).

## Monmorel, Charles Le Bourg De[[@Headword:Monmorel, Charles Le Bourg De]]

             a French preacher, was born at Pont-Audemar about the middle of the 17th century. In 1697 he became almoner to the duchess of Bourgogne, and was provided with the abbey of Lannoy, in Flanders, by the influence of Madame de Maintenon. He died in 1719, and left a highly esteemed collection of Homelies sur les evangiles des dimanches, sur la passion, sur les mysteres, et sur tous les jours du careme (Paris, 1698, 10 volumes, 12mo). The method he follows is very similar to that of the fathers of the Church, who familiarly explain the Holy Scriptures: he paraphrases all the verses, one after the other, draws from each some moral, and employs a simple and precise style. See Dict portatif des Pradicateurs, s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Monmouth, James, Duke of[[@Headword:Monmouth, James, Duke of]]

             reputed natural son of king Charles II of England, deserves a place here for the part he had in the agitation provoked by the Romish Titus Oates plot, and for his relation to the Scotch Covenanters. He was born at Rotterdam in 1649, and was brought to England by his mother, Lucy Walters, in 1656, during the Commonwealth. They were both imprisoned for a time, but finally James was intrusted to the care of a nobleman, and on the Restoration was handsomely provided for by the court. He had scarcely  completed his sixteenth year when he was married to a woman selected for him at court, and was then created duke of Monmouth. About 1670 he was put forward by lord Shaftesbury as the crown rival of the duke of York (later James II, q.v.), and during the revelations of the Titus Oates plot (1678), when the feeling against Romanists and all who favored them ran high, public opinion was so decidedly in his favor, and so indignant against the duke of York, that the latter was compelled to quit the kingdom; and a bill was brought forward by Parliament for excluding the duke of York from the succession; but Charles suddenly dissolved it, and a document was at the same time issued by the king, solemnly declaring that he had never been married to Lucy Walters. Monmouth himself was sent into Scotland in 1679 to quell the rebellion. He defeated the Covenanters at Bothwell Bridge; but his humanity to the fleeing and wounded was so conspicuous, and his recommendations to pardon the prisoners were so urgent, as to bring upon him the violent censures of the king and of Lauderdale. He thus became the idol of the English Nonconformists. The return of the duke of York and the exile of Monmouth having followed, the latter went to Holland, and allied himself with the leaders of the Nonconformist party, exiled like himself; and when he was allowed to return to London, he was received with such demonstrations of joy that Monmouth felt that he was the people's choice. In 1680 he made a semi- royal progress through the west of England, with the design, probably, of courting the Nonconformists, who were more numerous there than in any other part of the country, except London and Essex. In 1682 he traversed some of the northern counties. The king and his brother were alarmed; and Monmouth was arrested at Stafford, and bound over to keep the peace.

He meanly confessed his participation in the Rye-House plot, accusing himself and others of a design to seize the king's person, and subvert his government. The king pardoned him, on his solemn promise to be a loyal subject' to the duke of York, in case the latter should survive the king. In 1684 Monmouth fled to Antwerp, and remained abroad until the death of the king, when he embarked for England, landed (June 11, 1685) at Lyme- Regis, and issued a manifesto declaring James to be a murderer and usurper, charging him with introducing popery and arbitrary power, and asserting his own legitimacy and right by blood to be king of England. He was received with great acclamations at Taunton, where he was proclaimed as king. At Frome he heard the news of the defeat of Argyle, who, at the head of the Scottish exiles, had attempted to raise an insurrection in Scotland. Money and men were now abundant; but arms were lacking, and  thousands went home for want of them. On July 5 he was persuaded, with only 2500 foot and 600 horse, to attack the king's forces, which, under the command of the earl of Feversham, were encamped at Sedgemoor, near Bridgewater. Monmouth lost ground, and, having himself set a cowardly example of flight, his troops were slaughtered like sheep. About 300 of his followers fell in the battle; but 1000 were massacred in the pursuit. Monmouth was found concealed in a ditch, and was brought to London. He made the most humiliating submissions, and obtained a personal interview with James. "He clung," says Macaulay, "in agonies of supplication round the knees of the stern uncle he had wronged, and tasted a bitterness worse than that of death, the bitterness of knowing that he had humbled himself in vain." Even his prayer for "one day more," that he might "go out of the world as a Christian ought," was brutally refused. On July 15 he was brought to the scaffold, and beheaded on Tower Hill; the executioner performing his office so unskillfully that five blows were struck before the head was severed. See Robert, Life of Duke of Monmouth (1844); the histories of Macaulay, Hume, and Lingard; Stoughton, Eccles. Hist. since the Restoration; Chambers, Cyclop. s.v. and the article JAMES II in this Cyclopaedia.

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

             a noted Swiss literary character, deserves our attention specially on account of his humanitarian struggles in Switzerland. He was born at Berne in 1790, and was educated first at the academy in Lausanne, and then at Paris, where he enjoyed the friendship of the truly great, though himself a youth. In 1817 he returned to Lausanne, to become professor of French literature, and quickly rose to distinction for his great erudition, and the enthusiasm with which he approached his subject. He had taken orders, expecting to enter the service of the Church, but, turned aside by this appointment, he now devoted his leisure hours to the study of ecclesiastical and civil law. That Monnard largely profited by the knowledge thus acquired was manifest shortly after, when the obnoxious law passed, May 30, 1824, depriving men of the free exercise of the dictates of their conscience, intended, of course, mainly to stay the inroads which new Protestant doctrines were making in Switzerland, particularly those of the Momiers (q.v.). Monnard came forward as a defender of religious liberty, and declared the law unconstitutional. He enjoyed at this time the intimate association of the learned Swiss divine, Alexandre Rodolphe Viniet (q.v.), and brought out for this friend the treatises De la liberte des cultes (1826),  and Observations sur les sectaires (1829). This action resulted in Monnard's suspension from his professorship and removal to Geneva, where, however, he soon found as warm friends as he had left at Lausanne, both among the learned and those seeking knowledge. Political changes finally permitted his return to Canton Vaud, and he was publicly honored, and called to fill several civic offices. After the revolution of 1845, Monnard retired altogether from political life. It was supposed by his friends that he would now enter the Church; but he, having found that much ill-feeling still existed against him among the clergy for the position he had taken in behalf of the Momiers, finally resolved to quit Switzerland, and accepted a chair in the University of Bonn, which he held until his death, January 12, 1865. See Journal de Geneve, January 13, 1865; Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung, February 1865. (J.H.W.)

## Monniotte, Jean-Francois[[@Headword:Monniotte, Jean-Francois]]

             a French Benedictine monk, was born at Besanlon in 1723. He early entered the Congregation of St. Maur, and subsequently taught philosophy and mathematics in the abbey of St. Germain-des-Pres, at Paris. After the suppression of his order, he withdrew to the village of Tigery, near Corbeil, where he died, April 29, 1797. He was the editor of the Institutiones Philosophime of Francois Rivard (Paris, 1778 and 1780, 4 volumes, 12mo). It is an erroneous opinion which Courbier and other bibliographers have entertained that Monniotte should be considered the author of L 'Art du Facteur d'Oguues, published, under the name of Bedos de Celles, in the Description des Arts et Aetiers (1769, fol.). See Feller, Dict. Biog. s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Monod, Adolphe[[@Headword:Monod, Adolphe]]

             one of the distinguished divines of this century, was born at Copenhagen January 21, 1802. He belongs to a family to which France is indebted for an uncommonly large number of celebrated clergymen. His father, Jean Monod, who was a native of Switzerland, born about 1760, was at the time pastor of a French Protestant church; but in 1808, having received a call from a church at Paris, he removed thither with his family, and there enjoyed much distinction. He was president of the Reformed Consistory until 1834, and died in 1836. Adolphe was educated at the College Bonaparte at Paris, and after the completion of his studies there he pursued a course in theology in the University of Geneva, where he remained until  1824. In 1825 he made a journey to Italy, during which he felt drawn nearer to God, and decided to preach the Gospel to the little Protestant- congregation of Naples. There he remained until 1827. On his return he was appointed pastor of Lyons; here, however, his earnest Christian exhortations proved distasteful to a worldly congregation, and his removal was asked for and granted. Strengthened and encouraged by the spirit of the Lord, he now continued to preach, and to teach.

The Church of the state was locked for him. His congregation met in a private room, which was, however, soon exchanged for a spacious chapel, where numerous people were fed with the bread of eternal life. Thirty years have passed since, and at present the Evangelical Church of Lyons is a great association, with four pastors, many evangelists, and eight chapels. The government either touched by the religious activity of Monod, or wishing to make good the wrong it had done to him appointed him professor of theology at Montauban, where he remained eleven years. During this time he held prayer-meetings every Sunday, and in the vacations travelled in Southern France to preach and to instruct. Wherever he appeared, multitudes of people followed him, attracted by the spiritual power of his orations. In 1847 the Consistory of Paris appointed him minister of the Reformed Church there, the government confirming the selection and he accepting. He labored there with remarkable success for seven years. The churches where he preached, especially the large Oratoire, were filled every Sunday by pious people. In the smaller room of the Oratoire he gave Bible- lessons every Sunday; and a great many of his hearers, surprised by his beautiful, practical remarks on the Word of God, by his great knowledge of the Scriptures, and by his spiritual experience, preferred the Bible-lessons to his greater sermons. In 1856 he was suddenly stricken down by disease; but, with his Christian resignation, he acknowledged in sickness also the voice of God to his servant — “Lo, I come quickly." The physicians pronounced his disease incurable; Monod quietly heard the announcement, and prepared himself for departure to his Master. His faith grew stronger daily; not only a full resignation to the will of God, but a great joy filled his soul even in his greatest pain. Every Sunday, in the afternoon, his friends gathered around his bed. One of them read the Scriptures, preached, and prayed; after this he himself began to speak to them, teaching them, and bearing testimony to the Word of God. Never were his words so impressive as just before his death, occurring April 6, 1856, which was Sunday, while in all the churches of Paris prayers were ascending to the  throne of God for his recovery, the Protestant Church of France fairly trembling under the great loss that was befalling it.

Adolphe Monod was possessed of more than ordinary intelligence, a kind, sympathizing heart, and a lofty imagination. He had allied to these a great taste for the beautiful, and a mind aspiring after Christian perfection in wisdom. His knowledge of the German, English, and Italian languages supplied him with the treasures of the literatures of those nations, which he esteemed very much. Concerning his theological knowledge, his earlier studies might have been imperfect; but this imperfection was afterwards fully repaired, especially in the eleven years of his professorship. The Bible, which he daily read in the original languages, was the fountain from which he drew most of his theological knowledge. His Christian character was the foundation of his activity and his oratorical power. Of many a celebrated man it is said, "He was a perfect man;" all those who knew Monod say, "He was a perfect Christian." Since the moment when his heart was touched by Jesus, his whole life belonged to him. He saw and felt what he believed, and so he preached to others. Gifted with so many talents for the Christian ministry, he proved a perfect model as a preacher of the Gospel. One principle characterizes all his speeches — that is, to save immortal souls from destruction. His noble appearance, kind looks, classic style, combined with the purest pronunciation — his high seriousness, which impressed every hearer that his own heart was deeply touched by the feelings which he wished to awaken in them — his humility in confessing his own doubts and struggles, for the purpose of seeking together with his hearers the way of salvation and true happiness — all these qualities were combined for the one purpose, to gain souls for his Lord Jesus Christ.

The literary works of Adolphe Monod are few, being mainly sermons. In 1830 he published three of them; which bear evidence of his great talents. In the first of these sermons he speaks with a divine power about the relation of error and sin and that of virtue and truth. In his second and third sermons he treats of the wretchedness of sin and the great mercy of God. In 1844 he published a volume of sermons, the first of which (La credulite de l'incredule), covering 68 pages, is considered the most excellent apologetic of modern days. Before, as after his death, many other sermons of his were published; two of these about the duties of Christian women (Lafemme), and five about the apostle Paul, are especially celebrated. In these Monod answers the question, often heard, "Why has the preaching of the Gospel so little success in our century in comparison with the time of  the apostles?" thus: "The Word of God is as living and powerful now as then, but our sinful example in life is the cause of the little success of our preaching. The life of the ancient Christians was the world-conquering power of their witness. Restore that life in the Church of Christ, and she will be able to perform wonders as of old." The apostle Paul was to him witness of this truth, which he unfolded in five sermons, entitled Thee Work of Paul, His Christianity or his Tears, His Conversion, His Weakness, and his Example for us. In the days of his sickness Monod gathered all his writings. Three volumes of sermons were published after his death, namely, two volumes containing those preached at Lyons and at Montauban, and a third volume containing the sermons preached at Paris. See Christian Qu. October 1873, page 565; New-Englander, July 1873, page 594; Herzog, Real--Encylopadie. s.v.; Hase, Ch. Hist. page 609; Vapereau, Diet. des Contemporains, s.v. (J.H.W.)

## Monod, Frederic, D.D[[@Headword:Monod, Frederic, D.D]]

             brother of the above, and, like him, celebrated for his great attainments as a divine, was born at Monnaz, Canton de Vaud, Switzerland, May 17, 1794. He entered the ministry in 1820, and was a pastor of the Reformed Church in Paris until 1849. In 1824 he began the publication of the Archives du Christianisme, a leading organ of the evangelical portion of French Protestantism, and he remained its editor while he lived. At the time of the French Revolution, in 1848, Frederic Monod was the leader of a movement which resulted in the establishment of the union of free evangelical churches. The original intention of the movement was to restore the synodical constitution of the Reformed State Church, and to readopt a rule of faith which would exclude the Rationalists. When this attempt failed, Monod, count de Gasparin, and some of their friends, left the state Church (1849) and organized independent congregations, which soon after formed the "Union of Evangelical Free Churches." SEE FRANCE.

Monod was constantly reelected president of the different synods, and always remained one of the leading spirits of this new denomination, which, although small in comparison with the two Protestant state churches (the Lutheran and the Reformed), contains some of the best and most influential men of French Protestantism as count de Gasparin, E. de Pressense, and pastor Fisch, who attended the last general session of the Evangelical Alliance held in New York City in 1873. The hope of bringing over the majority of the French Protestants to the evangelical free churches was not realized but the existence, spirituality, and prosperity of the Free Church greatly  strengthened the evangelical party in the state Church, which has since steadily gained in influence, and appears to be at present in undisputed ascendency. (Comp. Zeitschrift fur historische Theologie [1851], No. III.) Monod, like all the members of the free evangelical churches, was an ardent admirer of American institutions. He, with his friends, pointed to the separation of Church and State as it exists here, and to the great amount of civil liberty which Americans are enjoying, as model institutions which the people of Europe, and especially of France, would do well to follow as much as lies in their power. The favorable opinion which he had always held of the United States was greatly strengthened by a journey he made through this country about 1855. After the outbreak of the American rebellion, he showed himself one of the warmest European friends of the Northern cause. He took a prominent part in all the demonstrations which the Protestant clergy made in favor of the Union, and in which they manifested a greater unanimity than the Protestant clergy of any other country in the world. Monod was himself one of the originators of the address — signed by the great majority of Protestant French ministers, and objected to by not a single one — in which Protestant France, through her clergy, recorded her opinion that "the triumph of the rebellion would throw back for a century the progress of Christian civilization and of humanity, would cause angels in heaven to weep, and would rejoice daemons in. hell; would throughout the world probably raise the hopes of the favorers of slavery and the slave-trade, quite ready to come forth at the first signal, in Asia, in Africa, and even in our refined cities of Europe; would give a sad blow to the work of evangelical missions; and what a terrible responsibility ,would it impose upon the Church which should remain mute while witnessing the accomplishment of this triumph." The address is noted for the change of opinion it wrought, not only in France, but also in England. Frederic Monod died December 30, 1863, mourned not only by his own country, but by the Protestant world, which recognised in him a zealous champion of the evangelical cause the world over. He was so busy with his pen for all humanity that he found but little time for extensive composition. Most of his writings are embodied in the Archives which he edited. He published, besides, a few pamphlets and several of his sermons. See Archives du Christianisme, January 1864; and Dr. M'Clintock in the N.Y. Methodist, January 30, 1864. (J.H.W.)

## Monod, Horace[[@Headword:Monod, Horace]]

             an eminent French Protestant minister, the youngest son of Jean (q.v.), was born in Paris, January 20, 1814. , He studied at Lausanne and Strasburg; and in 1838 was deacon at Marseilles. In 1842 he was appointed member of consistory, and died July 13, 1881. For forty years he preached in the same church with great success. He published eight volumes of Sermons and a French translation of Hodge's Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

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

             SEE MONOD, ADOLPHE.

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

             a learned Savoyard Jesuit, was born at Bonneville in 1586. He entered the Order of Jesuits in 1603, taught belles-lettres and philosophy in different colleges of his order, and finally became principal of that of Turin. Appointed confessor to the duchess Christine, sister of Louis XIII of France, he exercised much influence over that princess, and shared largely in the direction of political affairs. In 1636 he was sent to Paris to reclaim the honors of royalty for the house of Savoy, but he was unable to obtain an interview with Richelieu. Irritated by having his demands eluded, he allied himself with the enemies of the ministry, especially with Caussin, confessor to Louis XIII, with the object of overthrowing the cardinal. Richelieu, partly divining these intrigues, sent Monod back to Turin, when the latter endeavored to withdraw Christine from the French alliance. Then the cardinal attempted to remove him from the service of the duchess; but Monod knew how to preserve his authority over her. In 1640 he was arrested by the order of Richelieu, imprisoned first at Pignerol, and subsequently at Cundo, but found means of escaping; and was finally retaken and transferred to Miolan's, where, in spite of the interposition of the pope, he remained until his death, March 31, 1644. He is the author of Recherches historiques sur les alliances de France et de Savoie (Lyons, 1621, 4to): — Amedeus pacificus, seu de Eugenii IV et Amedei Sabaudiae ducis, in sua obedientia Felicis V nuncupati, controversiis (Turin, 1624, 4to; Paris, 1626, 8vo); reproduced in the seventeenth volume of the Annales of Baronius: — Apologie pour la Maison de Savoie contre les scandaleuses invectives de la Premiere et Seconde Savoysienne (Chambery, 1631, 4to); followed by a Second Apologie, which, translated into Italian by the author, appeared at Turin (1632, 4to): — Trattato del titolo regio dovuto alla casa di Savoya, con un ristretto delle revoluzioni del Reame di Cipri e ragioni della casa di Savoya sopra di esso (Turin, 1633, fol.) this work, published at the same time in Latin, was the cause of a quarrel between Savoy and Venice; it was attacked with violence by Graswinckel: — Il Capricorno ossia l'Oroscopo d'Augusto Cesare (Turin, 1633, 8vo); fictitious: — Extirpation de l'Heresie, ou Declaration des motifs que le Roi de France a d'abandonner la protection de Geneve; the second part remains unedited, as well as the following works, preserved in MS. in the university library of Turin: — Annales ecclesiastici et civiles Sabaudiae; Vita B. Margaritae Sabaudiae, marchionissae Montisferrati;  etc. See Rosetti, Scriptores Pedemontii, page 470; Richelieu, Memoirs, volume 10; Le Vassor, Hist. de Louis XIII; Botta, Storia d' Italia.

## Monogamy[[@Headword:Monogamy]]

             SEE MARRIAGE.

## Monogram[[@Headword:Monogram]]

             (Greek μόνος, single, and γράμμα letter), a character composed of two or more letters of the alphabet, often interlaced with other lines, and used as a cipher or abbreviation of a name, is found to be of frequent occurrence in the annals of early ecclesiastical history, and seems to have been introduced into the early Church from the heathen nations.

I. The use of monograms began at a very early date. They are found on Greek coins, medals, and seals, and are particularly numerous on the coins of Macedonia and Sicily. Both on coins and in MSS. it was the practice to represent the names of states and cities by monograms, of which above 500 are known, but some have not been deciphered. Monograms occur on the family coins of Rome, but not on the coins of the earlier Roman emperors. Constantine placed on his coins one of the earliest of Christian monograms, which is to be traced in the recesses of the catacombs, composed of the first and second letters of ΧΡιστός (Christus), a monogram which also appeared on the Labarum, and was continued on the coins of the succeeding emperors of the East down to Alexander Comnenus and Theodore Lascaris. We often find it combined with the first and last letters of the Greek alphabet (Rev 1:8). Another well-known monogram is that of the name of Jesus, IHS, from the first three letters of Ι᾿ΗΣοῦς. (See below, Monogram of Christ.) Popes, emperors, and kings, during the Middle Ages, were in the practice of using a monogram, frequently replacing by it their signatures. Painters and printers used it; and, unintentionally on the part of its authors, the monogram has frequently served in modern times to determine the age of a MS.; and even of early printed works. See Home, Introduction to Bibliography, volume 2; Brulliot, Dict. des Monogrammes (Munich, 1832-34). SEE ICONOGRAPHY; SEE ILLUMINATION, ART OF.

II. Monogram of Christ. — The sign used to represent the name of Christ. This name is usually given to the combination of the first two letters forming his name in Greek; but there is also a monogram of the name of Jesus, which is of great antiquity, and of both names together. We will examine them successively.

(1) For the name of Christ. The monogram used in the primitive Church is communicated to us by the ancient ecclesiastical writers, and also by the numerous Christian monuments of that period which are still extant. We find it generally formed by one of the two combinations of the letters XP, the P being set inside of the X, which latter is either an erect X or reversed, giving the forms K and P. The first is the form described by Eusebius (Vita Constant. 1:31) and Paulinus of Nola (Poem. 19, de Felic. Nat. 11:5. Orig. Opp. ed. Muret. page 481); the other is described by Lactantius (De mort. persecut. c. 44), for we can hardly make out his expression concerning the transversa X, the point of which is bent, to signify anything else than the +, the upright part of which is made into a P. These two forms give rise to two others, by merely turning the P the other way, thus, m and C. There are also instances of other less usual combinations. For a description of all the various forms, see, besides the special works on the monograms of Christ, Mamachi, Orig. et antiq. Christ. 53, 62 sq.; Miinter, Sinnbilder, part 5, page 3437; Didron, Iconogr. Chret. page 401 sq.; Letronne, Exalm. archeol. de deux quest. sur la croix ansee Egypt. (Meni. de l'Acad. des Inscript. volume 16, part 2, page 284); Twining, Symbols and Emblems, part 1, 3, 4. If we now inquire. into the further significance of these two forms of the monogram, in order to see whether it contain some further meaning of importance, we must first consider whether it is indeed always a distinctive mark of Christian monuments. Here we find that the form is exclusively used by Christians, and is the sign of the name of Christ. Yet it must be observed that it closely resembles the Egyptian hooped cross, da, the symbol of life, which is often represented in the hand of the Egyptian deities, and then, in consequence of little irregularities on both sides, the two monograms happen sometimes to be exactly alike; even the Egyptian Christians sometimes used the Egyptian sign for that of the cross (see Letronne,. Exam. archeol. in Meoires de l'Acad. des Inscript. 16:285 sq.). The other form, i, a combination of XP, is essentially of heathen origin. We find it on Greek money greatly anterior to Christ, namely, on the Attic tetradrachma (Eckhel, Doctr. num. 2:210), as also on the coins of Ptolemeeus, a specimen of which, with the head of Zeus Ammon on the  one side, and on the other an eagle holding the monogram ; in his claws, is to be seen in the collection of coins at Berlin (No. 428). It is also found in an inscription on a monument erected to Isis, in Egypt, in the year B.C. 137-8 (see Bockh, Corp. Inscr. Gr. n. 4713, b). At the same time such heathen monuments are very scarce; and where the sign is found on tombs, it may generally be taken for granted that it is there as the Christian emblem. In after-times the signification of this sign was altered, especially among the Greek writers, where we seldom find i used to designate Christ. It most generally stands for Χρυσόστομος, and in the construction Πολὺ Πολυχρόνιος; it is also used as an abbreviation for χρύσεον (see Montfaucon, Paleogr. Gr. page 344). On the other hand, in the Greek calendar, since the 11th century, f πάσχα is used for Χριστιανῶν πάσχα, in opposition to νομικὸν πάσχα (see Piper, Karl's des Grossen Kalendarium u. Ostertafel, page 130 sq.). It has long been a much controverted point to know whether this monogram were introduced only by the emperor Constantine, or whether it were in use anterior to his reign. It seems, however, pretty much established that the monuments which have been referred to in order to prove its greater antiquity are either spurious or doubtful (see Mamachi, Orig. et antiq. Christ. c. 1, page 54, n. 3); and the oldest monument of ascertained date which bears it is a grave-stone at Rome of the year 331, where the monogram i stands between branches of palm, and preceded by the words IN SIGNO, which recall the apparition of Constantine (Piper, Ueber den Christlichen Bilderkreis, pages 4, 65, with a plate, fig. 1).

Yet another inscription, lately discovered in the catacombs of Melos, and containing the monogram, is considered as belonging to the 2d century (see Ross, Inscript. Gr. ined. fasc. 3, n. 246, b, page 8). It is further probable that, since in the early part of the 2d century the first two letters of the name of Jesus were already used in that manner, as we shall see hereafter, the same was already done also with the name of Christ; and also that, from the moment Constantine wished to adopt a general sign. he would more likely have adopted one previously in use than invented a new one. After Constantine it became very numerous in private monuments, and especially on the graves, and that in most Christian countries. In Germany we find many such inscriptions, with either the i or the f, at Treves (Hersch, Centralmuseum, part 3, Nos. 56, 61; Le Blant, Inscrip. Chrit. de la Gaule, volume 1, No. 230, 244), and at Cologne (Hersch, page 1, No. 95, 96; Le Blant, volume 1, No. 355, 359). They are also found on things deposited in the graves, as, for instance, on lamps and glass vessels, and, finally, on things used in daily life, as on stones, rings,  etc. (D'Agincourt, Scult. pl. 9, fig. 1, 24). Under Constantine the Great the monogram came to be used on public monuments. He caused it to be inscribed on the Labarum (q.v.), doubtless in the form i (Eusebius, Vit. Constant. 1:28, speaks only of the cross; but the cross seen by Constantine was this very monogram), as also on his helmet, and on the shields of his soldiers. His vision is recalled in the Labarum by the monogram in the hand of the emperor, who is crowned by victory, and by the legend HOC SIGNO VICTOR ERIS on the coins of his son Constantius, and of the contemporary Vetranius (350) and Gallus (351-354). Of his own reign there is a celebrated coin with the monogram of the Labarum, placed on and piercing a snake, with the legend APES PUBLICA (Eckhel, Doctr. numm. 8, page 88). Coins show it also on the helmet of Constantine, and on the shield of the emperor Majorianus (457-461).

In the coins of the Eastern Roman empire, the monogram in its two principal forms is quite common until the time of Justinian I, with an interruption during the reign of the emperor Julian. Under Justinian (t 565) the sign of the cross took the place of the monogram. Soon after Constantine, in the second half of the 4th century, we find it placed on buildings. The oldest monogram of that kind of which theadate is known is an inscription of the year 377 at Sitten, in Switzerland, probably by the praetor of that place, and relating his restoration by the prsetor Pontius (Mornmiesse, Inscript. Ielvet. Lat. pl. 3, No. 10; Le Blant, Inscript. Chret. pages 496, pl. 38, No. 231; Gelpke, Kirchengesch. d. Schweiz. part 1, page 86 sq.). It was especially used in Church architecture. The oldest, from the time of Constantine, is to be found in the mosaic of S. Connstantia at Rome, where it is on a roll in the hand of Christ. In the Middle Ages it was especially placed on the top of the pulpit, as in the churches of S. Francesca Romana and of S. Maria Maggiore at Rome, both built in the 13th century. In the Lateran it is placed in the gable end, according to the orders given by Clement XII in 1735. This monogram, in funereal inscriptions, where it occurs at the beginning, in the middle, and at the end, may be considered in general as confessing Christ. It is sometimes used in connection with other words, but generally alone, as in an inscription at Vienna Faustina "in i" (Mai, Sanct. vet. nov. coll. 5:432, 433); one in the museum of the Vatican, on Gentianus, ends with the words "quia scimus te in" (Marini. Hist. Allan. page 37). In the images on the graves it is especially used to designate the person of Christ, particularly where there are any representations of him. Thus a lamb standing on a mountain, as represented in Rev 14:1, pictured: on a coffin in the Vatican grottoes, bears on its head the a  (Bottari, Scult. epitt, sacre, volume 1, tav. 21). It is also used with the bodily representations of Christ, either simply over his head, or in the nimbus around him, or one on each side of his head, as in a lately discovered painting in the cemetery of Praetextatus (Perret, Les Cataconmbes de Rome, t. 1, H.L.). There is a gem of heathen origin representing the heads of Jupiter, Apollo, and Diana, with the inscription Vivas in deo f(eliciter), in which the head of Jupiter is surmounted by the sign i:. 'This was probably added to it in after-times by a Christian owner, either to give it a sort of Christian consecration, or, more probably, to transform the head of Jupiter into a likeness of Christ (Piper, Mythol. u. Symb. d. christl Kunst. 1, 1, pages 115-117). Sometimes the monogram also appears alone in carvings, and is then intended to represent the person of Christ; for instance, on glass vessels, where it is placed between two persons, to signify that Christ is with them. An especially interesting instance of that kind recurs on several coffins, where a cross is represented, with those who watched at the grave at the foot of it, and on the cross the monogram j, in a wreath, borne by a soaring eagle. While the lower part is indicative of the crucifixion and burial, the crowned monogram held aloof is the emblem of the crucifixion and ascension. A drawing and explanation of it are to be found in the Evang. Kalender for 1857, page 37, 45 sq. Finally, we find also the monogram used with a symbolical meaning. On a grave-stone of the year 355 the i is placed by the side of the figure of a person who, with the outstretched right hand, takes hold of the name (Aringhi, Roma subterran. lib. 2, c. 23, t. 2, page 570).

(2) For the name of Jesus Christ we have, first, in Greek, the monogram IC XC. This is the usual abbreviation of the two names found in the oldest MSS. of the N.T., as in the Codex Alexandrinus of the 5th and the Claroonzontanus of the 6th century, and which is retained in the Minuskel MSS. It appears also on monuments, namely, in the inscription I X, found in the catacombs of Naples, in a niche, at the place of an old well (Pellicia, De eccles. Christ. polit. 2:414, ed. Bonn; Bellermann, Ueber d. iltesten christlichen Begrabnissstdtten, page 81), and is still used in the Greek Church, namely, on the bottom of the vases used for communion (Goar, Eucholog. page 99). In sculptures and carvings, we find this monogram accompanying the figure of Christ; as in the Byzantine coin, first under J. Zimisces (969-975), whence it remained in use until the downfall of the Greek empire. There is yet extant a fine gold medal of the last emperor, Constantine XIV Palaeologus, on the reverse of which is the figure of  Christ standing, with the inscription IC XC (a specimen of it is to be seen in the imperial collection of coins at Vienna) (see Eckhel, Doctr. numum. 8:273). It is also found on ancient Greek monuments, and on the ancient doors of the church of St. Paul at Rome of the year 1070. Byzantine paintings in which it is represented are to be found in the royal gallery of Berlin (Nos. 1044,1048).

The introduction of this monogram into the Latin Church is especially remarkable. The ancient church of St. Peter at Rome contained mosaics of the time of Innocent III, which represented Christ enthroned between the apostles Peter and Paul, with the inscription IC XC (see the Evang. Kalender for 1851, page 50). The same is found in the still extant mosaic of Philip Dusuti of 1300, in the church of S. Maria Maggiore at Rome (Valentini, Basil. Liber. pl. 103). There are also numerous easel pictures of Italian origin of the 14th and 15th centuries, which contain the likeness of Christ, together with this monogram, as, for instance, the crucifixion of Taddeo Gaddi, of 1334, in the royal gallery at Berlin, No. 1080, and an apparition of Christ to Magdalena after his resurrection, by Donatus Bizamanus, in the Christian Museum at the Vatican (D'Agincourt, Peint. pl. 92). Secondly, we have in Latin the monogram IHS XPS. The Latin Church has also a special abbreviation of both names, which we find in the oldest Latin MS. copies of the Bible; for instance, in the Greek and Latil Codex Claromontanus. It is occasionally preserved in the Minuskel MSS., as in the Sacramentarium of Gellone at Paris, in the 8th century, where the Gospel of Matthew begins with the words "Liber generationis ihu xpi" (facsimile in Silvestre, Paleogr. t. 3). This mode of writing gave rise to numerous researches in the French Church in the 9th century. Amalarius, from Metz, author of the book De Offciis Ecclesiasticis, asks, in a letter to Jeremiah, archbishop of Sens, in the year 827, to know why the name of Jesus is written with an aspirate, an H, and expresses the opinion that, according to the Greek, it should be written with IH, and C or S (D'Achery, Spicileg. 3:330); to which the other answers that it is not an aspirate, but a Greek H. He asked also bishop Jonas whether it were more correct to write IIC or IHS, and was answered that the latter form was preferable, the first two letters being taken from the Greek and the last from the Latin, as had been done with the name Christ, XPS. The formula IhS XPS (and IhS XIS) REX REGNANTIVM occurs on Byzantine coins, according to the example of Justinian II, from Basilius Macedo (De Saulcy, Essai de classificat. des suites monet. Byzantine, pl. 19, 1), down to Romanus IV Diogenes (1068-1071); and it is only there that the other monogram, IC XC, remained in use. In the West, we find the monogram  IHS XPS in use at a very early period, both in inscriptions, carvings, and paintings, as, for instance, miniatures in the Carolinian MSS., and in pictures of the Middle Ages.

(3) For the name of Jesus alone, we find in Greek the monogram IH. It is the first form of which we have any knowledge, and occurs as early as in the Epistle of Barnabas (q.v.), e.g., where the number 318 of the men circumcised by Abraham (resulting from a comparison between Gen 17:23; Gen 14:14) is found to be a sign of the name of Jesus and of the cross, for 318 is written with Greek letters, ιητ῎. This meaning was generally received, as also by the Latin Church (Coteler). This abbreviation, however. occurs but seldom on the more ancient monuments. In the West, the monogram IHS (q.v.) obtained great popularity in the Middle Ages through the preaching of Bernard of Sienna, who in divers cities, and especially at Viterbo, in 1427, was in the habit of exhibiting a tablet on which that monogram was painted in golden letters, surrounded by a halo of golden rays, and to which he directed their devotions. He was accused of innovation indeed, but succeeded in satisfying pope Martin V (Wadding, Annal. minor. T.V. a. 1427, page 183 sq.). This monogram, to which the cross is sometimes added, remained in use in small Latin letters, and sometimes in Gothic. Thus, in the picture of the adoration of the three kings, by Raphael, in the royal gallery at Berlin, we find at the upper edge of a golden sun, written in golden letters, which, however, must not be understood, as some have made it out, to signify in hoc signo. The Jesuits also appropriated that monogram to their use. On the election of the first general of the order, in 1541, which resulted in the elevation of Ignatius, the latter had headed his vote with the name IHS, and the sign his was engraved on his seal, the same with which the election of the generals since Jacob Laynez has always been sealed (Acta Sanct. d. 31, mens. Jul. t. 7, page 532 a). See. besides the authorities already referred to, Herzog, Real- Encyklopddie, 9:738 sq.; Minter, Sinnbilder u. Kunstvorstellungen d. alten Christen (Altona, 1825); Piper, Mythologie u. Symbolik d. christl. Kunst, volume 1 (1847) and 2 (1851); Withrow, Catacombs of Rome (N.Y. 1874) page 264 sq. SEE CHRIST, MONOGRAM OF.

## Monoimos[[@Headword:Monoimos]]

             an Arabian heretic of the 2d century, who appears to have been a follower of Basilides. He is mentioned by Theodoret; but the particulars of his system, which was formed of strange geometrical and arithmetical  speculations respecting the origin of the world, are given only by Hippolytus. The substance of these is that primal man is the universe; that the universe is the originating cause of all things, he himself being unbegotten, incorruptible, and eternal; that a son of the primal man was generated independently of time; that the Son of man is a monad represented by the iota and the tittle — that is, the Greek figure 10 (t); that all things have emanated from the substance of this monad; that cubes, octahedrons, pyramids, and all such figures, out of which crystallize fire, water, and earth, have arisen from numbers which are comprehended in the number 10. In a letter from Monoimos to Theophrastus, which is quoted by Hippolytus, the former avows that he believed in no God separate from man's own self. See Hippolytus, Refut. Haer. 8:5-8; 10:13; Theodoret, Hazer.-fab. 1:18; Taylor. Hippolytus, page 106.

## Monoism[[@Headword:Monoism]]

             SEE MONADOLOGY.

## Monomania[[@Headword:Monomania]]

             (μόνος, single, and , μανία, madness) has loosely been made to represent every form of partial insanity, but has been more rigidly defined as that mental condition in which a single faculty, or class of faculties or associations, become diseased, the mind generally remaining healthy. Slight and solitary aberrations — such as where a savage antipathy to cats coexists with a love for human kind; where there appears to be an incontrollable tendency to steal, to squander, to drink, to destroy — are of common occurrence, and are supposed to be compatible with the exercise of intelligence, and with the discharge of many of the ordinary duties of life. By a more strict limitation, the term has been confined to such affections as involve the emotions and propensities alone. It is, however, held that, notwithstanding its apparent integrity, the whole mind is involved or influenced by the presence of such morbid conditions, at least while they are predominant. It is undoubtedly difficult to point out in. what manner the belief, e.g., that a particular organ has been transmuted into glass can interfere with or render the memory, or the power of instituting comparisons, defective and untrustworthy; yet it is legitimate to receive with caution every manifestation of powers so constituted that they fail to detect the incongruities and absurdities with which they are associated, or, having detected the real character of these errors, are unable or unwilling to cast them out or to disregard them. There is much countenance given to this theory by facts which indicate that even trivial forms of mental obliquity are connected with an unsound organization, and that particular and rarely recognised monomanias are invariably associated with the same  structural alteration. The unhealthy elevation of the sentiment of cautiousness, for example, especially where it amounts to fear of death, panic, or panphobia, is a symptom of disease of the heart and large blood- vessels, while the monomania of ambition (or optimism, as it has been styled) is the concomitant of the general paralysis of the insane. It will be obvious, from the definitions previously introduced, that the species or varieties of monomania must correspond to the faculties or phases of the human mind, and to their combinations. Several great divisions, however, have been signalized, both on account of their frequency and of their influence upon the individual and upon society.

1. Monomania of suspicion, comprehending doubts in the fidelity and honesty of friends and those around, belief in plots and conspiracies, the dread of poison; and where, as is often the case, it is conjoined with cunning, the propensity to conceal, mystify, and deceive. This malady has frequently been observed in intimate connection with cancer and malignant growths.

2. Monomania of superstition and unseen agencies, where credulity, mingled with religious awe, peoples the external world with spectres, omens, mysteries, magnetism, and the imagination with horrors or ecstatic reveries. Insensibility to pain, or indifference to external injuries, has been observed as a characteristic of individuals affected with this disease.

3. Monomania of vanity, or euphoria, where display and ostentation are indulged, without reference to the position and means of the patient.

4. Monomania of fear.

5. Monomania of pride and ambition.

6. Kleptomania (q.v.).

7. Dipsomania, or Oinomania (q.v.). If it can. be proved that such morbid tendencies as have been here mentioned, and others still less prominent, are merely salient points of a great breadth and depth of mental disease, the plea of insanity may justifiably be employed more frequently in the consideration of criminal acts. — Chambers, s.v. Dr. Forbes Winslow, in The Pill Mall Gazette, holds that what is called partial insanity, or monomania, is not sufficient to prove of itself a testamentary incapacity. "I have often," he says, "witnessed among the insane the possession of delicate, just, and honorable ideas respecting their own social position, and  the pecuniary claims of those most near and dear to them." He approves the action of ecclesiastical judges in former times, who, when a will was brought before them to be contested, inquired, first, if there were prima facie evidence in the wording, arrangement, etc., of the will that its author was insane; and, next, whether the testator's lunacy were visible in the distribution of his property. If neither of these points was established, the will generally stood against unquestionable evidence of mental unsoundness or eccentricity in other things. He quotes a case where the testator left a large fortune to his housekeeper, and directed in the same will that his executors should make fiddle-strings of part of his bowels and smelling-salts of others, and that the rest of his body be vitrified into lenses for optical purposes. He did this, he said, to mark his moral aversion to funeral pomp. It appeared that he had conducted his affairs with great shrewdness and ability. See Esquirol, La Monomanie; Bayle, Maladies du Cerveau; Stephens, Criminal Law of England, page 92.

## Monophysites[[@Headword:Monophysites]]

             (Greek, Μονοφυσῖται, from μόνος,, single, and φύσις, nature) is the name of a Christian sect which took form under that name in the year 451, when the Eutychian heresy was condemned by the orthodox Eastern Church in the Council of Chalcedon. But though the name of the Monophysites first occurs in the acts of the Council of Chalcedon' Monophysitism must be regarded as of much older date, and is to be traced to Eutychianism (q.v.), from which it sprang, though by no means identical with it. Eutyches not only attributed but one nature to Christ after his incarnation, but held that Christ's body, being the body of God, was not identical with the human body. The Monophysites, in distinction, held that the two natures were so united that, although the "one Christ" was partly human and partly divine, his two natures became by their union only one nature (Μόνηφύσις). This modification of the Eutychian doctrine was taught by Dioscorus, the successor of St. Cyril as patriarch of Alexandria. He presided at the Council of Ephesus (A.D. 449), which considered the opinion of Eutyches, and from the murderous violence shown by his Egyptian partisans was called "Latrocinium," or "Robber Synod." Under the influence of Dioscorus, who wished to gain a victory over the patriarchs of Antioch and Constantinople, the chief opponents of Eutyches, the assembled bishops were persuaded to give their decision in favor of Eutyches, the key-note to that decision being struck by the passionate exclamation of Dioscorus: "Will you endure that two natures should be  spoken of after the incarnation" (Mansi, Concil. 6:583). "Partly thus terrified, partly ignorant, partly, perhaps, persuaded," says Neale, "the assembled fathers set their hands to the acquittal of Eutyches, and thus the Monophysite heresy was born in the Church" (Patriarchate of Alexandria, 1:295). The decision so given was not, however, accepted by the patriarchs of Antioch and of Constantinople, nor by the bishop of Rome, and another council was called by the new emperor Marcian in the following year, which assembled first at Nicsea, but eventually at Chalcedon, whence its name.

This council condemned the doctrine of the Eutychians and Monophysites, and it was stated "that Christ was really divine and really human; in his divinity co-eternal, and in all points similar to the Father; in his humanity, son of the Virgin Mary, born like all others, and like unto us men in all things except sin; that after his incarnation his person contained two natures unmixed (ἀσυγκύτως) and unaltered (ἀτρέπτως), yet at the same time completely (ἀδιαιρέτως) and intimately (ἀκωρίσως) united." The adherents of the Alexandrian school saw themselves overpowered and withdrew from the council, and thus "started those violent and complicated Monophysite controversies which convulsed the Oriental Church, from patriarchs and emperors down to monks and peasants, for more than a hundred years, and which have left their mark even to our day." Dioscorus himself was deposed from the patriarchate, and a certain Proterius placed in his stead. The people, however, sympathized with the persecuted, and the Monophysites increased very rapidly. They spread especially in Palestine, mainly through the agency of the monk Theodosius, who was instrumental in the expulsion of the patriarch Juvenal from Jerusalem, and got himself appointed in his place. The conflict between the two parties was only quelled by force of arms. Egypt, and in particular Alexandria, proved, however, the greatest strongholds of Monophysite views, and constant troubles were there the result. The patriarch Proterius was frequently annoyed by his opponents, and public quarrels were a common occurrence.

Finally, in the heat of passion, a few Monophysite partisans attacked the house of Proterius, and, driving him from it, followed him to the church, and there stabbed him to death, and disposed of his body in a most cruel manner. In Proterius's place was put a Monophysite, the presbyter Timotheus Elurus, and henceforth there ruled in Alexandria an unbroken succession of Monophysite patriarchs. Under Elurus's rule all who accepted the decisions of the Council of Chalcedon were excommunicated, especially pope Leo. But complaint being made against Elurus to the emperor, he was banished to Gangra in 460. In many respects  the rule of Elurus was a profitable one to the Church, and had fanatics only stood aside the best results would have been assured. He was conciliatory in his nature, as may be seen from his acts. He evidently intended to draw his flock back into the orthodox fold. Thus Dioscorus had followed Eutyches in denying Christ's human nature to be of the same kind as that of ordinary men; but when Timothy was on a visit to Constantinople, and Eutychian monks desired to join his communion, he took the opportunity of disclaiming this part of their belief, and declared the conviction of himself and his followers to be that the Saviour became consubstantial with men according to his human nature, as he had ever been consubstantial with the Father according to his divine nature. In this particular the Monophysite followers of Timothy, who were hence called "Timotheans," as the opposite party were called "Dioscorians," returned to the creed of St. Cyril, which his deacon and successor Dioscorus had forsaken.

Another patriarchate which the Monophysites appropriated was that of Antioch. Peter the Fuller (γναφεύς), an adherent of Eutyches, who had been driven out of two convents of Constantinople, having gone to Antioch with Zeno, a relation of the emperor, connected himself there with the remaining Apollinarists, and opposed the orthodox bishop Martyrius; the latter fled to ask help of the emperor, and in the mean time Fuller was appointed patriarch. He condemned the Council of Chalcedon, excommunicated all who held that God was not crucified, and introduced into the liturgy the formula θεὸς ὁ σταυρωθεὶς δἰ ἡμᾶς, which became subsequently the shibboleth of the Monophysites. He was finally deposed and exiled by the emperor.

The usurper Basiliscus, who succeeded Zeno on the throne in 476, protected Monophysitism, declaring it the religion of the state, and condemning the Council of Chalcedon and the epistle of Leo in an ἐγκύκλιον. But Acacius, bishop of Constantinople, having in the mean time organized a dyophysite counter-revolution, and gradually gaining strength, the orthodox succession was revived after the death of Alurus (477), when Zeno, who had recovered the throne, appointed Timothy Salophakiolus as patriarch of Alexandria. At the death of the latter, who had ruled for twelve years, the Catholic party nominated John Talaia, and the Monophysites Peter Mongus, as his successor: the latter succeeded through the influence of the emperor. In 482 Zeno issued his Henotikon for the purpose of uniting the two parties: it aimed at satisfying both parties, but it did not please either. The stricter Monophysites of Egypt, who  insisted on an unvarnished rejection of the Council of Chalcedon, separated from the others to form a Monophysite society of their own, which received the name of Α᾿κέφαλοι. SEE ACEPHALT.

The dyophysites also split into two parties, one of which accepted the Henotikon, while the other rejected it. At the head of the latter party stood Felix II of Rome, who excommunicated Acacius (484); thus this attempt at conciliation resulted only in making four parties instead of two, and in creating a schism between the Latin and the Greek churches which lasted thirty-five years (484-519). Zeno's successor, Anastasius, adhered strictly to the Henotikon, and even inclined somewhat to Monophysitism. In 513 Severus; one of the principal men among the Acephali, became patriarch of Antioch. His attempt to introduce the formula θεὸς σταυρωθεὶς δἰ ἡμᾶς in the churches of Constantinople created fresh troubles; the patriarch Macedonius, who opposed the innovation, was deposed, and the disorders which followed were hard to repress, But in consequence of the revolt of the general Vitalianus (514), the orthodox party were finally restored to the possession of their rights, and in 519 the unity with Rome was fully established. The partisans of the Henotikon were taken off the church lists, and all the Monophysite bishops deposed. Most of these withdrew to Egypt. Here they were soon divided among themselves. Julian, formerly bishop of Halicarnassus, affirmed that the body of our Lord was rendered incorruptible in consequence of the divine nature being blended with it. SEE APHTHARTODOCETE.

Others maintained that it was corruptible. SEE AGNOETE and SEE PHTHARTODOCETAE.

The leader of the last named was Severus, the deposed patriarch of Antioch, who maintained the corruptibility of Christ's human nature, or its identity with that of ordinary pain — suffering, weak, and mortal manhood. This theology eventually became that of the Monophysites at large, hence he deserves special attention in this connection. With him Monophysitism receded another step from Eutychianism; and although it was still maintained that Christ, after his incarnation, was of one nature only, the doctrine came to be held in such a way as not to be extremely divergent from the Church. For "in the theology of Severus, the qualities of human nature were all retained in Christ after the incarnation, although the nature was in him so amalgamated with the divine Being that it could not be said to possess any being or identity of its own. Thus the Monophysite conception of Christ's person settled into that of a Theandric, or composite nature, analogous to that composite action of his person which later divines have called a Theandric operation (θεανδρικὴ ἐνέργεια). Yet belief in such a  composite nature is inconsistent with the Nicene Creed, which asserts that Jesus Christ is 'of one substance with the Father,' and since the Father is not of such a composite nature, to declare the Son to be so is to declare him to be of a different substance from him." Thus the intellectual form which Severus gave to Monophysitism cannot escape from the charge of heresy any more than that earlier form of opinion which was condemned at Chalcedon. The instability of opinion, when disassociated from the safeguard of the Nicene Creed, was also strikingly illustrated in the case of this later monophysite school as it had been in the earlier. Severus himself "held views respecting the soul of the united natures of Christ which were not logically consistent with the theology respecting their oneness, and thus it was only one step forward for Themistius, his deacon, to invent the tenet of the Agnoetae, that the human soul of Christ was like ours in everything, even in the want of omniscience or ignorance." When, again, Severus maintained that the divine and the human wills in the united natures were also so united that there could be no volition of the one nature one way and of the other nature in the other direction, he was preparing the way for that development of his opinion which was made by the Monothelites (q.v.), who maintained that "there was only one will in Christ, as well as only one nature." After the death of Severus, his followers divided — the men of wealth and the clergy choosing as successor to Timothy a certain Theodosius, and the monks and lower classes choosing Gaianus, the leader of the Aphthiartodocetce, whose party took the name of the Gaianites SEE GAIANITE; the latter, viewing the body of Christ as created (κτιστόν), were also called Ktistolatrce (comp. Dorner, 2:159 sq.; and Ebrard, Kirchen- u. Dogmengesch. 1:268 sq.). This division, and the energy of the emperor Justinian in supporting the orthodox cause, finally led to a revival of the orthodox patriarchate in the person of Paul (A.D. 539), and for a hundred years there were two lines in the patriarchate — one monophysite, the other orthodox. Many other sects arose also, such as the Tritheists, the Philoponists, the Conists, the Damianists. Indeed, the 6th century was an age of as great turbulence in the Church on account of monophysitism as any that preceded. Justinian was even moved to call a council, which, convening at Constantinople in A.D. 553, constituted the fifth ecumenical council, the result of whose deliberations was a partial victory for the Alexandrian monophysite doctrine, so far as it could be reconciled with the definitions of Chalcedon.

But, notwithstanding the concessions of the fifth cecumenical council, the Monophysites remained separated from the orthodox Church, refusing to acknowledge in any manner the dyophysite  Council of Chalcedon. Another effort of Justinian to gain them, by sanctioning the Aphthartodocetic doctrine of the incorruptibleness of Christ's body (564), threatened to involve the Church in fresh troubles; but his death soon afterwards, in 565, put an end to these fruitless and despotic plans of union. His successor, Justin II, in 565 issued an edict of toleration, which exhorted all Christians to glorify the Lord, without contending about persons and syllables. Since that time the history of the Monophysites has been distinct from that of the Catholic Church. A numerous body of Monophysites of Alexandria seceded from the communion of the patriarch of that city appointed by the emperor, and chose another spiritual chief; and thus they continue to the present day, under the name of Copts. The Ethiopian or Abyssinian Church was always in connection with them. The Christians in Armenia and Georgia, among whom also monophysitism had early gained acceptance, openly declared themselves in favor of this doctrine; and thus the Armenian and Georgian churches continue at this time, separated from the other monophysite churches merely by peculiar customs. In Syria and Mesopotamia the Monophysites had nearly become extinct, in consequence of persecution and the want of ministers, when Jacob Baradaeus, an obscure monk, was the instrument of reviving them: after him the Syrian Monophysites are called Jacobites (q.v.). An attempt to reconcile the Monophysites with the orthodox party in the 7th century led to a modified form of the doctrine, and a new sect, the Monothelites, who attempted to compromise between the two factions by the hypothesis that after the union of the divine and human natures in Christ, though there continued to be two distinct natures, yet there was but one will. The only effect of this was to increase the controversy. SEE MONOTHELITES.

Monophysitism still continued to be held in some parts of the East, and even by the Maronites (q.v.) until their final reconciliation with the' Church of Rome in 1182, when it was renounced by them. The doctrine that Jesus Christ possesses only one simple nature, being not truly man, but the divine Spirit in a human body, has recently been revived by Henry Ward Beecher in his Life of Christ, and is also maintained by the Swedenborgians. SEE NEW JERUSALEM CHURCH.

The union of the divine and human natures in Christ is maintained by Dr. Hovey (God With Us). See the Acta, in Mansi, volume 7-9; Mai, Scriptorum veterum nova collectio e Vaticanis codicibus edita (volume 7); Gieseler, Commentat. qua Monophysitarum veterum varice de Christi persona opiniones inprimis ex ipsorum effatis recens editis, illustrantur (1835-1838); Assemani, De Monophys. (in Bibl. Or. volume 2); Le Quien, Oriens Christianus in IV patriarchatus digestus  (Par. 1740); Renaudot, Hist. Patriarcharum Alex. Jacobitarum (Par. 1743); Makrizii, Hist. Coptorum Christ., Arab. et Lat. ed. Wetzer (Solisbaci, 1828); Walch, Ketzerhistorie, vol. 6:7, 8); Baur, Tritatslehre, 2:37-96; Dorner, Lehre v. d. Person Christi (2d ed.). volume 2, part 1; Hefele, Conciliengeschichte, 2:545 sq.; Gfrorer, Allg. Kirchengesch. vol. 2, part 2; Schrockh, Kirchengesch. 18:433-636; Neander, Ch. Hist. 2:524 sq.; and his Dogma, 1:337; Ebrard, Handbuch der Kirchen- u. Dogmengesch. 1:263 sq.; Schaff, Ch. Hist. 3:143-145; Neale, Hist. East. Church (patriarchate of Alexandria), 1:278 sq.; 2:3 sq.; Stanley, Lect. East. Ch. page 92 sq.; Hagenbach, Hist. Doctrines, 1:277 sq.; Milman, Hist. Latin Christianity, page 312 sq.; Princeton Review, 38:567 sq.; Princeton Repository, (January 1867), art. 3. Compare also Cureton's edition of the Eccles. Hist. of John, Bishop of Ephesus (Oxf. 1853), part 3. SEE CHRISTOLOGY; SEE INCARNATION.

## Monotheism[[@Headword:Monotheism]]

             (from μόνος, one, and θεός, God) is the belief in and worship of one only God, in opposition to polytheism, which acknowledges a plurality of gods. All the different mythologies have, among the host of gods with which they people heaven and earth, some, superior or supreme deity, more or less defined, but in every case distinguished above the others; and in the history of all the different nations where polytheism has obtained we may trace a period when the idea of one God was more or less prevalent. The most ancient traditions concur with the testimony of sacred Scripture in representing this as the primary and uncorrupted religion of mankind. M. Renan, in his Histoire Generale et Systeme compare des Langues Semitiques (Par. 1858, 2d ed.), and Nouvelles Considerations sur le caractere general des Peuples Semitiques et en particulier sur leur tendance au Monotheisme (Par. 1859), takes the ground that the Shemitic nations of the world are the propagators of the doctrine of the unity of God — indeed, that "of all the races of mankind, the Shemitic race alone was endowed with the instinct of monotheism... a religious instinct analogous to the instinct which led each race to the formation of its own language" (page 73). Max Miller, however, takes exception to this position, and insists upon it that the primitive intuition of God was in itself neither monotheistic nor polytheistic, but consisted solely in that simplest article of faith — that God is God. "This must have been the faith of the ancestors of mankind previously to any division of race or confusion of tongues... It is too often forgotten by those who believe that a polytheistic worship was  the most natural unfolding of religious life, that polytheism must everywhere have been preceded by a more or less conscious theism. In no language does the plural exist before the singular. No human mind could have conceived the idea of gods without having previously conceived the idea of a god... There are, however, in reality two kinds of oneness which, when we enter into metaphysical discussions, must be carefully distinguished, and which for practical purposes are well kept separate by the definite and indefinite articles... If an expression had been given to that primitive intuition of the Deity, which is the mainspring of all later religion, it would have been, 'There is a God,' but not yet 'There is but one God.' The latter form of faith, the belief in one God, is properly called monotheism, whereas the term henotheism would best express the faith in a single God" (Chips, 1:348-50). This kind of monotheism, according to Miller, "forms the birthright of every human being... In some form or other, the feeling of dependence on a higher power breaks through in all the religions of the world, and explains to us the meaning of St. Paul, ‘that God, though in times past he suffered all nations to walk in their own ways, nevertheless left not himself without witness, in that he did good, and gave us rain from heaven and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness.' This primitive intuition of God, and this ineradicable feeling of dependence on God, could only have been the result of a primitive revelation, in the truest sense of that word" (pages 346-8, see also pages 363, 374; comp. Gould, Origin of Religious Belief, 1:267277). In this respect Judaism, Christianity, and Mohammedanism agree.

"Two facts," says Gould, "arrest our attention... the prevalence of monotheism, and the tendency of civilization towards it. Monotheism is at present the creed of a large section of the human race. The Christian, the Jew, and the Mohammedan hold the unity of the great cause with varying distinctness, according to their powers of abstraction" (Origin of Religious Belief, 1:238). But in regard to the Trinity they seriously differ, the Mohammedan and the Jew rejecting with vehemence the least approach to a trinitarian conception of the Deity. "The monotheism of the Mohammedan," says J.F. Clarke, "is that which makes of God pure will; that is, which exaggerates personality (since personality is in will), making the divine One an infinite Free Will or an infinite I. But will divorced from reason and love is wilfulness, or a purely arbitrary will. The monotheism of the Jews differed from this in that it combined with the idea of will the idea of justice. God not only does what he chooses, but he chooses to do only  what is right. Righteousness is an attribute of God, with which the Jewish books are saturated. Both of these systems leave God outside of the world; above all as its Creator and Ruler, above all as its Judge; but not through all and in all. The idea of an infinite love must be added and made supreme, in order to give us a Being who is not only above all, but also through all and in all. This is the Christian monotheism... Mohammed teaches a God above us; Moses teaches a God above us, and yet with us; Jesus teaches God above us, God with us, and God in us" (Ten Great Religions, pages 481-83). See Jahrb. deutsch. Theol. (1860), 4:669; Brit. Quar. Rev. (April 1873), art. 2; Lond. Quar. Rev. volume 127. SEE UNITY OF GOD.

Gould holds to a gradual development of monotheism. Recognising a Jewish, Mohammedan, and Christian monotheism. he traces first the development of the Jewish, which, under Moses, received "its final and complete form as a system, and embraced four leading doctrines:

(1) the absolute being of God;

(2) the absolute unity of his being;

(3) the difference in kind of matter from God;

(4) the subjection of matter to God"

(1:262; comp. SEE MOSAISM ). The Mohammedan's monotheism he recognises as "the offspring of Jewish monotheism." Yet has the pure deism proved inferior to the Jewish, for "as a working system it annihilates morality. Before the almighty power of God the creature is nothing. Man, ox, ass, are on a level; and if the notion be humbling to him, he may recover a little self-respect when he remembers that the archangels are in no better plight. Between man and God is a profound and wide abyss, and no bridge spans it. Too far above man to sympathize in any way with him, God can yet crush him with his jealousy. If man attempt to attribute to himself anything that is of God, and appear to encroach on his all. engrossing majesty by ever so little, the wrath of God is kindled and man is levelled with the dust" (1:265). "It is," says Palgrave, "his singular satisfaction to let created beings continually feel that they are nothing else than his slaves, tools, and contemptible tools also, that thus they may the better acknowledge his superiority, and know his power to be above their power, his cunning above their cunning, his will above their will, his pride above their pride; or, rather, that there is no power, cunning, will, or pride save his own. But he himself, in his inaccessible height, neither loving aught save his own and self-measured decree, without son, companion, or  counsellor, is no less barren for himself than for his creatures, and his own barrenness and lone egoism in himself is the cause and rule of his indifferent and unregarding despotism around" (Arabia, 1:366). SEE POLYTHEISM.

Christian monotheism Gould excludes from comparison with the Jewish and Mohammedan, because “its doctrine of the Trinity and the incarnation remove it from the class to which which Mosaism and Islamism... belong" (1:277). SEE GOD; SEE TRINITY. See besides Gould, Clarke, Max Miller, and Renan; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, 1:330; Christlieb, Modern Doubt and Christian Belief (N.Y. 1875, 8vo), lect. 3 and 4; Lewes, Hist. Philos. volume 2 (see Index); Liddon, Divinity of Christ, pages 67, 76, 95, 270, 307; and the literature appended to the article THEISM SEE THEISM .

## Monothelism[[@Headword:Monothelism]]

             (from μόνος, single, and θέλημα, will), the doctrine of a Christian sect, maintains that Christ, though possessed of two natures, was yet subject only to one will; the human will being merged in the divine, or absorbed by it. The doctrine was given shape in an attempt on the part of the emperor Heraclius to unite the different factions of the Catholic Church, and to bring back to the fold the Eutychians and the Monophysites. There was near the beginning of the 7th century much controversy in the Eastern Church respecting the two wills in Christ, kindred to that concerning his nature. The Monophysites were at that time a most powerful sect, and the movement, especially in Egypt, threatened to assume a political character. In this difficulty the emperor Heraclius, hoping to reconcile the two parties, adopted the doctrine that there was in Jesus the Christ, after the union of the two natures, only one divine human energy and one will (μόνον θέλημα); and when, in the course of a campaign against Persia, Heraclius passed through Armenia and Syria, he came to an understanding with the Monophysite leaders of the Severians and Jacobites, and induced Sergius (q.v.), the orthodox patriarch of Constantinople, to give his assent to the doctrine of ἕν θέλημα καὶ μία ἐνέργεια, or of an ἐνέργεια θεανδρική. Monothelism, it will be perceived, then, is nothing more nor less than a modification of Eutychianism (q.v.).

It consisted in maintaining that, although Christ has two natures, yet these natures possessed or are acted on by but a single will, the divine will superseding or supplying the place of a human will. It will be observed also that in this way the  controversy was removed from the province of pure metaphysics into the moral and practical sphere; and although the assertion of an independent nature without independent action was a contradictio in adjecto it was yet hoped that the doctrine might be adopted by the Monophysites. The author of this doctrine was probably Sergius himself; he was, at least, its most active propagandist. The progress of the doctrine was materially forwarded by the relation which, at the instance of Sergius, and under his representations, pope Honorius (q.v.) was induced to maintain regarding the question. The Monophysite Cyrus, whom the emperor had promoted from the episcopate of Phasis to the patriarchate of Alexandria, promptly called a synod (A.D. 633), which by the seventh canon of its decrees solemnly approved of the monothelite doctrine (in the words τὸν αὐτὸν ἕνα Χριστὸν καὶ υἱὸν ἐνεργοῦντα τὰ θεοπρεπῆ καὶ ἀνθρώπινα μιᾶ'/ θεανδρικῇ ἐνεργείᾷ, Mansi, Concil. 11:565), thereby hoping to effect permanently a union between the different parties (Mansi, Concil. 11:564 sq.; Letters of Cyrus, ibid. 561). As Cyrus was the principal mover in this attempt, he has been generally esteemed the founder of the Monothelites. The work of the council certainly proved salutary, at least for a time. By bringing the doctrine of the Council of Chalcedon nearer to the Eutychian system, numbers of the Eutychians, who were dispersed throughout Egypt, Armenia, and other remote provinces, returned to the bosom of the Church. The only dissenting leader proved a certain Sophronius, a monk of Palestine, who from the first opposed the decree of the Alexandrian Synod with violence and when elevated to the vacant patriarchate of Jerusalem (635) was thus afforded ecclesiastical position and power, and now came forward to contest the question, notwithstanding that the patriarch of Constantinople approved of the Alexandrian decision, and the pope at Rome offered no remonstrance. Sophronius (q.v.) endeavored to show that this doctrine was inadmissible, since the doctrine of two natures set forth by the Synod of Chalcedon (q.v.) necessarily implied that of two wills (see Sophronii Epistola Synodica which is given in Mansi, 11:461). He finally summoned a council, and condemned monothelism as a branch of the Eutychian heresy. In order to terminate, if possible, the commotions to which this division was giving rise, the emperor Heraclius in 638 issued an edict,῎Εκθεσις (so named because it contained an exposition of the faith), in which he confirmed the agreement made by the patriarchs for the preservation of ecclesiastical union, and in which all controversies upon the question whether in Christ there was a double operation were prohibited, though the doctrine of a  unity of will was inculcated. A considerable number of the Eastern bishops declared their assent to the Ecthesis, and above all Pyrrhus, who succeeded Sergius in the see of Constantinople. A similar acceptance was obtained from the metropolis of the Eastern Church; but at Rome the Ecthesis was differently received. John IV assembled a council, in which that exposition was condemned. SEE ECTHESIS.

Neither was the monothelite system maintained in the Eastern Church any longer than during the life of Heraclius. In 648 the emperor Constans II issued the Τὐπος, i.e. an edict, by which the Ecthesis was suppressed, and the contending parties were prohibited from resuming their discussions on the doctrine in question (see Mansi, 10:992,1029 sq.; Neander, Church Hist. [Torrey] 3:186-192). Pope Honorius, as we have seen, appeared in favor of the union, and was probably himself inclined to monophysitism; but his successors, Severinus and John 4, thought and felt differently. The latter condemned the doctrine of the Monothelites, and Theodore excommunicated Paul, patriarch of Constantinople, till the doctrine of two wills and two energies was at last adopted at the first synod of the Lateran, held under Martin I, bishop of Rome, in the year 649 (see Mansi, 10:863 sq.). "Si quis secundum scelerosos haereticos cum una voluntate et una operatione, quae ab haereticis impiis confitetur, et duas voluntates, pariterque et operationes, hoc est, divinam et humanam, quae in ipso Christo Deo in unitate salvantur, et a sanctis patribus orthodoxe in ipso praedicantur, denegat et respuit, condemnatus sit" (see Gieseler, c. 1, § 128, note 11; Munscher v. Colla, 2:78 sq.). The emperor was so indignant at this daring of Martin that he had him secured, carried to Constantinople, there treated for a time as a criminal, and then banished him to the Crimea, where he died in 655, to be numbered among the martyrs of the Western and the confessors of the Eastern Church. His great intellectual supporter at the council had been a Greek abbot named Maximus, and he, too, underwent a long persecution, being scourged, having his tongue cut out, and at last dying a death little short of martyrdom just as he had reached his place of exile, A.D. 662. The final and authoritative condemnation of the monothelite dogma took place at the sixth general council, held at Constantinople in the year 680, where it was decided that there are in Christ "two natural wills and two natural operations, without division, without conversion or change, with nothing like antagonism, and nothing like confusion, but at the same time the human will of Christ could not come into collision with his divine will, but is in all things subject to it." An anathema was also pronounced on Theodore, Sergius, Honorius, and all who had maintained the heresy, this  anathema being confirmed by Leo II, who wrote to the emperor respecting his own predecessor in the see of Rome: "Anathematizamus... necnon et Honorium qui hanc apostolicam ecclesiam non apostolicae traditionis doctrina lustravit, sed profana proditione immaculatam subvertere conatus est" (Mansi, Concil. 11:631-637, 731). This anathema of pope Honorius was repeated by his successors for three centuries. SEE HONORIUS; SEE INFALLIBILITY.

The council (also called the First Trullan) was summoned by Constantinus Pogonatus. The decision of the synod was based upon the epistle of Agatho, the Roman bishop, which was itself founded upon the canons of the above-mentioned Lateran synod (Agathonis Ep. ad Imperatores, in Mansi, 11:233 sq.). Baur says of this controversy (Dogmengesch. page 211): "Its elements on the side of the Monothelites were the unity of the person or subject, from whose one will (the divine will of the incarnate Logos) all must proceed, since two wills also presuppose two personal subjects (the chief argument of bishop Theodore of Cara, in Mansi, 11:567); on the side of the Dyothelites, the point was the fact of two natures, since two natures cannot be conceived without two natural wills, and two natural modes of operation. How far now two wills can be without two persons willing was the point from which they slipped away by mere supposition." See Combefis, Hist. hoer. Monothelit. (Paris, 1648); Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, 1:229, 241, 282; Schaff, Church Hist. 3:752, 782; Neander, Church Hist. 3:186 sq.; Gieseler, Church Hist. c. 1, § 128; Baur, Dogmengesch. 1:211; and his Trinitatslehre, volume 2; Ebrard, Kirchen- u. Dogmengesch. 1:279 sq.; Trench, Hulsean Lect. page 200; Gregory, Hist. of the Christ. Church, 1:379; Dorner, Doct. of the Person of Christ, volume 2, part 1; Neale, Hist. East. Church (patriarchate of Alexandria), 2:60 sq., 76 sq.; Stanley, East. Church, pages 94, 110; Knapp, Christian Theology, page 366; Milnan, Hist. of Latin Christianity, 2:266 sq.; Walch, Ketzerhistorie, 9:3-666; Gfrorer, Kirchengesch. volume 3, part 1, page 36 sq.; Dollinger, Kirchengesch. 1:170 sq.; Schrockh, Kirchengesch. 20:386 sq.; Westminster Rev. April 1871, page 247. SEE MONOPHYSITES. (J.H.W.)

## Monothelites[[@Headword:Monothelites]]

             (Μονοθελῆται), an ancient heretical sect which is first spoken of in the writings of St. John of Damascus, in the middle of the 8th century, but which may be traced back to Severus, the deposed patriarch of Antioch, who flourished in the first half of the 7th century. He founded Monophysitism (q.v.). In some fragments of his writings which have come  down to us, Severus remarks that Christ's words, "Not my will, but thine, be done" (Luk 22:42), do not prove the existence of a will distinct from the divine will, nor that there was any struggle or resistance on the part of the Saviour's soul, as if he had a human fear of death or a human unwillingness to die; but that the words are so set down by way of accommodation, and for Christian instruction (Mai, Coll. Nov. 7:288). The distinct formulation of monothelism is attributed, however, to Theodore, bishop of Cara, in Arabia. Although not a Monophysite, Theodore taught that all the acts of Christ proceeded from one principle, originating in the Word, and operating through the human soul and body. Hence, though the Logos and the manhood were distinct natures, they were both acted upon by one and the same iv6pyeta; and there being one activity, there was one will, by which it was moved, that will being divine. (Αὐτοῦ γὰρ τὸ θέλημα ἕν ἐστι, καὶ τοῦτο θεϊκόν; Mansi, Concil. 11:568.) Athanasius, the Monophysite patriarch of Antioch, was a zealous convert to the opinion of Theodore, and laid it before the emperor Heraclius as offering a basis for such a compromise between his sect and the Church as might enable them to reunite in one communion. The emperor most enthusiastically espoused the plan, and thus became the promoter of the monothelite dogma, and really, the founder of the Monothelites. This emperor, Heraclius I, was born about A.D. 575, and was a son of Heraclius, governor of Africa. By the violent death of the tyrant Phocas in 610, Heraclius, who had served in the army with credit, obtained the imperial power, and soon afterwards married Eudoxia. In the early part of his reign the empire was ravaged by pestilence and the barbarian armies of Chosroes, king of Persia. In 622 he led an army against Persia, defeated Chosroes at Tauris, and fought several successful campaigns, in which he displayed great military talents and personal courage. In the course of his campaigns against Persia he passed through Armenia and Syria, and came to a peaceful understanding with the Monophysite leaders of the Severians and the Jacobites, who at this time had become a powerful and dangerous political party. Hoping to reconcile them, he, in connection with Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, proposed to them the curious doctrine of monothelism, which satisfied the Monophysites, without apparently disturbing the decision of the Council of Chalcedon. Having made peace with Persia in 628, he returned to Constantinople, and abandoned himself to inglorious ease, sensual vices, and the subtleties of monotheism, of which he was the chief supporter, ignoring the victorious progress of the Mussulman arms, until the very subversion of his empire was threatened. In  639, finally, he made an energetic attempt to establish monothelism by issuing his ῎Εκθησις, with what result may be seen in the article MONOTHELISM SEE MONOTHELISM .

Heraclius died in 641. His character is a puzzle, and presents surprising contradictions. Protected and nurtured by imperial approbation, the Monothelites became a very considerable sect. The decisions of the sixth Council of Constantinople determined that their opinions were not consistent with the purity of the Christian faith, and monothelism was formally condemned; and though its advocates were sometimes the objects of royal favor, yet they were in general condemned and depressed. In 711, when Philippicus Bardanes was Greek emperor, they became once more influential and powerful. He convened a new council at Constantinople, which reversed the decisions of the sixth council, and adopted monothelism as an orthodox doctrine. Some few bishops resisted, but were driven from the council. Two years later Anastasius II reinstituted dyothelism, and the same bishops who had two years before vetoed dyothelism now changed their mind, and adopted it as the only true exposition of faith! Thus persecuted, the Monothelites retired to the neighborhood of Mount Lebanon. After the Crusades (1291), and especially after 1596, they began to gradually go over to the Roman Church, although retaining the communion under both kinds, their Syriac missal, the marriage of priests, and their traditional fast-days, with some saints of their own, especially St. Maron. SEE MARONITES.

The Monothelites have often been bitterly persecuted, but our concern for the cruelties they suffered cannot but be lessened by the consideration of the persecutions which in the day of their power they were tempted to commit against their orthodox brethren. See, besides the references in the article MONOTHELISM, Blunt, Diet. of Heresies and Sects, s.v.; Schaff, Church Hist. 3:752 sq.; Gregory, Hist. of the Christ. Church, 1:397; Mosheim, Ecclesiastical History, 2:36; Robinson, Palestine, 3:744; Walch, Geschichte der Ketzereien, 9:475; Baumgarten, Geschichte der Religionspartheien, page 617.

## Monrad, Ditler Gothard[[@Headword:Monrad, Ditler Gothard]]

             a Danish prelate of note, was born at Copenhagen November 24, 111. In 1836 he passed his theological examinations, and was two years later honored by the title of D.D. In 1846 he was called to the pastorate of Vester Ulsler, in the diocese of Laaland. Having taken a prominent position in the national party, he was made chaplain March 24, 1848, but occupied the position only until the following November, when he retired, together  with most of his colleagues. He continued to take an active part in political affairs until 1850, when he was created bishop of Laaland-Falster, and later figured as a cabinet officer until 1864. After the unsuccessful termination of the war against Prussia he migrated to New Zealand, where he died in 1874. He published valuable papers on the Organization of Schools in many large Protestant Cities (1844), besides which he issued mainly "Political Pamphlets" (1839-42). See Vapereau, Dictionnaire Universel des Contemporains, s.v.

## Monro, Alexander, D.D[[@Headword:Monro, Alexander, D.D]]

             an English prelate, was born in 1648, in the County of Ross. After having taught philosophy in the University of Aberdeen, he was principal of that of Edinburgh (1686), and had just been appointed bishop of the Orkney Islands when, refusing to take the oath of allegiance to William III, he lost that dignity. He was appointed in 1688 bishop of Argyle, but it is doubtful whether he ever were instituted. He died in 1713. Bishop Monro is the author of XII Sermons (London, 1673, 8vo): — Letter to Sir Robert Howard, occasioned by the Two-fold Vindication of the Presbyterians, etc. (1696, 8vo). He was also the author of one of the four letters published as An Account of the Present Persecution of the Church of Scotland (1690, 4to, 68 pages). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, volume 2, s.v.

## Monroe, Andrew[[@Headword:Monroe, Andrew]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, called the patriarch of Missouri Methodism, was born in Hampshire County, Virginia, October 29, 1792; was converted and joined the Church when but a youth. In March 1815, he was licensed to preach, and sent to labor on the Fairfield Circuit. In the following year he was admitted on trial to the Ohio Conference. In 1824 he was transferred to Missouri, and stationed at St. Louis; he returned the next year, and was then placed over the St. Louis District, which embraced the entire state. He was a member of eleven General Conferences, and took an active part in the establishment of the Church, South. He died in Mexico, Mo., November 18, 1871. His several appointments were: 1816, Jefferson Circuit; 1817, Franklin Circuit; 1818, Fountain Head Circuit; 1819, Bowling Green. In the Kentucky Conference: 1820, Hopkinsville; 1821 and 1822, Maysville; 1823, presiding elder of Augusta District. In the Missouri Conference: 1824 and 1825, St. Louis  Station; 1826 and 1827, presiding elder of Missouri District; 1828 and 1829, St. Louis Station; 1830, St. Louis District; 1831, left, by request, without an appointment; 1832 to 1835, presiding elder of St. Louis District; 1836 and 1837, Missouri District; 1838, Columbia District; 1839 and 1840, agent of St. Charles College; 1841 and 1842, St. Charles Station, and agent of the college; 1843, presiding elder of St. Charles District; 1844 and 1845, presiding elder of St. Charles District, and agent of the college; 1846 to 1849, presiding elder of Columbia District; 1850 and 1851, Fayette Circuit; 1852 and 1853, presiding elder of Hannibal District; 1854, transferred to the St. Louis Conference, and appointed superintendent of Kansas Mission District; 1855, transferred back to the Missouri Conference, and appointed presiding elder of Fayette District; 1856 to 1859, presiding elder of St. Charles District; 1860, agent of Central College; 1861 and 1862, Fayette Circuit; 1863 and 1864, Brunswick District; 1865, Fayette District; 1866 and 1867, Conference missionary; 1869 to 1870, St. Charles District; 1871, Conference missionary. It is not within the scope of this sketch to enter into any exhaustive analysis of a life so protracted, aims so single and sublime, purposes so pertinaciously adhered to through a long, eventful course. His name is historic: scarcely a book of Methodist annals has appeared within half a century past that does not contain it. See McFerrin, Hist. of Meth. in Tenn. 2:473; Minutes of Conference of Meth. Episc. Ch., South (1872); Elliott, Hist. of the Meth. Episc. Ch. in the South-west, page 74 and sq.

## Monroe, Jonathan[[@Headword:Monroe, Jonathan]]

             an American Methodist minister, was born in Annapolis, Maryland, June 11, 1801; joined the Baltimore Conference, and was appointed to Alleghany Circuit in 1825; in 1826, to Concord; in 1827 he was ordained deacon by bishop Soule, and appointed to Shamoken; in 1828, to Lewistown; in 1829 he was ordained elder by bishop M'Kendree, and appointed to Concord; in 1830, to Gettysburg; in 1831, to Shrewsbury; in 1833, to Patapsco; in 1835, to Calvert; in 1837, to Lewistown; in 1839, to Warrior's Mark; in 1841, to Huntingdon; in 1843, to Bedford; in 1845, to Westminster; in 1847, to Liberty; in 1849, to Montgomery; in 1850, to Gettysburg; in 1852, to Mechanicsburg; in 1854, to Mercersburg; in 1856, to East Hartford; in 1858, to Great Falls; in 1859, to Hereford; in 1861, to Westminster; in 1863, to Emmitsburg; and in 1864 he became supernumerary, and retired to Westminster, Carroll County, Md., where he died, December 4, 1869. His Christian virtues, uniform piety, and devotion  to his calling demonstrated the power of divine grace in his life, and endeared him to all who knew him. See Minutes of Baltimore Conference for 1870.

## Monroe, Samuel Yorke, D.D[[@Headword:Monroe, Samuel Yorke, D.D]]

             an eminent minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Mount Holly, New Jersey, July 1, 1816. He enjoyed the advantages of a thorough English training, and after his conversion, which occurred in 1833, decided to devote himself to the work of the Christian ministry. He labored for several years as a local preacher; was admitted on trial into the New Jersey Conference in 1843, and quickly rose to distinction among his brethren. His first appointment does not appear in the minutes. In 1844 he travelled the Sweedsborough Circuit. At the Conference held in Mount Holly in 1845 he was admitted into full connection, and stationed at Salem, N.J. He was returned to the same appointment in 1846. In 1847-48 he preached in Paterson; in 1849-50, in Newark; in 1851, at Princeton. He was next successively stationed at Newark, New Brunswick, Camden, Trenton, and Trinity Church, Newark (located in Newark Conference, to which he had been transferred). He served as presiding elder several years, first in the Bridgeton District, after he had preached at Camden; and in the Camden District after he had labored in Trenton. He was a member of the General Conference in 1856,1860, and 1864, at which last time he was prominently named for the episcopacy. He was by this body then elected a member of the General Missionary Committee, and shortly afterwards was appointed by the bishops of the Church as recording secretary of the newly organized society for "Church extension." Upon this work he entered with his usual vigor and zeal, and was meeting with success beyond the highest expectation of the friends of the enterprise. On Sunday, the 27th of January 1867, he had preached in St. Paul's Methodist Episcopal Church in New York City, for the cause of "Church extension," and was on his way from Camden, New Jersey, to New York, with the intention of occupying one of the city pulpits for the same object, when he was lost overboard a train, no one has ever found how, and was killed in the fall, February 9, 1867, as was declared by the verdict of a coroner's jury. Few men labored more earnestly for the Church than did Dr. Monroe. After his appointment to the secretaryship, besides attending to an extensive correspondence, he visited and addressed some fifty Conferences upon the subject of "Church extension;" preached once or twice nearly every Sabbath; organized his work almost over the whole Church; and raised and disbursed about  $60,000 during the first year of the society's existence. During this period his labors were undoubtedly excessive; and, in the opinion of those who had the best opportunity for knowing, were beginning sensibly to impair his health and vigor. "Dr. Monroe," say the Newark Conference Minutes of 1867, "was in many respects a remarkable man. As a Christian, he was conscientious, without being morbidly sensitive; fervent in spirit, without being boisterous or fanatical; faithful, without being severe or censorious; and spiritual and pure in heart, without a profession of extraordinary religious attainments... His success in winning souls to Christ proved that wherever he labored God was with him. As a preacher he was able, evangelical, and edifying; and as a pastor diligent, sympathetic, and faithful. But that which distinguished him more than anything else was his remarkably clear perception of the relations of things, his rapid mental comparisons and inductions, and his consequent seemingly intuitive and almost infallible judgment. In this respect he had probably no superiors, if, indeed, he had many equals, in our Church. Remarkably free from prejudice and selfishness, and ever cool and conscientious, and with a mind that could grasp a question, view it in all its relations, and at once deduce the appropriate conclusion, he was an eminently wise and safe counsellor in everything pertaining to the kingdom of God." The N.Y. Methodist (February 16, 1867), commenting on his death, says: "Dr. Monroe was one of the leading representatives of the American Methodist Church... As secretary of the Church Extension Society, he displayed his characteristic good sense, rare executive ability, laboriousness, and eminent pulpit power. In all these elements of character he excelled." See also Ladies' Repository, March, 1868; Appleton's Annual, 1867; N.Y. Christian Advocate, February 8, 1872 (MS. Sermons of the late Dr. Monroe). (J.H.W.)

## Monroe, William[[@Headword:Monroe, William]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Alleghany County, Indiana, September 8, 1783. He was converted when but a youth; was licensed to preach in 1809, and entered the Baltimore Conference in 1810. He was ordained deacon by bishop M'Kendree, and elder by bishop Asbury. His active ministerial life extended over a period of thirty-three years, during which time he labored on some of the most difficult circuits in the Baltimore Conference. Mr. Monroe was a man of Christian virtues and great piety, and his true devotion to Methodism has endeared him to the whole Church. His appointments were Lyttleton Circuit, Huntington Circuit, Greenville Circuit, Randolph Circuit, Georgetown, D.C., Redstone  Circuit, East Wheeling, Monongahela, Rockingham Circuit, Virginia; Alleghany,Virginia; Ebenezer, Washington, D.C.; Chambersburg; Winchester, Virginia; Stafford, Virginia; Rockingham, Virginia; Staunton, Virginia; Berkeley, Virginia; Jefferson; Berkeley, Virginia; South Branch; and Hillsborough. After this for two years (1837 and 1838) he was supernumerary. In 1839-40 he was stationed at Boonsborough, and in 1841 at Codorus Mission. In 1844 he was again supernumerary; in 1843- 44, Mercersburg; and in 1845, Greencastle. This year closed his active service, and in 1846 he asked for and obtained a superannuated relation, which he sustained until removed to the Church triumphant. He died in Washington County, Maryland, May 29, 1871. See General Minutes of the M.E. Church, 1872, page 17.

## Monseigneur[[@Headword:Monseigneur]]

             (my lord), a French title, once applied to saints, and subsequently to princes, nobles, certain high dignitaries of the Church, and other titled personages, is now only given to prelates. The Italian monsignore has a similar signification.

## Monsignore[[@Headword:Monsignore]]

             SEE MONSEIGNEUR.

## Monson, Abraham[[@Headword:Monson, Abraham]]

             a Jewish savant who flourished towards the end of the 16th century, was a native of Egypt, and died at Constantinople. He wrote ש8 8ות, i.e., Decisiones' et Responsa, which :are incorporated in Salomo Cohen's Decisions (Salonica, 1596) and in those of Joseph di Trani (Constantinople, 1641). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:388; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 3:52; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Monster[[@Headword:Monster]]

             SEE SEA-MONSTER.

## Monstrance[[@Headword:Monstrance]]

             SEE MONSTRANTIA.

## Monstrantia[[@Headword:Monstrantia]]

             (MONSTRUM, OSTENSORIUM) is a vessel used for the preserving of relics, and particularly for the consecrated host (sanctissimumn, vensersabile, eucharistia), and in which they are presented to the adoration of the people. When, in the 13th century, the doctrine of transubstantiation was established by the Church, the elevation of the host followed, as also its special exhibition, for instance, in the procession of Corpus-Christi Day (q.v.). For that purpose the host (q.v.) was placed on a curved surface  (lunula), and introduced in a transparent vessel (monstrantia, in qua sub vitro crystallino cruor inclusus [Du Fresne, Glossar. s.h.v.]). This case (phylacterium, arcula) is enlarged by the addition of rays, forming an image of the sun, or the like, and provided with a stand. It is placed on the altar. Thus the monstrantia becomes a movable shrine for the sacrament (taberncaculum gestatoriumn), generally made of costly material, and richly decorated. "At first," says Walcott (Sacred Archaeology, page 390), "it took the shape of an ordinary reliquary, but at length was made like a tower of crystal, of cylindrical form, and mounted on a foot like that of a chalice, and covered by a spire-like canopy, with flying buttresses. Inside the cylinder was a crescent held by an angel, in which the host was set: in some cases the cylinder was replaced by a quarterfoil, or was surrounded by a foliage like a jesse-tree, and at a later date by the sun, a luminous disk, with rays alternately straight and wavy, set upon a stand. Upon the vessel itself the Doom was often represented, and relics were placed in it. The monstrance did not become common till the 15th, and is probably not earlier than the 14th century. It bore different forms: (1) a little tower, jewelled, and having apertures of glass or crystal; (2) the figure of a saint, or the Holy Lamb, with St. John the Baptist pointing to it; (3) a cross; (4) a crystal lantern, or tube, mounted on a pedestal of precious metal, and covered with a canopy in the 15th century; (5) a sun, with rays, containing in the centre a kind of pyx (this is found as early as the 16th century)." The ecclesiastical laws now regulate its construction. The statutes of the archbishopric of Prague of 1605, tit. 18, command, for instance, "Monstrantia ad exponendam vel in processionibus deferendam hostiam magnam, si non ex auro, aut argento, saltern ex aurichalco bene aurato refulgeat, et velo vel peplo congruo ornata sit." The monstrantia is a sacred vessel, and not to be touched by an unconsecrated person; hence any one who stole it was to be burned to death. The high altar is always provided with a monstrantia, and often the side altars also. All evangelical churches have rejected the prayer De venerabile of the Romish Church, and Luther declared, "It is insulting and dishonoring to the holy sacrament to carry it about, and to make it an instrument of idle idolatry." See also Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 9:757.

## Mont de Piete[[@Headword:Mont de Piete]]

             SEE MONTES PIETATIS.

## Montagioli, Cassiodoro[[@Headword:Montagioli, Cassiodoro]]

             a learned Italian ecclesiastic, was born at Modena February 5, 1698; entered the Benedictine Order in 1717, and successively filled several prominent offices in the order. He gave himself largely to the study of  philosophy. His principal works are, Esercizi di celesti affetti, tratti dal libro de' Salmi (Rome, 1742): — Trattato practico della carita Cristiana in quanto e amor verso Dio (Bologna, 1751, and Venice, 1761): — Enchiridio evangelico (Mod. 1755): — Maniera facile di meditare con frutto le massime Cristiane (Bologna, 1759, 2 volumes): — Detti pratiche e ricordi di S. Andrea Avellino (Venice, 1771): — Parabole del figliuol di Dio (Plaisance, 1772): — Il divino sermone nel monte (Rome, 1779).

## Montagnuoli, Giovanni Domenico[[@Headword:Montagnuoli, Giovanni Domenico]]

             an Italian theologian, was born at Batignano (territory of Sienna) in the first half of the 17th century. As a Dominican monk, he was distinguished for his austere piety, as well as for his attachment to the doctrine of St. Thomas. He was the author of Defensiones philosophicae angelicae Thomisticce (Venice, 1609, fol.). This work, enlarged and revised, appeared again under the same title at Naples in 1610). See Echard et Quetif, Script. Ord. Prcedicat. 2:337.

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

             a Roman Catholic divine of note, was born at London in 1604. He was the son of Sir Henry Montagu, who afterwards became earl of Manchester. After being educated at Sidney College, Cambridge, he travelled abroad, and became a convert to Romanism. though opposed by his nearest friends. On returning to his native land, he attracted the attention and secured the favor of his queen, who appointed him her confessor. She also honored him by sending him on a confidential mission to Rome, where he met with a gracious reception by pope Urban VIII. The breaking out of the Civil War clouded his prosperity, and in 1643 he was imprisoned in the Tower, where he remained confined for several years. As soon as he was released he retired into France, where he became abbot of the Benedictine monastery at Nanteuil. He afterwards obtained the rich abbey of St. Martin's, near Pontoise, where he remained until the Restoration, when the queen-mother of England appointed him master of St. Catharine's Hospital, a position occupied by him till his death at Paris in 1677. As an author, the chief works of his pen are, The Shepherd's Paradise, a pastoral comedy possessing some merit, though ridiculed severely by Sir John Suckling in his "Sessions of the Poets": — Miscellanea Spiritualia, published in two parts (1648-54), a series of religious essays or tracts: — a Letter from Paris to his father, in which he justifies the Church of Rome, and states his  personal reasons for changing his belief. This letter was printed with lord Falkland's Discourse on Infallibility (1651). He also made an English translation of Bossuet's Exposition of the Doctrines of the Catholic Church (1672). (H.W.T.)

## Montague, Richard, D.D[[@Headword:Montague, Richard, D.D]]

             SEE MOUNTAGU.

## Montaigne, Michel, Seigneur de[[@Headword:Montaigne, Michel, Seigneur de]]

             a distinguished French moralist, remarkable for his deep insight into the principles of our common nature, was born February 28, 1533, and was a younger son of a nobleman, whose estate, from which the family name arose, was situated in the province of Perigord, near the river Dordogne. His father, an eccentric, blunt, feudal baron, placed him under the care of a German tutor who did not speak French, and the intercourse between tutor and pupil was carried on entirely in Latin; and even his parents made it a rule to address him in that language, of which they knew a sufficient number of words for common purposes. The attendants were enjoined to follow the same practice. "They all became Latinized," says Montaigne himself; "and even the villagers in the neighborhood learned words in that language, some of which took root in the country, and became of common use among the people." Thus, without the aid of scholastic teaching, Montaigne 'spoke Latin long before he could speak French, which he was afterwards obliged to learn like a foreign language. He studied Greek in the same manner, by way of pastime more than as a task. He was sent to the college of Guienne, at Bordeaux; and at the age of thirteen he completed his college education. He then studied law, and in 1554 he was made "conseiller," or judge, in the Parliament of Bordeaux. He repaired several times to court, and enjoyed the favor of Henri II, by whom, or, as some say, by Charles IX, he was made a gentleman of the king's chamber and a knight of the Order of St. Michael. When he was thirty-three years of age Montaigne married, to please his friends rather as he says, than himself, for he was not inclined to a married life. He, however, always lived on good terms with his wife, by whom he had a daughter. He managed his own estate, on which he generally resided, and from which he derived an income of about 6000 livres. In 1569 Montaigne translated into French a Latin work of Raymond de Sebonde or Sebon, a Spanish divine, on Natural Theology, at the request of his then recently deceased father, who  had feared for his son's apostasy to Protestantism (comp. Fisher, Hist. Ref. page 6, note 2). France was at that time desolated by civil and religious war, and Montaigne, disapproving of the conduct of the court towards the Protestants, and yet being by education a Roman Catholic, and by principle and disposition loyal to the king, was glad to live in retirement, and take no part in public affairs except by exhorting both parties to moderation and mutual charity. By this conduct he became, as might be expected, obnoxious to both sides. The massacre of St. Bartholomew plunged him into a deep melancholy, for he detested cruelty and the shedding of blood. It was about this dismal epoch of 1572 that he began to write his Essais, which were published in March, 1580, and met with great success. (See below.) With a view to restoring his health, which was not good, Montaigne undertook a journey to Germany, Switzerland, and lastly to Italy. At Rome he was well received by several cardinals and other persons of distinction, and was introduced to pope Gregory XIII, and received the freedom of the city of Rome by a bull of the pope, an honor of which he appears to have been very proud. Montaigne was delighted with Rome; he there found himself at home among those scenes and monuments which were connected with his earliest studies and the first impressions of his boyish years. He wrote a journal of his tour, evidently not intended for publication; but the manuscript, when discovered after nearly two centuries in an old chest in the chateau of his family, was published (in 1774) under the title of Journal du Voyage de Michel de Montaigne en Italie, par la Suisse et l'Allemagne, en 1580-81. It is one of the earliest descriptions 'of Italy written in a modern language. While he was abroad he was elected mayor of Bordeaux by the votes of the citizens, an honor which he would have declined had not the king, Henri III, insisted upon his accepting the office. At the expiration of two years Montaigne was re-elected for an equal period. On his retiring from office he returned to his patrimonial estate. The war of the League was then raging in the country, and Montaigne had some difficulty in saving his family and property from the violence of the contending factions. At this time the plague also broke out in his neighborhood (in 1586), and obliged him to leave his residence and wander about various parts of the country. He was at Paris in 1588, busy with a new edition of the Essais. It appears from De Thou's account that about this time Montaigne was employed in negotiations with a view to conclude a peace between Henri of Navarre, afterwards Henri IV, and the duke of Guise. At Paris he became acquainted with Mademoiselle de Gournay, a young lady who had conceived a kind of sentimental affection  for him from reading his book. Attended by her mother she visited him, and introduced herself to him, and from that time he called her his "fille d'alliance," or adopted daughter, a title which she retained for the rest of her life, as she never married. Montaigne was then fifty-five years of age. This attachment, which, though warm and reciprocal, has every appearance of having been of a purely Platonic nature, is one of the remarkable incidents of Montaigne's life. At the time of his death, Mademoiselle Gournay and her mother crossed one half of France, notwithstanding the civil troubles and the insecurity of the roads, to repair to Montaigne's residence and mingle their tears with those of his widow and daughter. On his return from Paris in the latter part of 1588, Montaigne stopped at Blois with De Thou, Pasquier, and other friends. The States-General were then assembled in that city, in which the duke de Guise and his brother the cardinal were treacherously murdered, on the 23d and 24th of December of that year. Montaigne had long foreseen that the civil dissensions could only terminate with the death of one of the great party leaders. He had also said to De Thou that Henri of Navarre was inclined to adopt the Roman Catholic faith, but that he was afraid of being forsaken by his party; and that, on the other side, Guise himself would not have been averse to embracing the Protestant religion, if he could thereby have promoted his ambitious views. After the catastrophe Montaigne returned to his chateau. In the following year he became acquainted with Pierre Charron, a theological writer of considerable reputation, and formed an intimate friendship with him. Charron, in his book De la Sagesse, borrowed many ideas from Montaigne's Essais. Montaigne by his will empowered Charron to assume the coat of arms of his family, as he himself had no male issue. Montaigne's health was in a declining state for a, considerable time before his death; he was afflicted with the gravel and the colic, and he obstinately refused to consult medical men, of whom he had generally an indifferent opinion. In September 1592, he fell ill of a malignant quinsy, which kept him speechless for three days, during which he had recourse to his pen to signify his last wishes. He invited several gentlemen of the neighborhood, in order that he might take leave of them, and when they were all assembled in his room, a priest said mass, and at the elevation of the host, Montaigne,. while half raised up in his bed, with his hands joined together as in prayer, expired, September 13, 1592. His body was buried at Bordeaux in the church of the Feuillants. The character of Montaigne is amply delineated in his Essais. They contain much that an advanced Christianity can hardly approve, yet, notwithstanding these inconsistencies,  it is impossible to avoid admiring the continued benignity and pensive gayety which distinguished his temper. The amiableness of his private life is attested by the fact that, under the five monarchs who during his time successively swayed the sceptre of a kingdom torn with fanatical divisions, his person and property were always respected by both parties; and few at an advanced age can say, like him, that they are yet untainted with a quarrel or a lawsuit.

Montaigne's Essais have been the subject of much conflicting criticism. If we reflect upon the age and the intellectual condition of the country in which the author lived, we must consider them a very extraordinary production, not so much on account of the learning contained in the work, although that is very considerable, as for the clear good-sense, philosophical spirit, and frank, liberal tone which pervades their pages, as well as for the attractive simplicity of the language. Literature was then at a very low ebb in France, the language was hardly formed, the country was disturbed by feudal turbulence, ignorant fanaticism, deadly intolerance, and civil factions, and yet in the midst of all this a country gentleman, living in a remote province, himself belonging to the then rude, fierce, feudal aristocracy, composed a work full of moral maxims and precepts, conceived in the spirit of the ancient philosophers of Greece and Rome, and founded on a system of natural ethics, on the beauty of virtue and of justice, and on the lessons of history; and this book was read with avidity amid the turmoil of factions, the din of civil war, and the cries of persecution and murder. "The Essais of Montaigne," says Hallam, "make in several respects an epoch in literature, less on account of their real importance than of their influence on the taste and opinions of Europe... No prose writer of the 16th century has been so generally read, nor, probably, given so much delight. Whatever may be our estimate of Montaigne as a philosopher a name which he was far from arrogating — there will be but one opinion of the felicity and brightness of his genius" (Introduction to the Literature of Europe, 2:29). "The author of these Essais," says Leo Joubert, "is certainly the most independent spirit that ever existed-independent without revolt, and detached from the systems of others without having any system of his own... We recognise in his Essais a nature well endowed, not heroic, perhaps, but generous, exquisitely sensible, not aspiring to the sublime, capable of devotion, and incapable of a base act-in fine, a model of what we may call average virtue" (la vertu moyenne) (Nouvelle Biographie Generale, s.v.). Sprightly humor,  independence, naivete, and originality are the characteristics of his mind; and his style is admired for its graceful simplicity. His works are highly seasoned with his own individuality, and afford much insight into his character. "The Essais," says Emerson, "are an entertaining soliloquy on every random topic that came into the author's head — treating everything without ceremony, yet with masculine sense. There have been men with deeper insight, but, one would say, never a man with such abundance of thoughts: he is never dull, never insincere, and has the genius to make the reader care for all that he cares for... This book of Montaigne the world has endorsed by translating it into all tongues and printing seventy-five editions of it in Europe — and that, too, a circulation somewhat chosen, namely, among courtiers, soldiers, princes, men of the world, and men of wit and generosity" (Representative Men). John Morley, the eminent English writer and most recent biographer of Jean Jacques Rousseau (Lond. 1873, 2 volumes, 8vo), frequently turns aside to pay a tribute to Montaigne, and acknowledges that the author of Enile had read Montaigne's Essais "with that profit and increase which attends the dropping of the good ideas of other men into fertile minds" (2:198; comp. 1:144).

The morality of the Essais has been called — and not unreasonably, though not correctly in the expression — a pagan morality: it is not founded on the faith and the hopes of Christianity, and its principles are in many respects widely different from those of the Gospel. Montaigne was a sceptic, but not a determined infidel; his philosophy is in a great measure that of Seneca and other ancient writers, whose books were the first that were put into his hands when a child. Accordingly Pascal, Nicole, and other Christian moralists, while they do justice to Montaigne's talents, and the many good sentiments contained in his work, are very severe upon his ethics, taken as a system. "Ancient scepticism," says Ueberweg, "was revived, and, in part, in a peculiar manner further developed by Montaigne. The scepticism of this clever man of the world was more or less directed to doctrines of Christianity, but was generally brought in the end, by whether sincere or merely prudent-recognition of the necessity of a revelation, on account of the weakness of human reason, into harmony with theology" (Hist. Philos. [N.Y. 1874, 2 volumes, 8vo] 2:14; comp. Fisher, Hist. Ref. [N.Y. 1873, 8vo] page 251). One of the ablest of moralists of our own time, Prof. Vinet, has given, we think, a very fair analysis of the spirit of Montaigne's ethics (Essais de Philosophie Morale Reeligieuse suivis de quelques  Essais de Critique Litteraire, Paris, 1828). In the fifty-fourth chapter of the first book of the Essais, Montaigne, after distinguishing two sorts of ignorance, the one which precedes all instruction, and the other which follows partial instruction, goes on to say that "men of simple minds, devoid of curiosity and of learning, are Christians through reverence and obedience; that minds of middle growth and moderate capacities are most prone to doubt and error; but that higher intellects, more clear-sighted, and better grounded in science, form a superior class of believers, who, through long and religious investigations, arrive at the fountain of light of the Scriptures, and feel the mysterious and divine meaning of our ecclesiastical doctrines. And we see some who reach this last stage through the second, with marvellous fruit and confirmation, and who, having attained the extreme boundary of Christian intelligence, enjoy their success with modesty and thanksgiving; unlike those men of another stamp, who, in order to clear themselves of the suspicions arising from their past errors, become violent, indiscreet, unjust, and throw discredit on the cause they pretend to serve."

A few lines farther on Montaigne modestly places himself in the second class, namely, of those who, disdaining the first state of uninformed simplicity, have not yet attained the third and last exalted stage, "and who," he says, "are thereby rendered inept, importunate, and troublesome to society. But I, for my part, endeavor, as much as I can, to fall back upon my first and natural condition, from which I have idly attempted to depart." In his chapter on prayers (book 1:56) he recommends the use of the Lord's Prayer in terms evidently sincere; and in the journal of his travels, which was not intended for publication, he manifested Christian sentiments in several places. Montaigne has been censured for several licentious and some cynical passages in his Essais. This licentiousness, however, appears to be rather in the expressions than in the meaning of the author. He spoke plainly of things which are not alluded to in a more refined state of society, but he did so evidently without bad intentions, and only followed the common usage of his time. Montaigne combats earnestly the malignant feelings frequent in man- injustice, oppression, inhumanity, uncharitableness. His chapters on pedantry, on the education of children, and on the administration of justice, are remarkably good. He also throws much light on the state of manners and society in France in his time. The Essais have gone through very many editions, and been translated into most European languages: the edition of Paris (1725, 3 volumes, 4to) was perhaps the most complete until the appearance of the recent edition, Avec les notes de tous les commentateurs  choisies et completees par M.J.V. Le Clerc, et une nouvelle etude sur Montaigne pars Prevost-Paradol (Paris, 1865). Cotton's, the best and oldest English translation, is somewhat coarse, though characteristic. It has frequently been revised, and in the form given it by the learned Hazlitt is pronounced a superior work. Very recently an edition of the Complete Works of Montaigne, ctc., was brought out at London (1873). Vernier published in 1810 Notices et Observations pour faciliter la Lecture des Essais de Montaigne (Paris, 2 volumes, 8vo). It is a useful commentary. Meusnier de Querlon published his journal under the title Journal du Voyage de Michel de Montaigne (Rome, 1774, 4to). Extracts from the Essais have at various times been published, as Pensees de Montaigne, propres aὰ former l'esprit et les maeurs, par Artaud (Paris, 1700, 12mo); L'Esprit de Montaigne, ou les maximes, pensees, jugements, et reflexions de cet auteur redigees par ordre de matieres, par Pesselier (Berlin [Paris], 1753, 2 volumes, 12mo); Christianisme de Montaigne, ou pensees de ce grand homme sur la religion, par M. l'Abbe L. (Labouderie) (Paris, 1819, 8vo). See De Thou, historia sui temporis; E. Pasquier, Lettres; La Croix du Maine, Bibliotheque Francaise; J. Bouhier, Memoires sur la vie et les ouvrages de Montaigne, avec une comparaison d'Epictete et de Montaigne (by B. Pascal); Talbert, Eloge de Mich. de Montaigne (Paris, 1775, 12mo) ; Dom Devienne, Eloge historique de Mich. de Montaigne (Paris, 1775, 12mo); La Dixmerie, Eloge analytique et historique de Montaigne (Paris, 1781, 8vo); Mme. de Bourdie-Viot, Eloge de Montaigne (Paris, 1800, 8vo); Jay, Eloge de Montaigne (1812, 8vo); Droz, Eloge de Michel Montaigne (1812, 8vo); Villemain, Eloge de Montaigne (Journal des Savans, July and October, 1855); Payen, Notice bibliographique sur Montaigne (new ed. Paris, 1856, 8vo); Documents inedits ou peu connus sur Montaigne (1847, 8vo); Nouveaux documents (1850, 8vo); Documents inedits (1855, 8vo); Recherches sur Montaigne (1856, 8vo); Grun, La vie publique de Michel Montaigne (Paris, 1855, 8vo); Vinet, Essai de Philosophie morale; Emerson, Representative Men; Sainte Beuve, Port-Royal; Causeries du lundi, volume 4; Clement, Revue Contemporaine, August 31, 1855; Bayle St. John, Montaigne, the Essayist (Lond. 1858); De Laschamps, M. de Montaigne (2d ed. Paris, 1860, 12mo); Brinbenet, Les Essais de Montaigne dans leurs rapports avec la legislation moderne (Orleans, 1864, 8vo); Mrs. Shelley, Lives of the most eminent French Writers; Tennemann, Geschichte der Philosophie, 9:443; Church, in Oxford Essays (1857); Morell, History of Modern Philosophy, page 199; Lewes, History of Philosophy (see Index in volume 2); the  Histories of France by Michelet and Martin; English Cyclopaedia; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 36:55-71; Retrospective Review, volume 2 (1820); Quart. Rev. (Lond.) October 1856; Westm. Rev. July 1838.

## Montaigu, Guillaume de[[@Headword:Montaigu, Guillaume de]]

             a French ecclesiastic, was born in the latter part of the 12th century. He was at first prior of Clairvaux, subsequently abbot of LaFerte, then of Citeaux. Gregory IX employed him in a very important negotiation. In 1229 he was sent to reconcile the kings of France and England, who were on the point of going to war. Montaigu first went to the king of France, calmed his resentment, and afterwards was similarly successful with the king of England, and consequently the impending war did not take place. Different letters of Gregory IX, published in the Annales des Citeaux, inform us that the court of Rome intrusted to Guillaume's sagacity the regulation of many other affairs of less general interest. In 1239, as he was proceeding to the Council of Rome, he fell into the hands of Frederick II, was taken captive, and loaded with chains. Towards the close of his life Montaigu abdicated the government of Citeaux, withdrew to the monastery of Clairvaux, and there died in the garb of a simple monk, May 19, 1246. See Annales Cistercienses, volume 4, passim; Hist. Litter. de la France, 18:358; Gallics Christiana, volume 4, col. 995. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gezerale, 36:72.

## Montaigu, Pierre Guerin de[[@Headword:Montaigu, Pierre Guerin de]]

             thirteenth grandmaster of the Knights Hospitallers of St. John of Jerusalem, was born at Montaigu-en-Combraille, near Riom, in Auvergne, France, about 1168. He was elevated to the grand-mastery in 1208, after having successively filled all the lower offices. His devotion and valor distinguished him everywhere during the second crusade (1186); but he refused to take part in the third (1188), though he had himself encouraged pope Gregory XIV to preach it, because this movement was headed by the German emperor Frederick Barbarossa, then under the major excommunication. Guerin de Montaigu died in 1230 in Palestine. See Bosio and Baudouin, Hist. de l'ordre de Jerusalem; Naberat, Privileges de l'ordre de Jerusalem.

## Montaigut, Gilles-Ayceltn De[[@Headword:Montaigut, Gilles-Ayceltn De]]

             a French prelate, was born at Glaine-Montaigut, near Billom (Auvergne), about 1252; appointed provost of the cathedral of Clermont in 1285, and shortly after canon of Narbonne. He was finally chosen archbishop of that city by a part of the chapter, in 1287. Ordained priest, March 17, 1291, by Simon de Beaulieu, archbishop of Bourges, he subsequently started for Rome, and cardinal Gerard Bianchi, bishop of Sabine, consecrated him at Viterbo in the following May. He is found in the number of counsellors of state present at the Louvre in 1296, when the chancellor, Pierre Flotte, read the letters by which Guy, count of Flanders, revoked the powers of his ambassadors commissioned to negotiate a peace with Philip the Fair. Gilles, in the name of the latter prince, signed, June, 1299, the truce concluded with the king of England at Montreuil, October 24, 1301, he was one of the assembly convoked at Senlis to judge Bernard Saisset, bishop of Pamiers, legate of the pope, and one of his suffragans. Called to Rome by this affair, Gilles was ordered by the king not to repair to that city, and he obeyed his royal master. He was one of the five prelates of the council at the Louvre, March 12, 1303, held against Boniface VIII, and labored for the election of Bertrand de Goth (Clement V), his friend. He was also the first of the French bishops appointed to proceed against the Templars. February 27, 1309, he was made keeper of the seals; and after having presided over a diocesan synod at Narbonne, and in 1310 over a council at Beziers, he exchanged his bishopric, May 5, 1311, for that of Rouen. Present at the council-general of Vienna, he was there persuaded that it was useless to allow the Templars to attempt to vindicate themselves. On his return to Rouen, he there presided at a provincial council, October, 1313; held two others at Rouen in 1315, and one at Pontoise, November 17, 1317. Montaigut died at Paric June 23, 1318. By his testament, December 13, 1314, he constituted his nephew, Albert Aycelin de Montaigut, bishop of Clermont, his heir, on the condition of maintaining in the houses belonging to him in Paris as many poor scholars as the number of times the sum of ten pounds should be contained in the annual revenue of these houses. Such was the origin of the College of Montaigut, on the site of which the Library of Saint Genevieve now stands. See Gallia Chrsistiana, volumes 6 and 12; Du Chesne, Histoires des Chanceliers de Fraince; France Pontificale.

## Montalembert, Charles Forbes Rene, Comte de[[@Headword:Montalembert, Charles Forbes Rene, Comte de]]

             one of the brightest lights in the history of modern France, noted for his attainments in ecclesiastical as well as secular learning, distinguished as statesman, orator, and writer, was born, of French extraction, at London, March 10, 1810. He was the descendant of one of the oldest noble families of France. One of his ancestors played an important part in the reign of Francis I. His own father served in the army of Conde, but quitted France during the Revolution, and, marrying a Scottish lady, entered the English service, and fought in Egypt and Spain against Napoleon, returning only to his native country after the restoration of the Bourbons in 1814. Charles was left in Britain in charge of his grandfather on his mother's side, an old gentleman who had evinced his interest in the child when yet only a one- year-old babe by dedicating to him a great work (Oriental Memoirs, 42 volumes, 4to), by which the name of Forbes was to live for ages to come. Mr. James Forbes watched over his young charge with the fondest affection, training and educating the boy himself, until, at the age of eight, it was thought best to place him at school in Fulham. Charles remained there, however, only one year, for, his grandfather dying in 1819, he was sent for by his parents, who were then residing in Paris, and leading a most fashionable and gay life. This was hardly a proper sphere for a boy who had been accustomed to spend much of his time in reading and study in the well-filled library of his grandpa's retreat at Hanmore, near Harrow, or in intellectual conversations with his accomplished ancestor, for whom, if we may believe Mrs. Oliphant, Montalembert's biographer, this boy, with his early and precocious intelligence, had become a "companion."

The count, his father, who had but recently returned from Stuttgard, where he had represented his country as minister plenipotentiary, was too much absorbed by political movements and intrigues to give any time to Charles, and his mother was still too young and too gay to assume parental cares and duties, sure to interfere with the exciting stir and bustle of her life, to which she had hitherto been left free by Charles's stay with his grandpa; hence the boy was largely left to his instructors or to himself. That he did not waste his opportunities is apparent from his diary, which he always kept. The life of mere amusement by which he saw himself surrounded had no attraction for his early developed sense of duty, and he marks the irksome demands frequently by a record of a "day lost, like so many others." His principal instructor at this time was Prof. Gobert, of the College Henri IV. In 1824 abbe Nicolle, head of the College of Sainte-Barbe, was brought into  contact with the precocious young student, and finally, in 1826, induced his parents to place him under a regular course of study. It was while in this school, engaged in close mental application, that the great thought which never after ceased to animate him, which became, in fact, the motto of all his labors — "God and freedom" first took shape. "He was seventeen," says Mrs. Oliphant, "when he wrote in his commonplace-book 'God and liberty — these are the two principal motive powers of my existence. To reconcile these two perfections shall be the aim of my life.'” "We call especial attention to this phenomenon," says a recent reviewer of Mrs. Oliphant's work, "for it is the best answer to the imputations so frequently levelled at his consistency. His probable liability to them even then dawned upon him: 'What shall I do? What will become of me? How shall I reconcile my ardent patriotism with religion?' He would neither have found nor feared any difficulty of the kind, if he had meant religion in the broad sense of the term. He was clearly speculating on the difficulty of reconciling love of country with ardent, uncompromising devotion to the Catholic Church. In August 1828, he records a fixed determination to write a great work on the politics and philosophy of Christianity, and, with a view to its completion, to waste no more time on the politics or history of his own time. Three notes of admiration in red ink are set against this entry in the original journal. He attended the debates in the Chamber of Peers, and found them d'une mediocrite effrayante. In fact, his thoughts, his plans, his subjects of interest were those of a matured intellect, of a formed man, who felt 'cabin'd, cribb'd, confined' within the walls of a lectureroom."

Yet he quitted Sainte-Barbe in the following year (1829) with great regret, for he knew that before him lay much more of frivolous gayety than delightful interchange of heart and mind. Far, then, from looking forward with fervent expectations of enjoyment to his approaching introduction to society, he foresaw no gratification in mingling undistinguished in the crowd: "I can imagine Pitt or Fox coming out of the House of Commons, where they had struck their adversaries dumb by their eloquence, and enjoying a dinner-party. I can imagine Grattan amusing himself, after fifty years of glory, playing hide-and-seek with children. But for an obscure and unknown individual, lost in the crowd of other men, or at the best numbered only among the elegants who feel themselves obliged to wander every evening into three or four houses where they are half stifled under pretence of enjoying themselves, I see neither pleasure nor honor in it. I see only a culpable loss of time, and mortal weariness." In this mood he started to join his father, then French ambassador at Stockholm, via Belgium and  Holland, lingering on the way to see everything worth seeing, and duly recording his impressions as they arose. Received at once into the gay circles of the Swedish capital, he was with difficulty induced to lay aside his stiffness and reserve; his manner naturally enough gave offence to the light-hearted and haply frivolous companions who were forced upon him; he was voted a prig; and it was not till some time that his really gentle and unassuming nature began to be recognized. But if Charles was formal on the surface at this time, in the consciousness of the grandeur of his youthful aims, he was yet sharply observant, as he always was, and his journal contains " an extremely lively sketch" of the Swedish court and its surroundings. He studied also carefully the institutions of Sweden, as may be seen from the article he published on the subject shortly after.

He besides devoted himself to the study of philosophy, and by advice of Cousin spent much time in the reading of Kant, whom he found "terribly difficult," as he himself tells us, and not by any means a congenial study — a fact not to be wondered at, for Montalembert's mind, with all its noble and powerful impulses, had no affinity for philosophic studies. He was throughout life impatient of sifting principles to their last results, and holding them upon his mind in pure rational abstraction. "Metaphysics," says his biographer, "were never much to his taste, and he was wont to arrive at conviction by a shorter road than argument. Truths divine did not come to him sounded by the tongue of a theologian; they came by insight, by intuition, by inspiration; and they went forth from him with the lightning flash of genius, in spontaneous and irresistible bursts." His genius was poetic, rhetorical, but in no degree philosophical. Hence the speeches of the great Irish orators, Grattan and O'Connell, and the eloquence of Burke, were far more attractive than even "the great Schelling," of whom he speaks at this time "as being so ill understood in France." But yet foremost among all his thoughts came forth the great objects to which he had consecrated himself — religion and freedom. Roman Catholicism was now, and always to him, religion, and this Catholicism, in order to triumph, he saw clearly, "must have liberty as its ally and tributary." Every effort of his own, and those of his friends whom he believed fitted to take a part in this great work, he endeavored to make serviceable in this direction. In this spirit he wrote to his friend Rio, the future historian of Christian art, whom he numbered thus early among his most devoted associates: "Do not, I beseech you, abandon yourself to that political discouragement which Burke justly calls the most fatal of all maladies. Do not despair of the cause which you have adopted, or give up sound principles, because a generation  without faith and without soul seem to dishonor them by pretended attachment." By a like spirit he was enthusiastically inspired for Roman Catholic Ireland, and resolved to make a journey to that country in order to fit himself properly as historian of the Gleeen Isle; this, however, was prevented by the sudden illness of a sister, who died at Besanon, October 29, 1829, in his arms but a few hours after he had reached her. He had been passionately attached to her, and this sudden removal threw him into a deep melancholic state. He was now more than ever interested in religious subjects, and was even inclined to take holy orders. But he finally forsook this plan, thought of studying law, and, under a passing impulse, even of joining the army of Algiers, a folly to which in after-life he thus pleasantly alluded: "Je suis le premier de mon sang qui n'ai guerroye qu'avec la plume." He had no real military ardor, and the pen in his hand proved a far more trenchant weapon than the sword.

In this restless state, utterly unable to make a choice for life, he wrote an article on Sweden, and presented it to the learned Protestant Guizot for publication in the Revue Frangaise, of which Guizot was editor. Though exception was taken to parts, and much erased that the young would-be litterateur thought his best, the article was printed, and at once established his fame as a good writer and careful observer. His literary friendships rapidly multiplied, and he counted among his most intimate associates Lamartine, Sainte-Beuve, and Victor Hugo, "then the poet of all sweet and virtuous things," cherishing the hope of "a universal religious restoration and rebirth of the world." He now also became a contributor to the Correspondant, a well-known Roman Catholic periodical, for which he continued to write all his life.

But, restless as he was, he could not give up the plan of writing on Ireland, and at length, in the end of July, on the very eve of the Revolution, he set out for that country. The news of the re- overthrow of the Bourbons met him at London, and he went back to Paris; not to stay, however, for his father insisted upon his quitting the scene, and he resumed his journey. We cannot touch upon his Irish visit in detail, but we must at least allude to his call at Maynooth, for the scene he there beheld had no doubt a wonderful influence on his life-work. He himself describes a most striking scene of suffering and devotion which he enjoyed at a mass celebrated there, "the men kneeling in the mud, all uncovered, though the rain fell in torrents, and the mud quivered beneath them." No wonder that such a scene deepened his ardent devotion to Romanism, and confirmed in him the hitherto half-resolved purpose to give himself to the  service of the Church and of Freedom! Mrs. Oliphant may well think that it was this visit to Ireland that decided the future of Montalembert. He had seen the Island of the Saints, the island in which liberty was making common cause with faith, in which the standard of patriotism was waved from the altar by the priest. In the Irish Church, then, the twin ideals of his young enthusiasm seemed to him united, sitting like "a dethroned queen" among her people, the guardian of their faith and of their rights, and all the more glorious in her rags and poverty to his dazzled vision. Here was an object worthy of all his ardor and labor. Here religion was the emblem, not of successful power, but of patient suffering. Here she was plainly on the side of the people. He returned to France, burning with eagerness to give a like noble place to the Church of his own country, that there also the Church might be the guardian of the people's faith and of their rights. Not only the peculiar condition of the country — the July Revolution had just ended favored his project, but Lamennais had long dreamed of just such a work as Montalembert proposed, and, being brought in contact with him and his pupil Lacordaire, the three men together launched a paper, L'Avenir, by which to give circulation to their opinions. SEE LACORDAIRE; SEE LAMENNAIS.

And why should they not? France was in one of its fits of " Liberal" ecstasy. The charter — the free institutions it guaranteed, the self-government which it held out to the hopes of the nation — was the popular idol. But in the midst of this impetuous rush towards political freedom the Church remained in bondage." Why should this be so? Why should the Church not be free as well as the State, with right to appoint her own bishops, and educate her own children as she wished? These were questions that demanded agitating, and for it L'Avenir came into existence. The first number of the paper appeared October 15, 1830. In a little more than three months the country was ablaze because of the severe attacks made upon the government by the triumvirate of L'Avenir. January 31, 1831, two of its editors were in criminal courts answering to charges of bitterly assailing the king for exercising his constitutional right in clerical appointments. This time they were lucky enough to secure acquittal. But, instead of profiting by their experience, they only drew from it encouragement to continue in their course, and, not content with the limited influence of L'Avenir, attempted a fresh and original enterprise. They formed a society called Agence de la liberte religieuse, which publicly announced that, attendu que la liberte se praend et ne se donne pas, three of their members would open a school, free and gratuitous, at Paris, for Catholic education, independent as well of the  university as of all other state influence, by way of testing the right. The school was opened on May 1, 1831, after due notice to the prefect of police, by three members of the society, Lacordaire, M. de Coux, and Montalembert himself, who succinctly relates what followed: "The abbe Lacordaire delivered a short and energetic inaugurative discourse. We formed each a class for twenty children. The next day a commissary came to summon us to decamp. He first addressed the children: 'In the name of the law, I summon you to depart.' Lacordaire immediately rejoined: 'In the name of your parents, whose authority I have, I order you to remain.' The children cried out unanimously, 'We will remain.' Whereupon the police turned out pupils and masters, with the exception of Lacordaire, who protested that the schoolroom hired by him was his domicile, and that he would pass the night in it unless he was dragged out by force. 'Leave me,' he said to us, seating himself on a mattress he had brought there; 'I remain here alone with the law and my right.' He did not give way till the police laid hands upon him; after which the seals were affixed, and a prosecution was forthwith commenced against the schoolmasters."

Montalembert's father having died soon after the commencement of these proceedings, he was entitled, by successorship in the peerage, to trial before the Chamber of Peers; and before them he appeared on September 19, 1831, and there made the event memorable by his first speech, one of the most brilliant upon record, and a clear foreshadowing, not alone of the eloquence, but of the bold and uncompromising earnestness in the cause of his Church and of the common interests of religious liberty which constantly characterized his later career. After a touching allusion to his great bereavement, and an exposition of the reasons which induced him to claim the judgment of his peers, he said: "It is sufficiently well known that the career on which I have entered is not of a nature to satisfy an ambition which seeks political honors and places. The powers of the present age, both in government and in opposition, are, by the grace of Heaven, equally hostile to Catholics. There is another ambition, not less devouring, perhaps not less culpable, which aspires to reputation, and which is content to buy that at any price; that, too, I disavow like the other. No one can be more conscious than I am of the disadvantages with which a precocious publicity surrounds youth, and none can fear them more. But there is still in the world something which is called faith; it is not dead in all minds. It is to this that I have early given my heart and my life. My life — a man's life — is always, and especially today, a poor thing enough; but this poor thing,  consecrated to a great and holy cause, may grow with it; and when a man has made to such a cause the sacrifice of his future, I believe that he ought to shrink from none of its consequences, none of its dangers. It is in the strength of this conviction that I appear today for the first time in an assembly of men.

I know too well that at my age one has neither antecedents nor experience; but at my age, as at every other, one has duties and hopes. I have determined, for my part, to be faithful to both." He thus, on the most solemn occasion of his life, deliberately took his stand upon the principles to which he persistently adhered to his dying day; and the nobility of thought, the moral courage, the spirit of self-sacrifice which actuated him are beyond cavil or dispute, whatever may be thought of the prudence or wisdom of his course. It must be borne in mind all the time that, inasmuch as in the infidel reaction following the great Revolution Roman Catholic France had been allowed to sink into a withering and hopeless secularism, nipping its youthful national life at the root, and yielding a stunted harvest of many evils (the end of which is not even vet), the effort of Montalembert and his colleagues to vindicate a place for religion in the national life and government to proclaim that society without God is a soulless and corrupting mass, never far from anarchy was a manifestation of an enthusiasm such as all France could not but pronounce both noble and true, and therefore it is not surprising that the result of the trial was a simple fine of 100 francs. But then came also the question what step to take next. The circulation of L 'Avenir had not reached 3000; instead of being self-supporting, it had proved a drain on the scanty resources of the society, which, having to sustain also the expense of prosecutions and propagandism, broke down. As the little band had contrived to place themselves very much in the position of Ishmael, and the clergy, headed by the episcopacy, were among the fellest of their foes, further appeals to an enlightened public were voted nugatory, and they formed the extraordinary step of submitting the crucial questions in dispute to the pope.

The great lawsuit was not to be at Paris, but at Rome. His holiness was to decide whether L'Avenir was or was not entitled to the support of the Roman Catholic world, and the journal was to be suspended till his sovereign will and pleasure should be made known. The suggestion came from Lacordaire: "We will carry our protest, if necessary, to the City of the Apostles, to the steps of the Confessional of St. Peter, and we shall see who will stop the pilgrims of the God of Liberty." No one thought of stopping them; the nore's the pity, for this expedition was a blunder of the first magnitude, conceived in utter ignorance or forgetfulness of that  traditional policy of Rome which lord Macaulay deems a main cause of her durability and strength. "She thoroughly understood, what no other Church has ever understood, how to deal with enthusiasts. In some sects, particularly in infant sects, enthusiasm is suffered to be rampant; in other sects, particularly in sects long established and richly endowed, it is regarded with aversion. The Catholic Church neither submits to enthusiasm nor proscribes it, but uses it." She used Ignatius Loyola and St. Teresa; she would have used John Bunyan, John Wesley, Joanna Southcott, Selina, countess of Huntingdon, and Mrs. Fry. The founders of L'Avenir were just the sort of enthusiasts she wanted, so long as they could be kept within bounds. But they had proved uncontrollable. If the pope and his advisers had been equally confident that the Church of Rome owed no more to absolute power than the primitive Church of Christ, or would rise the higher if cut free from its temporalities, they would have wished nothing better than the support of an organ like L'Avenir. But they would have been unaccountably wanting in the sagacity for which Macaulay gives them credit "had they not penetrated to the fallacy of such arguments at a glance, and drawn a widely different moral from the history. They could not shut their eyes to the fact that spiritual supremacy attained its loftiest pitch in the Dark Ages, and has everywhere declined in proportion to the spread of knowledge." The three apostles of the new era, which they hoped to inaugurate with the direct approval of an infallible guide, knocked at the gate of the Vatican, were admitted into the presence of "his holiness," but completely failed in their mission. SEE LACORDAIRBE; SEE LAMENNAIS.

The very Church they wished to serve — to whose cause they had consecrated, with such touching earnestness, all their gifts — repudiated their aid. The court of Rome understood its own mission better than they did. It admitted "their good intentions," but at the same time silenced them as inspired by a zeal without discretion in the treatment of "supremely delicate questions!" Indeed, this was but the only consistent course for Rome to take. It could not suffer severely orthodox followers to profess to hold upon essential points the doctrines of advanced modern liberalism without seeing them in direct antagonism with the teaching and practice of the Church in all ages; hence the encyclical of pope Gregory XVI, declaring the conviction of the writers of L'Avenir "abominable," and fulminating anathema against the most sacred liberties, declaring that freedom of conscience is a mortal pest." This was anything but a flattering and brilliant solution, yet the triumvirate meekly submitted. Outwardly all three were equally actuated by that sense of duty which — Roman  Catholics are wont to place as highest — of bowing reverentially and unqualifiedly before the wisdom of the papal incumbent, as "the voice of God in the flesh;" but in the inner camp there was a terrible struggle. To Montalembert the whole case was a matter of but little moment after all- certainly of much less moment than to the other two. True, his faith was not less sincere or ardent than theirs, but he was as yet merely a young writer; the other two were priests — Lamennais a preacher whose fame had already reached through the whole Catholic world, and had brought him back many distinctions. In vain did Lacordaire offer to submit quietly, and argue that they should act consistently, as there was only one alternative from the first — "Either we should not have come, or we should submit and hold our tongues." Montalembert and Lacordaire forever after acted on this plan, and held their peace; but Lamennais's submission was hollow and formal, and it wanted only (as was afterwards apparent) an opportunity to be disdainfully ignored. SEE LAMENNAIS.

We as Protestants, unaccustomed to such "Catholic" submission, find it, of course, difficult even to conjecture by what process of reasoning these men contrived to reconcile absolute submission to the Romish Church with the defence of that which she has again and again emphatically denounced and condemned. "The conduct of Lamennais," as the Brit. and For. Ev. Rev. (October 1863, page 726) has well said, "was at least more consistent than that of his two disciples. They, proclaiming themselves the faithful and obedient followers of an infallible Church — which says to its disciples, 'I am the truth; it is in me, in me alone; to seek it elsewhere is heresy and rebellion' — accepted a part of her doctrine and rejected a part. He, finding that his attempt to reconcile the Church with the tendencies of the age, to unite Republicanism and Romanism, was condemned by Rome herself, and that he must choose between the two, broke with Rome, and proclaimed himself ready to combat and to suffer for what he deemed, however erroneously, the cause of justice and humanity. He broke with a Church which had lost the germs of life and progress, and sought elsewhere the means of regenerating mankind, while they professed implicit submission. But his schism was at least logical and consistent; their submission partial and absurd. He and the Church were thenceforward in direct antagonism; while they, its submissive sons, for the rest of their lives went on endeavoring to carry out the plan which Lamennais had traced in the columns of L'Avenir, which Rome had emphatically condemned, and which its author had abandoned as impracticable.

He gave up Rome because he found her claims inconsistent with those of humanity; they attempted to  save her in spite of herself — to reconcile her with the wants and aspirations of the age — to put new cloth into old garments, new wine into old bottles. Yet we cannot but believe that both master and disciples were sincere and disinterested in their conduct: the former in his schism, the latter in their submission." No one certainly can be believed to know anything of either Lacordaire or Montalembert who would suppose for a moment that these men were influenced by any mere personal considerations. No men probably ever acted under a higher sense of duty, only they never thought of duty in the case apart from the pope. When they saw what the result was likely to be, they quietly and without struggle bowed the knee. "The position," says a writer in Blackwood (November 1872, page 603), "is intelligible, but hardly great or magnanimous. Submission may be heroic in a grave practical crisis which admits of no argument, but it is hardly so in questions of truth and right, which have roused the conscience as well as the judgment to vigorous action. We confess to following Lamennais in his disdainful retirement with far more interest than we contemplate the 'Catholic submission' of his colleagues. Duty loses its higher heroism when it loses individuality, and passes into blind selfsurrender." Lamennais's publication of Paroles d'un Croyant caused Lacordaire to step forward in defence of the papacy, and this left Montalembert, who had stood by Lamennais through good and evil report, no alternative but to concur with Lacordaire in separating from him. Hereafter the three men stand apart, Lamennais the propagator of a socialist theory, Lacordaire the exponent of papal Christianity, and Montalembert the student of mediaeval institutions.

His journalistic career being cut short by papal disapproval, and himself unable to enter political life for lack of age (the peerage begins at twenty- five), Montalembert now went abroad to travel, mainly in Germany, to study the preservation of Roman Catholicism as well as monuments of its history in that country. It was during one of his frequent tours of inspection of mediaeval buildings and monuments that he was inspired with the conception of his first sustained and eminently successful effort in literature, the history of St. Elizabeth (Hist. de Ste. Elisabeth de Hongrie [1836]; transl. into English by Mary Hackett and Mrs. J. Sadlier, N.Y. 1854). The opening sentences of the introduction to this work are so characteristic that we quote them here: "On the 19th of November, 1833, a traveller arrived at Marbourg, a town in the electorate of Hesse, situated upon the beautiful banks of the Lahn. He paused to examine the church,  which was celebrated at once for its pure and perfect beauty, and because it was the first in Germany where the pointed arch prevailed over the round in the great renovation of art in the 13th century. This church bears the name of St. Elizabeth, and it was on St. Elizabeth's day that he found himself within its walls. In the church itself (which, like the country, is now devoted to the Lutheran worship) there was no trace of any special solemnity, except that in honor of the day, and, contrary to Protestant custom, it was open, and children were at play in it among the tombs. The stranger roamed through its vast, desolate, and devastated aisles, which are still young in their elegance and airy lightness. He saw placed against a pillar the statue of a young woman in the dress of a widow, with a gentle and resigned countenance, holding in one hand the model of a church, and with the other giving alms to a lame man... The lady is there depicted, fairer than in all the other representations, stretched on her bed of death amid weeping priests and nuns; and, lastly, bishops exhume a coffin, on which an emperor lays his crown. The traveller was told that these were events in the life of St. Elizabeth, queen of that country, who died on that day six hundred years ago in that very town of Marbourg, and lay buried in that very church."

After his first visit to the church, Montalembert with great difficulty sought out a copy of a "Life of St. Elizabeth," of which he possessed himself as a prize; and though he found it "the cold, lifeless composition of a Protestant," the sympathetic chord was struck, and he set about the study of her career with hourly increasing eagerness, consulting traditions, visiting every place that she had hallowed by her presence, and ransacking all the books, chronicles, and manuscripts in which mention was made of her, or which threw light on her contemporaries or her age. He spent his days and his nights in the preparation of the work, and it need not surprise us, therefore, that the book established his fame as an author. What is really most valuable and most characteristic in the book is that which elucidates her age, especially the Introduction (135 pages royal 8vo), in which he seeks to prove that the 13th century, in which she flourished, has been shamefully calumniated; that it was not merely the age in which the papacy attained its culminating point of pride and power, but the age in which Christian literature and art — that is to say, what he deems the best and purest literature and art — approached nearer to perfection than they have ever approached since or are likely to approach again. This clearly manifests that though his historic insight was fine, minute, and picturesque, he yet lacked depth of historic judgment, and strength and range of sympathy. Here as everywhere fact, with its complex  variety of association and breadth of human interest, was not so attractive to him as sentiment, and the curious personation with which it can invest the most obvious realities. With all its beauty and grace of outline and charm of portraiture, Montalembert's life of St. Elizabeth does not gainsay this judgment.

On his return from Germany, Montalembert married, in the celebrated Flemish family De Merode, a sister of the now greatly renowned Monsignore de Merode, and selected for his wedding-trip an excursion into Switzerland and Italy. He then settled at Paris, and having succeeded to the peerage in 1835, he now fully entered upon his distinguished political career. Though not entitled to the right of voting until thirty, Montalembert was yet entitled to a seat, and in consequence to a participation in the debates, and in these he took a lively part, distinguishing himself very rapidly as an orator of no common rank, as well as a man of principle. He broke ground as a debater in September, 1835, in behalf of the liberty of the press, followed by other speeches, all of a liberal tendency. But his great aim at this time was the successful issue of. the work which he had intended to bring about by the Avenir — viz. liberty of the Church; struggling mainly in behalf of an educational system free from the state and in alliance with the Church. In its behalf he dared to say anything which he felt to be the truth. "He could," says Sainte-Beuve, "utter with all freedom the most passionate pleadings for that liberty which was only the excess of his youth. He could develop without interruption those absolute theories which from another mouth would have made the Chamber shiver; but which pleased them from his. He could even give free course to his mordant and incisive wit, and make personal attacks with impunity upon potentates and ministers... His bitterness — and he was sometimes bitter — from him seemed almost amenity, the harshness of the meaning being disguised by the elegance of his manner and his perfect good grace." "It was a sight full of interest," says another, "to see this ardent, enthusiastic, impetuous young man rise in the midst of the Chamber of Peers, composed almost entirely of the relics of past conditions of society — men grown gray in public business, conversant with politics, and among whom experience had destroyed enthusiasm — and disturb with the accents of an impassioned voice the decent calm, the elegant reserve, and the polite conventionalities of their habitual discussions, as he vindicated the rights and interests of that religion which was said to have no partisans but old men, and no life but in the past." Montalembert did not, indeed, shine by  lofty sustained imagery, like Burke and Grattan, the objects of his early admiration; nor by polished rhetoric, flights of fancy, or strokes of humor, like Canning. His strength lay in earnestness, ready command of energetic language, elevation of thought and tone, rapidity, boldness, conviction, passion, heart. His vehemence, his vis vivida, as power: when he warmed to his subject, he carried all before him with a rush. He had all, or almost all, that is comprised in the action of Demosthenes.

But as an author also Montalembert was now greatly adding to his fame. He devoted a large share of his time to study, and as a result published a work on "Mediaeval Art" (Du Vandalisme et du Catholicisme dans les iarts [1840]) and a "Life of St. Anselm" (Saint Anselme, fragmenet de l'introduction a l'histoie de St. Bernard [1844]). In 1843 he began to develop an unusually great activity in the debates in the Chamber of Peers, and he delivered some masterly speeches on such general questions as the liberty of the Church, instruction and education, the theory and constitution of the monastic orders, and the affairs of Poland, in which he always took a deep interest. Towards the close of the same year, while staying at Madeira for the sake of his health, he published Du Devoir des Catholiques dans la Question de la Liberte d'Enseignement. This was followed by his celebrated Letter to the Cambridge Camden Society, designed to disprove the attempts made by that society to identify the Reformed Church of England with that of the Middle Ages and of continental Europe. In 1847 he delivered his celebrated speech on the affairs of Switzerland, in which he distinctly foretold the revolution which broke out among the continental nations in the year following; and his brilliant Discours sur les afaires de Rome, delivered shortly after the popular outbreak, was received with a triple salvo of applause by an audience which sympathized but coldly with his views.

After the revolution of February 1848, the department of Doubs, in which he held property, elected him its representative to the National Assembly, from which he passed into the Legislative Assembly, where he uniformly acted true to his professions as the exponent of the views and interests of the Roman Catholic Church. He worked hard as a member of the commission which, under many difficulties and compromises, prepared the new law of education known as the "Loi Falloux" (and which he might be excused from thinking ought to have been the "Loi Montalembert"); but his influence was even at this time due in the main to his powers as an orator. Like many other men of the oratorical temperament, he was not fitted for parliamentary diplomacy and intrigue, or the many acts behind the  scenes by which political power is often acquired and maintained. It is thus that the estrangement of the extreme section of the clerical party from him after the passage of the educational law is to be accounted for. He called this settlement of the question the " Concordat d'Enseignement," and believed himself a valuable servant of Rome. But the Ultramontanes designated it as a base compromise of the best interests of the Church. The very paper which he had been mainly instrumental in raising up — L' Univers — denounced him and all who had been instrumental in passing the law in most virulent language. Thus is it evermore in the Church of Rome. Her most devoted members, if happily they do the bidding of the Ultramontanes, are applauded, and they who, while seeking earnestly to serve the Church, should yet fail to accomplish all that is demanded, are condemned and ignored. SEE MAYNOOTH.

Although Montalembert lost the support of those upon whom he had reason to lean, he now found, as every honest man is sure to find, support from all classes, and he enjoyed further successes. Yet none of these elated or even satisfied him. He had dedicated himself to the interests of the Church, and failing to gain that support from the source to which he believed himself entitled, he finally in 1852 determined to close his political life. He was not superseded in the Legislature until 1857, yet his political activity may be said to have closed in 1852. And now that he was free to consider the past and the part he had played, the bitter truth broke upon him that he had been acting for Romanism against liberty, and for the remainder of his life he determined to struggle manfully to repair or atone for his mistake. That he failed utterly it will not be necessary to state here. But even in his failure there is yet apparent the striving for truth and right, as we shall see presently. At the outset of his political career under the republic he had avowed democratic sentiments, and voted against Napoleon's admission to the Assembly; but when the Bonapartists turned defenders of Rome, Montalembert's sympathy was enlisted, and he for some time favored the Imperialists. After the confiscation of the Orleans property he ignored the Bonapartists, and it was therefore no small mark of distinction which he received at this time from the Academy by election to its membership.

In 1854 he was engaged in the publication of L‘Avenirpolitique de l'Angleterre (transl. in 1856), which aims to show that the future prospects of England would be improved by a resumption of intercourse with Rome; and this leading idea he pursues through an infinity of digressions and speculations, interspersed with various particulars of  English life as exhibited in its schools, its journalism, and its political institutions. He was bitterly assailed on both sides of the Channel, especially for what he said about the churches; and in a letter dated La Roche-en-Breny, January 3, 1856, he wrote, "This act has been, and deserves to be, looked upon as an act of foolhardiness. I have to contend both in Europe and America with the whole weight of religious prejudice against Protestant England, and of political prejudice against English freedom or English ambition." What turned out an act of still greater foolhardiness was an article in the Correspondant of October, 1858 (published separately in England), entitled Un Debat sur l'Inde au Parlement Anglais, which he made the vehicle of such exasperating allusions to the Imperial regime that it provoked a prosecution. In brilliant and enthusiastically admiring pictures he drew the social and political institutions of Britain, for the purpose mainly of covertly contrasting them with. the condition of his own native land. He was defended by Berryer, and gave his own evidence as to the exact meaning of the inculpated passages, which no English judge or jury could have held libellous, but he was found guilty, and the sentence on him was six months' imprisonment with a fine of 3000 francs: one month's imprisonment and a fine of 1000 francs on the publisher. The sentence, after being confirmed on appeal, was gladly remitted by the emperor; so that the prosecution proved a signal triumph to Montalembert in all respects, and had the singular advantage of presenting him for the last time before the world in the attitude which above all he would have probably most desired of an advocate for the freedom of the press.

The remainder of this noble man's life was entirely devoted to literary labors. He had for twenty years earnestly inquired into the mediaeval institutions and characters, and in 1860 brought out the first two volumes of Les Moines d'Occident depuis Saint Benoit jusquz a Saint Bernard (transl. into English by Mrs. Oliphant, Edinb. 1861 and sq.). The whole Western world, Protestant as well as Roman Catholic, was attracted, and everybody who claimed a place for culture read what were a decade's studies — the mature conclusions of this brilliant Frenchman. Especially in England, where Montalembert had always been well known and much admired, the work was universally spoken of and freely commented upon by the press. (See Blackwood's Magazine, June 1861.) The British and Foreign Evangelical Review, in July 1868, reviewing the first five volumes, observes, " However mistaken we may think this gifted son and servant of  the Church of Rome as to the importance of the object to which he has consecrated so large a portion of his life, it is impossible to withhold our admiration, either from the earnestness of spirit which prompted him to make the sacrifice, or from the fine conception and vigorous execution displayed in his attempt to teach the world what it owes to the monks, what it has gained by their existence, what it has lost by their overthrow... He would disclaim — indeed, he does expressly disclaim — the work of the panegyrist; he even admits and deplores the errors and follies and abuses which the system has developed in the course of ages" (pages 450, 454, 476; compare British Quarterly Review, July 1868, pages 202, 203). SEE MONASTICISM.

Montalembert lived to bring out three more volumes of this work, making five in all, but did not complete it. Though, as we have seen, Protestants cannot in every particular endorse it, they have yet gladly assigned it a most important place in ecclesiastical literature. Of course Roman Catholics regard it as a chef-d'ceuvre in all respects, and greatly lament that the author did not live to complete it. " This great monument of history, this great work interrupted by death," says M. Coclin, "is gigantic as an uncompleted cathedral." It is certainly a vast conception, a durable, if unfinished, monument of energy, zeal, literary skill, research, learning, eloquence, and (we must add) credulity. The most remarkable result of Montalembert's labors in this direction he reaped in his own household. "One day," says Mr. Coclin, "his charming and beloved child entered that library which all his friends know so well, and said to him, 'I am fond of everything around me. I love pleasure, wit, society and its amusements; I love my family, my studies, my companions, my youth, my country, but I love God better than all, and I desire to give myself to him.' And when he said to her, ' My child, is there something that grieves you?' she went to the bookshelves and sought out one of the volumes in which he had narrated the history of the monks of the West. 'It is you,' she answered, ' who have taught me that withered hearts and weary souls are not the things which we ought to offer to God.'" After describing the agony inflicted on both mother and father by this event, Montalembert. exclaims, "How many others have undergone this agony, and gazed with a look of distraction on the last worldly appearance of a dearly beloved daughter or sister." Yet it never once occurred to this warm-hearted, noble-minded man that a system which inflicts such agony on so many innocent sufferers, which condemns to the chill gloom of a cloister what is meant for love and light — which runs counter to the whole course of nature — may be wrong.

In 1862 Montalembert published a sketch of the life of Lacordaire (q.v.), which abounds, like all his other productions, in loyal expressions to the Church of his birth as well as of his choice. His motto was still, 'Tout pour l'eglise et par l'eglise" (comp. Brit. and For. Ev. Rev. October 1863, page 722 sq.). In the same year he gave yet more emphatic expression to his devotion to Romanism in his oration before the Roman Catholic Congress held at Mechlin, and afterwards published in a separate form under the title of L'Eglise Libre dans l'Etat Libre (Paris, 1863, 8vo). As in the Chamber of Peers and in the Assembly, so also at this time count Montalembert's orations proved highly interesting, both on account of the eloquence of style and nobleness of sentiment, as well as because they contain so strong an advocacy of the principles of religious toleration. Yet it was not inappropriately said by a Protestant journal in 1864 that in these discourses he appeared not as the exponent of the doctrines of the Church of Rome, but rather as an opponent and impugner of her teaching and authority. No doubt this was not his intention; quite the contrary. Yet in these speeches we Protestants can only see that "he praises what she condemns. He affirms what she denies. He claims as a right for every man what she refuses to accord to any. He, a devout Roman Catholic, defends doctrines which the head of the Church denounces as 'fatal,' and as 'works of Satan;' and, so far at least as these doctrines are concerned, distinctly and unequivocally despises and denies the authority Of the Church. In short, in these speeches count Montalembert has shown himself a good Protestant" (Brit. and For. Ev. Rev. April 1864, page 337).

The foolhardy move of 1869 to establish the infallibility dogma was the first occasion on which Montalembert rose in direct antagonism to the papacy. He clearly saw that the Jesuits were scheming the plot, and he boldly descended into the lists, and dealt vigorous sword-thrusts all around. Perhaps in his whole long and illustrious career Montalembert never committed a more courageous act, nor ever clothed lofty and noble thoughts in nobler and loftier language, than he did in his letter of February 28, 1870, addressed to a friend in England, and published in the London Times, March 7, 1870, in which he declared himself against the. absolute tendency in the Church; yes, he even boldly and uncompromisingly declared that he "gloried" in counting as his colleagues in the Academie Francaise two such great and good champions of truth as the bishop of Orleans and father Gratry, and he denounced the Jesuit intrigues at Rome as "idolatrous," quoting in support of the word "idol," as applied to the  pope, a most remarkable letter written to him seventeen years ago by the (then) archbishop of Paris, Mgr. Sibour. "Nothing," said a correspondent of the N.Y. Nation, under date from Paris, March 11, 1870, "so strong, so decided, or so eloquent has yet appeared on this terrible Roman question as this letter of count Montalembert. It will be read wherever the French tongue is spoken, and it will support and console all right-thinking, high- minded Catholics but the obloquy that will be cast upon M. de Montalembert by the Ultramontanes is indescribable. He perceives the bare truth when he says that the Litany of Abuse will be lavished upon him. It will be so unlimitedly, and it will require all the genuineness of his faith and all the chivalry of his nature to bear what will be his inevitable fate."

Of course such an act was enough to eclipse all the services of a lifetime. He had dared to act in harmony with the avowed opinions of his youth; he had supported the demands of the German Catholics, and he was to bear forever the sorrow of such a self-willed act, and it is most painful to reflect that not even his spirit was suffered to pass away in peace; that his dying hours were troubled by an imperative call to choose his side in a wantonly provoked schism. He died March 15, 1870, just sixteen days after writing his memorable letter on papal infallibility. In reply to a visitor who ventured to catechise him on his death-bed, he is reported to have given in his unconditional adhesion to what confessedly he did not understand. "And God does not ask me to understand. He asks me to submit my will and intelligence, and I will do so." This concession even failed to satisfy Rome. The atonement was not sufficient for the crime he had committed; and the highest tribute of ecclesiastical respect which the Church accords to a faithful son was denied to his memory; to the memory of him who had devoted his whole life to her cause, who had dared impossibilities for her sake, who had given up to her what was meant for mankind, and thereby abdicated that place among practical statesmen and legislators which, apart from her blighting influence, his birth, his personal gifts, his high and rare quality of intellect, his eloquence, his elevation of purpose, his nobility of mind and character, must have won for him (comp. Italian correspondence of the N.Y. Tribune, under date of March 25, 1870). No wonder that we are told by the Tribune correspondent that ' the feelings awakened in society were very strong both among the clergy and the laity, one of the former, a bishop, saying, 'I would have gone to Paris to attend a service,' and another, speaking of prohibition, observed, 'Ce n'est pas un crime, mais c'est une faute.'" And well might the Tribune editorial add that "count de Montalembert filled too large a space in the esteem and admiration of his  co-religionists, and of the political and literary world, not to be accorded a special chapter of remembrance."

Montalembert was a man whom title, gifts, accomplishments, fortune, united to make illustrious. The opposite in many respects of his great contemporary, Sainte-Beuve, who preceded him but a little while to the tomb, he laid down his life, with all its brilliancy and all its latter suffering, upon the altar of his faith. "We are dying of the same disease," Sainte- Beuve is said to have remarked; "only I trace it to nature while Montalembert will ascribe it to Providence." The man was not shallow who saw in life religion and in death Providence; and it will not be difficult to say which of the two great men has left the most earnest example. Well has it been said that "a braver or more chivalrous spirit never passed from earth. He was a veritable 'miles Christi' — Chevalier de l'Eglise as he liked to describe his monastic heroes. He was much besides — a picturesque historian, an eloquent orator, a keen and in many respects enlightened politician; but his religious chivalry was the essence of his nature. No monk of old ever consecrated himself with a more cordial devotion to the service of God and the Church. No knight ever fought more gallantly for the cause dear to his heart. Shall we say, in the view especially of his last words on the doctrine of infallibility — which he struggled against to the last, and yet was prepared to accept when once proclaimed — no hero of the cloister ever offered as the sacrifice and service of his faith higher powers or a more entire — only too entire! — self-submission?" (Blackwood's, November 1872, page 609). On one thing the whole world, irrespective of religious difference of opinion, can unite in praise of Montalembert. "He was the very personification of candor. He had not a shadow of bigotry; he hated intolerance; he shuddered at persecution; he had none of the arrogance or unbending hardness of the dogmatist; he was singularly indulgent to what he deemed error; the utmost he would accept from the temporal power, from the state, was a fair field and no favor; the Church, he uniformly maintained, far from having any natural affinity with despotism, could only blossom and bear fruit in an atmosphere of freedom; while liberty, rational liberty, was never safer than under the protecting shadow of her branches 'Nusquam Libertas gratior exstat Quam sub rege pio.' If he waved the consecrated banner of St. Peter with the one hand, he carried La Charte, the emblem and guarantee of constitutional government, in the other; and his life and character would be well worth studying if no higher or more useful moral could be drawn from them than that it is  possible to reconcile a dogmatic, damnatory, exclusive system of belief with generosity, liberality, Christian charity, patriotism and philanthropy" (Lond. Qu. Rev. April 1873, pages 219, 220).

Among publications of his not yet mentioned deserve to be alluded to his Des Interets catholiques au dix-neuvieme siecle (Paris, 1852, 8vo), which gives a rapid and brilliant, though one-sided, review of Catholicism throughout the whole of Europe in that day as compared with what it was some fifty years previous, maintaining that upon the whole the progress made is deep, sound, and likely to be lasting: in the same work he expresses himself strongly on the political changes that had taken place in France, and on the language of the French press in their regard, and thus this publication largely resembles the Political Future of England spoken of above. It was translated and published in English in 1855. He also republished two articles from the Correspondant — Pie IX et Lord Palmerston and La Paix et la Pairie, and a review of the memoirs of the duke de St. Simon. He was a frequent contributor to the Revue des deux Mondes and the Encyclopedie Catholique.

See Sainte-Beuve, Causeries du lundi, volume 1; Nettement, Histoire de la litterature Franqaise; De Lomenie, M. de Montalembert, par un Homme de Rien (Paris, 1841); Mrs. Oliphant, Memoir of Count de Montalembert, etc. (Edinb. and Lond. 1872, 2 volumes, 8vo); Duke d'Aumale's Eloge sur Montalembert, read in the Academy on April 4, 1873, and the periodicals quoted and referred to; Lond. Qu. Rev. April 1856, July 1861; Edinb. Rev. October 1861; North Brit. Rev. August 1861; Blackwood's Magazine, April 1870; also Le Temps (Paris), March 15, 1870; Le Journal des Debats, March 15, 1870. The catalogue raisonne of Montalembert's published writings, including his pamphlets and contributions to reviews, in the Revue Bibliographique Universelle, fills five closely printed pages of small type.

## Montalto, Elias[[@Headword:Montalto, Elias]]

             a Jewish savant, was born in Portugal in the second half of the 16th century, and, professing Christianity, went under the name of Felipe or Filotheo. About 1598 he went to Italy, where his medical skill and fame attracted the attention of Concino Concini, who caused his appointment as principal physician to Mary de Medici, queen of Henry IV of France, and this obtained for him the free exercise of his religion. He was subsequently physician and counsellor to Louis XIII, and died at Paris in 1616. The  queen caused his body to be embalmed, and it was conveyed into Holland by some of his Jewish relations whom he had about him. Montalto not only wrote some esteemed medical works, but also a theologico-apologetical book in the Portuguese language, wherein he defends Judaism against Christianity — his Livro Fayto, 2:388 sq. He also wrote a tract on Isaiah 53, and on Daniel, which are still in MS. See First, Bibl. Jud. 2:388 sq.; De Rossi, Dizionario (Germ. transl.), page 233; Cassel, Leiffcaden fur jud. Gesch. u. Literatur (Berlin, 1872), page 100; Basnage, Histoire des Juifs (Engl. transl.), page 676; Lindo, Hist. of the Jews in Spain, etc., page 362 sq.; Gratz, Gesch. d. Jumden, 9:521, 524; 10:10; Kayserling, Gesch. d. Juden in Portugal (Leipsic, 1867), page 274 sq., 283, 308; Sephardim, pages 176, 201; his essay, "Drei Controversisten," in Frankel's Monatsschrist, 1858, page 323 sq.; Zunz, Die Monatstage des Kalenderjahres (Berlin, 1872), page 9; Geiger, Ud. Zeitschriftfur Wissenschaft u. Leben, 1867, page 184 sq.; 1868, page 158 sq. (B.P.)

## Montandon, Auguste Laurent[[@Headword:Montandon, Auguste Laurent]]

             a French Protestant theologian, was born at Clermont-Ferrand in 1803. He studied at Geneva, was for some time pastor at Luneray, and accepted a call in 1832 to Paris as pastor adjunctus. He published Recits de l'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament, and took a great interest in the different religious organizations, especially in the work of the Bible Society. to which he rendered great services. Montandon died in 1876. (B.P.)

## Montani, Giovanni-Giuseppe[[@Headword:Montani, Giovanni-Giuseppe]]

             an Italian theologian, was born at Pesaro about 1685. He was descended from a noble family; joined the Society of Jesus at Rome, and taught in the schools of that order moral theology with so much success that persons came from distant parts to consult him. He revised and corrected a work of P. Pelizzari, made many additions to it, which he drew mostly from the decrees of the sacred congregation and from the bulls of Benedict XIV, and published it under the title Tractatus de Monialibus (Rome, 1755, 4to; 2d ed. Venice, 1761). He died in 1760. See Richard et Giraud, Bibliotheque Sacree.

## Montanism[[@Headword:Montanism]]

             SEE MONTANISTS,

## Montanists [[@Headword:Montanists ]]

             a Christian sect, is now generally believed to have arisen in Asia Minor, about the middle of the 2d century after Christ. But little if anything is known of their earliest history. It is apparent, however, that as a sect they embodied all the ascetic and rigoristic elements of the Church of the 2d century.  As Christianity had gradually become settled in humanity, "its supernatural principle being naturalized on earth," prophecy and miraculous manifestations were believed to be past. The Montanists, however, came forward to declare a continuance of the miraculous gifts of the apostolic Church, and proclaimed that the age of the Holy Ghost and the millennial reign had been established in the village of Pepuza, in Western Phrygia (Epiphan. De Haefes. 48, 14), which they termed the New Jerusalem. Those who followed the Holy Ghost, speaking through these new prophets, were held to be the only genuine Christians, and were to form the Church. They were the pneumatici, the spiritually-minded; and all the opponents of these new revelations were the psychici, the carnally-minded. As a sect they condemned second marriages, considering wedlock a spiritual union sanctified by Christ, and intended to be renewed beyond the grave. They expelled from the Church all that were guilty of notorious crimes, imposed rigid fasts, advocated celibacy, encouraged martyrdom, allowed of divorce, and held it unlawful to fly in time of persecution. Such were their notions of their own sanctity that, while they did not directly separate from the rest of the Church, they esteemed others very imperfect Christians, and deemed themselves a spiritual Church within the carnal Church. The Christian life was by them not merely referred to a miraculous beginning, the intervention in history of a reparative and saving power, inaugurating a new and final historical development. No there must be nothing less than a perpetual miracle; everything would be lost if the concurrence of natural activity, of patient labor, were for a moment admitted, if the conditions of a slowly progressive development were in any degree recognised. The Montanists thus conceived religion as a process of development, which they illustrated by the analogy of organic growth in nature, distinguishing in this process four stages:

(1.) natural religion, or the innate idea of God;

(2.) the legal religion of the Old Testament;

(3.) the Gospel during the earthly life of Christ; and

(4.) the revelation of the Paraclete; that is, the spiritual religion of the Montanists, and accordingly they called themselves the πνευματικοί, or the spiritual Church, in distinction from the psychical Catholic Church.  This is the first instance of a theory of development which assumes an advance beyond the New Testament and the Christianity of the apostles; misapplying the parables of the mustard seed and the leaven, and Paul's doctrine of the growth of the Church in Christ and his Word, not beyond them. In such a light, "the religion of the Spirit," says Pressense aptly, therefore "is not a new sun which has arisen on the horizon of humanity, and which is to run its regular course after the primary miracle of its appearance; it is to retain ever the brilliancy of its lightning; it is to be one long flashing storm, rather than the quiet shining of the sun. The divine does not harmonize with the human element; it always descends upon it as on its prey, overcoming and subverting" (Heresy and Christian Doctr. page 105). Such was the fundamental error of Montanism; it did not recognise the supernatural as taking possession of the natural order, penetrating and transforming it; it marked out the two domains as in direct and constant opposition. The Montanists, then, believed in the constancy of supernatural phenomena within the Church. The miraculous element, particularly the prophetic ecstasy, was not removed; on the contrary, the necessity for it was greater than ever, and they considered those only to be true or perfect Christians who possessed the inward prophetic illumination of the Holy Spirit — they, indeed, were the true Church; and the more highly gifted were to be looked upon as the genuine successors of the apostles. They thus asserted a claim to universal validity, which the Catholic Church was compelled, for her own interest, to reject; since she left the effort after extraordinary holiness to the comparatively small circle of ascetics and priests, and sought rather to lighten Christianity, than add to its weight, for the great mass of its professors.

According to Apollinaris of Hierapolis (quoted by Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History, chapter 16), the earliest Montanists were exclusively Phrygians; but this is not correct, though it is easy to see, from what we have said in the article MONTANUS, why his views should have laid strong hold on that race of excitable and superstitious Asiatics. Gieseler and Milman remark that the national character of the Phrygians impressed itself on their Christianity, and led to a sensuous, enthusiastic worship of the Deity, and to a wild mysticism. But this cannot have been the cause of the Montanist movement; it can only have given a peculiar character to the heresy, and influenced its details. For "Montanism is but one of a number of similar movements in the Church. At intervals throughout the annals of Christianity. the Holy Ghost has been summoned  by the hopes, felt as present by the enkindled imaginations, been proclaimed by the passionate enthusiasm of a few as accomplishing in them the imperfect revelation as the third revelation which is to supersede and to fulfil the law and the Gospel." This notion appears not only thus early, but again in the Middle Ages, as the doctrine of the abbot Joachim, of John Peter de Oliva, and the Fratricelli; in a milder form it is that of George Fox and of Barclay (Milman, Lat. Christianity, 1:1), and in the Irvingites of today. In all these cases there is a striving, but a misguided striving, after a higher standard. Certain it is that, whatever doubt may exist as to the historical existence and consequent influence of Montanus, the heresy which bears his name spread not only in Phrygia, but throughout the bounds of the Catholic Church; and that if he existed, and taught Montailism, he was rather, as Neander observes, “the unconscious organ through which a peculiar mental tendency, which had developed itself in various parts of the Church, expressed itself with clearer intelligence and greater strength" (Antignost.). Indeed, there was much in the system which their pretended revelations were employed to establish, not only well adapted to take root and flourish among such a people as the Phrygians, but also sure to find in every country persons prepared to receive it by previous habits of mind. "It was attractive to the more rigid feelings, by holding out the idea of a life stricter than that of ordinary Christians; to weakness, by offering the guidance of precise rules where the Gospel had only laid down general principles; to enthusiasm and the love of excitement, by its pretensions to prophetical gifts; to pride, by professing to realize the pure and spotless mystical Church in an exactly defined visible communion; and by encouraging the members of this body to regard themselves as spiritual, and all other Christians as carnal" (Robertson, page 71).

It is said to have been chiefly among the lower orders that Montanism spread; but even in the powerful mind of Tertullian it found congenial soil; and his embracing their opinions is one of the most interesting events in the history of the sect, as it is also in the biography of Tertullian himself. It occurred about A.D. 200, and the treatises which he wrote after that important period in his life give us the clearest insight into the essential character of Montanism; for he carried the opinions of the sect to their utmost length of rigid and uncompromising severity, though at the same time on the great fundamental points in which the Montanists did not differ from the Church he continued, as he had before been, one of the ablest champions of scriptural truth, and one of the mightiest opponents of every form of heresy.  Montanism, it is apparent, then, must be treated as a doctrinal development of the 3d rather than of the 2d century; for though the history of the sect may be dated back to the middle of Hebrews 2 d century, it remained for Tertullian to give definite shape to Montanism, and it is as a separate sect that we call first deal with the Montanists (or Tertullianists, as they were also called in Africa) in the 3d century, continuing to flourish as a sect until the close of the 6th century, and all this time being the subject of legal enactments under all the successors of Constantine down to Justinian (A.D. 530). As a doctrinal system, Montanism in its original inception agreed in all essential points with the most catholic teachings, and held very firmly to the traditional rule of faith. This was acknowledged even by those who were opposed to Montanism (compare Epiphanius, Haer. 28:1). Nor is this to be wondered at. "For Montanism," as Dr. Schaff has well said, " was not originally a departure from the faith, but a morbid overstraining of the practical morality of the early Church. It is the first example of an earnest and well-meaning, but gloomy and fanatical hyperchristianity, which, like all hyperspiritualism, ends again in the flesh... Its views were rooted neither (like Ebionism) in Judaism nor (like Gnosticism) in heathenism, but in Christianity, and its errors consist in a morbid exaggeration of Christian ideas and demands." It is true also that the Montanists combated the Gnostic heresy with all decision, and, through Tertullian, contributed to the development of the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity, in asserting against Patripassianism the personal distinctions in God, and the import of the Holy Ghost. Yet this orthodoxy in the substance of its doctrine did not give Montanism the right to claim its place in evangelical Catholicity, for it was itself a principle of implacable and irreconcilable exclusion. Though first seen and felt only in the field of practical life and discipline, this Montanistic movement, coming then into conflict with the reigning Catholicism, finally and consistently carried out, broke to some extent into the province of doctrine, and thus proved true the theory that "every schismatic tendency becomes in its progress more or less heretical" (Schaff).

The one thing by which Montanism came to be especially distinguished from the Church catholic was its assertion of the continuance of prophecy, and hence it went generally under the name of nova prophetia. Now there was nothing heretical in the simple doctrine that charismata had not ceased in the Church; but there was heresy in the doctrine, which the Montanists espoused, that these charismata introduced a new dispensation superior to  that of Christ and his apostles. That Christ, who came to fulfil the law and the prophets, and promised his Holy Spirit to his apostles to guide them into all truth, bequeathed to his Church only an insufficient morality, and a dispensation which needed to be supplemented by the Paraclete of Montanus, is utterly inconsistent with a true reception of the doctrines of the Church catholic and of the Holy Ghost, who spake by the prophets. This distinction in Montanism between the Paraclete and the Holy Ghost is not a distinction (or difference, rather) of person or nature, but the distinction of a plenary bestowal for a complete revelation following a partial bestowal for an imperfect and temporary revelation. It may be compared, and is virtually compared by Tertullian in the passages cited above from the treatises De Monog. and De Virg. Vel., to the distinction drawn by St. John when he says, "The Holy Ghost was not yet given." It was the same Spirit in the Mosaic and the Christian dispensations, yet might be called another on account of the different and larger grace of the Christian dispensation. So the Paraclete is in person and being identified with the Holy Ghost, but the larger measure of the Spirit given for the completion of Christianity introduces a distinction by which the Holy Ghost bestowed on the apostles is inferior to the Paraclete. The Paraclete is undeniably identified with the promised Spirit of Truth — i.e., the promise of Christ, which the Church believes to have been fulfilled on the first Pentecostal day, was not fulfilled until the Spirit came on Montanus. Mosheim (cent. 2, part 2, chapter 5, section 23, note), we must take the liberty of saying, entirely mistakes the nature of the distinction if his words imply, as we understand them to imply, a teacher other than the third person of the Christian Trinity. This heresy gave a character to the new disciplinary rules. It introduced also schism in its most aggravated form, asserting that the party of Montanus alone was the true Church, the pneumatic, all other nominal Christians being psychic.

Montanism manifestly claimed for itself a position above the organization and regular powers of the Church, asserting as its own monopoly the continuity of revelation. Anterior revelations, to be sure, are not set aside; they are, however, regarded simply as initiatory steps. The Old Testament retains its claims, but the New Testament suffers depreciation, inasmuch as it is no longer the final utterance of the divine teaching. It has not brought revelation to perfection; it has made, especially in the teaching of the apostles, more than one concession to human weakness, and, like Moses, it has allowed certain practices because of the hardness of men's hearts. "The  Lord," says Tertullian, "has sent the Paraclete, because human weakness was not capable of receiving the truth all at once; it was necessary that the discipline should be regulated and progressively ordered, until it was carried to perfection by the Holy Spirit" (De Virg. Veland. part 1). Paul gave certain instructions rather by permission than in the name of God; he tolerated marriage because of the weakness of the flesh, in the same manner as Moses permitted divorce. "If Christ has abolished that which Moses had commanded, why should not the Paraclete forbid that which Paul allows?" (De Mozog. 1:4). "In fine, the Holy Spirit is rather a restorer than an inovator (ibid.). Was not the new development of the revelations given foreseen and declared by Jesus Christ? The final and glorious economy of the Paraclete may, indeed, have commenced at Pentecost, but it only reached its culminating point with the appearance of Montanus and the prophetesses of Phrygia; none can tell where its developments may end." Such were the principles of Montanism. Surely it were impossible to make a more serious assault than this upon apostolic Christianity. It clearly enough regarded revelation not as a fact, but rather as a doctrine or a law, and in consequence religion lost the definitive character which belongs to that which is absolute. "Inspiration," says Pressense, "which thus had power to change everything, was exempted from the restraint of all the rules of reason, as well as from the authority of the Holy Scriptures.

It was admitted to be a sort of ecstasy, and its great merit, according to the sect, consisted in its bringing man into a state of complete passivity. Ecstasy seized the inspired man; this is the power of the Holy Spirit which produces prophecy' (Tertullian, De Anima, part 2). It is a sort of God-sent madness, which constitutes the spiritual faculty called by us prophecy. The soul is no longer self-possessed when it prophesies; it is in a state of delirium; a power not its own masters it. Dreams and visions occupy the principal place in the inspiration of the Montanists. Inspiration is only the harp which vibrates as it is touched by the player's finger (Epiphanius, Haer. 48, 4). ‘Man sleeps; I alone am walking,' says the Paraclete (ibid.). In such a conception of inspiration, flexible natures, susceptible of keen and rapid impressions, were the chosen organs of revelation... Ambiguous and lying oracles could thus be substituted for the clear and exact prescriptions of the sacred books. It is obvious that the whole of Christianity was imperiled by this doctrine of the Paraclete (q.v.). This was the fundamental heresy of Montanism, and infinitely more serious than the particular errors into which it might be led" (Heresy and Doctrine, pages 114-115).  The view which the Montanists took of divine inspiration led them to ignore the demands of the ecclesiastical order, and to assert the universal prophetic and priestly office of Christians — even of females. They found the true qualification and appointment for the office of teacher in direct endowment by the Spirit of God, in distinction from outward ordination and episcopal succession. They everywhere proposed the supernatural element, and the free motion of the spirit, against the mechanism of a fixed ecclesiastical order. Now they were undoubtedly right in their resistance to the encroachments of the hierarchy, and to the relaxation of discipline; but they went too far on this point, as on every other — insisting upon a Church of saints and perfect men, a standard applicable only to the invisible Church.

"The Church," said Tertullian, "is not constituted by the number of bishops; it is the Holy Spirit in the spiritual man" (De Pudicit. page 21) — a false and dangerous theory for practice in the visible Church, where the secrets of the heart can never be judged of where, as Pressense has aptly said, "the tares grow with the good wheat, and their separation is impossible. For the evil is not excluded by making a profession of the faith the personal condition of membership; there is no guarantee that this profession will be in all cases sincere, and, even were it so, there is no religious community in which it is not incomplete. It follows that no one such community can claim to be itself, to the exclusion of all others, the temple of the Holy Ghost; else it becomes an exclusive sect like the Montanists, who called themselves the perfect, the spiritual men, speaking scornfully of all other Christians as carnal. Their conception of inspiration, as never final and complete, moreover rendered any fixed order impossible, and destroyed ecclesiastical authority. All the elements of the faith were daily liable to change. It was impossible to divine what strange answers to spiritual questions might fall from heaven" (Heresy, page 116). Here, then, was the point where they necessarily assumed a schismatic character, and arrayed against themselves the episcopal hierarchy. They only brought another kind of aristocracy into the place of the condemned distinction of clergy and laity. They claimed for their prophets what they denied to the Catholic bishops. They put a great gulf between the true spiritual Christians and the merely psychical, and thus induced spiritual pride and false pietism. Their affinity with the Protestant idea of the universal priesthood is clearly more apparent than real; they go on altogether different principles. (Compare Schaff, 1:367.)

As to its matter, the Montanistic prophecy related

(1) to the approaching heavy judgements of God, a sort of visionary millenarianism;

(2) the persecutions;

(3) fasting and other ascetic practices, which were to be enforced as laws; and

(4) as to the distinction to, be made between the various kinds of sins.

One of the most essential and prominent traits of Montanism was its visionary millenarianism, founded, indeed, on the Apocalypse and on the apostolic expectation of the speedy return of Christ, but giving them extravagant weight and a materialistic coloring. The Montanists lived under a vivid impression of the great final catastrophe, and looked therefore with contempt upon the present world, and directed all their desires to the second advent of Christ, which they believed to be near at hand. "After me," exclaimed one of its prophetesses, "there is no more prophecy, but only the end of the world" (Epiphanius, Haer. 48, 2). The failure of these predictions weakened, of course, all the other pretensions of the system; though, on the other hand, it must be confessed here that the abatement of faith in the near approach of the Lord was certainly accompanied with an increase of worldliness in the Catholic Church.

But besides the prominent traits of Montanism already indicated, there remain those questions of discipline and morals, which were made the subject of special revelation in order to impart to the system its legal character. The distinction between the two covenants was lost sight of. "The Church," says Tertullian, "blends the law and the prophets with the Gospels and the writings of the apostles" (De Prescript. § 6). The Gospel was a code, no less than Mosaism, especially with the amplifications given to it by the Paraclete. "The law of liberty," says Pressense, "is replaced by precepts of the minutest detail. All that was not permissible was laid under a stern interdict (Tertullian, De Corona Milit. page 2), and thus vanished that noble Christian liberty which enlarges the domain of the moral: principle instead of narrowing it, and takes possession of the entire life, to bring it all under our direction, and to animate it with the inspiration of love as with the breath of life" (Heresy, page 117). Montanism, indeed, tended to a system of growing severity; and Tertullian, moreover, gloried in that the restoration of this rigorous discipline was made the chief office of the new prophecy (De Monog. c. 2 and 4). Now it must be confessed  that the Montanists raised a zealous protest against the growing looseness of the Catholic penitential discipline, which in Rome particularly, under Zephyrinus and Callistus, to the great grief of earnest minds, established a scheme of indulgence for the grossest sins, and began, long before Constantine, to obscure the line between the Church and the world; but, on the other hand, it must be remembered also that Montanism certainly went to the opposite extreme, and fell from evangelical freedom into Jewish legalism. It turned with horror from all the enjoyments of life, and held even art to be incompatible with Christian soberness and humility. Above all, it laid stress upon three points: first, it exalted martyrdom with solemn fervor. It courted blood-baptism, and condemned concealment or flight in persecution as a denial of Christ: "For if persecution proceeds from God, it is in no way their duty to flee from what has God for its author; it ought not to be avoided, and it cannot be evaded." The treatise of Tertullian, Flight and Persecution, clearly and perfectly expresses these ideas, and they were the ideas of the Montanists. The Church had given to martyrdom no niggardly honor, but in the spirit of its founder's teachings (Mat 10:23) flight was considered proper. Montanism, however, severely condemned every measure of prudence in times of proscription (comp. Eusebius, Hist. Ecc 5:16; Tertullian, De Fuga, § 4, pages 691-697).

The same extreme severity characterizes their practice of fasting. Kaye (in his Tertullian, page 416) sums up the differences between the orthodox and Montanists on the. subject of fasting thus: "With respect to the jejunium, or total abstinence from food, the orthodox thought that the interval between our Savioor's death and resurrection was only the period during which the apostles observed a total fast, and consequently the only period during which fasting was of positive obligation upon all Christians. At other times it rested with themselves to determine whether they would fast or not. The Montanists, on the contrary, contended that there were other seasons during which fasting was obligatory, and that the appointment of those seasons constituted a part of the revelations of the Paraclete. With respect to the Dies stationarii, the Montanists not only pronounced the fast obligatory on all Christians, but prolonged it until evening, instead of terminating it, as was the custom, at the ninth hour. In the observance of Xerophagice (q.v.), the Montanists abstained not only from flesh and wine, like the orthodox, but also from richer fruits, and omitted their customary ablutions." Apollonius (in Eusebius, H.E. 5:18), in this particular, simply notices of Montanus, "This is he who laid down laws  of fasting," pointing out in these words that Montanus's offence was not the changing of one law for another, but the imposition of a law where there had been liberty. Tertullian has written an entire treatise ill defence of fasting, and the objections brought against Montanism on this point show clearly the exaggerated legalism by which it was estranged from the true Christian tradition. The law and the prophets, it was said to the Montanists, were until John; fasting thenceforward should be a voluntary, not an enjoined act. The apostles themselves observed it, without laying it as a yoke upon any: we must not return to legal prescriptions. The prophets showed great contempt for all that is merely outward observance. Tertullian (Dejejuniis, c. 2 and 3) replies that nothing is more adapted to give large license to the flesh than the reducing of the law to the great commandment of love. He .maintains the necessity of fasting-first. on the ground that self-indulgence led to the fall. "It is necessary," he says, "that man should give satisfaction to God with the same element by which he offended, and that he should deny himself food, which caused his fall." That fasting is agreeable to God is proved by the words full of tenderness addressed to Elijah when he was fasting in the desert of Horeb, especially as compared with the severe tone of the call to Adam when he had been eating the forbidden fruit. Fasting facilitates holy visions, as is proved by sacred history from Daniel to Peter, and it prepares for martyrdom; while the neglect of such abstinence leads to apostasy, by fostering the love for material pleasures. To the objections drawn from Holy Scripture, Tertullian replies by the revelations of the Paraclete, which legitimately give expansion to its obligation, and refuses to recognise any distinction between the O.T and N.T., as might be naturally enough expected from his strictly legal stand-point (comp. De jejuniis, c. 6-8).

Its strongest protests, however, Montanism, like all ascetic doctrines, entered against the union of the sexes. It not only prohibited second marriage as adultery, for laity as well as clergy, but even went so far as to distinctly impugn all marriage, urging its faithful ones to absolute continence. Tertullian does not hesitate to compare the conjugal union to adultery, forgetting his own beautiful words about the perpetuity of marriage after death (Ado. Marc. 1, c. 29, page 452), and brands the union of sexes as caused by an impulse of lust. "Thus, then," he suggests, as an objection urged, "you set a brand even on first marriages." "And rightly," he replies, "since they consist in the same act as adultery... Thus it is good for a man not to touch a woman; virginity is the highest holiness, since it is  furthest removed from adultery" (De Virg. Veland. page 16). In his treatise on monogamy, however, Tertullian contents himself with prohibiting second marriages, taking his stand on Scripture, when he can make it sustain his view, appealing to the higher power of the Paraclete when he has to deal with the exact texts of St. Paul. The apostle, according to him, gave sanction to second marriages, but with a marked tone of antipathy, and simply in consequence of his knowledge and prophecy having been only in part. The Paraclete, however, in his new revelation, always acts in conformity with Jesus Christ and his promises. "We acknowledge," said Tertullian, "only one marriage, as we acknowledge only one God. Jesus Christ has had only one bride, which is the Church. By his example, and by the explicit command revealed by the Paraclete, he has restored the true nature; for monogamy dates from Eden. The priests were to have only one wife. Now, under the new economy, every Christian is a priest of Christ. No difference should be made in a moral point of view between the clergy and the laity, for the former are taken from among Christian people. Besides, how can marriage, which makes of the man and woman one flesh, be renewed? Is such an assimilation capable of repetition? Besides, the bonds between husband and wife continue in death; they have only become more sacred by becoming more spiritual." Yet Tertullian's views, though extreme, do not in this instance clearly set forth the views of all Montanists. Indeed some of them insisted that their founder taught λύσεις γάμωνdissolution of marriage and that Prisca and Maximilla, as soon as they recognised the spirit, abandoned their husbands. It is true Wernsdorf (see Routh's note, Rel. Sac. 1:473) observes that Montanus's teaching was on this point not by precept, but by the example of his two prophetesses, and yet the extreme asceticism must have had a far reaching influence even for Tertullian to advocate celibacy on the strength of it, and in his Exhortation to Chastity he comes to recognise a morality of perfection which rises above the ordinary standard. "Permanent virginity is its highest point; abstinence from the sexual relations in marriage is akin to it in virtue." In an extreme ascetic tendency Montanism forbade women all ornamental clothing, and required virgins to be veiled. Thus Tertullian urges that it be done so as not to kindle the flame of passion. "I entreat thee, O woman, be thou mother, daughter, or virgin, veil thy head: as mother, veil it for the sake of thy son; as sister, for thy brother; as daughter, for thy father. For thou dost imperil men of every age. Put on the armor of modesty ; encircle thee with a rampart of chastity. Set a guard  over thine own eyes, and over those of others. Art thou not married to Christ?" (De Virg. Veland. page 16).

The perversion of the doctrine of redemption, which is the source of all such legalism, casuistry, and extreme asceticism, as the Montanists taught, is more especially notable in the arbitrary disposition made by Montanism of various kinds of sins. In the same manner as it recognises two orders of perfection, and thus does violence to the true idea of good, so does it tamper with the idea of evil. In accordance with the words of John — "a sin not unto death," and "a sin unto death" — it made a difference between sins venial and mortal, and denied that the Church had power to pardon the latter, because, as it taught, there is no possibility of a second repentance for mortal sins, and therefore no power in the Church to restore the lapsed into fellowship. Tertullian's treatise on Modesty, called forth by the decree of the bishop of Rome, who had assumed the right to pardon the gravest sins, expresses the Montanist theory with perfect clearness. He does not dwell for an instant on the real difficulty of obtaining proof of true repentance, but speaks only of the comparative gravity of sins. "Some," he says, "are pardonable; others, on the contrary, are beyond remission some merit punishment, others damnation. From this difference in the offences comes the difference in the penitence, which varies according as it is exercised on account of a pardonable or unpardonable sin." He held all mortal sins (of which he numbers seven) committed after baptism to be unpardonable (De Pudicit. c. 2 and 19), at least in this world; and a Church which showed such lenity towards gross offenders, as the Roman Church at that time did, according to the corroborating testimony of Hippolytus, he called worse than a "den of thieves," even a "spelunca moechorum et fornicatorum." At the head of the black catalogue of unpardonable or mortal sins the Montanists placed adultery and apostasy. They did not deny that God could pardon them directly, or through the medium of an exceptional revelation; but on this side the grave no restoration was possible for those who had been guilty of such sins, even though they gave the strongest pledges of their repentance. Here we have a clear departure from the grand Christian doctrine of the fulness of God's mercy, irrespective of the proportion of sin, and that the Church must suffer all to enter its fellowship who manifest "a desire to flee from the wrath to come." If Montanism taught truly, it follows that the work of redemption is insufficient, and that, in addition to repentance, a certain satisfaction is  demanded of the sinner. We have here unquestionably reached the root of the error of Montanism, from which grows its legalism and its asceticism.

The religious earnestness which animated Montanism, and the fanatical extremes into which it ran have frequently reappeared in the Church after the death of Montanism, under various names and forms, as in Novatianism, Donatism, Anabaptism. the Camisard enthusiasm, Puritanism, Pietism, Irvingism, and so on, by way of protest and wholesome reaction against various evils in the Church. And what may appear perhaps more strange, several of those very doctrines of the Montanists which in their earliest rise were pronounced heretical gradually made their way into the Church of Rome, and. with slight modifications, remain to this day a part of her creed. Thus it is to Montanism that it owes the idea of the infallibility of its councils, which attempt in the same way to add to revelation. From the same source, too, it has derived its "counsels of perfection," and the distinction between venial and mortal sins. Says Dr. Newman, in his Essay on Development, a work which he would hardly care to own now," the prophets of the Montanists prefigure the Church's doctors, and their inspiration her infallibility; their revelations her developments" (pages 349-352). Since this was written a new significance has been given it by the proceedings of the last Vatican Council (1869), which has lodged in the individual head of the Church the infallibility formerly attributed to the Church as a whole. SEE INFALLIBILITY; SEE PAPACY.

We now return to the external history of Montanism. We have stated that it probably originated in Phrygia about the middle of the 2d century, and that it spread rapidly during the bloody persecutions under Marcus Aurelius. In Asia Minor, however, it met with opposition, and the bishops and synods almost universally declared against the new prophecy as the work of dsemons. Among its literary opponents in the East are mentioned Claudius Apollinaris of Hierapolis, Miltiades, Apollonius, Serapion of Antioch, and Clement of Alexandria. The Roman Church likewise, during the episcopate of Eleutherus (177-190) or of Victor (190-202), after some vacillation, set itself against it at the instigation of the presbyter Caius and the confessor Praxeas. Yet the opposition of Hippolytus to Zephyrinus and Callistus, and the later Novatian schism, shows that the disciplinary rigorism of Montanism found energetic advocates in Rome till after the middle of the 3d century. Indeed it was some time before the Montanists formed themselves into an independent sect in the Western Church (comp.  Gieseler, Eccles. Hist. 1:125, note 6). The Gallic Christians, Irenaeus at their head, took, it is now generally believed, a conciliatory posture, and sympathized at least with the moral earnestness, the enthusiasm for martyrdom, and the chiliastic hopes of the Montanists. They sent the bishop Irenseus to bishop Eleutherus at Rome to intercede in their behalf, and this mission may have induced him or his successor to issue letters of peace, which were, however, soon afterwards recalled. In North Africa they met with extensive sympathy, as the Punic national character leans naturally towards gloomy and rigorous acerbity. Here it secured Tertullian, who helped the gropers in the dark towards a twilight of philosophy. He is its proper and only theologian. Through him, too, its principles reacted in many respects on the Catholic Church; and that not only in North Africa, but also in Spain, as we may see from the harsh decrees of the Council of Elvira in 203. It is singular that Cyprian, who, with all his High-Church tendencies and abhorrence of schism, was a daily reader of Tertullian, makes no allusion to Montanism. Augustine (De hcresibus, § 6) relates that Tertullian left the Montanists and founded a new sect, which was called after him, but was through his (Augustine's) agency reconciled to the Catholic congregation at Carthage. As a sect, the Montanists run down into the 6th century; but, as has been remarked with much truth, although the actual number of the Montanists was at one period very considerable, the importance of the sect is really to be estimated by the extent to which their character became infused into the Church. Neander attributes much of this to the great influence which Tertullian exerted through the relation in which he stood to Cyprian, who called him his teacher. At the same time it is to be noticed that there was some tendency in the opposite direction in the introduction of a prophetical order superior in rank and importance to the order of bishops. The first order among the Montanists was that of patriarch, the second that of cenones, and the third that of bishop. The patriarch resided at Pepuza, in Phrygia, the anticipated seat of the millennial kingdom, and at that time almost exclusively inhabited by Montanists.

See Tertullian's works, especially his numerous Montanistic writings; Eusebius, Hist. Ecc 5:3; Ecc 5:14-19; Epiphanius, Her. pages 48, 49; Wernsdorf, De Montanistis (Dantsic, 1741); Muinter, Effata et oracula Montanistar. (Copenh. 1829); Neander, Antignosticus oder Geist aus Tertullian's Schriften (Berl. 1825; 2d cd. 1849); Schwegler, Der Montanismus u. die christl. Kirche des 2ten Jahrh. (Tub. 1841); Kirchner,  De Montanistis (Jena, 1852, 8vo); Baur, Das Wesen des Montanismus nach den neuesten Forschungen, in the Theol. Jahrbiucher (Tub. 1851; comp. his Christenth. der ersten Jahrh. pages 213-224); Niedner, Kirchen- Geschichte, p. 253 sq., 259 sq.; Ritschl, Entstehung der altkathol. Kirche (2d ed. 1857), p. 402-550; Pressense, Early Years of Christianity (Heresy and Doctr.), 3:101-124; Neander, Ch. Hist. 1:507, 526; Hist. Christian Dogma (see Index); Schaff, Ch. Hist. 1:362-469; Hagenbach, Hist. Doctr. 1:60 sq.; Walch, Gesch. der Ketzereien, 1:611 sq.; Killen, Anc. Ch. page 436 sq.; Burton, Eccl. Hist. First Three Cent. page 405 sq.; Ebrard, Kirchen u. Dogmengesch. 1:137 sq.; Mossman, Hist. Catholic Church (Lond. 1873, 8vo), ch. v; Lipsius, in Hilgenfeld's Zeitschr. fur wissenschaftliche Theologie, 1865 and 1866; Lond. Qu. Rev. January 1869, page 473; Christian Examiner, September 1863, page 157; Brit. Qu. Rev. October 1873, page 288.

## Montano, Leandro[[@Headword:Montano, Leandro]]

             a Spanish theologian, a native of Murcia, flourished in the 17th century. He was also known under the name Leandro of Murcia. He was a Capuchin monk, ecclesiastical inspector of Castile, qualificator of the Inquisition, and preacher to the king. Among his numerous works may be mentioned, Questiones regulares y reyla dee los menores (Madrid, 1645, 4to): — Commentaria in Esther (ibid. 1647, fol): — Explicacion de las bulas de Innocencio X (ibid. 1650, 4to): — Disquisitiones morales in primarm S. Thomas (ibid. 1663-70, 2 vols. fol.). See Antonio, Bibl. Nova Hispana; Saint-Antoine, Bibl. univ. Franciscana, 2:279.

## Montanus[[@Headword:Montanus]]

             a celebrated heresiarch of the early Christian Church, the supposed founder of a sect named after him Montanists (q.v.), was a Phrygian by birth, and, according to Eusebius (Hist. Ecc 5:16), made his first public appearance about A.D. 170, in the village of Ardabar, on the confines of Phrygia and Mysia, of which place he is believed to have been a native (comp., however, the bishop of Lincoln's [Kaye] Tertullian, page 13 sq.). He was brought up in heathenism, but appears to have embraced Christianity (about 170) with all the fanatical enthusiasm for which his countrymen were noted. Neander endeavors to explain his character and tendencies on the supposition of his possessing an essentially Phrygian temperament, and the little we know concerning him renders this highly  probable. The frenzy, the paroxysms, the fierce belief in the supernatural, that marked the old Phrygian priests of Cybele and Bacchus, are repeated under less savage, but not less abnormal conditions, in the ecstasies, somnambulism, and passion for self-immolation of the Montalists. According to some of the ancient writers, Montanus was believed by his followers to be the Paraclete, or Holy Spirit. But this is an exaggeration, for he, falling into somnambulistic ecstasies, came simply to consider himself the inspired organ of the Paraclete, the Helper and Comforter promised by Christ in these last times of distress. He, however, certainly claimed divine inspiration for himself and his associates. They delivered their prophecies in an ecstasy, and their example seems to have introduced into the Church the practice of appealing to visions in favor of opinions and actions, of which practice Cyprian and others availed themselves to a great extent (comp. Middleton, Free Inquiry, page 98, etc.). His principal associates were two prophetesses, named Prisca, or Priscilla, and Maximilla. The doctrines which Montanus, if he taught at all as a leader of a sect, disseminated are now clearly seen to have been in general agreement with those of the Church catholic of the 2d century, and the fact that Tertullian at one time became the most brilliant exponent of the Montanists would go far to confirm such a position. But the austerity of manner, the strictness of discipline, and the doctrine of a permanent extraordinary influence of the Paraclete, manifesting itself by prophetic ecstasies and visions, opened wide the door to all manner of fanatical extravagances, and brought reproach upon the name of founder and sect alike. Ecclesiastical writers of succeeding centuries have in consequence brought more or less reproach upon the name of Montanus by accusations of immorality and crime, and he is even said to have ended his days violently. But there is no authority for such statements, if we may believe Schwegler, Der Montanismus u. die christliche Kirche des zweiten Jahrh. (Tub. 1841, 8vo). He insists upon it that "there is nothing of historical value in the life of this man at our command" (page 242), and believes that "the person Montanus is of no significance in the examination and elucidation of what is known as Montanism," and would go ven so far as to " doubt the historical existence of this apocryphal character" (page 243). There is certainly ground for such a position in the fact that in their earliest days the Montanists were never spoken of under that name, but were generally called, especially by Tertullian and Eusebius, after the name of the country in which they originated, Cataphrygians, or after the name of the place to which they assigned special sanctity, Iepuzzians (comp.  Epiphan. Haer. 48, 14). Bishop Kaye, in his Tertullian (page 28 sq.), takes it for granted that Mcnatanus was a historical character, and awards to him the dignity of founder of the Montanists. The learned bishop even believes, depending upon Tertullian's work, "that the effusions of Montanus and his female associates had been committed to writing," and that "Tertullian, believing that Montanus was commissioned to complete the Christian revelation, could not deem him inferior to the apostles, by whom it was only obscurely and imperfectly developed." See references to the article SEE MONTANISTS.

## Montanus of Toledo[[@Headword:Montanus of Toledo]]

             a noted Spanish prelate of the early Christian Church, flourished in the 6th century. But little is known of his personal history. He succeeded Celsus in the see of Toledo A.D. 531; he presided at the council held in Toledo, and died in the year 540. There are two letters of his extant, one to the brethren of Palantia, and the other to Theodorius, bishop of Plalantia. See Clarke, Sacred Lit. 2:306.

## Montanus, Benedict Arias[[@Headword:Montanus, Benedict Arias]]

             SEE ARIAS.

## Montanye, Thomas B[[@Headword:Montanye, Thomas B]]

             a Baptist minister, was born in New York in 1769. He began preaching when quite young, and was in 1788 ordained pastor of the Baptist society in Warwick, N.Y., where he remained until 1801, when he accepted a call from the Church in Southampton, Bucks County, Pa., which situation he held until his death, September 27, 1829. He was a truly popular preacher, and on account of his talents and piety his services came to be much sought after for ordinations, councils, and especially religious anniversaries, yet none of his works have been published. See Sprague, Annals, 6:265.

## Montargon, Robert Francois De[[@Headword:Montargon, Robert Francois De]]

             (Hyacinthe de l'Assomption), a French preacher and theologian, was born at Paris May 27, 1705. He assumed the vows of the Augustines of the street Notre Dame of the Victoires at Paris (les Petits Peres), and very soon became remarkable for his oratorical talent. He was made court preacher by Louis XV, and received the title of almoner to Stanislaus I (ex- king of Poland), duke of Lorraine and of Bar. His life was consecrated to  his ministry. Attacked by paralysis, he resorted in 1770 to the waters of Plombieres for relief. An inundation of the Angronne destroyed that city, and Montargon found only death where he had expected recovery — July 25,1770. He is the author of Dictionnaire apostolique a l'usage de moessieurs les cures de la ville et de la campagne qui se destinent a la chaire (Paris, 1752-58, 13 volumes, 8vo); this work has remained the vade mecum of the ecclesiastics. It has often been reprinted, and translated into different languages. The first six volumes treat of morals, the seventh and eighth of the mysteries of Jesus Christ, the ninth of the Virgin, the tenth of the saints, the eleventh of the homilies of Lent, the twelfth of different subjects, and the thirteenth is a general table of the subjects treated in the other twelve volumes. See Recueils d'Eoquence sainte; Histoire de l'institution de lafete du Saint-Sacrement (1753, 12mo); Dictionnaire portatif des predicateurs, s.v.

## Montazet, Antoine De Malvin De[[@Headword:Montazet, Antoine De Malvin De]]

             a French prelate, was born August 17, 1713, in the castle of Quissac, near Agen. He belonged to a good family of the Agenais, and, embracing the ecclesiastical profession, obtained, among other benefices, the abbeys of Saint-Victor of Paris and of Monstier in Argonne. At the close of 1742 he became almoner to the king, and in 1748 was appointed bishop of Autun. March 31, 1759, he was raised to the archbishopric of Lyons in the place of cardinal de Tencin. "Zealously opposed to the philosophers," says Feller, "an ardent defender of the prerogatives of his see, which he claimed privileged even to the reformation of metropolitan judgments, a successful adversary to the customs and privileges of his chapter, which he succeeded in suppressing by civil authority, this prelate holds a distinguished place in the history of the Gallican Church of this century." He had numerous debates with M. de Beaumont, archbishop of Paris, relative to the religious quarrels of the time. He felt much inclined to side with the Jansenists, and did say much in their favor; yet he never became one of the number of the Appellants, and avoided any formal proceedings of opposition against the bull Unigenitus. He died May 2, 1788, at Paris. Montazet had a happy memory, a brilliant imagination, an active mind; his eloquence was lofty, energetic, and copious. In 1757 he was admitted to the French Academy. His principal writings are, Lettre a l'Archeveque de Paris (Lyons, 1760, 4to); he there takes the title of Primate of France: — Mandement contre “L'Histoire du Peuple de Dieu" de Berruyer (Lyons, 1762, 12mo): — Instruction pastorale sur les sources de l'incredulite et les fondements de  la religion (Paris, 1775, 4to); this work was greatly praised up to the time whee it was reprinted under the title of Plagiats de M. l'Archeveque, and with the passages drawn from the Principes de la foi chretienne of Daguet; but there is reason for believing that the composition of the Instruction pastorale is by P. Lambert: — Catechisme (Lyons, 1768): — Rituel de diocese de Lyon (Lyons, 1788, 3 volumes, 12mo). It was under his auspices that the Institutiones Theologicae appeared (Lyons, 1782,1784,6 volumes, 12mo); and the Institutiones Philosophicae (Lyons, 1784, 5 volumes, 12mo); this system of theology, proscribed in France, was introduced into Italy and Spain, where it was held in esteem for a short time. See L'Ami de la Religion, 22:161, 172; Bachaumont, Memoires secrets, passim; Migne, Diet. des Jansenistes, s.v.; Feller, Diet. Hist. s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Jervis, Hist. Ch. of France (Lond. 1872, 2 volumes, 8vo), 2:325 sq.

## Montbas, Jean Barton De[[@Headword:Montbas, Jean Barton De]]

             a French prelate, a native of Gueret, flourished in the 15th century. He was abbot of the Dorat in 1446, and on April 1,1457, was made bishop of Limoges, and counsellor to the Parliament. In 1465 he resigned his functions in favor of his nephew, Jean Barton de Montbas II, who put into print the Breviariumo Lemovicense (Paris, 1500, 8vo) and the Breviarium dioecesis Lemovicensis (1504), manuscrit de 1638, in the library of Limoges. He died in the castle of Isle, March 4, 1497, with the honorable title of archbishop of Nazareth. We owe to him the construction of the magnificent nave in the cathedral of Limloges, and the impression of the Missale ad usum Lemovicensis Ecclesiae: Parisiis, per Joannem de Prato (1483, 4to). See Gallia Christiana nova, volume 2, col. 536, 551; Bonaventura, 3:166, 713, 729, 731.

## Montboissier[[@Headword:Montboissier]]

             SEE PETER THE VENERABLE.

## Montbray, Geffroi De[[@Headword:Montbray, Geffroi De]]

             a French prelate, was born at Montbray, near Saint Lo, in the early part of the 11th century. Descended from a noble family of Normandy, he was early devoted to the Church, and on April 10, 1049, was consecrated bishop of Coutances. He was present at the assembly held in 1066 by William, duke of Normandy, at Lillebonne, in which it was resolved to  invade England. One of the principal promoters of that war, he followed the duke, his friend, to the conquest, and acquitted himself very courageously at the battle of Hastings. He accompanied William to London, and in the ceremony of the coronation at Westminster acted as chamberlain for the states of Normandy. When the Conqueror was recalled to his duchy, he left Geffroi de Montbray at the head of his soldiery. In 1067, when he had defeated the two Anglo-Saxon princes, Edmund and Godwin, Geffroi entered Dorset and Somerset, and there destroyed all who rose in arms, or who were suspected of having taken up arms. Some years after the earls of Northumberland, Norfolk, and Hereford, having rebelled against the Conqueror, Geffroi powerfully aided in the victory of Fagadon, obtained over them in 1074, and forced them to take refuge in Norwich, where he besieged and took them by capitulation. As a reward for these noble and numerous deeds, William gave to him in fief 280 manorial lands. After the death of that prince (1087) he was obliged to return to Normandy, where lie died, February 2, 1094. See Ordericus Vitalis, Historia ecclesiastica; Gallia Christiana, volume 11; Thierry, Hist. de la Conquete de l'Angletere par les Normands; Lecanu, Hist. des Eveques de Coutances; Fisquet, France poontificale.

## Montbrun, Charles du Puy[[@Headword:Montbrun, Charles du Puy]]

             a Huguenot warrior, and a zealous Protestant, was born in the diocese of Gap in 1530. He took an active part in the civil wars of his time, and rendered the Huguenots great service, performing several very daring deeds, and showing his bravery in an especial manner at Jarnac and Monontntoutr. He was at last captured and executed in 1575. See Allard, Vie du brave Montbrun (Grenoble, 1675, 12mo); Martin, Hist. de Charles Dupuy (2d ed. Paris, 1816, 8vo); Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 36:141- 43; Smiles, Huguenots.

## Montbrun, Guillaume[[@Headword:Montbrun, Guillaume]]

             SEE BRISONNET.

## Montchal, Charles De[[@Headword:Montchal, Charles De]]

             a French prelate, was born in 1589 at Annonay (Vivarais). His mother was Anne of Guillon. At first abbot of Saint-Amand-de-Boisse, in the diocese of Angouleme, and of Saint-Sauveur-le-Vicomte, in the diocese of Coutances, he became archbishop of Toulouse in 1627 by the resignation  of Louis de Nogaret, cardinal of La Villette. The cardinal of La Villette had not received holy orders, and was not even a simple clerk. As for Montchal, he had not only been ordained, but he was that rare thing among ecclesiastics of quality, a theologian, and even an erudite theologian. He was consecrated in Paris January 9, 1628, and subsequently repaired to his metropolitan town. Toulouse then had a prelate who, clothed in his sacerdotal robes, officiated and preached, which was a great novelty. Charles de Montchal returned to Paris in 1635, and assisted at the assembly of the clergy, where he was one of the principal orators. In 1641 he was present at the assembly of Mantes, the history of which he wrote. In 1645 he again took his seat in the assembly of Paris, where he energetically pleaded the cause of ecclesiastical franchise. September 8, 1643, he consecrated the church of Soreze. Under his administration the Church of Toulouse prospered greatly, and became enriched by a considerable number of monasteries and convents. He died at Carcassonne Aug. 22, 1651. The zeal of Montchal for religion was that of an enlightened mind. He thought that the Church should be powerful, and was sensible enough to seek for the elements of that power in the example of good morals, the progress of ecclesiastical studies, and the noble triumphs of eloquence. He was the patron of a multitude of learned men, who dedicated their works to him; among them may be mentioned Etienne Molinier, Francois Combefis, Innocent Cironius, Casanova, Ravel, etc. He is the author of Memoirs (Rotterdam, 1718, 2 volumes, 12mo); in these Meloires is the Journal de l'Assemblee (de Mantes. See Gallia Christ. volume 13, col. 61; Du Mege,Hist. des Institut. de la ville de Toulouse, 3:126, 127.

## Monte Cas(s)ino[[@Headword:Monte Cas(s)ino]]

             the first Benedictine convent ever established, "the venerable mother of Western monachism," and for a thousand years the spot especially dear to  the great Benedictine order, was so named after the place in which it was located.

## Monte Catino, Antonio[[@Headword:Monte Catino, Antonio]]

             an Italian philosopher, was born at Ferrara in 1536. Of noble extraction, he studied different sciences in his own country, and became professor of philosophy. He was particularly esteemed by duke Alfonso II, who chose him for his secretary, and sent him as ambassador to the court of France, and to that of Rome. According to Muratori, he repaid the family of his benefactor with ingratitude, and was the principal instrument in the overthrow of the duchy of Ferrara by the Holy See. He died at Ferrara in 1599. Monte Catino is the author of Aristotelis Politicorutm lib. iii  (Ferrara, 1587-97, 3 volumes, fol.); this Latin version is accompanied by a commentary, which Naude does not esteem very highly; and the second volume, which appeared in 1784, contains also the Republic and the Laws of Plato, as well as some fragments: — In octavum librum Physicae Aristotelis Commentarius (Ferrara, 1591, fol.): — In primam partem lib. iii Aristotelis de Anima. Francesco Patrizi has dedicated to Monte Catino one of the volumes of his Discussiones Peripatetice, and he has left a magnificent eulogy of the virtues of this philosopher. See Bayle, Dict. Critique, s.v.; Naude, Bibliogr. Polit. volume 27; Ag. Superbi, Apparato degli Uomini illustri di Fecrrara; Muratori, Antichita Estensi, part 2, c. 14; Tiraboschi, Storia della Letter. Ital. volume 7, part 1.

## Monte Corvino, John De[[@Headword:Monte Corvino, John De]]

             (chiefly known on account of his wonderful missionary labors in the East), a native of France, was born in 1247. By papal authority Monte Corvino visited India in 1291, and thence proceeded to China, where he was kindly received by the emperor Kublai Khan, who permitted him to build a church at Peking, then called Cambalu. In spite of the opposition he met, not only from Pagans, but also from Nestorians, he seems to have been so successful that as a result of eleven years' labor he baptized nearly 6000 persons and gathered 150 children, whom he taught Greek and Latin, and for whom he composed sundry devotional works. He also translated into the Tartar language all of the N.T. and Psalms. The success which attended his labors caused Clement V to constitute him archbishop of Peking in 1307, and seven bishops were sent to him as suffragans. His death occurred in 1330, and scarcely forty years passed before the results of his life-work were almost annihilated by the Ming dynasty, which expelled his successors. See Williams, Middle Kingdom (see Index in volume 2); Newcomb, Cyclop. of Missions. (H.W.T.)

## Monte Oliveto[[@Headword:Monte Oliveto]]

             a rich and famous abbey in Italy, is the most noted place of this order. The Order of the Holy Sacrament, also known as the Congregation of the Body of Jesus Christ, united with the Olivetenses in 1582. See Brunel, Hist. du Clergy seculier et regulier (Amst. 1716, 18mo), 2:288, 291.

## Monte, Andreas de[[@Headword:Monte, Andreas de]]

             (אנדריאס די מונטי), a celebrated Jewish convert to Christianity, so named after he had embraced the new faith (before his conversion he was called R. Joseph Tsarpathi Ha-Alphasi, יוסŠ צרפתי האלפסי), was born in the early part of the 16th century at Fez, in Africa (hence his second surname, האלפסי), of Jewish parents, who were natives of  France, which is indicated by his first surname (צרפתי, Gallus). He emigrated to Rome, where, after exercising the office of chief rabbi for many years, and distinguishing himself as an expounder of the Mosaic law, he embraced Christianity about the year 1552, during the pontificate of Julius III. He at once consecrated his vast knowledge of Hebrew and rabbinical literature to the elucidation of the prophecies, with a view to bringing his brethren into the fold of the Romish Church, and wrote —

(1) A voluminous work, entitled מבוכת היהודים, The Perplexity of the Jews, demonstrating both from the Scriptures and the ancient rabbinical writings all the doctrines of the Christian religion. Bartolocci, who found the MS. in loose sheets in the Neophyte College at Rome, carefully collated it and had it bound. He did not know that it ever was printed, but Furst (Bibliothecae Judaica, 3:544, s.v. Zarfati) states that it was published in Rome, 16—, 4to. However, Fabiano Fiocchi, in his work called Dialogo della Fede, has almost entirely transcribed it, so that the Biblical student may derive all the advantages from it for Christological purposes.

(2) An epistle to the various synagogues, written both in Hebrew and Italian, and entitled אגות שלום, Lettera di Pace, dated January 12, 1581. It treats of the coming of the true Messiah, and shows from the prophecies of the O.T., as well as from the works of the ancient rabbins, that he must have come long ago in the person of Jesus Christ (Rome, 16—, 4to). This learned work and the former one are very important contributions to the exposition of the Messianic prophecies, and to the understanding of the ancient Jewish views about the Messiah. Gregory XIII appointed Monte in 1576 preacher to the Hebrews of Rome in the oratory of the Holy Trinity; he was afterwards made Oriental interpreter to the pope, in which capacity he translated several ecclesiastical works from the Syriac and Arabic. He died in the beginning of the 17th century. See Bartolocci, Bibliotheca Magna Rabbinica, 3:848 sq.; Wolf, Bibliotheca Hebrcea i, 556 sq.; Ginsburg, in Kitto, Cyclop. Bibl. Lit. s.v.; Kalkar, Israel u. die Kirche, page 71; Fiirst, Bibl. Jud. 1:45 (s.v. Andreas).

## Monte, Cardinal del[[@Headword:Monte, Cardinal del]]

             SEE JULIUS II.

## Monte, Pietro dal[[@Headword:Monte, Pietro dal]]

             a celebrated Italian ecclesiastical canonist, was born at Venice in the latter part of the 15th century. After studying Greek and Italian under the direction of Guarino, he was made master of arts in Paris, and then obtained the rank of doctor in Padua. In 1433 he was made apostolic prothonotary, and in 1434 was sent by pope Eugenius IV to the council at Basle. He afterwards went to Rome to ask of her citizens, in the name of that council, a tax for liberating a nephew of the pope, whom cardinal Condolmieri had imprisoned. In 1434 he was sent to England to collect the taxes due the pontifical court. He remained in that country five years, during which time he became a favorite of the duke of Gloucester, uncle of the king. In 1442 he was made bishop of Brescia, a position which he held for two years. He was afterwards sent to France as legate of the Holy See. In 1447 he again visited Rome to assist in the ceremonies attending the ordination of pope Nicholas V. On his return to Brescia he founded many churches and a few religious institutions. Monte died in 1457, leaving a reputation worthy of a learned and pious man. His works are, Repertoarium Juris utriusque (Bologna, 1465, 3 vols. fol.): — Monarchia, in qua generalium conciliorum materia, de potestate et prcestantiat Romani Pontificis et Imperatoris discutitur (Rome, 1496, 4to): — a Latin translation of the Miraculum Eucharistice of St. Epiphany (Rome, 1523, 8vo). Some fragments of his discourses and letters have been published by cardinal Quirini in his Fr. Barbari Epistolce, t. 2, and in his Epistolae ad Benedictum.

## Montefiore, Sir Moses[[@Headword:Montefiore, Sir Moses]]

             a Jewish philanthropist, was born October 24, 1784. He was an opulent merchant of London, and was successively knighted and raised to a baronecy for his public labors; having served as sheriff of London in 1837, and also high-sheriff of Kent. He went in 1840 on a benevolent mission to the East, and on others in 1840 and 1867, in behalf. of his oppressed brethren. In the latter year he founded a Jewish college at Ramsgate. In 1875 he visited Jerusalem the seventh time. He died at Ramsgate, July 28, 1885. See his Centenary Biography, by Lucien Wolf (Lond. 1884; N.Y. 1885); The American Hebrew, October 9, 1885.

## Montenat, Benoit[[@Headword:Montenat, Benoit]]

             a French ecclesiastic, was born about the commencement of the 16th century; he was almoner to duke Charles of Bourbon, but he was so little known that his name cannot be found in the Bibliotheque Frangaise of La Croix du Maine. At the request of Anne of France, daughter of Louis XI, he wrote in 1505 a treatise on the Conformite desprophetes et Sibylles avec les douze articles de lafoi; this work remains unedited, and is preserved among the manuscripts of the Imperial Library, No. 7287. See Paulin. Paris, Manuscrits Frangais de la bibliotheque du Roi, 7:310.

## Montenegro[[@Headword:Montenegro]]

             called by the natives Tchernagora, and by the Turks Karadagh, i.e., Black Mountains, in view of the dark appearance of the wooded hills of this  remarkably mountainous country, is a semi-independent Slavish principality, between lat. 420 10' and 420 56' N., and long. 180 41' and 200 22' E.; bounded on the north by the Turkish provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina, on the south and east by Albania, and on the west by the Dalmatian circle of Cattaro, and covering a territory of 3738 square miles, with a population of about 311,000.

General Description. — The country is very mountainous, and agriculture is therefore prosecuted to a moderate extent only, and in a very rude and primitive manner. The products are like those of other European lands of the same latitudes. "The general aspect of Montenegro," says Wilkinson, the celebrated English traveller, "is that of a succession of elevated ridges, diversified here and there by a lofty mountain-peak, and in some parts looking like a sea of immense waves turned into stone. Trees and bushes grow amid the crags, and in the rugged district of Ceoo the fissures in the rocks are like a glacier, which no horse could pass over without breaking its legs. The mountains are all limestone, as in Dalmatia; but in no part of that country do they appear to be tossed about as in Montenegro, where a circuitous track, barely indicated by some large loose stones, calling itself a road, enables a man on foot with difficulty to pass from the crest of one ascent to another. Some idea of the rugged character of the country may be formed from the impression of the people themselves, who say that 'when God was in the act of distributing stones over the earth, the bag that held them burst, and let them all fall upon Montenegro.' The chief productions cultivated there are Indian corn and potatoes; cabbages, cauliflowers, and tobacco are also grown in great quantities, and vegetables are among the principal exports of Montenegro. Potatoes, indeed, have been a most profitable acquisition to the poor mountaineers, as well for home consumption as for exportation, since their introduction in 1786" (Dalmatia and Montenegro London, 1848, 2 volumes, 8vol, 1:411-413). Besides agriculture, the chief occupation of the Montenegrins is fishing. There are few who exercise any trade, though some perform the offices of blacksmiths, farriers, or whatever else their immediate wants may require. They are knit together in clans and families, and have many feuds among themselves, which are perpetuated by the hereditary obligation of avenging blood. In their disposition towards strangers they are, like most mountaineers, hospitable and courteous, and bear a friendly feeling for those who sympathize with their high notions of independence and devotion to their country. They are cheerful hi manner, and though very  rude, yet by no means uncouth. Education among them is at a very low ebb; in fact, it is held in contempt, and many, even among the priests, are unable to read or write. In 1841 several schools were established, and the art of printing introduced; but the unsettled state of the country has hitherto prevented much improvement. Their language is a very pure Servian dialect, called by Krasinski "the nearest of all the Slavonian dialects to the original Slavonic tongue; that is, that into which the Scriptures were translated by St. Cyril and Methodius in the 9th century, and which still continues to be the sacred tongue of all the Slavonian nations who follow the Eastern Church."

There are no towns in Montenegro, and the largest village contains only 1200 inhabitants. Cettigne or Tzettinie, the seat of government, contains between twenty and thirty well-built houses, besides a convent and the palace of the prince of Montenegro. The villages are unwalled; the houses, or rather huts, which compose them are very rarely provided with chimneys, and in the elevated districts are more wretched in appearance than even the mud-hovels of Ireland. "The houses," says Wilkinson, "are of stone, generally with thatched roofs, but many are covered partly or entirely with wooden shingles, a mode of roofing very common in Slavonic countries. Some of the better kinds are roofed with tiles, on which large stones, the primitive nails of Montenegro, are ranged in squares, to keep them from being torn off by the wind. Each house generally contains one or two rooms on the ground-floor, with a loft above, occupying the space between the gables, where they keep their Indian corn and other stores. The ascent to it is by a ladder, applied to a square hole in its floor, calling itself a door; and this floor, which performs the part of ceiling to the lower room, is frequently of wicker-work, laid on rafters running from wall to wall. The lower room is at once the parlor, the sleeping-room, and the kitchen; but in the small villages the houses have no loft, and their style of building is very primitive, the walls being merely of rude stones, without cement, and the roof of the coarsest thatch. In the better kind of houses is a bedstead, standing in one corner of the room. It may be styled a large bench, and generally consists of planks resting on a simple frame, having the head and one side to the wall; and a foot-board, with a post running up to the ceiling, completes the whole wood-work.

Those who can afford it have a large mattress and quilt, or blankets; but no Montenegrinbed is encumbered with curtains or sheets, and the only extras seen upon it are intended for warmth, in which the struccha [somewhat like the Scotch  plaid, and worn by both sexes over their shoulders] performs an essential part. Native visitors are satisfied to roll themselves up in their strucche and lie on the floor, which is the bare earth; and the poorer people, who cannot afford bedsteads, do the same at their homes, though this is no great hardship to the Montenegrin, who is accustomed, as long as the season will allow him, to sleep out of doors, upon the ground, or on a bench made of stones and mud. But whether in or out of the house, in a bed or on the ground, the Montenegrin always keeps on his clothes, his arms are close to his side, and when aroused by any alarm, or by the approach of morning, he is up at the shortest notice; and no toilet intervenes, on ordinary occasions, between his rising and his pipe. The embers of the fire, which had been covered up with ashes the night before, are then scraped up, and the usual habits of the day begin. The fireplace, which is in another corner of the room, is a raised hearth on the floor, with a caldron suspended from a ring above; it also serves as an oven, the Montenegrin bread being merely dough baked in ashes, as by the Arabs now and by the patriarchs of old, and without leaven. Chimneys are an unknown luxury in most Montenegrin houses, and the smoke escapes as it can. The furniture is not abundant, consisting of a bench, a few wooden stools, and a simple table; and the only brilliant-looking objects in the house are the arms and dresses of the inmates. Clocks or watches are also luxuries unknown to Montenegro, except at Tzettinie and the convents, and the only mode of ascertaining time is by watching the sun, or by common hour-glasses, and an occasional sundial. In some of the wildest mountain districts the houses or huts are of the meanest character, made of rough stones piled one on the other, or of mere wicker-work, and covered with the rudest thatch, the whole building being merely a few feet high. Few houses in Montenegro have an upper story, except at Tzettinie, Rieka, and some other places, where they are better built than in the generality of the villages, of solid stone, and roofed with tiles. Warm houses are indeed very requisite there in winter, when it is very cold, the level of the whole country being considerably above the sea, amid lofty peaks covered with snow during many months, and subject to stormy winds that blow over a long range of bleak mountains. The climate, however, is healthy, and these hardy people are remarkable for longevity.

"Both men and women are very robust, and they are known to carry as much as 200 funti (about 175 pounds) on their shoulders, over the steepest and most rugged rocks. All appear muscular, strong, and hardy in Montenegro; and the knotted trees, as they grow amid the crags, seem to  be emblematic of their country, and in character with the tough, sinewy fibre of the inhabitants. But, though able, the men are seldom inclined to carry anything, or take any trouble that they can transfer to the women, who are the beasts of burden in Montenegro; and one sees women toiling up the steepest hills under loads which men seldom carry in other countries. They are therefore very muscular and strong, and the beauty they frequently possess is soon lost by the hard and coarse complexions they acquire, their youth being generally exhausted by laborious and unfeminine occupations. The sheaves of Indian corn, the bundles of wood, and everything required for the house or the granary are carried by women; and the men are supposed to be too much interested about the nobler pursuits of war or pillage to have time to attend to meaner labors. As soon as the tillage of the lands is performed, they think they have done all the duties incumbent upon men; the inferior drudgery is the province of the women, and the Montenegrin toils only when his inclination demands the effort.

The men therefore (as often is the case in that state of society), whenever active and exciting pursuits are wanting, instead of returning to participate in or lighten the toils necessity had imposed on the women, are contented to smoke the pipe of idleness or indulge in desultory talk, imagining that they maintain the dignity of their sex by reducing women to the condition of slaves. The men wear a white or yellow cloth frock, reaching nearly to the knees, secured by a sash around the waist; under it is a red cloth vest, and over it a red or green jacket without sleeves, both richly embroidered, and the whole covered by a jacket bordered with fur. They wear a red Fez cap, and white or red turban, below which protrudes at the back of the neck a long lock of hair. The women wear a flock or pelisse of white cloth and open in front, but much longer than that of the men, and trimmed with various devices, and with gold ornaments in front as well as around the neck. The red cap of the girls is covered with Turkish coins arranged like scales. The red cap of the married women has, instead of coins, a black silk border, and on gala days a bandeau of gold ornaments. Women and men wear opanche (sandals), the soles of which are made of untanned ox-hide, with the hair taken off, and that side outward, and these enable them to run over the steepest and most slippery rocks with facility. The marriage ceremonies are celebrated with great signs of rejoicing. Eating and drinking form a principal part of the festivity, with the noisy discharge of guns and pistols, and the duration of the entertainment depends on the condition of the parties." When a young man resolves on marrying, he expresses the wish to the oldest and nearest  relation of his family, who repairs to the house of the girl, and asks her parents to consent to the match. This is seldom refused; but if the girl objects to the suitor, he induces some of his friends to join him and carry her off; which done, he obtains the blessing of a priest, and the matter is then arranged with the parents. The bride only receives her clothes, and some cattle, for her dowry.

Political Divisions and Government. — Montenegro is divided into the districts of Montenegro Proper and Brda or Zjeta, each of these being subdivided into four “nahies" or departments, and these are further subdivided, each subdivision having its own hereditary chief. Some islands in the Lake of Scutari also belong to Montenegro. Until 1852 the head of the government was the Vladika ("metropolitan," or "spiritual chief"), who, besides his proper office of archbishop and ecclesiastical superior, was at the same time chief ruler, lawgiver, judge, and military leader. This theocratic administration became (1697) hereditary in the Petrovitch family, but as the vladika cannot marry, the dignity was inherited through brothers and nephews. (See below.) Since 1852 the two offices have been disjoined, and the vladika is restricted to his ecclesiastical office, while the cares of government devolve upon the "Gospodar" (" hospodar") or lord, though the common people still apply to him the title "sveti gospodar," which properly belongs to the vladika alone. The vladika Pietro II (1830- 51) established a senate of sixteen members, elected from the chief families of the country, and in this body the executive power is vested. The public officers, local judges, and public representatives are appointed by popular election. From time to time an Assembly of all the adult males of the country takes place in a grassy hollow near Cettigne, the capital; but the powers of this assembly are very undefined. For defraying the expenses of government, taxes are levied on each household. The prince also receives from Russia a subsidy of 8000 ducats (£3733), and from France one of 50,000 francs (£1980). As the Montenegrin, even when engaged in agricultural operations, is always armed with rifle, vataghlan, and pistols, an army of 26,000 men can be summoned on the shortest notice, and in desperate cases 14,000 more troops can be raised. Their intense love of independence and heroism in defence of their country are worthy of the highest respect; but out of their own country they are savage barbarians, who destroy with fire and sword everything they cannot carry off.

History. — Montenegro belonged in the Middle Ages to the great Servian kingdom, but after the dismemberment of the latter, and its conquest by the Turks at the battle of Kossovo (1389), the Montenegrins, under their prince, who was of the royal blood of Servia, maintained their independence, though compelled to relinquish the level tracts about Scutari. with their chief fortress of Zabliak, and confine themselves to the mountains (1485). In 1516 their last secular prince resigned his office, and transferred the government to the vladika. The Porte continued to assert its claim to Montenegro, and included it in the pachalic of Scutari; but the country: was not conquered till 1719, and on the withdrawal of the Turks soon afterwards, it resumed its independence. In 1710 Montenegro sought and obtained the protection of Russia, the czar agreeing to grant an annual subsidy on condition of harassing the Turks by inroads, and this compact has, down to the present time, been faithfully observed by both parties. Another part of the agreement was that the vladika be consecrated by the czar, and this continues to be done even now, though this officer is at present only an ecclesiastical ruler. In 1796 the prince-bishop, Pietro I, defeated the pacha of Scutari, who had invaded Montenegro, with the loss of 30,000 men; and for the next quarter of a century we hear no more of Turkish invasions. The Montenegrins rendered important aid to Russia in 1803 against the French in Dalmatia, and took a prominent part in the attack on Ragusa, the capture of Curzola, and other achievements. Pietro II, who ruled from 1830 to 1851, made great efforts to civilize his people and improve their condition. He established the senate, introduced schools, and endeavored, though unsuccessfully, to put an end to internal feuds and predatory expeditions into the neighboring provinces. Some Turkish districts having joined Montenegro, the Turks attacked the latter in 1832, but were repulsed.

A dispute with Austria regarding the boundary resulted in a war, which was terminated by treaty in 1840. In 1851 the last prince- bishop died, and his successor, Danilo I, separated the religious from the secular supremacy, retaining the latter under the title of gospodar. This step caused the czar Nicholas to withdraw his subsidy (which was renewed, and the arrears paid, by the czar Alexander II), and the imposition of taxes thus rendered necessary caused great confusion. This was taken advantage of by the Turks, who, under Omer Pasha, invaded the country; but the intervention of the great powers compelled a treaty, February 15, 1853. Danilo, however, in vain endeavored to obtain the  recognition of Montenegro as an independent power, though he repaired to the Paris Conference in 1857 for this purpose. He, moreover, greatly improved the laws and condition of the country. In 1860 the Montenegrins excited an insurrection against the Turkish rule in the Herzegovina, which was soon suppressed, and in return they themselves were so hard pressed by the Turks that they were glad to agree to a treaty (September 13, 1862) by which the sovereignty of the Sublime Porte over Montenegro was recognised, though the word itself consigning such authority is not stated in the compact. The present ruler of the country is Nikita, a man of good education, secured in Paris and Berlin, and an excellent politician, who has been actively engaged in seeking support from Austria, Russia, and Germany to establish the complete independence of his realm. Since the commencement of the Pan-Slavic movement he has enjoyed many favors from Russia, and received from its emperor in 1869, while on a visit to St. Petersburg, a historical sword, with the Servian inscription "God save the king." In 1874 new complications arose with Turkey on account of murders committed on the Albanian borders, and Montenegro declared war in January 1875; but a compromise was effected towards the end of the month. Since 1871 a political weekly has been published at Cettigne, and there are now telegraphic connections in the Montenegrin possessions. There is also a postoffice department, which was established with the aid of the Austrian government in 1872. The most recent improvements are of a character indicating a very rapid progress in culture.

Religion. — The Montenegrins are members of the Non-united Greek Church, excepting only a few Roman Catholics and Jews. The czar of Russia is recognised as the highest authority, for to him belongs the ordination of the Vladika, the spiritual head of the Montenegrin Church. As we have seen above, the vladika was formerly both temporal and spiritual ruler. He is now prince-bishop, and next to him in authority stands the archimandrite of the convent of Ostrok. Priests, of whom there are about 200, are ordained by the vladika, and are charged thirty dollars for admission to holy orders, the money going to the state. They join in war and in the other occupations of the people. The priests must also be married before they can come up for consecration, but the vladika is not allowed to marry; and as the office must be kept within the family to which it has descended since 1516, the succession always falls to a nephew, or some other male relative. The vladika has an annual revenue of $10,000.  The Montenegrin Greek Christians, who number, according to the Statistical Year-book of the Russian Empire (volume 2, 1871), 125,000, hate the pope equally as the Turks. They reject images, crucifixes, and pictures, and will not admit a Romanist without rebaptizing him. Monasticism exists to a small extent. Their principal convents are those of Tzetinie, Ostrok, and St. Stefano. See Wilkinson, Dalmatia and Montenegro, volume 1, chapter 6; Krasinski, Montenegro and the Slavonians in Turkey (Lond. 1855); and the same author in the Brit. and For. Qu. Rev. July 1840; Vaclik, La Souverainte du Montenegro (Leipsic, 1858); Ubicini, Les Serbes du Turquie (Paris, 1865); Noe, Montenegro (Leipsic, 1870); Nightingale, Religious Ceremonies, pages 99-112; Daniels, Geographie, 2:61 sq.

## Montenses[[@Headword:Montenses]]

             seems to have been a local name of the Donatists. St. Augustine says distinctly that in his time those heretics were called "Montenses" at Rome (Aug. Hier. 69). Epiphanius and Theodoret both associate the name, on the other hand, with the Novatians (Epiph. Hier. 59; Theodor. Haer.-fab. 3:5). In the early list of heresies which goes under the name of St. Jerome it is said that the Montenses were found chiefly at Rome, and that they were so named because they had concealed themselves in the hill-country during a time of persecution. This author speaks of them as distinct from the Donatists and Novatians, but as adopting the heresy of the one as to the rejection of penitents, and of the other as to rebaptism (Pseudo-Hieron. Indicul. de Haeres. 34). In one of the canons of the African code, which directs the mode of receiving a person into the Church when coming "de Donatistis vel de Montensibus," the two names seem to be used as synonymous.

## Montereuil, Bernardin[[@Headword:Montereuil, Bernardin]]

             a learned Jesuit, was born in Paris in 1569, and died there in 1646. But little is known of his personal history. He is, however, distinguished for his works, of which A History of the early State of the Church and A Life of Jesus Christ are highly esteemed.

## Montes Pietatis[[@Headword:Montes Pietatis]]

             (Fr. Mont de Piete, Ital. Monte di Pieta) is the name of charitable institutions, thoroughly Christian in origin and purpose, the object of which is to lend money to the very poor at a moderate rate of interest. They date from the close of the mediaeval period, when all such transactions were in the hands of usurers to whom the necessities of the poor were but an inducement to the most oppressive extortion. The principle was to advance small sums, not ordinarily exceeding $100, on the security of pledges, but at a rate of interest barely sufficient to cover the working expenses of the institution, any surplus to be expended for charitable purposes. The earliest of these charitable banks is believed to have been that founded by the Minorite Barnabas at Perugia in 1464, and was confirmed by pope Paul III. Another was founded at Padua in 1491, and a third (the first in Germany) was established in 1498 at Nuremberg. The first opened at Rome was under Leo X; and the Roman Monti di Pieta are confessed to have been at all times the most successful and the best managed in Italy. The institution extended to Florence, Milan, Naples, and other cities. The Mont-de-Piete system has been generally introduced into France and Germany, the state now controlling its affairs, and not the Church. It has also been introduced into Spain, and into the Spanish provinces of the Netherlands. It formed the model of the Loan Fund Board of Ireland, established by the administration of queen Victoria.

## Montesar[[@Headword:Montesar]]

             SEE MONCON.

## Montesilo, Anthony[[@Headword:Montesilo, Anthony]]

             a noted Spanish Dominican, flourished in the 16th century. He entered the order at Salamanca, and died as a martyr in the West Indies in 1645. His only work is, Informatio juridica in Judaeorum defensionem. See Echard, Biblioth. Proedicatorumn (Par. 1719-21, 2 volumes, fol.), 2:123.

## Montespan, Francoise Athenais, Marquise de[[@Headword:Montespan, Francoise Athenais, Marquise de]]

             one of the mistresses of Louis XIV. noted for her profligacy and vices, deserves a place here because of the influence she exerted on the fate of the religion of France. She was born in 1641, married to the marquis de Montespan in 1663, but, supplanting the duchess de la Valliere in the affections of the king in 1668, the marquis was banished from court. The marchioness, freed from the authority of her husband, became the mistress of a ruler who claimed to be a faithful servant of the Church of Rome. In 1670 she accompanied him to Flanders, and unblushingly revealed her real position at court. She openly braved the queen and the whole kingdom. But, what is stranger still, she endeavored to reconcile imperious vice with humble piety, and formed a set of morals for herself which Christians would hardly care to endorse. She did not disdain to work for the poor, and, like many others, brought herself to believe that frequent alms and exterior practices of devotion would purchase a pardon for everything. She even presented herself at the communion-table, favored by absolutions, which she either purchased from mercenary or procured from ignorant priests. One day she endeavored to obtain absolution from the curate of a village who had been recommended to her on account of his flexibility. "What?” said this man of God, “are you that marchioness de Montespan whose crime is an offence to the whole kingdom? Go, madam, renounce your wicked habits, and then come to this awful tribunal." She went, not indeed to renounce her wicked habits, but to complain to the king of the insult she had received, and to demand justice upon the confessor. The king, naturally religious, was not sure that his authority extended so far as to judge of what passed in the holy sacraments, and therefore consulted Bossuet, preceptor to the dauphin and bishop of Condom, and the duke de Montauzier, his governor. The minister and the bishop both supported the curate, and tried upon this occasion to detach the king from Madame de Montespan. The strife was doubtful for some time, but the mistress at length prevailed. In 1675 she lost her hold on the king, who had fallen in love with Madame de Maintenon (q.v.), and she never regained her former  position in the reign of her master and former lover. She retired to Paris for the winter, and in the summer visited watering-places. In 1707, while away at one of these places (Bourbon), she died, neither regretted by the king, her children, nor the nation. One half of her life was spent in grandeur, and the other half in contempt. She was rather ashamed of her faults than penitent for them. In a word, her reign was so intolerable and fatal that it was looked upon in France as a judgment from heaven. See General Biographical Dictionary, s.v.; Saint-Simon. Memoires; Voltaire, Siecle de Louis XIV; Houssaye, Mlle. de la Valliere et Mme. de Montespan; see also Louis XIV. (J.H.W.)

## Montesquieu, Charles De Secondat, Baron de la Brede et de[[@Headword:Montesquieu, Charles De Secondat, Baron de la Brede et de]]

             one of the most noted moralists of the world, and a celebrated French writer, was born January 18, 1689, at the Chateau de la Brede in the  immediate neighborhood of Bordeaux. He was descended from a noble and otherwise distinguished family of the province of Guienne. Even as a youth he gave the promise of his future fame. His habits were most studious, and his desire for learning was encouraged in every way by a fond and judicious father. While engaged in a most laborious study of the civil law, with a view to the profession for which he was destined, young Montesquieu was also much devoted to the study of general literature and philosophy, and even found time to prepare a work on a theological subject, namely, Whether the Idolatry which prevailed among the Heathen deserved eternal Damnation? His love of the writers of antiquity had led him to enter the lists in defence of pagan writers, pronouncing them worthy of salvation. The book was favorably received, but did not create much stir. In 1714 Montesquieu attained the rank of "conseiller" in the Parliament of Bordeaux, and three years afterwards, on the death of a paternal uncle, he succeeded at the same time to his fortune and to his post of "president mortier" in the same Parliament. With the most assiduous and conscientious discharge of his duties as a judge, he yet continued the pursuit of literature. His most favorite studies were historical and moral sciences. But he also loved the study of the natural sciences, and even joined in 1716 the Academy of Bordeaux, zealous to direct the attention of this body to physical science.

He seems at this time to have been very much impressed with the importance of physical science. He wrote about this time his Physical History of the Ancient and Modern World, which was published in 1719. He shortly returned, however, and allowed the academy likewise to return, to literature and morals; and he now wrote several small essays on literary and moral subjects, which were read at meetings of the academy. In 1721, just six years after the death of Louis XIV, when France had outlived the lethargy of the last years of the great reign, and the orgies of the regency were in full swing, Montesquieu appeared with the work which first brought him fame, the Leftres Persanes, which was published anonymously. The author, however, was soon recognised, and his name was in everybody's mouth.

The book, in which in the character of a Persian, he ridicules with exquisite humor and clear, sharp criticism the religious, political, social, and literary life of his countrymen, secured him a place in the "Academy," though he had even levied his attacks against it. It is supposed that the Siamoois of Dufresny, or the Espion Turc, suggested the plan of this work, but, be this as it may, its execution is entirely original. "The delineation of Oriental manners," says D'Alembert, "real or supposed, of the pride and the dulness of Asiatic love, is but the smallest of  the author's objects; it serves only, so to speak, as a pretext for his delicate satire of our customs, and for other important matters which he fathoms, though appearing but to glance at them." Some censures which Montesquieu in his Persian Letters bestowed upon the conduct of Louis XIV caused the work to be regarded with an evil eye at court; and one or two sarcasms levelled at the pope awakened the zeal of such as were rigidly devout Romanists, or found it convenient to seem so, and Montesquieu was industriously represented as a man equally hostile to the interest of religion and the peace of society. Those calumnies reached the ear of cardinal de Fleury; and when Montesquieu, sustained by the public opinion of his talents, applied for the place which M. Sacy's death had left vacant in the French Academy, that learned body was made to understand that his majesty would never give his consent to the writer of the Lettres Persanes; because, though his majesty had not read the work, persons in whom he placed confidence had pointed out its poisonous tendency. Without feeling too much anxiety for literary distinction, Montesquieu perceived the fatal effect that such an accusation might produce upon his dearest interests.

According to D'Alembert, Montesquieu waited upon Fleury, therefore, and signified that, although for particular reasons he had not acknowledged the Lettres Persanes, he was very far from wishing to disown that work, which he believed to contain nothing disgraceful to him, and which ought at least to be read before it was condemned. Struck by these remonstrances, the cardinal perused the work, the objections were removed, and France avoided the disgrace of forcing this great man to depart, as he had threatened, and seek among foreigners, who invited him, the security and respect which his own country seemed little inclined to grant. This story of D'Alembert is by some discredited, and, instead of it, Voltaire's version is accepted. According to him, "Montesquieu adopted a skilful artifice to regain the minister's favor: in two or three days he prepared a new edition of his book, in which he retrenched or softened whatever might be condemned by a cardinal and a minister. M. de Montesquieu himself carried the work to Fleury — no great reader — who examined a part of it. This air of confidence. supported by the zeal of some persons in authority, quieted the cardinal, and Montesquieu gained admission to the Academy" (Ecrivains du Siecle de Louis XIV, sec. Montesquieu).

The authenticity of this statement, however, appears to rest solely on Voltaire's evidence, not altogether unexceptionable in the present case. D'Alembert's account is generally preferred. Shortly after his admission to the Academy, January 24, 1728, Montesquieu set out for a  journey to qualify himself for the arduous task of investigating and appreciating the different political or civil constitutions of ancient or modern times, and in order to study, as far as possible, the manners and character, the physical and moral condition, of the European nations by actual inspection. He first visited Vienna, along with lord Waldegrave, the English ambassador. From this city, after conversing with the celebrated prince Eugene, and surveying all that seemed worthy of notice, he passed into Hungary, and afterwards to Italy, where he met with lord Chesterfield, and travelled in his company to Venice. While examining the singular institutions of this republic, and canvassing the subject with eager frankness in places of public resort, he learned that he had incurred the displeasure of the authorities, and was in danger of persecution. He instantly embarked for Fucino, next visited Rome, and, having surveyed Switzerland and the United Provinces, he repaired in 1730 to Great Britain. Newton and Locke were dead, but the philosophical traveller found men in England qualified to estimate his talents. He was respected and patronized by queen Caroline, and enjoyed the intimacy of Pope, Bolingbroke, and many other eminent characters of that period. He spent there two years, and collected much material for his future literary labors. He was made aware of the great esteem in which the English held him by being chosen a fellow of the Royal Society.

After his return to Brede, Montesquieu published his Considerations sur les Causes de la Grandeur et de la Decadence des Romains (Paris, 1734), a masterly view of Roman history, expressed in a sententious, oracular, and vigorous style. "In attempting to derive the grandeur and downfall of Rome from the admitted principles of human nature, he gave a new turn to such investigations. If some elements of a problem so complex have been omitted, and others rated too high or too low, the work must be allowed to exhibit views of political society, at all times specious, often equally just and profound: the vivid pictures, the acute and original thoughts, with which it everywhere abounds, are to be traced in many succeeding speculations. It deserves praise also for the manly and liberal tone of feeling that pervades it." But by far his greatest work, on which he had been engaged for twenty years, the Esprit des Lois, he published in 1748 (Geneva, 2 volumes). In it Montesquieu attempts to exhibit the relation between the laws of different countries and their local and social circumstances. It was immensely popular. No fewer than twenty-two editions were published in eighteen months, and it was translated into various European languages. "The Esprit des Lois," says a contemporary, "is a wonderfully good book, considering the age in which it  appeared. Without adopting Voltaire's hypereulogistic criticism, that 'when the human race had lost their charters, Montesquieu rediscovered and restored them,' it may be said that it was the first work in which the questions of civil liberty were ever treated in an enlightened and systematic manner, and. to Montesquieu, more than to any other man, is it owing that the science of politics has become a favorite subject of study with the educated public." "The Esprit des Lois," says another, "is one of the most laborious books ever written. It had an immense influence on the literature of the age, and founded that method of philosophizing and finding out facts to justify opinion which characterized his followers of the French school, and entered in a great measure into the spirit of the Scottish school of philosophy. Like most original-minded men, he brought to his work a degree of genius and knowledge which his imitators could not cope with, and which concealed, in his hands, the defects of the system." "Notwithstanding," says Villemain, "some expressions here and there inexact, according to our ideas, from their very materialism, the character of his writing is generally metaphysical. Succeeding the light and brilliant epicureanism and scepticism of the 18th century, the Esprit des Lois began the spiritualist reaction which Rousseau carried on" (Cours de Litterature, volume 1, chapter 4). The work rendered great service to humanitarianism by the respect it paid to human life. Pascal, indeed, in his letter on homicide, had preceded him in this, but we know how indifferent on this subject were the courtly and elegant Frenchmen of that day; how little they troubled themselves about "those Breton peasants who were never tired of being hanged." Montesquieu did not wish absolutely to restrain the utmost penal power of the law, but he recommended clemency and equity, and in his own century Tuscany abolished capital punishment.

As Dr. Vinet has well said, we may further commend the author of the Spirit of Laws for his "respect for human nature; his love for justice; his true philanthropy; his reverence for all the virtues which ennoble man and his destiny; and, in short, for his attachment to the principles which form the basis of human society." But, though the work found many friends, there were vet some who took decided exception to many of its doctrines. Thus the editor of the Gazette Ecclesiastique, long deeply engaged in the Jansenist quarrels which then agitated France, assailed the author of the Esprit des Lois in two pamphlets with the charge of deism, and the weightier though contradictory one of following the doctrines of Spinoza. The defence which Montesquieu published, admirable for its strain of polite irony, candor, and placid contempt, was entirely triumphant. Indeed, abilities of a  much lower order than his would have sufficed to cover with ridicule the weak and purblind adversary who discovered the source of the Esprit des Lois in the Bull Unigenitus, and blamed his opponent for neglecting to examine the doctrines of grace and original sin. It is to be wished that Montesquieu had employed means so legitimate to counteract Dupin's criticism. His admirers would willingly forget that when a copy of the latter's work, ready for circulation, fell into his hands, he carried it to the royal mistress, Madame Pompadour, and allowed her to inform Dupin that, as the Esprit des Lois enjoyed her special favor, all objections to it must be instantly suppressed. It must be borne in mind, however, that Montesquieu held a place peculiarly his own, and quite apart from the Christian writers. He was a moralist to be sure, but he did not claim to be a theologian, nor even a devoted or enthusiastic Christian, but simply a cold and calculating philosopher, and as such it was much for him to turn aside and pay the high tributes and warm encomiums to Christianity which he did pay in all his writings; and it may indeed be asserted that "among the laymen of the 18th century no one has spoken so admirably of Christianity." Says he, in the Spirit of Laws, "How admirable the Christian religion, which, while it seems only to have in view the felicity of the other life, constitutes the happiness of this" (book 24, chapter 3). This is very unlike the sneering infidelity of Bayle or Voltaire.

Montesquieu's moral doctrine is, perhaps, best gleaned from his Pensees Diverses, collected from his MSS., and published in 1758. From this work it appears that he differed little from the ancient stoicism, though he has not laid it down in a systematic form. His own nature was his true system. Nevertheless he loses no opportunity of boasting of stoicism in general: "No philosopher has ever made men feel the sweetness of virtue and the dignity of their nature better than Marcus Aurelius; he affects the heart, enlarges the soul, and elevates the mind." "If I could for a moment cease to think that I am a Christian, I could not possibly avoid ranking the destruction of the sect of Zeno among the misfortunes that have befallen the human race." The stoicism of Montesquieu is softened and restrained by a certain feeling of religion. Stoicism alone could not satisfy this loving mind. In the picture which he draws of human virtues, the idea of God constantly returns, not as something useless, but as its necessary completion.

He several times took the opportunity of expressing the very lively aversion that he felt to atheism: "The pious man and atheist always talk of religion: the one speaks of what he loves, and the other of what he  fears." This aversion, which had its principle in the uprightness of his mind, was strengthened by his acquaintance with the real necessities and true condition of society. He defended with no less warmth the immortality of the soul: "Although the immortality of the soul were an error, I should be sorry not to believe it: I confess I am not so humble as the atheists. I know not how they think, but, for myself, I would not exchange the idea of my immortality for the happiness of a day. I delight in believing that I am immortal as God himself. Independently of revelation, metaphysics give me a very strong hope of my eternal happiness, which I would not willingly renounce. Indifference about a future life leads us to be soft and easy with regard to the present, and renders us insensible and incapable of everything which implies an effort." Montesquieu knew that all religion is social, while atheism is eminently anti-social. Montesquieu felt this, and more than once expressed it.

Not only does he admit that "all religions contain precepts useful to society," but he declares that religion is the best guarantee that we can have for the morals of mankind;" and he goes so far as to say that "all societies require a religion." No one has shown better than he the intimate relation between religion and social life; and it is interesting to observe that it is in the Persian Letters, namely in the work into which he has introduced the rashest statements, and in which he has conceded most to the ideas and manners of his time, that we find this remarkable passage, which explains so well what we have merely indicated: "In any religion which we profess, the observance of laws, love to men, devotedness to parents, are always the first religious acts... For, whatever religion a man professes, the moment any religion is supposed, it must also necessarily be supposed that God loves mankind, since he establishes a religion to render them happy; that, if he loves men, we are certain of pleasing him in loving them also; that is, in exercising towards them all the duties of charity and humanity, and not breaking the laws under which they live." In the Spirit of Laws, and in the Thoughts, we meet with passages much stronger in favor of Christianity, proving that Montesquieu understood it far better than the moralists of his time, at least in the philosophical view. But for further development of these criticisms we must refer the reader to Vinet, Hist. of French Lit. 18th Century (Engl. by the Reverend James Bryce, Edinb. 1855, 8vo), page 199 sq. Montesquieu died at Paris, February 10, 1755.

The private character of Montesquieu was such as the tendency of his works might lead us to anticipate. Possessing that calm independence which secured him respect, he possessed also that mildness and benignity of character which displayed itself in a cheerful temper, and obtained for  him universal love. He was distinguished by the readiness which he always manifested to use his influence with the government in behalf of persecuted men of letters; and strict frugality frequently enabled him, without impairing the property of his family, to mitigate the wants of the indigent. Burke characterizes him as "a genius not born in every country or every time; a man gifted by nature with a penetrating, aquiline eye; with a judgment trained by the most extensive erudition; with a herculean robustness of mind, and nerves not to be broken with labor." The most complete edition of his works is that by D'Alembert and Villemain (Paris, 1827, 8 volumes, 8vo). Nugent's translation of the Spirit of the Laws, together with D'Alembert's biographical sketch of Montesquieu, were published at Cincinnati in 1873. See Voltaire, Siecle de Louis XIV et Louis XV; D'Alembert, Ebloge de Montesquieu; Villemain, Eloge de Montesquieu (1820); Riaux, Notice sur Montesquieu (1849); Maupertui, Eloge de Montesquieu (1755); Bersot, Montesquieu (Paris, 1852); Burs, Montesquieu u. Cartesius, in Philos. Monatshefte, October 1, 1869; Sainte-Beuve, Causeries du Lundi, 7:41 sq.; Mennechet, Litirature Moderne (Paris, 1857, 12mo), 4:125-143; and the excellent article in the Edinburgh Cyclop. s.v.

## Montesquieu-Fezensac, De, Francois Xavier Marc Antoine, abbe[[@Headword:Montesquieu-Fezensac, De, Francois Xavier Marc Antoine, abbe]]

             a French ecclesiastic, was born near Auch in 1757. He was a deputy from the clergy of Paris to the States-General in 1789, and was twice elected president of the National Assembly. During the Reign of Terror he took refuge in England, but after the second Restoration returned to his native country and was made a duke, receiving the title of minister of state. He died in 1832. See Guizot, Memoires.

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

             a French Protestant theologian, was born at Milhau, Aveyron, in 1790. He studied at Lausanne and Geneva, and was made a licentiate. of theology at the latter place, on presenting Disputatio Theolog. de Authentia Librorumn Novi Testamenti, in 1813. In 1814 he was called as pastor to Realmont, Tarn; in 1825 he was made professor of Church history at Montauban, and dean of the faculty in 1835. In 1865 he retired from active duty, and died February 24, 1878. See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Monteth (or Monteith, or even Montieth), Robert[[@Headword:Monteth (or Monteith, or even Montieth), Robert]]

             a Scotch priest, who was chaplain of cardinal de Retz and a canon of Notre Dame, flourished near the middle of the 17th century. He wrote mainly works on secular history. See Allibone, Dict. of British and American Authors, s.v.

## Monteverde, Claudio[[@Headword:Monteverde, Claudio]]

             an Italian composer, was born at Cremona about 1565, and died at Venice in 1649. He composed both secular and ecclesiastical music, but was  particularly celebrated for his motets and madrigals; of the latter he produced five books.

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

             one of the learned Benedictines of Saint-Maur, noted for his valuable antiquarian labors, was born January 17, 1655, of a high family of Soulage, in Languedoc. He early evinced great facility for acquiring languages, and a remarkable love of study. He was educated at the College of Limoux, but threw aside his books, and in 1672 entered the army, and served in several campaigns under Turenne. After the death of his parents, he joined the Benedictines at Toulouse in 1675. His time was now largely employed in correcting the Latin translations of the Greek Church historians. Dom Claude Martin, to whom he communicated his work, pointed him out to his superiors as a man of great capacity, and particularly fitted to take a part in the publication of the Greek fathers contemplated by the Congregation of St. Maur.

He was consequently called to Paris in 1687. The following year he published his Analecta sive varia opuscula Graeca (Paris, 1844, 4to), which contains also some lives of saints. In 1690 he published La verite de l'histoire de Judith (2d ed. Paris, 1692, 12mo), in which, with a great deal of historical talent, he attempts to establish the authenticity of the facts related in that narrative against the opinion of those who consider it as a fable or a parable. But his reputation rests chiefly on the part he took in the publication of the works of the fathers. He first gave Athanasius (Paris, 1698, 3 volumes, folio), revised by means of the MSS. of Paris and of the Vatican, with a new Latin translation; the third volume contains the. doubtful and spurious works. With this is connected the Collectio nova patrum et scriptorum Graecorum (Par. 1707, 2 volumes, fol.).

In this work Montfaucon gives, besides an excellent biography of Athanasius, some newly discovered works of that father, those of Eusebius of Caesarea, and the Topographia Christiana of the Egyptian monk Cosmas Indicopleustes. The critical tact and acumen, the extensive learning, and the thorough linguistic knowledge which Montfaucon evinced in these works, led his superiors to intrust him also with the publication of the works of Chrysostom. As the MSS. at Paris were insufficient, he was sent to Rome to consult the codices of that city. Innocent XII showed him the greatest regard, while one of the librarians of the Vatican, out of jealousy, defamed and persecuted him. He refused high offices which were opened to him at Rome, and devoted himself exclusively to his studies. The pope and cardinals were lavish in their attentions and Montfaucon, during the  intervals of his ecclesiastical functions, gave frequent and unequivocal proofs of the learning which he possessed and was anxious to augment. It is related that Zacagni, then sublibrarian of the Vatican, feeling his vanity wounded by the praise bestowed on this accomplished foreigner, laid several schemes to lower him in the public estimation.

One day while Montfaucon, among a crowd of distinguished persons, happened to be sauntering in the library, Zacagni, with affected politeness, requested the antiquary to favor him with the date of a Greek manuscript which he spread out before him. Montfaucon replied that apparently it was written about 700 years ago. His antagonist, with a triumphant sneer, desired him to observe the name of Basil, the Macedonian, written at the top. The Frenchman asked if it were not Basil Porphyrogenitus, later by 150 years; and as this, upon examination, proved to be the case, Zacagni retired with his manuscript, and thenceforth left the stranger at peace. After his return to Paris Montfaucon published the Hexapla of Origen (1713, 2 volumes, fol.), with variations, notes, and introductory remarks not only on the, work itself, but on the general history of the Greek versions of the Bible. His next publication was an edition of the works of Chrysostom (Par. 1718 sq., 13 volumes, fol.; Venice, 1780,14 volumes, 4to). Montfaucon had consulted the French, Roman, English, and German codices; the text was accompanied by a new Latin translation, a biography of Chrysostom, numerous notes, and an introduction to each separate work.

This is universally pronounced one of the chef-d'oeuvres of the Maurines, and the best edition of this Church father. Some time previous to this Montfaucon had published another valuable work, Le Livre de Philon de la Vie Contemplative (Par. 1709, 12mo), with notes, and an attempt to prove that the Therapeutse of whom Philo speaks were Christians; and in 1710 an Epistola on the fact mentioned by Rufinus that St. Athanasius baptized children when himself a child. In 1719 he gave to the world a great work on the history of art, entitled, L'Antiquit expliquee et Representee en Figures; and in 1729 Les Monuments de la Monarchie Francaise. His last but not least important work is his Bibliotheca Bibliothecarum MSS. nova (Par. 1739, 2 volumes, fol.)! He died suddenly at the abbey of Saint- Germain-des-Pres, December 21, 1741. He was chosen a member of the Academy of Inscriptions in 1719, and contributed many papers to this and other learned bodies. Montfaucon was celebrated for the mildness and benignity of his character. Neither the favors which he had received from an emperor, nor the honors with which he was decorated by two successive popes, could at all abate his humility; and strangers who  conversed with him returned not more surprised at the amazing extent of his information than at the unpretending simplicity of his manners. Of an author who has left 44 volumes, folio, it may be expected that elegance will not be a characteristic; and, accordingly, Montfaucon's writings are blamed for their cumbrous style and defective arrangement. But his erudition, a quality more befitting such pursuits, has never been called in question; and his works are still looked up to as guides through that obscure and intricate department of knowledge which he devoted his life to study. See Edinburgh Cyclop. s.v.; Tassin, Histoire litteraire de la Congreigation de St. Maur, page 591 sq.; Fabricius, Bibl. Graeca, 13:849; Eloge de Montfaucon, in the Hist. de l'Acad. des Inscriptions, volume 16; Gentleman's Magazine (December 1855), page 572. (J.H.W.)

## Montferrat[[@Headword:Montferrat]]

             formerly an independent duchy of Italy, between Piedmont, Milan, and Genoa, and consisting of two separate portions, Casale and Acqui, lying between the Maritime Alps and the Po, and having an area of over 1300 square miles, with its capital at Casale, is now incorporated in the kingdom of Italy. Montferrat, after the downfall of the Frankish empire, was ruled by its own margraves till the beginning of the 14th century. This illustrious house for a long time disputed the sovereignty of Piedmont with the house of Savoy, and sent to the Crusades more heroes than any other sovereign house in Europe. Members of the family ruled simultaneously in Montferrat, Thessaly, and Jerusalem. On the death of the marquis John I in 1305, his sister, Iolande or Irene, who was empress of Constantinople, succeeded to Montferrat; and her second son became the founder of the family of Montferrat-Palaeologus, which became extinct in 1533, when Montferrat passed to the Gonzagas of Mantua. In 1631 the dukes of Savoy obtained possession of a portion of the territory, and in 1703, with the consent of the German emperor, the remaining portion passed under their sway, and was incorporated with their own dominions. The cession of Savoy to France after the war of 1869 placed Montferrat for a while under French rule, but after the conflict between Germany and France in 1870 Italy gained back this territory, and it now forms a part of the united kingdom. The ecclesiastical history is detailed in the article ITALY.

## Montfiquet, Raoul De[[@Headword:Montfiquet, Raoul De]]

             a noted French writer on asceticism, was born in the village of Montfiquet, near Bayeux, towards the close of the 15th century. He was a doctor of theology, and enjoyed great distinction among his fellows. He died about 1520. His works, which are much sought after by bibliographers on account of their antiquity, are, Tractatus de vera, reali atque mirabili existentia totius Christi (Paris, 1481, fol.): — Le Livre ou Traicte du sainct sacrement de l'autel (Paris, 1500, 4to): — Exposition de l'Oraison Dominicale (Paris, 1485, 4to): — Exposition de l'Ave Maria (Paris, 4to): — Le Guidon et Gouvernment des gens mariez, traitie singulier du sainct sacrement, estat et fruit du mariage (Paris, about 1520, 4to). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Montfort Manuscript[[@Headword:Montfort Manuscript]]

             (CODEX MONTFORTIANUS, known as MS. 61 of the Gospels, 34 of the Acts, 40 of the Pauline Epistles, and 92 of Revelation), so named from a Cambridge divine of the 17th century, who gave it to archbishop Usher, by whom it was presented to Trinity College, Dublin, in the library of which it still remains (there designated as G. 97); an octavo cursive Greek MS. of the entire N.T., written in the 15th or 16th century, on 455 paper leaves, and famous as containing the text of "the three heavenly witnesses" (1Jn 5:7, that leaf being glazed to preserve it from injury). An earlier owner was William Clap, once a fellow of Cambridge, who derived it from Thomas Clement, and originally it belonged to one Froy, a Franciscan friar. It is apparently the work of three or four successive scribes, perhaps in part at first independent of each other; and the Apocalypse bears marks of having been copied from the Codex Leicestrensis. It is doubtless the "Codex Britannicus" referred to by Erasmus as his sole authority for inserting the above disputed text in his edition of 1522, in accordance with a promise he had made to his detractors that if a single Greek MS. could be found containing it he would add it. SEE WITNESSES, THE THREE HEAVENLY.

It has the Ammonian sections, and the number of verses noted at the end of the MS., with the Latin division of chapters. There are many corrections by a more recent hand, erasures of the pen, etc. An  imperfect collation of it, while in Usher's hands, was printed in Walton's Polyglot. Dr. Banet collated the remainder for his edition of the Dublin palimpsest Z, and more recently Dr. Dobbin has published a complete collation (The Codex Montfortianus, etc., Lond. 1854). See Tregelles, in Horne's Introd. 4:218 sq.; Scrivener, Introd. to N.T. page 149. SEE MANUSCRIPTS, BIBLICAL.

## Montfort, Sect At[[@Headword:Montfort, Sect At]]

             In the 11th century a mystic Christian sect appeared in the north of Italy, having its headquarters at Montfort, in the neighborhood of Turin. Their presiding officer was one Gerhard, who was balled upon by Heribert, archbishop of Milan, to give an account of his doctrines. They were considered heretics, and subjected to great persecution, which they bore with the spirit of martyrs; but the sect made little progress.

## Montfort, Simon De[[@Headword:Montfort, Simon De]]

             a bold, merciless, and superstitidus, but devoted follower of the papacy, was descended from the counts of Montfort, near Paris. He was born about the middle of the 12th century. His career dates from the year 1199, when he appears as a leader in the Crusade of Cery, where he was associated with Rainald de Montmirail, Garnier, bishop of Troyes. Walther of Brienne, and the marshal of Champagne, Geoffroy of Villehardouin, and others. The crusade set forth October 8, 1202. A bargain had been previously made with the Venetians, by which the latter agreed to furnish "ships and other conveniences to pass the sea." When the time for embarkation arrived, the Crusaders were lacking 34,000 marks of the stipulated price. The "wise old doge" saw his advantage, and proposed that Venice would fulfil her part of the treaty if, in discharge of the 34,000 marks of silver, the Crusaders would lend their aid in the conquest of Zara. After much hesitation, the plan was acceded to by all but De Montfort. "We are Christians; we war not against our brother Christians," said he. "

His object in assuming this position," says Villehardouin, "was to break up the misguided army." After the capture of Zara, the Crusaders advanced to Constantinople for the purpose of placing young Alexius on the throne. The pope denounced the design. He excommunicated the Venetians; but of this no one took the slightest heed, except De Montfort. He, with his brother and a few French knights, separated themselves from the camp of the Crusaders, passed over to the king of Hungary, and, amid many difficulties, made for the Holy Land to fulfil his vows to the Church. He finally, however, returned home, and after a short rest took up arms again  at the summons of pope Innocent III, and in the summer of 1209 he was made leader of the crusade against the Albigenses.

Under his guidance and that of the pope's legate, Amaury, abbot of Citeaux, the crusading army marched into Languedoc and besieged the town of Bdziers, which was stormed July 22, 1209. A horrible massacre ensued. One of the superior officers inquired of the abbot of Citeaux how they were to distinguish the heretics from the faithful: "Slay them all!" returned the savage Churchman, "for the Lord knoweth those that are his." Not a living soul was spared. It is said that fifteen thousand people were thus mercilessly slaughtered in this one place. Carcassone was scarcely better treated; and at Lavaur the ferocious deeds of Montfort made his name a byword of tyranny and cruelty. In 1210 De Montfort was invested by Peter of Aragon with the viscounty of Beziers and Carcassone. Peter designed, no doubt, in this way to conciliate De Montfort, and protect his (Peter's) kinsmen from the rapacity and savagery of De Montfort. He was, however, disappointed, and in 1213 Peter crossed the Pyrenees with a force superior to that of Simon to protect his own. Yet Simon, impressed with a fanatical conviction that God would give him the victory, confessed his sins, made his will, placed his sword upon the altar, and declared that he took it back from God to fight his battles, and at the battle of Muret defeated and slew Peter and the larger part of his army.

After the battle of Muret, the progress and success of the Crusaders were uninterrupted. Toulouse was taken in 1215. De Montfort was chosen prince of the whole subjugated territory; a strict inquisition after heretics was ordered, and the Church of Rome, pleased with the faithfulness of her servant Simon, at a Council of the Lateran, November, 1215 (styled the twelfth General Council), confirmed him in all his conquests. On his return to Northern France, he was received with the greatest honor as the champion of the faith, and hailed with acclamations: "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord!" The remaining years of the life of De Montfort were consumed in a bloody struggle to maintain his ascendency over the territory he had subdued. During the year 1216 the people, under the leadership of the younger count Raymond, broke out in general insurrection. But success still followed De Montfort. He with his army sacked Toulouse, and plundered the inhabitants to the very last piece of cloth or measure of meal. "Oh, noble city of Toulouse!" exclaims the troubadour, "thy very bones are broken!" The ensuing year the war with the young count Raymond continued to the advantage of De Montfort, till suddenly the old count Raymond appeared before Toulouse. The city received him with the utmost joy. New walls were built and new  fortifications raised. It was in the siege of this place that De Montfort lost his life, June 25, 1218; when heading an attack, a stone from an engine struck on the head the champion of Jesus Christ (as he was called by his admirers), and he died on the spot. His fanatical followers reproached God with his death. A monkish historian adds also that he received five wounds from arrows; and in this respect likens him to the Redeemer, "in whose cause he died, and with whom we trust he is in bliss and glory." A daring and skilful leader; chivalric, affable, and popular; enthusiastically devout and fanatically attached to Romanism; ambitious, unscrupulous, and remorseless, he naturally rose to the position of guiding spirit in the turbulent times in which he lived and the cruel war in which he engaged. See Milman, Hist. of Latin Christianity; Chronique de Simon, Comte de Montfort (printed in Guizot's Memoires relatifs a l'Histoire de France); Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 36:246-257; and the histories of the Albigenses (q.v.).

## Montgaillard, Bernard de[[@Headword:Montgaillard, Bernard de]]

             also known as Petit Feuillant, a Roman Catholic ecclesiastic noted for his great talent in pulpit oratory, but especially for the part he bore in the Roman Catholic intrigues against the Huguenots, was born at Montgaillard, in the diocese of Toulouse, in 1563. He commenced as a Feuillant. or mendicant friar, in 1579, and began to preach immediately, though he had not studied divinity. He preached at Rieux, Rhodes, and Toulouse with so much success that they applied to him this passage in Holy Writ, "Happy is the womb which bare thee." He went to France at the time when Henry III drew the Feuillants thither, and so charmed the French court with his sermons that the king and queen-mother appointed him to preach upon several particular occasions. Here he acquired the reputation of the most eminent preacher that had been known in the memory of man — so great were his talents for the pulpit, especially in moving the passions and subduing the heart. He condemned himself to so austere a way of life among the Feuillants that the pope commanded him to quit that order, lest he should shorten his days by it. He behaved himself furiously in supporting the interest of the League, and bore a considerable part in the horrible crimes of that villainous combination. "The preachers," says Maimbourg (Hist. de la Ligue, 54, 3:295), "of whom the most noted were father Bernard de Montgaillard, surnamed the Petit Feuillant, and the famous Cordelier Feuardent, who preached in the parishes of Paris during the Christmas holidays, changed their sermons into invectives against the sacred person of the king," etc. Montgaillard is charged with having been instrumental in inflaming the rebellious elements of his day, and with having suborned an assassin to murder Henry IV. Montgaillard died in 1628. He was at that time abbe of Orval. Such a saint as Montgaillard, and one who had done such singular services to the holy Church must needs have possessed qualities above the usual standard, and therefore the writers of his life have not hesitated to assert that God performed great miracles both in his favor and by his means. See Bayle, Dict. Hist. s.v.; Genesis Biogr. Dict. s.v.

## Montgaillard, Jean Jacques de[[@Headword:Montgaillard, Jean Jacques de]]

             a French monastic, noted as a writer on religious topics, was born in 1633 at Toulouse, and early entered the Dominican order in his native place. He died there March 21, 1711. He is the author of a curious work entitled, Monumnenta Conventus Tolosani ordinis F.F. Predicatorum (Toul. 1693, fol.), which contains much valuable material for the history of the Inquisition in that district of France. Himself a devoted Romanist, and believing the harshest measures of the Inquisition justifiable in behalf of religion, he does not withhold anything, however barbarous or outrageous, and his work contains many a page presenting a most ghastly spectacle of inhumanity perpetrated by misguided fanatics.

## Montgaillard, Pierre Jean Francois de[[@Headword:Montgaillard, Pierre Jean Francois de]]

             a French prelate, brother of the preceding, was born at Toulouse, March 29, 1633, and was educated at Paris, where he entered the Sorbonne, by which high school he was created doctor. He entered holy orders, and soon rose to positions of ecclesiastical distinction. In 1664 he was made bishop of Saint-Pons, and distinguished himself by great liberality of sentiment as well as religious devotion. He was one of the nineteen bishops who signed a petition to pope Clement IX for the pardon of the bishops of Alet, Passiers, Beauvais, and Angers, who had opposed the doctrines espoused in the papal bull issued by Alexander VII to defend the Jesuits and their tenets and practices. He also afterwards defended persecuted ecclesiastics against the Jesuits, whose immorality he unhesitatingly denounced. He was so severe that he was branded as a Jansenist, but there is proof extant that he freed himself from the imputation of disloyalty to the Church of Rome. He died March 13, 1713. He was well versed in archaeological studies, and noted for his valuable attainments in ancient ecclesiastical history. His works are of a controversial nature, and of value only to those interested in the Jansenist controversy. A list of them is given by Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 36:265, 266.

## Montgomery, Alexander[[@Headword:Montgomery, Alexander]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Westfield, N.Y., in 1808. He graduated at Amherst College, Mass., in 1837; studied theology first in Union Seminary, New York City, and afterwards in Auburn Seminary, N.Y.; was licensed by Hampden Congregational Association, Mass., and ordained in 1839 as pastor of Maryville Church, N.Y., where he remained  until he removed West, and joined the Presbytery of Chicago, and was agent for some time. He finally settled at Beaver Dam, Wisconsin, where he labored until his death, February 18, 1859. Mr. Montgomery was an earnest Christian, a good theologian, and a fervent preacher. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1868, page 121.

## Montgomery, Henry Eglinton, D.D[[@Headword:Montgomery, Henry Eglinton, D.D]]

             a noted clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in Philadelphia December 9, 1820; was educated at the University of Pennsylvania, class of 1839; studied law for two years; travelled in Europe, and then continued his studies in Nashotah College, in Wisconsin. After remaining there two years, he entered the general theological seminary at New York. He was ordained for the holy ministry by bishop Alonzo Potter, and in 1846 assumed charge of All-Saints' Church of Philadelphia, then a small organization. His labors were very successful; the Church- membership rapidly increased, and the pastor became highly respected and beloved. In 1855 he received and accepted a call to the Church of the Incarnation of New York, which was an offshoot of and dependent upon Grace Church, and which worshipped in the edifice at the corner of Madison Avenue and Twenty-eighth Street. During the earlier years of his ministry in New York he was able to separate his church from Grace Church; and so efficient and satisfactory was his work that in 1864 a new church building was erected at Madison Avenue and Thirty-fifth Street. His labors were identified with it until his sudden decease, October 15, 1874. Dr. Montgomery was a man of acknowledged ability, and of more than ordinary endurance. He was always a hard worker; he had no assistant in his ministry, and, besides the constant demands upon his strength made by a growing Church, he had for years been a prominent member of nearly all the missionary and home societies for the advancement of the Gospel. The Missionary Society, which was in session when his death occurred, paid him a very warm and merited tribute through bishop Vail on October 15, 1874. See The Church Journal and Gospel Messenger, October 22, 1874.

## Montgomery, James (1), D.D[[@Headword:Montgomery, James (1), D.D]]

             a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in Philadelphia November 25, 1787, and was educated at Princeton College, where he graduated in 1815. After practicing law for a short time, he prepared for holy orders; was ordained in 1816, and elected rector of St. Michael's, N.J.  In 1818 he became rector of Grace Church, New York, and subsequently removed to St. Stephen's, Philadelphia, where he held several important offices, and devoted himself to his ministry with much earnestness till his death, March 17, 1834. His works are five Sermons, issued at different times. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 5:596.

## Montgomery, James (2)[[@Headword:Montgomery, James (2)]]

             one of the greatest of English hymnologists, was born at Irvine, in Ayrshire, Scotland, November 4, 1771. His parents were Irish — his father a Moravian preacher. James was designed for the same office, and in his sixth year was placed in the Moravian establishment at Fulneck, near Leeds, England. While here his parents went as missionaries to the West Indies, where they soon died. To their fate he thus beautifully alludes:

"My father-mother-parents, are no more!

Beneath the lion-star they sleep,

Beyond the Western deep;

And when the sun's noon glory crests the waves,

He shines without a shadow on their graves."

Left to himself, he refused to study for the ministry, and the Brethren placed him as an apprentice to a grocer in Mirfield. He disliked the drudgery of the shop, wrote verses, and at length ran away, with three shillings and sixpence in his pocket. He was soon compelled by necessity to engage as a shopboy in the village of Wath, in Yorkshire. He remained there but a year, and then, intent upon publishing a volume of verses, went up to London, and introduced himself to one of the Brethren in Paternoster Row, and gained employment as clerk and general assistant; but he could get no one to undertake publishing his poetry. In eight months we find him back again at Wath. In his twenty-first year he went to Sheffield as clerk to the editor of the Sheffield Register; and when, two years afterwards, a political prosecution was instituted against the editor, Montgomery succeeded him in the management of the paper, changing its name to that of The Iris. The tone of his paper was very temperate, but firm. At that time the quailing cause of arbitrary power and divine right was making its last struggles against freedom and commonsense. Notwithstanding the moderation of our poeteditor, it was not long before the hands of the officers of the law were upon him. The publication of a song written by a clergyman to commemorate the destruction of the Bastile, which had been printed in half the newspapers in the kingdom, was made the pretence of  fining Montgomery £20 and imprisoning him three months in the Castle of York. On his deliverance from his incarceration he resumed his editorial labors, and avoided every extreme in politics; but in giving a narrative of the circumstances attending the death of two men killed in a riot in the streets of Sheffield by the military, a volunteer officer, who was also a magistrate, feeling his honor wounded by the statement, presented him for libel. The result was another fine of £30, and imprisonment for six months. During his confinement, in 1796, he wrote his poems entitled Prison Amusements. He now became a regular contributor to magazines, and, despite adverse criticism in the Edinburgh Review (January 1807, pages 347-355; comp. however, July 1835, page 473), established his right to rank as a poet. (See the defence by Southey in [Lond.] Qu. Rev. 6:405 sq., and by Wilson in Blackwood's Magazine, September 1831, page 476.) In 1805 he issued The Ocean; in 1806, The Wanderer of Switzerland, and other Poems; and the next year The West Indies — this last meeting in its various editions with a most extraordinary patronage. In 1813 appeared The World before the Flood; in 1819, Greenland; and in 1827 The Pelican Island, the most original and powerful of all Montgomery's works. He now also collected two volumes of his sketches from periodicals, entitled Prose by a Poet. A Poet's Portfolio appeared in 1835. In 1830-31 he delivered a course of lectures on poetry and general literature, which were afterwards published in one volume. His collected works appeared in 1851 (1 volume, 8vo).

But it is with the poet as a writer of hymns and sacred songs that we have most to do, as it is by these that he has most endeared himself to his age, and will be longest and most favorably remembered. In 1822 he published his Songs of Zion, being Imitations of Psalms. This work consisted of sixty-seven pieces, being versions of fifty-nine Psalms, closely as well as beautifully rendered. In 1828 he published his Christian Psalmist, containing 103 original hymns; in 1853, Original Hymns for Public, Private, and Social Devotion. Judged by the use made of these hymns by the Christian world, Montgomery takes his place next to Watts and Wesley, in compare with Doddridge. This place we think he has well earned. What Advent song surpasses for comprehensiveness, appropriateness of expression, force, and elevation of sentiment, this one beginning "Angels from the realms of glory?" What a glorifying of God and his work from eternity to eternity is found in this hymn, " Songs of praise the angels sang!" Will the time ever come on earth when the Church will  not respond to “Stand up and bless the Lord, ye people of his choice?" or cease to look forward with anticipations of victory in the "Hark, the song of jubilee?" or forbear to encourage one another with "Daughter of Zion, from the dust?" or fail to use "Oh, where shall rest be found?" What a spirit of Christian love, mingled with hope drawn from the deepest truths of our faith, flows through the invitation, "Come to Calvary's holy mountain;" and a reaching out of the right hand of fellowship in this, "Come in, thou blessed of the Lord!"

In a letter written in 1807 Montgomery gives us the history of his hymnological efforts. "When I was a boy," he says, "I wrote a great many hymns; indeed, the first-fruits of my mind were all consecrated to Him who never despises the day of small things, even in the poorest of his creatures. But as I grew up, and my heart degenerated, I directed my talents, such as they were, to other services; and seldom indeed, since my fourteenth year, have they been employed in the delightful duties of the sanctuary. Many conspiring and adverse circumstances that have confounded, afflicted, and discouraged my mind, have also compelled me to forbear from composing hymns of prayer and praise, because I found that I could not enter into the spirit of such divine themes with that humble boldness, that earnest expectation and ardent feeling of love to God and truth which were wont to inspire me when I was an uncorrupted boy, full of tenderness and zeal and simplicity." We have indicated here the main ground of the excellence and usefulness of his hymns. They are the offspring not only of a heart naturally sensitive to religious themes, but of a deep, rich, and varied Christian experience. They were lived before they were sung. From the experiences of the Christian life came their expression in Christian song; hence they are applicable to every believer's feelings, and touch unexpectedly the most secret springs of joy and sorrow, faith, fear, hope, love, despondency, and triumph. This was the reason for their success given by the author himself. When advanced in life and seriously ill, he placed in the hands of his friend, Dr. Holland, "transcripts of his original hymns to be read to him. But as the poet was much affected, the doctor was about to desist, when Montgomery said, 'Read on; I am glad to hear you. The words recall the feelings which first suggested them, and it is good for me to feel affected and humbled by the terms in which I have endeavored to provide for the expression of similar religious experience in others. As all my hymns embody some portion of the joys or sorrows, the hopes and fears of this poor heart, so I cannot doubt but that they will be  found an acceptable vehicle of expression of the experience of many of my fellow creatures who may be similarly exercised during the pilgrimage of their Christian life.'

From the fact that he was a layman in active and laborious business, he was less likely than some of his clerical brothers in song to make the hymn simply a doctrine in rhyme. While evangelical in faith, his hymns are always far more than doctrinal statement in verse. The rules which he laid down in the "Introductory Essay" to his Christian Psalmist, which should be adhered to in writing hymns, he has seldom failed to regard. "There should be," he says, "unity, gradation, and mutual dependence in the thoughts, a conscious progress, and at the end a sense of completeness," and he insists that hymns ought to be easy to understand. It may be said of his hymns without exception that there is nothing in them to offend the taste, and much to gratify it. The most precious truths of Scripture and the richest experiences of the Christian find in them simple but poetic expression; and they are made suitable for the use of congregations by a poet who was quite familiar with the requirements of an assembly of worshippers. As expressive of how important Mr. Montgomery deemed his last work, and of his high appreciation of the works of others, may be quoted part of the closing paragraph of his preface. He says: "Having on three former occasions expatiated freely on hymnology and sacred poesy, I will close this egotistical preamble to the most serious work of my long life (now passing fourscore years) with a brief quotation from what may be esteemed a sainted authority on such a subject. Bishop Ken somewhere says, beautifully, humbly, and poetically:

‘And should the well-meant song I leave behind

With Jesus' lovers some acceptance find,

Twill heighten even the joys of heaven to know

That in my verse saints sing God's praise below.'"

His last years were passed in ease and comfort, he enjoying, besides the frugal earnings of an industrious life. from 1835 a pension from the government of £150 per annum. He died at his own residence near Sheffield, April 30, 1854. The London Atheneum, shortly after his death, thus spoke of him: "Montgomery held a place in the eyes of the English public — universal as well as sectarian — not far behind Campbell, by the side of Lisle Bowles and Milman, and before such lesser lights as Carrington and Crowe. This generation knows less than its predecessor of the poems of James Montgomery, of Sheffield. Some have adopted Pollok  as their religious poet elect; others have taken Keble as their bosom friend. But the author of 'The West Indies,' 'The World before the Flood,' and 'Greenland,' is still not forgotten, in spite of these shiftings of the shrine at which religious fashion chooses to burn its incense; and his vogue may one day return — the sooner because it was merited by the genuine gifts of the poet as well as by the eloquence of the class-preacher." Memoirs of the Life and Writings of James Montgomery, with Extracts from his Correspondence, etc., were published in 1855-6 (7 volumes, 8vo) by two of his friends, John Holland and James Everett. An abridgment of these Memoirs was published by Mrs. Helen C. Knight at Boston in 1857 (12mo, 416 pages). See British and For. Ev. Rev. volume 22; 43, 248; [Lond.] Qu. Rev. volume 11, art. 9; North Amer. Rev. (October 1857) page 563: Livin Age, 4, 370; 47, 282; Howitt. Homes and Haunts of British Poets; Wilson, Essays, Crit. and Imag. (1856) 2:238; and especially the excellent article in Allibone's Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. 2:1345-47.

## Montgomery, Robert[[@Headword:Montgomery, Robert]]

             an Anglican clergyman, very noted especially as a writer of sacred poetry, was born at Bath, England, in 1807, and was educated at Lincoln College, Oxford, where he secured his A.B. in 1833, and A.M. in 1838. He took holy orders in 1835; became curate of Whittington, subsequently (1836) removed to London as minister of Percy Street Episcopal Chapel; afterwards went to Glasgow, where he preached for four years, but returned to London, and resumed functions at Percy Street Chapel in 1843, and there preached until his death, December 3, 1855. Montgomery's works comprise a large number of volumes in prose and verse, on themes more or less sacred. He is best known by his poem The Omnipresence of the Deity (1828), which has passed through twenty-eight editions, and The Christian Life: a Manual of Sacred Verse (1848,12mo; 6th edition, 1853, 24mo). The former of these provoked unusual severity of criticism — even lord Macaulay unmercifully poured his invectives against it: "His works have received more enthusiastic praise, and have deserved more unmixed contempt, than any which, as far as our knowledge extends, have appeared within the last three or four years...

The circulation of this writer's poetry has been greater than that of Southey's Roderick, and beyond all comparison greater than that of Cary's Dante, or of the best works of Coleridge" (Macaulay, Essays, 1:257, 265-7, 269, 276). Nevertheless, as has been well said, the book must have pleased, or people would not have bought it in the face of such unfavorable comments. It must be stated also  that the work on its appearance met with the high commendations of those illustrious writers, Southey, Wilson, Alison, and Sharon Turner. Montgomery's Christian Life was generally commended; and some Anglican writers were most enthusiastic in its praise. The Church of England Quarterly (April 9, 1849, No. 50, page 286) pronounced it "far superior to anything else from the author; and, of all the uninspired collections of religious poetry which any poet has ever produced in any Church or age or country, there is none which, in our opinion, can venture a comparison — intellectual or poetical with Montgomery's Christian Life."

A writer in the Scottish Magazine goes even further: "To eulogize this divine now as a successful Christian poet would be to offer an indignity to all who have the slightest knowledge of what is passing in the literary world. His Omnipresence long ago stamped him as one of our greatest poets... We must, however, express our honest conviction that the present volume manifests higher and more intrinsic beauties and excellences than any one of his previous poetic works. And what will very much enhance it in the opinion of all true Churchmen is the fact that it is a thoroughly Church volumebreathing and inculcating her scriptural and catholic verities, exhibiting her in the thrilling and beautiful expression of a fond and sacred mother, who lovingly cares and unweariedly provides for the spiritual wants and comforts of her children. While all these poems are fraught with deep truth and lofty sentiments, portraying in poetical form the Church's creed and character, the duties and dangers the hopes and fears, the faults, privileges, and final destinies of a believer in the religion of Christ,... we must declare that we have not read anything more beautiful and heavenly, more eloquent and pathetic, than the poems on 'Baptism,' 'Visitation of the Sick.' 'Burial of the Dead,' 'Commination,' and the 'Eucharist.'

Nothing like this volume has appeared since the 'Christian Year,' whether we' consider its style and tone, its sentiments, the variety of its metres, or the harmony of its verse. It is a 'Voice of the Church,' a kind of second 'Christian Year.' A list of all his works is given by Allibone (Diet. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. 2:1348-9). We have room only for mention of his other religious works. Of those in verse: A Universal Prayer, Death, Heaven, Hell (1828, 4to, and often): Satan: or Intellect without God (1830): — The Messiah (1832): — Luther; or the Ideal of the Reformation (1842): — The Sacred Gift: a Series of Meditations upon Scripture Subjects (1842): — The Sanctuary: a Companion in Verse for the English Prayer-book (1855). Of those in prose: The Gospel in Advance of the Age: a homily for the Times, with an Introduction on the  Spirit of the Bible and the Spirit of the Age (1st ed. 1847; 3d ed. revised and rearranged, with additional matter, etc., 1848, and often since): — The Ideal of the English Church (1845): — Christ our All in All (1845): — Eight Sermons: being Reflective Discourses on some Important Texts (1843, 8vo): — The Great Salvation, and our Sin in Neglecting it: a Religious Essay, in Three Parts (1846): — The Scottish Church, the English Schismatics (1846; 3d ed. with documentary evidence, 1847, 12mo). A collected edition of his poetical works (in 6 volumes, 8vo) was published in 1839-40, and his Christian Poetry, by Ed. Farr, in 1854 (12mo). Selections from them were also made under the title, Religion and Poetry, with an Introductory Essay by Archer Gurney (1847, 8vo); and Lyra Christiana (1851, 32mo). See Fraser's Magazine, 1:95, 721; 4:672; Westm. Rev. 12:355; Lond. Month. Rev. 117, 30; 121, 313; Blackwood's Magazine, 23:751-71; 26:241 sq.; Lond. Gentleman's Mag. 1856, part 1:313; [Lond.] Athenceum, 1832, page 348; South. Qu. Rev. 2:290; N.Y. Lit. and Theol. Review, 1:688; Breen, Mod. Eng. Lit.: its Blemishes and Defcts (1857), page 206; Koenen, Voorlozing over den Engelschen Dichter Rob. Montgomery (Amst. 1853, 8vo); and the excellent and very full article in Allibone's Dict, of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v. (J.H.W.)

## Montgomery, Robert (2)[[@Headword:Montgomery, Robert (2)]]

             a distinguished English missionary was born at Bangor, August 19, 1811. He studied at Edinburgh, was licensed by his presbytery about the end of 18,41 and a few weeks afterwards was set apart for the mission to India. In 1843 he was stationed at Poorbliider, on the western coast, and three years later was transferred to Surat. He early acquired a scholarly knowledge of Gujarati, into which he translated the Epistle to the Romans and the prophecy of Isaiah likewise two little volumes by Dr. Barth, entitled,  Scripture Series of the Old and New Testament. He also prepared a Dictionary, English and Gujarati, which stands now as a help to all students of that language. He, wrote several hymns, three of which are included in the Gujarati Book of Praise. When he returned in broken health in 1876, advantage was taken of his presence to appoint him moderator of the General Assembly. He was one of the delegates at the general missionary conference in London in 1879. Montgomery died in November, 1880. (B.P.)

## Montgomery, William B[[@Headword:Montgomery, William B]]

             a missionary to the Osage Indians, who flourished in the early half of this century, died in 1834. He published a translation into the Osage language of various portions of Scripture.

## Month[[@Headword:Month]]

             (usually חֹדֶשׁ, cho'desh, i.e., new moon; later also יֶרִח, ye'rach, Chald. יְרִה, yerach'; Gr. μήν, etc.). The terms for ' month" and "moon" have the same close connection in the Hebrew language as in our own and in the Indo-European languages generally; we need only instance the familiar cases of the Greek μήν and μήνη, and the Latin mensis; the German mond and amonat; and the Sanscrit malsa, which answers to both month and moon. The Hebrew chodesh is perhaps more distinctive than the corresponding terms in other languages; for it expresses not simply the idea of a lunation, but the recurrence of a period commencing definitely with the new moon; it is derived from the word chaddsh, " new," which was transferred in the first instance to the "new moon," and in the second instance to the ' month," or, as it is sometimes more fully expressed, יָמַים

חֹדֶשׁ, "a month of days" (Gen 29:14; Num 11:20-21; comp. Deu 21:13; 2Ki 15:13). The term yerach is derived from yareach, "the moon;" it occurs occasionally in the historical (Exo 2:2; 1Ki 6:37-38; 1Ki 8:2; 2Ki 15:13), but more frequently in the poetical portions of the Bible.

1. The most important point in connection with the month of the Hebrews is its length, and the mode by which it was calculated. The difficulties attending this inquiry are considerable, in consequence of the scantiness of the datat. Though it may fairly be presumed from the terms used that the month originally corresponded to a lunation, no reliance can be placed on the mere verbal argument to prove the exact length of the month in historical times. The word appears even in the earliest times to have passed into its secondary sense, as describing a period approaching to a lunation; for in Gen 7:11; Gen 8:4, where we first meet with it, equal periods of 30 days are described, the interval between the 17th days of the second and the seventh months being equal to 150 days (Gen 7:11; Gen 8:3-4). We have therefore in this instance an approximation to the solar month, and as, in addition to this, an indication of a double calculation by a solar and a lunar year has been detected in a subsequent date (for from Gen 8:14, compared with Gen 7:11, we find that the total duration of the flood exceeded the year by eleven days; in other words, by the precise difference between the lunar year of 354 days and the solar one of 365 days), the passage has attracted considerable attention on the part of certain critics, who have endeavored to deduce from it arguments prejudicial to the originality of the Bible narrative. It has been urged that the Hebrews themselves knew nothing of a solar month, that they must have derived their knowledge of it from more easterly nations (Ewald, Jahrbiich. 1854, page 8), and consequently that the materials for the narrative and the date of its composition must be referred to the period when close intercourse existed between the Hebrews and the Babylonians (Von Bohlen's Introd. to Genesis 2:155 sq.). It is unnecessary for us to discuss in detail the arguments on which these conclusions are founded; we submit in answer to them that the data are insufficient to form any decided opinion at all on the matter, and that a more obvious explanation of the matter is to be found in the Egyptian system of months. To prove the first of these points, it will be only necessary to state the various calculations founded on this passage: it has been deduced from it (1) that there were 12 months of 30 days each SEE CHRONOLOGY; (2) that there were 12 months of 30 days, with 5  intercalated days at the end to make up the solar year (Ewald, 1.c.); (3) that there were 7 months of 30 days, and 5 of 31 days (Von Bohlen); (4) that there were 5 months of 30 days, and 7 of 29 days (Knobel, in Gen 8:1-3); or, lastly, it is possible to cut away the foundation of any calculation whatever by assuming that a period might have elapsed between the termination of the 150 days and the 17th day of the 7th month (Ideler, Chronol. 1:70). "The year being lunar, the interval is, in fact, but 148 days; the discrepancy, however, is of no account" (Browne, Ordo Sceclorum, page 326): both extremes are included, as is usual in Hebrew computations. SEE DELUGE.

But, assuming that the narrative implies equal months of 30 days, and that the date given in 8:14 does involve the fact of a double calcullation by a solar and a lunar year, it is unnecessary to refer to the Babylonians for a solution of the difficulty. The month of 30 days was in use among the Egyptians at a period long anterior to the period of the exodus, and formed the basis of their computation either by an unintercalated year of 360 days or an intercalated one of 365 (Rawlinson's Herodotus, 2:283-286). Indeed, the Bible itself furnishes us with an indication of a double year, solar and lunar, in that it assigns the regulation of its length indifferently to both sun and moon (Gen 1:14). SEE YEAR.

From the time of the institution of the Mosaic law downward the month appears to have been a lunar one. The cycle of religious feasts, commencing with the Passover, depended not simply on the month, but on the moon (Josephus, Ant. 3:10, 5); the 14th of Abib was coincident with the full moon (Philo, Vit. Mos. 3, page 686); and the new moons themselves were the occasions of regular festivals (Num 10:10; Num 28:11-14). The statements of the Talmudists (Mishna, Rosh Hash. 1-3) are decisive as to the practice in their time, and the lunar month is observed by the modern Jews. The commencement of the month was generally decided by observation of the new moon, which may be detected about forty hours after the period of its conjunction with the sun: in the later times of Jewish history this was effected according to strict rule, the appearance of the new moon being reported by competent witnesses to the local authorities, who then officially announced the commencement of the new month by the twice-repeated word "Mekuddash," i.e., consecrated (see Cudworth's Intellectual System, 2, Append. page 528). According to the rabbinical rule, however, there must at all times have been a little uncertainty beforehand as to the exact day on which the month would begin; for it  depended not only on the appearance, but on the announcement: if the important word Mekuddash were not pronounced until after dark, the following day was the first of the month — if before dark, then that day (Rosh Hash. 3:1). But we can hardly suppose that such a strict rule of observation prevailed in early times, nor was it in any way necessary; the recurrence of the new moon can be predicted with considerable accuracy by a calculation of the interval that would elapse either from the last new moon, from the full moon (which can be detected by a practiced eye), or from the disappearance of the waning moon. Hence David announces definitely “To-morrow is the new moon," that being the first of the month (1Sa 20:5; 1Sa 20:24; 1Sa 20:27), though the new moon could not as yet have been observed, and still less announced. Jahn (Arch. 3:3, § 352) regards the discrepancy of the dates in 2Ki 25:27, and Jer 52:31, as originating in the different modes of computing by astronomical calculation and by observation. It is more probable that it arises from a mistake of a copyist, substituting ן for ה, as a similar discrepancy exists in 2Ki 25:19 and Jer 52:25, without admitting a similar explanation. The length of the month by observation would be alternately 29 and 30 days; nor was it allowed by the Talmudists that a month should fall short of the former or exceed the latter number, whatever might be the state of the weather. The months containing only 29 days were termed in Talmudical language chaser (חָסֵר), or "deficient," and those with 30 nmal (מָלֵא), or "full."

The usual number of months in a year was twelve, as implied in 1Ki 4:7; 1Ch 27:1-15; but inasmuch as the Hebrew months coincided, as we shall presently show, with the seasons, it follows as a matter of course that an additional month must have been inserted about every third year. which would bring the number up to thirteen. No notice, however, is taken of this month in the Bible. We have no reason to think that the intercalary month was inserted according to any exact rule; it was sufficient for practical purposes to add it whenever it was discovered that the barley harvest did not coincide with the ordinary return of the month of Abib. In the modern Jewish calendar the intercalary month is introduced seven times in every 19 years, according to the Metonic cycle, which was adopted by the Jews about A.D. 360 (Prideaux's Connection, 1:209, note). At the same time the length of the synodical month was fixed by R. Hillel at 29 days, 12 hours, 44 minutes, and 3½ seconds, which accords very nearly with the truth.

2. The usual method of designating the months was by their numerical order, e.g. "the second month" (Gen 7:11), "the fourth month" (2Ki 25:3); and this was generally retained even when the names were given, e.g. "in the month Zif, which is the second month" (1Ki 6:1); "' in the third month, that is, the month Sivan" (Est 8:9). An exception occurs, however, in regard to Abib in the early portion of the Bible (Exo 13:4; Exo 23:15; Deu 16:1), which is always mentioned, by name alone, inasmuch as it was necessarily coincident with a certain season, while the numerical order might have changed from year to year. We doubt indeed whether Abib was really a proper name. In the first place, it is always accompanied by the article, "the Abib," as an appellation (the season of the new ears of grain); in the second place, it appears almost impossible that it could have been superseded by Nisan if it had been regarded as a proper name, considering the important associations connected with it. The practice of the writers of the post-Babylonian period in this respect varied: Ezra, Esther, and Zechariah specify both the names and the numbered order; Nehemiah only the former; Daniel and Haggai only the latter.

The names of the months belong to two distinct periods: in the first place we have those peculiar to the period of Jewish independence, of which four only, even including Abib, which we hardly regard as a proper name, are mentioned, viz.: Abib, in which the Passover fell (Exo 13:4; Exo 23:15; Exo 34:18; Deu 16:1), and which was established as the first month in commemoration of the exodus (Exo 12:2); Zif, the second month (1Ki 6:1; 1Ki 6:37); Bul, the eighth (1Ki 6:38); and Ethanim, the seventh (1Ki 8:2) — the three latter being noticed only in connection with the building and dedication of the Temple, so that we might almost infer that their use was restricted to the official documents of the day, and that they never attained the popular use which the later names had. Hence it is not difficult to account for their having been superseded. In the second place we have the names which prevailed subsequently to the Babylonian captivity; of these the following seven appear in the Bible: Nisan, the first, in which the Passover was held (Neh 2:1; Est 3:7); Sivan, the third (Est 8:9; Bar 1:8); Elul, the sixth (Neh 6:15; 1Ma 14:27); Chisleu, the ninth (Neh 1:1; Zec 7:1; 1Ma 1:54); Tebeth, the tenth (Est 2:16); Sebat, the eleventh (Zec 1:7; 1Ma 16:14); and Adar, the twelfth (Est 3:7; Est 8:12; 2Ma 15:36). The names of the remaining five occur in the Talmud and other works; they were Iyar, the second (Targum, 2Ch 30:2); Tammuz, the fourth (Mishna,  Taan. 4:5); Ab, the fifth, and Tisri, the seventh (Rosh Hash. i, 3); and Marchesvan, the eighth (Taan. 1:3; Josephus, Ant. 1:3, 3). The name of the intercalary month was Veadar, i.e., the additional Adar, because placed in the calendar after Adar and before Nisan. The opinion of Ideler (Chronol. 1:539) that the first Adar was regarded as the intercalary month, because the feast of Purim was held in Veadar in the intercalary year, has little foundation.

The first of these series of names is of Hebrew origin, and has reference to the characteristics of the seasons circumstance which clearly shows that the months returned at the same period of the year; in other words, that the Jewish year was a solar one. Thus Abib (אבַיב) was the month of" ears of corn," Zif the month of "blossom" (זַו or זַיו, or, more fully, as in the Targum, זַיו נַצָּנִיָּא, "the bloom of flowers;" another explanation is given in Rawlinson's Herodotus, 1:622; viz. that Ziv is the same as the Assyrian Giv, "bull," and answers to the zodiacal sign of Taurus), and Bul the month of "rain" (בּוּל; the name occurs in a recently discovered Phoenician inscription [Ewald, Jathrb. 1856, page 135]. A cognate term, מִבּוּל, is used for the "deliuge" [Gen 6:17, etc.]; but there is no ground for the inference drawn by Von Bohlen [Introd. to Genesis 2:156] that there is any allusion to the month Bul). With regard to Ethanim there may be some doubt, as the usual explanation, "the month of violent or, rather, incessant rain," is decidedly inappropriate to the seventh month. Thenius, on 1Ki 8:2, suggests that the true name was אתנים, as in the Sept. Α᾿θανίμ, and that its meaning was the " month of gifts," i.e., of fruit, from תָּנָה, "to give." There is the same peculiarity in this as in Abib. viz. the addition of the definite article (הָאֵיתָנַים).

In the second series, both the origin and the meaning of the terms are controverted. It was the opinion of the Talmudists that the names were introduced by the Jews who returned from the Babylonian captivity (Jerusalem Talmud, Rosh Hash. 1:1), and they are certainly used exclusively by writers of the post-Babylonian period (see Benfey and Stern, Monatsnamen einiger alter Vuolker, Berlin, 1836). It was therefore perhaps natural to seek for their origin in the Persian language, and this was done some years since by Benfey (Monatsnamen) in a manner more ingenious than satisfactory. The view, though accepted to a certain extent by Gesenius in his Thesaurus, has since been abandoned, both on philological grounds and because it meets with no confirmation from the monumental documents of ancient Persia. The names of the  months, as read on the Behistun inscriptions, Garmapada, Bagtayadish, Atriyata, etc., bear no resemblance to the Hebrew names (Rawlinson's Herodotus, 2:593-6). The names are probably borrowed from the Syrians, in whose regular calendar we find names answering to Tisri, Sebat, Adar, Nisan, Iyar, Tammuz, Ab, and Elul (Ideler, Chronol. 1:430). The names of the Syrian months appear to have been in many instances of local use: for instance, the calendar of Heliopolis contains the names of Ag and Gelon (Ideler, 1:440), which do not appear in the regular Syrian calendar, while that of Palmyra, again, contains names unknown to either. Chisleu and Tebeth appear on the Palmyrene inscriptions (Gesenius, Thesaur. pages 702, 543). The resemblance in sound between Tebeth and the Egyptian Tobi, as well as its correspondence in the order of the months, was noticed by Jerome (ad Eze 39:1). Sivan may be borrowed from the Assyrials, who appear to have had a month so named, sacred to Sill or the moon (Rawlinson,1:615). Marchesvan, coinciding as it did with the rainy season in Palestine, was probably a purely Hebrew term. Von Bohlen connects it with the root rachdsh (רָחִשׁ), "to boil over" (Introd. to Genesis 2:157). The modern Jews consider it a compound word, mar, "drop," and Cheshvan, the former betokening that it was wet, and the latter being the proper name of the month (De Sola's Mishna, page 168, note). With regard to the meaning of the Syrian names we can only conjecture from the case of Tammuz, which undoubtedly refers to the festival of the deity of that name mentioned in Eze 8:14, that some of them may have been derived from the names of deities. We draw attention to the similarity between Elul and the Arabic name of Venus Urania, Alil-at (Herod. 3:8); and again between Adar, the Egyptian Athor, and the Syrian Atargatis. Hebrew roots are suggested by Gesenius for others, but without much confidence. The Hebrew forms of the names are: נַיסָן, אַיָּר, סַיוָן, תִּמּוּז, אָב, אלֵוּל, תַּשְׁרַו, מִרְחֶשְׁוָן, כַּסְלֵו, טֵבֵת, שְׁבָט, אֲדָר, and וְאָדָר.

Subsequently to the establishment of the Syro-Macedonian empire, the use of the Macedonian calendar was gradually adopted for the purpose of literature or intercommunication with other countries. Josephus, for instance, constantly uses the Macedonian months, even where he gives the Hebrew names (e.g. in Ant. 1:3, 3, he identifies Marchesvan with Dius, and Nisan with Xanthicus, and in 7:7, 6, Chisleu with Appelleus). The only instance in which the Macedonian names appear in the Bible is in 2Ma 11:30; 2Ma 11:33; 2Ma 11:38, where we have notice of Xanthicus in combination with another named Dioscorinthius (2Ma 11:21), which does not appear in the  Macedonian calendar. Various explanations have been offered with respect to the latter. Any attempt to connect it with the Macedonian Dius fails on account of the interval being too long to suit the narrative, Dius being the first and Xanthicus the sixth month. The opinion of Scaliger (Emend. Temp. 2:94) that it was the Macedonian intercalary month rests on no foundation whatever, and Ideler's assumption that that intercalary month preceded Xanthicus must be rejected along with it (Chronol. 1:399). It is most probable that the author of 2 Macc. or a copyist was familiar with the Cretan calendar, which contained a month named Dioscurus, holding the same place in the calendar as the Macedonian Dystrus (Ideler, 1:426), i.e., immediately before Xanthicus, and that he substituted one for the other. This view derives some confirmation from the Vulgate rendering, Dioscorus. We have further to notice the reference to the Egyptian calendar in 3Ma 6:38, Pachon and Epiphi in that passage answering to Pachons and Epep, the ninth and eleventh months (Wilkinson, Anc. Egyp. 1:14, 2d ser.).

3. The identification of the Jewish months with our own cannot be effected with precision on account of the variations that must inevitably exist between the lunar and the solar month, each of the former ranging over portions of two of the latter. It must therefore be understood that the following remarks apply to the general identity on an average of years. As the Jews still retain the names Nisan, etc., it may appear at first sight needless to do more than refer the reader to a modern almanac, and this would have been the case if it were not evident that the modern Nisan does not correspond to the ancient one. We are indebted to J.D. Michaelis for discovering the true state of this case, after the rabbinical writers had so universally established an erroneous opinion that it has not even yet disappeared from our popular books. His dissertation, "De Mensibus Hebraeorum" (in his Commentationes per annos 1763-68 oblatae [Bremen, 1769], page 16; translated by W. Bowyer, Lond. 1773; also in the Critica Biblica [London, 1827], 3:324-340), proceeds on the following chief arguments: First, that if the first month began with the new moon of March, as was commonly asserted, the climate of Palestine would not in that month permit the oblation of the sheaf of barley, which is ordered on the second day of the Paschal Feast (Lev 23:10); nor could the harvest be finished before the Feast of Weeks, which would then fall in May; nor could the Feast of Tabernacles, which was after the gathering of all fruits, accord with the month of September, because all these feasts  depend on certain stages in the agricultural year, which, as he shows from the observations of travellers, solely coincide with the states of vegetation which are found, in that climate, in the months of April, June, and October. This has been confirmed by later accounts; for the barley harvest does not take place even in the warm district about Jericho till the middle of April, and in the upland districts not before the end of that month (Robinson's Researches, 1:551; 3:102, 145).

Secondly, that the Syrian calendar, which has essentially the same names for the months, makes its Nisan absolutely parallel with our April. Lastly, that Josephus (Ant. 2:14, 6) synchronizes Nisan with the Egyptian Pharmuth, which commenced on the 27th of March (Wilkinson, 1.c.), and with the Macedonian Xanthicus, which answers generally to the early part of April, though considerable variation occurs in the local calendars as to its place (comp. Ideler, 1:435, 442). He further informs us (3:10, 5) that the Passover took place when the sun was in Aries, which it does not enter until near the end of March. Michaelis concludes that the later Jews fell into this departure from their ancient order either through some mistake in the intercalation, or because they wished to imitate the Romans, whose year began in March. Ideler says, "So much is certain, that in the time of Moses the month of ears cannot have commenced before the first days of our April, which was then the period of the vernal equinox" (Handbuch der Chronologie, 1:490). As Nisan, then, began with the new moon of April, we have a scale for fixing the commencement of all the other months with reference to our calendar; and we must accordingly date their commencement one whole month later than is commonly done: allowing, of course, for the circumstance that, as the new moon varies in its place in our solar months, the Jewish months will almost invariably consist of portions of two of ours. For the details of each month, SEE CALENDAR, JEWISH. See, in addition to the treatises above noticed, Langenberg, De mense ve. terun Hebrceorum lunari (Jen. 1713). SEE CHRONOLOGY.

## Monthly Meeting[[@Headword:Monthly Meeting]]

             SEE MEETING.

## Montholon, Jean De[[@Headword:Montholon, Jean De]]

             a French ecclesiastic, was born at Autun near the middle of the 15th century. At an early age he received the degree of doctor of laws, and was registered among the regular canons of St. Victor, at Paris. His theological  learning and his superior attainments in jurisprudence rapidly advanced his name among his fellows, and he was finally promoted to the cardinalship by pope Clement VII. Montholon died in Paris in 1528. His works are: Promptuarium sen Brevitarium Juris divini et utriusque humani (Paris, 1520, 2 volumes, fol.): — De sacramento altaris (ibid, 1517, 8vo).

## Months Mind[[@Headword:Months Mind]]

             is the name by which is designated an office performed for the period of one month, in the Romish Church, for her dead. "Mind" in that case is used in its old sense of memory, as in the phrases "to call to mind," "time out of mind."

## Monthyon (or Montyon), Antoine Jean Baptiste Robert[[@Headword:Monthyon (or Montyon), Antoine Jean Baptiste Robert]]

## Monti, Filippo Maria[[@Headword:Monti, Filippo Maria]]

             an Italian prelate, was born March 23. 1675, at Bologna, of an illustrious and noble family; studied at the high school of his native place; then went to Rome, where by his superior talent and acquisitions he quickly rose to eminent favor with popes Clement XI and XII. In 1743 Benedict XIV created Monti a cardinal. He died January 17, 1754, at Rome. His library of over 12,000 volumes was given, by his request, to the library of his native place; also other valuable treasures, among them a fine collection of paintings. He wrote: Roma tutrice delle belle arti, scultura ed architettura: — Prose degli Arcadi: — Elogia cardinalium pietate, doctrina, legationibus ac rebus pro Ecclesia gestis illustrium a pontificatu Alexandri III ad Benedictum XIII (Rome, 1751, 4to).

## Monti,Vincenzo[[@Headword:Monti,Vincenzo]]

             a noted Italian ecclesiastic, who wrote poetry of a superior order, and only used his position in the Church as a general passport into society, flourished in the second half of the 18th century. He was a native of Ferrara (born in 1753), and studied in the university of that place. He was made abbe in 1776, and became secretary to the pope's nephew. He soon found favor in the eyes of Roman celebrities, and was generally noticed by prelates and cardinals as a fit subject for promotion in the Church. He was especially popular when, in 1792, he wrote a poem commemorating the efforts of Pius II against the Austrian court, which then, in the person of Joseph II, was fast breaking away from the papacy. The poem which Monti wrote on this occasion of Pius's visit to Vienna is entitled Il Pellegrino Apostolico. He died at Milan, October 1828.

## Montignot, Henri[[@Headword:Montignot, Henri]]

             a French ecclesiastic, was born about 1715, at Nancy. He was a doctor of theology, canon of the cathedral, and member of the academy in his native place, where he died about the close of the 18th century. He wrote: Remarques theologiques et critiques sur l'histoire du Peuple de Dieu du P. Berruyer (1755, 12mo): — Dictionnaire diplomatique, ou Etymologie des termes de la basse Latinite pour servir a l'intelligence des archives, des  chartes, etc. (Nancy, 1787, 8vo): — Reflexions sur les immunites ecclesiastiques (Paris, 1788, 8vo): — Etat des Etoiles fixes au second sicle par Cl. Ptolemie, compare a laposition de memes etoiles en 1786, avec le texte Grec a la traduction Francaise (Nancy, 1786; Strasburg, 1787, 4to).

## Montigny, Jean De[[@Headword:Montigny, Jean De]]

             a French prelate of some note, was born in Bretagne in 1637, of parents highly esteemed in the best social circles of France; and thus, surrounded with superior advantages, was especially fitted for the highest literary culture. He entered the ecclesiastic life, and soon attained to eminence. In 1670 he was made bishop of Leon, and in the same year was admitted to membership in the French Academy. He died September 28, 1671, at Vitre. He wrote: Lettre a Eraste pour reponse a son libelle contre La Pucelle de Chapelain (Paris, 1656, 4to): — Oraison funebre d'Anne d'Autriche (Rennes, 1666, 4to): — Lettre contenant le voyaye de la cour en 1660; dans le Recueil de quelques pieces nouvelles et galantes.

## Montjoy[[@Headword:Montjoy]]

             is the name given to mounds serving to direct the travellers on a highway, probably often originally tumuli, or funeral-mounds of an elder peopleheaps of stones, overgrown with grass, which have been piled over a dead chieftain. They often were crowned with a cross. Montjoie St. Denis was the French wgrcry; Montjoie St. Andrew, that of Burgundy; Montjoie Notre Dame, of the dukes of Bourbon; and Montjoie St. George, of England.

## Montlaur, Jean De[[@Headword:Montlaur, Jean De]]

             a French prelate, was born near Montpellier about 1120; entered the ecclesiastical life while yet quite a youth, and rapidly advanced to positions of prominence and responsibility. In 1158 he was made bishop, and everywhere gained friends by his generous and open-hearted life. He was particularly devoted to his diocesan work, and built up the people in holy and consistent living. He died February 24, 1190, in his native place, with whose history his whole life was interwoven. His works remain in MS. See Histoire litteraire de la France, volume 14, s.v.; Gallia Christiana, volume 6.

## Montluc Jean de[[@Headword:Montluc Jean de]]

             brother of the preceding, a distinguished French prelate, noted both for his attainments in ecclesiastical and political life, was born about 1508. He entered in boyhood days the Dominican Order of Gray Friars, and soon made himself the favorite of his associates. The outer world also took a liking to him, and even at court he had many friends. Francis I reposed much confidence in him, and he was intrusted with diplomatic missions. He was successful especially in efforts for a peaceful solution of the differences between his native country and the Ottoman power, concluding for Francis an advantageous peace with Soliman. In 1553 he was made bishop of  Valence and of Die, and gained great popularity as a pulpit orator. He was not unfrequently invited to preach at court during the rule of Catharine de Medici. However, after the Conference of Poissy (1561), Montluc seems to have fallen into disrepute at court, for he was believed to have been one of the bishops whom Beza's argument had almost persuaded to be a Protestant" (Browning, Huguenots, 1:108); and two years later he was one of the prelates excommunicated by pope Pius IV (Browning, 1:180). Montluc was finally restored to his former influence and position by the French Parliament; but he never thereafter exerted himself much in ecclesiastical labors, and because of his shrewdness, wisdom, and learning, he was selected by the government of his country for several diplomatic missions, the most important of which was to Poland (in 1572), where he zealously exerted himself to secure the crown for the duke of Anjou. It is generally conceded that Montluc's conduct in this affair was anything but honorable and manly. He persuaded the Poles to believe that the duke had had no part in the massacre of St. Bartholomew. On his return to France he lived at Toulouse, where he died April 13, 1579. His theological writings are: Deux instructions et deux epistres au clerge et peuple de Valence (Avignon, 1557, 8vo): — Cleri Valentii et Diensis Reformatio (Paris, 1557, 8vo): — Recueil des lieux de l'Ecriture servant a decouvrir les fautes contre les dix commandenants de la loi (ibid. 1559, 8vo):Sermons (ibid. 1559, 8vo): — Familiere Explication des articles de la foi (ibid. 1561, 8vo): — Sermons sur les articles de la foi et de l'Oraisoun dominicale (ibid. 1561, 8vo). See De Thou, Hist. sui temporis; Sismondi, Hist. des Francais, chapters 17, 18, 19; Smedley, Hist. of the Ref. Religion in France, 1:122 sq., 189; 2:82; De Felice, History of the Protestants of France, page 142 sq. (J.H.W.)

## Montluo, Blaise de[[@Headword:Montluo, Blaise de]]

             a French marshal, noted for his cruelty towards Protestants; one of the “two personages who obtained by their enormities a notoriety so hideous that the history of cruelty would be imperfect if they were passed over in silence" (Smedley, 1:211). He was a brother to the succeeding, and was born in Gascony in 1501. When only a youth of twenty, he entered military life, and soon distinguished himself by his bravery as well as his brutality. He was universally severe with his enemies, and would give no quarter. In the contest with the Huguenots, he advised their absolute extermination, and actually wrote a memoir (in 1562) showing how easily it might be done (see Memoires de Conde, 3:184 sq.). Placed in charge of his native province, he used his unlimited power to destroy every one who appeared to be tainted with the heresy, and instituted a strict inquisition " into the strange names of overseers, deacons, consistories, synods, and conferences," "food of which kind," he adds, " never yet had furnished me with a breakfast" (Comment. lib. 5, tom. 2, page 3). The number of persons who fell victims to his rage is legion, and he appears to us in the role of a modern Nero. We have not room to enter here into detail, but refer to Smedley (Hist. of the Ref. Religion in France, 1:211 sq.; 2:25). Montluc fought also against the imperialists, commanded by Charles V, and assisted at the siege of La Rochelle and Calais. For his services against the Protestants he was in 1573 made "marshal" by Henry III. Montluc died in 1577, leaving the Memoires of his military life (1592), which are not an honor to any man's memory nor to any man's country. See Brantome, Vies des Hommes illustres Francais; Mezeray, Abregy de l'histoire de France; Sainte-Beuve, in the Moniteur (Paris), October 1854; Browning, Hist. of the Huguenots, 1:118,136, 280; 2:4. (J.H.W.)

## Montmignon, Jean Baptiste[[@Headword:Montmignon, Jean Baptiste]]

             a French theologian, was born at Lucy in 1737, prepared in his studies for holy orders, and finally became successively secretary of the bishopric of Soissons, canon, vicar, grandvicar, and archdeacon. In 1786 he accepted the editorship of the Journal Ecclesiastique; but as early as January, 1788, abandoned this work, and took part in the publications which were preparing at the outbreak of the Revolution under the bishop of Soissons. Obliged to quit France in 1793, he went to Belgium, and remained there until the government of the Directory made his return possible. He was then nominated grand-vicar of Poitiers; in 1811 was made canon of the metropolis, and then grand-vicar of this diocese. He was also made censor  of all ecclesiastical publications at Paris. He died at Paris February 21, 1824. He wrote: Crime d'apostasie; lettre d'un religieux a un de ses amis (1790, 8vo): — Vie edifiante de Benoit-Joseph Labre, mort a Rome, en odeur de Saintete, Leviticus 16 Avril, 1783, composee par ordre du Saint-Siege, etc., par M. M —— (Marconi), lecteur du college Romain, confesseur du serviteur de Dieu; traduit de l'Italien (Paris, 1784, 12mo): — Preservative contre le fanatisme, ou les nouveaux millenaires rappeles aux principes fondamentaux de la foi Catholique (Paris, 1806, 8vo): — Exposition des predictions et des promesses faites a l'Eglise, pour les derniers temps de la Gentilite (1806, 2 volumes, 12mo): — Choix de Lettres edifiantes, ecrites des missions etrangres, etc. (1808, 8 volumes, 12mo): — Do la Regle de varite et des Causes dufinatisme (1808, 8vo).

## Montmorency[[@Headword:Montmorency]]

             is the name of one of the oldest noble families of France, which figures both in secular and ecclesiastical history, though oftentimes its celebrity was purchased at the expense of all humanitarian principles. The name of the family was derived from the village in which its several members lived, and dates from the 10th century. Oftentimes the house of Montmorency has been styled "the first barons of France," and in recognition of their services to Romanism, "the first Christian barons." They furnished officers of state and generals for the French army, distinguished ecclesiastics for the Church of Rome, some of whom rose even to the cardinalate, besides a number of grand-masters and knights of the different European orders. One of the branches established in the Netherlands furnished count of Horn (Philip II de Montmorency-Neville), who, together with Egmont, was executed in Brussels during the bloody reign of the Spanish general Alva. But we have room here only for those chiefly concerned in the Huguenot movement.

1. ANNE, first duke of Montmorency, marshal and grand-constable of France, noted for his alliance with the Guises, SEE HUGUENOTS, was born in March, 1493. His Christian name, Anne, it is said, he received from his godmother, Anne of Brittany. He distinguished himself by his gallantry and military skill in the wars between Francis I and the emperor Charles V, and was taken prisoner along with his sovereign in the battle of Pavia, which was fought against his advice. He afterwards became the leader of the French government, showing great ability in matters of finance and diplomacy, and was made constable in 1538; but his rough manners made  him an object of dislike to many; and the suspicions of the king having been aroused against him, he was suddenly banished from court in 1541, and passed ten years on his estates, till the accession of Henry II, when he came again to the head of affairs. In 1548 he suppressed the insurrection in Guienne, but was less successful in 1557 in his contest with the celebrated general of Philip II, duke Philibert Emmanuel of Savoy, which resulted in the, to France, disadvantageous peace of Chateau-Cambresis; and hence, with the accession of the youthful king, Francis II, there came a decline of the power of the house of Montmorency, and the ascendency of the house of the Guises, who had Francis entirely under their control. Fortunately for Montmorency, the widow of the late king, Catharine de Medici, ambitious to rule the kingdom, cast her influence with constable Montmorency, who had retired from court, though apparently she coveted the friendship of the Guises (Martin, 8:362).

An alliance was now formed among disaffected courtiers, bourgeoisie, and Protestants against the Guises, and him who, ruling over the nation, had submitted to their guidance; and though it is not believed that Montmorency had any part in it, it is certain that some of his house-three brothers of the house of Chatillon (Obet, cardinal of Chatillon, admiral Coligny, and Dandelot, colonel of the Cisalpine infantry), sons of Louisa of Montmorency, the sister of the constable-were more or less intimately associated with all Protestant movements in France, and that possibly two of these three had actually a part in, or at least a knowledge of, the conspiracy of Amboise ( SEE HUGUENOTS; and comp. Ranke, Fracnzs. Gesch. 1:147; Mrs. Marsh, The Protest. Ref. in France, 1:142; BrantSme, Vie des Honmes illustres, 3:20). The sudden termination of the reign of Francis II (1560) brought forward the minor, Charles IX, and with him the regency of Catharine. Her object was to effect a fusion of parties, or, rather, to hold the balance evenly between them, and, by allowing neither to preponderate, to preserve the paramount authority in her hands. By the advice of the sagacious counsellor L'HSpital (q.v.), the king of Navarre was made lieutenant-general, and Montmorency was again given the direction of military affairs, while the Guises kept their places in the council, and duke Francis retained the post of master of the royal household. The Guises, perceiving the intent of the queen, now denominated "apostate," labored earnestly for an alliance with Montmorency, in order to foil the queen in her designs. The constable finally separated from his nephews, who had reappeared at court, and were enjoying many favors, and allied himself with the duke of Guise and the marshal St. Andre, composing the famous triumvirate which resisted  Catharine de Medici, and proceeded in most stringent measures against the Huguenots (q.v.). The colloquy at Poissy had softened the heart of Catharine, and the Protestants were given many privileges.

The triumvirate opposed all such concessions, and finally brought on the massacre at Vassy — “the St. Bartholomew of 1562" (March). The queen-mother and king were seized, and forced to inaugurate a new policy. Montmorency himself signalized the new departure by various open attacks on the Huguenots. Thus he led a mob to storm a Protestant church in the suburbs of Paris called "the Temple of Jerusalem." "Bursting in the doors of the empty place, they tore up the seats, and, placing them and the Bibles in a pile upon the floor, they set the whole on fire, amid great acclamation." He returned to Paris as if a victor fresh from battle, and, flushed with success, he rested not until other churches had been submitted to a like treatment, and he was given the nickname of "Captain Burnbenches."

In 1562 he commanded the royal army against the Huguenots, but at the battle of Dreux was wounded and taken prisoner by the Protestants. Released by the peace of Amboise in 1563, he plotted a massacre of the Protestants; but the court not only refused to approve his proposal, but also caused his retirement finally. In 1567 he again appeared on the stage of public affairs, and again took part in the warfare against the Huguenots; but he did not long remain in the field, for he received a fatal wound at St. Denis, and died at Paris on the following day, November 12, 1567. His death was in many respects a blessing to France. From a neutral, if not a friend of the Huguenots, he had turned to a most deadly enemy, because, after he had espoused the Guises' interest, and had been placed in command of the army, he had never been able to gain a victory over the Huguenot armies. Even the duke of Guise, who had fallen in 1563 (when returning from his outposts he was mortally wounded by a fanatical Huguenot, Poltrot [q.v.] de Mere), had counselled in his dying hour that the queen-regent should make peace with her revolted subjects, but Montmorency insisted on their destruction, and counselled their massacre in open battle and by private means. His last hours were spent in a most deadly struggle, and yet even then he failed to be the victor; for, though he sacrificed himself, the contest remained undecided, the Huguenots. if anything, having the vantage- ground. as they had saved their leader. It is generally asserted that Montmorency's death was welcome news to Catharine de Medici and the courtiers, whom he had frequently offended by his overbearing manners. See Lescouvel, Anne de Montmorency (1696); Davila, Hist. of the Civil Wars of France; Martin, Hist. of France, volume 9; Ranke, Franzosische  Gesch. vornehmlich im 16 u. 17 Jahrh. (Engl. transl. Hist. of Civil Wars and Monarchy in France), 1:164-212; Sir J. Stephen, Lect. Hist. France (3d ed. Lond. 1857, 2 volumes, 8vo), volume 2, lects. 16 and 17; Student's Hist. of France, pages 311, 316, 319, 324, 337; Jervis, Hist. of the Church of France (Lond. 1872, 2 volumes, 8vo), volume 1, chapter 2; Fisher, Hist. of the Ref page 258 sq.; and the works referred to in the article SEE HUGUENOTS.

2. HENRI, second Duc de Montmorency, grandson of the famous constable de Montmorency, but more honorable and consistent in his conduct, thought he also warred against the Huguenots, was born at Chantilly April 30, 1595. His godfather was the great Henri Quatre, who always called him his "son." Louis XIII made him admiral when he was but a youth of seventeen. He succeeded his father in the governorship of Languedoc, and took an active part in the wars against the Hugueenots, distinguishing himself on the royal side in the sieges of Montauban and Montpellier, and in 1625 by taking the Isle of Re from the Huguenots of Rochelle. He afterwards gained other victories over them, and in 1629 was mainly instrumental in bringing about the peace of Alais, which terminated the religious civil wars in France. In 1630 he received the chief command of the French troops in Piedmont, where he defeated the Spaniards, for which he received a marshal's baton. Unfortunately for himself, he ventured to oppose Richelieu, who had always been his enemy, and espoused the cause of Gaston, duke of Orleans; for this he was declared guilty of high- treason, and marshal Schomberg being sent against him, defeated him at Castehlnaudary, and took him prisoner. Although almost mortally wounded, Montmorency was carried to Toulouse, sentenced to death by the Parliament, and notwithstanding his expressions of penitence, and the most powerful intercession made for him — for example, by king Charles I of England, the pope, the Venetian republic, and the duke of Savoy — was beheaded, October 30, 1632. He was distinguished for amiability and courtesy of manners, as well as for his valor. His life was written by one of his officers (1663, 4to). See also the works cited above.

## Montolivetenses[[@Headword:Montolivetenses]]

             a name given to the monks of Mount Olivet, because living in a residence so called. The Montolivetenses dress in white serge, and profess the rule of St. Benedict. They sprang up in the 14th century, were approved by pope John XXI, and confirmed by Gregory XI in 1371. They trace their origin to  St. Bernard Ptolornei of Sienna, and their first monastery was at Ancona; but the order soon spread through Italy and Sicily. SEE MONKS, EASTERN.

## Montorsoli, Fragiovann Angelo[[@Headword:Montorsoli, Fragiovann Angelo]]

             a celebrated Italian sculptor, largely engaged on sacred and ecclesiastical subjects, was born about the beginning of the 16th century at Montorsoli, near Florence. His first instruction in art he received from Andrea de Fiesole, with whom he lived three years. He then found employment at Rome, at Perugia, and at Volterra. He was next employed by Michael Angelo on the church of San Lorenzo at Florence, and gained the admiration and lasting friendship of the great Florentine. In 1527 Montorsoli had a strong disposition to turn, as it appeared to him, to the only life in which peace was to be obtained; but after trying in vain several convents, he fixed in 1530 upon the brotherhood of the Nunziata at Florence, and became a friar of the Order Dei Servi della Nunziata. Shortly after he had taken up his abode in this convent, having been recommended to the pope by Michael Angelo, he was called to Rome by Clement VII to restore several ancient monuments, much to the dissatisfaction of his brothers of the Nunziata. When the tasks assigned him by the pope were finished, he returned to Florence with Michael Angelo to complete the statues and other sculptures of the sacristy and library of San Lorenzo. After the death of Clement, Montorsoli again joined Michael Angelo at Rome, and assisted him in the works of the monument of Julius II; but while engaged on this work he was invited by cardinal Turnone, and advised by Michael Angelo to go with the cardinal to Paris. Owing, however, to difficulties with the treasury and servants of the French court, Montorsoli left Paris and returned to Florence. After completing there several works, he went by Rome to Naples, and there constructed the tomb of Jacopo Sanazzaro. He next went to Genoa, and ornamented the church of San Matteo there, besides many other works, and upon their completion returned to Michael Angelo at Rome; but departed again soon afterwards, in 1547, for Messina, where he was employed to make a grand fountain for the place in front of the cathedral, and designed the church of San Lorenzo, etc. In 1557, by a decree of pope Paul IV, all religious persons, or all who had taken holy orders and were living at large in the world without respect to their religious character, were ordered to return to their convents and reassume their religious habits; and Montorsoli was accordingly obliged to leave many works unfinished, which he intrusted to his pupil Martino, and  he returned to his convent at Florence. He was, however, shortly afterwards called to Bologna to construct there the high altar of the church of his own order, Dei Servi, which he completed with great magnificence in twenty-eight months. He returned to Florence in 1561, and being rich he built a common sepulchre for artists in the chapter-house of the convent of the Nunziata, with the requisite endowment for regular masses at appointed times, and gave the whole sepulchre, chapter, and chapel to the then almost decayed society of St. Luke, or company of painters, etc., which, upon the completion of the sepulchre, was at a solemn feast celebrated by forty-eight of the principal artists of Florence, re-established by the consent and authority of the duke Cosmo I upon a firmer and permanent basis; and the society still subsists as the Academy of Florence, though since that time it has been considerably enriched and endowed by successive dukes of Tuscany. Montorsoli died, says Vasari, on the last day of August, 1563. See Cicognara, Storia della Scultura; Valery, Voyages historiques et litteraires en Italie; Spooner, Biographical Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.; English Cyclop. s.v.

## Montpellier[[@Headword:Montpellier]]

             (Lat. Mons pessulanus or puellarum), a city of France, in the department of Herault, in 43° 36' N. lat. and 30 50' E. long., with a population (1881) of 52,673, is noted as the seat of several Church councils held there in the 12th and 13th centuries. At the first of these, held in 1162, by pope Alexander III, assisted by ten bishops, the antipope Victor (Octavianus) was excommunicated (Labbe, Cone. 10:1410). At the second council, held in 1195, indulgences were granted to those who marched into Spain to fight against the infidels (Moors), and interdicts were intrusted to the bishops in whose dioceses the Albigenses were gaining ground (Labbe, Cone. 10:1796). At the third council, held in 1215, by the papal legate, Peter of Beneventum, the question was the disposition of the city of Toulouse, and the other cities conquered by the Crusaders, count Simon of Montfort claiming them. Montfort (q.v.) was granted his demand. There were also forty-six canons passed relating to the dress of monastics and the clergy (Labbe, Cone. 11:183, and Append. page 2330). At the fourth council. held in August, 1224, and composed of all the bishops of the province, under the archbishop of Narbonne, the propositions of peace made by Raymond, count of Toulouse, and the Albigenses were considered. Raymond promised to keep the Catholic faith, and to cause it to be held throughout his territories, to purge out from them all heretics, to  restore the Church to her rights, to preserve her liberties, and to pay within three years 15,000 marks as an indemnification for what she had suffered, upon condition that the count of Montfort should relinquish his pretensions to the lands of the county of Toulouse; but Amauri, who pretended to be count of Toulouse, in virtue of a decree of Innocent III given in the Council of Lateran, wrote to the bishops, and represented to them that, as he hoped to be able to bring the Albigenses into subjection, it would be a scandal to the whole Church should they enter into any agreement with Raymond. The council appear to have acquiesced in his view of the matter, and the offer of Raymond was rejected (Conc. 11:289, and Append. page 2334). The fifth council was held September 6, 1258, by James, archbishop of Narbonne. Eight statutes were published:

1, excommunicates ipso facto all who usurp the property of the Church and insult the persons of the clergy;

2, forbids bishops to give the tonsure or holy orders to persons not of their own diocese;

3, declares that clerks not living as clergymen ought to do so, or carrying on any business, they shall lose their privileges;

5, forbids Jews to exact usury;

6, forbids bishops to give letters to mendicant friars to authorize their begging before the friars have obtained leave of the metropolitan (Labbe, 11:778). See Hefele, Concilienyeschichte, volumes 5 and 6 (see Index); Landon, Manual of Councils, s.v.

## Montpellierians[[@Headword:Montpellierians]]

             a fanatical sect which, under the religious garb, committed all manner of excesses, and became guilty of most immoral conduct, but which, fortunately, was only short-lived, the people soon becoming disgusted with the licentiousness of its members. It arose at Montpellier, France, about the year 1723. Its founder, master, and high-priest took the name of Jacob Prophetus, and designated his meeting as the "New Sion." They held nightly meetings, in which the grossest licentiousness was indulged in under cover of religion. Their place of assembly contained numerous apartments, carpeted with white, and furnished with beds and mattresses. In the farthest apartment, considered as the sanctum sanctorum, stood an altar, a pulpit, , candlestick with seven branches, and a gazophylakion.  There were also some priests dressed in the garb of the Hebrew priests. They circumcised and baptized their children, but in the latter ceremony brandy was used instead of water. Louis XV commissioned the marquis de Roquelaure to put an end to their abomination, and the sect was speedily suppressed. See P.I. von Huth, Versulch einer Kirchengesch. d. 18ten Jahrh. 1:543 sq.

## Montredon[[@Headword:Montredon]]

             (also called Montrond), RAIMOND DE, a French prelate of some note, was born at Nismes near the beginning of the 12th century. He was in 1130 archdean of Beziers, when he was promoted to the bishopric of Agde. He was made archbishop of Arles in 1143. He died about 1155. He figured prominently in the civil affairs of France, but gave little time to theological studies, and left no works of value in that field of knowledge. See Gallia Christiana, volume 1, col. 560; Hist. litter. de la France, 13:236.

## Montrelais, Hugues De[[@Headword:Montrelais, Hugues De]]

             a French cardinal, was born at Montrelais, near Ancenis, about 1315. He early entered the service of the Church, and was made canon, and later archdeacon, of St. Peter's at Nantes. In 1354 he was elected bishop of Nantes, but the year after he was transferred by pope Innocent VI to the see of Treguier, and in 1358 to that of Sainte-Brienne. Devoted to Charles the Bald, Hugues accompanied that prince in 1364 to Poitiers to assist in diplomatic conferences. He also performed other diplomatic services. The troubles which agitated Brittany in 1371 caused Hugues's retirement to Avignon, where pope Gregory XI created him cardinal (December 20, 1375). He died there, February 28, 1384. See Gallia Christiana, volume 3, col. 71.

## Montreuil, Bernardin De[[@Headword:Montreuil, Bernardin De]]

             a French theologian, was born in Paris in 1596. He joined the Jesuits in 1624, and taught philosophy and moral theology. He died in Paris in 1646. His works are: Vie de Jesus Christ, tiree des quatre Evangelistes (1637, 4to): — La Vie glorieuse de Jesus-Christ et l'etablissement de son Eglise par le sministere des Aptres, ou fes Actes des Apotres et 1'Histoire de l'Eglise naissante (Paris, 1640 and 1799, 2 volumes, 12mo): — Les derniers Combats de l'Eglise, dans lexplication de l'Apocalypse (Paris, 1645, 4to).

## Montrocher[[@Headword:Montrocher]]

             (Guido de Monte-Rocheri), GUI DE, a Spanish theologian of some note, who flourished in the first half of the 14th century at Valencia, is noted as the author of Manipulus Curatorum, a work regarded of so much value that it was among the very first books issued after the invention of the art of printing, and passed through over fifty editions in the first thirty years of the 15th century. The oldest edition is entitled Manipulus Curatorum, liber utilissimus, per Christophorum Bugamumo et Johannem Glim (Savigliano, 1471, folio). See Du Pin, Biblioth. des Auteurs Eccles. du quartorzieme scicle; Fabricius, Biblioth. Graeca, 10:786; Biblioth. Hispana vetus, 2:155, 156.

## Montrose, James Graham, Marquis of[[@Headword:Montrose, James Graham, Marquis of]]

             a Scotch soldier, noted for the part he took in the contests between the Covenanters and king Charles I, was a member of a celebrated noble family, and born at the family estate of Auld Montrose in 1612, and on the death of his father in 1626 became earl of Montrose. He was educated at the University of St. Andrews; and after having married a lady who lived only four years before death separated them, leaving him a child, he went abroad and travelled for several years in France and Italy, devoting much of his time to study in general literature and army tactics. Introduced on his return to England to king Charles, he was so coldly received that he at once left for his native country, and there allied himself with the Covenanters, who were just then arrayed against the king. It was the year 1637 when the tumults broke out in Edinburgh on the attempt to introduce the Prayer-book. Montrose, to all appearances, became heart and soul enlisted in the movement to resist the introduction of episcopacy in the Scottish Church, and was one of the four noblemen selected to compose the "table" of the nobility, which, along with the other tables of the gentry, of the burghs, and of the ministers, drew up the famous National Covenant, SEE COVENANT and SEE COVENANTERS, sworn to by all ranks at Edinburgh in the spring of 1638. He was likewise sent on a mission to Aberdeen, to secure the support of its citizens also; was instrumental in bringing many of them to join the national cause, and in 1639 went there with an army to overawe those who had refused to join his side. Encountering finally the army of king Charles, he gave it battle at Meagra Hill, near Stonehaven (June 15), and obtained a complete victory.

When the temporary peace of Berwick was made, Charles invited several of the  Covenanting nobles to meet him at Berwick, where he was then holding his court, and to consult with him about Scottish affairs. Among those who went was Montrose, and his party dated what they regarded as his apostasy from that interview. Be that as it may, his political position was certainly much modified after his return. In the General Assembly which met August 13, 1639, under the presidency of the earl of Traquair as royal commissioner, he showed symptoms of toleration towards the Royalists, and was the object of much popular obloquy. One night he is said to have found affixed upon his chamber-door a paper bearing these words, Invictus armis, verbis vincitur. The dissolution of the Parliament, in June, 1640, led to an open rupture between the king and the Covenanters, and both parties prepared to decide their quarrel by force of arms. The former assembled at York an army of 21,000 horse and foot; the latter another of 26,000, which, under the command of Leslie, crossed the Tweed August 21,1640. Montrose was the first man who forded the stream. The successes of the Scots, as is well known, soon forced Charles to summon a new Parliament for then settlement of the national grievances. But though Montrose had fought, he had, along with several other influential nobles, entered into a secret engagement at Cumbernauld, for the purpose of frustrating what they regarded as the factious designs of extreme Covenanting leaders. His conduct in England, too, had been questionable.

It was accidentally discovered that he had been communicating with the king; and when the Parliament assembled (November, 1640), he was cited to appear before a committee. The affair of the Cumbernauld Bond, discovered by the ingenuity of Argyle, was brought up; but Montrose defended his conduct and that of his colleagues, and nothing came of it, though some fiery spirits among the clergy, says Guthrie, "pressed that their lives might go for it." In the following June, Montrose and some others were accused of plotting against Argyle, and were confined in Edinburgh Castle, where they remained till the beginning of 1642, when they were set at liberty in return for the concessions which Charles had made his Scottish subjects. Although they had frequently been examined, nothing definite had been proved against them. The accusation that Montrose had proposed to the king to assassinate Argyle is not historically substantiated, and is intrinsically improbable. During the next year or two Montrose kept aloof, at least outwardly, from public affairs, and became alienated from the Covenanters. He went to York to wait on the king some time in 1643, but failed to meet him. He finally joined the queen, but did not secure any open alliance with the king; the Covenanters all this time trying to win him over  to their side again.

The civil war which had broken out in England determined Charles and his advisers to crush the Presbyterian leaders in Scotland, who were abetting the efforts of the English Parliamentarians. In the spring of 1644 Montrose finally entered into the king's service, and was raised to the rank of marquis. He left Oxford, where he had been residing with his sovereign, and proceeded to Scotland to raise the Royalists in the North. The battle of Marston Moor for a moment paralyzed him, but his resolution speedily returned. He threw himself into the Highlands, and, after skulking about the hills for some time in disguise, met at BlairAthol some Irish auxiliaries and a body of Highlanders, who had forced their way thither from the Western Isles in hopes of joining him, and with these enforcements he marched south, fell suddenly (September 1) on the Covenanting army commanded by lord Elcho at Tippermuir, near Perth, and gained a complete victory. Not a single Royalist was slain. After a three-days' stay at Perth, he set out for the North, defeated a force of Covenanters under lord Burleigh at Aberdeen (September 13), and took possession of the city, which was abandoned for four days to all the horrors of war. The approach of Argyle, at the head of 4000 men, compelled Montrose, whose forces were far inferior in numbers and discipline, to retreat into the wilds of Badenoch, whence he recrossed the Grampians, and suddenly appeared in Angus, where he wasted the estates of more than one Covenanting nobleman. With fresh supplies, he then once more returned to Aberdeenshire, with the view of raising the Gordons; narrowly escaped defeat at Fvvie in the end of October, and again withdrew into the fastnesses of the mountains. Argyle, baffled in all his attempts to capture or crush Montrose, returned to Edinburgh and threw up his commission. His opponent, receiving large accessions from the Highland clans, planned a winter campaign, marched southwestward into the country of the Campbells, devastated it frightfully, drove Argyle himself from his castle at Inverary, and then wheeled north, intending to attack Inverness, where the Covenanters were posted in strong force under the earl of Seaforth. The "Estates" at Edinburgh were greatly alarmed, and, raising a fresh army, placed it under the command of general Baillie, a natural son of Sir William Baillie of Lamington. After consulting with Argyle, it was arranged that he should proceed by way of Perth, and take Montrose in front, while Argyle should rally his vast array of vassals and attack him in the rear. The Royalist leader was in the great glen of Albin — the basin of the Caledonian Canal — on his way to Inverness, when he heard that Argyle was following him. He instantly turned on his pursuer,  fell upon him unexpectedly at Inverlochy, February 2, 1645, and utterly routed his forces. Fifteen hundred of the Campbells were slain, and only four of Montrose's men.

He then resumed his march northwards, but did not venture to assault Inverness — his wild mountaineers being admirably fitted for rapid irregular warfare, but not for the slow work of beleaguerment. Directing his course to the east, he passed, with fire and sword, through Elgin and Banff into Aberdeenshire, which suffered a similar fate. On the 9th of May he attacked and routed Hurry at Auldearn, near Nairn; and after enjoying a short respite with his fierce veterans in Badenoch, again issued from his wilds, and inflicted a still more disastrous defeat on Baillie himself at Alford, in Aberdeenshire (July 2). There was nol nothing to prevent his march south, and about the end of the month he set out with a force of from 5000 to 6000 men. He was followed by Baillie, who picked up reinforcements on his way, and on the 15th of August again risked a battle at Kilsyth, but was defeated with frightful loss — 6000 of the Covenanters being slain. The cause of Charles was for the moment triumphant, and Montrose, who was virtually master of the country, was made lieutenant-governor of Scotland, and commander-in-chief of the royal forces. All the principal cities in the west hastened to proclaim their fidelity, and laid the blame of the recent troubles on the unfortunate Presbyterian clergy. But gradually affairs took a turn. Great numbers of the Highlanders, having become restless, returned home, and Montrose was obliged to seek safety near the borders. On the 4th of September he broke up his camp at Bothwell, and marched for the eastern counties, where Charles had informed him that the earls of Traquair, Home, and Roxburgh were ready to join him. In this he was disappointed, and on the 13th of the same month he was surprised at Philiphaugh, near Selkirk, by David Leslie, who fell upon the relics of Montrose's army and his raw levies with 6000 cavalry, and completely annihilated them. Escaping.from the field of battle, he made his way to Athol, and again endeavored, but in vain, to arouse the Highlands; and at last Charles, now beginning to get the worst of it in the civil war, was induced to order him to withdraw from the kingdom.

On the 3d of September, 1646, Montrose sailed for Norway, whence he proceeded to Paris, where he endeavored, but unsuccessfully, to enlist queen Henrietta Maria in aid of her husband; and at last Montrose, in despair, betook himself to Germany, in hope of service under the emperor. He soon after returned to Holland, and entered into communication with the prince of Wales, afterwards Charles II. It was here that news of Charles I's execution reached him. Montrose fainted on receipt of the dreadful  intelligence, and gave way to the most passionate regrets. Charles II reinvested him with the dignity of lieutenant-governor of Scotland, and Montrose undertook a fresh invasion on behalf of the exiled monarch. In March, 1650, he arrived at the Orkneys with a small force, and after the lapse of three weeks proceeded to Caithness; but neither the gentlemen nor the commons would rise at his call. He forced his way as far south as the borders of Ross-shire, where his dispirited troops, not over 1500 strong, were attacked and cut to pieces at a place called Corbiesdale, near the pass of Invercarron, by a powerful body of cavalry under colonel Strachan. Montrose fled into the wilds of Assynt, where he was nearly starved to death, when he fell into the hands of M'Leod of Assynt, who delivered him up to general Leslie, by whom he was brought to Edinburgh. Condemned to death as a traitor to the Covenant, he was executed May 21, 1650. His demeanor in his last moments was dignified, but that of the Covenanters open to condemnation, for they were cruel, and heaped indignities upon him even on the gallows. His head was placed on the Tolbooth, and his limbs were sent to different parts of Scotland. After the Restoration his remains were collected and given a public funeral. See Napier, Montrose and the Covenanters (Lond. 1838, 2 volumes, 8vo); Grant, Life of Graham, Marquis of Montarose (1859); Wishart, Memoirs of Graham, etc.; Sir Edward Cust, Lives of the Warriors of the Civil Wars (1867); Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, volume 2; Hetherington, Hist. Ch. of Scotland, pages 175,178,191; Russell, Hist. Ch. of Scotland, volume 2, chapters 12, 13; Stephen, Hist. Ch. of Scotland (Anglican view), 1:576, 641; 2:6, 17, 34, 44, 50, 61, 63, 96, 111, 144, 156, 167, 316, 317; and the works referred to under COVENANTERS.

## Montyon[[@Headword:Montyon]]

             SEE MONTHYON.

## Monument[[@Headword:Monument]]

             is the incorrect rendering in Isa 65:4 for נָצוּר, nzatsur', a guarded place (" hidden thing," as in Isa 48:6; elsewhere "besieged," etc.), such as caves (so the Sept. σπήλαιον), or the adyta or shrines of heathen temples (so the Vulg. delubra), as places of idolatrous or illicit devotion. It was anciently a practice in most nations for persons to resort to the sepulchres for the purpose of magic or necromancy, and this still holds its ground in India and other Oriental countries. SEE SUPERSTITION.

In the Apocrypha, "monument" is the correct rendering in Wis 10:7 for μνημεῖον, but inexactly in 1Ma 13:27 for ᾠκοδόμησε, and in 2Ma 15:6 for τρόπαιον. SEE TOMB.

For the monuments of Egypt and Assyria, see those countries respectively.

## Monumental Theology[[@Headword:Monumental Theology]]

             a term of late employed to designate the scientific presentation of the notions and doctrines of theology as they are found in and taught by monuments. It aims to interpret the life and thought of the Christian Church as these are unconsciously recorded in monumental remains. It goes out of the ordinary course of historic investigation, and searches for the isolated and fragmentary. Indeed, wherever Christian peoples have left a monumental trace of their life this discipline directs its inquiries.

Relation to other Departments. — Since these monumental remains are mostly of the nature of art-works, monumental theology is very intimately connected with Art Criticism, Art History, Archaeology, Epigraphics, and Numismatics. What have usually been regarded as only auxiliaries to Historical Theology have been recently elevated to an independent science.  Art and written language differ entirely, both in their scope and in their modes of expression. Art appeals to the whole race; not, indeed, through the faculty of the understanding, but through the higher faculty of the intuition, to which physical sight is only a medium or instrument. The difference is this: while in thought the subject under consideration is resolved into its constituent elements by the discursive faculty, and, therefore, such knowledge is connected with a series of elements that are apprehended successively, an art-work, as an object in space, may be understood at once in the totality of its elements, without division and without succession. In this respect the theology of art differs from dogmatics, for example, since the former would have to do chiefly with intuitive truth, the latter with results of the exercise of the discursive faculty.

But since the Christian Church was founded in the midst of two great opposing systems of religion and philosophy — viz. Heathenism and Judaism — these so-called Christian monuments will often appear of a mixed character. Likewise, in the course of the history of the Church she has been subjected to various attacks of error from within and without. Heresies within the Church, the hostile spirit of philosophy, and the persecuting spirit of the temporal powers, have been potent moulding influences. Hence the complete discussion of "Monumental Theology" would demand a careful estimate of the reciprocal influence of these opposing elements. It would therefore include the examination of those heathen monuments that testify, by their monotheistic character, either of lingering traces of an original divine revelation, or of an expectation of an approaching deliverance, as well as that class of monuments that clearly show the presence and influence of heretical systems in the Church itself.

Chronological Limits. — The principles of Christianity, from its institution to the present time, have evidently exerted a most powerful influence on human thought and life. Art has likewise been affected. While at different periods (e.g. in the Western Church during the invasion of the Northern tribes, and in the iconoclastic struggle of the East) art has suffered terrible catastrophes, it has, nevertheless, ever had a more or less intimate connection with the Christian Church. Hence it is with no sufficient reason that a class of writers (Bingham, Rheinwald, Bohmer, Guericke, and Neander) have limited ecclesiastical monuments and Christian archanology to the chronological bounds of Patristics, i.e., to the first six centuries. More scientific is the view of another class of writers (Baumgarten,  Augusti, etc.), who regard the Reformation of the 16th century as a modern boundary; since by the revival of classical studies, and the introduction of new elements of life, Art was liberated from its servitude to the Church, and found its subjects and inspiration more in nature and the affairs of common life. Nevertheless the highest art must ever find its truest inspiration in the Christian religion, and therefore art monuments must continue to embody much of the Christian thought and spirit of an age. Hence the more recent writers on Theological Encyclopedia (Hagenbach, Rosenkranz, etc.) extend the study of Christian monuments to the present time.

Synoptical View of the Science. — Piper, the chief defender of monumental theology as an independent discipline, presents the following scheme in his Einleitung in die Monumentale Theologie: Since inscriptions and art monuments are the chief subjects examined by monumental theology, these demand a twofold treatment: (a.) An ontological; (b.) a historical. In other words, the subject must be discussed partly according to its essence, as it is a product of intellectual activity exerted on a given material; and partly according to its historical development. And since Christianity is recognised as the chief inspiring motive of these Christian art monuments, another closely related division is necessary, viz. the systematic arrangement and representation of the ideas that have found expression in Christian monuments. Expanded, there would result the following outline:

A. Of the essential nature of Christian art.

1. Of the art faculty.

a. The relation of the Church to art per se. Rise of a Christian art.

b. Relation of Christian art to the art of classical antiquity.

c. Emancipation of art from the Church at the end of the Middle Ages. Relation of Protestantism to art.

2. The artist.

a. Relation of the artist to the Church office:

(1) In Christian antiquity

(2) in the Middle Ages;

(3) since the close of the Middle Ages.

b. The training of the artist:

(1) His relation to the antique;

(2) his relation to nature;

(3) schools and guilds.

c. The individuality of the artist.

3. Art works.

a. The synthetical division

(1) The material and its treatment;

(2) the idea and its embodiment.

aa. The language of art. Symbolism.

bb. Art composition.

b. The analytical division:

(1) Antoptics;

(2) criticism and hermeueutics of art-works

B. History of Christian art and art-works

1. Chronology and geography of art.

2. The various species of art.

a. History of architecture.

b. History of the graphic arts.

3. Art monuments.

a. Civil monuments with Christian characters

(1) Coins;

(2) consular diptychs

b. Private monuments:

(1) Monuments of domestic life-gems, rings, etc.;

(2) sepulchral monuments

c. Ecclesiastical monuments:

(1) Architecture, cemeteries, churches, cloisters;

(2) vessels of the churches;

(3) ornameutation of churches-mosaics, paintings, etc.

d. Monuments of ideal or free creative art

C. Christian art ideas.

1. In architecture: symbolism of architecture.

2. In the graphic arts.

a. The development of the scope and range of Christian representation.

b. The content of Christian representation:

(1) Monumental exegesis;

(2) monumental history of the kingdom of God;

(3) monumental dogmatics and ethics.

c. Practical utility of Christian representations. Explanation and Justification of the foregoing Synopsis. —

(I.) In the first branch,

1. If we discuss the harmony of art with the Christian Church, and its realization therein, the first thing to be examined is the essential nature of that art itself, both generally as a necessary subject of the activity of the human mind, as well as specially how it accords with the genius of Christianity itself. However, the problem here is not the same as in the art archaeology of classical antiquity, since early Christianity holds an entirely different relation to art. It is similar to its relation to philosophy. Neither art nor philosophy was originated by the Church, but both had already passed through all stages of a great development. The Church found art already occupying human thought, and its rise and history are presupposed. By this art the early Christians were as much attracted as repelled. This conditions the dependence of the earliest Christian art on the antiquemost especially in technical treatment, but also to some extent in spirit and motive; so that this comes to be a constitutive element in the discussion, just as in the earliest history of doctrines we must carefully note the influence of the Greek (specially the Platonic) philosophy. On the other hand, the independence of Christian art is shown even in the presence of the antique. Specially those peoples who subsequently appeared upon the stage of history, and received contemporaneously their culture with Christianity, have developed from the first a characteristically Christian art; since the final grounds of art antiquity are found in the nature of man itself, and to these we must at last return. This art activity likewise takes direction among a people to that extent that the period of the perfection of Christian art may be delayed by means of its connection with a development so influenced by the models of antiquity. At the same time another sphere of  art life of universal interest will be liberated, and attain to an independent value. According to this view, the subjects that pertain to the essence of Christian art, as springing from a general art susceptibility, demand a preliminary discussion.

2. The essential nature of art from its objective side discussed, it is necessary to pass to the subjective element, the interest in which part will depend upon the personality — specially the gifts and endowments — of him who devotes himself to the service of art and the Church. In this connection, the first question that meets us is the personal and official relation of the artist to the Church. At the beginning we find the strange contrasts that heathen artists became interested in Christian works of art, while also Christian artists became martyrs. After a period of untrammelled art development had elapsed, at length, during the Middle Ages, both science and art fell under the exclusive superintendence of monks and priests, until the transference of art to the laity introduced the new aera. In this connection must also be discussed the question of the culture of artists, and the diffusion of those important guilds, partly industrial, partly ecclesiastical, by whose means the flourishing period of art in the later mediaeval period was ushered in. Here, as elsewhere, progress is connected with the individual and his work, and the measure of this progress is determined by investigation of the condition of the individual. In the study of the development of doctrines and the organization of the early Church an acquaintance with the Christian fathers is of fundamental importance. In monumental theology, the history of artists corresponds to patristics in the history of doctrines and ecclesiastical polity; yet in an inverse chronological order, since the most noted names of the Christian fathers are found at or near the organization of the Church, while the names of the most renowned masters of art are associated with the conclusion of the Middle Ages and the dawning of the modern epoch., With the exception of a few noted architects, the names of artists hardly appear at all in Christian antiquity. So completely was art merged in the general interest of the Church that individual service is almost forgotten. In the later Middle Ages the guilds effected a like result, so that the names of the architects of those most wonderful works that stand at the very acme of perfection are entirely wanting. Subsequently to the 13th and 14th centuries, however, in the departments of sculpture and painting, the individuality of the artist again asserted itself, and art pursued its high  mission in a most noteworthy union of free endowment and the observance of organic aesthetic laws.

3. The third division has reference to art-creation. An art-work presupposes a material as well as an idea. Each is to be examined by itself, as well as in its combination in the production of a work of art. On the one side is such a moulding of the material as to breathe into it a living soul, and create in it a spiritual presence. This leads to the discussion of the laws of Technics. On the other hand, there is the projection of the idea into form-its embodiment in the material. This gives rise to questions of art composition. This latter involves the laws of the grouping in space of art representations. The first question pertains to the conception of the idea in space, to the successive stages of the transition from spiritual life to corporeity; or, according to the language of art, through what means, and by what law, art expresses thought and feeling. If we examine painting and sculpture, we find this occurs in part directly through historic composition; in part, indirectly through symbolic composition. In symbolic representation, the entire visible world is laid under contribution to aid in this transition to the unseen. When this method is practiced, as in delineations within the sphere of the Church, such means are perfectly legitimate. Hence arise the doctrines of Christian art symbolism, that occupies so wide a field, and, theologically considered, is of such vast significance.

Here is also naturally connected a department to which no certain and well- defined position has hitherto been assigned (since notice has only been taken of it in connection with the art archaeology of classical antiquity); we refer to Christian archaeological criticism and hermeneutics. This is the very reverse of art composition: the latter treating of the transition from the thought and the person of the artist to the execution of his work; the former leading from the art-work back to the thought, purpose, and character of the artist, and to the discovery of the circumstances under which the work was produced.

(II.) The second chief division of the subject — the history of art — treats of the different kinds of art. It remains an open question whether the subject of monuments should be connected directly with this division of the subject or receive an independent treatment. Authorities are divided. To both, however, must there be a preliminary section that shall describe art as a whole in its chronological development. With this also is naturally  connected an account of the geographical distribution of monuments. This would include a description of those in situ, as well as of those that have been artificially distributed or gathered into art collections, both public and private.

(III.) The third division, that treats of art ideas, corresponds in some extent to that which is embraced in the archaeology of classical art, under the head "Subjects of Formative Arts." For theological purposes this is the chief difficulty, and to illustrate this all the other portions are preliminary and subordinate. Architecture, from its very nature, furnishes to this department but a meagre contribution, since here symbolism has not a wide range or application. Much more copious in materials are painting and sculpture, inasmuch as since the 16th century the history of images has been a subject of theological literature.

For a methodical treatment of this subject we must carefully observe the distinction between the historical course that the representation of images has generally taken (in which connection would be discussed the questions what, by what means, and in what spirit such representation has taken place), and the content of such representation (in which latter case the whole range of image representation is to be canvassed and carefully estimated). This subject, being Christian in its nature, has reference partly to the sacred history in its entire extension with Church history, and partly to the supersensuous subjects of faith, as well as the phenomena and motives of moral life. Hence would arise two further divisions, viz. 1, the monumental history of the kingdom of God; 2, monumental dogmatics and ethics. For the illustration of these two departments the whole wealth of monuments that have been preserved would be useful, and their connection as well with the course of history as of dogma would be shown.

At this point would arise yet two other themes of discussion:

(1.) The return from this range of Biblical representations to the text of the Holy Scriptures themselves. Since the subjects of the Bible, in whole or in part,, are found in numerous works of art in all periods of the history of the Church. we are thereby furnished a kind of translation and commentary of the same. This pictorial representation frequently proves more impressive than an oral or written exegesis, since the speaker or writer can pass by what is difficult in the Scriptures or let it remain undetermined, while the artist cannot, but must bring whatever topic he treats distinctly before the perception of himself and others. As, therefore, the artist has to practice a  most searching exegetical avocation, monuments of art are exceedingly rich original sources of information for the interpretation of the Word of God, and also for the related questions of Biblical introduction, viz. the doctrines of the canon and of linguistic usage. Here rests the claim of "Monumental Exegesis."

(2.) The other theme has reference to practical theology. Through the contemplation of a sacred subject present to the beholder, and through the interpenetrating genius of a gifted artist, there is doubtless in Christian art representations a grand power to enkindle and exalt devotional feeling. An art-work, equally with the fleeting word, has its language of eloquence, and is able to convince and to inspire. Hence there is in monuments a practical power that has been used by the Church in all ages for purposes of moral and religious training. The "Lay-Bible," for example, illuminated as it was most copiously, became a most efficient means of the moral education of the masses, who were unable to read the text of the Scripture; and even the cultured have derived almost equal pleasure and profit from these sources, Practical theology, however, does not receive such helpful and constant illustration from monuments as the other chief divisions of theology.

The foregoing are among the chief reasons urged by Piper in justification of the term "Monumental Theology," and for regarding it as an independent discipline equally with "Patristics," " the History of Doctrines," etc. This claim to independence of treatment has been controverted by many eminent modern encyclopaedists, and the question must be regarded as still unsettled.

Literature. — Since "Monumental Theology" includes under it archaeology, art history, epigraphics, and numismatics, its literature would include the literature of these subjects. Specially, see Piper, Einleitung in die Monumentale Theologie (Gotha, 1867, 8vo), who gives the literature from the earliest time; also his article in Herzog's Real-Encyklopadie, 15:752 sq., which is a copious summary. See also Bennett, in the Methodist Quarterly Review (January 1871), page 5 sq., for a brief estimate of some of the most important works on this subject. One of the most interesting fields of monumental theology is found in the early Christian catacombs of Rome, and the results of explorations have been succinctly presented by Withrow, The Catacombs of Rome, and their Testimony relative to primitive Christianity (N.Y. 1874, 12mo). See also Lond Academy, October 1, 1873, page 370; Brit. and For. Ev. Rev.  January 1874, art. 6; Bibliotheca Sacra, volume 94; Meth. Qu. Rev. October 1874, art. 4. (C.W.B.)

## Moodie, William, D.D[[@Headword:Moodie, William, D.D]]

             a Scotch Presbyterian minister, who died June 11, 1811, in the fifty-third year of his age, was one of the ministers of St. Andrew's Church, Edinburgh, from 1787, and professor of Hebrew and Oriental languages in the University from 1793. He was a man of considerable literary acquirements, very popular as a preacher, and the author of several works. A volume of his Sermons has been published, to which is prefixed a biography of the author (Edinburgh, 1813, 8vo). See Fasti Eccles. Scoticance, 1:73.

## Moody, Granville, D.D[[@Headword:Moody, Granville, D.D]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Portland, Maine, January 2, 1812. In 1833 he joined the Ohio Conference, and served as a pastor until 1860, when he became colonel of the Seventy-fourth Ohio regiment. He served until May 1863, when illness forced him to resign. He. again enitered the pastorate, and served as pastor and presiding elder until 1882, when he took a supernumerary relation, which he held until his death, June 4, 1887. See Minutes of Annual Conferences (Fall), 1887, page 366; Appletons' Cyclop. of Amer. Biography.

## Moody, John, D.D[[@Headword:Moody, John, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Dauphin County, Pennsylvania, July 4, 1776. After graduating from Princeton College, in 1796, he studied theology with Reverend James Snodgrass, and was licensed by the Presbytery of Carlisle in 1801. In 1803 he was ordained by the same presbytery pastor of Middle Spring, where he remained: until-his death, in 1857. During the latter years of his life he was unable to perform his ministerial work. He was a laborious, faithful, and successful pastor, See Alexander, Prince Col. 18th Cent.

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

             an American divine of the Congregational Church, was born in 1701. But little is known of his early life. As a minister he was noted for his many eccentricities, but also for his piety, and as a remarkably useful preacher of the Gospel. In his younger years he often preached beyond the limits of his own parish, which was in Maine, and wherever he went the people hung upon his lips. In one of his excursions he went as far as Providence, R.I., where his exertions were the means of laying the foundation of a church. Such was the sanctity of his character that it impressed the irreligious with awe. He also with importunate earnestness pleaded the cause of the poor, and was very charitable himself. It was by his own choice that he derived his support from a free contribution, rather than a fixed salary; and in one of his sermons he mentions that he had been thus supported twenty years, and yet had been under no necessity of spending one hour in a week in care for the world. Some remarkable instances of answers to his prayers, and of correspondence between the event and his faith, are not yet forgotten in York. The hour of dinner once came, and his table was unsupplied with provisions; but he insisted upon having the cloth laid, saying to his wife he was confident that they should be furnished by the bounty of God. At this moment some one rapped at the door, and prevented a ready-cooked dinner. It was sent by persons who on that day had made an entertainment, and who knew the poverty of Mr. Moody. He published several of his discourses. See Sullivan, Maine, page 238; Allen, Biographical Dictionary, s.v.; Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, volume 2.

## Moody, Joshua[[@Headword:Moody, Joshua]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in Wales in 1633. His father migrated to this country, and settled at Newbury, Massachusetts, in 1635, and Joshua was educated at Harvard College, class of 1653. There had been no regular clergyman in Portsmouth, N.H., previous to 1658, in which year he began to preach, and a church being formed in 1671, he was ordained pastor. In 1684 Cranfield, the governor, had him unjustly imprisoned for nonconformity with the Church of England rites, and after a confinement of thirteen weeks he was set free, but commanded to cease preaching in the province. Going to Boston, he became the assistant in the First Church,  and was also invited to take charge of Harvard University, but he declined the last-named offer, and in 1692 returned to his charge at Portsmouth. During the witchcraft troubles in 1692 he had opposed the unjust and violent measures towards the imagined offenders, and aided Philip English and his wife to escape from prison. His zeal in this matter caused his dismissal from his church, and he retired from the ministry. He died in 1697. He published, A practical Discourse concerning the choice Benefit of Communion with God in his House, witnessed unto by the Experience of Saints as the best Improvement of Time, being the Sum of several Sermons on Psa 84:10, preached at Boston on Lecture Days (Boston, 1685 and 1746, 12mo): — A Sermon on the Sin of Fornmality in God's Worship, or the Formal Worshipper proved a Liar and Deceiver, preached on the Weekly Lecture in Boston from Hos 2:12; and two or three occasional sermons. See Cotton Mather's Funeral Sermon, Magnolia, 4:192-199; Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1:160; Drake, Dict. of Amer. Biog. s.v.

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

             an American divine of some note, was born at Newbury, Massachussetts, January 4, 1676; was educated at Harvard College, where he graduated in 1697; then entered upon the special study of theology, and December 29, 1700, was ordained to the sacred ministry in the Congregational Church at York, Me., where he died, November 13, 1747. Like his namesake, Joseph, who flourished very near his time, he was eccentric, though also a very useful man. He also refused a stated salary, and( depended altogether upon voluntary contributions, many of which were spent upon the poor and the needy. He published, The Doleful State of the Damned (1710): — Judas Hung up in Chains (1714): — Election Sermon (1721): — Life and Death of Joseph Quasson, an Indian (1729). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors s.v.; Drake, Dict. of Amer. Biog s.v.; Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, volume 2.

## Moody, Samuel S[[@Headword:Moody, Samuel S]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. was born in Powhattan County, Virginia, May 1, 1810; was converted in 1828, joined the ministry in the Tennessee Conference, and held the following appointments: 1831, Lebanon Circuit; 1832, Sandy Circuit; 1833, Nashville Station; 1834, Memphis Station; 1835, Florence Station; 1836,  Montgomery Circuit; 1837, Lebanon District; 1839, Murfreesborough District; was transferred to the Memphis Conference in 1841, and appointed to Jackson District; in 1842 to Memphis Station; in 1843 to Jackson Station; was transferred back to the Tennessee Conference in 1844, and appointed to Murfreesborough Station; in 1845, 1846, and 1847, to Huntsville District, and in 1848 to Nashville District. In the fall of 1850 failing health obliged him to take a supernumerary relation, and, after years of wasting affliction, he died May 5, 1863. "The older members of this Conference will long cherish the memory of his many virtues, and class him among the brightest and best as more universally beloved; indeed, the virtues of this holy man will live in the memories of thousands as long as life shall last. He never had an enemy. Our Church has seldom produced so pure a specimen of our holy religion." See Min. Ann. Conf. M.E. Church, South, 2 (1858-65), 546.

## Moon[[@Headword:Moon]]

             ( יָרֵחִyare'ach, so called from its paleness; Chald. יְרִח, yerach', Ezr 6:15; Dan 4:26; poetical לְבָנָה, lebanah', the white, Son 6:10; Isa 24:23; Isa 30:26; Gr. σελήνη), the lesser of the two great celestial luminaries. SEE ASTRONOMY.

1. It is worthy of observation that neither of the terms by which the Hebrews designated the moon contains any reference to its office or essential character; they simply describe it by the accidental quality of color. Another explanation of the second term is proposed in Rawlinson's Herodotus, 1:615, to the effect that it has reference to lebenah, "a brick," and embodies the Babylonian notion of Sin, the moon, as being the god of architecture. The strictly parallel use of yareach in Joe 2:31 and Eze 32:7, as well as the analogy in the sense of the two words, seems a strong argument against the view. The Greek σελήνη, from σέλας, expresses this idea of brilliancy more vividly than the Hebrew terms. The Indo-European languages recognised the moon as the measurer of time, and have expressed its office in this respect, all the terms applied to it — μήν, moon, etc.-finding a common element with μετρεῖν, to measure, in the Sanscrit root ma (Pott's SEym. Forsch. 1:194). The nations with whom the Hebrews were brought into more immediate contact worshipped the moon under various designations expressive of its influence in the kingdom of nature. The exception which the Hebrew language thus presents would appear to be based on the repugnance to nature-worship  which runs through their whole system, and which induced the precautionary measure of giving it in reality no name at all, substituting the circuitous expressions "lesser light" (Gen 1:16), the "pale," or the "white." The same tendency to avoid the notion of personality may perhaps be observed in the indifference to gender, yarmiach being masculine, and lebanah feminine. See below.

2. The moon held an important place in the kingdom of nature as known to the Hebrews. In the history of the creation (Gen 1:14-16) it appears simultaneously with the sun, and is described in terms which imply its independence of that body as far as its light is concerned. Conjointly with the sun, it was appointed "for signs and for seasons, and for days and years;" though in this respect it exercised a more important influence, if by the "seasons" we understand the great religious festivals of the Jews, as is particularly stated in Psa 104:19 ("He appointed the moon for seasons"), and more at length in Sir 43:6-7. Hence, as a measure of time among the Israelites. a lunation was the period of their month; and many of their festivals were on the new moon, or on one of its quarterly phases (Sir 43:6 sq.; comp. Sohar in Gen. fol. 236). SEE MONTH.

This was especially the case with the Passover, their chief festival (see Bihr, Symbol. 2:639). SEE PASSOVER. Besides this, the moon had its special office in the distribution of light; it was appointed "to rule over the night," as the sun over the day, and thus the appearance of the two founts of light served "to divide between the day and between the night." In order to enter fully into this idea, we must remember both the greater brilliancy of the moonlight in Eastern countries, and the larger amount of work, particularly travelling, that is carried on by its aid. The appeals to sun and moon conjointly are hence more frequent in the literature of the Hebrews than they might otherwise have been (Jos 10:12; Psa 72:5; Psa 72:7; Psa 72:17; Ecclesiastes 12:2; 24:23, etc.); in some instances, indeed, the moon receives a larger amount of attention than the sun (e.g. Psa 8:3; Psa 89:37). The inferiority of its light is occasionally noticed, as in Gen 1:16; in Son 6:10, where the epithets "fair" and "clear" (or, rather, spotless, and hence extremely brilliant) are applied respectively to moon and sun; and in Isa 30:26, where the equalizing of its light to that of the sun conveys an image of the highest glory. Its influence on vegetable or animal life receives but little notice; the expression in Deu 33:14, which the A.V. refers to the moon, signifies rather months as the period of ripening fruits. The coldness of the night-dews is  prejudicial to the health, and particularly to the eyes of those who are exposed to it, and the idea expressed in Psa 121:6 ("The moon shall not smite thee by night") may have reference to the general or the particular evil effect: blindness is still attributed to the influence of the moon's rays on those who sleep under the open heaven, both by the Arabs (Carne's Letters, 1:88) and by Europeans. If this extreme (comparative) cold is considered in connection with the Oriental custom of sleeping sub divo, out of doors, a la belle etoile, on the flat roofs of houses, or even on the ground, without in all cases sufficient precautionary measures for protecting the body, we see no difficulty in understanding whence arose the evil influence ascribed to the moon. In the East Indies similar effects result from similar exposure. The connection between the moon's phases and certain forms of disease, whether madness or epilepsy, is expressed in the Greek σεληνιάζεσθαι (Mat 4:24; Mat 17:15), in the Latin derivative "lunatic," and in our "moon-struck." The various influences anciently attributed to the moon in her different phases (Pliny, 2:102), not only in changes of the weather (Varro, R.R. 1:37; Virgil, Georg. 1:275, 427; comp. Hos 5:7; Isa 47:13), but also in physical effects upon the human system (Macrob. Sat. 7:16; comp. Psa 121:6), is a superstition (Horat. Ars Poet. 5:454; Virgil, En. 4:512) still very prevalent in the East (Rosenmuller, Morgenl. 4:108), and has not even ceased among modern Occidentals (comp. Hone, Every-day Book, 1:1509; Shakespeare, Mids. N. D. 2:2; Othello, 5:2), although science has shown that this planet has no specific influence either upon meteorology or health. See Hayn, De Planetar. in Corp. hum. Influxu (Frckf. 1805); Kretschmar, De Astror. in Corp. hum. Imperio (Jena, 1820); Raschig, De lunae imperio in valetud. coip. hum. nullo (Vit. 1787); Krazenstein, Einfluss des Mondes in d.m. Kirp. (Halle, 1747); Reil, Archiv f. Physiol. 1:133 sq. SEE LUNATIC.

3. The clearness of the Oriental atmosphere early led to the worship of the heavenly bodies (Herod. 2:47; Strabo, 12, page 557; Pliny, 8:1, etc.), among which the moon received special honors (Job 31:26; comp. Julian, Orat. in Salem. page 90), as the most conspicuous object of the nocturnal firmament (comp. Deu 4:19; Deu 17:3; 2Ki 23:5; Jer 8:2; see Selden, Dii Syr. 1:239 sq.). If the sun "rules the day," the moon has the throne of night, which, if less gorgeous than that of the sun, is more attractive, because of a less oppressively brilliant light, while her retinue of surrounding stars seems to give a sort of truth to her regal state, and certainly adds not inconsiderably to her beauty. There is to the  same effect a remarkable passage in Julian (Orat. in Salem. page 90): "From my childhood I was filled with a wonderful love for the rays of that goddess; and when, in my boyhood, I directed my eyes to her ethereal light, I was quite beside myself. By night especially, when I found myself under a wide, pure, cloudless sky, I forgot everything else under her influence, and was absorbed in the beauties of heaven, so that I did not hear if addressed, nor was aware of what I did. I appeared solely to be engaged with this divinity, so that even when a beardless boy I might have been taken for a star-gazer." Accordingly the worship of the moon was extensively practiced by the nations of the East, and under a variety of aspects. In Egypt it was honored under the form of Isis, and was one of the only two deities which commanded the reverence of all the Egyptians (Herod. 2:42, 47). In Syria it was represented by that one of the Ashtaroth (i.e., of the varieties which the goddess Astarte, or Ashtoreth, underwent) surnamed "Karnaim," from the horns of the crescent moon by which she was distinguished. SEE ASHTORETH.

In Babylonia it formed one of a triad in conjunction with Ether and the sun, and, under the name of Sin, received the honored titles of "Lord of the month," "King of the gods," etc. (Rawlinson's Herodotus, 1:614). There are indications of a very early introduction into the countries adjacent to Palestine of a species of worship distinct from any that we have hitherto noticed, viz. of the direct homage of the heavenly bodies —sun, moon, and stars — which is the characteristic of Sabianism (q.v.). The first notice which we have of this is in Job (Job 31:26-27), and it is observable that the warning of Moses (Deu 4:19) is directed against this nature-worship, rather than against the form of moon-worship which the Israelites must have witnessed in Egypt. At a later period, however, the worship of the moon in its grosser form of idol-worship was introduced from Syria: we have no evidence indeed that the Ashtoreth of the Zidonians, whom Solomon introduced (1Ki 11:5), was identified in the minds of the Jews with the moon, but there can be no doubt that the moon was worshipped under the form of an image in Manasseh's reign, although Movers (Phonie. 1:66, 164) has taken up the opposite view; for we are distinctly told that the king " made an asherah (A.V. 'grove'), i.e., an image of Ashtoreth, and worshipped all the host of heaven" (2Ki 21:3), which asherah was destroyed by Josiah, and the priests that burned incense to the moon were put down (2Ki 23:4-5). At a somewhat later period the worship of the "queen of heaven" was practiced in Palestine (Jer 7:18; Jer 44:17). The title has generally been supposed to belong to the moon (comp. Horace, Carm.  Sac. 35; Apuleius, Metam. 2, page 254), but some think it more probable that the Oriental Venus is intended, for the following reasons:

(1) the title of Urania "of heaven" was peculiarly appropriate to Venus, whose worship was borrowed by the Persians from the Arabians and Assyrians (Herod. 1:131, 199);

(2) the votaries of this goddess, whose chief function was to preside over births, were women; and we find that in Palestine the married women are specially noticed as taking a prominent part;

(3) the peculiarity of the title, which occurs only in the passages quoted, looks as if the worship were a novel one; and this is corroborated by the term kavvan (כִּוָּן) applied to the "cakes," which is again so peculiar that the Sept. has retained it (χαυών), deeming it to be, as it not improbably was, a foreign word. Whether the Jews derived their knowledge of the "queen of heaven" from the Philistines, who possessed a very ancient temple of Venus Urania at Ascalon (Herod. 1:105), or from the Egyptians, whose god Athor was of the same character, is uncertain. SEE QUEEN OF HEAVEN.

The moon was regarded in the old Syrian superstition as subject to the sun's influence, which was worshipped as the active and generative power of nature, while the moon was reverenced as the passive and producing power. The moon, accordingly, was looked upon as feminine. Herein Oriental usage agrees with our own. But this usage was by no means universal. The gender of mond in German is an exception in modern days, which may justify the inference that even among the Northern nations the moon has masculine qualities ascribed to it. By the people of Carran, in Mesopotamia, the moon was worshipped as a male deity, and called Lunus. Spartian tells us these people were of the opinion that such as believe the moon to be a goddess, and not a god, will be their wives' slaves as long as they live; but, on the contrary, those who esteem her to be a god will ever be masters of their wives, and never be overcome by their artifices. The same author tells us that there were remaining several medals of the Nysaeans, Magnesians, and other Greek nations, which represented the moon in the dress and under the name of a man, and covered with an Armenian bonnet. The Egyptians also represented their moon as a male deity, Ihoth; and Wilkinson (Anc. Egypt. 5:5) remarks that "the same custom of calling it male is retained in the East to the present day, while  the sun is considered feminine, as in the language of the Germans. Ihoth, in the character of Lunus, the moon, has sometimes a man's face, with the crescent of the moon upon his head supporting a disk." Plutarch says the Egyptians "call the moon the mother of the world, and hold it to be of both sexes: female, as it receives the influence of the sun; male, as it scatters and disperses through the air the principles of fecundity." In other countries also the moon was held to be hermaphrodite. Another pair of dissimilar qualities was ascribed to the moon — the destructive and the generative faculty — whence it was worshipped as a bad as well as a good power. The Egyptians sacrificed to the moon when she was at the full. The victims offered to her were swine, which the Egyptians held to be impure animals, and were forbidden to offer them to any other deities but that planet and Bacchus. When they sacrificed to the moon, and had killed the victim, they put the end of the tail, with the spleen and fat, into the caul, and burned them on the sacred fire, and ate the rest of the flesh on the day of the new moon. Those whose poverty would not admit of the expense of this sacrifice moulded a bit of paste into the shape of a hog, and offered up that (Herodotus, 1:2). In India this goddess bore the name of Majra; among the Syrians, Mylitta; among the Phoenicians, Astarte or Ashtoreth; among the Greeks, Artemis; and among the Romans, Diana (see Bithr, Synbol. 1:436 sq., 478; 2:222, 232). In these nations, however, the moon was usually the representative of the benign or prolific power of nature. See Carpzov, Apparat. page 510; Frischmuth, De Melecheth Cceli (Jen. 1663); A. Calov, De Selenolatria (Vit. 1680). SEE ASTROLOGY.

In the Western world also the moon has been, and continues even now to be worshipped or superstitiously regarded. In Europe there are several countries in which untold superstitious acts are performed, depending upon the moon's rotation (see Brand, Popular Antiquities of Great Britain, Index in volume 3). In Great Britain and the Northern wilds the moon is placed highest in the scale of nature-worship. In America the wild man, like other heathen, both of civilized and barbarous races, has been long accustomed to the thought that all the heavenly bodies are possessed of animation, and even gifted with some measure of intelligence. To each, accordingly, has been ascribed an independent, vitalizing soul. The sun- god, for example, is the living sun itself, and worship is never paid to it symbolically, as if it were the representative of some invisible or absent spirit, but because it is an actual depository of the supersensuous, an embodiment of the divine. As the sun stands for the Creator, so the moon  is connected, as in Babylonian mythology, with the thought of some evil principle. Says Miller (Anzerikanische Urreligionen), "The rude American was haunted by the thought of some co-equal and coordinate array of hostile deities, who manifested their malignant nature by creating discord, sickness, death, and every possible. form of evil. These were held in numerous cases to obey the leadership of the moon, which, owing to its changeful aspects, have become identical with the capricious. evil-minded spirit of American Indians" (page 53; comp. 170, 272; comp. also Brinton, Myths of the New World, pages 130-140). In Africa moon-worship prevails to a considerable extent, and is spoken of by Livingstone (Travels in South Africa, page 235).

4. In the figurative language of Scripture the moon is frequently noticed as presaging events of the greatest importance through the temporary or permanent withdrawal of its light (Isa 13:10; Joe 2:31; Mat 24:29; Mar 13:24): in these and similar passages we have an evident allusion to the mysterious awe with which eclipses were viewed by the Hebrews in common with other nations of antiquity (comp. Jer 13:16; Eze 32:7-8; Rev 8:12). With regard to the symbolic meaning of the moon in Rev 12:1, we have only to observe that the ordinary explanations, viz. the sublunary world, or the changeableness of its affairs, seem to derive no authority from the language of the O.T., or from the ideas of the Hebrews.

## Moon Or Lunette[[@Headword:Moon Or Lunette]]

             (Isa 3:18). SEE TIRE.

## Moon, New[[@Headword:Moon, New]]

             SEE NEW MOON.

## Moor, Michael[[@Headword:Moor, Michael]]

             a Roman Catholic divine, who flourished in England from 1640 to 1726, was a native of Dublin, Ireland, and spent some time in France, at one time filling the post of principal of the College of Navarre. In England he was regius professor of philosophy, Greek, and Hebrew. He wrote, De Existentia Dei et Humana Immortalitate (Paris, 1692, 8vo): — Hortatio ad Studium Linguce Grcecae et Hebraicae (1700, 12mo): — Vera Sciendi Methodus (Paris, 1716, 8vo) against the philosophy of Des Cartes. See  Harris's Ware's Ireland, s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Moor, Thoroughgood[[@Headword:Moor, Thoroughgood]]

             a missionary of the Anglican establishment to the "Iroquois or Praying Indians," flourished near the opening of the 18th century, in the vicinity of the place now known as Albany, the capital of the state of New York. Mr. Moor arrived in New York from England in 1704, and, after a stay at Albany long enough to acquire the Indian tongue, he at once set out upon his work, and for many years labored among the Iroquois. His success was limited because of the opposition manifested by lord Cornbury, at that time governor of the New York and New Jersey colonies. Moor for some time braved all opposition, but, encountering the ill-will of the governor, he was incarcerated, and after his escape from prison went to sea, and was lost on his homeward voyage. See Anderson, Hist. Col. Ch. 3:415 sq.; Hawkins, Hist. page 264 sq., 271, 281.

## Moore, Aaron[[@Headword:Moore, Aaron]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Ohio April 2, 1813; joined the Church when about twenty years old, was admitted into the Louisville Conference in 1846, and remained a regular minister of the Gospel, filling many important appointments with great acceptability until the fall of 1859, when, his health failing him, he accepted a superannuated relation, and retained it till the time of his death, which occurred in Madisonville, Kentucky, October 15, 1863. See Min. Ann. Conf: M.E. Church, South, 1 (1858-65), 481.

## Moore, Benjamin, D.D[[@Headword:Moore, Benjamin, D.D]]

             a bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born at Newton, N.J., and was educated at King's (now Columbia) College, New York, where he graduated in 1768, and then devoted his time to the study of theology, supporting himself by private instruction in Greek and Latin. In May 1774, he went to England to enter into holy orders, and in June of that year was ordained deacon and priest by the bishop of London, and on his return to America officiated in Trinity Church, New York, of which he became rector, December 22, 1800. The extent of Dr. Moore's labors, and his popularity in this position, were beyond all precedent, and when, in 1801, the diocese needed a bishop, he was elected and consecrated. He was also  made president of Columbia College in this year, and so remained until 1811, continuing all the while the duties of his ministry, and even until his death, February 27, 1816. From 1811 to the hour of his death, Dr. Hobart, who afterwards succeeded him, acted as his assistant bishop, bishop Moore having been struck with paralysis, and thus disabled from discharging any longer the duties of his office. Bishop Moore was an accomplished scholar and an able pulpit orator. He was, with one single exception, the last of the venerable men in the diocese of New York who had derived their ordination from the parent Church of England. He published two sermons in the American Preacher (volumes 1 and 2, 1791): — A Sermon before the General Convention (1804): — A Pamphlet in Vindication of Episcopal Services (2 volumes, 8vo). His Posthumous Sermons were published under the direction of his son, Clement C. Moore, LL.D. (N.Y. 1824, 2 volumes, 8vo). See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 5:299; Bishop White, Memoirs of the Episcopal Church (1836), page 32; Moore, Hist. of Columbia College; Anderson, Hist. of the Colonial Church, 3:611 sq.; Drake, Dict. of Amer. Biog. s.v. (J.H.W.)

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

             a clergyman of the English Establishment, eldest son of archbishop Moore, was educated first at Westminster School, and next at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he took his degrees and obtained a fellowship. He flourished in the second half of the last century, first as rector of Cuxton, in Kent, then as vicar of St. Nicholas at Rochester, and latex as one of the six preachers of the cathedral of Canterbury. He wrote, A Visitation Sermon preached before his Father (1785, 4to): — A full Inquiry into the Subject of Suicide (1790, 2 volumes, 4to): — The good Effects of a united Trust in the Arm of the Flesh and the Arm of the Lord a Sermon (1804, 8vo): — Female Compassion illustrated, a Sermon (1806, 8vo): — Personal Reform the only effectual Basis of National Reform, a Sermon (1810, 8vo). See Biog. Dict. of Living Authors (Lond. 1816, 8vo), page 239.

## Moore, Clement Clarke, LL.D[[@Headword:Moore, Clement Clarke, LL.D]]

             an American scholar, noted for his knowledge of exegetical theology, son of Benjamin Moore, was born in New York July 15, 1779; was educated at Columbia College, class of 1798; then entered on the special study of Hebrew, and after a while secured the appointment as professor of Biblical literature in the Protestant Episcopal Seminary, New York; in 1821 was  transferred to the chair of Hebrew and Greek literature, and later to Oriental and Greek literature. While in connection with the "General Seminary" of his Church, as it came finally to be known, he donated to it the large plot of ground upon which its buildings now stand. In 1850 he received the title of: emeritus professor, and lived to take an interest in the institution he had served so many years, and so acceptably, until July 10, 1863, his death occurring at Newport, R.I., whither he had gone to spend the summer recreating. To Dr. Moore belongs the honor of having published the first American contributions to Hebrew philology, viz. a Hebrew Lexicon, with Notes, a Grammar, and a complete Vocabulary of the Psalms (N.Y. 1809, 2 volumes, 8vo). He also published his father's sermons, and contributed valuable works to the department of belles-lettres (for which see Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.). See Drake, Diet. of Amer. Biog. s.v.

## Moore, Franklin, D.D[[@Headword:Moore, Franklin, D.D]]

             a minister of note of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born February 14, 1822, in Beaver, Pennsylvania. In quite tender years he was converted and though his father, who was a lawyer and eminent at the bar, wished him to choose the legal profession as his life-calling, his mind drifted beyond all persuasion towards the ministry. In preparing for this work he studied at Washington College, in Washington, Pennsylvania, and also at the Presbyterian Theological Seminary in Alleghany City, and graduated from both institutions with honor. In 1845 the Pittsburgh Conference held its annual session in the place of his nativity, and during the session he, having shortly after his conversion joined the Methodist Church, was received into the travelling connection, and appointed to Chartiers Circuit. The next year he was sent to Steubenville, and in 1847 he was received into full connection and ordained deacon. He was stationed at New Lisbon, Ohio. In 1849 he was ordained elder, and stationed at Uniontown, Pa.; in 1851 and 1852 he was in Washington, Pennsylvania; and in 1853 and 1854 on Uniontown District. He was transferred in 1855 to the West Virginia Conference, then called Western Virginia Conference, and stationed for two years at Fourth Street, in Wheeling. At the close of his term of service in that station he was transferred to the Philadelphia Conference, and there filled the following appointments: in 1857 and 1858, Trinity Church, Philadelphia; in 1859 and 1860, Wharton Street Church, Philadelphia; in 1861 and 1862, Harrisburg; in 1863 and 1864, Union Church, Philadelphia; in 1865 a supernumerary, but doing work a part of the year; in 1866 in  Thirty-eighth Street Church, but still a supernumerary; in 1866 and 1867, Pottsville; and in 1869 he was finally placed on the superannuated list, his failing health making further duties in the ministry impossible. He was suffering from laryngytis, and was counselled by physicians to go South. He visited Florida, but, finding no relief, then went to California, and died there Jan. 22,1870, in the city of Sacramento. Dr. Moore was widely known among Methodists for his sweetness of spirit, his devout and genial life, and his earnest services in the ministry of the Church. "His life," says the Pittsburgh Christian Advocate, "embraced more of excellences than usually falls to the lot of man. Unassuming, gentle, loving, true as steel, thoroughly conscientious, he moved through society a centre and source of the very best Christian influences. Around him grew up, as one result, some of the most enduring affections." During his travels he wrote for the Church papers, and filled the place of corresponding editor of the Philadelphia Home Journal. His letters were largely circulated, and much admired for their beauty of description. His love of nature was such that he levelled in woodland scenes, in quiet dells and unbroken forests, in towering hills and mountains, in broad and picturesque valleys, in the changing hues of foliage and flowers; and no weariness did he ever seem to know in descanting upon these themes. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1870, page 48; Methodist Home Journal, January 29, 1870; Pittsburgh Christian Advocate, February 5, 1870. (J.H.W.)

## Moore, George C[[@Headword:Moore, George C]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Barre,Vermont, in 1832. He was educated in the State University, Burlington, Vermont, and became a member of the legal profession. In 1858 he removed to Texas, commenced teaching at Goliad, and soon after was called to take charge of Aranama College in that city. Becoming very much impressed with the spiritual desolation of Texas, he removed to Clinton in that state, and entered upon the study of theology under the care of the Reverend Joel T. Case; was licensed and ordained in 1865, and became pastor of the churches in Victoria and Lavaca, Texas. He was a member of the General Assembly which met in Memphis, Tennessee, in 1866. On his return he continued his labors until his death, September 3, 1867. Mr. Moore was remarkable for his piety, general intelligence, and impressive manner of preaching. His sermons were rich in thought and unction, and he was quite successful as an educator. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1868, page 345.

## Moore, George W[[@Headword:Moore, George W]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Charleston, S.C., September 27,1799. He was converted in 1819, was licensed to preach in 1823, and continued in the itinerancy until about 1855, when he entered the mission-field, and labored among the colored population of South Carolina. He died in the Anderson District, S. C., Aug. 16, 1863. See Min. Asnn. Conf. M.E. Church, South, 2 (1858-65), 449.

## Moore, Hannah[[@Headword:Moore, Hannah]]

             SEE MORE, HANNAH.

## Moore, Henry (1)[[@Headword:Moore, Henry (1)]]

             SEE MORE, HENRY.

## Moore, Henry (2)[[@Headword:Moore, Henry (2)]]

             a Wesleyan preacher and writer of considerable note, and an associate of the founder of Methodism, was born in Dublin, Ireland in 1751. He had heard Wesley in his childhood, and had at once become impressed with the preacher's bearing and earnestness. On removing to London he often attended the preaching of Madan and Charles Wesley, and the religious impressions of his early childhood were renewed; yet he failed to identify himself with the Methodists until, after his return to Ireland, he heard Smyth, a nephew of an archbishop, who had left friends and position to preach the simple Methodist theology. This "good man," as Moore himself delighted to call him persuaded Moore finally to cast his lot with the Wesleyans. His family opposed the step, but Moore persisted, and he was even permitted to introduce domestic worship among them. He at once gave himself to the work. He visited the prisons, braving fever and pestilence, and the still harder trial of agonizing sympathy with felons condemned to the gallows. After a while he was induced to exhort, and in a short time to preach, His audience gathered in a deserted weaver's shop, which was furnished for the purpose with seats and a desk. He soon gathered the masses, and in a very brief period had an organized society of twenty-six members. He was zealous in good works, and rich in his personal religious experiences. Wesley's attention was called to Moore, and in 1780 he ordered him to take the field as an itinerant of the Londonderry  Circuit. He soon progressed in his work, and finally Wesley called him to London, where he became the constant companion of the great religious reformer of the 18th century. The two men of God met together in the morning at five o'clock to answer letters; they travelled together, and Moore became the counsellor of the Connection.

Wesley himself had so high an estimation of Moore's talents and character that he endeavored to procure him ordination in the national Church; and, when disappointed in this, he himself set Moore aside for the sacred work, assisted by two presbyters of the establishment, Peard Dickinson and James Creighton. Visiting Ireland now and then, he helped to build up the interests of Methodism in that country. Indeed, one of the principal Methodist chapels in Dublin now stands a monument of his successful labors in the Irish capital. Like the other Methodist preachers, Moore frequently addressed the people in the open air, and shared the usual persecutions of his ministerial brethren. When the controversies arose in the Wesleyan Connection on Church polity, Moore proved himself worthy of the trust reposed in him by Wesley. Conservative by nature, he had so carefully cultivated his judgment as to make a competent counsellor for the Methodist body, and to his untiring efforts the successful issue of the conferences and controversies from 1791 to 1797, resulting in the definite outlines of a Wesleyan polity, are largely due (see Wesleyan Magazine, 1845, page 314; Smith, History of Wesleyan Methodism, volume 2, Append. 9; Life, by Mrs. Smith, ann. 1794, page 164). Wesley's estimate of Moore is especially manifest in the fact that he suffered Moore to be a witness to his conference with the lady of his early affection, who, when the Christian laborer in his eightyfifth year happened to be near her, had sent word for his presence (Stevens, Hist. of Methodism, 2:406); and also in his appointment of this companion of his youth as one of the trustees of his manuscripts and books. Moore's love for Wesley is manifest in the biography which he furnished of the founder of Methodism in conjunction with Dr. Coke (q.v.). Henry Moore lived to be "the last survivor of the men whom Wesley had ordained;" and by his pen and his preaching " promoted Methodism through nearly seventy years, and died in his ninety- third year April 27,1843, its most venerable patriarch" (Stevens). Besides a Life of John and Charles Wesley and the Family (1824, 8vo), Moore published, Private Life and Moral Rhapsody (1795, 4to): — Reply to a Pamphlet entitled "Considerations on a Separation of the Methodists from the Established Church" (1794, 8vo): — Memoir of Henry Fletcher. See Life of Rev. Henry Moore, by Mrs. Richard Smith (daughter of Adam  Clarke) (Lond. 1844, 8vo); Stevens, History of Methodism, 2:190 sq.; 3:52, 56, 75; Smith, History of Wesleyan Methodism, volume 1, book 2, chapter 5-7; Tyerman, Life of Wesley, volume 3 (see Index). (J.H.W.)

## Moore, Henry Eaton[[@Headword:Moore, Henry Eaton]]

             an American composer of music, both sacred and secular, was born at Andover, N.H., July 21, 1803, and took up the study of music while engaged in the printing business. In 1826 he began to teach it, and then published several valuable contributions to the science of this fine art, among which are of interest to us, N.H. Coil. of Ch. Music: — Collect. of Anthems, Choruses, and Set Pieces: — The Northern Harp, a Collection of Sacred Harmony. He died at East Cambridge, Massachusetts, October 23, 1841. A brother of his, John Weeks Moore, who was born at Andover April 11, 1807, has published A Cyclop. of Music: — Sacred Minstrel; etc. See Drake, Dict. of Amer. Biog. s.v.

## Moore, Humphrey, D.D[[@Headword:Moore, Humphrey, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in Princeton, Massachussetts, about the year 1779; graduated at Harvard College in 1799; in 1802 was ordained pastor of the Congregational Church in Milford, where he preached for a period of more than thirty years. He died April 8, 1871. Dr. Moore was a man of more than ordinary ability, and his influence extended widely throughout the southern portion of iNewv Hampshire. Appleton's Annual Cyclop. 1871, page 572,

## Moore, Jacob[[@Headword:Moore, Jacob]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Sussex Co., Del., in 1791; was converted while young; entered the Philadelphia Conference in 1815; was presiding elder of the West Jersey District in 1823-4; on Chesapeake District in 1825-6; and died at Dover, Del., April, 1828. He was a pious and exemplary minister, a vigorous and successful student, and abounded in labors and usefulness, in spite of ill-health and great discouragements. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 2:39.

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

             an early minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Tyrone County, Ireland, in 1760; joined the Methodists in 1786; migrated to America in 1792, and joined the Philadelphia Conference in 1794. For  forty-eight years he was a faithful and useful minister, particularly gifted in exhortation. He died at Medford, N.J., May 11, 1842. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 3:355.

## Moore, James G[[@Headword:Moore, James G]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born near Johnsonburg, N.J., November 30, 1813. At the age of eleven years he was apprenticed to a tailor in Newton, N.J.; during his apprenticeship was converted, and, through the influence of his pastor, was persuaded to turn his attention to the ministry. He graduated at Lafayette College, Easton, Pennsylvania; studied theology at Princeton, N.J.; was licensed and ordained pastor of the church at Beaver Meadow, Pa., in 1845; shortly after resigned this charge for a Dutch Reformed Church at Montague, N.J., where he remained until 1849, when he took charge of the academy at Blairstown, N.J., under the patronage of the Presbyterian Church. Close confinement broke down his health, and in 1851 he removed to Croton Falls, N.Y., and took charge of a small select school. In 1853 he moved West, to try a change of climate, but all in vain; he died near Philadelphia, Marion County, Missouri, May 28, 1858. Mr. Moore was a man of decided piety. The great desire of his soul was to preach the Gospel. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1860, page 76.

## Moore, James Lovell[[@Headword:Moore, James Lovell]]

             a clergyman of the Church of England, who flourished near the beginning of this century, was successively master of the free school at Hertford and vicar of Benger, in Hertfordshire, also incumbent of the perpetual curacy of Denham, Suffolk. He wrote, View of the External Evidence of the Christian Religion (1791, 8vo): — On the Plenary Inspiration of the New Testament (1793, 8vo): — The Columbiad, a Poem (1793, 8vo): — Commentaries on the Corruptions of the Roman Catholic Religion (1811,12mo). See Biog. Dict. of Living Authors (London, 1816,12mo), page 239.

## Moore, John (1), D.D[[@Headword:Moore, John (1), D.D]]

             a noted prelate of the Anglican communion, was born at Market Harborough, Leicestershire, near the middle of the 17th century. He was educated at Clare Hall, Cambridge, where he graduated in 1665, and became a fellow of the college. Afterwards he was appointed chaplain to the earl of Nottingham, whose interest secured Moore the first prebendal  stall in the cathedral church of Ely. His next preferment was the rectory of St. Austin's, London, to which he was admitted in 1687. Two years later he was presented by William and Mary (to whom he was then chaplain in ordinary) to the rectory of St. Andrew's, Holborn, vacated by Dr. Stillingfleet's promotion to the episcopate; and in 1691, on the deposition of the bishop of Norwich, Dr. Moore was appointed to that see, from which he was in 1707 transferred to the see of Ely. He died in 1714. Debary (Hist. of Ch. of Engl. from the Accession of James II [Lond. 1860, 8vo], page 235) speaks of Dr. Moore as "a man of considerable celebrity in his day, but now better remembered for his connection with the fortunes of Dr. Samuel Clarke and Bentley than for his once famous discourses from the pulpit." His Sermons, which were published after his death by his chaplain, Dr. Samuel Clarke (Lond. 1715-16, 2 volumes, 8vo; 2d ed. 1724), were translated into the Dutch. His library, which was a very valuable collection, was purchased by king George I and presented to the University of Cambridge. See Burnet, Reformation; id. His Own Times; Bentham, Ely; Birch, Life of Tillotson; Blackwood's Mag. 28:455; Hook, Eccles. Biog. s.v. (J.H.W.)

## Moore, John (2), D.D[[@Headword:Moore, John (2), D.D]]

             a noted prelate of the Church of England, was born of very humble parentage, at Gloucester, in 1733, and was educated at Pembroke College, Oxford. He took holy orders; and after filling various minor appointments in the Church, he became chaplain to the duke of Marlborough, and tutor to one of his sons, and obtained by that interest a prebendal stall in the cathedral of Durham; in 1771 he was installed into the deanery of Canterbury; in 1776 was awarded the bishopric of Bangor; and in 1783 was raised to the metropolitan see, recommended to this great distinction by bishops Lowth and Hurd, both of whom had been offered the place, but preferred that it be assigned to bishop, Moore, whom they esteemed as a superior man, particularly fitted "by his business-like habits and affable manners." It does not appear, says Perry (Hist. of Ch. of Engl. 3:444, 445), that he possessed any special literary or theological claims, nor yet can it be believed that his advancement was due to strong family interest, for he had none to commend him. He died in 1804 or 1805. He published several Sermons (Lond. 1777, 4to; 1781, 4to; 1782, 8vo). (J.H.W.)

## Moore, John (3)[[@Headword:Moore, John (3)]]

             a clergyman of the Church of England, who flourished about the opening of this century, was minor canon of St. Paul's, lecturer of St. Sepulchre's, rector of St. Michael Barrisham, London, and of Langdon Hills, Essex. He in vain endeavored to secure public aid for the publication of an edition of bishop Waldon's Ecclesiastical History of London. He was a learned man and an excellent preacher. He published, Case of the London Clergy (1802, 8vo): — Attempt to Recover the Reading of 1Sa 13:1, with Inquiry of the Duration of Solomon's Reign (1797, 8vo): — Prophetiae de LXX Hebdonadis ap. Danielumn explicatio (1802, 8vo): — Prophecy of Isa 7:14-15 (1809, 8vo). See Biog. Dit. of Living Auth. s.v.

## Moore, John L., D.D[[@Headword:Moore, John L., D.D]]

             a pioneer Baptist minister, was born in Lewis County, N.Y., February 17, 1803. He was converted at the age of twenty-two; graduated from the Hamilton Institute in 1831; vas ordained the same year at Watertown; visited and preached in several of the larger towns of Ohio, under the direction of the Home Mission Society; and in 1834 settled in Piqua, in that state, spending half his time with a new church at Troy. Next he was pastor at Dayton for two years, and then, for eight years, was in the service of the Ohio Convention, acting a part of the time as an agent of the college at  Granville, now Denison University. After a short pastorate in Springfield, he devoted himself to promoting the interests of the theological seminary at Fairmount.: In 1855 he became an exploring missionary in Ohio, and finally gave up public life, preaching occasionally. He died in Topeka, Kansas, January 23, 1878. See Cathcart, Baptist Encyclop. page 812. (J.C.S.)

## Moore, John Weeks[[@Headword:Moore, John Weeks]]

             SEE MOORE, HENRY EATON.

## Moore, Martin[[@Headword:Moore, Martin]]

             a Congregational minister of some note as a religious journalist, was born at Sterling, Massachusetts, April 22, 1790; was educated at Brown University, where he graduated in 1810; and for nearly thirty years served in the ministry at Natick, Massachusetts, and afterwards at Cohasset; and then was for some twenty years editor of the Boston Recorder. He was also from 1861 to 1866 vice-president of the "New England Historical and Genealogical Society." Moore died at Cambridge, Massachusetts, March 12, 1866. — He wrote Life of John Eliot (1842): — Hist. of Natick (1817). See Drake, Dict. of Amer. Biog. s.v.

## Moore, Nathaniel F., LL.D[[@Headword:Moore, Nathaniel F., LL.D]]

             an American educator of note, was born at Newtown, Long Island, December 25, 1782, and was the nephew of bishop Benjamin Moore (q.v.). Educated at Columbia College. class of 1802, he turned to the bar as his life-work; but in 1817 was induced to take the adjunct professorship in Greek and Latin, and in 1820 was given the full chair, which he held until 1835, when he went to Europe. On his return, in 1837, he was made librarian. In 1839 he again went to Europe, and this time travelled also in the Orient. In 1842 he was made president of his alma mater; and he served in that capacity until 1849, when he retired to private life. His works are of a secular character, and do not concern us here; but his life-work was  eminently Christian and greatly enriched American Christian culture. He died April 27, 1872. Dr. Moore was a man of rare scholarly attainments, and was greatly beloved for his gentle nature and purity of character. See Duyckinck, Cyclopedia of American Literature, 1:380-383.

## Moore, Philip[[@Headword:Moore, Philip]]

             a clergyman of the Anglican communion, noted for his pulpit oratory and his scholarship, flourished in the second half of the 18th century. He was born about 1709, was for some time rector of Kirkbridge, and chaplain of Douglas, Isle of Man, and died January 22, 1783. He is noted as the reviser of the translation of the Bible into Manks, in which task he had the counsel of bishop Lowth and Dr. Kennicott, and also as the translator of the Book of Common Prayer, and several theological works. See Butler, Memoirs of Bp. Hildesby, page 186; General Biog. Dict. (Lond. 1798), 11:61.

## Moore, Richard Channing, D.D[[@Headword:Moore, Richard Channing, D.D]]

             an early bishop of the Episcopal Church in America, was born in New York August 21, 1762; was educated at King's College, and then practiced medicine for four years, when he suddenly turned towards the ministry, and was ordained by bishop Provoost of New York in 1787. He preached at Rye, Westchester County, N.Y., and then at St. Andrew's, Richmond, Staten Island (the parish embracing the whole of the island), where he labored successfully for twenty-one years. In 1808 he represented the diocese of New York at the General Conference in Baltimore, and aided in making a selection of hymns for the Church. In 1809 he succeeded to St. Stephen's Church, New York; in 1814, to the rectorship of the Monumental Church at Richmond, and to the episcopate of Virginia, for which he proved himself preeminently qualified. "Bishop Hobart hesitated not to express the conviction of his thankful heart that the 'night of adversity had passed, and that a long and splendid day was dawning on the Church" (Anderson, Hist. Ch. of Engl. in the Colonies, 3:277). The efforts of bishop Moore were "unremittingly exerted to build up the nearly exhausted diocese committed to his care; and so well directed were his labors, and so beneficial his example and influence, that at the time of his death the number of the Episcopal clergymen in Virginia had increased to upwards of one hundred. During the last twelve years of his life his episcopal duties were shared by bishop Meade, who had been appointed his assistant, and who succeeded him in office. He was a prominent leader in  the evangelical branch of the Church." He died November 11, 1841. He published many Charges: — A Sermon on "the Doctrines of the Church" (1820). A Memoir appeared shortly after his death, by Reverend J.P.K. Henshaw (1843, 8vo). See also Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, v, 367; Bishop Wilberforce, Hist. Am. Ch. pages 286, 293; Hawks, Eccl Hist. of Virginia, page 251-260. (J.H.W.)

## Moore, Sir Thomas[[@Headword:Moore, Sir Thomas]]

             SEE MORE, THOMAS.

## Moore, Smith William, D.D[[@Headword:Moore, Smith William, D.D]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born November 1, 1818, in North Carolina. He was converted in 1837, and entered Randolph-Macon College in 1838, but was obliged to leave a few months before graduation. He then taught school in Tennessee for two years, preaching in the meanwhile, and joined the Tennessee Conference in 1844, when he was ordained deacon. From 1849 to 1852 he was professor n the Female Institute at Athens, Alabama, when he was elected president, which position he resigned in 1853 to accept the vice-presidency of La Grange College. After a few months he resigned this position, and being transferred to Memphis Conference, became president of Bascom Female Seminary, a position he retained several years. One year he was agent of the Book and Tract Society, and at the same time one of the editors of the conference paper, Christian Advocate. In 1866 he was appointed president of Andrew College at Trenton, Tennessee, where he continued four years. The remainder of his life was given to the itinerancy, his last appointment being Central Church, Memphis, in 1879. He died at Brownsville, September 2, 1880. Dr. Moore was a polished scholar, skilled theologian, and faithful Christian. His preaching was clear, strong, instructive, and impressive. He was generous, kind, studious, prayerful, laborious, pure in heart, chaste in speech, consistent in life, catholic as well as evangelical, and profoundly earnest as a minister of the gospel. See Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M,E. Church South, 1880, page 167.

## Moore, Thomas Jefferson[[@Headword:Moore, Thomas Jefferson]]

             a minister of note of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Franklin, Kentucky, March 2, 1824. His parents were useful and devoted members of the Methodist Church. His father died when Thomas was but twelve years of age, and he was obliged to shift for himself. He learned the art of printing, and thus earned a livelihood. In his eighteenth year (1841) he was converted and joined the Church, and soon after felt that his calling was to preach the Gospel. He was licensed, and appointed to the Owensboro Circuit in 1843. In 1845 he was ordained deacon, and appointed to Litchfield, and the next year to Henderson Circuit. In 1847 he was ordained elder, and appointed to Salem Circuit. The next year he travelled on the Lafayette Circuit, and the following year on the Hopkinsville Circuit. After a year's rest he resumed his labors on the Lebanon Circuit, where he remained for two years; he then went to the Jefferson Circuit for one year, and afterwards preached two years with great success on the Logan Circuit. He was next appointed agent of the Southern Methodist Book Concern and Tract Society, and he so ably discharged the obligations of his office as to largely increase the influence of the institution. He met with great success — preaching, raising funds, or circulating books. The next year he was appointed to the Franklin Circuit, and the following year he was made presiding elder of the Glasgow District. His last work was on the Logan District. He died September 14, 1867. Mr. Moore was a preacher of no ordinary ability. He was a diligent student, possessing a clear perception and a retentive memory. He was well versed In the doctrines and history of the Bible and of the Church. See Min. Ann. Conf. M.E. Church, South, 1867, page 163.

## Moore, Thomas Verner, D.D[[@Headword:Moore, Thomas Verner, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Newville, Pennsylvania, February 1, 1818. He graduated from Dickinson College in 1838; became agent for the Pennsylvania Colonization Society; graduated from Princeton Theological Seminary in 1842; was ordained pastor at Carlisle the same year; was settled at Greencastle in 1845; the First Church, Richmond, Virginia, in 1847; editor of the Central Presbyterian, and pastor of First Church, Nashville, Tennessee, in 1869, and died there, August 5, 1871. He was  moderator of the General Assembly in 1867. His chief published works are, Commentary on ,Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi (N.Y. 1856): — Evidences of Christianity: — Occasional Sermons. His contributions to religious journals were numerous. See Genesis Cat. of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1881, page 124; Nevin, Presb. Encyclop, s.v.

## Moore, Zephaniah Swift, D.D[[@Headword:Moore, Zephaniah Swift, D.D]]

             a noted American educator and Congregational minister, was born November 20, 1770, in Palmer, Massachusetts; graduated at Dartmouth College in 1793; entered the ministry February 3, 1796, and was made pastor at Leicester, Mass. He was elected professor of languages at Dartmouth College in 1811, and president of Williams College in 1815. In 1821 he was chosen first president of Amherst College, then just founded, and he occupied this position until his death, June 30, 1823. He published an Oration at Worcester, July 5, 1802: — An Address to the Public in respect to Amherst College (1823); and two occasional Sermons. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 2:392; Drake, Dict. of Amer. Biog. s.v.

## Mooring, Christopher S[[@Headword:Mooring, Christopher S]]

             an early Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Surrey County, Virginia, in 1767; entered the Virginia Conference in 1789; and died September 30, 1825, having preached with excellent success until called to his future home. He was distinguished for modesty, gravity, and faithfulness; always ready to teach and to preach, and many souls were converted through his labors. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1:507.

## Moors[[@Headword:Moors]]

             (Lat. Marui, meaning dark; Span. Moros), the original designation of the inhabitants of the ancient Mauritania or Morocco (q.v). The Arabs, who entered and conquered this country in the 7th century, denominated the native population Moghrebins, i.e., "Westerners," or "men of the West," but they called themselves Berbers, while to the Europeans they were known as Moors. The Arabic language, customs, and manners soon came to prevail among the Berbers; and the Arab conquerors, who gave them the Mohammedan faith, freely amalgamating with them, their character was totally changed, and they became hardly distinguishable from their conquerors; and under Moors we now generally understand the mixed races that arose in the 7th century, when the Saracens wrested North Africa from the Byzantine empire, and incorporated it with the caliphate of Damascus. The Moors were distinguished by the warlike spirit which was then common among the Mohammedan nations, and at an early period began to make inroads for plunder into Spain. A battle with the Visigoths of that country took place in A.D. 672, in which they were defeated with  considerable loss; but an opportunity which favored their designs occurred when, during a rebellion which in A.D. 710 placed Roderic, duke of Cordova, on the Spanish throne, the defeated party called in the aid of the Moors. A force of them, led by Taric, entered in the following year, and at the battle of Xeres de la Frontera, near Cadiz, July 11, 711, the army of the Goths, under king Roderic, was almost entirely destroyed, while the death of Roderic himself, who was killed in the battle, put an end to the dominion of the Goths. Muza, the governor of North Africa, jealous of the success of Taric, now advanced with a new army, and took Cordova and Toledo, and within five years subdued the greater portion of the peninsula to his power. Receiving re-enforcements from Africa, he even crossed the Pyrenees, twenty years later, and advanced as far as Bordeaux and Tours. Here, however, the invaders were defeated by Charles Martel in the battle of Poitiers, and they recrossed the Pyrenees, never to return. The defeat not only drove the Moors from the Continent, but forever after confined them to the Iberian peninsula; and even here the inhabitants of Asturia. Galicia, and the Basques successfully resisted their dominion.

Also in the parts in which the African invaders had successfully established themselves, internal divisions, which soon arose among the chiefs, together with insubordination towards the caliph of Africa, often brought them near an overthrow, until after the extinction of the family of the Ommiades, when Abderahman I, the last representative of the Ommiade caliphs, who had escaped from Damascus on the subversion of that dynasty in A.D. 752, brought about the consolidation of the government with the caliphate of Cordova, and annulled its previous dependence on the caiiphate of Damascus. Under this new government order and prosperity revived. Abderahman changed the laws, regulated the administration, built a fleet, and provided for the instruction of the people. His residence was established at Cordova, where he built a magnificent mosque. His successors, and particularly Abderahman III and Alhakem II, followed his example; and under the dynasty of the Ommiades Spain became the equal in civilization and learning of any country in Europe. It seemed as if the Arabs had only been transplanted to Spain to enable them to acquire the high intellectual culture which was unknown in the East. But while they advanced in civilization, they gradually lost the warlike qualities which had enabled them to make their conquest, and the oppressed Spanish Christians came to look forward to the time when they could throw off the yoke and regain their nationality. The flourishing period of the reign of the Ommiades lasted until the 10th century, the whole period covering the  brightest page of Moorish history.

After holding for 282 years the caliphate of Cordova, the Ommiade family became extinct in 1037 in the person of Hesham III, who, on account of the insubordination of his subjects, retired from the government in 1031, to devote himself to science and literature. With his retirement the caliphate of Cordova also ended; and the territory was divided into a number of little states, the governors erecting themselves into hereditary and independent princes, and they severally wasted their strength in internecine wars, interrupted only occasionally by an alliance for mutual defence when the Christians threatened their very existence. The latter had not in the mean time remained stationary. By A.D. 801 Charlemagne had definitely incorporated the territory north of the Ebro with the Frankish dominions, and the Moors were driven out of Catalonia. They then retained simply the provinces of Leon and Castile. But even there the Arab population was greatly diminishing; and when in 1085 the Castilians succeeded in taking Toledo, and the Tagus became the frontier of Christian Spain, the Arabs clearly saw their dominion seriously threatened, and, for centuries broken up and scattered, now became more united, and finally resolved to call Jussuf, of the family of the Almoravides, who had established a great empire in Africa, to assist them against the king of Castile. Jussuf arrived in 1086 with a numerous army, and promptly defeated the Christians at Zalacca, but was obliged to return to Africa to defend his possessions there. He came back soon afterwards, however, and all the Moors of Spain remained united under his government. After his death, in 1106, a second period of internal ruptures followed. Abdelmumen, chief of the Almohades, a family opposed to the Almoravides, came from Africa with a large army, and, taking Cordova and Granada in 1157, established for a while its supremacy. Whenever the Arabs were at peace with each other, the surrounding Christian princes thought it their duty to attack these enemies of the cross. Unity having been in a measure restored by the Almoravides, the archbishop Martin of Toledo invaded Andalusia in 1194, and laid the country waste; the following year king Alphonso III of Castile sent a challenge to Africa to the governor, Jacob Almansor, who, in return, came to Spain with a large army, and defeated Alphonso, July 19, 1195.

Thirty thousand Christians, including the most distinguished Spanish knights, were left slain on the field of battle. Almansor fortunately died soon after, and his successors had neither the spirit nor the means to follow up his advantage. The Christians now perceived the necessity of combined action on their part also, and pope Innocent III caused a crusade to be preached against the Moors, both  in Spain and in France. In the wars which ensued the Christians proved successful, and completely routed their adversaries in the battle of Las Naves de Tolosa, on the Sierra Morena, July 16, 1212, and by this result brought about the termination of the rule of the Moors in Spain; so that a tract of land, comprising 430 square miles, in the vicinity of Granada, alone remained free from Christian rule. The Aragonians took Valencia, a part of Murcia, and the Balearic Islands; the Castilians took Estremadura, Cordova, and the remaining part of Murcia; even Granada was compelled in 1246 to surrender to king Ferdinand of Castile. Yet this province retained a sort of independence on account of its position, and its almost completely Moorish population. The position of the Arabs varied greatly in the different conquered provinces; but to the shame of the so-called Christians of the Iberian peninsula be it said that generally it was much worse than had been that of the Christians under the rule of the Moors. The Goths, after the conquest, under Moorish rule, had remained in possession of their lands; their taxes were made no higher than those which rested on the Moors subject to military services; they retained their religion, their worship, their laws, and their judges. The bishops, with their chapters, occupied their former position, and were allowed to call together councils. They were only forbidden building new churches, ringing bells, and having processions. The civil government was intrusted to a civil magistrate appointed by the people, who was to act with the bishop. Lawsuits between Christians were to be adjusted by the cadi according to the Gospel and the Gothic laws, and only disputes between Christians and Arabs were judged by the Koran. The Christians who under these circumstances had endured Mohammedan rule received the name of Mozarabic Christians. SEE MOZARABIC LITURGY.

The military classes ever remained entirely distinct, and in constant communication with their brethren at the north, acting secretly as their allies whenever they invaded the Moorish provinces, The Arabs under Christian rule, on the other hand, were in quite different conditions, and even the concessions granted them were seldom conscientiously observed. They were generally allowed to follow their own mode of worship, but often excessive proselytizing zeal created exceptions, and converted the mosques into churches. They were allowed to retain possession of their estates, but were seldom permitted to sell them, or to change their residence. They were suffered to elect their own judges, and only disputes with Christians were decided by Christian judges. They were obliged to pay tithes of all their income to the state, besides the poll-tax levied by their feudal lords. They were forbidden  having slaves or Christian servants; but this was the fate only of those who had submitted to the Christians. Those whose cities had resisted and been conquered were all reduced into slavery in its severest form. The master could sell, punish, or kill them at his pleasure, and all their earnings were his by law. They could, however, obtain their freedom by becoming Christians; but in after-times even this was restricted to the case when the master was either a Mohammedan or a Jew. By their conversion the Arabs were indeed endowed with all political rights, but by no means could they attain to the same social position as the old Christians; they were everywhere despised, and could seldom enter into other Christian families. A relapse into Islamism was punished with the greatest severity, the penalty being, according to the circumstances, death by fire, spoliation, and inability to inherit. Occasionally, however, the relations between Moors and Christians were more friendly, especially in the country, where landowners fully appreciated the skill and activity of the Arabs as agriculturists. Among the nobility, the Arab nobles, by their courage and skill, as well as by their learning — much superior to that of their Spanish conquerors — knew also how to command respect.

All the Arab learning, art, industry, and fortune gradually centred in Granada, which succeeded in maintaining its political autonomy until about the end of the 15th century. A small sea-coast province of not over 430 square miles, it arrived — partly owing to its situation, and more particularly to the zeal and industry of its inhabitants — at a degree of prosperity which other and larger countries might well have envied. But its principal glory was the city of Granada, its capital, which in the 14th century counted 200,000 inhabitants. It contained the world-renowned palace of the Alhambra — a sort of fortress in which 40,000 people might find refuge. (See a popular and accurate account in Prime, Ahambra and Kremlin, 1874, 12mo.) Its principal feature is the so-called Lions' Court, built in 1213-38, which is considered as the finest specimen of Moorish architecture. It was the residence of the kings of Granada, which vied in splendor with those of the most favored European monarchs, and where many a Christian prince was entertained with bountiful hospitality.

Next in rank to Granada were the sea-towns of Almeria and Malaga, distinguished for their manufacturing and commercial importance as well as for the beauty and richness of their palaces. There the finest kinds of silken fabrics and steel-work were produced as far back as the 12th century, and from thence exported to Italy and to the East. But its very prosperity only  increased the greed of the neighboring Christian princes, and especially of Ferdinand and Isabella; and, unfortunately for the Moors, one of their own rulers-the reigning king of Granada, Muley-Abul-Hakem -himself voluntarily broke the peace with Castile by refusing to pay the tribute. At first he haughtily declared that the mint of Granada no longer coined gold, but only steel. A few years afterwards he went so far as to seize on the frontier fortress of Zahara by treachery, and took the whole population as slaves to Granada. In reprisal, a Spanish knight, with a determined band of warriors, stormed the city of Alhama, the summer residence of the king of Granada.

The king of Granada himself left for Fez, and died soon after ill battle in the service of another prince, showing a courage which he had not exhibited in the defence of his own country. In the mean time a revolution broke out in Granada, occasioned by the jealousy of the queen against a rival, and resulted in Muley's oldest son being called to the throne, while Muley himself was obliged to retire to Malaga. A younger brother of his, El Zagal (the courageous), having surprised the Christian army in a narrow pass and destroyed it entirely, king Ferdinand now determined to wage war for the extermination of both. He improved this opportune moment of their dissensions, and first marched against Granada with all his forces, and in 1487 besieged Malaga, which was compelled by famine to surrender on the 18th of August. El Zagal, looking upon the fall of Malaga as an omen, surrendered Almeria, and left for Africa. The young king, Abdallah (generally named Boabdil), had promised to submit when Almeria was taken. but the inhabitants of Granada would not hear of submitting; they trusted to the strength of their fortifications, consisting of strong walls and 1030 towers. The summer of 1491 was spent by both armies in single combats, which have been the subject of numerous romances and tales. But Granada was destined to fall — the more after the Christians had erected opposite Granada a rival fortified city, Santa Fe. The king, certain of being unable to resist, began secretly to negotiate with the Spaniards, and the terms of surrender were settled November 25, 1491. The conditions were such as might have satisfied the inhabitants of Granada had they been observed.

They were to retain possession of their mosques, and to be allowed to follow their own religious worship; their own laws were to be administered by their own cadis, under the oversight of the Spanish governor; they were to retain their own customs, language, and dress, and to have the free and unlimited use of all their property; those who preferred leaving the country were to be furnished ships to take them to Africa. The taxes to which they would be subjected should not exceed those which  they paid under their own government. King Abdallah was to retain his estates, and to administer them under the supervision of the Spanish authorities. The city was on these terms surrendered (January 2, 1492) to the Spaniards, who made a triumphal entry; but shortly after the capitulation the Moors found that they had surrendered their rights to the conquerors, and were in danger of losing much, more than they had granted. The finest houses in Granada were occupied by the Spanish noblemen; a converted Moor (such, according to the terms of surrender, were not to hold any official situation) was made chief alguazil, and the largest mosque was changed into a church. The most zealous members of the Romish Church were advising that the Moors should be made to choose between baptism and banishment. But this unwise counsel did not at first prevail. Count de Tendilla and the archbishop Fernando de Talavera, who were at the time governors of the province, sought by mild treatment to unite the Moors with the Spaniards; the archbishop especially was so successful with them by his kindness that large numbers consented to be baptized by him.

This system of conversion, however, appeared too slow to the fanatical party, and the archbishop of Toledo, cardinal Ximenes (q.v.), obtained from the grand inquisitor an authorization to establish an Inquisition among the Elches (Christians who had embraced Islamism; most of them were baptized Moors), and this gave him the means of gradually monopolizing the work of converting the Moors. He set to work, not only by preaching, but also by bribery, and he was at first so successful that thousands were baptized. But this awakened the opposition of the most earnest believers in Mohammedanism. This opposition Ximenes thought to subdue by imprisonment and other severities against their priests; and, in order to strike at the root, he caused all the copies of the Koran and all Arab works of theology to be seized. It is said that he thus collected 80,000 (?) works. He then caused them to be publicly burned. These proceedings led, as he had expected, to an outbreak, directed chiefly against himself. Count Tendilla and the archbishop of Talavera, however, succeeded in quelling the insurrection by promising that the grievances complained of would be inquired into. A capitulation was drawn up, which needed only the royal sanction. Ximenes, whose conduct had at first been sharply blamed by Isabella, had, however, succeeded in converting both her and the king to his views; and the capitulation, for which count Tendilla had given both his wife and children as hostages, was rejected by the king. A royal edict was  even proclaimed leaving the Moors to choose between being baptized and punishment for high-treason. Some 50,000 of the inhabitants of Granada sought peace by submitting to baptism; others sold their possessions and emigrated to Africa.

The Moors who became Christians received now the name of Moriscoes. But the manner in which the inhabitants of Granada had been treated led to an insurrection in the mountains of the district of Alpujarras. The energetic measures taken to repress that outbreak seemed at first successful; but an attack, in 1500, on the mountains of Serrena de Bonde, almost entirely inhabited by Moors, proved disastrous to the Spaniards; one of their best generals, Alonso de Aguilar, was killed, and his army destroyed. The Moors, however, were at last obliged to submit. A large number emigrated to Africa; others were baptized, stipulating for nothing of their former rights but their dress, language, and exemption from the Inquisition for forty years. This was granted them, but soon evaded; no tribunal of the Inquisition was, indeed, established at Granada, but that of Cordova extended its jurisdiction over Granada. Nine years later another remnant of Mohammedan Moors were forcibly Christianized in the same manner. and baptized en masse in 1526. In the same year a tribunal of the Inquisition was finally established at Granada, and on the 7th of December a proclamation appeared forbidding the Moors from wearing their national dress, or using their national language and their Arab names. But the very next day the Moors purchased the recall of that decree for a sum of 260,000 ducats; this was subsequently several times renewed. The Moors were also, in spite of the treaties concluded with them, subjected to several heavy taxes; so that, besides paying tithes to the Church, they had to pay tithes to the king, and a tax for breeding silk-worms.

Aside from their outward compulsatory profession of Christianity, which the vexatious treatment they experienced at the hands of the Christians did not tend to make them like any the more, they were at heart firmly attached to the old religion, and grew more attached to it in proportion as they suffered for it. They retained the mosque beside the church, had their alfaki as well as their Romish priests, circumcised their children after they were baptized, celebrated their marriages according to Mohammedan customs, etc. At times this was winked at. Thus in the latter part of the reign of Charles V the Moriscoes were left in peace; Philip II expressly commanded the Inquisition to show great mildness and toleration towards them, and even a papal bull was promulgated to that effect. But when, during the war with the piratical Moors of Barbary, it was found out that the Moriscoes  had always remained in communication with their African brethren, they became again the objects of persecution. They were forbidden to carry arms without a special authorization, under a penalty of six years of hard labor in the galleys. This gave rise to numerous insurrections, which finally settled into a war of ambush and assassination, and the government was thereby forced to restore the former more rigorous system. After trying other means, Philip II was finally brought to issue a proclamation (November 13, 1556), in which the use of Arabic either in speaking or writing, that of Arab names, and of the national costume of the Moors, even that of their usual baths, was forbidden them; three years were given them to learn Spanish, and those who after that time should contravene these commands were to be punished, according to circumstances, by imprisonment or banishment. This proclamation, against which the Spanish governor of Granada and many Spanish statesmen (among them the duke of Alba) emphatically protested, was nevertheless enforced by the advice of a cardinal and an archbishop. The first result was an insurrection, organized in secret, with the aid of the Moors of Africa, which broke out in the spring of 1568, and at once assumed the character of a war of extermination. The war continued with various vicissitudes — the Moors rising up again when they were thought to have been thoroughly subjected for several years, until finally, after the assassination of the second leader of the insurgents, Aben-Abi (March 18, 1571), the war ended.

The kingdom of Granada, previously the most populous and richest province of Spain, had now become a desolate desert, with here and there a few bands of Moors supporting themselves by robbery amid the ruins of its former splendor. The greater number of Moors were transplanted into other provinces, where they were strictly watched. The use of the Arabic language or of any article of their national dress, the dancing an Arab dance or playing on an instrument suspected to be of Arab origin, were punished as crimes. Only those Moors more anciently settled in Valencia were allowed a little more liberty. Yet, in spite of oppression and watching, the Moriscoes after a few years began to contemplate again a revolt-the more as Spain was then weakened by her war in the Netherlands, and threatened both by France and England.

They opened negotiations with France, and in 1605 a vast conspiracy was organized, relying on the assistance of the French. It was, however, betrayed, and the grand inquisitor now clamored that the Moriscoes should either be sent out of Spain or destroyed by the sword. Although Philip III, who was then on the  throne, did not wish to accede to so general a measure, and even the pope declined to favor it, yet, as this step seemed to be the only possible means of securing tranquillity to the state, the king issued a proclamation (August 4, 1609) banishing the Moriscoes of Valencia to Africa. The landed nobility, who foresaw the loss of their best farmers, and the clergy that of their tenants, protested in vain, and grand preparations were made to secure the execution of the edict. A delay was granted the Moors for the regulation of their affairs; they were not allowed to sell their land, and could only take away so much of their personal property as they could carry off themselves. At first the Moors offered to pay enormous sums to obtain the recall of that edict; but afterwards, when they had time to reflect, and saw that nothing was to be done, their sorrow changed to joy; they looked upon their exile as a liberation from slavery, in which they could cast aside their mask of Christianity.

The emigration proceeded well at first, the nobility even helping the poor people by purchasing their property at a fair price. But this did not suit the Viceroy, who forbade such purchases being made. The Moors now became again frightened, and those of the south of Valencia, who had not yet emigrated, rose in arms. Many were killed, the others very cruelly treated. The emigration from Murcia and Andalusia succeeded better, most of the Moriscoes from those provinces taking refuge in Fez. Those of Aragon, Castile, and Estremadura were ordered to Navarre, but on the frontiers were informed by the French that they had strict orders not to allow them to penetrate into the country. Exasperated, they either fought their way through or purchased permission to enter. Those of Catalonia were directed to Africa. A small remnant of about 30,000, who had been permitted to stay on exhibiting certificates from their bishops testifying to their sound Christianity, were also driven away a few years later, and left Spain in 1612 and 1613.

The whole number of persons thus forced to emigrate is generally reckoned at about a million, and consisted largely of the most active and industrious among the inhabitants of Spain. Those who had emigrated to Africa were at first well received, but subsequently persecuted also by their own coreligionists, whom their European views and habits displeased, and who were jealous of their skill as workmen; so that they were driven out of Algiers and Fez. Only at Tunis, whose inhabitants were mostly descendants of the Moors of Granada, did they find a really hospitable shelter. A small remnant of Moriscoes, some 60,000 in number, remained concealed in the valleys of the Alpujarras, and have to this day retained their peculiar manners and customs, but they have long since become earnest Roman Catholics. See  Conde, Historia de la Dominacion de los Arabes enl Espanna (Madrid, 1820-21, 3 volumes; Engl. transl., Hist. of the Dominion of the Arabs in Spain, by Mrs. Jonathan Foster [London, 1855, 3 volumes, 12mo, Bohn's Library]); Moron, Curso de historia de la Civilizacion de Espanna (Madrid, 1841-3, 3 volumes); Aschbach, Gesch. d. Ommajaden in Spanien (Frankf.-ain-Main, 182,9, 2 volumes); id. Gesch. Spaniens u. Portugals z. Zeit d. Herrschaft d. Almoraviden u. Almohaden (Frankf. 1833-7, 2 volumes); Von Rochau, Die Moriskos in Spanien (Leips. 1853); Herzog, Real Encyklopadie, 9:183 sq.; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, 6:933 sq.; Prescott, Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella; Dozy, Gesch. der Mauren in Spanien bis zur Eroberung Andalusiens durch die Almoraviden (7111110) (Leips. 1873-5); Hallam, History of the Middle Ages (student's ed.), pages 237-43; Ticknor, Spanish Literature, 3:389 sq.; Southern Review (Jan. 1874), art. 2; and especially the seventeen articles by Prof. Coppee on the "Moorish Conquest of Spain," in the Penn Monthly of 1873 (Phila.). SEE MOROCCO.

## Moosias[[@Headword:Moosias]]

             (Μοοσίας, Vulg. Moosias), a Graecized form (1Es 9:31) of the MAASEIAH SEE MAASEIAH (q.v.) of the Heb. text (Ezr 10:30).

## Moph[[@Headword:Moph]]

             SEE MEMPHIS.

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

             a learned French ecclesiastic, was born at Rheims in 1685; took the vows of a Benedictine in 1703 at the monastery of St. Farom, where he had been educated, and largely devoted himself to literary labors. After having assisted Didier in his edition of Tertullian, he was summoned to Paris about the year 1715 by his superiors, and was there associated with father Peter Constant in preparing his collection of the Lettres des Popes. The first volume of this work was published in 1721 (fol.), with a dedication to Innocent XIII, and a preface by Mopinot; and he was preparing to print a second volume when he was attacked by a violent dysentery, of which he died in 1724.

## Mopsuestia, Church Council Of[[@Headword:Mopsuestia, Church Council Of]]

             (Concilium Mopsuestauomi), was held June 17, 550, by order of the emperor Justinian, on account of the troubles excited by the Three Chapters (q.v.). There were in attendance nine bishops. Examination was made whether the name of Theodore of Mopsluestia was to be found in the diptychs of that church, and, if not, whether it had been there within the memory of man. It appeared from the testimony of irreproachable witnesses far advanced in years that his name had either never been inserted, or had been erased before their time. Notice of this was sent to the pope and the emperor.

## Moquamo[[@Headword:Moquamo]]

             a designation of the temples or chapels of the inhabitants of the island of Socotra, on the coast of Africa. These islanders are idolaters, and worship the moon as the parent of all things. The moquamos are very small and low. They have three little doors, and in order to enter any one of them a person must stoop almost to the ground. In each of them is an altar, on which are deposited several sticks formed like flower-de-luces, which have something of the resemblance of a cross. Every moquamo has a priest, called hodanzo, who is annually chosen, and the general insignia of office are a staff and cross, which he must not presume to give away on any pretence whatever, or suffer any person to touch on pain of losing one of his hands. The usual time set apart for divine service in these chapels is when the moon sets, or when she rises. They then strike a certain number of blows on a long staff with a shorter one, and walk around the chapel three times. This ceremony is accompanied with an oblation of some odoriferous wood, put in an iron basin, which hangs by three chains over a large fire. After this the altar is incensed three times, and the doors of the temple as often, and the devotees make the most solemn vows and earnest supplications to the moon. In the mean time the hodamo sets on the altar a lighted taper made of butter, and besmears the crosses and other utensils with this favorite grease. On certain days they make a solemn procession around the temple, when one of the chief men of the country carries a sacred staff. After the procession is over very singular honors are paid him. See Broughton, Biblioth. Historica, s.v. SEE SOCOTRA.

## Mor[[@Headword:Mor]]

             SEE MYRRH.

## Morabites[[@Headword:Morabites]]

             a Mohammedan sect found chiefly in Africa. They were founded about the 8th century by Mohaidin, the last son of Hossein, who was the grandson of Mohammed. They live in sequestered places, like monks, either separately or in small communities; are very licentious in their habits, and follow many practices utterly opposed to the Koran.

## Moraht, Adolph[[@Headword:Moraht, Adolph]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born November 28, 1805, at Hamburg. He studied at Halle and Gottingen, and for nine years acted as teacher at his native place. In 1838 he was deacon at Molln, in the duchy of Lauenburg, in 1846 pastor, and died December 6, 1884. He published, Versuch einer Methodik des Religionsunterrichtes (2d ed. Merseburg, 1833): Harfenklange, eine Sammlung christlicher Gedichte (Luneburg, 1840), besides a number of sermons. See Zuchold,Bibl. Theol. 2:903; Koch, Geschichte desdeutschen Kirchenliedes, 7:296. (B.P.)

## Moral Ability[[@Headword:Moral Ability]]

             SEE INABILITY.

## Moral Agency[[@Headword:Moral Agency]]

             SEE WILL.

## Moral Attributes[[@Headword:Moral Attributes]]

             SEE GOD.

## Moral Faculty[[@Headword:Moral Faculty]]

             SEE MORAL SENSE.

## Moral Inability[[@Headword:Moral Inability]]

             SEE INABILITY.

## Moral Intuitions[[@Headword:Moral Intuitions]]

             SEE MORAL SENSE.

## Moral Law[[@Headword:Moral Law]]

             may be contemplated under three aspects: first, as a branch of the Decalogue, for this, SEE LAW OF MOSES; secondly, in a practical point of view, SEE ETHICS; and, thirdly, in a metaphysical light, as a department of theology or theosophy, which is the only relation under which we here propose to treat it. Under the head MORAL SENSE, we suggest that a law emanating from a beneficent Creator for the government of responsible intelligences can be essentially no other than a transcript of his own benignant nature, hence the deep philosophy as well as cogent value of the Gospel axiom that love is the one essential requirement of the law (Mat 22:36-40 : Rom 13:8-10; 1Jn 4:21); and this applies no less to angelic than to human creatures, and extends through time and through eternity. It is proper to consider more distinctly these questions of the origin, universality, permanence, and sanction of the divine law.

1. Its Source. — Some philosophers have been in the habit of representing — either expressly or by implication — the basis of morality as independent of, if not prior to and externally stringent upon the divine  Being himself. They have used such expressions as "the eternal principles of right," "God was absolutely bound to do so and so," "he could not have done otherwise," etc.; and although these phrases are usually accompanied with some caveat of reverence or disclaimer of limiting the Almighty's perfection, they yet savor of fatalism, or at least of dualism, and do not attribute the moral system of the universe to its precise cause. That origin is no other than God himself, simply and purely. To his sovereign will everything that exists owes its being, with all the qualities that relate to it; and this grand postulate includes the Deity himself, with all the laws that he has promulged and now administers.

He is self-existent, the "I am," the "one that is, and was, and is to be;" and he is what he is and as he is merely because he pleases it himself. In the same absolutely autocratic yet unconstrained manner he has produced the substance, mechanism, organic forces, and mutual relations — which we call laws — of the material and spiritual creation; and they are all, therefore, intrinsically copies of his own nature. This view differs essentially from pantheism, which confounds the universe with God himself; and at the same time from atheism, which dissevers it from his being or control. That this is the true doctrine of Scripture may be easily and abundantly proved (Gen 1:1; Isa 45:6; Joh 1:3; Col 1:16-17, etc.). Both sides of this universal proposition — the self-constitution of the Infinite, and the externality of the finite — are necessarily and impenetrably mysteries to our mind; yet we can sufficiently comprehend them by a comparison with our own microsmic nature — in which our wills are self-conditioned, and our bodies are extrinsic to our spirit — to enable us to receive them as intelligible truth. There is, therefore, no essential difference between the "moral laws" of God and the so-called laws of nature: they are both neither more nor less than his own will as expressed in the material and spiritual departments of his dominion. Human nature, in so far as it is a just reflection of this will, is a correct transcript of these laws; and is generally recognised as such, wherever not perverted by the effects of free agency. This latter is but an extension of the externality of creation, adding merely — and a very important increment it is — the godlike productive power, to be exercised within a certain range ever subordinate to the divine agency. It is thus that God retains full jurisdiction, without incurring the responsibility of human conduct. The divine law, of course, continues its claims over the accountable creature, whether he acknowledge or submit to them or not; for it would be the height of absurdity to make his puny rebellion or insolent disregard operate their abrogation. The penalty may be suspended  at the divine pleasure, but it is sure in the end to overtake every transgressor with a complete vindication.

2. Its Extent. — This likewise is self-evident. As the "natural" laws of God are coextensive with the universe, so his "moral" laws are obligatory upon all his moral creatures, i.e., those endowed with a capacity for understanding the relations of right and wrong. Hence the enactments of the Decalogue have been essentially accepted in all ages and countries as the foundation of the civil code, and religious usages have generally conformed to the prescriptions of the first table (those relating to God and his worship, the family, etc.), not excepting even the seeming conventionality of a stated day of rest. But the two fundamental principles underlying these Mosaic statutes, so admirably summed up in the New Testament as fealty to God and equity to man, have never failed to be admitted. theoretically at least, as the only secure basis of social organization. How it is with other worlds, if such exist, we are not called upon to speculate; but this fact of the universality of the divine law on the globe is so emphatically attested by all history and legislation that we need dwell no further upon it.

3. Its Duration. — It follows from the above views of the cause and character of moral law that it must forever remain essentially the same, and of permanent obligation on all its legitimate subjects throughout their being. It is a peculiar trait of the divine creations that while their form changes to suit the varied circumstances of diversified beauty and harmonious co-operation, their substance ever remains, imperishable except by the fiat which first called it into existence. Annihilation is not God's method; he never absolutely extinguishes any light of his own kindling. Man's works, as they are not real creations, pass away into a nonentity that leaves only their memory; but God builds for eternity. Especially is this true of the divine administration: amid all the variety of his different and successive dispensations the same fundamental principles, as we have seen, prevail; and even in the future world the obligations of supreme allegiance to God and mutual regard for each other will beatify the inhabitants of bliss by their spontaneous and full discharge, or torment the denizens of hell by their relentless and irksome grasp. The joy of conscious rectitude is the greatest bliss of which a rational soul is capable, and the remorse for an irremediable violation of clearly known duty we may well imagine to be the most poignant ingredient in the cup of endless damnation.

4. This brings us, lastly, to the penalty of moral law. Statutes without awards attached to their observance or neglect are valueless and ineffectual. The rewards and punishments of moral law are, as its nature implies, and as we have already seen, chiefly and properly of a moral character. Yet we see no impropriety in the current belief — sanctioned by the figurative language of Scripture — that the immunities and penalties experienced in the other world are likewise — at least after the resurrection state (which by its renewed bodily organism furnishes at once the means and the pledge of corporeal enjoyments and sufferings) — of a physical nature, suited to the new conditions of being then entered upon. Precisely what will be the form of either kind of award, beyond the presumed — and indeed promised — emotions from the genial or uncomfortable society and surroundings, we can only conjecture; but this much we may safely argue from the well-known consequences of obedience or transgression in this life, that they will be of the highest pungency of which the human spirit is susceptible; and we may infer from God's justice and impartiality-no less than from the express statements of the Bible (Pro 16:5; Ecc 12:14; Joh 5:29; Rom 2:6; Gal 6:7) — that they will be exactly meted out in accordance with the real merits or demerits of each individual. In this life we know that this retribution or compensation does not in all cases precisely occur — virtue often lies oppressed, and vice stalks about triumphant; hence the greater presumption that in the coming world all this will be balanced (Luk 16:25), and a necessity indeed arises for such a state in order to the proper adjudication (Psalms 73). There remain under this head three points of much importance to be briefly discussed.

(1.) Each class of laws is in the main administered separately yet co- ordinately with the rest. — Thus a violation of or a compliance with any physical law is invariably followed by its corresponding penalty or disadvantage, and this without regard to the religious character of the subject himself (Mat 5:45); on the other hand, moral delinquency or exemplariness will ensure its appropriate need or degradation, whatever be the care or negligence of the actor in temporal concerns. A good child is as likely to be burned if it thrust its finger into the flame as a bad one, and a pious traveller is as liable as a wicked one to lose his life by venturing on board an insecure train or vessel. Yet the practice of virtue tends to habits of thrift, economy, and prudence, thus naturally promoting earthly welfare (1Ti 4:8), and a special divine blessing may also be expected  upon the good man's affairs (Psa 37:25). On the other hand, since great prosperity is inimical to piety, the Lord often afflicts his children with temporal reverses for their spiritual benefit (Joh 16:33). It thus appears that while physical laws regularly have their own course, and the physical effects duly follow, yet Providence specially watches over those who commit their ways to the divine keeping, and they are accordingly saved from many of the consequences which their own inadvertence might bring upon them. This, however, is not effected by miracle (except in a few anomalous cases), nor by extraordinary interference with the usual operation of law, but by those secret and delicate connections which pervade the whole economy of nature, and perhaps by an unseen touch of the divine hand directly upon the inscrutable springs of human intercourse. Indeed, as it is the same Being who administers both series of laws, we might reasonably expect that he would make them cooperate in harmony for the higher — i.e., moral — ends (Rom 8:28). SEE PROVIDENCE.

(2.) The effects of transgression are not always confined to the individual offender. — This is evidently true of the violation of physical laws, for the children, friends, and neighbors of the person erring are frequently involved in calamity consequent upon his blunders. How often does a mistake or a careless act spread conflagration, disaster, and even death, in a community. The same takes place to a certain extent with regard to the temporal results from a violation of moral laws, as in cases of inherited disease, murder, and crimes generally, in which the family or victims innocently suffer. Nor is this all: a continued course of immorality is sometimes propagated through successive generations, mostly, no doubt, by the force of vicious example and defective or erroneous training, but partly also perhaps by a certain congenital taint or bias to the same vices. With regard to social sins, these forms of retribution are especially illustrated — for national wrongs and crimes are as certain to be visited by the appropriate penalty as personal ones. But the punishment that falls upon the nation is of course shared by its individual members in common, some of whom, however, and frequently those most guilty, escape in whole or in part by reason of their exalted position and peculiar advantages (2Sa 24:17), while in other instances the blow falls most heavily upon eminent individuals as representative characters (2Sa 21:1-9). Nor does the retribution always come upon the same generation or the same portion of the community that has sinned (Mat 23:35). These are but specimens  of that inequality in the penalty of wrong-doing that prevails in the present life (Jer 31:29); but they do not extend to the other world. There the account will be strictly personal, and the settlement rigidly just. As we have already indicated, it is this final award that vindicates the sentence of the supreme Judge. The vicarious sufferings of the Redeemer as a ransom from this ultimate adjudication have been considered under the article MEDIATION SEE MEDIATION .

(3.) We thus finally reach the question of the alleged disproportion between human guilt and endless punishment. We do not seek, with many, to justify the everlasting doom of the wicked by magnifying their crime as having been committed against infinite authority, majesty, and forbearance, however much we may conceive these features as aggravating its enormity. We base our theodicy upon simpler and more palpable ground, namely, the continued and hopelessly incorrigible sinfulness of the condemned themselves. We may presume that none are cut off from probation till they have evinced a desperate moral condition (Luk 13:8); but whether this be so or not, it follows inevitably from the above line of reasoning, and from the character of the depraved heart bereft of the probationary aids to reform, that the impenitence, unbelief, and rebellion for which the sentence is at first pronounced will but harden and intensify as the ages of eternity advance. Unless the fable of purgatory be true — and its absurdity is not less than its mendacity — there can be no improvement in the fate of the finally lost, because there can be no amendment in their moral character. Their destiny is eternally fixed, not so much by the arbitrary decree of omnipotent vengeance as by their own determined resistance of sovereign law. Perdition is but another name for self-destruction (ἀπόλλυμαι , in the middle voice). See Pye-Smith, First Lines of Christian Theology, page 177 sq.; Miller, Christian Doctrine of Sin; Howarth, Abiding Obligation of the Moral Law; Watts, Uses of the Moral Law; Cobbin, View of Moral Law; Cudworth, Eternal and Immutable Morality; Cumberland Presb. Qu. Jan. 1873, art. 2; New-Englander, July 1872; Academy, September 1, 1873, page 328.

## Moral Obligation[[@Headword:Moral Obligation]]

             SEE MORAL LAW; SEE MORAL SENSE.

## Moral Philosophy[[@Headword:Moral Philosophy]]

             Nearly every system of philosophy broached in ancient or modern times has impinged more or less closely upon the domain of morals. Indeed, this part of the field has usually been the most hotly contested, as the theosophical problems which it presents have afforded more occasion for philosophical as well as theological polemics than all other themes. The paramount importance of the subjects mentioned the relation of the finite to the Infinite, and the consequent duties and destiny of man at the hands of God have given the most intense interest to the reasonings, teachings, and controversies respecting them. But as these have been so commonly mentioned in the intellectual or metaphysical branches of the investigation, we will here content ourselves with referring to PHILOSOPHY in general for the history of their development, and to the article ETHICS for their more systematic classification. We shall therefore in the present article discuss, in a brief and practical manner, only a few points upon which every scheme of moral philosophy worthy of the name must hinge.

1. Human Responsibility. — Were man a mere animal, endowed with locomotion, instinct, and perception, or could we conceive of him as possessing simply emotion and will, such as brutes seem to evince — nay, even as capable of the boldest stretch of reason and the highest flights of fancy, yet destitute of the power of appreciating the difference between right and wrong, and therefore unable to recognise the fundamental relation of allegiance subsisting on his part toward his Maker, and the common bond of brotherhood between himself and his Fellows, we could not justly hold him amenable for his moral conduct, since this entirely depends upon a due observance of these twofold claims. It is the faculty of conscience, sitting as a viceroy of heaven and a representative of earth within his breast, urging the rights of all outside himself, that constitutes him an accountable being; and though this interior light may become dim through the mists of passion and the clouds of ignorance, it yet shines sufficiently clear to show him his essential duties, or, if utterly eclipsed, the fault will generally be found to be his own — the few cases of congenital paralysis being thereby removed from the category of responsibility. SEE MORAL SENSE.

His first obligation, therefore, and his prime measure of safety, is to cultivate this facility by information and prompt obedience, that it may the more surely guide him through the labyrinths of life to the portals of endless day. The beginning and the termination of his personal responsibility, as well as its boundaries on either hand throughout his  mortal pilgrimage, are exactly marked by the development of this faculty- one peculiar to him of all the occupants of the globe. This accountability is, in the nature of the case, an individual one, each for himself alone, and it is due in the threefold aspect above indicated to the several classes of beings with whom he has here to do in the order and degree named below. This sums up all his duty, even under the perfect code of Christianity, and is the staple — the core and substance — of every ethical system devised for human conduct.

2. Duty to God. — This is obviously paramount. In this the Holy Scriptures do but enforce, by an authoritative mandate, what all pagan religions have more feebly demanded — namely, the unconditional and primary obligation of obedience to the divine behests. These have been promulged in different ways — sometimes more expressly, at other times more enigmatically and imperfectly; but when once fairly understood, the commonsense of mankind has declared that they must be unflinchingly and peremptorily obeyed. This claim is universally grounded on an admitted creatorship, supported by the avowed dependence of the creature; the Bible adds a third most touching argument to these of natural religion, namely, redemption, thus forming a triple cord — paternity, providence, and grace. The foremost and generic duty that grows out of this obligation is that of reverence — so all the older dispensations conceive it, but Christianity terms it love, taking a nearer and more privileged position. SEE ADOPTION.

This reverential regard is chiefly expressed in worship, which accordingly occupies the prominent place in all religions, standing at the very head of the Decalogue. The devotion thus due is unique as well as supreme, because no other being can possibly occupy this relation, nor any higher; worship is therefore due exclusively to our Maker. Idolatry is consequently reckoned as the most odious and damning of all sins, because it virtually overthrows the throne of heaven itself, and thus destroys the very basis of all moral law. Jehovah brooked every transgression of his chosen people but this; and when the captivity had burned away its exterior manifestation, the final excision affirmed his detestation of its still cherished spirit, which incited Israel to the culminating apostasy of the Crucifixion. The same crime in essence has reappeared in the mummeries of Christian churches; and even Protestants may be guilty of it under another name, for any undue love of earthly objects is tantamount to idolatry (Col 3:5; 1Jn 2:15). Under the Christian economy, again, the worship due to God is to assume a purely spiritual form, in distinction from the typical  and ceremonial guise of Mosaism (Joh 4:24); but this, of course, does not exclude all exterior observances — it rather requires them, at least for congregational concert. SEE WORSHIP.

We mention here but one other specific duty under this head, because it is inclusive of all others — namely, regard for God's revealed word. The respect we show to any one naturally extends to his communications; and in the case of an invisible sovereign or an absent friend, our reverence is often measured chiefly by this mark. How much more highly should we prize and cheerfully heed the words of our God and Saviour! Nor is the Bible to be fondly cherished merely as a memento of dying love, or as a token of kindly concern, nor yet is it to be valued simply as a useful guide-book in ancient lore, but still more as a practical directory to regulate our hearts and our lives: it must become our vade-mecum in everyday concerns of the most vital moment, for by it shall we be finally adjudged. As prayer, therefore, is the central act of divine worship, so is searching the Scriptures the most direct method of ordering our behavior aright in all respects; the two are the complete counterparts, internal and external; one fortifies and purifies the heart, the other moulds and directs the life. The devout Bible-student cannot fail of becoming a strong, earnest, consistent fulfiller, of all the claims of God upon him.

3. Duties to one's Fellow-beings. — These spring immediately out of the above relation of the common fatherhood of God, and they can never be successfully met except by bearing this thought constantly in mind. Selfishness, the most common and baleful besetment of every association of life, is most effectually counteracted by this consideration; and Scripture, no less than conventional politeness, and even statute law, everywhere holds forth teachings grounded on this principle. We hazard nothing in affirming that all the disorders of society have their root in a violation or neglect of this truth — the universal brotherhood and consequent essential equality of all human beings.

We may therefore be spared, after the enunciation of this one general clew to the. multiform and complex duties of life, from entering upon a discussion of these in detail, simply observing that they may all be classified under two divisions: 1, the domestic, including the relations of parent and child, of husband and wife, of brother and sister, and of near consanguinity or affinity; 2, the social, embracing the relations of neighbor, fellow-citizen, churchmember, and voluntary association for literary, benevolent, or commercial purposes. For all these, see the appropriate titles in this Cyclopaedia. We here dismiss this branch of the subject, with the remark that our duty in all these regards  is not fully discharged by the mere rendering of justice to these various classes of persons connected with us; we owe them likewise the offices of courtesy, charity, and sympathy. This is true, not only in the family and the Church, but also in the community and the world at large; the twofold obligation extends to every ramification of the social fabric. The question of Cain, "Am I my brother's keeper?" expresses the first and most wide- spread heresy against the mutual rights and well-being of the race. It is here, as everywhere else, that the doctrine of the Gospel shows its transcendent excellence — as wise as it is beautiful — doctrine appropriate to the lips of him who was both God and man; namely, the inculcation of love for all mankind as such, and as the common offspring of the one Being to whom we all owe supreme allegiance. The sublime extension of this precept to our very enemies (Rom 12:14) is a peculiar trait of Christianity (Mat 5:43-48); not a mere fancy sketch (Mat 18:23-35), as an offset to our own shortcomings (Mat 6:14-15), or as a noble revenge (Rom 12:20), but a lifelikeness (1Pe 2:19-24) of the heroism of the faultless Master (Luk 23:34), realized (Act 7:60) by saints (1Co 4:12): so faithfully are the divine lineaments (Exo 33:18-23; Exo 34:5-7) mirrored (Heb 1:3) in the enduring (1Pe 1:25) Word (Rev 19:13), whose command (Luk 6:36) is a promise of performance (1Th 5:24). This is the only effectual motive, as well as the sole general bond, in the eager rush of men, each for the maintenance of himself and his. The natural instincts of home affection, and the ties of mutual advantage, may go far to soften the asperities of intimate association; but a wide-reaching and generous philanthropy can never be attained, nor can even the sweetest amenities of closely domestic and social intercourse be steadily Secured, without the habitual recognition of this fellowship in the divine sight.

4. Duties towards one's Self. — These are properly and advisedly placed last, although in the perversity and suicidal folly of human nature they are usually promoted to a front rank, and, indeed, enhanced almost to the exclusion of all the preceding. But no maxim was ever more profoundly true in its application to this subject than our Lord's paradox: "He that seeketh his own life [i.e., personal gratification as his foremost aim], shall lose it." There is no joy equal to that of making others happy; and he who is willing to forego his own ease, comfort, and emolument for the sake of blessing, consoling, and enriching his fellow-creatures, will find himself repaid a thousand-fold even in the satisfaction he experiences in this life, to  say nothing of the rewards of that life which is to come. Selfishness always misses its mark, and is therefore sure to be miserable, whereas generosity invariably succeeds in its noble purposes. We need not here enter upon the metaphysical question of purely disinterested benevolence; God has not required us to scan our motives so closely as to detect and eject a thought of the reflex influence of our philanthropy upon our minds in the bliss of doing good and the retrospect of usefulness.

On the contrary, he encourages us to a beneficent course by such considerations; and the Son of God himself did not disdain, in his consummate act of self-devotion for the rescue of a fallen world, to contemplate the fruit of his redeeming love (Isa 53:11; Heb 12:2). We may preliminarily remark, as a confirmation and parallel of this secret of the most successful happiness, that all the proclivities of the heart (especially the passions and the appetites) tend not only to excess, and therefore require, even for their own best ends, to be held in check by counter influences of a higher character, but they likewise are set upon the most immediate gratification possible; and as this is not always, nor even usually, the safest or the most complete, the prudent and experienced habitually restrain and defer them till the time and object are ripe for full and wholesome enjoyment. For this reason, all the more do we need to keep the love and pursuit of self in the background, till our nobler sentiments have acquired such strength and discipline that we may securely give to self-love the rein, and guide it to its most successful and harmonious results; otherwise we shall be likely to grasp only the present shadow, and lose the more remote substance. It is precisely this most egregious and irreparable folly of which the mass of mankind are guilty, in pursuing the pleasures of time and sense to the hazard of spiritual and eternal joys. We devote the remainder of this article to a few practical suggestions, under the head of personal duties to one's self, specifically calculated to guard against so lamentable an error, and secure the highest accomplishment of each one's destiny as a subject of moral government.

(1.) The harmonious development of all one's native faculties. — The gift of reason, and still more of a moral faculty, carries with it the obligation to exercise and improve it; we owe this no less as a debt of gratitude to the Giver than as a means of extracting the full value for ourselves. Hence, while a sense of self-preservation naturally and justly leads us to care for and cultivate our physical powers, the neglect of our intellect in any of its glorious capacities is a self-stultification that entitles one to the contempt  of his fellows; but the crushing out of conscience or the dwarfing of any of our godlike moral capabilities is a literal suicide of the soul. Such a dereliction defeats the very end of probation, and turns it into a curse forever. Because we are surrounded by and filled with temptation in this scene of trial, all the more diligent do we need to be in rousing and confirming and intensifying every moral power that may aid us in the life- long struggle with our desperate inward and outward foes. Most of all have we occasion to lay hold on the alliance with almighty grace which is proffered us as a restorer to the full image of Deity (Php 2:13).

(2.) The careful culture of any particular aptitude that each may possess. — Variety within certain limits of uniformity is evidently God's law as expressed in nature, and the same rule is observed in the human constitution — bodily, mental, and spiritual. Hence the obvious propriety, and indeed necessity, of noting and turning to account the peculiar genius of every individual, in order to its perfection by judicious practice. In this way the economy and skill of that ingenious modern contrivance the "division of labor" have their higher results. The idea that all are reduced by piety to the same Procrustean bed, either here or hereafter, is preposterous. The facile dexterity of the expert, as compared with the clumsy slowness of the tyro in art, is but a type of the excellence of one saint above another (1Co 15:41), or even of the same in successive stages of growth (Luk 8:18); and this superiority on earth furnishes a vantage-ground by reason of which the moral distance must be forever widening in heaven. The same is true in this life of all the human powers, especially of the mind and heart; and doubtless a like perpetually increasing pre-eminence in these endowments, so akin with the spiritual, will hold good in the other world. From this we see the transcendent importance of cultivating in the present state of existence every power of the soul, before eternity shall fix the plastic ductile condition that pertains to probation. This thought again suggests, on the other hand, the mistaken policy of altogether neglecting even the less marked talent; for a feeble indication may lead to the discovery of a precious treasure, many unpromising beginnings having eventuated in brilliant eminence. And it is the common virtues — like the ordinary acquirements — that are most generally useful; as we approve the necessity of teaching every child, however dull, at least the simple rudiments of education, while we deem it worth while to expend years at the piano or the easel only upon those who evince extraordinary artistic tact. Once more, let no one excuse himself  from the everyday duties of life on the ground of his small natural ability (Luk 19:15-26), nor plead his peculiar indisposition or special hinderances to any form of morality, for all really experience the same difficulties and insufficiency in one form or another; this very reluctance, arduousness, opposition, calls for redoubled zeal and effort (Ecc 10:10), for it is an omen, or rather symptom, of moral death the more imminent and total.

(3.) The earnest and constant application to practical results of all one's time, powers, and resources. — It is not enough to possess, enlarge, and employ wealth, influence, learning, skill, health, or longevity; we have not yet reached the just standard of requirement till we fully direct them towards useful ends — till they positively redound to the glory of God and the benefit of mankind. We should not be so absorbed in the luxury of their acquisition, increase, or exercise as to forget their ultimate design. In short, we must everywhere, at all times, and in all things, bear in mind that we are but stewards in the occupancy of these endowments, and hold ourselves constantly in readiness to give to the great Proprietor a satisfactory account of their appropriation (1Co 6:20).

(4.) The sober but cordial and devout enjoyment of whatever blessings Providence has conferred upon us. — Asceticism and epicureanism are equally removed from sound godliness (Ecc 11:9-10). A morose piety is next to none at all, but a cheerful moderation is the best recommendation of saintliness, and thankfulness sweetens the homeliest morsel. Stoicism can never teach us to be content with our lot. Distrust of God's mercies is as atheistic as their abuse. The moral philosophy of the Bible is alike guarded against all extremes, because it begins, centres, and ends in a true theism (Ecc 12:13): "He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" (Mic 6:8). In our lapsed estate, to regain the lofty completeness we must trace our way back by the same steps; for penitence is the fit condition to our restoration to moral rectitude through divine clemency and fidelity (1Jn 1:9).

Literature. — One of the earliest treatises on the subject in English is Paley's Moral Philosophy (Lond. 1785; often reprinted with extensive modifications by later editors); but it essentially ignores conscience, and has generally been reprobated by sound moralists. See Blakey, Hist. of  Morals (4 volumes, 8vo); Garve, Different Principles of Moral Philos. (from Aristotle to 1798); Channing's Jouffroy, Introd. to Moral Philos. (includes a critical survey of modern systems); Doddridge, Lectures; Belsham, Moral Philos.; Gisbourne, Principles of Moral Philos. (1789); Grove, Moral Philos.; Pearson, Theory of Morals (1800); Beattie, Moral Science (Edinburgh, 1816, 2 volumes); Taylor (J.), Sketch of Moral Philos.; Turnbull, Principles of Moral Science; Smith (J.S.), Lectures on Moral Philos.; Stewart, Outlines of Moral Philos.; and his Active and Moral Powers; and Progress of Ethical Philos. in Europe; Merivale, Boyle Lectures, 1864; Calderwood, Hand-book of Moral Science (Lond. 1872, 8vo); Gillett (E.H.), The Moral System (N.Y. 1874, 8vo), the latest and best work on the subject. Among express treatises on the general subject, we may name, as being best known and most accessible in this country, Wayland, Elements of Moral Science (Bost. 1835, 12mo); Whewell and Henry, Morals (Bost. 1839); Alexander, Outlines of Moral Science (N.Y. 1852); Hickock, Moral Science (N.Y. 1853); Upham, Moral Philos. (N.Y. 1857, 12mo); Winslow, Elements of Moral Philos. (N.Y. 1857, 12mo); M. Hopkins, Lectures on Moral Science (Bost. 1862, 12mo); ibid., Law of Love (N.Y. 1869, 12mo). The periodicals which contain valuable articles on this topic are: Christian Examiner, 8:265; 18:101; 19:1, 25; 28:137; 29:153; 30:145; 41, 97; 49, 215; 52, 188: Christian Rev. 7:321; Princeton Rev. 5:33; 7:377; 18:260; 20:529; Meth. Qu. Rev. 5:220; New-Englander, October 1870, page 549; Brit. and For. Ev. Rev. January 1874, page 183; Lond. Qu. Rev. 3:1; 6:407; 11:494; 48, 83; October 1873, art. 5; Bib. Sacra, April 1873, art. 9; Edinb. Rev. 7:413; 61, 195; 91, 86; Prospect. Rev. 2:577; 2:400; North Brit. Rev. 14:160; Westm. Rev. 1:182; 2:254; 12:246; North Amer. Rev. 9:293; Contemp. Rev. July 1872, art. 7. SEE MORALS.

## Moral Science[[@Headword:Moral Science]]

             SEE MORAL PHILOSOPHY.

## Moral Sense[[@Headword:Moral Sense]]

             is a term frequently used to designate the conscience. It is believed to have originated with lord Shaftesbury, who contended for the existence of disinterested affections in man, as against Hobbes (q.v.), and in anticipation of what Hutcheson (q.v.) afterwards advocated. Whatever we may think of the principles involved, the term Moral Sense itself is incorrect, however,  in at least two essential particulars in which that faculty differs from the characteristics of the senses. In the first place, these latter are exercised upon external objects, whereas the conscience συνείδησις, consciousness, or self-knowledge) is exclusively introversive or subjective, and passes in review only the acts or states of the individual himself. Secondly, the senses give us absolute and invariable information of the real properties or relations of things, and when acting normally they never mislead or deceive any one as to the facts in the case; while conscience is so subjective that it conveys to us intimation only of a relative character, and hence affects different persons quite variously in respect to the same act or condition of things, according to the habit of mind, or education, or preconceived notions. In short, conscience is a sense only in the general signification of an impression or influence of an emotive nature. It has usually been defined as that faculty of the mind by which we become aware of the moral quality of an act (purpose, sentiment, etc.), and are suitably (i.e., agreeably or painfully) affected by it.

Only the latter part of this definition is accurate; for the apprehension of the agreement or contrariety between the given subjects of thought (the act, purpose, etc.) is a purely intellectual exercise of the judgment, comparing the thing contemplated or reviewed with some previously acquired or adopted standard or principle of right. Hence the importance of a correct and true rule by which to try all moral questions; and hence, too, the exceeding diversity and even opposition of views on moral points between persons of different religions and associations. The tendency of the passions, moreover, to warp the judgment is proverbial; and as human nature is constitutionally corrupt, the unaided and untrained conscience cannot be relied upon to give a just verdict. It is chiefly at this point that a divine revelation becomes necessary in order to furnish a perfect norm to the erring judgment, as well as to reinforce the sanction of the conscience in its conflict with the depraved inclinations.

On the other hand, the emotional function of conscience, which is benumbed by nature as well as by habitual sin, needs quickening, so that it may become a clearer and more emphatic monitor in advance, as well as a more effectual penalty or reward after the performance of a praiseworthy or the commission of a guilty act, and thus stimulate by its twofold action to virtue in the future. It is revelation, again, that furnishes this aid, not only by the motives which the light that it sheds upon the rewards and punishments of a future state supplies, but likewise by the supernatural influences of the Holy Spirit promised to all who humbly seek and encourage them. As this double culture of the natural conscience — its  habitual exercise in accordance with a heavenly standard of duty, and its alliance with Almighty power — ensures its sound development and steady action, so, on the contrary, the repeated violation of its behests, and the incorrigible rejection of the proffered assistance from above, must eventually lead — as we find to be actually the case with many hardened wretches — to an apparent obliteration of the faculty itself, or at least a total suppression of its admonitions and awards. The latter state is one of hopeless impenitence, SEE JUDICIAL BLINDNESS, and the former that of assured salvation.

Yet even in an unfallen condition man's conscience was not of itself adequate for his moral guidance, and hence an objective law the prohibition of the single tree as a prescriptive sample only was given to supplement and direct its energy; and still Eve's judgment seems to have been incompetent, under that non-redemptive economy, despite her moral perfection, to detect the mortal error that lurked in the tempter's suggestions: the actual "knowledge of good and evil" by bitter experience alone was effectual to awaken the full power of this faculty. So, on the other hand, in the world of perdition we are wont to imagine that the seared and blunted conscience will rouse itself to chastise the soul with retributive agony. But the pangs of guilt, at least in this probationary existence, are not strictly the measure or criterion of wrong-doing; for then the self-complacent Pharisee would be acquitted, and the tender penitent would be condemned. The most atrocious crimes have been committed under the plea of conscience, and that not hypocritically, but in self- delusion (Act 26:9); while the first steps in transgression are visited by a-degree of remorse which gradually lessens as the offender progresses in his downward career. This leads us back once more to the main proposition of this discussion, namely, the insufficiency of conscience as a moral light. Nothing is right simply because our conscience approves it. The appeal must be to a higher authority than man's nature affords. He is not an absolute “law unto himself." It is his Creator who retains supreme jurisdiction over him, and who has reserved the prerogative of prescribing what he may innocently do, and what he is morally bound to do. SEE MORAL LAW.

Yet when an individual has availed himself of the best means within his reach for ascertaining his Maker's will, and has scrupulously followed that light, he is not culpable for any error of faith or practice into which he may fall by reason of his fallible judgment, or for any other consequence of his naturally defective or even depraved condition. He must and he ought to obey his reason and conscience, however imperfect; but if sincere and docile, he will not long remain in serious  misapprehension of moral truth; and in any case his responsibility is exactly proportioned to the measure of light he enjoys or might have attained (Luk 12:47-48). While therefore a mistake, be it ever so grievous or closely related to moral subjects, is not in itself a sin, yet every man's conduct should be tried — both by himself and others, as it certainly is and finally will be by the unerring Judge — according to that standard of rectitude which the divine law as vouchsafed to him enjoins. To the heathen, walking by the dim light that tradition reflects upon his path from the primeval revelations, supplemented only by the uncertain flickerings of the lamp of experience, or perchance by a few rays that occasionally break through the embrasure of his shrouded pilgrimage from the radiance of more favored dispensations, the office of conscience is all-important in aiding him to grope his way out of the thraldom of nature to a sense of the divine acceptance; and we may charitably hold that in rare examples he has thus been enabled to reach the day of moral purity, and emerge at last into the serene glory of the heavenly abode; but the melancholy facts of past history and present observation seem only to justify the fear that the mass of paganism, even in the cultured instances of Greece and Rome, of India or China, have but grovelled in the mire of sensuality, and quenched their higher aspirations and better convictions in the absurdities of a beastly idolatry. Even Islamism, setting out with much of borrowed truth to reform a polytheistic faith, rapidly degenerated into puerile fanaticism, and aims no higher than a licentious Paradise; while Judaism, disciplined by a direct contact with the supernatural to the sternest regimen that the race has ever known, has generally resulted in heartless Pharisaism and puerile formalism.

Under the Redemptive scheme a simpler and profounder maxim — that of universal benevolence — has supervened for the resuscitation and tuition of the believer's conscience, stunned and bewildered by the burdensome technicalities of previous systems; yet we find, alas! a large share of Christendom either reverting to the obsolete methods of salvation by asceticism and ritualism and ecclesiasticism, or abusing the liberty of the Gospel by fanaticism and humanitarianism and rationalism. Yet, amid these vagaries and inconsistencies, the one cardinal principle of "faith that works by love and purifies the heart" must be recognised by the candid and thoughtful of all times and all climes as the sole test of genuine piety and philanthropy. Selfishness is the bane of all morality, and in proportion as the carnal self is crucified the spiritual self is resurrected out of the ruins of the fall, until at length the ideal man — God's own image — becomes transfigured in its permanent beauty; for " God is love" (comp. 1 John 4).  Literature. — Abercrombie, Philos. of the Moral Feelings; Brown, Lect. on the Mind; Butler, Analogy of Religion and Nature; Hutcheson, Inquiry into Beauty and Virtue; and his Essay on the Passions; Necker, On Religious Opinions; Witherspoon, Lectures, Lect. 4; Bentham, Morals and Legislation; Smith (Southwood), O Divine Government; Mackintosh, Preliminary Dissertation (1832); Dymond, Essay on Morality (1832); Hall (Robert), Sermon on Mod. Infidelity; Sedgwick (Adam), Discourse on the Studies of the University of Cambridge (1834); Dwight (T.), Sermon 99, and many others; Wainwright, Vindication of Paley's Theory of Morals, etc. (1830); Edwards, Works (see Index); Bautain, Moral Qualifications of Man; Furst, Moral des Evangeliums mit den verschiedenen philos. Moral- systemen; Knapp, Christian Theol. page 31; Pye-Smith, Outlinee of Christian Theol. (see Index); Hopkins, Outline Study of Uman (N.Y. 1874, 12mo), Lect. 9 and sq.; Ueberweg, His. Philos. 2:319 sq., 446, 494; Leckey, Hist. Europ. Morals (N.Y. 1870, 2 volumes, roy. 8vo), 1:93, 123; Contemporary Rev. Jan. 1872, art. 5 (Savages); Appleton, Works, Lects. 15 and 17; Jenkins, Reasonableness of Christianity; Law, Theory of Religion, part 2; Pearson. Rem. on Morals; Liddon, Bampton Lecture on the Divinity of Christ; Blackie, Four Phases of Christian Morals; Spalding, Philos. of Morals, with a Review of Ancient and Modern Theories; Lewes, Hist. Philos. volume ii (see Index); Old and New, April, 1870; Brownson's Rev. January 1853; Presb. Rev. April 1870; Bib. Sacra, April 1870; Studien und Kritiken, Jan. 1866; Lond. Qu. Rev. January 1871, page 26; Westminster Rev. 42:286 sq.; Brit. and For. Ev. Rev. 1843, page 293; 1844, page 412; October 1872, art. 3; Journal of Speculat. Philos. January 1870, art. 4; April 1870, art. 7; January 1871, art. v; New- Englander, January 1871, page 160; Princeton Rev. October 1871, page 634; Theol. Presb. (Cumberland Presb. Qu.) July 1871, art. 9; Univ. Qu. October 1873, art. 5 (German and Anglo-American Morals); Revue Chretienne, January 1867; Contemporary Rev. August 1868, art. 7. SEE MORAL PHILOSOPHY.

## Moral Theology[[@Headword:Moral Theology]]

             is only another name for the science of ETHICS SEE ETHICS (q.v.). Under the last-named heading we have considered as much of the subject as can be encompassed from a strictly philosophical and Protestant theological stand-point. Only the views of Romanists remain to be treated here. These are in many respects radically different from those of the other classes referred to. The Protestant view, as we have seen in the article  Ethics, is that Christianity is essentially an ethical religion; that, while it is true that other religious favor certain virtues, or give a certain sanction to all virtues, Christianity is truly morality, for it aims at moral regeneration, and that is itself religion. Says Blackie (Four Phases of Morals), "It is a religion; by its mere epiphany it forms a Church; in its startingpoint, its career, and its consummation, it is 'a kingdom of heaven upon earth " (page 207 sq.; comp. page 219 sq., 266 sq.). As the sources of this science, we pointed out, "Christ, his person and teaching; also the writings of the apostles as shown in the N.T., as objective and as subjective to the influence of the Holy Spirit in the faithful." The Roman Catholic Church, however, recognises no standard of morality except that of her own construction, and insists upon it that not only the Scriptures, but also the tradition and declarations of the Church must control any effort, even in the domain of speculative philosophy.

Says Dr. Fuchs, in the Roman Catholic Cyclopaedia of Wetzer and Welte: "The traditions of the Church, together with the Scriptures, constitute the source of ethical knowledge. Tradition serves partly to complement the moral precepts of the Bible by further demands and institutions, and partly to elucidate and more clearly to interpret their sense and purpose." Not even does he rest here. Lest he be misunderstood as to the extent of the domain of ecclesiastical tradition, he continues: "From the domain of ecclesiastical tradition we regard especially as important for moral purposes: (1) the rules and canons of the general ecclesiastical councils; (2) the decisions and declarations of the holy chair; (3) the infallible (?) utterances of the Church fathers." Not content yet, he goes even so far as to declare that "into the circle of moralistic sources we most naturally and properly admit also ecclesiastical customs and the lives of the saints, for in the life of the Church and her saints is reflected the life of our divine Lord and Master." In quoting Dr. Fuchs we do not by any means wish to be understood as citing only one writer; as a contributor to the standard Roman Catholic Cyclopaedia of Germany, he speaks most assuredly the opinions of the Church for which he writes, and his views are those of the Romish Church at large. It is apparent, then, that by an outward law of the Church Romanists have modified the ethics of the N.T., and controlled the ethical consciousness of Christendom down to the period of the Reformation. The Protestant regards this modification as adulterous, and insists that notably sacerdotalism played no unimportant part; the clergy interpreting as they saw fit, and the people being taught by them as they were themselves influenced by the ascetic notions which invaded the Church in the 4th  century, and have ever since continued to exert their authority among papists. SEE ASCETICISM; SEE MONASTICISM: SEE SACERDOTALISM.

In our references in the article Ethics we have inserted the works of writers who deal carefully with the early teaching of the Church on this subject, and we here give only a brief resume of the views of ecclesiastical writers from the apostolic period down, in order to furnish the names most prominently connected with Roman Catholic ethics from the foundation of Christianity to the present.

1. Apostolic Period. — As regards the extent of apostolic ethics, it encompasses pretty much all departments of life, and the duties and virtues corresponding with them. Yet in this province such are made particularly conspicuous and praiseworthy as are natural to the spirit of Christianity. For while all antiquity had made the sovereign good consist in escape from pain, either by virtue or by pleasure, Christianity, by the mystery of the passion, announced the divinity of sorrow, and the most characteristic element in Christian virtue to be love. Hence the apostolic writers gave special prominence to those Christian ideals of faith, hope, love, prayer, mercy, chastity, martyrdom, and the like, which are the characteristic elements of perfect charity, and which, if realized, must absorb like ethics and politics in a higher science. The vacillation on some single moral questions and principles observable in the writings of these early Christian fathers gradually died out as a more profound and comprehensive Christian consciousness spread in the Church. As regards the manner of treatment of this subject, most apostolic writings deal with it in a way serviceable mainly to devotional purposes. "Their basis," it has been well said, "remained from the first rather religious than speculative, notwithstanding the persuasion that in the reason enlightened by the Word there was given a ground of union between objective revelation and subjective knowledge." Even among those contributions to this field, in that period, which rise above the sphere then usually occupied, only a few maintain a strictly scientific character.

 Earliest among the productions of that age stand the writings of the celebrated disciple of the apostle Paul, Clement of Rome, whose epistle to the Christian congregation at Corinth is one of the finest monuments of Christian antiquity. Its especial object was, however, to reconcile the dissensions and factions which had arisen in that congregation, and it contains therefore mainly admonitions to concord and peace. More noteworthy in this department of Christian ethics are the productions of Ignatius (q.v.), who wrote six epistles to diverse congregations, and one to  Polycarp; they were penned on his way to the lions of the Colosseum, and breathe the spirit of a man who had beheld John, and, full of faith, is ready to meet his Lord and Master. The moral precepts and admonitions of the Ignatian epistles are mostly passages quoted from the N.T., or sentiments in accord with its contents, expressed with fervency as well as simplicity. A remarkable feature in them is the emphasis with which their author insists on the propriety to belong publicly and externally to the Church, though he by no means forgets its value in the sight of God as consisting in the communion with Christ and in the sincere search for union with God. We learn to recognise ecclesiastical consociation, the alliance of so many thousands by unity of faith and love, as something grand, the true obedience to the officers of the Church (elders) as something inseparable from Christian life. This decidedly ecclesiastical disposition is also shared by Polycarp (q.v.) himself in his epistle to the congregation at Philippi. Above all things, he desires that attachment to pure unadulterated faith be strengthened; like Ignatius, he establishes Christian ethics on Christian Church creed. His moral precepts are rightly denominated "apostolic grains of gold." But really the most eminent attempt to reconcile Christian ideas with the forms and views of ancient philosophy, especially those of its latest efflorescence — New Platonism — was made in the mystic speculations of the Areopagite Dionysius, in which the Christian scientific spirit aims at an innermost comprehension of itself, for this end calling in the support of traditional knowledge. No other product of mind has exercised a deeper or more powerful influence upon the development of Christian mystic is the culminating-point of ecclesiastical ethics — than his writings, in which the several dispersed rays of mystical ideas and views, such as here and there glimmer in Clemens Alexandrinus, Augustine, Macarius, and others, converge as in a focus, and form one of the strongest links connecting the period of which we are speaking with the subsequent ones. To these relics of spiritual treasures of the apostolic fathers we join three compositions, two of which plainly show spurious authorship, and a third gives no clew at all. They are the Epistle of Barnabas, the Shepherd of Hermas, and the Epistle to Diognetus.

The author of the first-named work calls his moral precepts the road of light, in contrast with the crooked road of darkness, as he designates sinful life. The Shepherd is divided into three sections, the second of which deals entirely with ethics. The letter to Diognetus, as already stated, comes from an unknown hand. The principal interest which attaches to this ancient Christian memorial lies in the excellent description which the author gives of the life and morals of the  early Christians. Here, also, two other writings adorned with the name of apostles deserve to be mentioned-namely, "The Apostolic Constitutions" and "The Apostolic Canons." Both collections, as to their origin, it is true, come far short of reaching up to the apostolic age, but they deserve a place here because Romanists assert "that they exhibit a picture of the most primeval condition of Christian manners and ecclesiastical discipline." They are certainly worthy of attention on account of the treasure of tradition they furnish; still more, the peculiarity of their moral character renders them notable and significant, this character being wholly catholic, mingling severity with mildness, keeping the right medium between laxity and rigor.

2. Patristic Period. — We now reach the period in which we deal with the writings of the fathers of the Church. The series opens with Justin Martyr (q.v.), "the evangelist wearing the mantle of a philosopher." It was his mind, trained by ancient ethical philosophy, which placed in the ground of Christian ethics the first seed of scientific treatment. He clothed the Christian ideas in the scientific forms of antique wisdom, and showed that the classic must bend before the higher light of the Gospel. Particularly noticeable is his conception of reason as identical with knowledge and conscience. One of the fundamental Christian ideas — liberty of human will — in contraposition to fatalism, sustained by pagan views, he vindicated by an argumentation as acute as striking. He tried to elucidate the relation of Christian principles to the Mosaic law, and defended the Christian ethics against objections raised both from the Jewish and from pagan stand- points. Next we place the two apologists, Athenagoras (q.v.) and Theophilus (q.v.), bishop of Antioch. Their writings furnish a rich store for ethics. After them we meet that great disciple of Polycarp, St. Irenieus (q.v.). In opposition to the transcendental speculations of the Gnostics, he urges with emphasis to a practical life. But in thus giving prominence to the practical part of Christianity, he is far from falling into a "moralizing" tendency. Far greater services than those named were rendered in the scientific elaboration of Christian ethics by Clement of Alexandria. His three principal writings form e tripartite entity, in which he successively imparts the Christian doctrine of life in its fundamental features.

His first work (Λόγος προτρεπτικὸς πρὸς ῞Ελληναι) is polemico-apologetic; he combats what is morally injurious in popular religions and in the philosophical systems of heathendom, and compares with it the beneficial influence which Christianity exercises on its professors; he shows the absurdity of the pagan legends of gods, and demonstrates how the religious  mysteries of the pagans so often most deeply offend the moral sentiments, while the Christian doctrines and mysteries have the advantage of harmonizing with reason and moral purity; he admits that the writings of pagan philosophers contain seeds of morality, but reminds us that they owe their origin to the Λόγος, the source of all vital truth in the world.

The second treatise (ὁ παιδαγωγός) is divided into several books. The first treats of moral life in general; it may be considered an introduction to Christian ethics. The second treats of Christian ethics in its main features. The remaining books, corresponding to special morals, expatiate on the particular duties and virtues, and discuss conduct, in the several relations and occurrences of external life, from the Christian stand-point.

The third essay (οτρώματα, miscellanies) leads to a higher degree of moral knowledge and action. The difference of the two degrees lies in γνῶσις. On the foundation of the ideas gained by a deeper and increased knowledge a higher religio-moral culture is constructed, the culmination of which is love assimilating and uniting with the Deity. In conclusion of the whole, Clement sketches the image of the γνωστικός, and thus presents the Christian ideal of a moral personage. The γνῶσις Clement deduces from no other source than from the idea of the divine Logos which personally appeared in Christ; an idea which, supporting and illustrating, pervades all his definitions of morality. In his smaller address,Τίς ὁ σωζόμενος πλούσιος ("Who is the rich man saved?"), he discusses a practical question of the time concerning the use of earthly valuables and possessions. It may not be too much to assert that Clement, by his literary activity, is of no less significance for the department of Christian ethics than his worthy disciple Origen, by his celebrated workΠερὶ ἀρχῶν, became to that of Christian dogmatics. To these two Alexandrian Christians science is indebted for the most profound and lasting stimulus. The merits of Origen about Christian apologetic ethics we need but allude to here, and can speak only of his two practical treatises — Περὶ εὐχῆς (on prayer) and Εἰς μαρτύριον προτρεπτικὸς λογός (on exhortation to martyrdom). One feature to which we have alluded in the writings of these Church fathers — the leaning on the definitions of the ethics of classical antiquity — need of course hardly excite surprise. For it must be apparent to every wellread student of antiquity that the fathers, in order to be understood, had to speak the language of the then prevailing scientific consciousness; they could not break at one stroke the barriers of the surrounding cultured circle, and they felt the less obliged to do this as they were thoroughly convinced that in reason, enlightened by the Logos, was  given a point of intermediation between the classical and Christian consciousness, between the objective basis of revelation and the subjective principle of cognizance.

This definition of unity is by no one more emphasized than by Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen. They agree in the view that reason is the source and measure of morality, consequently that what is rational is moral, what is irrational is immoral or sinful, and therefore that Christian ethics, as the most rational, because derived from absolute reason personified in Christ, must also be the most complete and perfect. The writings of Tertullian (q.v.), which come next. are marked by a dark rigor, growing more prominent in proportion as he inclined to Montanism (q.v.). The moral earnestness of Christianity, under Montanist direction, was aggravated into unnatural severity; the moral advice of the Gospel was made a command, and extended to all Christians. With this theory, if it had prevailed, Christian principle would have failed of its mundane victory, and must have ultimately perished. In the use, then, of Tertullian's moralistic writings we must distinguish the ante-Montanistic period of the author's life from his later. Of the first class are De Patientia, De Oratione, De Pmnitentia, Ad Mnartyres, Ad Uxorem. Next stands Cyprian. Though in general he shared the strictly moral view of Tertullian, highly spoken of by him, and though, in contrast with Alexandrian speculation, he was strenuously attached to practical ecclesiasticism, yet he was never carried away to the rigid, excessive severity of his exemplar, and by his more spiritual manner of contemplation he inclined to the ideal, thus offering points for reconciling the Alexandrian and North African schools. (See, however, this Cyclopedia, 3:321, Colossians 2.) Cyprian's writings belonging to the department of ethics are De zelo et livore, distinguished by its psychological tenor, the third book of his Libri testimoniorum, which gives an outline of moral rules for life; De Bono Patientiae; De Opere et Eleomosynis; De Oratione Dominica; De Lapsis, etc.

We find in his letters also specimens of casuistry — decisions on difficult cases presented to him by bishops. Next Lactantius (q.v.), the Christian Cicero, spreads over the morals of the Gospel the splendor of rhetoric, and proves by comparison the insufficiency and perversity of pagan ethics. His Institutiones Divinae, in which he performs that task, call be looked upon as an exemplar of a development tending to reconcile speculative and practical elements. The Christian religion, which teaches man to find his supreme happiness in God, is pronounced by him the true philosophy of life. If some obliquity and error have crept into his ethical statements, they must be attributed to the circumstance that at the time of his authorship the moral doctrines of  the Church were not yet so fixed as they were after the Pelagian disputes. Of not equal, yet of considerable importance, are the writings of Athanasius, the pillar of orthodoxy in the Arian controversy. One would naturally suppose that he, busy with an attempt to solve the great dogmatic problem, had no time for moralistic discussion; nevertheless we find in his numerous dogmatic writings many moral reflections disseminated. Almost exclusively devoted to moral subjects are the writings of Ephraem (q.v.) the Syrian, whose edifying compositions contain a rich store of moral ascetic thoughts. A condign pendant to the writings of the propheta Syrorum are the ethical writings of Macarius (q.v.); they are especially important for mysticism, containing as they do the germs of the ecclesiastic traditional form later represented by the great mystics of the Middle Ages. Cyril (q.v.) of Alexandria is too well known as the zealous advocate of Christian ethics against the assaults of Julian to need special consideration here. Beside him stands Cyril (q.v.) of Jerusalem, who distinguishes between the dogmatic and ethic in the later usual manner, designating what concerns faith, δόγμα, and what has moral action for its purpose, πρᾶξις. ῾Ο τῆς θεοσέβειας τρόπος ἐκ δύο τούτων συνέστηκε, δογμάτων εὐσεβῶν καὶ πράξεων ἀγαθῶν. The dogmas he regards as the roots of moral motives. We turn next to that bright triple constellation of Cappadocia — Basil the Great and the Gregories — those great influential theologians of the 4th century. The sublime moral earnestness which animated them, their warm attachment to the Church, the superior culture which they had gained by industrious study, are mirrored in their literary products, spirit, learning, and eloquence. The main merit about Christian ethics is undoubtedly due to Basil the Great; yet also his brother, Gregory of Nyssa (in his writings on the life of Moses, on perfection, on virginity, as well as in his homilies), and his theological friend, Gregory of Nazianzum (in his poems and homilies), labored in the department zealously and successfully.

The ἠθικά of Basil contain the main features of Christian moral doctrine continuously based on sentences of Holy Writ. His ἀσκητικά have the higher morality and the perfection of monastic orders for their principal topic. Three of his letters addressed to Amphilochius, the bishop of Iconium, which contain regulations of Church discipline, have acquired canonical authority in the Roman Catholic Church. At the confines of the 4th century we are met by the grave and venerable form of Ambrose, the bishop of Milan, whose writings introduce us into a green and flowery garden of moral meditations. In his three books, De Officiis, he furnishes a counterpiece to Cicero's treatise of the same title. It aims to  bring the purity, sublimity, and sanctity of Christian ethics to a conscious and clear recognition. After him we come to three men — (347-407) Chrysostom, Jerome, and Augustine — all more or less connected with the Pelagian controversy. The first of them discourses on the question of free- will and grace, and in a most practical manner. Soon after his death we see the same raised as an issue of controversy full of moral interest by Pelagius, a British monk. Until the commencement of the 5th century strictly doctrinal questions had been the topics of ecclesiastical disputes; now the Pelagian contest, an eminently moral question, engaged public attention. The contrast of liberty and grace must have been recognised at the first awakening of reflection. It found, however, no final equitable solution, and remained in continual vacillation, sometimes grace, at other times liberty, preponderating, at the expense of the adverse. (Compare the view of the Grecian fathers of the Church of ἑκούσιν, Petavius, De theol. dogm. tom. 1, lib. 5, cap. 2.) Pelagius, however, asserted the freedom of will to such lengths that the divine influence of grace was nearly reduced to a nullity. Pelagius, in referring man to the power of his will, wished to rouse him to energetic action. This intention is ingenious, and deserving of respect. But, as Neander (Joh. Chrysostomus u. die Kirche, 2:134 sq.) correctly observes, man should be brought not only to the consciousness of his originally divine nature, but at the same time to the recognition of his internal corruption unlike it, and to the ideal of sanctity to be obtained: he ought to have cheered man, bowed down, by proclaiming what the infinite love of the Deity has done in Christ to deliver him from this corruption; he ought to have led him to the inexhaustible spring of divine life, by which the faithful may be renewed in heart, in order to impart to him confidence in moral exertions, not liable to be deceived, but rather confirmed, by selfknowledge and experience, which, according to his needs, humiliate and elevate him. Jerome (q.v.) preceded Augustine in coming forth to the conflict; he had already retired when the latter made his appearance, and by the momentum of speculative talent, mental profundity, and Christian knowledge and experience, turned and decided the contest. SEE PELAGIANISM.

Of the three, however, Augustine deserves by far the most important place. Except perhaps Clement of Alexandria and Ambrose. St. Augustine is certainly the ablest moralist of all the patristic writers. He was among the first to be distinguished by reduction to principles, by clear statement, dialectic progress of ideas, and systematic organization in general. The sovereign genius of Augustine, moreover, succeeded best in emancipating himself from classical influences. Nowhere  is the Christian vital principle of love (caritas) more exactly defined and carried out more consequentially than in his excellent treatise, De moribus ecclesiae catholicae et Manichaeorum, c. 15, 21-24 (comp. also his De civit. Dei, 14:9, page 54, 167; Enchirid. c. 121; Defide et operibus, c. 7). It is true he does not exhibit in his writings a strictly ethical system, but wherever and whenever he treats moral subjects, he is always led by a scientific dialectic spirit, and never loses sight of the spiritual ideal unity floating before his clear and comprehensive mind. Among his ethical works, besides the one mentioned above, the following are especially worthy of note: Enchiridion ad Laurentiunm s. defide, spe et caritate; De fide et operibus; De vita beata; De agone Christiano; De mendacio; De bono conjugali; De sancta virginitate; De continentia; De patientia.

See, however, the article AUGUSTINE. In the further lapse of' this period a number of men, partly of the Greek, partly of the Latin Church, have rendered service to ethics. Among these is Isidore of Pelusium, whose moral writings breathe the spirit of Chrysostom, and plainly show the love devoted by him to this great master, so influential in the Greek Church. Nilus also must be considered as being in spiritual connection with this illustrious exemplar. Both clothed their ethic definitions, precepts, counsels, and casuistic decisions in epistolary form. Even in the Occident we meet with a disciple of the "Gold-mouthed," John Cassian, who was actively engaged in the Pelagian movement by an attempt at mediation, which, however, miscarried. For ethics, not only his De octo capit. vitiis is worthy of mention, hut also his Collationes Patrum, and his twelve books, De institutis coenobiorum. Among the moralistic authors of the Greek Church, the series of the fathers hitherto enumerated is worthily concluded by John the Scholastic, author of that moral-ascetic treatise, Climax Paradisi, and by Anastasius Sinaita, whose writings are mainly of an ascetic description. In the Western Church Gregory the Great closes the period by his Moralia, a work which he skilfully introduces by some passages from Job, disseminating many suggestive thoughts, the abundant fruits of which will not escape the attentive observer in subsequent periods of ethic history.

3. Scholastic Period. — The men whom we meet from the beginning of the 7th until the end of the 11th century, with few exceptions, made it their main task to collect from the patristic mines all moralistic material, and to distribute and group it under definite rubrics and titles. Among these collectors archbishop Isidore of Hispalis deserves first mention. His  principal ethical work is Sententiarum s. de summo bono libri iii.

The maxims gathered from older fathers treat of virtue and sin in general, the auxiliaries of virtue, and particular duties. The main source from which he draws are Augustine and Gregory the Great. In his De Differentiis Spiritualibus also a moralistic tendency predominates, while his Synonyna and Soliloquia are entirely pervaded by it. With perspicuity he develops in them etymologically moral ideas, and reduces them to logical connection. He is surpassed, if not in learning, in mental productiveness by the abbot Maximus (the Confessor), whose Κεφάλαια on love contain the most profound ideas, and are extremely valuable for scientific ethics. He besides has well deserved by the interpretation of the mystic writings of the Areopagita. Maximus enunciates the proposition that the incarnation of the Λόγος had to be renewed in us spiritually; the human and divine must penetrate vitally. He distinguishes between the law of nature, the written law, and the law of grace, and attempts to develop the three elements in their single and in their interchanging relations. The collections of moral maxims by the Palestinian monk Antiochus in his Pandects of Holy Writ, and Beda the venerable in his Scintillae Patrum, are surpassed by John of Damascus in his extensive work Ta Epai. This ample collection of materials, surpassing all previous ones as regards completeness, is arranged alphabetically; the single articles are divided into a Biblical and a Patristic part.

Also his still more renowned work, ῎Εκδοσις ἀκριβὴς τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως, contains moral sections, the more significant the higher they stand in a scientific point of view. Alcuin's writing, De Animce Ratione, is allied to Platonic doctrines, as they are stated by Augustine. It descants on virtue in general, and the cardinal virtues and principal vices. His other work, De Virtute et Vitiis, is less scientific, and more remarkable for diligence in collecting. The thread of ethical writings, without enriching its particular sphere, was continued through the darkest times of the Middle Ages by Smaragdus (Via Regia and Diadema Monachorum), by bishop Halitgar of Cambray (De Poenitentia libri v), by Jonas, bishop of Orleans (Libri iii de Institutione Laicali and Libri de Institutione Regia), by Rabanus Maurus (De Vitiis, De Poenitentia, De Institutione Clericorum), by Pascharius Radpertus (Tract. de Fide, Spe et Caritate), by Hincmar (Epp. de Canendis Vitiis et Virtut. Exercend.), by Ratherius (A Medit. Cordis libri vi), and by Peter Damiani. The next writer, Anselm of Canterbury, really opens up the most auspicious outlook of the scholastic field. His writings, which in greater part belong to the department of morals, indicate a decided advance in a well-cultured spirit; and there are  foreshadowed in them the tendencies of the moralists of the latter part of the Middle Ages, by whom were brought forth those extravagances which successively held sway in the theological world under the name of mysticism, scholasticism, and casuistry. We come here upon Bernard of Clairvaux and Hugo of St. Victor, who were truly the coryphaei of Middle Age ethics, and the leading representatives of mysticism (see Helfferich, Die Christl. Mystik [Gotha, 1842], 1:349 sq., 430 sq.).

Bernard is surpassed by no author in his delineations of the worth and power of love. From him proceeded that passionate inspiration which the monastery of St. Victor perpetuated through the Middle Ages, and which remains embodied in the Imitation of Christ. The two pre-eminent Christian sentiments, according to him, are humility and love; both spring from the knowledge of ourselves. A sense of humiliation is the first experience when we duly regard ourselves, and this prepares for intensity of love, which in its highest degree is felt only in reference to God. We come next to the great masters of scholastic theological ethics. These are Peter Lombard, Thomas Aquinas, and Duns Scotus. Their aim is to harmonize Aristotelianism and Christianity. The first completed, in his Magister Sententairum, the list of the seven cardinal virtues by adding faith, hope, and charity to the ancient series of justice, fortitude, temperance, and wisdom. His scholars, Alexander of Hales and Albert the Great, still further perfected his system.

Thomas's task is to fully develop, in his Summa Theol. part 2, the mediaeval philosophy of virtue. He makes the intellect the highest principle, and distinguishes between universal and special ethics, the former being that of perfect beings in heaven, the latter that of imperfect beings on earth. This work is by all critics conceded to be the most magnificent of all ethical structures of the Middle Ages. Duns Scotus, in his Quaestiones in iv libb. sent., opposes the primacy of the will to that of the intellect, and thus introduces a subjective element in place of the objective knowledge to which Aquinas has given prominence. Besides these great writers of this period, there are many others who have greatly distinguished themselves as contributors to the department of ethics. Among these, above all others of the Christian writers of these times whom we have just passed in review, towers the revered Bonaventura, the conciliator of the dialectico-scholastic and mystical forms of the Middle Age spirit. He commented upon Lombard's writings, and wrote in a scholastic manner his Breviloquium and his Centiloguium; in a mystical tendency he composed his Itinerarium mentis in Deum, and smaller works. A pretty exhaustive epitome of Christian ethics was furnished by William Perault (Peraldus) in his Summa  de Virtutibus et Vitiis. A still richer and more thorough treatise of moral theology came from the pen of the Dominican Antoninus, archbishop of Florence, who, after Thomas, performed the greatest service in this field. He deserves to stand by the side of Bonaventura, as the author of Summa Theologiae in iv partes distributa. The Speculum Morale of Vincence of Beauvais stands in intimate relation to Thomas's writings, many regarding Thomas as its. author even, because of the similarity to the Secunda Secuondc,; yet there seems to be little ground for this supposition, and Vincence should be counted here as a writer of merit. Gerson also deserves mention here for his valuable contributions to scholastic morals (as contained in volume 3 of the Antwerp edition of his works).

Mysticism during the quarrels of the scholastics, developed and flourished more than ever in the latter part of this (14th) century, and brought forth much valuable fruit. Prominent among those who at this time gave to mysticism a popular, practical tendency were John Tauler (q.v.) and Henry Suso (q.v.). On the borders of the objective ecclesiastical and subjective unecclesiastical mysticism we meet John Ruysbroech, who is by Gerson ruled out of the Church writers as a heretic (see Ullmann, Reformers before the Reformation). But the greatest influence by far was exerted by Thomas a Kempis, who, breaking away altogether from speculation, entered the practical popular road in his Imnitation, to which we have already referred. But while thus gradually by this new mystical method morality was referred to inner feelings, aspirations, and conflicts, and by the scholastic method it was founded on systems of intellectual principles, prominence was given to the casuistical method, which limits itself to the determination of duty in particular cases (casus conscientie) in practical life. Numerous works on casuistry, some of them designed for the use of the confessional, were produced from the 13th to the 16th century, the principal of which are the Astesanca, by a Minorite of Asti; the Angelica, by Angelus de Calvasio; the Pisanella, also called the Magistruccia, by Bartholomeo de Sancta Concorlia, in Pisa; the Rosella, by the Genoese Minorite Trouamala; and the Monaldina, by archbishop Monaldus, of Benevento. The Astesanam treats, in eight books, of the divine commandments, of virtues and vices, of covenants and last wills, of the sacraments, of penance and extreme unction, of ordination, of ecclesiastical censures, and of marriage. The tendency of casuistry is to dissipate the essential unity of the Christian life in the technical consideration of a diversity of works.

4. Modern Period. — Casuistry had begun to decline when it was revived and zealously improved by the Order of Jesuits, and became their peculiar ethics. The doctrine of probabilities was developed by them in connection with it. The number of writers who devoted themselves to this task is very large. We can only make room here for the more noted. Though rather a polemic than a moralist, Bellarmine (t 1621) deserves to be first mentioned here because of the Jesuitic moral sentiments contained in his Disputationes de controversiis Christianae fidei. He has, moreover, played his part as a mystico-ascetic writer. His Libri iii de genitu Columbae (Antw. 1617), and his De ascensione mentis in Deum per scalas rerum creatarum (Par. 1606), are greatly valued by Romanists. But little less noted is Peter Canisius (t 1597), author of Summa doctrinae Christianae, a work which, though intended as an aid to catechetics, is yet much valued by Roman moralists because of the many important hints which it furnishes them. Other Jesuitical moralists who deserve mention here are Francis of Toledo (t 1596), Summa casuum conscientie s. Instructorium sacerdotum in libb. viii distinctum (Rome, 1602); Immanuel Sa (t 1596), Aphorismi confessariorum ex doctorum sententiis collecti (ed. ult. Duac. 1627); John Azor (t 1600), Institutiones Morales (Rome, 1600 sq.); Gregory of Valentia (t 1603), Commentt. theol. et disputt. in Summam Thomae Aquinatis; Gabriel Vasquez (t 1604), Commentt. et disputt. in Thom. (Ingolst. 1606); Thos. Sanchez (t 1630), Opus Morale in praecepta Decalogi (Mad. 1613); Disputationes de legibus ac Deo legislatore in decem libros distributee (Lugd. 1613, et Opp. t. 11); De Triplici virtute theologica, Fide, Spe et Caritate (Aschaffenb. 1622; Opp. 12); De Ultino hominiis Fine, voluntario et involuntario, humanorum actionunt Bonitate et Malifia, Passionibus, Habitibus, Vitiis et Peccatis (Mogunt. 1613; t. 6 et 7); Paul Laymann (t 1635), Theologia Moralis (Monach. 1625); Vincence Filliatius (t 1622), Quaestiones morales de Christianis officiis et casibus conscientiae ad formam cursus, qui praelegi solet in Societate Jesu Collegio Rom. (Lugd. 1622 sq.); Leonhard Less (t 1623), lib. 4, De Justitia et Jure coeterisque virtutibus cardinalibus ad Secundam Secundae Thomae (Lugd. 1630); Ferdinand de Castro Palao (t 1633), Opus Morale de Virtutibus et Vitiis (Lugd. 1633 sq.); John de Lugo (t 1660), Disputt. de Sacramentis, etc.

Pascal, and others with him, though not so ably as he, assailed the indefiniteness and ambiguity of casuistical principles as espoused by many of these Jesuitic moralists, SEE PROBABILISM; as the adequate type of  whom it should, however, be stated here that the Medulla of Hermann Busenbaum, which is the basis of the Theologia Moralis of Liguori, attained the highest reputation. Busenbaum's work is truly the embodiment of Jesuitical ethics. It appeared first in 1645 at Munster, and passed through fifty editions, enjoying a circulation like that of no other moral compend; and yet this was not the end, for its embodiment into the Theologia Moralis of Liguori gave it another lease of life, and thus the Medulla may be said to have enjoyed a two-hundred-years' rule. See, however, our article LIGUORI SEE LIGUORI .

The Medulla was also used and commented upon by Claude Lacroix and Francis Anth. Zacharia. Of like tendency are the writings of Taberna, Viva, Mazotta, Francolinus, and Edm. Voit. The casuisticomoral treatise of the last named is now, after Liguori's, the great favorite of Romanists, especially of Jesuits and Ultramontanes, and has in recent years been repeatedly published at Rome and Paris.

Among the writers of the Roman Catholic Church who have stood aloof in a great measure from the casuists, as well as the reformers led by Pascal, the first place in this period belongs to bishop Louis Abelly (t 1691), whose Medulla Theologica has passed through several editions (last, Regensb. 1839). A favorite text-book for theological students, because of its brevity and clearness, is the Examen theologice Morale, by Marianus at Angelis. It has been exceeded in popularity only by Sobiech's Compend. theologiae Moralis, and more recently by Liguori's Homo Apostolicus.

5. Recent Period. — Among those who in more recent days have led the Romanists on moral subjects, none deserve so high a place as Hirscher, whose Christl. Moral (Tiib. 1835, 3 volumes, 8vo, and often) is really a work of more than ordinary merit. Perhaps equal merit is accorded to Sailer (Christkatholische Moral, Ratisbon, 1831), also a scholar and a clear thinker. These two men were liberal in sentiment, and accommodated themselves to the spirit of the age; but for this reason they are well known only in Germany and among the Gallican clergy of France. Everywhere else Liguori still holds sway. Ambrose Joseph Stapf may in many respects be counted a disciple of Sailer and Hirscher. His Christliche Sittenlehre was published at Innsbruck in 1850, edited by J.B. Hofmann.

Other works of like tendency and worth are from the distinguished Roman Catholic theologians Filser, Martin, Propst, and especially Werner.. Danzler, Muttschelle, and Schreiber may be pointed out as principal organs of a negative tendency. They are Pelagian in their interpretation of Christianity,  and betray the modern rationalistic leaning in their moral systems. Among those who have closely allied themselves with the sceptical philosophic schools of our day the following are worthy of mention: Aug. Isenbiehl (t 1800), Tugendlehre nach Grundsatzen der reinen Vernunft u. des praktischen Christenthums (Augsb. 1795); Jos. Geishtutner (t 1805), Theol. Moral in einer wissenschaftlichen Darstellung (Augsb. 1805). The last named is a disciple of Fichte, and, together with Maurus Schenkl (t 1816), who published Ethica Christiana (5th ed. Vienna, 1830), indicates a passing over to a more positive tendency. One of the more recent and noted works on the subject is Prof. Paul Palasthy's Theologia Morum Catholica (1861, 4 volumes). Though the author is a Hungarian, the work has been brought out in Germany, and there enjoys a wide circulation, and is acknowledged superior to the German works (comp. Literarischer Handweiser f. d. kath. Deutschland, September 18, 1867). It is based on the labors of Suarez, Billuart, Less, Laymann, and Leander. Another work of about the same date is Prof. F. Friedhoff's Allgem. Moraltheoloyie (Mayence, 1860). Later he wrote another work on the subject, entitled Specielle Moraltheologie (1865), but neither of them compares favorably with the Hungarian production. Of greater value even than Palasthy's work, and more recent in origin, is Prof. Simar's Lehrb. d. kathol. Moral theologie (Bonn, 1867, 8vo), which is fast gaining ground in the theological schools of Germany. In his introduction he furnishes a valuable resume of the history of Roman Catholic moral theology, which we have freely consulted in writing this article. See Wetzer mi. Welte, Kirchen- Lexikon, 7:294-308; Aschbach, Kirchen-Lexikon, s.v. Moral Theologie; Dublin Rev. October1853; Brownson's Rev. January 1853; and for Protestant criticisms, Manning and Meyrick, Moral Theology of the Church of Ronme, or certain Points in S. Alonso de Liguori's Moral Theology considered, in 19 Letters (1855); Presbyterian Quarterly, April, 1873, page 367; North British Review, July, 1870, page 266; Westminster Reviewz, January 1873, page 118 sq.; Christian Remembrancer. January, July, and October 1854.

## Morales, Ambrosio[[@Headword:Morales, Ambrosio]]

             a learned Spanish Dominican, the best authority on early Spanish history, was born at Cordova in 1513. His parents and relatives were people eminent in literary circles, and Ambrosio enjoyed all the advantages his country could afford him. One of his uncles, Fernan Perez de Oliva, who was a professor of philosophy and theology at Salamanca, took a  prominent part in his education, and greatly influenced his tendency to theological study. He was also indebted to Juan de Medina and to Meichior Cano, two great writers and eloquent professors of divinity of that time, the former at Alcala, the latter at Salamanca, where he was the great antagonist of his eminent colleague Bartholomeo Carranza, and a still greater opponent of the Jesuits. This Cano, or Cansus, is the author of the excellent treatise De Locis Theologicis, and was a great reformer of the schools, from which he banished many futile and absurd questions. While yet a youth Morales produced a translation of the Pinax or Table of Cebes. But religious enthusiasm arose far above all his literary aspirations, and pervaded all his actions. At the age of nineteen Morales became a Jeronvmite, when, his religious fervor being no longer controllable, in order to secure himself against temptation, he attempted to follow the precedent of Origen. The excruciating pain inseparable from this self- mutilation drew from him a shriek which brought a brother monk to his cell in time to give him effectual relief. In order to obtain a papal dispensation for his conduct, he set out for Rome, but fell into the sea, and was saved, according to his own account, by a miracle. Considering this accident as a warning not to proceed, he joined his friends at court, and lived thenceforward as a secular priest. After the death of his father he became a professor at Alcala, where he had, among others, Guevara, Chacon, Sandoval, and the first Don Juan of Austria, among his pupils. He sustained the high literary credit of his family by his investigations into the antiquities of Spain. He also devoted himself to belles-lettres, and did much to cultivate among the Spanish of his day a taste for literature. His services were recognised at court, and he was made historiographer to Philip II, king of Spain. Morales died in 1590. He was the author of several works on the secular as well as religious history and antiquities of Spain; but his extreme credulity greatly deteriorates the value of his writings. See Bouterweck, Hist. of Spanish Lit. (see Index); Ticknor, Hist. of Spanish Lit. 3:129.

## Morales, Juan Bautista[[@Headword:Morales, Juan Bautista]]

             a Spanish moralist, was born at Montella, Andalusia, and flourished in the first half of the 17th century. Scarcely anything is known of his personal history. He is, however, noted as the author of Jardin de Suertes morales y civitas (Seville, 1616, 16mo). See Antonio, Bibliotheca Hispana nova, s.v.

## Morales, Luis de[[@Headword:Morales, Luis de]]

             a Spanish artist, noted for his paintings of sacred subjects, was born in Badajoz in 1509. Either from his constant choice of sacred subjects, or (less probably) from the merits of his works, he received the surname of El Divino, "the divine." His pictures were nearly all heads, generally of Christ or the Virgin; some authorities believe that there are no instances of his painting the figure at full length. His Ecce Homo and Mater Dolorosa are the best types of his paintings. in spite of his acknowledged ability, the prices lie received for his works are said not to have been enough to compensate him for the great labor and time he spent upon them; and he lived in the greatest want until his old age, when he was supported by Philip II. His chief works are at Toledo, Valladolid, Burgos, and Granada. He died in Badajoz in 1586.

## Moralities[[@Headword:Moralities]]

             a term used for the theatrical representations made by the monks in the Middle Ages, designed to exhibit virtue and vice, so as to make the former look desirable, the latter detestable. This word is classed with two others of similar meaning-miracles and mysteries. SEE MYSTERIES.

## Morality[[@Headword:Morality]]

             is that relation which human actions bear to a given rule of rectitude. Says Whately, "To lay down in their universal form the laws according to which the conduct of a free agent ought to be regulated, and to apply them to the different situations of human life, is the end of morality" (Lessons on Morals). It is the opposite of legality, as that expresses only conformity with justice, while morality is applied to the tendency in the mind or heart towards harmonious action with the law. It is the doctrine, in short, which treats of actions as right or wrong. It does not cover so vast a field as religion, but is, nevertheless, the outgrowth of it. "Morality," it has been aptly said, "is a studious conformity of our actions to the relations in which we stand to each other in civil society. Morality comprehends only a part of religion; but religion comprehends the whole of morality. Morality finds all its motives here below; religion fetches all its motives from above The highest principle in social morals is a just regard to the rights of men; the first principle in religion is the love of God."

While religion, then, covers the whole life both in its present and future relations, morality confines itself virtually to the temporal, or better civil life. "Morality," says  Coleridge, "commences with and begins in the sacred distinction between thing and person. On this distinction all law, human and divine, is grounded" (Aids to Refection, 1265). "There are in the world," says Sewell. "two classes of objects, persons and things; and these are mutually related to each other. There are relations between persons and persons, and between things and things; and the peculiar distinctions of moral actions, moral characters, moral principles, moral habits, as contrasted with the intellect and other parts of man's nature, lies in this, that they always imply a relation between two persons, not between two things" (Christian Morals, page 339). Now the Christian Church holds that so much of the glory of man's origin remains in him, that even when farthest from the light and grace of Christ's presence in the Church he retains some spark of that divine conscience which is derived from him — "the true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world" (Joh 1:9). "Morality," argues Culverwell aptly, "is founded in the divine nature. It is an eternal ordinance made in the depth of God's infinite wisdom and counsel for regulating and governing the whole world, which yet had not its binding virtue in respect of God himself, who has always the full and unrestrained liberty of his own essence that it cannot bind itself" (Light of Nature). Hence a knowledge of good and evil, some sense of responsibility to God, and some capacity for practical virtue, may be possessed even by persons not Christians; those of them at least who have not been brought within reach of the Church, with its revelation of truth and its sacraments of grace. Of such St. Paul speaks in Rom 2:14; or at least his words respecting the Gentiles who had not the Jewish "law" may be fairly interpreted as extending also to those who have not the Christian law. They may do by nature some of those duties which are extended and heightened by grace, and may thus be "not far from the kingdom of God." To what extent such natural morality now exists (after eighteen centuries of Christianity) it is impossible to say; probably to a very small extent. In his epistle to the Romans, St. Paul clearly distinguishes between that conformity with the letter of the law springing from a Christian heart, and that external conformity prompted simply by a desire to evade the odium or punishment of the transgressor. The latter the apostle does not recognise as true morality; the δικαιοσύνηνομικη is in its simple legality, and for want of a real inwardness of a moral or better spiritual life, only an apparent morality.

The ἔργα νόμου are not by any means the ἔργα ἀγαθά which the spirit of Christianity elicits; they want that life-giving spirit which is none other than the spirit of divine love, of the fullest,  inmost, and truly unconditional surrender to God and his most holy purposes. The germ, the life or essence, of Christian morality is love, itself the principle of union in and with God, the fountain and original of all good. It is to Christian morality, then, that the highest standard and the noblest place must be assigned; indeed, it is Christian morality which must not only precede, but supersede, all other systems of morality. "What the duties of morality are," says Coleridge, “the apostle instructs the believer in full, comprising them under the two heads of negative and positive: negative, to keep himself pure from the world; and positive, beneficence from loving-kindness — that is, love of his fellow-men (his kind) as himself. Last and highest come the spiritual, comprising all the truths, acts, and duties that have an especial reference to the timeless, the permanent, the eternal. to the sincere love of the true as truth, of the good as good, and of God as both in one. It comprehends the whole ascent from uprightness (morality, virtue, inward rectitude) to godlikeness, with all the acts, exercises, and disciplines of mind, will, and affections that are requisite or conducive to the great design of our redemption from the form of the evil one, and of our second creation or birth in the divine image. It may be an additional aid to reflection to distinguish the three kinds severally, according to the faculty to which each corresponds, the part of our human nature which is more particularly its organ. Thus, the prudential corresponds to the sense and the understanding; the moral to the heart and the conscience; the spiritual to the will and the reason, that is, to the finite will reduced to harmony with and in subordination to the reason, as a ray from that true light which is both reason and will, universal reason and will absolute" (A ids to Reflection, 1:265, also 22, 23). On the near coincidence of this scriptural division with the Platonic, SEE PRUDENCE.

See Bishop Horsley's Charge (1790); Paley's and Grove's A Moral Philosophy; Beattie's Elements of Moral Science; Evans's Sermons on Christian Temper; Watts's Sermons on Christian Morals; Mason's Christian Morals; More's Hints, 2:245; Gisborne's Sermons designed to illustrate and enforce Christian Morality; Meysenburg, De Christiance religionis vi et effectu in jus civile (Gott. 1828, 8vo), Hoffbauerr, Das allgem. oder Naturrecht u. die Moral (Halle, 1816); Schleiermacher, Grundlinien einer Kritik der bisherigen Sittenlehre (Berl. 1813), page 465; Brend, Difference between the Morality of Jesus and that of the Jews; Ensor, Principles of Morality; Hildreth, Theory of Morals; Kames, Principles of Morality; Whewell, Morality, § 76; Maurice, Lectures on Social Morality (1873); Smith, Characteristics of Christian Morality (Bampton Lects. 1873);  Contemip. Rev. April 1872, art. 6 and 8; March 1872, art. 5; Westminster Rev. April 1871, pages 243, 260, 261; and literature in Malcom, Theol. Index, s.v.

## Morals[[@Headword:Morals]]

             a term usually employed to designate the aggregate of the moral principles of an individual or a community as evinced in its conduct in comparison with the acknowledged rules of morality. The various general relations of this subject are so fully discussed in the articles ETHICS SEE ETHICS , MORAL LAW SEE MORAL LAW , etc., that we here bring together only some special distinctions under the head of duty, the fulfilment of which is the ultimate criterion of public and private morals.

Baumgarten defines duties to be actions which one is bound to perform, and Christian August Crusius coincides with this opinion when he defines duty as the application of the principles of morality to individual cases, and with Opitz, who calls it the inward knowledge of what one must do or abstain from doing in order to lead a religious life. Reinhard defines duty as the moral necessity of doing or not doing a certain thing, resulting from our perception of right (System d. christl. Moral, part 2, § 196). This is the view taken by many others, even by Roman Catholic moralists (see Riegler, Christl. Moral, part 1, § 124 sq.). This, however, considers only the outward part of duty, as manifested in action; its scope was afterwards enlarged by connecting it with the conscience ( SEE MORAL SENSE ), which Crusius understands to be the inborn impulse by which we recognise the obligation of subjecting all our thoughts and actions to the will of God. Paley stands almost alone in making virtue consist in utility, and those who resolve it into "the fitness of things" do but indirectly refer it to the will of God, who has ordained the constitution of the universe. All our duties to God are comprised in the expression, honor God (Walch), or love God. For to fear God and keep his commandments is the whole duty of man (Ecc 12:13). It was already presented as such in the O.T., but in the N.T. this is put in the first place, as the one important principle: unlimited love towards God, and to one's neighbor as the image of God, as well as of one's self (Mat 22:37-40; Rom 13:8-10; Deu 6:4-9; Lev 19:14; Lev 19:17-18, etc.).

As the Kantian philosophy, abandoning the cognition of a thing per se, placed the power of truth entirely in the consciousness of obligation (categorical imperative), duty, as that commanded by it. acquired in that system an extraordinary  significance. Will nothing, and do nothing which it cannot be lawful for entire mankind to do; or, As ye would that men should do to: you, do ye also to them likewise (Mat 7:12; Luk 6:31). The total submission to the categoric imperative arising from pure regard for the law is the highest morality; while that arising from love, a sort of subjective satisfaction in it, is less pure, since the motive is akin to egotism. Thus morality resolved itself into the doctrine of law and duty, while previously it was considered as almost exclusively a question of good. Indeed, Paley made morality itself consist in seeking the high-est good, a theory not far removed from the purer form, of ancient Epicureanism. The modern philosophy, however, has justly repudiated this utilitarian text, and thrown the subject back for solution upon the deeper convictions of mankind as expressed in the instinctive discriminations of conscience. SEE MORAL PHILOSOPHY.

## Morand, ST[[@Headword:Morand, ST]]

             a Clugny monk, was born in Germany, and flourished in the 11th century. He was educated at Worms, and then went to Burgundy, in France, and joined the Congregation of Clugny. Falling in with Hugo of Samur, a severe ascetic, Morand was enlisted in behalf of monasticism, and he preached in its favor wherever he went. He roamed all over France and Switzerland, restoring as far as possible the former interest in monastic institutions, and creating new ones where they had never been. His austerity and piety secured for him a place in the list of saints; and it is claimed by Romanists that he worked many miracles. See Vita S. Morandi in Biblioth. Cluniacensis, col. 501; Montalembert, Monks of the West, volume 3 (see Index).

## Morando, Paolo[[@Headword:Morando, Paolo]]

             a Veronese painter, sometimes called Cavazzuola, was born in 1491. He died young, and consequently left but few works to perpetuate his name; these, however, are of a high order of merit. Christ bearing his Cross, now in the gallery of Verona, is attributed to him, and is one of the best compositions on the subject which can be found among the old painters. Mrs. Jameson says: "This conception is one of the few which realize the scriptural and historical picture to the mind. Simon is here in his suitable character, and no superadded incident diverts the eye from the chief  figure." See Mrs. Jameson and Eastlake, Hist. of Our Lord (Lond. 1864, 2 volumes, 8vo), 2:113.

## Morange, Bedion[[@Headword:Morange, Bedion]]

             a French theologian, was born at Paris about 1635, and was educated at the Sorbonne, where he received the doctorate. In 1660 he became canon of Lyons, and later vicar-general of that diocese. He died there in 1703. He wrote, Libri de preadamitis brevis Analysis (Lyons, 1656, 8vo): — Prizatus Lugdunensis Apologeticon (1658, 8vo): — Sumna uneiversce Theologiae Catechistae (1670, 4 volumes, 8vo).

## Morant, Philip[[@Headword:Morant, Philip]]

             a British antiquary and divine, was born in the island of Jersey in 1700; was educated at Pembroke College, Oxford; then entered the sacred ministry, and became, first, rector of St. Mary's, Colchester, afterwards of Aldham, Essex. He died in 1778. Morant edited several works, and wrote a History of Colchester (Lond. 1748, fol.); also enlarged, and incorporated in a later work of his, Hist. and Antiquities of the County of Essex (1768, 2 volumes). He also wrote all the biographies marked with the letter C and the life of Stilliigh-eet in the Biog. Brit. (1st ed. 17 volumes, fol.). See Allibone, Diet. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, 2:1359.

## Morasthite[[@Headword:Morasthite]]

             (Heb. Morashti', מוֹרִשְׁתַּי, gentile from Moresheth; Sept. Μωραθίτης, Μωρασθεί), a native of MOKESHIETH-GATH (Jer 26:18; Mic 1:1). SEE MICAH.

## Morata, Olympia Fulvia[[@Headword:Morata, Olympia Fulvia]]

             an Italian lady of great genius and learning, noted for her piety and faithful service to Italian Protestantism, and spoken of by the biographer of the duchess Renee as " a woman whose history may be pondered in silent compassion, yet in silent admiration — a saint so tried in life, so blessed in death," was born at Ferrara in 1526. Her father, preceptor to the young princes of Ferrara, sons of Alphonso I, observing her genius, took great pains in cultivating it; and when Olympia was called to court for the purpose of instructing the princess Anna d'Este, daughter of the duchess of Ferrara, and of herself studying belleslettres with the princess of Ferrara, under the tutelage of her father, she astonished the Italians by declaiming in  Latin and Greek, explaining the paradoxes of Cicero, and answering any question that was put to her. The example of Renee de France, duchess of Ferrara, who was much interested in the religious controversies of the times, had a great influence upon Olympia's mind. Men like Jamet, Marot, Peter Martyr, Lalio Giraldi, and Celius Calcagnilli were received at court, and formed a select circle. Calvin, who went in disguise from France to Italy to see her, brought her over to his opinions, and her court became the refuge of all those suspected of heresy. Peregrino Morata, Olympia's father, became himself converted, but Olympia showed little inclination as yet for a devout, religious life. Her whole mind was taken up with her own literary works and the court gayeties. "If Olympia," says Young, the biographer of Paleario, "learned anything at court of true religion, she also found much to distract her attention. The extreme precocity of her talents had early called forth her reasoning and reflective powers, but she herself owns that at this time she did not duly relish the sacred Scriptures.

They were to her a holy, but a sealed book; her intellect revelled with greater delight in the mazes of human learning and philosophy." She wrote several essays at this time, the best known of which is a eulogy on Mucius Scaevola. But the year 1548 brought a decided change. Her friend, the princess Anna of Ferrara, married and went to Lorraine, and shortly afterwards her father died. His death, and the ill-health of her mother, withdrew her from court, and she devoted herself to household affairs, the education of three sisters and a brother, and especially to spiritual contemplation and devotion. In communing with her own heart she began to perceive her need, and from that moment resolved to live and die a follower of the Gospel. In this her hour of greatest happiness she made the acquaintance of a young German named Andrew Grunthler, who had studied medicine, and taken his doctor's degree at Ferrara. He was a Protestant, and the day when she was married to him (in 1549) she followed her father's example and embraced Protestantism. Her husband, unprepared to depart at once with his bride, advanced to Germany to prepare the way for her, and over a year elapsed before he was ready to return for her. Together with her little brother and her husband she now left for Germany. They went to Schweinfurt, in Franconia, which was soon after besieged and burned, and they barely escaped with their lives. They suffered many hardships in consequence, until Grunthler in 1554 received a call to Heidelberg as professor of medicine. Now at last it was hoped that better days had come for poor Olympia, but the fearful hardships she had suffered during the siege of Schweinfurt had undermined her health. In  December 1554, she was taken sick, and never left her bed again. She died October 26, 1555. A few months later her husband and brother died also. Several of her works were burned at Schweinfurt, but the remainder were collected and published at Basle in 1558 by Ccelius Secundus Curio. They consist of orations, dialogues, letters, and translations, and are known as Olympiae Fulviae Morate, mulieris omnium eruditissimae Latina et Graeca, quae haberi potuerunt, monumenta (Basle, 1558). They are distinguished for a deep religious conviction and great refinement of language and thought. See Bonnet, Vie d'Olympie Morata (Paris, 1850; in English, Life of O. Morata, with a Historical Sketch of the Ref. in Italy [Edinb. 1854, 18mo]); Turnbull, O. Morata, her Life and Times (Bost. 1846, 12mo); Mrs. Smith, Life, Times, and Writings of O. Morata; Some Memorials of Renee of France, Duchess of Fertara (2d ed. Lond. 1859,12mo), page 62 sq.; Trollope, Decade of Italian Women, volume 2; Colquhoun, Life in Italy and France in the Olden Time; Young, Life and Times of Paleario, 2:90 sq.; M'Crie, Hist. of the Ref. in Italy, page 54; Littell's Living Age, March 13, 1852, page 510. (J.H.W.)

## Morata, Peregrino Fulvio[[@Headword:Morata, Peregrino Fulvio]]

             an Italian writer, noted as the father of the foregoing, and also for his defence of the Reformatory movement, which made him a Protestant, was born at Mantua near the close of the 15th century. During the early half of the 16th century he was professor of belles-lettres at the university of his native place, and later at Ferrara, whither the fame of his learning and virtue had brought him. He now taught not only in the high schools, but was also employed by duke Alphonso d'Este as preceptor of his two sons. He frequently appeared in the receptions at court, but he remained nevertheless an alien to the gayeties of its surroundings, and devoted himself largely to sacred meditations, in which he was assisted by his pious wife, Lucrezia. As a result of these studies, he brought out finally an exposition of the Lord's Prayer in 1526 (Expozitione dell' orazione Dominicale della "Pater Noster"), and shortly after he published a book taking ground favorable to the Reformed opinions (see Calcagnini, Opera, p. 156). He was on this account obliged to leave Ferrara in 1533, and only after a six years' stay abroad secured permission to return. He died in 1548. See Young, Life of Paleario, 2:96 sq.; Bonnet, Life of Olympia Morata, page 69 sq.

## Moravia[[@Headword:Moravia]]

             (German Mahren, Slavic Morawa), a margraviate of the Austrian empire, especially interesting as being the chief seat of the Church of the United Brethren.

General Description. — Moravia, situated in 480 40'50° N. lat., and 150 10'-183 28' E. long., is bounded N. by Prussian and Austrian Silesia, E. by Hungary and Galicia, S. by the duchy of Austria, and W. by Bohemia, and contains in superficial area about 8555 square miles, with a population in 1882 of 1,997,897, divided about as follows: 450,000 are Germans, upwards of a million and a quarter Slavonians, and 50,000 belonging to other nations. The Slavonians of Moravia are composed of Zechs and Poles, the former of whom are inferior to their brethren in Bohemia, being an incorrigibly lazy, dirty people. The Moravian Poles, although less industrious and cultivated than the Germans, are a physically well- developed, courageous, and enterprising people. Moravia is a very mountainous country, and except in the south, where are extensive plains, the level above the sea is about 800 feet. Not more than half of the territory is arable. The more elevated parts are not fertile, and the climate is severe; but in the mountain valleys and on the southern plains the soil is remarkably rich, and the temperature more genial than in other European countries lying in the same parallel. Moravia produces largely for export fine crops of grain, also hops, mustard, potatoes, clover-seed, beet-root; and in the south, maize, grapes, chestnuts, and many other of the less hardy fruits and vegetables. The breeding of cattle and sheep, and the making of cheese from sheep's milk, constitute an important branch of industry; in the southern districts of the Hanna (a plain famous for its fertility), horses are bred for exportation. Geese and fowls are reared in large numbers for the sake of their feathers, and the keeping of bees is conducted with great success.

The mineral products, which include gold, silver, iron, alum, saltpetre, coal, graphite, whetstones, sulphur, vitriol, pipe-clay, marble, topazes, garnets, and other precious stones, have not been made as available as they might have been. Some of the mines have been known since the 8th century. No gold or silver has been extracted since the 16th century, and the iron and coal mines are but little worked. The principal branches of industry are the manufacture of linen and thread, which now enjoy a European reputation, and leather goods, cotton, flannels and other woollen fabrics. Bruinn, the capital, is the chief emporium for the manufacturing trade, and Olmutz the principal cattle-mart.  Religion and Education. — Christianity was introduced among the Slavic nations as early as the reign of Charlemagne, SEE SLAVES, but the conversions then made were only transitory. In 863 the Holy Scriptures, the preaching of the Gospel and the service of the Christian religion as then practiced, were introduced to the Moravians in the Slavonic tongue by the Greek monks Cyrillus (Constantine) and Methodius, who became connected with Rome, but did not relinquish their peculiar Greek forms of worship. Methodius was consecrated at Rome archbishop of Moravia, and the Slavish forms of worship received the papal sanction (880), on the ground that God understood all languages, and should be worshipped by all nations. The efforts, however, to erect a distinct national Church met with continual opposition on the part of the German bishops, and finally, in 908, the Moravian kingdom was divided by the swords of the Hungarians and Bohemians. The Slavish ritual was kept up under these new rulers in only a few churches, and gradually the Romish practices were here the same as elsewhere (comp. Dobrowsky, Cyrill u. Methodius, der Slaven Apostel [Prague, 1823]). The Reformation made some inroads into the country, but as conformity to the Romish worship was enforced by law, many of the people holding the doctrine of the Reformation had to meet secretly for worship, and as opportunity offered fled into the Protestant states of Germany. This was especially the case with the Moravian Brethren (q.v.).

The bulk of Moravians remain Romanists to this day, the Protestants only counting about 57,000, among whom the Lutherans and Reformed, who are the most numerous, have each a superintendent appointed by the state. There are also about 30,000 Jews, who, since 1848, have been freed from all oppressive obligations and restrictions. The Romanists have an archbishop, who resides at Olmutz, and a bishop, whose episcopal head-quarters are at Brunn. Both of these ecclesiastics are admitted to the provincial diet as members. The educational advantages of the country are exceptionally good. Until recently there was a university at Olmiitz. There are now twelve Catholic gymnasia, besides numerous parish schools, and about ninety-nine per cent. of the children of proper age attend school.

History. — Moravia was anciently occupied by the Quadi, who, on their migration in the 5th century to Gaul and Spain, were replaced first by the Rugii, next by the Heruli and Longobardi, and finally by a colony of Slavonians, who, on their settlement in the country, took the name of Moravians, from the river Morava. Charlemagne, who brought the people  under nominal subjection after they had spread themselves over a territory greater than the present Moravia, constrained their king, Samoslav, to receive baptism.

Moravia was made tributary to the German empire before the close of the century; but in 1029 it was incorporated with Bohemia, after having for a time been a prey to the incursive attacks of its Slavonic and Teutonic neighbors. At the close of the 12th century, Moravia was erected into a margraviate, and declared a fief of Bohemia, to be held from the crown by the younger branches of the royal house. On the death of Lewis II, at the battle of Mohacz, in 1526, Moravia, with all the other Bohemian lands, fell to Austria, in accordance with a pre-existing compact of succession between the royal houses. Since then it has shared the fortunes of the empire, and in 1849 was formally separated from Bohemia, and declared a distinct province and crown-land. See Dudik, Miahren's algem. Gesch. (Brin, 1860-65, 4 volumes, 8vo); Pilaret Morawitz, Moravian. Hist. Eccles. et Pol. (Brin, 1785 sq. 3 volumes, 8vo).

## Moravia, Andrew De[[@Headword:Moravia, Andrew De]]

             a Scotch prelate, was bishop of Moray from 1224 to 1242, in which year he died. This prelate laid the foundation of that magnificent church which was dedicated to the Holy Trinity, and ordered to be the cathedral church of Moray forever. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 138.

## Moravian Brethren[[@Headword:Moravian Brethren]]

             the designation of a body of Christians, will be considered under two heads.

## Moravians[[@Headword:Moravians]]

             SEE MORAVIAN BRETHREN.

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

             a Scotch prelate, was consecrated bishop of the see of Moray in 1299, at Avignon. He died January 20, 1326. This prelate founded the Scots College at Paris in 1325. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 140.

## Moray, Gilbert[[@Headword:Moray, Gilbert]]

             a Scotch prelate, was consecrated bishop of the see of Caithness in 1222. He died at Scrabister in 1245, after having built and consecrated the  cathedral church of Caithness, at Dornoch. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 207.

## Morcelli, Stefano Antonio[[@Headword:Morcelli, Stefano Antonio]]

             a celebrated Italian archaeologist, of the Order of Jesus, was born at Chiari January 17, 1737: studied at Rome, then joined the Jesuits; was sent to Ragusa, and afterwards returned to Rome, and was made professor in the Roman College. After the suppression of the order in 1773, Morcelli became librarian to cardinal Alessandro Albani, and while thus employed wrote his De Stilo Inscriptionum Latinarum, libri in (Rome, 1780, 4to). In 1790 he was elected, provost of the chapter in his native town, and so interesting became this work to him that he refused the proffered see of Ragulsa. He died in 1821. Few men lived more unselfishly than Morcelli. He liberally bestowed of his own to the poor, and abounded in philanthropic labors. Among other provisions, he founded an institution for the gratuitous education of young girls. Besides the work mentioned above, he wrote Inscriptiones Commentariis subjectis (Rome,1783,4to): — Parergon Inscriptionum Novissimarum (Padua, 1818, 4to): — Kalendarlium Ecclesiae Constaninopolintanae cun Commentariis illustratum (Rome, 1785, 2 volumes, 4to), from an ancient MS.: anterior to the schism between the Eastern and Western churches. Morcelli  translated the MS. from Greek into Latin, adding his own commentaries, and rendering it a valuable work on Church history: — Explanatio Ecclesiastica Sancti Gregorii. This Gregory was one of the earliest bishops of Agrigentum: — Africa Christiana (Brescia, 1816, 3 volumes, 4to). This is another ,important work on Church history, from A.D. 197 till A.D. 697. It may be styled the Fasti of the Christian churches in Northern Africa. Morcelli's works on inscriptions have been collected and published together: Opera Epigraphica (Padua, 1818-25, 5 volumes). Professor Schiassi has added to them a Lexicon Epigranphicum Morcellianum, in Latin and Italian. Morcelli wrote also a book of epigrams — Electorum Libri ii — and various dissertations on Roman antiquities. See Baraldi, Notizia di a Morcelli (Mod. 1825); Tipaldo, Biogrs. degli Ital. 10:102.

## Morclar, Jean-Piere-Francois De Ripert, Marquis de[[@Headword:Morclar, Jean-Piere-Francois De Ripert, Marquis de]]

             a French religious writer, noted as a defender of the Huguenots, was born October 1, 1711, at Apt, Provence. He was descended from the family of the dauphiness, and was the son of a magistrate whom the chancellor Daguesseau had surnamed L'Amour du bien, December 19, 1732, he succeeded his father as procurator general to the Parliament of Provence;  he was then twenty-one years of age. He was a ready orator, a brilliant lawyer, and profoundly versed in public law. From 1749 he energetically declared himself in favor of the Protestants, and endeavored to obtain for them civil rehabilitation and liberty of conscience. In his article, on the clandestine marriages of the Reformed, he raises his voice, in the name of justice and humanity, against the iniquitous laws which condemned to ignominy and illegitimacy the fruits of their unions; and at the same time he demonstrated, by learned calculations, that was greatly to the interest of the state to favor the progress of population. In 1752 the republic of Gendva a prey to civil dissensions, rendered homage to the integrity of the magistrate by choosing him as arbiter of the two parties in collision. — “At this time,” says M Villemain, “an event occurred which developed the talents of several men in the parliaments of the kingdoms this was the trial and expulsion of the celebrated society of the Jesuits. Monclar took a lively and active interest in this affair, and his expose of their doctrines was a masterpiece of method and clearness, without exaggeration, and without false eloquence. In the remonstrance, that he was charged to draw up in the name of those opposed to the Jesuits, Monclar knew how to unite dignified firmness with the respect due to the sovereign and to avoid that rather republican severity with which Voltaire reproaches Malesherbes.” He was instrumental in restoring Venaissin to France (in 1768), and received for his services from Louis XV a pension and the title of marquis (October 1769). Monclar, after forty years of active life, withdrew to his estate of Saint-Saturnin, where he died, February 12, 1773. Romanists claim that Monclar in his dying hour made known to his confessor a regret for what he had said against the Holy See and the Society of Jesus. But there seems to be no ground for the declaration, as the whole life of the marquis speaks against any such change. He wrote Moire theologique et polique au sujet des marinage clandestins des Protestants en France (1755, 8vo); at the time of its appearance it aroused a warm discussion: more than twenty pamphlets were published for or against: — Compte rendu des Constitutions des Jesuite (1762, 2 volumes, 12mo); reprinted since with the Requisitoire du 4 Janvier, 1763, and the Conclusions du 5 Mars, 1765, on the bull Apostolicum pascendi (Paris, 1769, 2 volumes, 4to and 8vo). The complete works of Monclar, comprising 8 volumes, 8vo, were published in 1855. See Bordly, Eloge de Monclar, pronounced November 1843; Achard, Dict. de Provence, s.v.; Villemain, Tableau du dix-huitieme siecle, de leon; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gezerale, s.v.

## Mordecai[[@Headword:Mordecai]]

             (Heb. Mordekay', מָרְדְּכִי, either from the Persian, little man, see Gesenius, Thes. Heb. p. 818; comp. Benfey, Monatsnamnen, page 201; or from MERODACH, i.q. worshipper of Afars, Simon, Onom. page 558; Sept. Μαρδοχαῖος v.r. in Nehemiah Μαρδοχέος), the name of one or two men during the Babylonian exile.

1. One of the principal Israelites who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:2; Neh 7:7). B.C. 536. He was perhaps identical with the following.

2. The son of Jair, of the tribe of Benjamin, and of the lineage of king Saul; apparently one of the captives transported to Babylon with Jehoiachin (Est 2:5). B.C. 598. He was resident at Susa, then the metropolis of the Persian empire, and had under his care his niece Hadassah, otherwise Esther, at the time when the fairest damsels of the land were gathered together, that from among them a fitting successor to queen Vashti might be selected for king Xerxes. Among them was Esther, and on her the choice fell; while, by what management we know not, her relationship to Mordecai, and her Jewish descent, remained unknown at the palace. B.C. 479. The uncle lost none of his influence over the niece by her elevation, although the seclusion of the royal harem excluded him from direct intercourse with her.

He seems to have held some office about the court, for we find him in daily attendance there; and it appears to have been through this employment that he became privy to a plot of two of the  chamberlains against the life of the king, which through Esther he made known to the monarch. This great service was, however, suffered to pass without reward at the time. On the rise of Haman to power at court, Mordecai alone, of all the nobles and officers who crowded the royal gates, refused to manifest the customary signs of homage to the royal favorite. Some think that this refusal arose from religious scruples, as if such prostration (προσκύνησις) were akin with idolatry (see Thenne's two monographs, Sorau, 1747, Brieg, 1750). It would be too much to attribute this to an independence of spirit which, however usual in Europe, is unknown in Eastern courts. Haman was an Amalekite; and Mordecai brooked not to bow himself down before one of a nation which from the earliest times had been the most decided enemies of the Jewish people. The Orientals are tenacious of the outward marks of respect, which they hold to be due to the position they occupy; and the erect mien of Mordecai among the bending courtiers escaped not the keen eye of Haman. He noticed it, and brooded over it from day to day: he knew well the class of feelings in which it originated, and, remembering the eternal enmity vowed by the Israelites against his people, and how often their conquering sword had all but swept his nation from the face of the earth, he vowed by one great stroke to exterminate the Hebrew nation, the fate of which he believed to be in his hands.

The temptation was great, and to his illregulated mind irresistible. He therefore procured the well-known and bloody decree from the king for the massacre of all the Israelites in the empire in one day. When this decree became known to Mordecai, he not only felt impelled to exert himself to save his countrymen, as he was himself the cause of their meditated destruction, but he found his own safety involved, as well as that of his royal niece. Accordingly he covered himself with sackcloth and ashes, and rent the air with his cries. This being made known to Esther through the servants of the harem, who now knew of their relationship, she sent Hatach, one of the royal eunuchs, to demand the cause of his grief; through that faithful servant he made the facts known to her, urged upon her the duty of delivering her people, and encouraged her to risk the consequences of the attempt. She was found equal to the occasion. She hazarded her life by entering the royal presence uncalled, and having by discreet management procured a favorable opportunity, accused Haman to the king of plotting to destroy her and her people. His doom was sealed on this occasion by the means which in his agitation he took to avert it; and when one of the eunuchs present intimated that this man had prepared a gallows fifty cubits high on which to hang Mordecai, the king at once said,  "Hang him thereon." This was, in fact, a great aggravation of his offence, for the previous night the king, being unable to sleep, had commanded the records of his reign to be read to him; and the reader had providentially turned to the part recording the conspiracy which had been frustrated through Mordecai. The king asked what had been the reward of this mighty service, and being answered, "Nothing," he commanded that any one who happened to be in attendance without should be called. Haman was there, having come for the very purpose of asking the king's leave to hang Mordecai upon the gallows he had prepared, and was asked what should be done to the man whom the king delighted to honor? Thinking that the king could delight to honor no one but himself, he named the highest and most public honors he could conceive, and received from the monarch the astounding answer, "Make haste, and do even so to Mordecai that sitteth in the king's gate!" Then was Haman constrained, without a word, and with seeming cheerfulness, to repair to the man whom he hated beyond all the world, to invest him with the royal robes, and to conduct him in magnificent cavalcade through the city, proclaiming, "Thus shall it be done to the man whom the king delighteth to honor." After this we may well believe that the sense of poetical justice decided the perhaps till then doubtful course of the king. when he heard of the gallows which Haman had prepared for the man by whom his own life had been preserved (Esther 3-8). B.C. 474. SEE HAMAN.

Mordecai was invested with power greater than that which Haman had lost, and the first use he made of it was, as far as possible, to neutralize or counteract the decree obtained by Haman. It could not be recalled, as the kings of Persia had no power to rescind a decree once issued; but, as the altered wish of the court was known, and as the Jews were permitted to stand on their defence, they were preserved from the intended destruction, although much blood was, on the appointed day, shed even in the royal city. The Feast of Purim was instituted in memory of this deliverance, and is celebrated to this day (Est 9:10). SEE PURINI.

He was probably the author of the book of Esther, which contains the narrative. His name is freely introduced into the apocryphal additions to that book, to which, however, it is unnecessary to pay attention. SEE ESTHER, BOOK OF.

There are some questions connected with Mordecai that demand further consideration.

1. His date. This is pointed out with great particularity by the writer himself, not only by the years of the king's reign, but by his own genealogy in Est 2:5, G. Most interpreters, indeed, have understood this  passage as stating that Mordecai himself was taken captive with Jehoiachin. But that any one who had been taken captive by Nebuchadnezzar in the eighth year of his reign should be vizier after the twelfth year of any Persian king among the successors of Cyrus is not very easy to believe. Besides, too, the difficulty of supposing the ordinary laws of human life to be suspended in the case of any person mentioned in Scripture, when the sacred history gives no such intimation, there is a peculiar defiance of probability in the supposition that the cousin-german of the youthful Esther, her father's brother's son, should be of an age ranging from 90 to 170 years at the time that she was chosen to be queen on account of her youth and beauty. But not only is this interpretation of Est 2:5, G excluded by chronology, but the rules of grammatical propriety equally point out, not Mordecai, but Kish, as being the person who was taken captive by Nebuchadnezzar at the time when Jehoiachin was carried away. Because, if it had been intended to speak of Mordecai as led captive, the ambiguity would easily have been avoided by either placing the clause אֲשֶׁר הָגְלָה, etc., immediately after בְּשׁוּשִׁן הִבַּירָה, and then adding his name and genealogy, "וּשְׁמוֹ מ, or else by writing וַהוּא. instead of אֲשֶׁרat the beginning of Est 2:6. Again, as the sentence stands, the distribution of the copulative וdistinctly connects the sentence וִיְהַי אֹמֵןin Est 2:7 וךתה הָיָהךנ Est 2:5, showing that three things are predicated of Mordecai: (1) that he lived in Shushan; (2) that his name was Mordecai, son of Jair, son of Shimei, son of Kish the Benjamite, who was taken captive with Jehoiachin; (3) that he brought up Esther. This genealogy does, then, fix with great certainty the age of Mordecai. He was great- grandson of a contemporary of Jehoiachin. Now four generations cover 120 years and 120 years from B.C. 598 brings us to B.C. 479, i.e., to the sixth year of the reign of Xerxes; thus confirming with singular force the arguments which led to the conclusion that Ahasuerus is Xerxes. SEE AHASUERUS. This carrying back of the genealogy of a captive to the time of the captivity has an obvious propriety, as connecting the captives with the family record preserved in the public genealogies before the captivity, just as an American would be likely to carry up his pedigree to the ancestor who emigrated from England (see Bertheau, Exeq. FIctndb. ad loc.). Furthermore, it would seem entirely possible (though it cannot be certainly proved) that the Mordecai mentioned in the duplicate passage, Ezr 2:2; Neh 7:7, as one of the leaders of the captives who returned from time to time from Babylon to Judaea, SEE EZRA, was the same as  Mordecai of the book of Esther. It is not unlikely that on the death of Xerxes, or possibly during his lifetime, he may have obtained leave to lead back such Jews as were willing to accompany him, and that he did so. His age need not have exceeded fifty or sixty years, and his character points him out' as likely to lead his countrymen back from exile if he had the opportunity. The name Mordecai not occurring elsewhere makes this supposition the more probable. We may add that in a passage of Josephus (Ant. 11:4, 9), which gives an account of troubles excited by the Samaritans against the Jews about that time, as they were rebuilding the Temple, the names of Ananias and Mordecai (Μαρδοχαῖος) are given along with that of Zerubbabel as ambassadors from the Jews to king Darius.

2. As regards Mordecai's place in profane history, the domestic annals of the reign of Xerxes are so scanty that it would not surprise us to find no mention of this Jew. But there is a person named by Ctesias, who probably saw the very chronicles of the kings of Media and Persia referred to in Est 10:2, and whose name and character present some points of resemblance with Mordecai, viz. Matacas or Natacas (as the name is variously written), described by him as Xerxes's chief favorite, and the most powerful of them all. His brief notice of him in these words, ἡμιαῤῥένων δὲ μέγιστον ἠδύνατο Νατακᾶς, is in exact agreement with the description of Mordecai (Est 9:4; Est 10:2-3). He further relates of him that when Xerxes, after his return from Greece, had commissioned Megabyzus to go and plunder the temple of Apollo at Ilelphi (perhaps, rather, the temple of Apollo Didlymnus, near Miletus, which was destroyed by Xerxes after his return, Strabo, 14, cap. 1, § 5), upon his refusal, he sent Matacas the eunuch to insult the god and to plunder his property; which Matacas did, and returned to Xerxes. It is obvious how grateful to the feelings of a Jew, such as Mordecai was, would be a commission to desecrate and spoil a heathen temple. There is also much probability in the selection of a Jew to be his prime minister by a monarch of such decided iconoclastic propensities as Xerxes is known to have had (Prideaux, Connect. 1:231-233). Xerxes would doubtless see much analogy between the Magian tenets of which he was so zealous a patron and those of the Jews' religion; just as Pliny actually reckons Moses (whom he couples with Jannes) among the leaders of the Magian sect, in the very same passage in which he relates that Osthanes the Magian author and heresiarch accompanied Xerxes in his Greek expedition, and widely  diffused the Magian doctrines (lib. 30, cap. 1, § 2); and in § 4 he seems to identify Christianity also with Magic. From the context it appears highly probable that this notice of Moses and of Jannes may be derived from the work of Osthanes, and, if so, the probable intercourse of Osthanes with Mordecai would readily account for his mention of them. The point, however, here insisted upon is that the known hatred of Xerxes to idolworship makes his selection of a Jew for his prime minister very probable, and that there are strong points of resemblance in what is thus related of Matacas and what we know from Scripture of Mordecai. Again, that Mordecai was, what Matacas is related to have been, a eunuch, seems not improbable from his having neither wife nor child, from his bringing up his cousin Esther in his own house (to account for this, the Targum says that he was seventy-five years old), from his situation in the king's gate, from his access to the court of the women, and from his being raised to the highest post of power by the king, which we know from Persian history was so often the case with the king's eunuchs. With these points of agreement between them, there is sufficient resemblance in their names to add additional probability to the supposition of their identity. The most plausible etymology usually given for the name Mordecai is that favored by Gesenius, who connects it with Merodach the Babylonian idol (called Mardok in the cuneiform inscriptions), and which appears in the names Mesessi-Mordacus, Sisi-Mordachus, in nearly the same form as in the Greek, Μαρδοχαῖος. But it is highly improbable that the name of a Babylonian idol should have been given to him under the Persian dynasty (Rawlinson [Herod. 1:2701 points out Layardt's conclusion [Ain. 2:4411, that the Persians adopted generally the Assyrian religion as "(quite a mistake"), and it is equally improbable that Mordecai should have been taken into the king's service before the commencement of the Persian dynasty. If, then, we suppose the original form of the name to have been Matacai, it would easily in the Chaldee orthography become Mordecai, just as כָּרְסֵאis for כַּסֵּא, שַׁרְבַיטfor שֵׁבֶט, דִּרְמֶשֶׁקfor דִּמֶּשֶׁק, etc. In the Targum of Esther he is said to be called Mordecai because he was like דִכְּיָא לְמֵירָא"to pure myrrh."

3. As regards his place in rabbinical estimation, Mordecai, as is natural, stands very high. The interpolations in the Greek book of Esther are one indication of his popularity with his countrymen. The Targum (of late date) shows that this increased rather than diminished with the lapse of centuries. There Shimei in Mordecai's genealogy is identified with Shimei the son of  Gera, who cursed David, and it is said that the reason why David would not permit him to be put to death then was that it was revealed to him that Mordecai and Esther should descend from him; but that in his old age, when this reason no longer applied, he was slain. It is also said of Mordecai that he knew the seventy languages, i.e., the languages of all the nations mentioned in Genesis 10, which the Jews count as seventy nations, and that his age exceeded 400 years (Juchasin ap. Wolf, and Stehelin, Rabb. Liter. 1:179). He is continually designated by the appellation צִדַּיקָא, "the Just," and the amplifications of Est 8:15 abound in the most glowing descriptions of the splendid robes, and Persian buskins, and Median scimitars, and golden crowns, and the profusion of precious stones and Miacedonian gold, on which was engraved a view of Jerusalem, and of the phylactery over the crown, and the streets strewed with myrtle, and the attendants, and the heralds with trumpets, all proclaiming the glory of Mordecai, and the exaltation of the Jewish people. Benjamin of Tudela mentions the ruins of Shushan and the remains of the palace of Alasuerus as still existing in his day, but places the tomb of Mordecai and Esther at Hamadan, or Ecbatana (page 128). Others, however, place the tomb of Mordecai in Susa, and that of Esther in or near Baram in Galilee (note to Asher's Benj. of Tud. page 166). With reference to the above-named palace of Ahasuerus at Shushan, it may be added that considerable remains of it were discovered by Mr. Loftus's excavations in 1852, and that he thinks the plan of the great colonnade, of which he found the bases remaining, corresponds remarkably to the description of the palace of Ahasuerus in Esther (Loftus, Chaldnea, ch. 28). It was built or begun by Darius Hystaspis. The socalled tomb of Esther and Mordecai at Hamadau has no claim, as Flandin remarks, to a very remote antiquity, for the dome and the general style of architecture correspond with those commonly found in Mussulman sepulchres in Persia. Although the tomb now standing is more ancient than that of Ezra, it is on essentially the same plan, both in its exterior and interior appearance, with such differences as proceeded from the difference of situation, one being in the midst of a town, and the other on the borders of the desert. The bell-shaped dome is also in an older taste than that which the other tomb exhibits. The stork's nest by which it is surmounted frequently appears upon the highest points of public buildings in that country. The tomb stands on ground somewhat more elevated than any in the immediate neighborhood, and is in rather a decayed condition. It occupies a small space in the midst of ruins, in the quarter appropriated to Jewish families. The entrance to the building is by a stone door of small  dimensions, the key of which is always kept by the chief rabbi. This door conducts to the antechamber, which is small, and contains the graves of several rabbies. A second door, of still more confined dimensions than the first, leads to the tomb-chamber, which is larger than the outer apartment. In the midst of this stand the two sarcophagi of Mordecai and Esther, of dark and hard wood, like that of Ezra. They are cenotaphs, standing beside each other, distinguished only by the one (Mordecai's) being a little larger than the other. They are richly carved, and have a Hebrew inscription along the upper ledge, taken from Est 2:5; Est 10:3. The wood is in good preservation, though evidently very old. The present building is said to occupy the site of one more magnificent, which was destroyed by Timur Beg, soon after which this humble building was erected in its place, at the expense of certain devout Jew's; and it is added that it was fully repaired about 160 years since by a rabbi named Ismael. If this local statement be correct, some of the inscriptions which now appear must, as the resident Jews state, have belonged to the preceding building, which, however, could not have been the original mausoleum, since one of these inscriptions describes it as having been finished posterior to the Christian era (see, I.K. Porter's Travels in Persia, 2:107). SEE ACHMETHA.

## Mordecai Ben-Hillel[[@Headword:Mordecai Ben-Hillel]]

             of Austria, a pupil of the famous Meir of Rothenburg (q.v.), son-in-law of R. Jechiel of Paris, and brother-in-law of R. Jacob of Corbeil, flourished towards the end of the 13th century, and was martyred in 1310 at Nuremberg. He is the author of the book מרדכי, Mordecai, also called הִמָרְדְּכִי סֵפֶי, the Book of Mordecai; a treatise on the legal code (סֵפֶר הִהֲלָכוֹת), embodying all the laws of the Talmud, which was compiled, revised, corrected, annotated, and supplemented by Isaac Alfasi (q.v.). The Sepher A Mordeci has been printed with the Sepher Hallalachoth (Constantinople, 1509; Venice, 1521-22; Sabionetta, 1524, etc.). It has also been published separately (Venice, 1558; Cracow, 1598, etc.). — Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:324 sq.; De Rossi, nizionazrio (Germ. transl.), p. 234; Steinschneider, Cataclogus libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana, 1659, etc.; Basnage, Hist. des Juifs (Taylor's transl.), page 685; Ginsburg, in Jacob ben-Chajim ibn-Adonijah's Introduction to the Rabbinic Bible (Lond. 1867), page 76 sq.; Cassel, Leitfadenfiir jiid. Gesch. u. Literatur (Berlin, 1872), page 87; Grutz, Gesch. d. Juden (Berlin, 1873), 7:252 sq.;  Zunz, Literaturgeschichte der synagogalen Poesie (Berlin, 1865), page 364; Die Monatstage des Kalendejahres (Berlin, 1872), page 44. (B.P.)

## Mordvinian Version[[@Headword:Mordvinian Version]]

             SEE RUSSIA, VERSIONS OF.

## Mordvins[[@Headword:Mordvins]]

             is the name of a people inhabiting Eastern Russia. They form a subdivision of the Bulgaric or Volgaic family of the Finnic branch of the Suranian, Uralo-Altaic, or Mongolian races, and are related to the Tcheremisses and Tchuvashes. Their number has been estimated at 400,000, and their territory lies principally between the rivers Oka and Volga, in the Russian governments of Nishni No-vgorod, Tambov, Pensa, Simbrisk, and Saratov, extending also into Samara and Astrachan. Dialectically they may be subdivided into Mokzhas, chiefly dwelling on the banks of the Sura and Mokzha, and Ersas, occupying the shores of the Oka.

## More, Alexander[[@Headword:More, Alexander]]

             a very noted preacher of the French Protestants, who flourished in the 17th century in France and Switzerland, was born at Castres, Languedoc, September 25, 1616, of Scottish parents. He received his preparatory training under his father at Castres, and went from home at the age of twenty to study divinity at Geneva. But it so happened that the chair of Greek was vacant at this time, and though so young a man and a stranger, More was chosen to fill it. He promptly accepted the proffered honor, and three years later had the pleasure of being promoted to a professorship in divinity, he having improved his time in the study of that department. His rapid advance made him many enemies, and he was accused of heresy. But, notwithstanding much and able opposition, More advanced, and in 1645 was made rector of the high school with which he was connected. He was, however, destined soon to decline, for he was very arrogant and proud, and some even dared to assert that he was immoral. He was wise enough to perceive the near approach of his fall, and he therefore decided to quit Geneva. In 1649 he secured the divinity professorship and pastoral office at Middleburg, in Zealand, and there also he won a reputation for his learning and ability, which opened to him in 1652 the university at Amsterdam. He had been proffered before a position in that noble high school, but had refused it; now he accepted, and removed thither. In 1654 he vacated his chair, and went on a visit to Italy, and became well acquainted with the men of note and of rank in that country. He enjoyed a personal intercourse with the duke of Tuscany, and was a favorite at Venice. Returning to his  charge, he encountered decided opposition, many of his congregation doubting his sincerity, and declaiming against the unholiness of his life.

Charges were brought against him, and he was condemned by the Synod of Torgau. He quitted his parish, and accepted a call from a Church in Paris, and though there was great variety of opinion as to his trustworthiness, he was confirmed in the position. He had not, however, occupied it long before he was openly attacked. Though his manner of preaching procured him applause from a crowd of hearers, his character was generally acknowledged to be ambiguous, and he had the mortification to see his reputation attacked by persons of merit, who accused him anew to the synod. He escaped further condemnation by quitting France in December 1661. He returned again in the summer following, and, finding that the opposition had not subsided, he sickened at heart, as it is generally believed, declined rapidly in health, and died at Paris in September 1670. By the confession of his friends, he was proud, vindictive, imperious, satirical, contemptuous; not to say that his character was not quite unblemished in point of chastity, although there is no occasion to believe all that Milton has said of him. Milton had had a quarrel with More, and this may have provoked much that was far from the truth, though the great English bard was not given to falsifying. The trouble had been produced by a publication of More in 1652, addressed under the printer's name to the king of Great Britain, entitled Regii sanguais clamor ad coelum adversus parricides Anglicanos. It is a very violent invective against the Parliament party; and Milton, in particular, is extremely abused in it. He is no better used in the epistle dedicatory than in the book itself. Milton therefore wrote a reply, in which he considered More as the author as well as the editor of the book. He is treated upon the footing of a dog, or rather of a goat; for he is accused of a thousand lewd tricks, particularly of several acts of debauchery. He was also charged with having been convicted of heresies at Geneva, and of having shamefully abjured them with his lips, though not with his heart. Milton accused him of having for many months been deprived of his salary at Geneva, and suspended from his offices as a professor and a minister on account of a process of adultery which had been entered against him; and for which, says he, he would have been condemned, if he had not avoided the decisive sentence by declaring that he would leave the place. But, whatever Milton's opinion, the pious Huetius favored More, and wrote in his be half. He even praised him in song (Pcenat p. 30 and 77, ed. 1700). More published some works: there is a treatise of his, De gratia et libero arbitrio (Geneva, 1644, 4to;  Middleburg, 1652); and another, De Scriptura Sacra, sive de causa Dei (Middleburg, 1653, 4to): — A Comment on the 53d Chapter of Isaiah: — Notae ad loca quaedam Novi Faederis (Lond. 1661, 8vo): — a reply to Milton, with the title of Alexandri Mori fides publica (La Haye, 1654, 12mo): — some Orations and Poems in Latin. See Senebier, Hist. litter. de Geneve; Haag, La France Protestante, 7:543 sq.; Bayle, Hist. Dict. s.v. (J.H.W.)

## More, Hannah[[@Headword:More, Hannah]]

             one of the most brilliant female ornaments of Christian literature, was born at the village of Stapleton, in Gloucestershire, February 2, 1745, and was the daughter of a clergyman of the Church of England, a man eminent for his classical attainments, and at that time employed as a village schoolmaster in charge of a charity school. Some time after the birth of his daughter Hannah he removed to Bristol, where he kept a private school. There were other daughters, and the family soon began to be taken notice of as one in which there was a display of talent that was unusual; so that some exertions were made by persons to whom they were known, and the sisters became early in life established in a school for the education of girls, which continued for many years the most flourishing establishment of the kind in the west of England. Hannah was from the beginning the most remarkable of the group. She wrote verse at a very early age, and though these compositions were highly thought of in the family circle, they were never allowed to go beyond the precincts of their own house. And vet, in ways and by circumstances almost unnoticed, the fame of her literary talent was widely spread, and in 1773 she was prevailed upon to publish a pastoral drama, which was entitled The Search After Happiness. It was brought out under the direction of her pastor, Dr. Stonehouse, a learned clergyman of the Church of England. He it was also who introduced Hannah to the great literati.

In 1774 she published a regular tragedy on the story of Regulus, and two tales in verse; and her turn being then thought by her friends to incline to the drama, means were taken to obtain an introduction for her to Garrick, by whom she was very kindly received. He, in turn, introduced her to Dr. Johnson, Burke, Sir Joshua Reynolds, and other persons, who at that time formed what was considered the best literary society of London. Her manners and conversation confirmed the good impression elicited by her talents, and the position in society  originally conceded as a favor was soon acknowledged as a well- established right. During this period of her life she produced two tragedies, Percy (1777) and The Fatal Falsehood (1779), and other poems.

These attempts at dramatic composition, and the consequent connection with the stage, seem to indicate that she was then, in a great measure, if not altogether, a stranger to evangelical views of Christian duty. But the death of David Garrick (1779), to whom she had become very much attached, produced a great change in her character. Educated as she had been with a deep impression of the truths of the Christian religion, the life which she now led began to appear to her as unbefitting a creature with the glorious prospects which Christianity opens to man. She therefore determined on forsaking the drama and retiring from the gay circles of fashion and of literature, and even quitted London in order the better to devote herself to the life befitting, as she thought, a child of God and an heir of immortality. She established her residence at a little rural retreat in the vicinity of Bristol, named Cowslip Green, where she enjoyed a freshness of feeling and a sweet mental tranquillity to which she had previously been a stranger. In her transitive state she had produced her Sacred Dramas (1782), a publication more favorably received perhaps than her former works. But she finally resolved to devote herself to a treatment of subjects surer of good results, and to write with careful preparation. She felt obliged to confess, to quote her own words from the Preface of the third volume of her works, that she did not "consider the stage in its present state as becoming the appearance or countenance of a Christian; on which account she thought proper to renounce her dramatic productions in any other light than as mere poems." Having become sensible of the follies of the world and the reigning defects of modern society, she resolved to embody the results of her observations and experience in the form of earnest and solemn admonitions against them. The first in this series of contemplated works was of a didactic nature, and was entitled Essays to Young Ladies.

This was almost immediately followed by Thoughts on the Manners of the Great, a little volume which was issued in 1788 anonymously, and the object of which was to expose, in order to amend, the low morality — the loose and licentious principles — of fashionable society. Having excited a considerable degree of interest and curiosity, the work was attributed to the pen of more than one person of official dignity in the Church as well as the State. But the real author was ere long discovered, and the eclat which the discovery gave to her name encouraged her to persevere in the course of moral instruction she had contemplated. Almost every successive year  brought out some new production from her pen; and such was the power as well as the charms of her eloquent composition that her works were universally applauded, and by none more than by the very classes whose faults many of them were designed to expose and censure. Thus, immediately after the last-mentioned popular work, appeared An Estimate of the Religion of the Fashionable World (1791), and this enjoyed as great a measure of success as its predecessor. To counteract the principles of the French Revolution, which had unsettled every European nation, and introduced a wild and turbulent spirit among some classes even of Great Britain, she conferred an incalculable benefit on her country by publishing, first, Village Politics, by Will Chipp, and next a periodical work, "The Cheap Repository Tracts" — a series of admirable tales of a moral and religious nature for the common people, one of which is the well-known Shepherd of Salisbury Plaim.

The influence which both these publications had over the popular mind is almost beyond conception. They were circulated by hundreds of thousands in all parts of the United Kingdom, and were more than anything else instrumental in maintaining the cause of order and of true religion against the torrent of infidel philosophy which had set in so strongly from France. The next work which came from her pen was entitled Strictures on the Modern System of Female Education (1799). Exceptions were taken by some to the "high Calvinistic principles" of this work; but it amounted to little after all, for she was known to do so much good that the opposition soon died out. Testimony was borne to its merits by bishop Porteus, in that he recommended the authoress as a competent person to superintend the education of the young princess Charlotte; and although an absurd etiquette, it seems, prevented that responsible office being held by any lady beneath the ranks of the aristocracy, she showed her fitness for the task by the publication of Hints towards Forming the Character of a Young Princess (1805). After the lapse of some years she published Caelebs in Search of a Wife, one of the best of novels in respect to principle and moral tendency; and this was followed by Practical Piety (1811); Christian Morals (1812), The Spirit of Prayer (1813), An Essay on the Character and Writings of St. Paul (1815), and Modern Sketches (1819). But though these literary labors demanded much of her time, she yet found a portion for philanthropic labor; and having built a pleasant home and received her sisters there. she devoted herself with them to the people of her vicinity, especially the poor, of whom there were many — it being a mining district — who "had grown up coarse, brutal, ferocious, utterly neglected by their clergy, without any  means of education or hopes of improvement" (Perry).

Determined to elevate these downtrodden and forlorn people, the three sisters attempted the appalling task of alleviating all suffering and of educating the laboring classes. They devised various schemes of benevolence and usefulness, not the least of which was the erection of schools, which, though at first confined to the children of their immediate surroundings, soon extended their operations over no less than ten parishes where there were no resident clergymen, and in which upwards of 1200 children were thus provided with the benefits of a moral and religious education. Miss Hannah More's numerous writings, which produced her upwards of $150,000, enabled her to do much, but she was by no means dependent upon her own resources. Her high character had impressed itself on her friends and associates, and these freely poured out their treasures for the promotion of the More schemes. Bibles were distributed, prayer-books given away, and instruction provided for all who came to study, whether adult or child. In short, so unremitting were they in their labors and measures that what had been a moral desert was changed into a garden, which brought forth in rich abundance the excellent fruits of wide-spread intelligence, of elevated morality, and genuine religion. But at last age came upon Hannah More, and brought along some of its infirmities. In 1828 she was moved therefore to quit Barleywood, the place in which many years had been spent, and she now took up her abode at Clifton. Here she continued amid a painful and protracted illness until relieved by death on the 7th of September, 1833, surrounded by many to honor her and many also to love her; who looked up to her as one of the great reformers of the manners of English society; one who had asserted very successfully the right of Christianity, or, in other words, the right of the Christian Scriptures to have a larger share than it had been the wont to allow them in forming the character and directing the course of human beings while in this state of their probation. She bequeathed £10,000 for pious and charitable purposes. The best edition of her works is in 11 volumes, 16mo (Lond. 1853). See The Memoirs and Correspondence of Hannah More, by William Roberts (Lond. 1834, 4 volumes, 8vo; N.Y. 1836, 2 volumes, 12mo, abridged in "Christian Family Library"); Life, by Reverend H. Thompson (Lond. 1838, 8vo); Correspondence of Hannah More with Zachary Macaulay (Lond. 1860); Mrs. Hall's visit to Mrs. Hannah More in Pilgrimage to English Shrines; Lives of Bishop Wilberforce; Perry, Hist. Church of England, 3:480 sq.; Clissold, Lands of the Church (Lond. 1863, 12mo), page 167  sq.; Jamieson, Cyclop. Religious Biog. s.v.; and the literature appended to the excellent article in Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.

## More, Henry[[@Headword:More, Henry]]

             an English Arminian divine and moralist, noted as a leader of that class of English philosophers who arose in the 17th century to exorcise the spirit of Calvinism from the English high schools, was born at Grantham, Lincolnshire, October 12, 1614. He was educated at Eton, where, aside from his regular studies, he bestowed much time on the reading of the philosophical works of Aristotle, Julius Scaliger, etc., poring, immature as he was, over the doctrine of predestination. His parents were Calvinists, and they had reared him with like notions, but he early became distrustful as to the real ground of Calvinism, and finally turned sceptic. In 1631 he went to Christ College, Cambridge, and graduated in 1635. More all his years at college was most diligently employed in metaphysical studies. He says himself, "I immersed myself over head and ears in the study of philosophy, promising a most wonderful happiness to myself in it." Dissatisfied with all other systems, he found rest for his mind only when he came to the writings of the Platonic school; whence, as he tells us, he learned that something better and higher than the knowledge of human things constitutes the supreme happiness of man, and that this is attainable only through that purity of mind and divine illumination which raise man to a union with God. But yet, he adds himself, that though the Platonic writings attracted and benefited him, there was "among all the writings of this kind none which so pierced and affected" him "as that golden little book with which Luther is also said to have been wonderfully taken, viz. Theologia Gernmanica.

This book More prized next to the Bible, and studied it until he could say that he was free from all scepticism, and once more truly devoted to Christian interests. He had taken his M.A. in 1639, and had been made also a fellow of his college. With these honors he contentedly rested, and, insisting upon refusal of all Church preferments, he withdrew to retirement for a course of "spiritual discipline." He in short gave himself up to a life of most devout spiritual exercise, and would suffer nothing to stand in his way to eternal happiness as it had been taught him by the mystical work he so fondly read. "From this time," says More's biographer, "he had a wonderful sense of God, sacred and ineffable, and of his unconceivable attributes, and he soon found all things to his satisfaction, and himself not unsuitable to them. And that there may be a 'turning after righteousness' (as he speaks) as well as a 'running after  knowledge,' More now actually came forward to demonstrate with great care the principles both of revealed and natural religion, and to recommend to all at the same time, with the greatest seriousness possible, the practice of morality and virtue; or, rather, what is justly called the Christian or divine life." 'It would seem, therefore," adds his biographer, "that Henry More was raised by a special Providence in those days of freedom, as a light to those that may be fitted or inclined to high speculations, and a general guide to all that want it, how they are to mix the Christian and philosophic genius together, and make them rightly to accord in one common end, viz. the glory of God with the highest felicity and perfection of man."

The depth and originality of his metaphysical theories, and the remarkable combination of great argumentative abilities, extensive learning, and ardent piety with which he set them forth, occasioned his being looked up to as a person of an extraordinary character by the greatest and best of his contemporaries. Indeed, he himself admitted, with frankness and simplicity natural to his temper, that the talents and dispositions lavished upon him were such as brought him into singular responsibilities; that, to adopt his own expression, he had "as a fiery arrow been shot into the world, and he hoped that it had hit the mark." After his election to a fellowship by his college he took charge of several pupils, some of them persons of rank, whose studies he directed with great fidelity and application-his management of them being distinguished from that of ordinary tutors chiefly by unusual gentleness, and by the deep tone of piety which pervaded his instructions. He has recorded his opinion that "the exercise of love and goodness, of humanity and brotherly kindness, of prudence and discretion, of unfeigned religion and devotion, in the plain and undoubted duties thereof is, to the truly regenerate soul, a far greater pleasure than all the fine speculations imaginable." It was life, not notions, which he chiefly valued; and he preferred "a single-heartedness of temper beyond any theories." He had no ambition to play the part of a leader in society, and steadily declined every attempt to draw him into a public position.

He was content in the youthful circle which he gathered about himself as private tutor, and preferred to address the masses by his pen. The deanery of Christ Church in Dublin, with the provostship of Trinity College, and also the deanery of St. Patrick's, were proposed for his acceptance, as a step to either of the two bishoprics when a vacancy should occur; but he could not be persuaded to accept these preferments. It is said that after the failure of these attempts, a very good English bishopric was procured for him, and that his friends had actually brought him, on some  pretence or other, as far as Whitehall, designing to introduce him to the king to kiss the hands of his royal master for the appointment; but when More understood on what business he had been brought thither, nothing could induce him to enter the royal grounds. Once, late in life (in 1675), he accepted a prebend in the cathedral of Gloucester; this, however, as the event proved, only with the view of serving his friend, Dr. Fowler, afterwards bishop of that diocese, into whose hands, with the chancellor's permission, he resigned it, refusing at the same time repayment of the expenses he had incurred. In the same manner, he for a short time kept possession of the rectory of Ingoldsbury, in Lincolnshire, which his father had purchased for him, and then presented it to several friends in succession. He had the satisfaction of providing in this way for his friend, Dr. Worthington, when that accomplished divine, in common with many other clergymen, lost his church in the fire of London.

When the mastership of his college fell vacant, it was proposed to him, in preference to Cudworth, as a piece of preferment likely, if any could do so, to suit his wishes; he declined it as he had done everything else, "passing otherwise his time within those private walls, it may be as great a contemplator, philosopher, and divine as ever did or will hereafter visit them." In fact, he believed that by a life of contemplation, and by laying the results of it before the world in his writings, he followed the course appointed him by Providence as best suited to his disposition and abilities, and likely to be serviceable to that and succeeding generations. Yet so humble were his notions of what he had accomplished by the employment of many years in earnest pursuit of those august theories which filled his mind, that he would say he "had lived a harmless and childish life in the world." His works, he remarked to a person who was speaking in commendation of them, "were such as might please some solitary men that loved their Creator." In his later years Dr. More was sorely tried by the separation of his friend and former pupil, lady Conway, from the communion of the Church which was his ideal in the form "as it existed before the times of disturbance — the Church of the Reformation and of Hooker." To popery in every form he was violently opposed, as is evinced by a work of his on The true Idea of Antichristianism (see below), and also to the sects he was opposed: "Both his reason and his love of quietness and order were opposed to what he considered the excesses of Puritanism — the dismal spectacle of an infinity of sects and schisms." Yet it should not be thought that More loved the ecclesiastical organization of England rather than the cause of Christ. "His main concern," says his biographer, "is that neither  one order of the Church government nor another usurp the place which only religion itself should hold. He is for the 'naked truth of Christianity,' and nothing more; willing even to be called a Puritan, 'if this be to be a Puritan.'"

Such was his liberality, and yet he sought earnestly to recall lady Conway to the Church communion. She had been a favorite of his in her girlish days, and much of his time he had passed at Ragley, in Warwickshire, her country-seat after marriage to lord Conway. She was a person of enthusiastic piety and great accomplishments, and by her More and his opinions were known to be held in high veneration. Indeed, her husband is said to have been hardly less enthusiastic, and to have treasured everything of More's "with as much reverence as if it were Socrates's." Among such friends it was but natural that More should frequently pass his time, and it was among the shades of Ragley that he composed some of his writings, among them his Conjectura Cabalistica, his Philosophicce Teutonicce Censura, and his Divine Dialogues (see below).

He often counselled with lady Conway, and is believed to have been urged into authorship by her. She was particularly attracted by his mystical studies. Her consultations with him ultimately led her to turn aside and make her life one of most intense mystical devotion. She thus came to admire the patient quietude of the Quakers, as well as the opinions of that sect, at that time flushed with all the fervor attendant on novelty, persecution, and success, and finally she was induced to join them. Perhaps the doctor was conscious that his own religious views, characterized as they are by a degree of subjectiveness which unfits them for general reception (when eagerly adopted by a person of her peculiar temperament, not fortified by the counteraction of those healthier and more robust attainments which prevented any very evil consequences in his own case), might have prepared the way to this unfortunate result. At all events, he received the account of it with unfeigned affliction, and labored many years with all the earnestness of a faithful friend to reclaim the fair proselyte for the Church establishment of which he was a most devout adherent. He was thus led into a controversy with William Penn, both by writing and conversation. An admirable letter on Baptism and the Lord's Supper, addressed on this occasion to Penn, is printed in the appendix to his life. He encountered also George Fox, and has left a description of the interview on his own feelings little flattering to that ill-used religious enthusiast. More failed to reconvert his pupil, but he retained her friendship. He continued to spend much of his time, as before, at Ragley "and its woods," and there composed several of his books at lady Conway's "own desire and instigation." After her death he  drew her portrait under another name, and with so much address that" the most rigid Quaker would see everything they could wish in it, and yet the soberest Christian be entirely satisfied with it." At Ragley, More formed several valuable acquaintances; of these we shall come to speak hereafter. But it is only there that he was surrounded by any associates. In his own "paradise," as he called his home at Christ College, he lived very much alone. Yet if he thus kept himself retired from the world, this life of solitude greatly stimulated his productivity as an author.

More began authorship in 1640 by the publication of his Psychozoia, or the First Part of the Song of the Soul, containing a Christiano-Platonical Display of Life (reprinted in 1647, and, together with some additional pieces, published under the title of Philosophical Poems). It was a most singular effort in the literary line, for it seeks to turn metaphysics into poetry. It is an early attempt on his part to express in verse the Platonic principles which he afterwards so clearly and forcibly expressed in prose. These poems are now hardly known. His first prose work was published in 1652 — Antidote against Atheism (new ed. 1655; also in coll. of philos. writings, 1662).

In the following year he sent forth Conjectura Cabalistica, or Attempt to Interpret the first three Chapters of Genesis in a threefold Manner — literal, philosophical, and mystical, or divinely moral. His next work of importance appeared in 1659, being an essay on the Immortality of the Soul (also 1662), accompanied by a valuable preface on the general subject of his philosophy. The leading principle of More's ethical system is that "moral goodness is simple and absolute, and that right reason is the judge of its nature, essence, and truth; but its attractiveness and beauty are felt by a special capacity, in boniformi anince facultate, not unlike the moral sense of later writers. Therefore all moral goodness is properly termed intellectual and divine. To affect this as supreme gives supreme felicity. By the aid of reason we state the axioms or principles of ethics in definite propositions, and derive from them special maxims or rules." In his philosophical views More espouses Descartes in the main, stating at great length and with much minuteness the doctrine of innate ideas, and defending it against misconceptions and objections. He qualifies Descartes's opinion that the soul has its seat in the pineal gland, and contends for the extension or diffusion of the soul, at the same time arguing that this does not involve its discerptibility. He contends at times for the reality of space as an entity independent of God, and again makes space to be dependent on God (anticipating the argument of Samuel  Clarke).

He argues the existence of God from the moral nature of man. He also ably defends the doctrine of free-will "as the basis of morality." "Against the theological Necessitarians, who deny contingency, More argues clearly that God himself can alone know what events are necessary and what contingent. Prescience of such events either implies a contradiction or not. But to suppose a contradiction is virtually to say that the prescience is not divine. Contradictory objects cannot come within the sphere of the divine omniscience. And if there is no contradiction, we may recognise in this very fact that there is no inconsistency betwixt the divine prescience and free-will. Either way no solid argument can be drawn against moral liberty from the idea of divine prescience. Again, the whole force of the objections as to the will always following what appears for the moment best, More supposes to be met by the simple experience that the good we know we frequently do not do. Our works are not determined by our knowledge of what is best.

We may have fine ideas of virtue, and yet never put them in practice. Our freedom in this sense is only too real; and it is the very object of morality to bring the idea and the will into unison, and so enlighten the one and discipline the other that they may attain to the highest good." Hobbes is said to have entertained a very high opinion of More's philosophical views, and to have declared that if his "own philosophy was not true, he knew none that he should sooner like than Henry More's, of Cambridge." In 1660, finally, More came out again, and this time with one of the ablest productions we have from his pen, being an extended treatise on the Mystery of Godliness, "written after an illness in which he had vowed, if spared, to write a book demonstrative of the truth of the Christian religion — so far as concerns the person and offices of Christ, he would attempt to construct the Christian theology after those subjective ethical relations and beliefs which were taught by Plato and Plotinus, and at the same time to recognise the reality of the supernatural in the Christian history — to the confusion of fanatics and infidels alike." He here reverently discusses the incarnation of Christ in all its bearings, and illustrates it with many curious and interesting thoughts derived from philosophy and history. Notwithstanding the Platonic dress in which he loves to array everything, More holds firmly and expounds reverently and lovingly all the great doctrines of Christianity. He protests most energetically against the tendency to spiritualize away the reality of the Gospel history. "That the human person of Christ," he says, "is not to be laid aside is evident from the whole tenor of the epistle to the Hebrews. For he that there is said to be a high-priest forever is that very man who  was crucified on the cross at Jerusalem."

Again he says, "I have with all earnestness and endeavor, and with undeniable clearness of testimony from reason and Scripture, demonstrated the truth and necessity of both Christ within and Christ without." It would appear that he did not altogether relish the phrase "imputative righteousness," yet his views on justification did not really differ from those of, other divines of the period; but he was perhaps fonder of laying stress upon this, that "the end of the Gospel was to renovate the spirits of men in true and real inherent righteousness and holiness," and he spoke of the phrase in question a aa" great scandal and effectual counterplot against the power of the Gospel, the nullifying and despising of moral honesty by those that are great zealots and high pretenders of religion." "For what an easy thing it is," he exclaims, "for a man to fancy himself an Israelite, and then to circumvent his honest neighbors under the notion of Egyptians." As for the Roman Catholic Church, he says that the economy of that Church "naturally tends to the betraying of souls to eternal destruction;" but adds, nevertheless, "not that it is possible for me (who cannot infallibly demonstrate to myself that all who lived under paganism are damned) to imagine that all who have gone under the name of papists have tumbled down into hell." The Mystery of Godliness enjoyed great popularity, and so did his Inquiry into the mystery of Iniquity, a work directed chiefly against popery. But of all his writings, the only one which can be said to have retained any lasting popularity, or to be commendable to the modern reader, is his Divine Dialogues, which he brought out in 1668, containing "Disquisitions concerning the Attributes and Providence of God."

This is pronounced by Tulloch the period which "may be said to mark the apex of More's intellectual activity." Of the book itself, Dr. Blair speaks in his lectures on rhetoric (lect. 36) as "one of the most remarkable in the English language." "Though the style," he adds, "be now in some measure obsolete, and the speakers be marked with the academic stiffness of those times, yet the dialogue is animated by a variety of character and a sprightliness of conversation beyond what are commonly met with in writings of this kind." What is recounted in the Dialogues under the name of Bathynous is believed to be his own peculiar experience, and gives an admirable picture of his clear, confiding, and enthusiastic spirit. The third dialogue is regarded as the best, for it is strikingly illustrative of the dreamy ideal enthusiasm with which the young Platonist (More) pursued his studies and inquiries. The Divine Dialogues are certainly, upon the whole, the most interesting and readable of all of More's works. They possess, moreover, the advantage of condensing his  general views on philosophy and religion. More's authorship continued far beyond this time (to 1687, making a period of thirty-five years in all), and he composed after this his Manual of Metaphysics (1671, 4to), and attacked both Jacob Bohme (in Philosophice Teutonicce Censura [1670]), and Spinoza (Duarum praecipuarum, Atheismi Spinoziani columnarum subversio [1672]) in elaborate treatises. But the elasticity and temper of his philosophical genius are less buoyant in these efforts. "His Metaphysics," says Tulloch, "elaborate though they be, are in the main only a systematic and somewhat desultory expansion of views regarding the nature and proof of incorporeal substances, which he had already more than once expressed; while his cabalistical and prophetical studies have acquired a stronger hold of his mind." Within the next ten years he issued no fewer than five publications taken up with mystical subjects — some of them of the most curious technical character — including a Cabalistic Catechism.

Two of these writings are addressed to his friend Knorr (q.v.), the learned German Orientalist, whose speculations on the cabalistic art at this time considerably influenced More. After this we find him deeply engaged in prophetical studies. The theosophic elements, already so apparent in his philosophical poems, had been for some time held in check by his higher life of reason and healthy appreciation of natural and moral facts. But gradually they acquired a more marked ascendency, as his mental habits became fixed and the elasticity of natural feeling and thought began to decay. The balance, which had long been trembling began at length to decline on the unhealthy side. Ezekiel's Dream and the Synchronous Method of the Apocalyptic Visions received elaborate transcendental explanation. He was himself apparently conscious of an undue confidence in this sort of study. Yet he was unable to resist its fascinations. In allusion it is supposed to himself, he makes one of the speakers in his fifth dialogue say: "The greatest fanaticism I know in him is this, that he professeth he understands clearly the truth of several prophecies of the mainest concernment, which yet many others pretend to be very obscure." His latest work, which he left incomplete, is a practical treatise entitled Medela Mundi, or the Cure of the World. There is no trace of this work except allusions to it in his correspondence, and it is probably the work which he mentions in one of his letters under the name of The Safe Guide. It was, to judge from what can be gleaned from his correspondence, intended to vigorously advocate the rights of reason, and one of its chief objects was to show how the "Christian and philosophic genius" should "mix together." "The Christian religion, rightly understood," appeared to him to be "the  deepest and choicest piece of philosophy that is." It was "the main, if not the only scope" of his long and anxious studies to demonstrate the rationality of the Christian religion throughout. "For to heap up a deal of reading and notions and experiments, without some such noble and important design, had but been to make his mind or memory a shop of small wares." He adopted, therefore, without hesitation the generous resolution of Marcus Cicero — "Rationem quo ea me cunque ducet, sequor." He was proud to adorn himself as a writer with "the sacerdotal breastplate of the Λόγιον, or Rationale." "Every priest," he adds, quoting Philo, "should endeavor, according to his opportunity and capacity, to be as much as he can a rational man, or philosopher." Again, "to take away reason, under what fanatic pretence soever, is to dissolve the priest, and despoil him of this breastplate, and, which is worst of all, to rob Christianity of that special prerogative it has above all other religions in the world — viz. that it dares appeal unto reason, which as many as understand the true interest of our religion will not fail to stick closely to; the contrary betraying it to the unjust suspicion of falsehood, and equalizing it to every vain imposture. For, take away reason, and all religions are alike true; as, the light being removed, all things are of one color" (Pref. to Antidote, page 6).

Though More's strength was displayed rather in what he could elaborate by thought than in the immediate use of his reading, he was nevertheless a laborious student. He devoted himself to the study of the best authors only. "He was wont to say that he was no wholesale man." It was with the weightiest matters that his mind was mostly engaged; though there was no part of learning, laudable and worthy, for which he had not a due esteem. For about a year before his death he was visibly sinking. His mind, sympathizing with his body, was, says his biographer, "'in sort out of tune.' I speak as to that deep and plastic sense (to use his own terms) he had been under usually in divine matters." His progress towards the close of life was nevertheless marked by humble piety and cheerful resignation. "Never," he said, "any person thirsted more for his meat and drink than he, if it pleased God, after a release from the body." "Yet," says Tulloch, " it is pleasant to reflect that his active mind remained full of thoughts for others to the last, and that those great questions in which he had spent all his time — What is good? and What is true? — were apparently as fresh and important with him at the end as, at the beginning."

He frequently in his last days expressed the hope that when he was called out of the present life his  writings would be of use to the Church of God and to the world. Shortly before his death he expressed his view of what awaited him by repeating the first words of Cicero's famous exclamation, "praeclarum illum diem," etc.; intimating, as he had also done before, his conviction that at his release from this painful world he would be admitted to converse with blessed and congenial spirits. He expired calmly, and almost imperceptibly, September 1, 1687, and lies buried in the chapel of the college of which he had been for so many years an admired ornament. In person Henry More was tall and thin, but of a "serene" and vivacious countenance — rather pale than florid in his later years — yet was it clear and spirituous, and his eye hazel, and vivid as an eagle's. There is, indeed, as all who have seen his portrait by Loggan will admit, a singularly vivid elevation in his countenance, with some lines strongly drawn around the mouth, but with ineffable sweetness, light, and dignity in the general expression. As he is the most poetic and transcendental, so he is, upon the whole, the most spiritual looking of all the Cambridge divines.

He was from youth to age evidently gifted with the most happy and buoyant religious temper. "He was profoundly pious, and yet without all sourness, superstition, or melancholy." His habitual cast of mind was a serene thoughtfulness, while his "outward conversation" — with his friends was for the most part "free and facetious." Religion was in practice with him clearly what he conceived it to be in theory — the consecration and perfection of the natural life — the brightest and best form which it could attain, under the inspiration and guidance of the Divine Spirit. Although he chose for himself a secluded life, and so far suffered in consequence from a lack of that comprehensive experience which is more than all other education to the wise and open mind, he yet was not actuated in doing so by any indifference to the lighter and more active interests of humanity. It was remarked that his very air had in it something angelic. He seemed to be full of introversions of light, joy, benignity, and devotion at once, as if his face had been overcast with a golden shower of love and purity. Strangers even noticed this "marvellous lustre and irradiation" in his eves and countenance. "A divine gale," as he himself said. breathed throughout all his life as well as his works; but, however far it lifted him, it never inflated him. Ward, in his life of this remarkable man, repeats some extraordinary encomiums passed upon him while living by eminent persons who knew him well. One of them averred that he looked upon Dr. More as "the holiest man on the face of the earth;" another that "he was more of an angel than a man." More substantial proofs, however, than words of the respect felt for him by his  contemporaries were offered in the attentions paid to him by the learned world. Yet it would be difficult indeed to name a Christian grace in which he did not excel. His charity and humility were not less conspicuous than his piety. "His very chamber door was a hospital to the needy." Self-denial he regarded as the practical ground of moral virtue; and in his own heart and behavior he evinced his observation that humility is the most precious part of piety.

The fervor of his direct approaches to and intercourse with God in prayer could not be surpassed. When the winds were ruffling about him, he made the utmost endeavor to keep low and humble, that he might not be driven from that anchor. So intense were his acts of worship, and accompanied with such a joyful sense of the divine presence, that his friends, when sometimes coming upon him unexpectedly while engaged in prayer, were surprised by indications of peace and joy in his countenance truly angelic. His temper was serene and cheerful, his discourse serious, yet lighted up with playful coruscations of wit and humor. "Few were of a cheer fuller spirit than he; none of a more deep felicity and enjoyment. In short, he possessed in as great purity perhaps as it has existed in any man of modern times the light, sanctity, and blessedness of the divine life." It is truly said by Tulloch that, "while More was no hero, either in thought or in deed — his speculations were too transcendental and his life too retired for this — he yet comes before us a singularly beautiful, benign, and noble character — one of those higher spirits who help us to feel the divine presence on earth, and to believe in its reality." His works were published in 1679, in 3 volumes folio; his philosophical writings in 1662, folio (4th ed. 1712); his theological works in 1675, folio. An analytical catalogue of all his works may be found in Cattermole's Literature of the Church of England, and' also in Tulloch's Rat. Theology, from which we extract this view of More as a writer: "More, still more than Cudworth, repeats himself, adding prefaces and appendices to what he has already written, and returning again and again upon the same track of thought. The germ, in fact, of most of his speculations may be traced in his early Philosophical Poems.

His genius in one sense was singularly fecund. Work after work sprang with easy luxuriance from his pen. But his writings do not exhibit any clear growth or system of ideas, unfolding themselves gradually, and maturing to a more comprehensive rationality. This lack of method is more or less characteristic of the school. Not only so, in his later productions there is rather a decay than an increase and enrichment of the rational element. To enter into any exposition of his cabalistical studies, of his discovery of Cartesianism in the first chapters of Genesis, and his favorite  notion of all true philosophers descending from Moses through Pythagoras and Plato; and, still more, to touch his prophetical theories — the divine science which he finds in the dream of Ezekiel or the visions of the Apocalypse would be labor thrown away, unless to illustrate the weakness of human genius, or the singular absurdities which beset the progress of knowledge, even in its most favorable stages. The supposition that all higher wisdom and speculation were derived originally from Moses and the Hebrew Scriptures; and that it was confirmatory both of the truth of Scripture and the results of philosophy to make out this traditionary connection, was widely prevalent in the 17th century. It was warmly supported and elaborately argued by some of the most acute and learned intellects. Both Cudworth and More profoundly believed in this connection. But this was only one of many instances of their lack of critical and historical judgment. Historical criticism, in the modern sense, was not even then dreamed of; and it is needless to consider forgotten delusions which have perished, rather with the common growth of reason than by the force of any special genius or discovery" (2:351-353). See his Praefatio Generalissima prefixed to his Opera Omnilia (1679); Ward, Life of Henry More (Lond. 1710, 8vo); Burnet, Hist. of his own Times; Tulloch, Rational Theol. and Christian Philos. in England in the 17th Century (Lond. 1872, 2 volumes, 8vo), 2:303-409; Mullinger, Cambridge Characteristics in the 17th Century (Lond. 1867, 8vo), chapter 4; Tennemann, Hist. Phil. pages 302, 321; Morell, Hist. Mod. Philos. pages 208, 211 sq.; Stoughton, Eccles. Hist. 2:385, 454, 482-485; Hallam, Introd. to Lit. (see Index in volume 2, Harper's edition); Enfield, Hist. Phil. book 8, chapter 3, sec. 3; Theodore Parker, in Christian Examiner, volume 26, art. 127:48 sq.; Retrospective Rev. volume 5 (1822).

## More, Sir Thomas[[@Headword:More, Sir Thomas]]

             the noted chancellor of king Henry VIII of England, celebrated for the part he played in the political and ecclesiastical history of his country and for the philosophical views he espoused, was the son of Sir John More, one of the justices of the Court of King's Bench. Thomas was born in London in 1480 (some say 1479, others again 1484), and was educated at St. Anthony's School in Threadneedle Street until about his fifteenth year, when he was placed, according to the custom of the times, in the house of cardinal Morton, archbishop of Canterbury, where he became known to  Colet, dean of St. Paul's, who used to say “there was but one wit in England, and that was young Thomas More."

In 1497 More went to Oxford. He had rooms in St. Mary's Hall, but carried on his studies at Canterbury College (afterwards Christ Church). Here he became intimately acquainted with Erasmus, who resided there during the greater part of 1497 and 1498, and formed a friendship which continued during life. It was also at Oxford that More composed the greater number of his English poems, which, though deficient in harmony and ease of versification, are spoken of by Ben Jonson as models of English literature. After More left Oxford he prosecuted the study of the law, and soon acquired great celebrity for his legal knowledge. He was appointed reader at Furnival's Inn. where he delivered lectures on law for three years; and about the same time he also delivered lectures at St. Lawrence's church in the Old Jewry, on the work of St. Augustine, De Civitate Dei. It must be remembered that religion, morals, and law were then taught together without distinction; yet More, in his lectures, did not so much discuss the points of divinity as the precepts of moral philosophy and history. It is, however, well known that More also did delight to touch on questions of theology, for he was always fond of it, and for some time thought of taking orders. "He manifested," says Mackintosh, "a predilection for monastic life, and is said to have practiced some of those austerities and self-inflictions which prevail among the gloomier and sterner orders" (Life, in Works, 1:405).

He resolved indeed at one time to turn monk, and actually became a lay-brother of the Carthusian convent (the Charter-House) in London, where he is said to have passed several years. But he finally relinquished the ecclesiastical life, influenced perhaps by the general corruption of the priestly orders, or, as Erasmus has it, he preferred to be a chaste husband rather than an impure priest. More was called to the bar, though at what time is uncertain. He appears to have acquired an extensive practice. He came to be generally regarded as one of the most eloquent speakers of his day; indeed, his reputation became so great towards the latter part of the reign of Henry VII that it is said that there was no case of consequence before any court of law in which he was not engaged as counsel. About 1502 he first entered upon public office.

He was then made an under-sheriff of London, an office at that time of great legal responsibility. Only two years later he was elected to Parliament, in which he opposed a subsidy which had been demanded by Henry VII for the marriage of his eldest daughter. In consequence of this opposition More incurred the displeasure of Henry 7:a -prince who never forgave an injury; and had not the king died soon  afterwards, More would have been obliged to leave the country. Notwithstanding all opposition at court, More flourished, and gained constantly in reputation and friends. His graceful and varied learning, coupled as it was with sprightly, inexhaustible wit, so that Erasmus could write of him that "with More you might imagine yourself in the Academy of Plato," no doubt contributed in a large measure to his rapid advancement. "His professional practice became so considerable," says Mackintosh, "that about the accession of Henry VIII (1509) it produced £400 a year, probably equivalent to an annual income of £5000 in the present day." With the accession of Henry VIII to the English throne More's most auspicious days began. He became a favorite of his royal master, always so quick to detect in his surroundings whatever and whoever was likely to prove serviceable to him. King "Harry" remarked More's talents, and not only gladly consulted him on affairs of state, but sought him as the companion of his amusements and convivial hours. According to the account of Erasmus, the circle there collected must have been one of the most brilliant and engaging that the world has ever seen, and it was adorned by virtues which to other associations, high in intellect, have often been wanting. More was appointed to several important civil offices, and even employed as envoy on foreign missions. Thus, in 1514, he was sent to Flanders, to secure favors from the prince afterwards known as emperor Charles V. More was also employed by his king on various public missions to France, and so interested did Henry VIII become in More that he ordered cardinal Wolsey, then his chancellor, to engage More in the service of the court. Accordingly More was made treasurer of the exchequer in 1520. and not only acceptably performed his public functions, but also grew in popularity with the courtiers and the king, by reason of his sweet temper and great conversational power. The king frequently met More, and enjoyed many hours with him, not only socially, but intellectually.

Indeed, in 1521, when king Harry was working up his reply to the German Reformer, More assisted his royal friend by casting that celebrated treatise against the Protestant effort into a proper method. It was published in 1521, under the title of Assertio septem sacramentorum adversus M. Lutherum, etc., and in 1523 More himself published Responsio ad convitia Al. Lutheri congesta in Henricum regent Angliae. "In this Answer to Luther," says Atterbury, "More has forgot himself so as to throw out the greatest heap of nasty language that perhaps ever was put together; and that the book throughout is nothing but downright ribaldry, without a grain of reason to support it, and gave to the author no other  reputation but that of having the best knack of any man in Europe at calling bad names in good Latin, etc. The like censure do his English tracts against Tindal, Barnes, etc., deserve" (Epistolary Correspondence, 3:452). And though this criticism is rather harsh, it was yet in a large measure deserved (comp., however, More's Apology, in which he denies these charges of overzeal against heresy).

In 1523 More was chosen speaker of the House of Commons, and now entered upon a career in which for a time he alienated both his royal master and the chancellor. The cardinal had taken the liberty of asking a greater subsidy for the king than he was entitled to, and was inclined to be generally lavish in his expenditures for the crown, as well as very unmindful of the ancient liberties and privileges of the house. More valiantly defended the people's cause, and hesitated not to speak out, though it endangered his popularity with the king. Indeed, More had never deceived himself as to the extent of his favor with the king, though his friend Erasmus had dared to assert that "the king would scarcely ever suffer the philosopher to quit him," and though Henry visited him uninvited at Chelsea, and walked with him by the hour in his garden, "holding his arm about his neck.” More had a true insight into Henry's character, and clearly revealed this in an answer which he once gave when congratulated by his son-in-law, Roper, on the king's favor: "If my head would win him a castle in France, when there was war between us, it should not fail to go." Henry's faithfulness, was, however, more lasting in More's case than it was wont to be, for he clung to him notwithstanding this waywardness, and shortly after caused his appointment as chancellor of Lancaster, and on the death of the cardinal in 1529 More was even more strongly impressed with his royal friend's affection by his appointment to the high chancellorship of all England, vacated by the disgrace of Wolsey. Here was more than usual expression of confidence and affection. The favor was, moreover, the more extraordinary as he was a layman, and it was wont to be the custom to invest an ecclesiastic with the office of lord chancellor. But it was afterwards revealed why this apparent warmth and fervor.

Henry had simply advanced More to the chancellorship with the hope that he would assist him in his divorce, and marriage with Anne Boleyn, and no sooner had he been elevated to the high chancellorship than the king pressed him strongly for his opinion on the subject. But More was sincerely attached to the Roman Catholic Church; he looked with a certain degree of horror upon a project which was denounced by the pontifical head of the Church, and therefore begged Henry to excuse him from giving an opinion. This was granted for a time; but as it was evident that Henry had determined to  effect the divorce, and would soon require the active cooperation of his chancellor, More, who determined not to be a party to the transaction, finally asked and obtained permission to retire from the office, May 16, 1532. From this time Henry, who never seems to have recollected any former friendship when his purposes were in the least degree thwarted, appears to have resolved upon the destruction of his old favorite. Anne Boleyn's coronation being fixed for May 31, 1533, all fair means were used to win him over; and when these proved ineffectual, recourse was had to threats and terrors. More was included in the bill of attainder which was passed against Elizabeth Barton, the celebrated nun of Kent, and her accomplices for treasonable practices, on the ground that he had encouraged Elizabeth; but his innocence in the case was made so clear that his name had to be withdrawn from the bill of accusation. He was then accused of other crimes, but with the same effect. Yet the court party soon found an opportunity of gratifying their vindictive master. By a law passed in the session of 1533-34 it was made high-treason, by writing, print, deed, or act, to do anything to the prejudice, etc., of the king's lawful matrimony with queen Anne; and it was also provided that all persons should take an oath to maintain the whole contents of the statute. At the end of the session commissioners were appointed to administer the oath, and on April 15, 1534, More was summoned before them to take it. This More declined doing, but at the same time offered to swear that he would maintain the order of succession to the throne as established by Parliament. In consequence of his refusing to take this oath, More was committed to the Tower; and in the same year two statutes were passed to attaint More and Fisher, SEE FISHER, JOHN of misprision of treason, with the punishment of imprisonment and loss of goods.

More remained in prison for thirteen months, during which time several efforts were made to induce him to take the oath, and also to subscribe to the king's ecclesiastical supremacy. His reputation and credit being very great in the kingdom, and much being apprehended from his conduct at that critical conjuncture, all arguments that could be devised were alleged to him by archbishop Cranmer and others to persuade him to a compliance, and many fair promises were made from the king to induce him thereto; but, as nothing could prevail, he was finally brought to trial for high-treason. He appears to have been indicted under the statute alluded to above, which made it high-treason to do anything to the prejudice of Henry's lawful marriage with queen Anne, and also for refusing to admit the king's ecclesiastical supremacy; and although the evidence against him completely failed, he was found guilty and  condemned to death. He was beheaded July 6, 1535, and met his fate with intrepidity and even cheerfulness. In the words of Addison: "The innocent mirth which had been so conspicuous in his life did not forsake him to the last. When he laid his head on the block, he desired the executioner to wait until he had removed his beard, 'for that had never offended his highness.' He did not look upon the severing of his head from his body as a circumstance which ought to produce any change in the' disposition of his mind; and as he died in a fixed and settled hope of immortality, he thought any unusual degree of sorrow and concern improper" (Spectator, No. 349). His body was first interred in the Tower, but was afterwards begged and obtained by his daughter, Margaret Roper, and deposited in' the chancel of the church at Chelsea, where a monument, with an inscription written by himself, had been some time before erected, and is still to be seen. His head was placed on London Bridge, but was taken down and preserved also by his daughter in a vault belonging to the Roper family, under a chapel adjoining St. Dunstan's church in Canterbury. The story of Margaret's tenderness and devotion to her father should live as long as the English language endures.

More was the author of many and various works, which were mostly in defence of Romanism, and directed against the revolutionary tendencies of the Church of his day. They have no value now as literary productions. There is, however, one work of his which deserves special notice. It is entitled De optimo reipublicae statu deque nova insula Utopia (Lovanni, 1566, 4to), the first communistic writing by an English author. It criticises the English government and European politics, and is an account of an imaginary commonwealth on the island of Utopia, feigned to have been discovered by a companion of Amerigo Vespucci, and from whom More learns the tale. Society is represented there as an ideal system, in which opinions are expressed with great boldness and originality, and especially favorable to freedom of inquiry even in religion. In it all its members would labor for the public good, all being equally obliged to contribute, and the only difference being in the nature of the labor; all its members would thus be on a footing of absolute equality, all property be in common, all forms of religion perfectly free, etc. "Many questions of the highest importance to the citizen," says Lieber, "are discussed in a spirit far in advance of his time. He recommended perfect freedom of conscience, which was a thing absolutely unknown then, and for centuries afterwards" (Political Ethics, part 1, page 332). Of the work as a whole, lord Campbell says that "since  the time of Plato there had been no composition given to the world which, for imagination, for philosophical discrimination of men and manners, and for felicity of expression, could be compared to the Utopia" (Lives of the Lord Chancellors; Life of Sir Thomas More). Hallam pronounces it "the only work of genius that England can boast in this age" (Lit. Hist. of Europe [4th ed. 1854], page 276). Yet, though Sir Thomas advocated such lofty principles in his Utopia, it must be admitted that he was not himself altogether free from the religious bias of the times, being not. only a most strenuous advocate of the power of the pope, but also a vehement opponent and persecutor of heretics. It is true Erasmus cites as proof of More's clemency "that while he was chancellor no man was put to death for these pestilent dogmas;" but Froude contradicts this statement, and implicates Sir Thomas in the persecutions for conscience' sake. There is, however, a solemn declaration by the chancellor himself in his Apology (published in 1533), in which he expressly denies that he was guilty of any cruel treatment of the heretics. It was never contradicted in his own time, and therefore should be well considered before Froude's statement is accepted.

If now, from his works, we turn to the personal character of Sir Thomas More, we find that he is generally acknowledged to have been, "for justice, contempt of money, humility, and a true generosity of mind, an example to the age in which he lived." His Christian temper, too, we may add, was such as made him an honor to the Christian cause in general. It is true he declared upon the scaffold that he died in and for the faith of the Church of Rome, but any Church might have wished him theirs; and therefore that Church has placed him, not without reason, among the brightest of her martyrs. "More," says bishop Burnet, "was the glory of his age; and his advancement was the king's honor more than his own, who was a true Christian philosopher. He thought the cause of the king's divorce was just, and as long as it was prosecuted at the court of Rome, so long he favored it; but when he saw that a breach with that court was likely to follow, he left the post he was in with a superior greatness of mind. It was a fall great enough to retire from that into a private state of life, but the carrying matters so far against him as the king did was one of the justest reproaches of that reign. More's superstition seems indeed contemptible, but the constancy of his mind was truly wonderful" (Hist. Reformation, 3:100). A British writer of considerable note thus summarizes upon More: " The terseness and liveliness of his sayings, his sweet temper and affectionate  disposition, his blameless life, his learning and probity, combine to make a union of perfect simplicity with moral and intellectual greatness which will forever endear his memory to his countrymen of every sect and party." The English works of Sir Thomas More were collected and published at London in 1557, and his Latin works at Louvain in 1556. His letters to Erasmus are printed in the collection of Erasmus's letters published at London in 1642. His Utopia, which has been translated into many European languages, and has had a world-wide circulation, was given an English dress by Robynson (Lond. 1551), by bishop Burnet, and more recently by Arthur Cavley (Lond. 1808). The Life of Sir Thomas More has been written by his son-in-law, Roper, who married his favorite daughter Margaret (Lond. 1626); by his great-grandson, T. More (1626); by Hoddesden (Lond. 1652); by Cayley (1808); by Walter [R.C.] (Lond. 1840); and by Sir James Mackintosh, in Lives of Eminent British Statesmen, published in Dr. Lardner's Cabinet Cyclop., and in Miscell. Works (Lond. 1854, 18mo), 1:393 sq. See also lord Campbell, Lives of the Lord Chancellors; Froude, Hist. of Enyl. volume 2, chapter 9, reviewed in North Brit. Rev. 1859; Burnet, Own Times, i, 155 sq.; Wordsworth, Eccles. Biog. 2:49 sq.; Soames, Reformed Ch. of Eng. volume 1 and 2; Macaulay, Crit. and Hist. Essays, 2:543; Seebohm, The Oxford Reformers of 1498 (Lond. 1869); Edinburgh Rev. 14:360; Westminster Rev. 11:193; Foreign Rev. 5:391; Retrospective Rev. (1822), 5:249; North American Rev. 8:181; 66, 272; National Qu. Rev. June 1863, art. 3.

## Morea[[@Headword:Morea]]

             SEE GREECE, KINGDOM OF.

## Moreau, Gabriel Francois[[@Headword:Moreau, Gabriel Francois]]

             a French prelate, was born at Paris September 24, 1721. Descended from a lawyer's family, he became council scribe in the Parliament of Paris, and was in 1737 provided with a sinecure canonship in the metropolitan church, but rapidly rose to distinction, and in 1759 was made bishop of Vence. In 1763 he was transferred to the see of Macon. After the concordat of 1801 he obtained the bishopric of Autun, where he died, September 8, 1802. The first consul (Napoleon Bonaparte) esteemed him highly, and demanded from the pope the cardinal's hat for him. His literary remains, however, are scanty, consisting mainly of a few funeral sermons on distinguished individuals, viz. Oraison funebre de Ferdinand VI et Marie de Portugal, roi et reine d'Espagne (1760), and Oraison funebre de M. le Duc de Bourgogne (1761). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 36:479.

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

             a French theologian, was born at Laval near the opening of the 16th century. He was educated at Paris, and when about thirty years of age was appointed professor of theology at the University of Paris. He next became canon at the cathedral of Meaux. He died about 1584. His work, — Nomenclatura sen Legenda aurea pontificum Cenomanensium, ab anno Verbi incarnati 902 usque ad annum 1572, is still preserved in MS.

## Moreau, Mace[[@Headword:Moreau, Mace]]

             a French martyr to Protestant Christianity, was born in the first half of the 16th century, and flourished at Troyes, in Champagne. He was reared in the Roman Catholic faith, but about 1547 accepted the Reformed faith, and went to Geneva to study theology. In 1550 he returned to France, going about the country distributing tracts that might turn men's attention from this world's affairs to spiritual things. While at Troyes he was entrapped by Romanists, and after a short imprisonment brought to trial before the Inquisition, and condemned to death at the stake unless he should recant. This he refused to do; and he continued steadfast even at the stake, " until  he was smothered by the flames, and his voice on earth forever hushed." See Hurst, Martyrs to the Tract Cause (N.Y. 1872, 18mo), page 111.

## Moreh[[@Headword:Moreh]]

             (Heb. Moreh', מוֹרֶה, an archer, as in 1Sa 31:3, etc., or teaching, as in Isa 9:14), an old title that appears in the designation of two localities of central Palestine.

1. Apparently a Canaanite (perhaps a chief, like Mamre), B.C. 2088, owning or inhabiting the region south of Shechem, from whom the grove (אֵלוֹן, oak [also in the plur.], Auth.Vers. "plain") of Moreh derived its name as early as the time of Abraham, who made this his first tarrying- place in the land (Gen 12:6, where the Sept. has ἡ δ ρ ὺ ς ἡ ὑ ψ ληλή,Vulg. convallis illustris), a designation that continued till the exode (Deu 11:30, Sept. ἡ δ ρ ὺ ς ἡ ὑ ψ ηλή,Vulg. vallis tendens et intrans procul) — "the first of that long succession of sacred and venerable trees which dignified the chief places of Palestine, and formed not the least interesting link in the chain which so indissolubly united the land to the history of the nation. See OAK. Here Jehovah 'appeared' to Abraham, who here built the first of the series of altars (it may be roughly said that Abraham built altars, Isaac dug wells, Jacob erected stones) which marked the various spots of his residence in the Promised Land, and dedicated it 'to Jehovah, who appeared נַרְאֶה, again, as if a play upon the name of the place) unto him' (Gen 12:7). It was at the 'place of Shechem' (Gen 12:6), close to (אֵצֶל) the mountains of Ebal and Gerizim (Deu 11:30), where the Samar.

Cod. adds 'over against Shechem.' Sir 1:26 perhaps contains a play on the name Moreh that foolish people (ὁ λαὸς ὁ μωρός ) who dwell in Sichem.' If the pun existed in the Hebrew text, it may have been between Sichem and Sichor (drunken). A trace of this ancient name, curiously reappearing after many centuries, is probably to be found in Morthia, which is given on some ancient coins as one of the titles of Neapolis, i.e., Shechem, and by Pliny and Josephus as Mamortha or Mabortha (Reland, Diss. 3:§ 8). The latter states (War, 4:8, 1) that ‘it was the name by which the place was called by the country people' (ἐπιχώριοι), who thus kept alive the ancient appellation, just as the peasants of Hebron did that of Kirjath-arba down to the date of Sir John Mande-ille's visit." From the notices given, the grove of Moreh appears to have been a forest occupying the ridge afterwards  known as the mountains of Ephraim. (The treatise of Chr. J. Grabener, De Allon Moreh, Lips. 1737, is valueless.)

2. An eminence (hill of Moreh, גַּבַעִת הִמּוֹרֵה, i.e., teacher's hill; Sept. βουνὸς τοῦ Α᾿μορέ v.r. Γαβαωθαμοραί ,Vulg. collis excelsus) in the valley of Jezreel, on the north side of the well of Harod, near which the Midianitish host was encamped when attacked by Gideon (Jdg 7:1); probably identical with that known as Little Hermon, the modern Jebel ed- Duhy (see Bertheau, Comment. ad loc.), or, rather, one of the lower southern spurs of this mountain (where ruins are still extant), since it is itself too lofty (1839 feet, Van de Velde, Memoir, page 178) for a military encampment. It is a bare gray ridge parallel to Mount Gilboa on the north, and between them lay the battle-field. No doubt — although the fact is not mentioned — the enemy kept near the foot of Mount Moreh, for the sake of some spring or springs which issued from its base, as the AinCharod did from that on which Gideon was planted. SEE HAROD.

The hostile camp probably extended from the village of Shunem on the west down to the strong city of Bethshan on the east, for we are told that "the Midianites and the Amalekites, and all the children of the east, lay along the valley like grasshoppers for multitude" (Jdg 7:12). The mountain is the site not only of Shunem, but also of Endor and Nain (see Porter, Handbook, page 357 sq.). Whether this place has any connection with the preceding is doubtful; and it is still more unlikely that either is related to Moriah, as thought by Stanley (Sin. and Pal. pages 141, 232). Van de Velde locates the battle too far south (Syr. and Pal. 2:341). SEE GIDEON.

## Morehead, Robert, D.D[[@Headword:Morehead, Robert, D.D]]

             an English divine of some note, flourished in the first half of this century. But little is known of his personal history. He was for some time rector of St. Paul's in Edinburgh, and there attained to distinction as a pulpit orator. Subsequently he became rector of Easington, Yorkshire, and died in 1840. He was one of the early and most valued contributors to the Edinburgh Review. His works are Tour to the Holy Land (18mo): — Discourses on Religious Belief (Edinb. 1809, 8vo; 4th ed. 1811-16, 2 volumes, 8vo); commended by lord Jeffrey in the Edinburgh Review, 14:82-95: — Sermons (1816, 8vo): — Dialogues on Natural and Revealed Religion (1830, 12mo); praised by Lowndes's Brit. Lib. Page 941, the Edinb. Rev., and the British contemporary press generally, in most unqualified terms: —  Explanation of St. Paul's Epistles (1843, fcp. 8vo): — Philosophical Dialogues (1845, 8vo).

## Morel, Claude[[@Headword:Morel, Claude]]

             a French theologian and preacher of note, flourished in the 17th century. He was a doctor of the Sorbonne and court preacher, but is best known as a passionate adversary of the Jansenists. He published against them La conduite de Saint Augustin contre les Pelagiens (1658), and L'Oracle de la Velrite, ou l'Eglise de Dieu contre toutes sortes d'heresies (1666). The Jansenists failed not to answer him, as four pieces still attest, viz. a Latin epistle in prose, two pieces in Latin verse inveighing against him, and a French sonnet. In 1659 the council of state instituted proceedings against these Jansenistic opponents and sentenced them.

## Morel, Guillaume[[@Headword:Morel, Guillaume]]

             a learned French printer, noted for the valuable editions he published of the writings of distinguished ecclesiastical writers, was born at Le Tilleul, near Mortain, in 1505. He was the successor of Turnebius (1550) in the office of director of the royal printing-office, and died in 1561. Besides his editions of Greek and Latin authors (Aristotle, Strabo, Dio Chrysostomus, Cicero, etc.), he published a French translation of the treatise on the use of images approved by the seventh Nicene Council, and of John Damascenus's Treatise on Images.

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

             a French martyr to the cause of Protestant Christianity in its earliest days in France, was born in 1538 near Lisieux, of a poor and obscure family in Normandy. He sought the capital, and though without means contrived to pursue and finish a scholarly education, during this period earning his living partly by instruction, partly by work in a printing-office. Thereafter, it is not known from what motive, he made a journey to Geneva, and returned full of enthusiasm for the new religious doctrines. He then entered the service of the (Calvinistic) minister, Antoine de Chandieu, both as domestic and secretary. While in this position the police came to seize the books written in favor of the new religion, and he, along with his master, was arrested. Chandieu, at the reclamation of the king of Navarre, was soon set at liberty; but Morel was placed in one of the most dismal dungeons of the Chatelet, and thence transported to Fort l'Eveque, where he had to  undergo numerous interrogatories. He resisted the entreaties of his judges and the urgent requests of his relatives, who tried to make him abjure his creed, and February 16, 1559, was declared a heretic, expelled from the Church, and surrendered to the secular power. Four days later he was found dead in the Conciergerie — rumor reported poisoned. Like the condemned dying in prison, his body was buried the day following; but by order of the procureur general it was disinterred, brought back to the Conciergerie, carried in a rubbish-cart to the area before the church of Notre Dame, and publicly burned, February 27, 1559.

## Morel, Robert[[@Headword:Morel, Robert]]

             a French Benedictine monk, was born in 1653 at La Chaise Dieu, in Auvergne. He took holy orders at the abbey of Saint Faron de Meaux in 1671; was sent to the abbey of Saint Germain des Pres to finish his studies, and in 1680 became its librarian. He was afterwards appointed superior (prior) of a convent at Meulan, and at Saint Crespin de Soissons, and secretary to the visiting officer of France. Deafness, with which he became afflicted, obliged him to resign these offices, and he retired in 1699 to Saint Denis, near Paris, where he divided the rest of his life between pious religious exercises and the editing of several ascetic works. He died August 19, 1731, in the odor of sanctity. He was a man of a clear, well-balanced, fertile mind; his words breathed charity and righteousness; but great modesty, joined to simplicity, served to conceal his talents. His publications are: Effussions de coeur, ou entretiens spirituels et affectifs d'une ame avec Dieu sur chaque verset des Psaumes et des Cantiques de l'Eglise (Paris, 1716): — Meditations sur la regle de Saint-Benoit (Paris, 1717): — Entretiens spiritueels sur les Evangiles (Paris, 1720): — Entretiens spirituels pour servir de preparation a la mort (Paris, 1721): — Imitation de Jesus-Christ, a translation, with additional pieces (Paris, 1723): — Meditations Chretiennes sur les Evangiles (Paris, 1726): — Du bonheur d'un simple Religieux et d'une simple Religieuse, qui aiment leur etat leurs devoirs (Paris, 1728): — De l'esperance Chretienne (Paris, 1728): — Effusion de ceur sur le Cantique des Cantiques (Paris, 1730).

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

             an Irish Presbyterian minister, flourished in the second half of the 18th century. He was born about 1744, and was educated at Dublin. He was a young man of rare promise, and was very much liked as a minister. He  began preaching when not more than twenty-five years old at Tullylish, in the Synod of Ulster, but during the civil disturbances of 1772 he was persecuted for the part he took in behalf of law and order, and in a riot which occurred on the 6th of March of that year he was shot down in the streets, and died from the effects of the wound. See Reid and Killen, Hist. Presbyt. Ch. in Ireland, 3:370.

## Morell, Thomas, D.D[[@Headword:Morell, Thomas, D.D]]

             an eminent English critic and lexicographer, was born at Eton in 1703. He studied first at Eton, then at Cambridge, where he became a fellow of King's College. He was noted, however, not as a theologian, but as a classical scholar. He published valuable editions of Ainsworth's Latin Dictionary and Hedericus's Greek Lexicon, and was the author of Annotations on Locke's Essay on the Human Understanding (1794). He edited the plays of Euripides and Eschylus, translated the Epistles of Seneca, assisted Hogarth in writing his Analysis of Beauty, and selected the passages of Scripture for Handel's oratorios. Several of his best sermons were also published; among these, one on the death of queen Caroline (1739, 8vo). He died in 1784.

## Morellet, Andre[[@Headword:Morellet, Andre]]

             a celebrated French abbot, noted for his literary labors, was born at Lyons in 1727, and educated in the Sorbonne, at Paris. He became a friend of Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot, and D'Alembert, to whose Encyclopedie he also contributed. He translated into French Beccaria's treatise On Crimes and Penalties (1766), and wrote several treatises on political economy, and many others, among which is Melanges de la Litterature et de la Philosophie du dix-huitienme siecle (Paris, 1818, 4 volumes, 8vo). In 1785 he was admitted to the French Academy, and concealed its archives at the risk of his life during the reign of terror. He died in 1819. See Lemontey, Eloge de Morellet. prefixed to Morellet's Memnoires (1821, 2 volumes); Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; "Morellet and his Contemporaries," in the North Amer. Rev. October 1822, by A.H. Everett.

## Morelli, Cosimo[[@Headword:Morelli, Cosimo]]

             an Italian architect of considerable note among those of the last century, deserves a place here because his life-labors were very largely devoted to ecclesiastical architecture. He was born at Imola in 1732, and was the son  of Domenico Morelli (also an architect), and studied under Domenico Trifogli, who executed several works of merit at Imola. It was Cosimo's good fortune to obtain powerful patronage at the very outset of his professional career — first, that of Giovan-Carlo Bandi, bishop of Imola, for whom he made designs for rebuilding the cathedral of that city, and through him that of his nephew Giovanni Antonio Braschi, who was elevated to the papal throne in 1775, with the name of Pius VI. The new pontiff, who entertained a personal regard for Morelli obtained for him the appointment of city architect at Cesena (the pope's native town), and various other commissions. He died, after a severe paralytic attack, in February, 1812. The principal structures executed by him in the line in which we are interested are the cathedral of Imola, the metropolitan church at Fermo, the duomo at Macerata, and the conventual church at Fossombrone, St. Petronio at Castel Bolognese, a church at Barbiano, that of the nuns of St. Chiara at Imola, and St. Maria in regola in the same city, and another church at Lugo; also some alterations in the metropolitan church at Ravenna. See Tipaldo, Biogr. degli Italiani illustri; Engl. Cyclop. s.v.; Spooner, Biog. Dict. of the Fine Arts, 2:588.

## Morelli, Giacomo, Abbe[[@Headword:Morelli, Giacomo, Abbe]]

             an Italian ecclesiastic, noted for his antiquarian labors, and one of the most distinguished librarians of modern times, was born at Venice, April 14, 1745. He was the son of poor parents, who were unable to give him a liberal education. It was against their will that he resolved to enter the Church, although in all other respects he always showed the greatest deference to their wishes. He afterwards supplied the deficiencies of his education by private study, and the knowledge which he thus acquired was more substantial and extensive than that of any of his Italian contemporaries, though it was not till late in life that he became acquainted with the Greek and French languages. His love of independence induced him to refuse several very advantageous offers that were made to him both by the Church and by wealthy collectors of books at Venice, and he continued to live as a simple abbe. He formed, however, an intimate friendship with the patrician Farsetti, of whose rich collection of MSS. he published a catalogue, under the title of Bibliotheca Manuscritta del bali T.G. Farsetti (Venice, 1771-80, 2 volumes, 12mo). While this work was in course of publication, he also wrote Dissertazione Storica intorno alla Publica Libreria di S. Marco (Venice, 1774), in which he discussed and solved a great many questions connected with the history of literature.

He  then prepared a similar work on the history of the library of the academy at Padua, whither he had accompanied his friend Farsetti; but the materials which he collected for that purpose were unfortunately left in the hands of Colle, the historiographer of that institution, through whose carelessness they were lost. In 1776 he published a catalogue of the MSS. of ancient writers which were in the library of the Narni family 7 and somewhat later a catalogue of the MSS. of Italian works contained in the same library. These works alone would have sufficed to secure to Morelli an honorable place among the eminent bibliographers of modern times; but he acquired a still greater reputation as librarian of the library of St. Mark — an office which he received in 1778, and which he held until his death, which occurred May 5, 1819. In 1795 he discovered a considerable fragment of the 55th book of Dion Cassius, which he published at Bassano, together with new various readings of other books of the same historian. The work which exhibits his extensive knowledge and his critical acumen in the strongest light is his Bibliotheca Manuscripta Graeca et Latina, of which, however, only one volume was published at Bassano (1802), although he had collected materials for several more volumes. His last production was Epistole septens variae eruditionis (Padua, 1819). After his death there appeared Operette ora insieme con Opuscoli di Antichi Scrittori (Venice, 1820, 3 volumes, 8vo). See Zendrini, Elogio di Morelli (Mil. 1821); reproduced in the Galleria du Letterati ed artisti illustri della provincii Veneziane nel Secolo XVIII (Venice, 1822-24); Bettio, Orazione recifata nelle solenne Esequie nella Chiesa Patriarcale di Venezia (Venice, 1819).

## Morelstshiki[[@Headword:Morelstshiki]]

             (i.e., self-immolators), also called the "Voluntary Martyrs," a Russian sect of fanatics, whose wild and savage practices are more like those of ancient Scandinavians than of professing Christians of the 19th century. It is difficult to know what are the dogmas of these voluntary martyrs, because they have no printed books, and they do not confide to foreigners the mysteries of their sect. Regarding the Old and New Testament as having been corrupted, it is said that they give themselves the right to change it. They recognize God the Father, manifested to men under the double form of Jesus Christ and the Holy Ghost. They reject the true death and resurrection of Jesus, maintaining that the body placed in the sepulchre by Joseph of Arimathea was not the Lord's body, but that of an obscure soldier. They think that Christ will soon return, and make his triumphant entrance into Moscow, and that thither his disciples will hasten from every  part of the earth. They do not observe the Sabbath. Their only religious holiday is Easter. They then celebrate the Lord's Supper with bread which has been buried in the tomb of some saint, supposing that it thus receives a kind of mysterious consecration. Their meetings are held on Saturday night. The following are a few lines of one of their hymns: "Be firm, mariners! Triumph over the tempest! Fear neither fire nor whirlwind. Christ is with us. He will collect the faithful in his vessel. His masts will not break; his sails will never be rent; and he will hold the helm firmly, and land us in a safe haven.

The Holy Spirit is with us; the Holy Spirit is in us." Their custom is to meet together on a certain day in the year in some retired place, and, having dug a pit, to fill it with wood, straw, and other combustibles, while they are singing weird hymns, like that of which we have given an extract, relating to the ceremony. Fire is then applied to the piled fuel, and numbers leap into the midst of it, stimulated by the triumphant hymns of those around, to purchase a supposed martyrdom by their suicidal act. Others, without sacrificing life, cruelly mutilate their bodies, like the fanatics of India, who throw themselves beneath the triumphal car of their idol. These sectarians are to be found chiefly in the north of Russia, especially Siberia, but they are also represented on the banks of the Volga. There are a few at Moscow, St. Petersburg, Riga, Odessa, etc. They try to make proselytes in the army, but the imperial police pursue their missionaries, and when they are discovered punish them most cruelly. The Russian government has endeavored to suppress them by means of very severe measures, but has thus far failed in doing so. See Marsden, Hist. of Christian Churches and Sects, 2:231, 232.

## Morely (or Morelly) (Lat. Morelius), Jean Baptiste[[@Headword:Morely (or Morelly) (Lat. Morelius), Jean Baptiste]]

             a French Protestant divine, noted for his attempts to introduce into the Church a democratic organization such as it had in apostolic times, was born at Paris about 1510. But little is known of his early personal history. He suddenly became noted by his criticism of the fourth book of Calvin's Institution Chretienne, in an essay on ecclesiastical discipline, in which he tried to prove that the laity ought to have power to decide on all important questions of doctrine, morals, election of pastors, etc., privileges assigned by the Geneva Reformer to a Consistory, and fortified his theory by declarations of Scripture and the usages of the primitive Church. He submitted the same in manuscript to Calvin; but Calvin returned it with the excuse that he had not time to peruse so long a treatise on a subject already settled by the Word of God. Morely then had it printed under the title,  Traite de lae discipline etpolice Chrltienne (Lyons, 1561). The moderation, the force of argument, the clearness of exposition displayed in it found little countenance with the Calvinistic churches, and when in 1562 he presented it to the National Synod held at Orleans it was rejected. This condemnation appeared rather strange to a large number of the Reformed; among others, Soubise expressed himself strongly against this proceeding to Theodore de Beza, who, however, succeeded in quieting him. Morely retired to Tours, where he found a violent adversary in the pastor of Saint- Germain, and thence to Geneva (November 1562).

Here he was ere long summoned before the Consistory, and asked to retract. This he refused to do, but proposed to submit the matter to the judgment of Farel, De Viret, and Calvin. The latter would not accept the part of arbiter, saying he would not place himself above the synod, which had condemned his book. Even Morely's request to give him permission to defend himself in writing was not granted; on the contrary, the Consistory treated him as an obstinate heretic, and (August 31, 1563) excommunicated him; his book, referred to the council, was condemned to be burned (September 17), and all bookstores were forbidden to expose it for sale, all citizens and inhabitants of Geneva warned not to purchase it for reading, and all who possessed copies of it were ordered to bring them, and those who knew where there were any, to denounce them within twenty-four hours at the risk of severe punishment in case of non-compliance. Morely left Geneva, but the passion of the Calvinistic clergy ceased not to manifest itself against him. When in 1566 he acted as tutor to the son of Jeanne d'Albret, the Consistory did not rest satisfied until he was dismissed from that family. The National Synods of Paris (1565) and Nimes (1572) also condemned his Traite de la Discipline, as well as his Reponse, which he published against An Apology of the Calvinistic Doctrine, variously attributed to Chandieu and Viret. On the other hand, a goodly number of persons of rank, several churches of Languedoc, those of Sens, Meaux, and others, approved and shared his opinions concerning church organization, and demanded with him that the laity should have a vote in the election of elders, pastors, etc. Ramus, too, became interested, and insisted upon that right. The author of all this agitation in 1572 dropped out of sight. He is supposed to have died towards the end of the 16th century in London, England. His plan of congregational lay representation in ecclesiastic government is now realized essentially in most Protestant churches, after three hundred years of controversy. Besides the two principal works mentioned, two other publications are ascribed to him, viz. Verborum Latinorum cum Gracis  Anglicisque conjunctorum locupletissimi Conmmentarii (1583), and De Ecclesia ab antichristo per ejus excidium liberanda (Lond. 1589); the latter was dedicated to queen Elizabeth, and translated into German. See Bayle, Hist. Dict. s.v.; Haag, La France Protestante, s.v.; Niceron, Memoires, volume 36; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 36:546, 547.

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

             a French ecclesiastic noted for his literary labors, was born at Bargemont, in Provence, in 1643. He first studied the classics in the Jesuitical college at Aix, and finally theology at Lyons, and was there ordained for the priesthood. When only eighteen years of age he made himself noted as the author of an allegorical composition, and later by a collection of his poems. He applied himself diligently to the study of the Italian and Spanish languages, and translated Rodriguez's book on Christian Perfection, which he published under the title Pratique de la perfection Chretienne et religieuse, traduite de l'Espagnol (Lyons, 1677, 3 volumes, 8vo). Moreri preached for five years at Lyons with great success, and while there formed his plan for his Historical Dictionary. He so applied himself to this stupendous work, of which the first edition appeared at Lyons in 1674, that his health was impaired and his strength exhausted. In 1680 appeared the first volume of the second edition. He died in the same year, July 10. But though Moreri had lived only so few years, he had yet accomplished the work of a common lifetime, and secured a name among posterity for centuries. His Historical Dictionary contains whatever is curious and noteworthy in sacred and profane history; hence everybody was amazed to see so prodigious a work from so young a man. He was at once, after the publication of the book in 1674, surrounded by the learned of his country, taken from his charge, and made welcome into the family of the bishop of Apt, in Provence, whom he attended the year following to Paris; he was there soon introduced to the prelates, who held their assembly in St. Germain en Laye, and the learned men in the metropolis. His friends also recommended him to M. de Pompone, secretary of state, who invited him to his house in 1678; and he might have expected great advantages from the patronage of that minister had not his intense application cut short his life. Indeed, he may be said to have sacrificed both his fortune and his life for the public when he undertook so laborious a work. Besides the writings above alluded to, he put the Lives of the Saints into more elegant French, and added methodical tables for the use of preachers, with chronological. tables; and in 1671 he published at Lyons the following book, Relations  nouvelles du Levant, ou traites de la religion, du gouvernment, et des coutumes des Perses, des Armeniens, et des Gaunes, composes par le P.G.D.C.C. (that is, P. Gabriel du Chinon, capuchin), et donnms au public par le sieur L.M.P.D.E.T. (that is, Louis Moreri, pretre, Docteur en Theologie). The Historical Dictionary has passed through many editions, and has from one vol. fol. been extended constantly until in its 19th edition (Paris, 1759) it made 10 volumes, fol. Both the well-informed Bayle and the scholarly Du Pin have enlarged and enriched the work as its editors. See Genesis Biog. Dict. s.v.; Nicdron, Memoires, s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Pericaud, Moreri a Lyon (Lyons, 1837, 8vo). (J.H.W.)

## Mores, Edward Rowe[[@Headword:Mores, Edward Rowe]]

             an English Roman Catholic noted for his antiquarian labors, was born of Protestant parents January 13, 1730, at Tunstall, in Kent, where his father was rector for nearly thirty years. He was educated at Merchant Taylor's school and at Queen's College, Oxford. Even while yet a student at the university he was noted for his attainments, and assisted in antiquarian labors. Being intended for orders by his father, he took the degrees of B.A. May 12, 1750, and M.A. January 15, 1753, before which time he had formed considerable collections relative to the antiquities, etc., of Oxford, and particularly to those of his own college, whose archives he arranged, and made large extracts from, with a view to its history. He also gathered some collections for a history of Godstow Nunnery and of Iffley church. His MSS. relative to his own college, with his collections about All Souls' College, are still unpublished, but are treasured in the Bodleian Library. In 1752 he printed in half a 4to sheet some corrections made by Junius in his own copy of his edition of Ccedmon's Saxon Paraphrase of Genesis, and other parts of the Old Testament (Amstelod. 1655), and then went to the Continent, where he seems to have fallen in with Roman Catholics, and to have secretly joined their communion. He is even reported to have taken orders, but there is no clear record of this. He was favored by the Sorbonne with the degree of D.D., indicating that he must have made strong friends among the French Romanists. On his return to England he entered into deacon's orders in the Establishment, but never held any preferments, as he was universally disliked for his peculiar religious opinions. Thus he avowed a preference for the Latin language in religious worship, and composed a creed in it, with a kind of mass, of which he printed a few copies in his own house, under the disguised title of Ordinale Quotidianum (1685), Ordo Trigintalis (1685). That Mores, however, had  forsaken his Roman Catholic notions, at least in part, in later life, is apparent from his conduct in the case of his daughter, who, while under the tuition of French Romanists, was surrounded by influences of such a character as might secure her conversion. He no sooner gained knowledge of it than he had her removed, besides severely remonstrating against the breach of good faith of the friends he had trusted. He died in 1778, leaving many works and collections of great value to the antiquarian. A curious work which he left in MS. in Latin, entitled De AElfrico Archiepiscopo Dorovernensi Commentarius Auctore Edwardo Rowe Mores, A.M., Soc. Antiq. Lond. Soc., seems to have been intended for publication. It contains ten chapters; and the first seven relate to archbishop AElfric; cap. 8 is entitled "De AElfrico Bata;" cap. 9, "De AElfrico Abbate Meildunensi;" cap. 10, "De aliis AElfricis." An appendix is subjoined, containing transcripts of Saxon charters and extracts from historians concerning archbishop l'Elfric. It is now preserved in the Lambeth Library. See Genesis Biog. Dict. s.v.; and the Memoirs prefixed to his history of Tunstall. (J.H.W.)

## Moresheth-gath[[@Headword:Moresheth-gath]]

             (Heb. More'sheth-Gath, גִּת מוֹרֶשֶׁת, possession of Gath; Sept. κληρονομία Γέθ, Vulg. haereditas Geth), a town of Palestine (perhaps so named from its vicinity to Gath), where the prophet Micah appears to have been born or to have resided (Mic 1:14), who was hence called a MORASTHITE (Mic 1:1; Jer 26:18). It is named by that prophet (Mic 1:13-15) in company with Lachish, Achzib, Mareshah, and other towns of the lowland district of Judah. His words, "Therefore shalt thou give presents to Moresheth-gath," are explained by Ewald (Propheten, page 330) as referring to Jerusalem, and as containing an allusion to the signification of the name Moresheth, which, though not so literal as the play on those of Achzib and Mareshah, is yet tolerably obvious: "Therefore shalt thou, O Jerusalem, give compensation to Moreshethgath, itself only the possession of another city." Hitzig (Comment. ad loc.) lately insists upon the old Jewish interpretation of the name as an appellative for some dependency of the Philistines (but see Maurer, Comment. ad loc.). Jerome (Onomast. s.v. Morasthi) places it a short distance east of Eleutheropolis, and remarks (Comment. in Mic. prol.) that it was still a moderately sized village ("haud grandis viculus"), containing a church over the tomb of Micah (Ep. ad Eustach. page 677).  From these intimations Dr. Robinson (Researches, 2:423) concludes that it must have been near Mareshah, perhaps at the site of the church of Santa Haanneh, twenty minutes S.S.E. of Beit-Jibrin, close by which are the ruined foundations of a village possibly ancient. Thomson inclines to identify it with Mareshah (Land and Book, 2:360); but the sacred writer clearly distinguishes them (Mic 1:15). SEE GATH; SEE MICAH.

## Moretto Da Brescia[[@Headword:Moretto Da Brescia]]

             a distinguished Italian artist of Titian's school, and sometimes called Bonvicino, was born, according to Lanzi, in 1514, and was the first to introduce Titian's style to his native district. His picture of St. Niccolo, painted for the Madonna de Miracoli, is in Titian's best manner. He was mostly employed in his native province, distinguishing himself more by his delicacy than by his grandeur of handling. A fine specimen of this last qualification, however, may be seen in his terrific picture of Elias in the old cathedral. His picture of St. Lucia, in the church of St. Clemente, is not so much studied as that of St. Catharine, and even this yields to his painting of the great altar, representing Our Lady in the air, with the titular and other saints seen below. An altar-piece, consisting of various saints, at St. Andrea, in Bergamo, another at St. Giorgioj in Verona, with the Fall of St. Paul, at Milan, are all of the most finished composition. A work entitled the Flagellation, in the Museo Tosi at Brescia, is remarkably fine; also the Murder of the Innocents, in the church of St. Giovanni Evangelista at Brescia. The time of his death is unknown. See Lanzi, History of Painting (transl. by Roscoe), 2:180; Mrs. Jameson and Eastlake's History of Our Lord, 1:271; 2:98.

## Morgan, Abel[[@Headword:Morgan, Abel]]

             a Baptist minister of some note, was born in Wales in 1637, emigrated to this country in 1711, and settled at Pemupek, Pa., where he preached until his death, December 16, 1722. He was a good man, well beloved by his people, and did efficient service for the Christian cause among the Welsh who were settled in Pennsylvania in his day. He compiled a folio Concordance to the Welsh Bible, which was printed at Philadelphia, and also translated The Century Confession into Welsh, with original additions. See Benedict, Hist. Bapt. 1:583; Bapt. Quar. July 1874, art. 5.

## Morgan, Abel (2)[[@Headword:Morgan, Abel (2)]]

             an early Baptist minister, was born at Welsh Tract, Delaware, April 18, 1713. He was baptized at twenty years of age, and began to preach soon after; became pastor at Middletown, N.J., in 1739, and continued there until his death, November 24, 1785. He was an eminent revivalist. See Cathcart, Baptist Encyclop. s.v.

## Morgan, Asbury[[@Headword:Morgan, Asbury]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Mecklenburg County,Virginia, August 25, 1797; converted in 1812; entered the South Carolina Conference in 1818; was stationed in Charleston in 1828, and died there, September 25th of the same year, of the "stranger's fever." He was a good man, had been successful on former appointments, and promised usefulness to the Church. See Minutes of Conferences. 2:36.

## Morgan, Caesar, D.D[[@Headword:Morgan, Caesar, D.D]]

             an English divine of some note, flourished in the second half of last century as canon of Ely. But little is known of his personal history. His works, however, show that he was a man of much erudition and a close student. He published several of his sermons (1780, 4to; 1781, 4to); also a work on Philosophy and Revelation (1789, 8vo); and another, The Trinity of Plato and Philo-Judaeus, etc. (1797, 8vo), universally commended as an able work from an orthodox standpoint. See Allibone's Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Morgan, Erasmus B[[@Headword:Morgan, Erasmus B]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Wilmington, Vermont, in 1806. He was converted when about twenty-five years of age, and immediately began to preach. For two years he was employed by the presiding elder, and in 1833 joined the New Hampshire Conference. He was stationed successively at Athens, Putney, Claremont, Peterborough, Westmoreland, and Chesterfield, Keele, Landaff, East Haverhill, Lancaster, Canaan, and South Reading. In 1846 he was superannuated, and continued in that and the supernumerary relation for seven years, after which, in 1853, he was stationed at Chesterfield, Massachusetts, within the bounds of the New England Conference. Afterwards he was stationed at Palmer, Three Rivers, Brookfield, and Dudley. In 1857 he was superannuated, after which time he never resumed an effective relation. During 1871, while supplying the Church at North Blandford, his health failed, and he removed his residence to Williamsburghj Mass., where he died, June 10, 1872. “Morgan was a man of strong, clear mind... He was a decided man — uncompromising in hostility to the powers of darkness, and in his advocacy of every movement calculated to elevate humanity, and reveal more of the glory of Deity." See Minutes of Conferences, 1872, page 47.

## Morgan, Gerard[[@Headword:Morgan, Gerard]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Baltimore County, Maryland, June 8, 1784; was converted in 1801; entered the Baltimore Conference in 1806, and died March 17, 1846. He possessed a clear intellect, a penetrating judgment, and his life was equable, evangelical, and eminently useful. See Minutes of Conferences, 4:10.

## Morgan, Gilbert, D.D[[@Headword:Morgan, Gilbert, D.D]]

             a noted minister of the Southern Presbyterian Church, was born at Salem, N.Y., May 23, 1791, received his collegiate training at Union College, Schenectady, and pursued his theological studies at Princeton, N.J. At an early age he engaged in Central and Western New York in the foundation of churches and institutions of learning, one of his co-laborers being Dr. Archilaus G. Smith. Ill 1836 Dr. Morgan became president of the Western University of Pennsylvania at Pittsburgh, and at the invitation of the Legislature drew up a report, which finally was substantially introduced into the educational system of Pennsylvania. He afterwards became connected with the Hampden Sidney College in Virginia, later removed to North Carolina, and finally made South Carolina his permanent home, and there preached as a member of the Southern Presbyterian Church. Failing health and advanced age finally induced his return North. He died in New York City May 27, 1875. Dr. Morgan was highly esteemed by his brethren, and greatly beloved among those to whom he ministered in spiritual things. Few men in the Church South could claim the superior scholarship to which he had attained. He was an ornament to his own denomination and to the Christian Church. (J.H.W.)

## Morgan, Hector Davies[[@Headword:Morgan, Hector Davies]]

             an English divine, noted for his sociological studies, was born in 1768, and was educated at Cambridge University. After taking holy orders he at once rose to positions of prominence, and finally became canon of Trallong. In 1819 he had the honor to be selected Bampton lecturer, and his sermons preached that year were published (1819, 8vo). He also published several other theological treatises of minor value. But he is best known as the author of Doctrine and Law of Marriage, Adultery, and Divorce (Oxford, 1826, 2 volumes, 8vo). This valuable work exhibits a theological and practical view of the divine institution of marriage, the religious ratification of marriage, the impediments which preclude and vitiate the contract of  marriage, the reciprocal duties of husbands and wives, the sinful and criminal character of adultery, and the difficulties which embarrass the principle and practice of divorce, etc. See Lond. Gent. Mag. 1851, part 1, page 562; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, volume 2, s.v.

## Morgan, Homer Bartlett[[@Headword:Morgan, Homer Bartlett]]

             a missionary of the Presbyterian Church, was born at Watertown, N.Y., May 31, 1827. He was educated at Hamilton College, N. Y., studied theology at Auburn Seminary, N.Y., was licensed by Cayuga Presbytery, and ordained by Watertown Presbytery in 1850. He entered upon the foreign missionary work under the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, and was by them, in 1851, sent to Salonica, in Greece, and afterwards transferred to Antioch, in Syria. He thus completed nearly fourteen years of missionary life, when it was decided by the committee and the Central Turkish Mission to which he belonged that he should return with his family to this country. When they were about ready for their journey his youngest son sickened and lied. This event, with his responsibility at his post, and official cares as treasurer of the mission, devolved upon him an amount of labor which brought on typhoid fever, and after proceeding on his journey as tar as Smyrna he died, Aug. 25,1865. Mr. Morgan, writes the Reverend Dr. Hamlin, then president of Robert College, Constantinople, "was a noble missionary, a man of right judgment, of executive power, and of self-denying devotion to his work. He has finished it early, but done it well." See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, page 218.

## Morgan, John, D.D[[@Headword:Morgan, John, D.D]]

             a Congregational divine, was born at Cork, Ireland, in November 1802. He graduated from Williams College in 1826; taught some years in New York, while studying theology; was afterwards instructor in Lane Seminary, professor in Oberlin Theological Seminary (1835-80, emeritus thereafter), ordained in 1837, and died September 27,1884. He published a few essays and sermons. See Cong. Year-book, 1885, page 28.

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

             a minister of the (Dutch) Reformed Church, was born of Welsh parentage in 1674, and ordained in 1697 in Connecticut. After settlements at East Chester, N.Y., from 1699 to 1704, and Greenwich, Connecticut, from 1704 to 1708, he became pastor at Freehold and Middletown, N.J., where he served both the Dutch and Presbyterian churches (1709-31). He gave to the former church about three fourths of his services, although he was a member of the Philadelphia Presbytery. A revival of religion followed his labors in 1721. His last settlement was at Hopewell and Maidenhead, N.J., where he preached from 1732 to 1737. Although his library was very small, he seems to have been a studious man and a voluminous author. He was a correspondent of Cotton Mather. One of his Latin letters to Mather, dated  in 1721, is still preserved at Worcester, Mass. In addition to several printed sermons, he published treatises on Baptism, Original Sin, Sin its own Punishment, Election, etc. His latter years were sadly overcast with trials and sorrow. In 1728 he was charged with having "practiced astrology, countenanced promiscuous dancing, and transgressed in drink." These charges were not proved. In 1736 he was suspended from the ministry for intemperance, but was restored in 1738. He died in 1740. See Webster, Hist. Presb. Ch.; Corwin, Manual Ref. Ch. s.v. (W.J.R.T.)

## Morgan, Morgan[[@Headword:Morgan, Morgan]]

             a prominent lay-worker of the early days of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was a native of Wales, but had come to this country while yet a youth, and settled in Pennsylvania. In 1726 he removed to the south of the Potomac, in Virginia, and there built in 1740 the first Episcopal church, now known as the Mill Creek Church, and situated in the parish of Winchester. He lived to an advanced age, pursuing to the last a course of ardent and active piety, which made him a light and a blessing to all within his influence. Under the direction also of the clergymen, whether present or absent, Morgan fulfilled the duties of lay-reader, which enabled him the more intimately to know the people's wants and cares. and to direct them along the path of duty. In the exercise of these duties he was succeeded by a son, who prosecuted them with the same affectionate, diligent, and humble spirit. See Episc. Recorder, volume 1, No. 5, quoted in Hawk's Eccles. Hist. pages 111-113.

## Morgan, Nicholas J. B., D.D[[@Headword:Morgan, Nicholas J. B., D.D]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church of some note, was born in Bath County, Virginia, November 23, 1811. He was the oldest son of the Rev. Gerald Morgan, also a preacher of the same body, who died in March, 1846, closing a forty years' ministerial service of honor and usefulness long to be remembered among those for whom he labored. Nicholas's early educational advantages were secured at the common school, and under private tutorship at Harrisonburg, whither his parents removed when he was ten years old. He was converted in 1825, and shortly after believed himself called to preach. He taught school a while to prepare for the work before entering upon it, and in 1829 was admitted into the Baltimore Conference, and appointed to the Fincastle Circuit. After this he successively served in this Conference as follows: in 1830,  Pendleton; 1831, Liberty; 1832, Jefferson; 1833-34, Winchester Circuit; 1835-36, Warrenton; 1837, London; 1838-39, East Baltimore Station; 1840-41, Harper's Ferry; 1842-45, Rockingham District; 1846-47, Foundry, Washington City; 1848-50, Baltimore District; 1851-54, North Baltimore District; 1855-56, Fayette Street Station; 1857, Winchester Station; 1858-59, Baltimore City Station; 186061, Georgetown; 1862-65, Baltimore District; 1866-69, Washington District; 1870-71, Baltimore City Station; and in 1872, First Charge, Annapolis. On the morning of his second Sabbath (March 24) in this charge he was taken with a chill while preaching. This resulted in pneumonia, and he died April 6, 1872, in Anne Arundel County, Maryland. From this list of appointments it is apparent that Dr. Morgan was deemed fitted to fill the best stations in the Conference, and nineteen years out of the forty-three in which he preached he had the honor to be presiding elder, and in length of service in this office was exceeded only by Peter Cartwright. The esteem in which he was held by his ministerial brethren is best judged when it is knowu that he was regularly chosen to represent them in the highest ecclesiastical council of the Church. He was elected to the General Conference in 1844, and to every succeeding one but the last, to which he declined an election.

On account of ill-health, he did not attend the session of 1868. Dr. Morgan certainly lived in an eventful period of Methodism. He had some knowledge of the agitation that produced the Methodist Protestant Church, and was an actor in the scenes through which the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, came into being. Though his district in 1844 was in Virginia, and literally upon the border, he stood by the Methodist Episcopal Church. and the Church South met with but little success in its bounds during his term upon it. It is true that while in General Conference in 1844 he voted for the so-called plan of separation, a step which he afterwards regretted, yet to his fidelity may largely be attributed the adherence of nearly that whole section to the Methodist Episcopal Church. In the great trouble which came to his Conference from the action of the General Conference of 1860, incorporating a new chapter in the Discipline against slavery, he stood faithfully for the Northern Church, and led the minority of the Baltimore Conference in 1860-61 opposed to the efforts made to take the Conference from under the jurisdiction of the Church; though, notwithstanding his efforts, it resulted in the secession of a number of preachers and a large number of members from it to the Church South. But for the efforts of himself, his brother, Dr. L.F. Morgan, and a few others, very little of the old Baltimore Conference would have remained in  the Northern Church. Like a true man and patriot, Virginian though he was he stood by the government in the dark days of the Rebellion. He was antislavery in his convictions, Methodistic in doctrine, experience, and practice. All in all, Dr. Morgan's career was not that of a brilliant man, but rather that of a faithful and devoted man, endowed with more than ordinary capacity for work, and born to be a leader of his associates. " With strong intellectual endowments, there were blended in him those stanch moral qualities which made him the man he was. Mental power and moral force characterized him in the pulpit and on the Conference floor. As a preacher, he was a man of one work. To this he gave the study of life." See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1873, page 2830; Dr. M'Cauley, in New York Methodist, May 18, 1872.

## Morgan, Richard U., D.D[[@Headword:Morgan, Richard U., D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born in Delaware County, Pennsylvania, January 9, 1800. He was ordained deacon in 1822, presbyter  in 1823, was rector for twenty-three years of Trinity Church, New Rochelle, N.Y., and died at Stamford, Connecticut, October 9, 1882.

## Morgan, Thomas (1)[[@Headword:Morgan, Thomas (1)]]

             a Scotch Presbyterian divine of the Unitarian cast, who flourished near and after the opening of this century as pastor of a congregation in London, is noted, in conjunction with some others of his persuasion, as the editor of a mutilated edition of Dr. Watts's psalms and hymns, which, from being Calvinistic, they perverted to Socinianism. He was also the coadjutor of Dr. Aikin in compiling the work entitled General Biography (1799-1814, 10 volumes, 4to), and was besides editor of the New Annual Register after the demise of Dr. Kippis. See Dict, Liv. Auth. Gr. Britain and Ireland (Lond. 1816, 8vo), s.v.

## Morgan, Thomas (2)[[@Headword:Morgan, Thomas (2)]]

             a distinguished English deist, noted for his attempt to make moral excellence the only test of every system of religion, and for his rejection of a historic revelation of positive duties as inadmissible, flourished about the middle of last century. Of his life we know but very little, and the following meagre facts are taken from Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Mr. William Whiston (1749, page 318). "Morgan ministered for some time to an orthodox Presbyterian congregation, but in 1726 was deposed for Arianism by the presbytery. He then seems to have practiced medicine among the Quakers at Bristol, but finally devoted himself entirely to literary labors, and died at London January 14, 1743" (see Baumgarten, Hall. Bibl. 5:331 sq.; 6:181). Morgan published a number of works against the Holy Scriptures, the best known of which is The Moral Philosopher, in a Dialogue between Philalethes, a Christian Deist, and Theophanes, a  Christian Jew (Lond. 1737). This work was supplemented by a second volume, Being a Further Vindication of Moral Truth and Reason, in 1739, and by a third, Superstition and Tyranny inconsistent with Theocracy, in 1740. This work elicited many answers, for a list of which see Lowndes, Brit. Libr. page 1203; see also the references at the end of this article. Morgan acknowledges himself a firm believer in God as the almighty creator and ruler of the universe. He lays especial stress on God's continued presence, power, and agency. "God governs the natural and moral worlds by his constant, uninterrupted presence, power, and incessant action upon both, and not by any such essential, inherent powers or properties in the things themselves as might set aside the continued presence, power, and agency of God as unnecessary, or as having nothing to do in the government of either the natural or moral world" (Moral Philosopher, 1:186). Like his predecessors, Hobbes (q.v.), Blount (q.v.), and Toland (q.v.), Morgan refuses, however, to acknowledge any revelation of the divine will. He asserts the supremacy of reason, or, as bishop Van Mildert expresses it (Boyle Lectures), "Morgan allows the possibility and even the utility of revelation, but artfully destroys the effect of the admission by confounding revelation with man's natural reason."

In his examination of Judaism, Morgan rejects its claims wholly on grounds similar to those explained by Chubb, as incompatible with the moral character of God. According to his view, there exists an irreconcilable opposition between the Jehovah of the Jews and the God of the Christians, or, in other words, between the two religious systems — the Law and the Gospel. The O.T. and the N.T. he considered essentially antagonistic. The love and charity which are manifested in the Gospel of Christ he is unable to find in the 0. T. He calls Moses "a more fabulous, romantic writer than Homer or Ovid" (Moral Philosopher, 1:251; 3:94 sq.). The moral law of the O.T., he argues, was but national, and has reference to this life only; "none of its (the law's) rewards or punishments relating to any future state, or extending themselves beyond this life" (Moral Philosopher, 1:27). The old dispensation was, according to his view, the reign of a " national tutelar God," but not of the almighty Jehovah who chose the Jews for his own people." Their God was an "idol, after the manner of the Egyptians." The Israelites, from the days of Moses, believed their national tutelar God to be Jehovah, or the supreme God, but no other nation upon earth ever believed it (Moral Philosopher, 1:315). In short, he looked upon the O.T. as a religious system not only differing from, but entirely opposed to  Christianity. Lechler (Gesch. d. Englischen Deismus, page 383) calls Morgan the modern Marcion; and in reality the system of Morgan bears a close resemblance to that of Marcion. In examining the New Testament, he, like his deistical predecessors, attacked the evidence of miracles and prophecy, and asserted the necessity of moral right and wrong as the ground of the interpretation of Scripture. Morgan wrote against religion, wishing to set up morality in its stead. Leland judges him thus (Deistical Writers, page 107): "By a prevarication and a disingenuousness which is not easily paralleled except among some of those that have appeared on the same side, under all his fair pretences and disguises he hath covered as determined a malice against the honor and authority of the Christian revelation as any of those that have written before him." Morgan's writings all created quite a sensation, and called forth numerous refutations. Among his opponents were Hallet, Leland, Chapman, Chandler, and bishop Warburton. The last named was provoked by Morgan to write his celebrated treatise, On the Divine Legalism of Moses (1737-38). See Walch, Bibl. Theol. 1:773 sq., 807-810; Mosheim, Eccl. Hist.; Leland, Deistical Writers; Von Milcert, Boyle Lect.; Schlosser, Hist. of the 18th Cent. (Davison's transl.) 1:47; Lechler. Gesch. d. Englischen Deismus, page 380 sq.; Farrar, Crit. Hist. of Free Thought, page 140 sq.

## Morgan, W., D.D[[@Headword:Morgan, W., D.D]]

             a Welsh Baptist minister, was born in Pembrokeshire in 1801. He studied at Abergavenny, was ordained pastor of a small church in Holyhead, April 19, 1825, and died September 15, 1872. See (Lond.) Baptist Hand-book, 1873, page 267. (J.C.S.)

## Morgan, William[[@Headword:Morgan, William]]

             a learned British prelate, was born at Gwibernant, in Carnarvonshire. Wales, in the second half of the 16th century, and was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge. We know but little of his progress in the Church, but we find that in 1595 he was elevated to the episcopate of Llandaff, and in 1601 was transferred to the see of St. Asaph. He died in 1604. Bishop Morgan is worthy of immortal honor as the author of the translation of the Scriptures into Welsh, published in 1588; also the translation of the Psalms in the same year. See Soames, Elizabethan Rel. Hist. page 611.

## Morgan, William Ferdinand, D.D[[@Headword:Morgan, William Ferdinand, D.D]]

             a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born at Hartford, Connecticut, December 21, 1817. He graduated from Union College in 1837, and from the General Theological Seminary in 1840. He was a rector in Norwich, Connecticut, and New York city until his death, May 18,  1888. In 1864 he was sent to Paris to preach the sermon at the dedication of Holy Trinity, the first Protestant Episcopal church on the Continent. See Appletons' Cyclop. of Amer. Biography.

## Morgan, William N[[@Headword:Morgan, William N]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Mecklenburg County, Virginia, June 1, 1806. His early educational advantages were limited. In 1836, being impressed with a call to preach, he joined the Memphis Conference of the then Methodist Episcopal Church, and in 1844 went over with the Separatists into the Church South. He was  actively engaged in the work for twenty years, preaching in Tennessee and Mississippi. For thirteen years he sustained a supernumerary relation, and finally died October 18, 1869, in Sommerville, Tennessee, where he had settled because of impaired health. He occupied an important position in the Conference. He was a good preacher, sound in doctrine, clear and practical in the exhibition of divine truth, and earnest and forcible in his appeals to the Church and to the world. Many gracious revivals were the result of his pastoral visitations of the people and the faithful preaching of the Word. See Minutes of Conf. of M.E. Ch., South, 1869, pages 344, 345.

## Morganatic marriage[[@Headword:Morganatic marriage]]

             (Goth. morgjan, to curtail, limit), sometimes called left-handed marriage, a lower sort of matrimonial union, which, as a civil engagement, is completely binding, but fails to confer on the wife the title or fortune of her husband, and on the children the full status of legitimacy or right of succession. SEE CONCUBINE.

The members of the German princely houses were for centuries in the practice of entering into marriages of this kind with their inferiors in rank. Out of this usage has gradually sprung a code of matrimonial law by which the union of princes with persons of lower rank in other than morganatic form involves serious consequences, especially towards the lady. In the 16th and 17th centuries a fashion began among German princes of taking a morganatic wife in addition to one who enjoyed the complete matrimonial status — landgrave Philip of Hesse setting the example, with a very qualified disapprobation on the part of the leading Reformers. In the present century morganatic marriages are on the decline among the German reigning houses. They are recognised not only among the princely families, but among the higher aristocracy of the empire; and in Prussia even the "Niedere Adel," or inferior gentry, may contract unions of this kind. There is, however, a strong public opinion against the practice, and as the people begin to enter into the control of state affairs, the practice is sure to be opposed by special legislation. No such alliance is now permitted to any one having another wife, and the State as well as the Church hold the parties as having entered the strictly matrimonial state. A sort of left-handed or "hand-fasted" marriage was recognised in early times in the Highlands of Scotland and in Ireland: the hand-fasted bride could be put away, and a fresh union formed, with the full status of matrimony. Unlike the case of German morganatic marriages, the issue were often accounted legitimate, even to the prejudice of the children of the more regular union that followed. The Royal Marriage Acts , 12 Geo. 3, c. 11, reduces to a position somewhat like that of morganatic unions every marriage in the royal family of Great Britain not previously approved by the sovereign under the Great Seal, provided the prince entering into it is under twenty-five, and every such marriage of a prince above twenty-five which is disapproved by Parliament. In the United States no such marriages are lawful. SEE MARRIAGE.

## Morghen, Raffaelle Sanzio, Cavaiere[[@Headword:Morghen, Raffaelle Sanzio, Cavaiere]]

             one of the most celebrated engravers of modern times, who devoted himself largely to sacred art, was born at Florence, Italy, June 19, 1758. His father, Filippo Morghen, was also an engraver, and instructed his son in the principles of the art with such success that at the age of twelve Raffaelle could engrave a very tolerable plate. At twenty his father, believing his son's genius worthy a more cultivated master, sent him to the celebrated Volpato at Rome, whose daughter he afterwards married. In 1771 he engraved Raphael's allegorical figures of Poetry and Theology, from the Vatican. In 1792 the Neapolitan court, wishing him to reside in Naples, offered him a salary of 600 ducats; but he accepted in preference an invitation from the grand-duke of Tuscany to Florence, where he established himself in 1793, with a salary of 400 scudi and free apartments in the city, under the condition that he might found a public school for engraving, and the privilege of engraving what he deemed fit, also retaining all his prints as his individual property. His first work in Florence was the Madonna della Seggiola. In 1795 he commenced the celebrated Madonna del Sacco, after Andrea del Sarto, and Raphael's Transfiguration. The first picture is in Florence, but the Transfiguration he engraved from a drawing by Tofanelli; the latter was completed in 1812, and dedicated to Napoleon I, by whom Morghen was invited to Paris and honored with valuable presents. This print was originally sold at four guineas, or twenty scudi, but the price afterwards realized for some impressions was £20 and £30. The engraving is a work of immense labor and great skill, and though not altogether satisfactory in the way of aerial perspective, being in parts hard and metallic, is highly valued as a work of art. Morghen's masterpiece, upon which he was engaged three years, is a copy of Leonardo da Vinci's Last Supper, the early impressions of which (1800) are among the most precious engravings of the work. He died at Florence April 8, 1833, having engraved, according to a list published by his pupil, Palmerini, 73 portraits, 47 Biblical and religious pieces, 44 historical and mythological pieces, 24  views and landscapes, and 13 vignettes and crests. See Engl. Cyclop. s.v.; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine rts, s.v.; Nagler, Kiinstler Lex. s.v.

## Morgians[[@Headword:Morgians]]

             a Mohammedan sect, hold that faith without good works is sufficient to salvation. Gazali, a Mohammedan doctor, tells us that the Morgians expect that God will work everything in them, and affirm that sin does not hurt believers; works without faith signifying nothing. Shabi, another Mohammedan doctor, in his allusions to this sect, exhorts his disciples to be afraid of the threatenings of God, and not to behave like those who defer doing anything that is good, and hope to be saved notwithstanding. See Broughton, Hist. of Religion, 2:141; D'Herbelot, Biblioth. Orientale, s.v.

## Morgues, Matthieu De, Sieur de St. Germain[[@Headword:Morgues, Matthieu De, Sieur de St. Germain]]

             a noted French Roman Catholic pulpit orator of the 16th century, was born at Vellai, in Languedoc, in 1582, of no inconsiderable family. He turned Jesuit at first, and had several pupils at Avignon, in the Jesuits' college there, but afterwards got disgusted with the Jesuits and quitted their order. He preached at Paris with great success, and in 1613 was made preacher to queen Margaret. He was nominated to the bishopric of Toulon by Louis XIII, but never could obtain his bulls from Rome. Some impute this to his talking too freely about the liberties of the Gallican Church; but others are of opinion that his grant was stopped by the secret artifices of Richelieu. Upon the imprisonment of Mary de Medici he retired from court to his father's house, where Richelieu took measures to seize him. The commission bore "that they should take St. Germain dead or alive; that they should seize him without making an inventory of the papers they should find, and that they should send the said papers to bishop Bueaucaire, while the prisoner should be conducted to Mande to be put into the bishop's hands." It is believed that Beaucaire, who had been a domestic of the cardinal, would have caused him to be quietly strangled, if secured. But fortunately Morgues was apprised of the design of his persecutors, and he retired into the most uncultivated parts of France, where he lay concealed for six weeks under all the inconveniences his health could be exposed to. "What was the most insupportable circumstance," says he, "of this whole proceeding, was the uneasiness which the presence of the officers gave my father and mother, who were  much advanced in years; for by this time I, the youngest of eight children, was beginning to have gray hairs." It is very probable that the cardinal, who had the weakness to be infinitely sensible of satire, was afraid of St. Germain's pen, and aware of the severities it would inflict; for we see that in all the negotiations for recalling the queen-mother, he made it a condition "that St. Germain, who by his defamatory libels had forgotten nothing to ruin his reputation, should be delivered up to the king." Meanwhile the queen-mother, coming from Compiegne, and being desirous to publish an apology for herself. sent in quest of St. Germain, and ordered him to write an answer to a pamphlet entitled La Defense du Roi et de ses Ministres, whose author, it seems, had taken great freedom with that princess's honor. In 1631 he published an answer to the queen's satisfaction, but afterwards wrote several pieces against the creatures of Richelieu. This obliged him to quit the kingdom when Mary left France, and he did not dare to return until after the death of the cardinal. Morgues died in 1670. He left in MS. a complete history of Louis XIII, by him surnamed "the Just." See Genesis Biog. Dict. s.v.; Bayle, Hist. Dict. s.v.

## Moriah[[@Headword:Moriah]]

             (Heb. Moriyah', מוֹרַיָּה, 2Ch 3:1; and , מֹרַיָּה, Gen 22:2; as to the etymology, Gesenius remarks [ Thesaur. Heb. Page 819] that the sacred writers themselves derive it from רָאָה, to see, and understand it as for מָרְאַיאּיָהּ, chosen or shown by .ehovah, but the form may be readily made as the part. fem. of , מָרָה, to be bitter, i.e., obstinate, and thus signifying the resisting, i.q. castle; comp. Fuller, Miscell. 2:14; Sept. in Genesis ὑψηλός, Vulg. visio; in Chron. Α᾿μορία v.r. Α᾿μωρία, Vulg. Moria), one of the hills of Jerusalem, on which the Temple was built by Solomon, on the spot that had been occupied by the threshing-floor of Oman the Jebusite (2Ch 3:1). SEE TEMPLE.

The name seldom occurs (not even in 1Ki 6:1), being usually included in that of Zion, to the north-east of which it lay, and from which it was separated by the valley of Tyropceon (Josephus, Ant. 8:3, 9; War, 5:4, 1; see Robinson, Researches, 1:393, 413, 416). SEE JERUSALEM. The land of Moriah, whither Abraham went to offer up Isaac (Gen 22:2), is generally supposed to denote the same place, and may at least be conceived as describing the surrounding district (comp. Josephus, τὸ Μώριον, Ant. 1:13, 1). The Jews themselves believe that the altar of burnt-offerings in the Temple stood upon the very site of the altar on which the patriarch  purposed to sacrifice his son (see Michaelis, Suppl. 5:1551; Janisch, in Hamelsveld, 2:39 sq.; Bleek, in the Theol. Stud. u. Krit. [1831], page 530 sq.; comp. Hengstenberg, Pentat. 2:195 sq.; Ewald, Israel. Gesch. 1:358; 3:35). The force of the tradition is impaired by the mythic addition that here also Abel offered his first sacrifice, and Noah his thank-offering (Munster, Fagius, and Grotius, ad loc.). The following disquisition treats of certain disputed points. SEE ABRAHAM.

Before considering the geographical and other difficulties in the way of this identification, it is desirable to investigate the derivation of the word מֹרַיָּה. Various etymologies supplied by Jews all proceed on the supposition of the identity of the Moriah of Genesis with that on which the Temple was built. The oldest, that of Onkelos and Gerundensis, was that it was derived fromמוֹר, myrrh, as in Son 4:6, "I will go to the mountains of myrrh." Fuller (in llsc. Sacra, 2:15) .maintains that the הִמּוֹר of Canticles was an abbreviation of הִמּוֹרַיָּה, and referred to the holy mount where the great king had just erected his Temple. Rabbi Solomon supposes it to be derived from הוראה, instruction, because thence the word of the Lord went forth into all Israel. Kalisch (Comment. on Genesis ad 22:2) approaches this interpretation by saying that it springs in all probability from מֹרַיאּיָהּ, "Jehovah is my instructor," from יָרָה, the root of the great derivative תּוֹרָה. Jonathan derives it from מוֹרָא, fear or reverence, and imagines that the word was used anticipatory of the worship and fear of God there solemnized (Lightfoot, Opera, Descriptio Templi, 1:553). Fuller (Misc. Sacra, ii, 15) maintains that the word represents an abbreviation of מוֹרַאֶהאּיָּה, conspicietur Jehovah, because there eventually the Son of God would appear in human flesh. Knobel insists that it is a compound of , מָרְאֵה(a dual form of רָאָה, to see) and יָהּ; and Hengstenberg (Dissert. on Genesis of Pentateuch, 2:159-163, Clark's transl.), Kurtz (Old Covenant, 1:272), Gesenius (Thesaurus, p. 819), Fiirst (Lex.), all agree as to the presence in the word of the elements of the name of Jehovah. Vatke, Vater,Van Bohlen, the early opponents of the genuineness of the Pentateuch, even based a portion of their antagonism on this proof of a later date. Bishop Colenso (Pentateuch and Joshua, part 2, chapter 9, 10) labors to demolish the etymology, but without much success. The existence of a proper name Moriah would be a proof of the existence of the name and worship of Jehovah before some of the modern documentists would find it at all satisfactory. Hengstenberg states that the  word הִמּוֹרַיָּהּ is a compound of מָרְאֶה, the Hophal participle of רָאָה, to see, and means that which is shown, or the appearance of Jehovah.

Colenso objects to the sense of the interpretation, and maintains that there is no explanation of the disappearance of the characteristic radical א. Gesenius accounts for the form מָרַיָּהּ by a combination of the Hophal participle of רָאָה and the jod-comnpa.ginis common in derivatives from verbs of the form of לה. Thus מָרְאֵה, combined with יָהּ, would suffer the following change, מָרְאַיאּיָהּ= מֹרַיָּה. There is another proper name, derivable from the same root, which has lost its characteristic radical א viz. רוּת, from רְאוּת, beautiful to look upon (Ruth). But whatever may be the precise nature of the contraction, the obvious interpretation of the writer is given in Gen 22:8 : יְהוֹה יַרְאֶה which is the name given by Abraham to the place where Jehovah saw his agony and provided a victim in place of his son. Here it was that the proverb was originated, "In the mountain Jehovah shall be seen." Moriah was the name permanently attaching itself to the place, just as קִיַן had been the abbreviation of Eve's exclamation, קָנַיתַי אַישׁ; and it was used by the narrator 400 years afterwards to describe a district, a land, a mountain which had always gone by that name ever since the proverb had first been uttered, amid the very circumstances he was then proceeding to describe. It would be presumptuous to assert to what extent the knowledge and worship of Jehovah was diffused, on the ground of the mere presence of the name Jehovah ill this proper name; still, there is nothing to shake the conclusion. It is curious that the Sept. translates the אֶרֶוֹאּהִמֹּרַיָּה by εἱς τὴς γῆν ὑψηλήν; and it also renders by some similar expression the various references to the oak or plains of MOREH, near Sichem (Gen 12:6); where the Hebrew text has אֵלוֹן מוֹרֶה the Sept. reads τὴν δρῦν τὴν ὑψηλήν (see also Deu 11:30). The translation of Aquila in Gen 22:2 is εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν καταφανῆ; and Symmachus has εἰς τὴν γῆν τῆς ὀπτασίας, closely resembling the in terram visionis of the Vulgate.

Dr. Davidson (in Introduction to the O.T. volume 1) conjectures that Moreh was the original reading; but neither Kennicott, De Rossi, nor Dr. Davidson himself (in his Printed Text of the O.T.) give any diplomatic authority for such a reading. The translations of Aquila and Symmachus may have originated with some reading resembling that in the Samaritan text, מוראה, and signifying "far seeing" or "conspicuous." But when  Josephus wrote (Ant. 1:13, 2), it is quite clear that the reading in Gen 22:2 and 2Ch 3:1 must have been identical, as he speaks of the place of Abraham's sacrifice as τὸ ὄπος ἐφ᾿ ου τὸ ίερὸν Δαβίδης ὁ βασιλεὺς ὕστερον ἱδρύεται. In 2Ch 3:1 the Sept. does not attempt to translate the proper name הִמּוֹדַיָּהbut writes ἔν ὄρει τοῦ Α᾿μωρία. It is true that there is no reference to the original manifestation of God on this site to the patriarch, and express mention is made of second and additional reasons for this hill being called Moriah (see 1Ch 21:16; 1Ch 22:1; 2Sa 24:1; 2Ch 3:1). This was in perfect harmony with the law of God that forbade the offering of burnt sacrifices in any place which the Lord had not consecrated by his visible manifestation (Hengstenberg, Diss. 2:32 sq.). The geographical conditions supplied by the narrative in Genesis are not inconsistent with the Samaritan tradition (see Robinson, Biblical Researches, 3:100) that Gerizinz was the scene of the sacrifice, and that the mountains of Gerizim and Ebal, from their neighborhood to Moresh. a spot well known to Abraham, were the mountains in the land of Moriah (Colenso, part 2, chapter 10). They have led dean Stanley (Syr. and Pal. page 250 sq.; Hist. of Jewish Church, 1:48, 49) to decide on Gerizim as the scene of the event. His arguments are weighty, but not conclusive.

(1.) The distance from Beersheba to the plain of Sharon, from which Gerizim might be seen "afar off," corresponds with the two-days' journey of Abraham; while the third day, which would be occupied by the great event, would be sufficient for the journey to the summit and the return. The same thing, however, may be said with greater certainty of Jerusalem itself.

(2.) Stanley objects that there is no spot from which the "place" where the sacrifice was to be offered could be seen from "afar off;" that the hill of Moriah is not visible at all until the traveller is close upon it, at the southern edge of the valley of Hinnom, from whence he looks down upon it, as on a lower eminence. Now the narrative informs us that Abraham lifted up his eyes and saw the place of which the Lord had spoken to him. That "place" was the אֶרֶוֹ הִמּוֹרַיּה, as Gesenius translates it, the land about Moriah, just as אֶרֶוֹ הָעִיis the land about Ai. It is very possible to see from the ridge Mar Elias the heights about Jerusalem, if not the hill of Moriah itself; and we are expressly told that Abraham did not see the place until he was fairly within a walk Of the spot, and could leave the young  men and the ass while he and Isaac proceeded, personally laden with the materials for the sacrifice.

(3.) A formidable difficulty urged by others is that the fortress of Zion must at that time have been occupied by the king of the Jebusites, some forerunner of Adonizedek, or by Melchizedek himself, and therefore Abraham must have prepared to perform this awful sacrifice under the walls of the city. To obviate the great apparent improbability of this, it may be said that sometimes the outside of fenced cities — where a deep ravine runs between the wall and the suburb — is often one of the loneliest spots in the world. The name Moriah is unquestionably given by the chronicler to the Temple hill, but this passage is a solitary one. The more ordinary name, even for the entire city of Jerusalem and for the holy mountain, is Mount Zion, and various psalms and prophecies speak of the dwelling-place of Jehovah under this old and honored name. It cannot be true that any writer of the time of Solomon composed the narrative of Abraham's sacrifice to do honor to the Temple hill, as was suggested by De Wette; for, if that had been his intention, he would have called it Zion, and not Moriah. Great stress has been laid by bishop Colenso and by the writer in Smith's Dictionary, 2:423, on the absence of other reference besides that of the chronicler to the name of Moriah as the site of the Temple hill, and also on the impropriety of associating the name and career of Abraham so vitally with Jerusalem. In the same article, however, Jerusalem is spoken of as the city of Melchizedek. For the shape of Moriah, its relations with Bezetha and Acra, the bridge that connected it with Zion across the valley of the Tyropoeon,' SEE JERUSALEM.

Notwithstanding the various and variously motived endeavors to disturb the old Hebrew tradition, it has not been proved necessary to deny the identification of the two sites; nor to denounce the old etymology; nor to cease perceiving the interesting link of connection supplied by it between the sacrifice of Isaac, the vision of God's judgment and mercy, the erection of the Temple, and the offering up of God's only-begotten Son. SEE SOLOMON.

## Moriarty, Peter[[@Headword:Moriarty, Peter]]

             an early and very useful minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Baltimore County, Maryland, April 27, 1758, and educated a papist; was converted through Methodist influence about 1776; entered the itinerancy in Virginia in 1781, but subsequent to 1787 his labors were mostly at the North, in the bounds of what has since become the New York  Conference. He died at Hillsdale, N.Y., June 23, 1814. Mr. Moriarty was one of the oldest and most widely known ministers in the connection at the time of his death, a man who had labored long and ardently in the work of saving men. Although not eloquent, he was among the most useful men and successful preachers of his time, and an excellent presiding elder. Many souls were converted through his labors, and he died honored and beloved in all the churches. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1:240; Stevens, Memorials of Methodism, volume 2, chapter 10. (G.L.T.)

## Morice de Beaubois, Dom Pierre Hyacinthe[[@Headword:Morice de Beaubois, Dom Pierre Hyacinthe]]

             a French scholar, was born October 25, 1693, at Quimperle, Basse Bretagne, of noble and wealthy parentage. He studied at the College of Rennes, and made his vows in 1713 at the abbey Saint Melaine, which belonged to the Order of the Benedictines of Saint Maur, where he was intrusted with several offices, and also with the instruction of novices. In 1731 he was called to Paris to elaborate the genealogy of the family Rohan, and lived there in the monastery of "Notre Dame of the White Robes." After the completion of this work, which procured for him a pension of 800 livres, he engaged, at the solicitation of the authorities of Bretagne, on a new history of that province, but death surprised him at Paris, October 14, 1750, before the entire publication of this work (afterwards revised and completed by Dom Taillandier). Morice edited Lobineau's Memoires pour servir depreuves a l'Histoire ecclesiastique de Bretagne (Paris, 1742-46, 3 volumes, fol.), and himself published L'Histoire ecclisiastique et civile de Bretagne (Paris, 1750-56, 2 volumes, fol.), which is considered superior to Lobineau's by the additions and explanations, as well as by its style and exactness of details, and very valuable to the French ecclesiastical student. A new edition of the two works in 20 volumes, 8vo (Guincamp, 1836-37) leaves much to wish for.

## Morid[[@Headword:Morid]]

             is the Arabic name which the Mohammedans give to those who aspire to a life of uncommon spirituality and devotion, and for this purpose they are put under the direction of another, whom they call Morsbid, that is "director." They have a famous book, entitled A dab al-Monridin, which treats of the qualifications those ought to have who put themselves under the direction of one of those spiritual guides. See Broughton, Hist. of Religion, 2:142.

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

             noted as the author of a series of novels descriptive of Eastern life and manners, and also for his accurate observations of the East as recorded in his books of travel, was born in England in 1780. When still very young he made an extensive tour through the East, the main incidents of which he described in his Travels through Persia, Armenia, Asia Minor, to Constantinople (Lond. 1812). In 1810 he was appointed British envoy to the court of Persia, where he remained till 1816, and soon after his return he published A Second Journey through Persia, etc. (ibid. 1818). During his stay in the East Morier made great use of his opportunity of studying the character of the people; and the knowledge thus acquired was turned to excellent account in his Adventures of Hajji Baba of Ispahan (1824-28, 5 volumes) (a species of Gil Bias, like Hope's Anastasius), whose "adventures in England" he described in a second series (1834); Zohrab the Hostage; Ayesha, or the Maid of Kara; Abel Alnutt; The Banished, etc.; in all of which, but especially in the first three, the manners, customs, and modes of thought prevalent in the East are portrayed with a liveliness, skill, and truthfulness to nature attained by few. He died in 1848. See the references in Allibone's Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, 2:1368, 1369.

## Morigia, Jacobo Antonio de (1)[[@Headword:Morigia, Jacobo Antonio de (1)]]

             an Italian monastic, noted as the founder of a religious order, was born in November 1497, at Milan. Up to the age of twenty-five he indulged in all the pleasures of the world, but at that period experienced a change of heart, and enrolled himself directly in a brotherhood of penitents which existed in Milan under the name of "Brotherhood of Eternal Wisdom." Admitted into the Franciscan Order of the Minorites, he refused the rich abbey of San Victor, and performed ministerial functions of charity during the plague which in 1525 devastated Milan. A few years later he joined Antonio Maria Zacharia of Cremoona and Barthelemi Ferrari of Milan, noblemen like himself, and the three together founded the Congregation of the Regular Clericos of St. Paul, so named after their first chapel, taking subsequently the appellation of Barnabites, from the church of San Barnabas. By a decree of February 18, 1533, Clement VII approved the institution, and Morigia, after he had become formally a priest, was appointed its first provost, April 15, 1536. These regulars, established for missions and other sacerdotal functions, lived in their beginning only upon alms, and were not allowed any fixed revenues; but all this has since  changed. Morigia undertook missions to Vicenza, Verona, and several other cities of Italy. He resigned his office in November, 1542, after he had governed wisely his congregation; but his colleagues re-elected him June 30, 1545, and on October 20 following he took possession of the church of San Barnabas. He died April 14,1546. At present the Barnabites have a general in Rome and a house at Paris, and are spread through almost all Roman Catholic countries. SEE BARNABITES.

## Morigia, Jacobo Antonio de (2)[[@Headword:Morigia, Jacobo Antonio de (2)]]

             an Italian prelate of note, was born at Milan February 23, 1632, entered the Order of the Barnabites when only seventeen years of age, taught philosophy at Macerata and at Milan, and preached with success in the principal churches of Italy. Cosmo III of Medici, grand-duke of Tuscany, chose him for theologian, and made him tutor of Ferdinand, his oldest son. The influence of this same prince procured for him in 1681 the bishopric of San Miniato, whence he was transferred, January 11, 1683. to the archbishopric of Florence. In the promotion of December 12, 1695, he was made cardinal "in petto" by pope Innocent XII, but this nomination was not published until the Consistory of 1698, simultaneously with the declaration that Morigia should have precedence of all the cardinals created in 1695, because he had been reserved for that very purpose. Archpriest of the Basilica Liberiana, it was he who at the jubilee of 1700 was charged to open the holy gate. Vacating his bishopric of Florence in 1699, he refused in the same year, after the death of Federigo Cacua, the appointment as archbishop of Milan, became a titular official of two abbeys, and tinally in 1701 bishop of Pavia, where he died, October 18, 1708. Literary remains of his are Orazione funebre nelle obsequie di Filippo Visconte, vescovo di Cantanzano (1664, 4to): — Pietosi tribuuti resi alla grand' anima di Filippo IV (Milan, 1666, 4to): — L'Aquila volante, orazione funebre, per la stessa occasione (Milan, 1666, 4to): — Lettere pastorali al popolo di' Firenze (fol.).

## Morikofer, Johann Karl[[@Headword:Morikofer, Johann Karl]]

             a Swiss theologian, was born at Frauenfeld, Switzerland, in 1799. In 1830 he was rector of the city-school of his birthplace, in 1853 pastor at Gottlieben, in 1870 at Winterthur, and died at Zurich, October 17, 1877. He is the author of, Die schwoeizerische Literatur des achtzehlnfen Jahrhunderts (Leipsic, 1961): — Bilder aus dem kirchlichen Leben der Schweiz (1864): — Ulrich Zwingli nach den urkundlichen Quellen (1867- 69, 2 volumes): — Johann Jacob Breitinger (Zurich, 1874): — Geschichte der evangelischen Fluchtlinge in der Schweiz (1876). See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Morin, Etienne[[@Headword:Morin, Etienne]]

             a learned French Protestant, noted for his attainments in Orientalia, was born at Caen January 1, 1625. His father, who was a merchant, died when he was only three years of age, and his mother, though designing him for trade, suffered his vehement inclination to books, until she found him so, greatly drawn to study as to make any attempt for his conversion to trade  futile. He went through the classics and philosophy at Caen, and then removed to the Huguenot seminary at Sedan, to study theology under Peter du Moulin, who conceived a great friendship for him. Morin afterwards continued his theological studies under Andrew Rivet, and joined to them that of the Oriental tongues, in which he made a great proficiency under Golius. Returning to his country in 1649, Morin became a minister of two churches in the neighborhood of Caen. He was distinguished by uncommon tact and learning, and had several advantageous offers from abroad; but he did not care to stir from his own, country. In 1664 he was chosen minister of Caen, and his merits soon connected him in friendship with several learned men who were then in that city, such as Huetius, Segrais, Bochart, and others. The revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685 obliging him to quit Caen, he retired with his family into Holland. He went at first to Leyden, but soon after was called to Amsterdam to be professor of the Oriental tongues in the university there, to which employment was joined, two years after, that of minister in ordinary. He died May 5, 1700. Morin wrote considerably. His most important works are, Dissertationes octo, in quibus multa sacrae et profanae antiquitatis monumenta explicantur (Geneva, 1683, 8vo; a 2d ed., enlarged and corrected, Dort, 1700, 8vo): — Oratio inaugauralis de linguarum orientalitum ad intelligentiam Sacrae Scripturae utilitate (Ludg. Bat. 1686): — Explanationes sacrae et philologicae in aliquot V. et N. Testamenti loca (ibid. 1698, 8vo): — Exercitationes de lingua primaeva ejusque appendicibus (Ultraj. 1694, 4to): — Dissertatio de paradiso terrestri (printed in Bochart's works, the 3d ed. of which was published at Utrecht in 1692, with Bochart's life by Morin prefixed): — Epistolae duae, seu responsiones ad Ant. Van Dale de Pentatelcho Samnaritano (printed with Van Dale's De origine et progressu idolatriae, Amst. 1696, 4to): — Lettre sur l'origine de la langue Hebraique, with an answer of Huetius; printed in volume 1 of Dissertations sur diverses matieres de Religion et de Philologie recueillis par Tilladet (Paris, 1712,12mo). In this work he argues boldly that Adam was inspired with a knowledge of the Hebrew tongue by the Almighty. See Niceron, Memoires, volume 12; Haag, La France Protestante; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Genesis Biog. Dict. s.v. (J.H.W.)

## Morin, Fredfric[[@Headword:Morin, Fredfric]]

             a French philosopher, was born at Lyons June 18, 1823. After preliminary studies he entered the Normal School in 1844; received a fellowship in  philosophy in 1848, and lectured on this branch successively at the lyceums of Macon and Nancy, and at the Lycee Bonaparte. When, after the coup d'etat of 1852, he had refused the oath to the usurper, Louis Napoleon, he was considered as having resigned his professorship. He devoted himself henceforth to private instruction, and published works on religious philosophy, seeking to harmonize democratic principles with Christian beliefs. We have of him, Saint Francois d'Assisses et les Franciscains (1853, 12mo): — De la Genese et des Principes metaphysiques de la societe moderne (1856, 8vo): — Dictionnaire de Philosophie et de Theologie scolastique (1857-58, 3 volumes, large 8vo). Besides, he has furnished articles to the journal L'Avenir, to the Correspondant (first period), to the Revue de Paris, to the Revue de l'Instruction publique, and to the Biographie Generak. He died in 1874.

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

             a most learned French writer on theological subjects, and a convert to the Romanists, was born at Blois in 1591. His parents were members of the Reformed faith, but at Leyden, where he was studying philosophy and theology, the violent discussions between Calvinists and Arminians estranged him for a time from all religious connection, and he finally, falling under the influence of Romanists, accepted their creed, at Paris, under cardinal Perrone. Some time after his conversion to Romanism he entered into the Congregation of the Oratory, then but recently established, and began to make himself known by his learning and his works. In 1626 he published De Patriarcharum et Primatum Origine (Paris, 4to), dedicating the work to pope Urban VIII. In 1628 he undertook an edition of the Septuagint Bible, with the version made by Nobilius, supplying it with a preface, in which he treats of the authority of the Septuagint. He commends the edition of it that had been made at Rome by order of Sixtus V in 1587, which he followed, and maintained that we ought to prefer this version to the present Hebrew text, because that has been, he says, corrupted by the Jews. Having gone from the Protestant to the Romish fold, Morin very naturally, like all apostates, became a most enthusiastic adherent of Romanism, and therefore now engaged upon a systematic defence of those versions which the Church had approved by weakening the texts which passed for original (Simon, Einleitung, page 522). Before this work was ready to appear, he published in 1629 Histoire de la deliverance de l'Eglise Chretienne par l'Empereur Constantin, et de la grandeur et souverainete temporelle donnee l'Eglise Romaine par les rois  de France (Paris, fol.); but this book was not well received at Rome, and Morin was forced to promise that he would retrench and correct it. Soon after he published Exercitationes eccesiasticae in utrumque Samaritanorum Pentateuchum (Paris, 1631, 4to), for the sake of establishing which, he, as we have already seen above, also now stoutly attacked the integrity of the Hebrew text. As there was then preparing an edition of the Polyglot at Paris, Morin took upon himself the care of the Samaritan Pentateuch.

His endeavors to exalt this, together with the Greek and Latin versions of the Bible, at the expense of the Hebrew, made him very obnoxious to many savans, especially Hebraists; and he was attacked by Hottinger and Buxtorf in particular. Simon and Kennicott, however, countenance Morin's position. The opposition which Morin encountered only enhanced his merit at the court of Rome, insomuch that cardinal Barberini invited him thither by order of the pope, who received him very graciously, and intended to employ him in the communications that were then passing between the Eastern and Western churches looking towards reunion. He was greatly caressed at Rome. and intimate with Holstenius, Allatius, and all the learned there. After having remained nine years at Rome, he was recalled by order of cardinal Richelieu to France, where he spent the remainder of his life in learned labors, and died at Paris in 1659. Morin's works are very numerous, and some of them much valued by Protestants as well as Romanists on account of the Oriental learning contained in them. The writer of a sketch of his life and labors in Kitto's Cyclopedia pronounces Morin "the restorer of the ancient Samaritan language,' but takes exception, like most Hebraists, to "his anti-Masoretic zeal as not according to knowledge, as later investigations in the same field have abundantly proved." The most important works not yet mentioned are, Exercitationes Biblicae de Hebraici Graecique textus sinceritate (Paris, 1633, 4to, and greatly enlarged and improved in 1699, fol.: prefaced with a life of the author by father Constantine, of the Oratory).

But also in positive theology Morin exerted himself as an author. Thus he wrote Commentarius historicus de disciplina in administratione sacramenti penitentice xiii primis sceculis in Ecclesia occidentali et huc usque in orientali observata (Paris, 1651, fol.; Anvers, 1682, fol.; Bruxelles, 1687, fol.), a work on which he is said to have spent thirty years of hard mental labor, but which, nevertheless, failed to gain much admiration. He attacks in it both the Port Royalists and the Jesuits: — Commentarius historico- dogmaticus de sacris Ecclesiae ordinationibus secundum antiquos recentiones Latinos, Graecos, Syros, et Babylonicos, in quo demonstratur  orientalia ordinationes conciliis generalibus et sunmmis pontificibus ab initio schismatis in hunc usque diem fuisse probatae (Paris, 1655, fol.), which is generally praised, and pronounced among his best efforts: Opera posthuma de catechumenorum expiatione, de sacranento confirmationis, de contritione et attritione (Paris, 1703, 4to): — Antiquitates Ecclesiae Orientalis (Lond. 1682, 12mo), treating of ecclesiastical antiquities as gleaned from his correspondence with the savans of Europe. Several of his works remain unedited and unpublished. Among these we notice De Sacrament of Matrimonii, and De Basilicis Christianorum et de Paschale et de vetustissimis Christianorum paschalibus ritibus. See Niceron, Memoires, 9:30-48; Du Pin, Bibl. des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques; Schrockh, Kirchengesch. seit der Reformation, 4:123 sq.; Marsh, Lect. Divinity; Wolf, Bibliotheca Hebraica, part 4, page 7; part 2, pages 25 and 270. Simon's biography is a mere satire, and unworthy of credit. (J.H.W.)

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

             a French scholar, was born at Paris in December, 1531. He was a man of great attainments in languages, belles-lettres, and ecclesiastic antiquity. From France passing into Italy, he stopped at Venice, where Paulus Manucius secured him for his printing establishment. He lectured as professor of Greek and cosmography at Vicenza and Ferrara. By recommendation of San Carlo Borromeo he went to Rome in 1575, and there popes Gregory XIII and Sixtus V employed him on the editions of the Septuagint (1587), the Vulgate (1590, fol.), the Bible translated from the Septuagint into Latin (Rome, 1591, 3 volumes, fol.), the Decretals till Gregory VII (Rome, 1591, 3 volumes, fol.), and on the collection of the general councils (Rome, 1608, 4 volumes). He died before the completion of this his last work, some time in 1608. He bears the reputation of a pious, modest, and learned man. Besides the works enumerated, we possess of him, Traite du bon Usage des Sciences, published with some others of his writings by Quetif in 1675; a Latin translation from St. Basil's discourses on the forty martyrs, and of a dozen selected sermons of St. Chrysostom.

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

             a celebrated French religious visionary and fanatic of the 17th century, was born at Richemont, near Aumale. He was a very illiterate person, yet notwithstanding the want of all educational facilities he entered the field of authorship, and gave the world his extreme views on religion and  philosophy. He meddled much in spiritual matters, and fell into great errors. His first book, which he caused to be privately printed in 1647, under the title of Pensees de Morin dediees au roy, is a medley of conceit and ignorance, and contains the most remarkable errors, which were afterwards condemned in the Quietists; but Morin carries them to a greater length than any one else had done, for he affirms that "the most enormous sins do not remove a sinner from the state of grace, but serve, on the contrary, to humble the pride of man." He says "that in all sects and nations God has a number of the elect, true members of the Church; that there would soon be a general reformation, all nations being just about to be converted to the true faith; and that this great reformation was to be effected by the second coming of Jesus Christ, and Morin incorporated with him." About the middle of the 17th century Morin was civilly prosecuted and for a time incarcerated, but he was finally set at liberty as a visionary, and suffered to continue so till 1661, when Des Marets de St. Sorlin, who, though a fanatic and visionary himself, with intent to injure, entered, under pretence of accepting all the views of Morin, into his whole scheme, only to have him taken up.

Marets, in his treachery and dissimulation, went so far as to acknowledge Morin as "the Son of Man risen again," and thereby so pleased Morin that he conferred upon him as a particular grace the office of being his harbinger, calling him "a real John the Baptist revived." Then Des Marets impeached him and became his accuser, and Morin, after due trial, was condemned to be burned alive at Paris, March 14, 1663. He was burned, together with his book entitled Pensees de Morin, as also all his own papers and those of the trial. His ashes were thrown into the air, as a punishment for his having assumed the title of the "Son of God." His accomplices were obliged to assist at his execution, and then to serve in the galleys for life, after having been whipped and branded by the hangman. Morin in his last hours gave out that he would rise again the third day, which made many of the mob gather together at the place where he was burned. It is said that when De Lamoignon asked him whether it was written in any part of the Scriptures that the great prophet or new Messiah should pass through fire, he cited this text by way of answer, " Igne me examinasti, et non est inventa in me iniquitas" (Thou hast tried me in the fire, and no wickedness has been found in me). See Niebron, Memoires, volume 27; Bayle, Hist. Dict. s.v.; General Biog. Dict. s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v. (J.H.W.)

## Morison, John, D.D[[@Headword:Morison, John, D.D]]

             a Scottish Presbyterian divine of some distinction, was born at Millseat, Aberdeenshire, July 8, 1791. But little is known of his personal history. He was for many years pastor of the Independent Chapel at Brompton, and in 1816 removed to London as pastor of Tower Chapel. In 1824 he was appointed editor of the Evangelical Magazine, and held this position for thirty-two years. He died July 13, 1859. He wrote an Exposition of the Psalms (1819, 8vo), of which Horne speaks favorably, though it is far from being an independent and thorough work. His other works, which are mainly in the department of Practical Religion, are too numerous to be mentioned here. But noteworthy among his different publications are an Exposition of Part of the Epistle to the Colossians (1829, 8vo): — Lectures on the Reciprocal Obligations of Life (1822, 12mo), of a practical and useful character: — Protestant Reformation in all Countries (1843, and often): — Protestantism in Great Britain: — The Fathers and Founders of the Lond. Miss. Soc. (1844, 8vo, and often): — Christianity in its Power (1847, fcp. 8vo), a work which received the unqualified commendation of the English press and the Church. Said one: "The friends of vital Christianity may regard it as an appropriate sequel to the well known work James's Anxious Inquirer." See Metropolitan Pulpit, 1839, 2:152-161; Allibone, Dict. Brit. and Amer. Auth. 2:1369; Steele, Burning and Shining Lights (1864), chapter 6; Kitto, Journal Sacred Lit. 1852, October (J.H.W.)

## Morisonianism[[@Headword:Morisonianism]]

             a term which has been much used in Scotland since about the year 1841, and to some extent in the north of England, to designate a system of religious doctrine strongly opposed to the Calvinism of the Scottish Presbyterian churches, and exhibiting in the highest degree many distinctive features of Arminianism. It derives its name from a minister named JAMES MORISON, suspended from his office by one of the Scottish Presbyterian churches in 1841, and now a professor of theology in the academy of the Evangelical Union (q.v.). The doctrinal views stated by him prior to 1841 were far from having that complete development which they soon after received from himself and his followers. The point to which prominence was first given was the universal extent of the atonement that Christ died for the sins of all men equally; with which was naturally connected the opinion that saving faith consists simply in a man's belief that Christ died  for him, inasmuch as he died for the sins of the whole world; this further leading to the opinion that a believer must know the reality of his own faith in Christ; and to the opinion that every man possesses a sufficient ability to believe the Gospel, without any aid of grace but what is vouchsafed to all who hear it, and in the very fact of its being preached or presented to them; and so verging on the tenets which have long received the designation Pelagian. The opposition to the standards of the Scottish Presbyterian churches is very complete regarding the fall of man, the work of the Holy Spirit, election, and kindred subjects; while on the subject of justification the doctrine of imputation stated in the standards is repudiated, and the atonement is represented as a satisfaction of "public justice," not securing the salvation of any man, but rendering the salvation of all men possible.

The following summary of the Morisonian views is taken from the tract of the Reverend F. Ferguson on the denomination (London and Glasgow, 1852), page 10: "That God the Father regarded mankind — sinners with an eye of compassion, and wished 'all men to be saved;' that God the Son became 'a propitiation for the sins of the whole world;' that God the Spirit has been 'poured out upon all flesh,' and 'strives' with all the irregenerate, and 'dwells' in all believers; that all those who, 'led by the Spirit,' 'yield themselves unto God,' are his chosen people, 'elect according to foreknowledge;' and that those who remain finally unsaved, and are thus the non-elect and reprobate, have themselves to blame for their infatuated 'resistance' of the Holy Ghost; that for the conversion of any soul all the glory is to be given to God, who 'quickens' the dead, while over every soul that perishes Jehovah complainingly cries, 'Why will ye die?' that although all men in their natural state are depraved and love sin, yet they possess the power to obey the command to believe the Gospel — a power bestowed by God, and not destroyed by the fall; that every sinner who believes the good news of salvation is conscious of the act, and, 'being justified by faith, has peace with God through Jesus Christ our Lord;' that Christ is 'made' to every believer ‘wisdom, righteousness, and sanctification and redemption;' and that before the finally impenitent and 'the faithful unto death' there lies, respectively, either a miserable or glorious immortality." The same paper adds that "a printing and publishing establishment was commenced by private parties connected with the movement in 1846, in Glasgow, and from it there are issued a weekly newspaper entitled The Christian News, which was commenced in 1846, and a small monthly magazine called The Day-Star, which was started the year preceding, and has a large  circulation, besides other periodicals, and an immense number of tracts and minor treatises, exhibiting in various forms the distinctive tenets of the denomination."

## Moritz, Johann Christian[[@Headword:Moritz, Johann Christian]]

             a Jewish missionary of the Christian Church among his people, was born at Bernstein, in Pomerania, January 1, 1786. He received a careful instruction according to the fashion of that time. The study at home of history, geography, poetry, and philosophy, more especially the works of Mendelssohn, greatly strengthened his mind. When sixteen years of age Moritz went to Berlin, where he was taken care of by his uncle. Here he met with free-thinking Jews, who, although they could not draw him into the fatal meshes of infidelity, yet exercised for a time a baneful influence upon his conversation and conduct. When Prussia suffered much humiliation in the wars of the first Napoleon, Moritz determined to go to England until the dawning of better days. With a letter of introduction to the chief rabbi of England of that time, Dr. Herschell, he reached London in July, 1807, and was kindly received by that divine. Moritz obtained a scanty living by teaching French and German, until the summer of 1808, when he made the acquaintance of Dr. Steinkopff, whose ministry he regularly attended and by whom he was publicly baptized on the 31st of December, 1809, according to the forms of the Lutheran Church. He then laid aside his original Jewish name, Moses Treitel, and received the above Christian name, by which he has always since been known. In 1811 he went to Gottenburg, where he married, and where he stayed until 1817, when in a wonderful manner the way was opened for him to labor among his brethren in Russia. At St. Petersburg he met the Reverend Lewis Way, and formed a friendship which lasted for life. He labored in Russia under the sanction of the emperor Alexander, until by an official mandate he was compelled to abandon the labors of the last eight years. In May 1820, Mr. Moritz was accepted by the London Society for Propagating Christianity among the Jews, which sent him to labor at Hamburg. He next labored at Copenhagen, Neuwied, Frankfort, and Stockholm, returning to Hamburg in 1834. He then removed to Dantzic, until, in 1843, his residence was finally fixed at Gottenburg, and Norway and Sweden assigned him for his field of labor. On January 1, 1868, he retired from active service, after forty-two years' faithful labor for his Master in the society's ranks, and died on February 17, at Gottenburg, rich in peace and joyful in hope. See Jewish Intelligencer, 1868. (B.P.)

## Morl, Gustav Philipp[[@Headword:Morl, Gustav Philipp]]

             a German theologian, was born at Nuremberg December 26, 1673, and was educated first in the schools of his native place and then at the university in Altdorf, where he studied philosophy and philology from 1690 to 1692, when he was removed to Jena to study theology and the ancient languages. He travelled through Holland, and visited its most important universities. After his return home he was appointed assistant of the philosophic faculty at Halle, and in 1698 became professor and ecclesiastical inspector at Altdorf. He resigned this position in 1703, and was appointed dean of St. Sebald's church at Nuremberg. In 1706 he was appointed minister of the St. Aegidien church, and inspector of the gymnasium; in 1714 minister at St. Lawrence, in connection with which he had the supervision of the ecclesiastical seminary. In 1724 he was appointed minister of the church of St. Sebald, superintendent of the consistory of Nuremberg, city librarian, and professor of divinity of the Aegidische gymnasium. He died May 7, 1750. Besides several dissertations in journals, he published Diss. de distinctione essentiali agnoscenda et attributis (Jenae, 1694, 4to): — Diss. continens theses miscellaneas (Halae, 1694, 4to): — Diss. continens vindicationem regularem methodi Cartesianae (ibid. 1694, 4to): — Diss. i et ii de mense humana (ibid. 1696, 1697, 4to): — Repetitio doctrinae orthodoxae de fundamento fidei, occasione disputationis Halensis de questione: An haeresis sit crimen? (ibid. 1696, 4to): — Defensio repetitionis hujus adversus Chr. Thomasium (ibid. 1697, 4to): — Disquisitio defide, occasione epistolae ad Chr. Thomasium scriptae (ibid. 1698, 4to): — Diss. de modo dirigendi omnes actiones nostras ad gloriam Dei (Altdorf, 1701, 4to): — Vindiciae doctrinae Lutheranae de gratia proedestinationis (Norimb. 1702, 8vo): — Die Lehre von der Busse, in 122 Predigten, nach den Lehrsatzen und Texten entworfen (Nurnberg, 1711, 4to): — Ordnung der Knige in Juda und Israel, in einer Tabelle (ibid. 1740, fol.): —Sterbeschule; eine Sammlung von Predigtentwurfen (ibid. 1743, 1744, 2 volumes, fol.).

## Morl, Johann Sigmund[[@Headword:Morl, Johann Sigmund]]

             a German theologian, son of the preceding, was born at Nuremberg March 3, 1710, and was educated in his native place until ready for the university at Altdorf, where he studied theology after 1727. In 1735 he was appointed dean of a church at Nuremberg. He preached until 1759, when he was appointed minister and inspector of the "Egidianum." In 1765 he  was elected in this gymnasium to the professorship of Greek. Towards the close of 1770 he was called to the position of minister of St. Lawrence's church. In 1773 he accepted the position of first minister at St. Sebald's church, the superintedency of the consistory of Nuremberg, the office of city librarian, and also a professorship of positive divinity and moral philosophy. He died February 22, 1791. Besides several contributions to the Hachische Allgeneine Welthistorie and the Antideistische Bibel (Erlangen, 1768), to which he contributed a new computation of time from the exodus of the Jews to the time of Solomon, he published Scholia philologica et critica ad selecta S. Codicis loca (Norimb. 1737, 8vo; improved ed. by Wilder, ibid. 1793, 8vo): — Schediasma philologico- geographicum, in quo Jo. Harduini disquisitio de situ Paradisi terrestris examinatur (ibid. 1750, fol.): — Oratio de meritis Norimbergensium in Geographiam (ibid. 1750, 8vo).

## Morlaks or Morlachians[[@Headword:Morlaks or Morlachians]]

             (Slav. Primortzi, i.e., “adjoining the sea"), the name of a rude people of uncertain origin, inhabiting the mountainous coast-land of Dalmatia, the Croatian military frontier, and the maritime districts of Austro-MHungary. They speak a south Slavic dialect, and are mostly Roman Catholics. They are skilful mariners. The strait which separates the islands of Veglia, Arbe, and Pago from the same coast is generally called from them the Strait of Morlacca.

## Morley, George, D.D[[@Headword:Morley, George, D.D]]

             a learned English prelate, noted for his able polemics against Romanism and his faithful adherence to king Charles II in the face of all opposition, was born in London in 1597. He lost his parents when very young, and also his patrimony. However, at fourteen he was elected a king's scholar at Westminster School, and became a student of Christ Church, Oxford, in 1615, where he took the first degree in arts in 1618, and the second in 1621. Then he entered holy orders, and in 1628 became chaplain to Robert, earl of Caernarvon, and his lady, with whom he lived till 1640, without having or seeking any preferment in the Church. After that he was presented to the rectory of Hartfield, in Sussex, which he exchanged for the rectory of Mildenhall, in Wiltshire; but before this exchange, Charles I, to whom he had been appointed chaplain in ordinary, had given him a canonry of Christ Church, Oxford, in 1641. This is said to be the only  preferment he ever desired. In 1642 he was admitted to the degree of D.D. About that time also he preached before the House of Commons, then largely made up of Nonconformists, but so little to their liking that he was not commanded to print his sermon, as all the other preachers had been. Nevertheless he was nominated one of the assembly of divines at Westminster because of his strong leaning to Calvinism, but he never appeared among them; on the contrary, he always remained with the king, and did him what service he could. Dr. Morley also used his influence at Oxford University to incline its professors to opposition against the Visitation Bill which had been enacted by the anti-royalists in Parliament; and as the Cromwellian party gained the ascendency he was marked out for punishment. In 1648, the Presbyterians having in the mean time gained the control of state affairs, Dr. Morley was deprived of all his preferments, and imprisoned for some little time. The length of his imprisonment is not exactly known, but in 1649 we find him preparing to quit England to join his royal master in Holland. Dr. Morley met the king at the Hague, and was for some time a constant companion of Charles II. In 1650, when the king set out on his expedition to Scotland, Dr. Morley went first to the Hague and then to Antwerp, where he resided, together with his friend, Dr. John Earle, in the house of Sir Charles Cotterell, and a year later in the house of Sir Edward Hyde. While thus retired from home and public life, he yet remained a most faithful adherent of the royal and episcopal cause, and even held Church services daily, "catechized once a week, and administered the communion once a month to all the English who would attend" (Hook). About 1654 he became chaplain to the queen of Bohemia at the Hague, but about 1656 he removed to Breda with the family of Sir Edward Hyde, and there continued the same practice as at Antwerp.

During the protectorate of Richard Cromwell, while the royalists were preparing for the Restoration, Charles employed Dr. Morley as a messenger to the Presbyterians. He quickly gained their confidence, because he was known to be a strong Calvinist. He was, moreover, a fit person to instil the Presbyterians with a desire for moderation, for he had been a prominent party in the treaty agreed to by Charles I in the Isle of Wight, which favored the Presbyterians in many respects. SEE PRESBYTERIANS. It is true Baxter did not very much like Dr. Morley, because, as he complains, Morley "talked of moderation in the general, but would come to no particular terms" (Autobiography, page 218). Yet Morley himself must have been persuaded of the successful issue of his  mission if we judge him by his letter of May 4, 1660, in which he writes: "I have reason to hope that they (i.e., the Presbyterians) will be persuaded to admit of and submit to episcopal government, and to the practice of the liturgy in public, so they may be permitted, before and after their sermons, and-upon occasional emergencies, to use such arbitrary forms as they themselves shall think fit, without mixing of anything prejudicial to the government of the Church and State as they shall be settled" (Clarendon, State Papers, 6:738, 743). Upon the royalists, particularly, Dr. Morley had a good influence. They, as soon as they saw the approach of victory, manifested a too forward zeal, and made uncomfortable threatenings of revenge upon the republican party. Dr. Morley checked these evil tendencies, and thus softened down all opposition on both sides. Dr. Morley also, though incorrectly, represented the king's religious views, and refuted the statement that Charles II was a convert to popery. Of course Dr. Morley was duped by the king, and could never have served Charles had he known that man to have been a hypocrite. Morley was a diplomatist, seeking to gain the ascendency of the episcopal party in the English realm, but he was also an honest Christian, and would not have suffered himself to be the tool of an apostate. Indeed his position later in life against papists makes this plainer still. (See below.)

Upon the restoration of Charles II, Dr. Morley was rewarded for his faithfulness to his royal master by elevation to the bishopric, besides being restored to his canonry, and appointed dean of Christ Church. He was consecrated bishop of Worcester in 1660. In 1661 bishop Morley played a prominent part in the Savoy Conference (q.v.), commissioned to bring about such changes in the liturgy as might enable the Presbyterians and Episcopalians to unite once more. Though the archbishop of York was present, Morley appeared as the chief speaker of the bishops, and was for the Episcopalians what Baxter was for the Covenanters. Stoughton puts Morley next to Sheldon, yet acknowledges that the latter acted chiefly as adviser, "taking little share in the viva-voce discussions," while Morley appeared constantly as leader in the debates (1:163). In 1662 bishop Morley was made incumbent of the deanery of the royal chapel, and shortly after was transferred from the see of Worcester to that of Winchester. In 1673, when the royalists made a desperate attempt to introduce severe measures against the Nonconformists, bishop Morley figured prominently in the effort, and thus brought reproach upon himself for intolerance and stubbornness. He especially favored the modification of the "Test Act" in  such a manner that it became necessary for every English subject to be faithful to "the Protestant religion as established by law in the Church of England." Yet Morley's position at this time may be satisfactorily explained. "His main policy was to protect the Establishment, on the basis of the Act of Uniformity, against papists on the one hand and dissenters on the other. He shared in the alarm which conversions to Rome and the encroachments of that Church inspired throughout England at the time; and partly from that cause he was induced to support the bill,... thinking by the new oath, which established the Church, to prevent an invasion by the enemy... Strength was wasted by internecine warfare' at a moment when Episcopalians and Presbyterians stood before a common foe. It was the story of the Crusaders repeated. Why not gather the forces of the Church and of the sects, and concentrate them upon the great enemy of the country's liberty and peace? Such impressions, under the circumstances, were not unnatural in the mind of a man like Morley" (Stoughton, 1:439, 440).

In his old age Morley is reputed to have become more tolerant again, for it is related that he stopped proceedings against an ejected minister, and invited him to dinner, endeavoring to soften down the terms of conformity; but, better still, it is said that in Morley's last days he drank to an intermeddling country mayor in a cup of Canary, advising him to let dissenters live in quiet, "in many of whom, he was satisfied, there was the fear of God" — and he thought they were "not likely to be gained by rigor or severity." The bishop died in 1684. Burnet says that he "was in many respects a very eminent man, very zealous against popery, and also very zealous against dissent; considerably learned, with great vivacity of thought; soon provoked, and with little mastery over his temper" (1:590). His zeal against the doctrines of popery is apparent in his writings, and not less so his zeal against dissent; in connection with his opposition to both, he avows the doctrine of passive obedience, declaring in terms the most unequivocal "the best and safest way for prince, state, and people is to profess, protect, cherish, and allow of that religion, and that only, which allows of no rising up against or resisting sovereign power — no, not in its own defence, nor upon any other account whatsoever" (Morley's Treatises, sermon before the king, page 38). Indeed, he maintains, again and again, the principle of intolerance in the government of the Church, and the principle of despotism in the government of the State; holding the king to be sole sovereign, while Parliament is only a concurring power in making laws, and the bishops the only legitimate ecclesiastical rulers. Bishop Morley was a very generous man, and freely expended his income for the  good of his benefices.

He was a benefactor to Oxford University by granting Christ Church £100 per annum, and by establishing several prizes at Pembroke and other colleges. He spent much money in repairing the buildings in the see of Winchester, bequeathed a considerable sum to St. Paul's, London, and left £1000 to purchase lands for the support of small vicarages. The bishop also bore a high reputation for theological learning before the civil wars, as well as after the establishment of the episcopacy, and was acknowledged as well versed in the logic of the schools, and as a formidable controversialist. He wrote A Sermon at the Coronation of Charles II, April 23, 1661. In the dedication to the king, by whose command it was published, he says that he was now past his great climacteric, and this was the first time that ever he appeared in print: — Vindication of himself from Mr. Baxter's Calumny, etc. (1662): — Epistola apologetica et parcenetica ad theologum quendan Belgam scripta (1663, 4to; written at Breda, June, 1659; reprinted in 1683, under this title, Epistola, etc., in quae agitur de seren. regis Car. II erga reformatan religionem afectu). In this letter he attempts to clear Charles II from the imputation of popery, and urges the Dutch to lend their utmost assistance towards his restoration; but he was mistaken in his master's religion, and perhaps lived long enough to know it: — The Sum of a Conference with Darcey, a Jesuit, at Brussels (1649): — An Argument drawn from the Evidence and Certainty of Sense against the Doctrine of Transubstantiation: — Vindication of the Argument, etc.: — Answer to Father Cressy's Letter, written about 1662: — Sermon before the King, November 5, 1667: — Answer to a Letter written by a Romish Priest (1676): — Letter to Anne, duchess of York (1670). This lady, the daughter of Sir Edward Hyde, was instructed in the Protestant religion by our subject while he lived at Antwerp, but she afterwards forsaking the faith of her family, Dr. Morley wrote this defence of Protestantism: — Ad Virum Janum Ulitium Epistolae duae de Invocatione Sanctorum (1659). All the above pieces, except the first and second, were printed together in 1683, 4to: — A Letter to the Earl of Anglesey concerning the Means to keep out Popery, etc., printed at the end of A true Account of the whole Proceedings betwixt James, duke of Ormond, and Arthur, earl of Anglesey (1683): — Vindication of himself from Mr. Baxter's injurious Reflections, etc. (1683): — he made also An Epitaph for James I (1625), which was printed at the end of Spottiswood's History of the Church of Scotland, and is said to have been the author of A Character of King Charles II (1660, in one sheet 4to). In his polemics against Romanism bishop Morley discusses  only three important points. The treatment of these indicates deep learning and great skill. He plies with much success the argument against transubstantiation, "drawn from the evidence and certainty of sense," maintaining his convincing argument with the dexterity of a practiced logician, so as to parry most successfully all the objections of Roman Catholic antagonists. He decidedly opposes the popish doctrine of purgatory; but he vindicates prayers for the dead in the way in which they were offered in the early Church, and as by modern Ainglicans they are still encouraged to be offered; that is, for the rest of the soul, the resurrection of the body, and the plenitude of redemption at the last day. Whatever may be the propriety of praying for the dead in such a qualified sense as this, Morley contends there is no ground on which to rest the doctrine of the invocation of saints. That doctrine he overthrows by an appeal to Scripture; and then he proceeds, after the Anglican method, to examine the writings of the fathers, and to show that they do not justify the popish dogma and its associated practices. The bishop enjoyed the association of some of the most distinguished literati of his day. He was an intimate friend of Falkland, and mixed much with Ben Jonson and Edmund Waller. He was strict and exemplary in his life, though much given to witticisms, and surrounded by a host of gay courtiers and literati; and was acknowledged by all as truly abstemious and laborious in his habits. See Chambers's Magazine, 8:69; Stoughton, Eccles. Hist. of England (Church of the Restoration) (see Index in volume 2); Perry, Eccles. Hist. volume 2 (see Index in volume 3); Wood, Athenae Oxon.; Neal, Hist. Puritans (Harper's ed.), 2:230; Burnet, Hist. of his own Times, 1:590; Salmon, Lives of the English Bishops, page 346. (J.H.W.)

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

             one of the most distinguished of England's early composers of sacred and profane music, and author of the first regular English treatise on the art of music, was born probably about the middle of the 16th century, but the exact time is not determined. All that is known of this eminent professor is gathered from Wood, who, in his Athenae Oxoniensis, tells us that he was a disciple of Birde, to whom he dedicated his book in very reverential and affectionate terms; that he obtained a bachelor's degree in 1588, and was sworn into his place as gentleman of the royal chapel in 1592. He died, Dr. Burney supposes, in or near the year 1604. Morley produced many compositions that are still well known, among which are canonist of different kinds, particularly for two voices, madrigals for five voices, and  services and anthems, including the fine Funeral Service published in Dr. Boyce's collection, the first that was set to the words of the Anglican Reformed Liturgy. See Engl. Cyclop. s.v.; Burney, Hist. of Music.

## Morlin, Joachim[[@Headword:Morlin, Joachim]]

             a well-known German Lutheran theologian, and one of the most zealous defenders of the great German Reformer and his views, was born at Wittenberg April 6, 1514. His father, Jodocus. Morlin, professor of metaphysics at the Wittenberg University, and afterwards pastor at Westhausen, in Franconia, gave Joachim a careful training intellectually and morally, and in 1527 he entered the newly-founded University of Marburg, but soon left for his native city, where, under Luther's and Melancthon's special guidance, he devoted himself to the study of theology. When not quite twenty-three years of age he was chosen dean of a church at Wittenberg, and in 1539 accepted a call to the church of Eisleben. At Luther's request he returned in the following year to Wittenberg; but, hardly arrived, left it again for Arnstadt, whence he had received a call as its first ecclesiastical superintendent. He was now but twenty-six years old, and by far too young and inexperienced to fill such an influential position. Zealous in his religion, and of rather coarse and contentious disposition, he soon came into serious difficulties with some powerful church members, who. persecuted him mercilessly. In 1543 he was deposed, without having been allowed the benefit, of a trial. Though the citizens appealed for his retention, Morlin had to leave Arnstadtn and removed to Gittingen, where he remained until 1549. About this time he, together with many other Lutheran theologians, openly declared against the Augsburg Interim, alleging that it re-established popery; thereupon duke Erich was deposed and Morlin banished. A few months later he received a pastoral call to Kneiphof, one of the main quarters of Konigsberg, in Prussia, which he accepted. Greatly favored by duke Albrecht, Morlin was at first universally esteemed and beloved. But he soon became involved in the Osiandrian controversy. SEE OSIANDER; SEE JUSTIFICATION.

In his strict Lutheranism he opposed Osiander's views on the nature of justification and its relation to sanctification. According to the manner of the times, Osiander's departure from the grand Lutheran doctrine of Justification (q.v.), and especially of views approximating the Roman Catholic doctrine, were therefore made the subject of severe comment by Morlin in a rather coarse and abusive way. The duke of Prussia, anxious to restore peace between the contending parties, issued an edict to all Prussian clergymen  and professors of theology, in which slanders and denunciations of their respective opponents was threatened with severe bodily punishment. But the quarrel, in spite of the ducal edict, grew more and more bitter, and after Osiander's death Morlin attacked and persecuted his followers. Several of them, among them Johann Funk, were beheaded because they refused to recant. Uncharitable against all opponents, and of a naturally contentious and passionate disposition, Morlin grew so violent and abusive in his language that he called the ducal edict an inspiration of the devil, to which he refused to submit. In consequence he was dismissed (1553), and, notwithstanding his numerous and influential followers, had to leave Konigsberg. He went to Dantzic, and lived there for some time, supported by voluntary contributions of his Konigsberg friends, until he received a call to Brunswick as ecclesiastical superintendent and first city-preacher. Here, in connection with his friend, Martin Chemnitz, late librarian of duke Albrecht, Morlin devoted himself to a closer study of the Bible and the fathers, and took a prominent part in all the theological controversies of the time. When in 1556 Albrecht Hardenberg attempted to introduce into the republic of Bremen Calvin's doctrine respecting the Lord's Supper, Morlin, together with Chemnitz, opposed him most violently, and after his dismission caused the issue of that bigoted Bremen edict (October 6, 1561) "against the sacramental enthusiasts and Anabaptists" (Gegen die Sacraments-Schwarmer u. Wiedertauffer). At this occasion he published his Erklarung aus Gottes Wort u. kurzer Bericht d. Herren Theologen, and Von der Condemnation streitiger Lehr (Magdeburg, 1563). These works are a not overlucid exposition of the strict Lutheran view on the Lord's Supper, and are far inferior to Chemnitz's work, Repetitio sanae doctrinae de vera praesentia corporis et sanguinis Domini in caena sacra. In 1557 he went to Wittenberg, vainly endeavoring to put a stop to the Adiaphoristic controversies. He subsequently separated himself from Flacius, writing against him in his usual abusive and violent style. He was also present at the Worms Colloquy, which, like most such disputations, led to no result whatever. After the death of Melancthon, he grew, if possible, still more zealous in his strict Lutheranism, ample proof of which is to be found in the numerous works which he published about this time. We mention here his Historia Prutenici: — Treue Warnung und Trost an die Kirchen in Preussen: — Sendschreiben an den Vogel: — Apologia auf die vermeynte Widerlegung dess Osiandrischen Schwarms.

Things meanwhile had changed materially in Prussia. Osiander and his followers had been entirely suppressed, and duke Albrecht, yielding to the repeated  appeals of the citizens, recalled Morlin in 1566 to Konigsberg, nominating him bishop of Samland. Chemnitz, who always had been a great favorite with the duke, accompanied Morlin to Konigsberg, and became associated with him in the preparation of the Corpus doctrinae Prutenicum, designed as the symbolical text-book of Prussia. July 7, 1567, the work was approved by the duke, and on the following day Morlin left for Brunswick, choosing not to accept the proffered position (see Biblioth. Lubec. 12:607 sq.). Owing to his contentious disposition, he came into a new difficulty with the city council of Brunswick, and was now glad to accept duke Albrecht's offer. As bishop of Samland, Mirlin took a very prominent part in the Majoristic controversy, and published his Disputatio contra novam corruptilam, qua asseritur, operum praesentiam in actu justificationis necessariam esse (Jene, 1567), and his Verantwortutng wider die falschen Auflagen der neuen drei Wittenberger in ihrer Grundfeste Konigsberg. He died May 23, 1571, at Konigsberg, before the Majoristic controversy was concluded. Besides the works already named. Morlin wrote also Disputatio de communicatione idiomatum (1571): — Postilla: — Psalter-Predigten: — A new Catechism (Eisleben, 1565): — Vom Berufe der Prediger, sammt zwei Briefen Lutheri (ibid. 1565, 4to). Morlin was evidently a tenacious man, and born to be a polemic. His opponents charged him, and perhaps not unjustly, with assuming to be the guardian of the Church. He was evidently sincere and deeply in earnest, asserting that he became involved in these various controversies as a faithful son of the Church, doing only what every one was bound to do, namely, guarding its purity with all the power and skill at command. See Adam, Vitae Theol. Germ. page 457 sq.; Rettemeyer, Kirchen-historie, 3:207; Salig, Historie der Augsburg Confession; Naton, Gesch. der Concordienformel; Schrockh, Kirchengesch. seit d. Reformation; Planck, Protest. Lehrbegriff, 4:291; 5, pass.; and his Gesch. Protestantischer Theologie, 6:60 sq.; Kurtz, Ch. Hist. 2:134; Dollinger, Die Reformation, 2:453 sq.; Gieseler, Eccles. Hist. volume 4 (Harper's ed.); Erdmann, Biog. sammtlicher Pastoren zu Wittenberg (Elberf. 1869, 8vo). (J.H.W.)

## Morlin, Maximilian[[@Headword:Morlin, Maximilian]]

             a younger brother of the preceding, was born at Wittenberg October 14, 1516. He received his classical education at the Wittenberg Gymnasium, and studied theology under Luther and Melancthon, both of whom esteemed him highly, though subsequently he was one of Melancthon's most determined opponents. After his ordination he preached at Pegau and  Zeitz, and in 1543 received a call to Schelkau, in Franconia, where he was so universally beloved for his piety and eloquence that the people would not let him go when in 1544 he was called to Coburg as court-preacher. In 1546 the theological faculty of his alma mater conferred the honorary degree of S.T.D. upon him, and two years later he was nominated superintendent of the churches and schools of Coburg. Like his brother Joachim, he was very decided in all his peculiar religious views, and the words which he inscribed (1530) on a copy of the Augsburg Confession give an insight into his strict Lutheranism: "Huic sacrosanctae confessioni et indubitatae assertioni ex verbo Dei toto pectore assentior et subscribe et Deum oro, ut in illius constanti confessione et immutabile professione per spiritum S. me perpetuo servet," etc. Everything outside of Lutheranism he considered heresy, and treated as such. In the same copy of the Augsburg Confession we find the following marginal note, which is significant of his character: "Ad hanc subscriptionem impulit me impia profanatio, corruptio et mutatio praecipuorum hujus confessionis articulorum per ipsum autorem in corpore suae doctrine, quam ut hujus confessionis negationem detestor et abjicio et damno in articulis mutatis." His strict Lutheran views led him to subscribe the so-called Censurce passed upon Andreas Osiander by the Saxon theologians at Weimar and Coburg, and with the same zealotism he fought against Justus Menius (q.v.) at the Synod of Eisenach (1556), determined to have him cut off from the Church for heresy.

When this plan failed, he, nothing daunted, drew up a paper in which Menius's heretical views were set forth and his condemnation called for, and then travelled with Stolz, of Weimar, through all Saxony, to gather subscriptions thereto. As an undoubted champion of the genuine theology of Saxony, as taught by Luther, he, by order of his prince, went to the Worms Colloquy (q.v.), and so strictly followed the instructions of Flacius (q.v.) that the conference had to be abandoned as hopeless. Like Flacius, he was sincere and deeply in earnest, and as a true follower of Luther espoused the cause of his deceased teacher, showing by the severest logic that the Lutheran Church was, under Melancthon's guidance, drifting away from its moorings. Like a great many Lutherans of this period, he was mercilessly, though conscientiously, contentious. He was a born polemic. In connection with Flacius, Stossel, and Musaus, he published the Sachsische Confutationsschrift (1559), which was afterwards declared law by the prince of Saxony; and as such proved injurious both to the university and Flacius. About this time the elector Frederick prepared to introduce the doctrines of the Reformed Church into his territory. His zealous Lutheran  son-in-law, prince Frederick of Saxony, tried his best to prevent him, and in 1560 went with Morlin and Stossel to Heidelberg to meet Peter Boguin and other Reformed clergymen in open conference. The disputation, which was afterwards published under the title of Propositiones, in quibus vera de caena Domini sententiis juxta confessionem Augustanam, etc., propositae 1560 in Academia Heidelb. (Magdeb. 1561), led to no result. Shortly after his return, Morlin separated from Flacius, who had made himself odious by the rash statement (in his discussion with Strigel at Weimar in 1560) that original sin is the very substance of man in his fallen state, thus laying himself open to the charge of Manichaeism. Morlin openly denounced Flacius, and the duke established a censorship, of which Moirlil was made a member.

Flacius and his followers were deposed. March 3, 1562, he signed Strigel's declaration, and in his official visits tried to prevail upon the different ministers to sign the same, and to desist in future from all public denouncements of the Synergistic heretics. In 1569, when the government of Saxony was placed into the hands of John William, than whom there was no more ardent friend of Flacius, Morlin was deposed, but yet in the same year was called as courtpreacher to Dillenburg. His strict Lutheranism did not, however, prove acceptable to the count of Dillenburg; and when in 1572 John William extended a call to him to resume his former position, he gladly accepted it. But the clergy of Coburg, mostly followers of Flacius, with Musaus at their head, opposed him so decidedly that he had to leave Coburg again. At last (in 1573) Musaus and all the clergymen opposed to Morlin were dismissed, and Morlin resumed his former position. He died April 20, 1584. It cannot be denied that Morlin was a consistent upholder of the doctrines which he originally learned from Luther. In his theological views he opposed Melancthon, asserting that if that reformer was great, truth was greater. He seemed to consider it his special mission to call every man to account who either openly or secretly attempted to destroy what Luther had built up. See Beck, Johann Friedrich der Mittlere, 1:94, 213 sq.; 2:12 sq.; Steubing, Biog. Nachrichten aus d. 16ten Jahrhundert, 1790, page 57; Jocher, Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Gieseler, Ecclesiastical History, volume 4 (Harper's edition); Kurtz, Church History, 2:134.

## Morlot, Francois Nicolas Madeleine[[@Headword:Morlot, Francois Nicolas Madeleine]]

             a French prelate of note, was born at Langres (department Haute Marne) December 28, 1795. His father, a modest mechanic, sent him to the college of his native town. Having afterwards passed through the course of  theological studies at Dijon, before reaching the age required for priesthood, young Morlot was for some time private tutor. In 1825 he was appointed vicar of the diocese of Dijon, where, after the revolution of 1830, he made himself conspicuous by his resistance to bishop Rey, who was obnoxious to the clergy and legitimist party for having accepted his see from Louis Philippe. Discarded from the grand vicariate, but supported by the Ammi de la Religion and other papers of the same party he repeatedly refused an appointment as curate, and accepted only the place of canon. He published, under the title of Remonstrance, a censure of his bishop's acts, and was foremost in the attacks which at last forced the bishop to resign in 1838. In 1839 Morlot was appointed bishop of Orleans. He was also for his valuable services decorated with the cross of the Legion of Honor on the occasion of the baptism of the comte de Paris, and in 1842 was elevated to the archiepiscopal see of Tours. Created cardinal March 7, 1853, he took as such his seat in the senate of the new empire, and January 24, 1857, he was promoted to the archbishopric of Paris. The same year he was also put at the head of the grand Aumnnerie, and at the beginning of 1858 he was called to the counsel of regency and to the private council. Cardinal Morlot died in 1870. His literary activity was very limited. Besides his Mandements and Circulaires, or Lettres Pastorales, all of them written with great simplicity, he edited Explication de la doctrine Chretienne, en forme de lectures (2 volumes, 12mo): —Catechisme du diocese de Dijon (18mo): — the Heures choisies de la Marquise d'Andelarre (1825, 12mo). See Dict. des Cardinaux, s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 36:614-15; Vapereau, Dict. des Contemporains, s.v.

## Mormons[[@Headword:Mormons]]

             the usual name of a religious sect which was founded in this country A.D. 1830, and claims to be called of God to gather within its fold the people of this universe, by authority of a new dispensation, which is to be the last given to man in his present existence. They style themselves " The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints," or briefly, "Latter-day Saints," and object to the popular designation, Mormons, derived from the name eof one of their sacred books (i.e., The Book of Mormon). Though this word is derived from the Greek (μορμών), and literally signifies a lamia, maniola, female specter (the mandrill for its ugliness was called Cynocephalus Mormon), the Saints, according to Joseph Smith, the first prophet and originator of Mormonism, treat its etymological origin thus extravagantly: "We say from the Saxon good, the Dane god, the Goth goden, the German  gut, the Dutch goad, the Latin bonus, the Greek καλός, the Hebrew טוב, and the Egyptian mon. Hence, with the addition of more, or the contraction mor, we have the word mormon, which means literally more good." According to anti-Mormons, the name Latter-day Saints was assumed in 1835 by the Mormons, at the suggestion of one of their leaders, Sidney Rigdon, and the word "Mormon" is more distasteful to them than is the word "Mohammedan" to the Muslim or "Jew" to the Hebrew. In accordance with our general practice to let each religious body speak for itself in these pages, we insert here the history of the organization of the Church of these "Saints" as furnished by their apostle Orson Pratt, the ablest living exponent of Mormonism, and George A. Smith, the first counsellor of president Brigham Young.

1. History. — The Church of Jesus Christ of Latterday Saints was founded by Joseph Smith, who was born in the town of Sharon, Windsor County, Vermont, December 23, 1805. When ten years old his parents, with their family, moved to Palmnyra, N.Y., in the vicinity of which he resided for about eleven years, the latter part in the town of Manchester. He was a farmer by occupation. His advantages for acquiring scientific knowledge were exceedingly small; being limited to a slight acquaintance with two or three of the common branches of learning. He could read without much difficulty, and write a very imperfect hand, and had a very limited understanding of the elementary rules of arithmetic. These were his highest and only literary attainments, while the rest of those branches so universally taught in the common schools throughout the United States were entirely unknown to him.

When about fourteen or fifteen years old, he began seriously to reflect upon the necessity of being prepared for a future state of existence; but how or in what way to prepare himself was a question as yet undetermined in his own mind: he perceived that it was a question of infinite importance, and that the salvation of his soul depended upon a correct understanding of it. He saw that if he understood not the way, it would be impossible to walk in it except by chance, and the thought of resting his hopes of eternal life upon chance or uncertainty was more than he could endure. If he went to the religious denominations to seek information, each pointed to its own particular tenets, saying, "This is the way — walk ye in it;" while at the same time the doctrines of each were in many respects in direct opposition to the rest. It also occurred to his mind that God was the author of but one doctrine, and therefore could acknowledge but one denomination as his Church, and that such  denomination must be a people who believe and teach that one doctrine (whatever it may be) and build upon the same. He then reflected upon the immense-number of doctrines now in the world, which had given rise to many hundreds of different denominations. The great question to be decided in his mind was: If any one of these denominations be the Church of Christ, which one is it? Until he could become satisfied in relation to this question he could not rest contented. To trust to the decisions of fallible man, and build his hopes upon them, without any knowledge of his own, would not satisfy the anxious desires that pervaded his breast. To decide without any positive and definite evidence on which he could rely upon a subject involving the future welfare of his soul was revolting to his feelings. The only alternative that seemed left to him was to read the Scriptures and endeavor to follow their directions.

He accordingly began perusing the sacred pages of the Bible with sincerity, believing the things that he read. His mind soon caught hold of the following passage: "If ally of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally and upbraideth not, and it shall be given him" (Jam 1:5). From this promise he learned that it was the privilege of all men to ask God for wisdom, with the sure and certain expectation of receiving liberally, without being upbraided for so doing. This was cheering information to him — tidings that gave him great joy. It was like a light shining forth in a dark place to guide him to the path in which he should walk. He now saw that if he inquired of God, there was not only a possibility but a probability, yea more, a certainty, that he should obtain a knowledge which of all the doctrines was the doctrine of Christ, and which of all the churches was the Church of Christ. He therefore retired to a secret place in a grove but a short distance from his father's house, and knelt down and began to call upon the Lord. At first he was severely tempted by the powers of darkness, which endeavored to overcome him; but he continued to seek for deliverance until darkness gave way from his mind, and he was enabled to pray in fervency of the spirit and in faith; and while thus pouring out his soul, anxiously desiring an answer from God, he saw a very bright and glorious light in the heavens above, which at first seemed to be at a considerable distance. He continued praying, while the light appeared to be gradually descending towards him; and as it drew nearer it increased in brightness and magnitude, so that by the time that it reached the tops of the trees the whole wilderness, for some distance around, was illuminated in a most glorious and brilliant manner.

He expected to see the leaves and boughs of the trees consumed as soon as the light came in contact with them; but perceiving that it did not produce  that effect, he was encouraged with the hope of being able to endure its presence. It continued descending slowly until it rested upon the earth, and he was enveloped in the midst of it. When it first came upon him it produced a peculiar sensation throughout his whole system, and immediately his mind was caught away from the natural objects with which he was surrounded, and he was enwrapped in a heavenly vision, and saw two glorious personages who exactly resembled each other in their features or likeness. He was informed that his sins were forgiven. He was also informed upon the subjects which had for some time previously agitated his mind, namely, that all religious denominations were believing in incorrect doctrines; and, consequently, that none of them was acknowledged of God as his Church and kingdom. He was expressly commanded not to go after them; and he received a promise that the true doctrine — the fulness of the Gospel — should at some future time be made known to him; after which the vision withdrew, leaving his mind in a state of calmness and peace indescribable. Some time after having received this glorious manifestation, being young, he was again entangled in the vanities of the world, of which he afterwards sincerely and truly repented. It pleased God, on the evening of September 21, 1823, again to hear his prayers; for he had retired to rest as usual, except that his mind was drawn out in fervent prayer, and his soul was filled with the most earnest desire "to commune with some kind messenger who could communicate to him the desired information of his acceptance with God," and also unfold the principles of the doctrine of Christ, according to the promise which he had received in the former vision. While he thus continued to pour but his desires before the Father of all good, endeavoring to exercise faith in his precious promises, "on a sudden, a light like that of day, only of a purer and far more glorious appearance and brightness, burst into the room — indeed the first sight was as if the house were filled with consuming fire.

This sudden appearance of a light so bright, as must naturally be expected, occasioned a shock or sensation that extended to the extremities of the body. It was, however, followed with a calmness and serenity of mind and an overwhelming rapture of joy that surpassed understanding, and in a moment a personage stood before him." Notwithstanding the brightness of the light which previously illuminated the room, "yet there seemed to be an additional glory surrounding or accompanying this personage, which shone with an increased degree of brilliancy, of which he was in the midst; and though his countenance was as lightning, yet it was of a pleasing, innocent, and glorious appearance — so much so that every fear was banished from  the heart, and nothing but calmness pervaded the soul." "The stature of this personage was a little above the common size of men in this age; his garment was perfectly white, and had the appearance of being without seam." This glorious being declared himself to be an angel of God, sent forth by commandment to communicate to him that his sins were forgiven, and that his prayers were heard; and also to bring the joyful tidings that the covenant which God made with ancient Israel concerning their posterity was at hand to be fulfilled that the great preparatory work for the second coming of the Messiah was speedily to commence — that the time was at hand for the Gospel in its fulness to be preached in power to all nations, that a people might be prepared with faith and righteousness for the millennial reign of universal peace and joy.

He was informed that he was called and chosen to be an instrument in the hands of God to bring about some of his marvellous purposes in this glorious dispensation. It was also made manifest to him that the "American Indians" were a remnant of Israel; that when they first emigrated to America they were an enlightened people, possessing a knowledge of the true God, enjoying his favor and peculiar blessings from his hand; that the prophets and inspired writers among them were required to keep a sacred history of the most important events transpiring among them, which history was handed down for many generations, till at length they fell into great wickedness. The greatest part of them were destroyed, and the records (by commandment of God to one of the last prophets among them) were safely deposited to preserve them from the hands of the wicked who sought to destroy them. He was informed that these records contained many sacred revelations pertaining to the gospel of the kingdom, as well as prophecies relating to the great events of the last days; and that to fulfil his promises to the ancients who wrote the records, and to accomplish his purposes in the restitution of their children, etc., they were to come forth to the knowledge of the people. If faithful, he was to be the instrument who should be thus highly favored in bringing these sacred things to light. At the same time he was expressly informed that it must be done with an eye single to the glory of God-that no one could be intrusted with those sacred writings who should endeavor to aggrandize himself by converting sacred things to unrighteous and speculative purposes (see Book of Mormon, chapter 4, § 2, page 510). After giving him many instructions concerning things past and to come, which would be foreign to our purpose to mention here, he disappeared, and the light and glory of God withdrew, leaving his mind in perfect peace, while a calmness and serenity indescribable pervaded his soul. But before  morning the vision was twice renewed, instructing him further and still further concerning the great work of God about to be performed on the earth. In the morning he went out to his work as usual, but soon the vision was renewed — the angel again appeared, and having been informed by the previous visions of the night concerning the place where those records were deposited, he was instructed to go immediately and view them.

Accordingly he repaired to the place, a brief description of which was best given by Oliver Cowdery [Joseph Smith's scribe and first follower by baptism], who shortly after this event visited the spot:

"As you pass on the mail-road from Palmyra, Wayne County, to Caanadaigua, Ontario County, New York, before arriving at the little village of Manchester, about four miles from Palmyra, you pass a large hill on the east side of the road. Why I say large is because it is as large, perhaps, as any in that country. The north end rises quite suddenly until it assumes a level with the more southerly extremity, and I think I may say an elevation higher than at the south a short distance, say half or three fourths of a mile. As you pass towards Canandaigua it lessens gradually, until the surface assumes its common level, or is broken by other smaller hills or ridges, watercourses, and ravines. I think I am justified in saying that this is the highest hill for some distance around, and I am certain that its appearance, as it rises so suddenly from a plain on the north, must attract the notice of the traveller as he passes by. The north end (which has been described as rising suddenly from the plain) forms a promontory, without timber, but covered with grass. As you pass to the south you soon come to scattering timber, the surface having been cleared by art or wind; and a short distance farther left you are surrounded with the common forest of the country. It is necessary to observe that even the part cleared was only occupied for pasturage, its steep ascent and narrow summit not admitting the plough of the husbandman with any degree of ease or profit. It was at the second-mentioned place where the record was found to be deposited, on the west side of the hill, not far from the top, down its side; and when myself visited the place in the year 1830 there were several trees standing — enough to cause a shade in summer, but not so much as to prevent the surface being covered with grass, which was also the case when the record was first found. How far below the surface these records were anciently placed I am unable to say; but from the fact that they had been some fourteen hundred years buried, and that, too, on the side of a hill so steep, one is ready to conclude that they were some feet below, as the earth  would naturally wear, more or less, in that length of time. But being placed towards the top of the hill, the ground would not remove as much as at two thirds, perhaps. Another circumstance would prevent a wearing of the earth: is all probability, as soon as timber had time to grow the hill was covered, and the roots of the same would hold the surface. However, on this point I shall leave every man to draw his own conclusion and form his own speculation; but, suffice to say, a hole of sufficient depth was dug. At the bottom of this was laid a stone of suitable size, the upper surface being smooth. At each edge was placed a large quantity of cement, and into this cement, at the four edges of this stone, were placed erect four others, their bottom edges resting in the cement, at the outer edges of the first stone. The four last named, when placed erect, formed a box; the corners, or where the edges of the four came in contact, were also cemented so firmly that the moisture from without was prevented from entering. It is to be observed, also, that the inner surfaces of the four erect or side stones were smooth. This box was sufficiently large to admit a breastplate, such as was used by the ancients to defend the chestetc., from the arrows and weapons of their enemy. From the bottom of the box, or from the breastplate, arose three small pillars, composed of the same description of cement used' on the edges, and upon these three pillars were placed the records. This box containing the records was covered with another stone, the bottom surface being flat, and the upper crowning. When it was first visited by Mr. Smith on the morning of the 22d of September, 1823, a part of the crowning stone was visible above the surface, while the edges were concealed by the soil and grass; from which circumstance it may be seen that however deep this box might have been placed at first, the time had been sufficient to wear the earth, so that it was easily discovered when once directed, and yet not enough to make a perceivable difference to the passer-by. After arriving at the repository, a little exertion in removing the soil from the edges of the top of the box, and a light lever, brought to his natural vision its contents. While viewing and contemplating this sacred treasure with wonder and astonishment, behold in the angel of the Lord, who had previously visited him, again stood in his presence, and his soul was again enlightened as it was the evening before, and he was filled with the Holy Spirit, and the heavens were opened, and the glory of the Lord shone round about and rested upon him. While he thus stood gazing and admiring, the angel said, 'Look!' and as he thus spake he beheld the Prince of Darkness, surrounded by his innumerable train of associates. All this passed before him, and the heavenly messenger said, 'All this is shown —  the good and the evil, the holy and the impure, the glory of God and the power of darkness — that you may know hereafter the two powers, and never be influenced or overcome by the wicked one. Behold, whatsoever enticeth and leadeth to good, and to do good, is of God; and whatsoever doth not, is of that wicked one. It is he that filleth the hearts of men with evil, to walk in darkness and blaspheme God; and you may learn from henceforth that his ways are to destruction, but the way of holiness is peace and rest. You cannot at this time obtain this record, for the commandment of God is strict; and if ever these sacred things are obtained, they must be by prayer and faithfulness in obeying the Lord. They are not deposited here for the sake of accumulating gain and wealth for the glory of this world; they were sealed by the prayer of faith, and because of the knowledge which they contain; they are of no worth among the children of men only for their knowledge. On them is contained the fulness of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, as it was given to his people on this land; and when it shall be brought forth by the power of God it shall be carried to the Gentiles, of whom many will receive it, and after will the seed of Israel be brought into the fold of their Redeemer by obeying it also. Those who kept the commandments of the Lord on this land desired this at his hand, and through the prayer of faith obtained the promise that if their descendants should transgress and fall away a record should be kept, and in the last days come to their children. These things are sacred, and must be kept so, for the promise of the Lord concerning them must be fulfilled. No man can obtain them if his heart is impure, because they contain that which is sacred... By them will the Lord work a great and marvellous work; the wisdom of the wise shall become as naught, and the understanding of the prudent shall be hid; and because the power of God shall be displayed, those who profess to know the truth but walk in deceit shall tremble with anger; but with signs and with wonders, with gifts and with healings, with the manifestations of the power of God and with the Holy Ghost shall the hearts of the faithful be comforted. You have now beheld the power of God manifested, and the power of Satan: you see that there is nothing desirable in the works of darkness — that they cannot bring happiness — that those who are overcome therewith are miserable; while, on the other hand, the righteous are blessed with a place in the kingdom of God, where joy unspeakable surrounds them. There they rest beyond the power of the enemy. of truth, where no evil can disturb them. The glory of God crowns them, and they continually feast upon his goodness and enjoy his smiles. Behold, notwithstanding you have seen this great display of power, by  which you may ever be able to detect the Evil One, yet I give unto you another sign, and when it comes to pass, then know that the Lord is God, and that he will fulfil his purposes, and that the knowledge which this record contains will go to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people under the whole heaven. This is the sign: When these things begin to be known — that is, when it is known that the Lord has shown you these things — the workers of iniquity will seek your overthrow. They will circulate falsehoods to destroy your reputation, and also will seek to take your life; but remember this, if you are faithful, and shall hereafter continue to keep the commandments of the Lord, you shall be preserved to bring these things forth; for in due time he will give you a commandment to come and take them. When they are interpreted, the Lord will give the holy priesthood to some, and they shall begin to proclaim this gospel and baptize by water, and after that they shall have power to give the Holy Ghost by the laying on of their hands. Then will persecution rage more and more; for the iniquities of men shall be revealed, and those who are not built upon the Rock will seek to overthrow the Church; but it will increase the more opposed, and spread farther and farther, increasing in knowledge till they shall be sanctified and receive an inheritance where the glory of God will rest upon them; and when this takes place, and all things are prepared, the ten tribes of Israel will be revealed in the north country, whither they have been for a long season; and when this is fulfilled will be brought to pass that saying of the prophet, "And the Redeemer shall come to Zion, and unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob, saith the Lord." But notwithstanding the workers of iniquity shall seek your destruction, the arm of the Lord will be extended, and you will be borne off conqueror if you keep all his commandments. Your name shall be known among the nations, for the work which the Lord will perform by your hands shall cause the righteous to rejoice and the wicked to rage; with the one it shall be had in honor, and with the other in reproach — yet with these it shall be a terror, because of the great and marvellous work which shall follow the coming forth of this fulness of the Gospel. Now go thy way, remembering what the Lord hath done for thee, and be diligent in keeping his commandments, and he will deliver thee from temptations and all the arts and devices of the wicked one. Forget not to pray that thy mind may become strong, that when he shall manifest unto thee thou mayest have power to escape the evil and obtain these precious things."' The above quotation is an extract from a letter written by elder Oliver Cowdery,  which was published in one of the numbers of the Latter-day Saints' Messenger and Advocate.

Although many more instructions were given by the mouth of the angel to Mr. Smith, for which we have not space here, yet the most important items are contained in the foregoing relation. During the period of the four following years he frequently received instructions from the mouth of the heavenly messenger. On the morning of the 22d of September, A.D. 1827, the angel of the Lord delivered the records into his hands. These records were engraved on plates which had the appearance of gold. Each plate was not far from seven by eight inches in width and length, being not quite as thick as common tin. They were filled on both sides with engravings in Egyptian characters (see Book of Mormon, Mormon, chapter 4:§ 8, page 515), and bound together in a volume as the leaves of a book, and fastened at one edge with three rings running through the whole. This volume was something near six inches in thickness, a part of which was sealed. The characters or letters upon the unsealed part were small and beautifully engraved. The whole book exhibited many marks of antiquity in its construction, as well as much skill in the art of engraving. With the records was found “a curious instrument, called by the ancients the Urim and Thummnim, which consisted of two transparent stones, clear as crystal, set in the two rims of a bow. This was in use in ancient times by persons called seers. It was an instrument by the use of which they received revelation of things distant or of things past or future." (See Biogr. Sketches, page 101; Book of Mormon, Ether, chapter 1, § 7-11, p. 520 sq. See also Nephi, § 20, page 5 sq.) In the mean time the inhabitants of that vicinity, having been informed that Mr. Smith had seen heavenly visions, and that he had discovered sacred records, began to ridicule and mock at those things. After having obtained those sacred things, while proceeding home through the wilderness and fields, he was waylaid by two ruffians, who had secreted themselves for the purpose of robbing him of the records. One of them struck him with a club before he perceived them; but being a strong man and large in stature, with great exertion he cleared himself from them and ran towards home, being closely pursued until he came near his father's house, when his pursuers, for fear of being detected, turned and fled the other way. Soon the news of his discoveries spread abroad throughout all those parts. False reports, misrepresentations, and base slanders flew as if upon the wings of the wind in every direction. The house was frequently beset by mobs and evil-designing persons. Several times he was shot at,  and very narrowly escaped. Every device was used to get the plates away from him. Being continually in danger of his life from a gang of abandoned wretches, he at length concluded to leave the place and go to Pennsylvania; and accordingly packed up his goods, putting the plates into a barrel of beans, and proceeded upon his journey. He had not gone far before he was overtaken by an officer with a search-warrant, who flattered himself with the idea that he should surely obtain the plates; after searching very diligently, he was sadly disappointed at not finding them. Mr. Smith then drove on, but, before he got to his journey's end he was again overtaken by an officer on the same business, and after ransacking the wagon very carefully, he went his way as much chagrined as the first at not being able to discover the object of his research. Without any further molestation Smith pursued his journey until he came into the northern part of Pennsylvania, near the Susquehanna River, in which part his father-in-law resided. Having provided himself with a home, he commenced translating the record, as he himself tells us in his Autobiography, "by the gift and power of God, through the means of the Urim and Thummim;" and being a poor writer, he was under the necessity of employing a scribe to write the translation as it came from his mouth. (See, for criticism, editorial appendix below, and Stenhouse, page 23.)

Mr. Smith continued the work of translation, as his pecuniary circumstances would permit, until he finished the unsealed part of the records. The part translated is entitled the Book of Mormon, which contains nearly as much reading as the Old Testament. This volume purports to be a history of ancient America, from its early settlement by a colony who came from the Tower of Babel at the confusion of languages, to the beginning of the fifth century of the Christian sera. By these records we are informed that America, in ancient times, was inhabited by two distinct races of people. The first, or more ancient race, came directly from the great Tower, being called Jaredites. The second race came directly from the city of Jerusalem, about six hundred years before Christ, being Israelites, principally the descendants of Joseph. The first nation, or Jaredites, were destroyed about the time that the Israelites came from Jerusalem, who succeeded them in the inheritance of the country.

The principal nation of the second race fell in battle towards the close of the fourth century. The remaining remnant, having dwindled into an uncivilized state, still continue to inhabit the land, although divided into a "multitude of nations," and are called by Europeans the "American Indians." We learn  from the same history that at the confusion of languages, when the Lord scattered the people upon all the face of the earth, the Jaredites, being a righteous people, obtained favor in the sight of the Lord, and were not confounded. Because of their righteousness, the Lord miraculously led them from the Tower to the great ocean, where they were commanded to build vessels, in which they were marvellously brought across the great deep to the shores of North America. The Lord God promised to give them America, which was a very choice land in his sight, for an inheritance; and he swore unto them in his wrath that whoso should possess this land of promise, from that time henceforth and forever should serve him, the true and only God, or they should be swept off when the fulness of his wrath should come upon them, and they were fully ripened in iniquity. Moreover, he promised to make them a great and powerful nation, so that there should be no greater nation upon all the face of the earth. Accordingly in process of time they became a very numerous and powerful people, occupying principally North America; building large cities in all quarters of the land, being a civilized and enlightened nation. Agriculture and machinery were carried on to a great extent. Commercial and manufacturing business flourished on every hand; yet, in consequence of wickedness, they were often visited with terrible judgments. Many prophets were raised up among them from generation to generation, who testified against the wickedness of the people, and prophesied of judgments and calamities which awaited them if they did not repent, etc. Sometimes they were visited by pestilence and plagues, and sometimes by famine and war, until at length (having occupied the land some fifteen or sixteen hundred years) their wickedness became so great that the Lord threatened by the mouth of his prophets to utterly destroy them from the face of the land. But they gave no heed to these warnings; therefore the word of the Lord was fulfilled, and they were entirely destroyed-leaving their houses, their cities, and their land desolate; and their sacred records also, which were kept on gold plates, were left by one of their last prophets, whose name was Ether, in such a situation that they were discovered by the remnant of Joseph, who soon afterwards were brought from Jerusalem to inherit the land. This remnant of Joseph were also led in a miraculous manner from Jerusalem, in the first year of the reign of Zedekiah, king of Judah. They were first led to the eastern borders of the Red Sea; then they journeyed for some time along the borders thereof, nearly in a south-east direction; after which they altered their course nearly eastward, until they came to the great waters, where, by the command of God; they built a  vessel, in which they were safely brought across the great Pacific Ocean, and landed upon the western coast of South America. In the eleventh year of the reign of Zedekiah, at the time the Jews were carried away captive into Babylon, another remnant were brought out of Jerusalem, some of whom were descendants of Judah. They landed in North America, soon after which they emigrated into the northern parts of South America, at which place they were discovered by the remnant of Joseph, something like four hundred years after. The same records inform us that this remnant of Joseph, soon after they landed, separated themselves into two distinct nations. This division was caused by a certain portion of them being greatly persecuted, because of their righteousness, by the remainder. The persecuted nation emigrated to the northern parts of South America, leaving the wicked nation in possession of the middle and southern parts of the same.

The former were called Nephites, being led by a prophet whose name was Nephi. The latter were called Lamanites, being led by a very wicked man whose name was Laman. The Nephites had in their possession a copy of the Holy Scriptures, viz. the five books of Moses and the prophecies of the holy prophets down to Jeremiah, in whose days they left Jerusalem. These Scriptures were engraved on plates of brass in the Egyptian language. They themselves also made plates soon after their landing, on which they began to engrave their own history, prophecies, visions, and revelations. All these sacred records were kept by holy and righteous men, who were inspired by the Holy Ghost, and were carefully preserved and handed down from generation to generation. The Lord gave them the whole continent for a land of promise, and he promised that they and their children after them should inherit it, on condition of their obedience to his commandments; but if they were disobedient they should be cut off from his presence. The Nephites began to prosper in the land, according to their righteousness; and they multiplied and spread forth to the east, and west, and north-building large villages, cities, synagogues, and temples, together with forts, towers, and fortifications to defend themselves against their enemies. They cultivated the earth, and raised various kinds of grain in abundance. They also raised numerous flocks of domestic animals, and became a very wealthy people, having in abundance gold, silver, copper, tin, iron, etc. Arts and sciences flourished to a great extent. Various kinds of machinery were in use. Cloths of various kinds were manufactured; swords, scimitars, axes, and various implements of war were made, together with head-shields, arm-shields, and breastplates to defend themselves in battle with their enemies. In the days of their  righteousness they were a civilized, enlightened, and happy people. But, on the other hand, the Lamanites, because of the hardness of their hearts, brought down many judgments upon their own heads; nevertheless they were not destroyed as a nation; but the Lord God sent forth a curse upon them, and they became a dark, loathsome, and filthy people. Before their rebellion they were white and exceedingly fair, like the Nephites; but the Lord God cursed them in their complexions, and they were changed to a dark color; and they became a wild, savage, and ferocious people, being great enemies to the Nephites, whom they sought by every means to destroy. Many times they came against them with their numerous hosts to battle, but were repulsed by the Nephites and driven back to their own possessions, not, however, generally speaking, without great loss on both sides; for tens of thousands were very frequently slain, after which they were piled together in great heaps upon the face of the ground, and covered with a shallow covering of earth, which will account for these ancient mounds, filled with human bones, so numerous at the present day both in North and South America.

The second colony, which left Jerusalem eleven years after the remnant of Joseph left that city, landed in North America, and emigrated from thence to the northern parts of South America; and about four hundred years after they were discovered by the Nephites, as stated above. They were called the people of Zarahemla. They had been perplexed with m-any wars among themselves, and having brought no records with them, their language had become corrupted, and they denied the being of God. At the time they were discovered by the Nephites they were very numerous, and only in a partial state of civilization; but the Nephites united with them and taught them the Holy Scriptures, and they were restored to civilization, and became one nation with them. In process of time the Nephites began to build ships near the Isthmus of Darien, and launch them forth into the western ocean, in which great numbers sailed a great distance to the northward, and began to colonize North America. Other colonies emigrated by land, and in a few centuries the whole continent became peopled. North America at that time was almost entirely destitute of timber, it having been cut off by the more ancient race who came from the great Tower at the confusion of languages; but the Nephites became-very skilful in building houses of cement; also much timber was carried by the way of shipping from South to North America. They also planted groves and began to raise timber, that in time their wants might be supplied. Large  cities were built in various parts of the continent, both among the Lamanites and Nephites.

The law of Moses was observed by the latter. Numerous prophets were raised up from time to time throughout their generations. Many records, both historical and prophetical, which were of great size, were kept among them; some on plates of gold and other metals, and some on other materials. The sacred records, also. of the more ancient race who had been destroyed were found by them. These were engraved on plates of gold. They translated them into their own language by the gift and power of God, through the means of the Urim and Thummim. They contained a historical account from the creation down to the Tower of Babel, and from that time down until they were destroyed, comprising a period of about thirty-four hundred or thirty-five hundred years. They also contained many prophecies, great and marvellous, reaching forward to the final end and consummation of all things, and the creation of a new heaven and new earth. The prophets also among the Nephites prophesied of great things. They opened the secrets of futurity- saw the coming of Messiah in the flesh — prophesied of the blessings to come upon their descendants in the latter times — made known the history of unborn generations-unfolded the grand events of ages to come — viewed the power, glory, and majesty of Messiah's second advent — beheld the establishment of the kingdom of peace — gazed upon the glories of the day of righteousness — saw creation redeemed from the curse, and all the righteous filled with songs of everlasting joy. The Nephites knew of the birth and crucifixion of Christ by certain celestial and terrestrial phenomena, which at those times were shown forth in fulfilment of the predictions of many of their prophets. Notwithstanding the many blessings they had received, they had fallen into great wickedness, and had cast out the saints and the prophets, and stoned and killed them. Therefore at the time of the crucifixion of Christ they were visited in great judgment: thick darkness covered the whole continent the earth was terribly convulsed — the rocks were rent into broken fragments, and afterwards found in seams and cracks upon all the face of the land — mountains were sunk into valleys, and valleys raised into mountains — the highways and level roads were broken up and spoiled — many cities were laid in ruins; others were buried up in the depths of the earth, and mountains occupied their place; while others were sunk, and waters came up in their stead; and others still were burned by fire from heaven. Thus the predictions of their prophets were fulfilled upon their heads. Thus the more wicked part, both of the Nephites and Lamanites, were destroyed. Thus the Almighty  executed vengeance and fury upon them, that the blood of the saints and prophets might no longer cry from the ground against them.

Those who survived these terrible judgments were favored with the personal ministry of Christ; for after he arose from the dead, finished his ministry at Jerusalem, and ascended to heaven, he descended in the presence of the Nephites, who were assembled round about their temple in the northern parts of South America. He exhibited to them his wounded hands, side, and feet; commanded the law of Moses to be abolished; introduced and established the Gospel in its stead; chose twelve disciples from among them to administer the same; instituted the sacrament; prayed for and blessed their little children; healed their sick, blind, lame, deaf, and those who were afflicted in any way; raised a man from the dead; showed forth his power in their midst; expounded the Scriptures, which had been given from the beginning down to that time; and made known unto them all things which should take place down until he should come in his glory, and from that time down to the end, when all people, nations, and languages should stand before God to be judged, and the heaven and the earth should pass away, and there should be a new heaven and a new earth. These teachings of Jesus were engraved upon plates, some of which are contained in the Book of Mormon; but the greater part are not revealed in that book, but hereafter are to be made manifest to the saints. After Jesus had finished ministering unto them, he ascended into heaven; and the twelve disciples whom he had chosen went forth upon all the face of the land preaching the Gospel, baptizing those who repented for the remission of sins, after which they laid their hands upon them, that they might receive the Holy Spirit. Mighty miracles were wrought by them, and also by many of the Church. The Nephites and Lamanites were all converted unto the Lord, both in South and North America, and they dwelt in righteousness above three hundred years; but towards the close of the fourth century of the Christian sera they had so far apostatized from God that he suffered great judgments to fall upon them. The Lamanites at that time dwelt in South America, and the Nephites in North America. A great and terrible war commenced between them, which lasted for many years, and resulted in the complete overthrow and destruction of the Nephites. This war commenced at the Isthmus of Darien, and was very destructive to both nations for many years. At length the Nephites were driven before their enemies a great distance to the north and north-east; and having gathered their whole nation together, both men, women, and children, they encamped on and  round about the hill Cumorah, where the records were found, which is in the State of New York, about two hundred miles west of the city of Albany. Here they were met by the numerous hosts of the Lamanites, and were slain, hewn down, and slaughtered, both male and female the aged, middle-aged, and children. Hundreds of thousands were slain on both sides; and the nation of the Nephites were destroyed, excepting a few who had deserted over to the Lamanites, and a few who escaped into the south country, and a few who fell wounded, and were left by the Lamanites on the field of battle for dead, among whom were Mormon and his son Moroni, who were righteous men.

Mormon had made an abridgment from the records of his forefathers upon plates, which abridgment he entitled the Book of Mormon; and (being commanded of God) he hid in the hill Cumorah all the sacred records of his forefathers which were in his possession; except the abridgment called the Book of Mormon. which he gave to his son Moroni to finish. Moroni survived his nation a few years, and continued the writings, in which he informs us that the Lamanites hunted those few Nephites who escaped the great and tremendous battle of Cumorah until they were all destroyed, excepting those who were mingled with the Lamanites, and that he was left alone, and kept himself hid, for they sought to destroy every Nephite who would not deny the Christ. He furthermore states that the Lamanites were at war one with another, and that the whole face of the land was one continual scene of murdering, robbing, and plundering. He continued the history until the four hundred and twentieth year of the Christian aera, when (by the commandment of God) he hid the records in the hill Cumorah, where they remained concealed until by the ministry of an angel they were discovered to Mr. Smith, who, by the gift and power of God, translated them into the English language by the means of the Urim and Thummim, as stated in the foregoing. (See editorial criticisms below.)

After the book was translated the Lord raised up witnesses to bear testimony to the nations of its truth, who at the close of the volume send forth their testimony, which reads as follows:

"Be it known unto all nations, kindreds, tongues, and people unto whom this work shall come, that we, through the grace of God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ, have seen the plates which contain this record, which is a record of the people of Nephi, and also of the Lamanites, their brethren, and also of the people of Jared, who came from the Tower of which hath  been spoken; and we also know that they have been translated by the gift and power of God, for his voice hath declared it unto us; wherefore we know of a surety that the work is true. And we also testify that we have seen the engravings which are upon the plates; and they have been shown unto us by the power of God, and not of man. And we declare, with words of soberness, that an angel of God came down from heaven, and he brought and laid before our eyes, that we beheld and saw the plates and the engravings thereon; and we know that it is by the grace of God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ that we beheld and hear record that these things are true, and it is marvellous in our eyes; nevertheless, the voice of the Lord commanded us that we should bear record of it; wherefore, to be obedient unto the commandments of God, we learn testimony of these things. And we know that if we are faithful in Christ we shall rid our garments of the blood of all men, and be found spotless before the judgment-seat of Christ, and shall dwell with him eternally in the heavens. And the honor be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost, which is one God: Amen.

"Oliver Cowdery,

David Whitmer,

Martin Harris."

Then follows the testimony of eight witnesses: "Be it known unto all nations, kindreds, tongues, and people unto whom this work shall come, that Joseph Smith, Jr., the translator of this work, has shown unto us the plates of which hath been spoken, which have the appearance of gold; and as many of the leaves as the said Smith has translated we did handle with our hands; and we also saw the engravings thereon, all of which has the appearance of ancient work and of curious workmanship. And this we bear record with words of soberness, that the said Smith has shown unto us, for we have seen and hefted, and know of a surety that the said Smith has got the plates of which we have spoken. And we give our names into the world, to witness unto the world that which we have seen; and we lie not, God bearing witness of it.

CHRISTIAN WHITMER,

JACOB WHITMER,

PETER WHITMER, JR.,

JOIN WHITMER,

HIRAM PAGE,

JOSEPH SMITH, SR.,

HYRUM SMITH,

SAM. H. SMITH."

In the year 1829, Mr. Smith and Mr. Cowdery, having learned the correct mode of baptism from the teachings of the Savior to the ancient Nephites, as recorded in the Book of Mormon, had a desire to be baptized; but knowing that no one had authority to administer that sacred ordinance in any denomination; they were at a loss to know how the authority was to be restored; and while calling upon the Lord with a desire to be informed on the subject, a holy angel appeared and stood before them, and laid his hands upon their heads, and ordained them priests of the order of Aaron, and commanded them to baptize each other, which they accordingly did. In the year 1830 a large edition of the Book of Mormon first appeared in print. "As some began to peruse its sacred pages, the spirit of the Lord bore record to them that it was true; and they were obedient to its requirements, by coming forth humbly repenting before the Lord, and being immersed in water for the remission of sins, after which, by the commandment of God, lands were laid upon them in the name of the Lord for the gift of the Holy Spirit. And on the 6th of April, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and thirty, the ‘Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints' was organized in the town of Fayette, Seneca County, State of New York, North America. Some few were called and ordained by the spirit of revelation and prophecy, and began to preach and bear testimony, as the spirit gave them utterance; and although they were the weak things of the earth, yet they, were strengthened by the Holy Ghost, and gave forth their testimony in great power, by which means many were, brought to repentance, and came forward with broken hearts and contrite spirits, and were immersed in water confessing their sins, and were filled with the Holy Ghost by the laying on of hands, and saw visions and prophesied. Devils were cast out, and the sick were healed by the prayer of faith and the laying on of hands. Thus was the word confirmed unto the faithful by the signs following. Thus the Lord raised up witnesses to bear testimony of his name, and laid the foundation of his kingdom in the last days. And thus the hearts of the saints were comforted and filled with great joy."

Editorial Appendix and Criticisms. — Mr. Pratt's account stops with the organization of the Saints as an ecclesiastical body. We supplement it with the later history.  Joseph Smith seems at first to have had vague and confused ideas as to the nature and design of the Church he was about to establish until he found a convert in Sidney Rigdon, an able Campbellite preacher, then residing in Ohio. He was inclined to teach Millenarianism and bring his flock over to the new faith. This settled Smith, and together they worked out a sort of Millenarian faith, in which at that time Western New York was largely interested. It was by these two religionists declared that the millennium was close at hand, that the Indians were to be speedily converted, and that America was to be the final gathering-place of the Saints, who were to assemble at New Zion or New Jerusalem, somewhere in the interior of the American continent. With the Book of Mormon as their text and authority, they began to preach this new gospel; and Smith's family and a few of his associates, together with some of Rigdon's former flock, were soon enough in numbers to constitute a Mormon Church, which, as we have learned from Mr. Pratt's account, was organized April 6, 1830, at Fayette, N.Y. Though exposed to ridicule and hostility, the Saints continued to gather disciples. The publication of the Book of Mormon, and some alleged miracles and prophecies, attracted the people to the preaching of Smith and his companions, and at the first Conference of the Church, June 1, 1830, held at Fayette, N.Y., thirty members were present. Missionaries were now set apart, and every member was utilized, and in consequence the Saints were soon met with everywhere. Their missionaries were full of zeal, and converts gathered rapidly. Among them were Brigham Young, the two brothers Pratt. and Sidney Rigdon, the Campbellite preacher, who all became most efficient workers in Mormondom. Churches also were established in Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York, and even so far west as Indiana and Illinois. But with their growth persecution intensified, and the Saints finally turned their eyes westwards for a permanent home. In the beginning of 1831 they established their head-quarters at Kirtland, Ohio, and everything pointed to it as the seat of the "New Jerusalem." Indeed, Smith advised the Saints to gather there. In a short time, however, opposition was strengthening also at Kirtland, and Smith urged the people to pray to the Lord "that he would in due time reveal unto them the place where the New Jerusalem should be built, and where the Saints should eventually be gathered in one." Smith's eyes were now turned to the far West to the region of the great prairies — hoping there to work out his religious system in peace and freedom. In the autumn of 1831 a successful work was inaugurated at Independence, Jackson County, Missouri; and shortly after the revelation came that "it was appointed by the finger of the  Lord" that a colony of the Saints should be established in that part of Missouri, it being "the land of promise and the place for the city of Zion." In a very short time nearly 1200 persons gathered in the place "where Christ would shortly reign in person." Land was largely bought; preaching was vigorously carried on; a printing-press was established; a monthly periodical (The Morning and Evening Star) and a weekly newspaper (The Upper Missouri Advertiser) were started to propagate the doctrines of the new sect; and it is only fair to the Mormons to state that a spirit of industry, sobriety, order, and cleanliness was everywhere visible. Account for it how we may, the Mormons were in many important respects, morally, socially, and industrially, far in advance of their neighbors. Smith himself, with such of the Saints as preferred to stay in Ohio until forced from it, continued to reside there, though, as we shall see presently, he was by no means stationary there, and was now in Ohio, now in Missouri, as the state of affairs required. In 1838 unsuccessful financial speculations obliged the Prophet also to withdraw, after having besides encountered persecutions from mobs.

In Missouri also the Mormons early engendered opposition. Secret societies were formed a short time after their settlement to expel them from that region; their periodicals were stopped, their printing-press confiscated, their ministers tarred and feathered, and numberless other outrages were committed. Finally, in 1833 the hapless Saints were compelled to flee across the Missouri River, and men, women, and children had to encamp in the open wilderness on a winter night (see Parley P. Pratt, Hist. of the Missouri Persecutions). The cruelty with which they were treated is a disgraceful page in American colonization history, and every true man has reason to regret the outrages perpetrated against these religionists. They subsequently settled in Clay County, in the same state. Smith, when informed of these outrages, at once set out for Missouri; and now assumed, besides the role of "prophet, seer, revelator, and translator," that of military leader of his people. A lengthened revelation was given in February, 1834, to raise " the strength of the Lord's house," and go up to Missouri to redeem Zion, and the Prophet became, by the election of a council of elders, "commander-in-chief of the armies of Israel." With a band of 150 men, the "Prophet," set out from Kirtland for Missouri. By the time he reached Missouri the little band had increased to 205; but they were intercepted by the settlers before they could effect a junction with the Saints in Clay County, and were so badly defeated in their schemes that the  few faithful ones who were left, together with the Prophet himself, gladly enough returned to their home at Kirtland. Here, while recruiting from the trials of this warfare, Smith determined upon a more perfect organization of his adherents. In 1833 he had published for their spiritual guidance The Book of Doctrine and Covenants, and in May, 1834, had adopted as the formal title of his ecclesiastical body "The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter- day Saints." He now instituted the hierarchical organization to which the Mormons owe in so large a measure their success and perpetuity. As heads of the Church he appointed a presidency of three (and this remains the practice of the Mormons), assigning to himself the first place, and associating with himself the Rigdon of whom we have had occasion to speak before, and one Frederick G. Williams, a "revelation" from the Lord having declared that the sins of Rigdon and Williams were forgiven, " and that they were henceforth to be accounted as equals with Joseph Smith, jun., in holding the keys of his last kingdom." His own superiority the Prophet had declared to his followers as early as 1830 by special "revelation," which, after appointing him "seer, translator, prophet, apostle of Jesus Christ, and elder of the Church," also demands that "the Church shall give heed to all his words and commandments which he shall give unto you; for his word shall ye receive as if from my own mouth, in all patience and faith." On February 4, 1835, Smith selected his high council of twelve, and delegated these his apostles — ‘to go unto all nations, kindreds, tongues, and people, to preach the Gospel of the New Covenant." They departed into the Eastern States, and later into Europe; the first in 1837 to England, where the first Conference of converts was held at Preston, Lancashire on December 25th of that year. Everywhere the Saints now gained adherents. In March 1836, when the Temple at Kirtland was dedicated, over 1000 Mormons were gathered in that little town to witness the "sacred ceremony," and "to receive great blessings."

The year 1837 was a most auspicious one for the Saints, though for a time it threatened their very life as an ecclesiastical body. In Ohio they lost the confidence and support of their "Gentile" associates by the mismanagement of mercantile affairs, so that the Prophet laid himself open to the suspicion of deceit, double-dealing, and fraud. They also sustained several important apostasies from their ranks, one seceder being one of Joseph's councillors, and three others apostles in the "kingdom." But while these trials awaited them at their own "Zion," the New Covenant was rapidly spreading in England, under the preaching of the apostles Orson Hyde and Heber C.  Kimball, and the Saints received large accessions to their numbers, especially from the masses in the great manufacturing and commercial towns — Manchester, Liverpool, Leeds, Birmingham, Glasgow; and above all from the mining districts of South Wales, where Mormonism, in some places, almost competed for popularity with Methodism itself. Since then they have extended their strange evangelization to the East Indies, Australia, the islands of the Pacific, Egypt, Palestine, Turkey, and almost every country on the continent of Europe. In 1838 Kirtland was finally altogether abandoned, for, luckily for the Prophet, just at the moment of his indictment for swindling, etc., a new "revelation" ordered his immediate departure for Missouri, which he promptly obeyed, with all the more alacrity as internal disorders had painfully manifested themselves also in Missouri, resulting in the expulsion of several influential members, among them David Whitmer, the second witness to the Book of Mormon, and Oliver Cowdery, the first convert by baptism. Smith's presence soon healed all internal disorders. but the conflict between the Saints and the other Missourians became daily fiercer. The organized religionists, though guilty of fanatical extravagance in their faith, were yet so perfectly united in all their material undertakings as to make their prosperity almost a necessity, and this success annoyed the other settlers to such a degree that a constant warfare was maintained. The rapid increase of the Saints made them, moreover, a subject of suspicion, especially as they had declared it to be their intention to take Missouri as their earthly portion for an "everlasting possession."

The Prophet, it was said, had declared that he would yet trample on the necks of his enemies, and these had therefore every reason to fear his growing strength. Besides, it was known that a band of men had secretly organized to defend the first presidency by any means, fair or foul; and it is therefore not to be wondered that there was constant quarrelling and fighting between Saints and Gentiles, until the contest amounted to civil war, and called for the interference of the state authorities. That such a step was really necessary became clearly apparent when on October 24, 1838, Thomas B. March, himself the president of the Mormon Apostolical College, and Orson Hyde, one of the twelve apostles, and now (1875) again a faithful "Saint," made before a justice of the peace in Ray County, Missouri, an affidavit in which it is declared that "They (i.e. the Mormons under Smith) have among them a company consisting of all that are considered true Mormons, called the Danites, who have taken an oath to support the heads of the Church in all things that they say or do, whether right or wrong... The plan of said Smith, the Prophet, is to take this state;  and he professes to his people to intend taking the United States, and ultimately the whole world. This is the belief of the Church, and my own (i.e., March's) opinion of the Prophet's plan and intentions. The Prophet inculcates the notion, and it is believed by every true Mormon, that Smith's prophecies are superior to the law of the land. I have heard the Prophet say that he would yet tread down his enemies and walk over their dead bodies; that if he was not let alone he would be a second Mohammed to his generation, and that he would make it one gore of blood from the Rocky Mountains to the Atlantic Ocean." Coming from the Saints' own fellow- worshippers, this statement was of course credited by the "Gentiles." It was, moreover, confirmed by the published utterances of Sidney Rigdon, who, in a sermon on July 4, 1838, preached at Far West, had said: "We take God and all the holy angels to witness this day that we warn all men in the name of Jesus Christ to come on us no more for war. The man or the set of men who attempts it does it at the expense of their lives. And that mob that comes on us to disturb us, it shall be between them and us a war of extermination, for we will follow them till the last drop of their blood is spilled, or else they will have to exterminate us. For we will carry the seat of war to their own houses and their own families, and one party or the other shall be utterly destroyed." Near the close of 1838 the state militia was finally called out, nominally to establish peace, really to crush the Mormons. After much loss and suffering, especially at a place called Hawn's Mill, where several Mormons were massacred, the Saints were driven in the depth of winter across the Mississippi into Illinois. The Prophet, his brother Hyrum, and other leading Mormons, were seized, and sentenced by court martial to be shot; but the sentence was not carried out. and after some months' close confinement they all escaped into Illinois (April 1839).

The number of Saints who at this time gathered in Illinois is estimated at no less than 15,000, notwithstanding the defections which the Saints sustained by their expulsion from the land of promise. The people of Illinois treated the newcomers very kindly, and gave them a grant of land on the east bank of the Mississippi, forty miles above Quincy, and twenty miles below Burlington, Iowa. Here, on the bend of the river, upon rising ground that commands a magnificent view of the Mississippi for many miles, they established themselves a new home, which, in obedience to a "revelation" given to Smith, was called Nauvoo, or the "City of Beauty." The country  was a mere wilderness when the Mormons settled in it; it soon, however, began to rejoice and blossom as the rose. The foundation of the first house was laid in 1839, and in less than two years over 2000 dwellings; together with school-houses and public edifices, were erected, besides other evidences manifesting the great prosperity of their body. The Legislature of the state was induced to grant a charter to Nauvoo; a body of Mormon militia was formed under the leadership of the Prophet, who, as we have seen before, hesitated not to assume also the part of a military leader, and he besides assumed such civil offices as gave him entire control of the place, and made him safe from all persecution of the Missourians, in case they should attempt to take him back into their own state for punishment. He enjoyed, moreover, making military displays. Thus, on April 6, 1841, when the cornerstone of the grand Temple was laid, the Prophet appeared at the head of his military legion, and in the local papers of that time is only spoken of in his military capacity. A special revelation had demanded the building of the Temple, which was to be on a far grander scale than the edifices in Ohio or Missouri (see Doctrines and Covenants, sec. 103). Another revelation had summoned all converts to Nauvoo, bringing with them "their gold, their silver, and their precious stones" (see Doctr. and Cov. sec. 103).

Still another revelation now ordered a mansion-house to be begun, where the Prophet and his family were to be lodged and maintained at the public cost. "Let it be built in my name, and let my servant Joseph Smith and his house have place therein from generation to generation, saith the Lord; and let the name of the house be called the Nauvoo House, and let it be a delightful habitation for man" (Doctr. and Cov. sec. 103). Thus the spiritual and temporal power of Smith increased until he found himself absolute ruler of over 20,000 persons, besides having many spiritual adherents in the different parts of this vast country, and no less than 10,000 in Great Britain. Smith's head was so far turned by his success that in 1844 he offered himself as a candidate for the Presidency of the Union. Probably, however, this proceeding was only meant as a bravado. In Nauvoo itself he reigned supreme. The contributions of his votaries and the zeal of their obedience fed his appetite for riches and power. But opposition gradually sprang up; and though it was obliged to hide itself for a while, and could only be nourished secretly, it was yet growing, and it soon was rumored among the Saints that Smith failed to restrain himself from the indulgence of more sensual passions, which ease and indolence had bred. As early as 1838 the Prophet, it is affirmed, had commenced to practically carry out his doctrine of the "Celestial Marriage" (see below, p. 627 sq.), or of a  "Plurality of Wives;" but it was not till July 1843, that he formally received a revelation on the subject authorizing polygamy.

When the "revelation" became public, considerable indignation was felt even in Nauvoo, and serious disturbances took place. Several women whom Joseph and his apostles had taken a, fancy to, and sought to will over under the new revelation, declined their proposals, and disclosed them to their relatives. These circumstances roused into activity a latent spirit of resistance which had for some time been secretly gathering force. The malcontents felt themselves strong enough to beard the lion in his own den; they renounced Mormonism, and even ventured to establish an opposition paper, called the Expositor, and published in its first number the affidavits of sixteen women, who alleged that Smith, Rigdon, Young, and others, had invited them to enter into a secret and illicit connection under the title of spiritual marriage. This open and dangerous rebellion was put down forthwith by the application of physical force. Joseph Smith ordered a body of his disciples to “abate the nuisance," and they razed the office of the Expositor to the ground. The proprietors fled for their lives, and when they reached a place of safety sued out a writ from the legal authorities of Illinois against Joseph and Hyrum Smith as abettors of the riot. The execution of the warrant was resisted by the people and troops of Nauvoo, under the Prophet's authority. On this the governor of the state called out the militia to enforce the law; and the ultimate result was that the Prophet and his brother Hyrum were thrown into prison at Carthage. After a short time it began to be rumored, however, that the governor of the state was desirous of letting the two Smiths escape, and thereupon a band of "roughs," about 200 in number, broke into the jail, June 27, 1844, and shot them (see accounts of eye-witnesses in Burton, appendix 3; Mackay, page 189 sq.).

The sudden removal of their leader and the manner of his death caused great agitation among the Mormons, and they were much confused for a while. This status led the people of Illinois to the belief that the sect would rapidly be broken up. The opinion seemed at first reasonable. There was much disputing as to the successorship, and it seemed very likely that the Church would thus be shattered into fragments. There were four claimants, and it was doubted whether any one of them could be persuaded to yield. And yet order was soon brought out of all this chaos, and disastrous as this termination of his career was to Smith himself, it proved a most fortunate thing for the system which he founded. "The blood of the martyrs is the  seed of the Church." A halo of solemn and tender glory now encircles the memory of one who, whatever were his virtues or vices, stood greatly in need of this spiritual transfiguration. As Burton tells us, the Saints came to revere the name of Smith beyond that of any other name. They speak of him "with a respectful veneration, sotto voce, as Christians name the founder of their faith." Brigham Young had been Joseph's favorite. He was known to have been such by the apostolical college, of which he was chairman, and he was therefore chosen Joseph's successor by a unanimous vote of that body. The choice made by the highest council, the Mormons had been taught, no one should gainsay, and consequently it was accepted by the great majority of the inhabitants of Nauvoo, and approved of by a general Council of the Church, summoned about six weeks after Joseph's death. The other pretenders were excommunicated, and the council even ventured to "deliver over to Satan" the great Rigdon himself; one of the aspirants, although their sacred books declared him equal with the Prophet; who had, however, latterly shown a disposition to slight and humble him. The Mormons throughout the world acquiesced in all these decisions, and Brigham Young was established in the post of "seer, revelator, and president of the Latter-day Saints."

This manifestation of complete organization aroused the people of Illinois once more to a sense of the danger of constant strife with the settlers at Nauvoo. In 1845 the state Legislature revoked the charter given to the city of Nauvoo, while the citizens banded together for possible contingencies. Open and severe hostility against the Mormons was frequent, and henceforward it was evident that while they continued to inhabit Nauvoo they must live in a perpetual state of siege, and till their fields with a plough in one hand and a rifle in the other. Moreover, experience had shown that elements of disunion existed even among themselves. So long as they were established in any of the settled states they could not exclude unbelievers from among them. There must always be Gentile strangers who would intrude among the Saints for lucre's sake, and form a nucleus around which disappointed or traitorous members might rally and create internal conflict. This could only be avoided by the transplantation of the Mormon commonwealth beyond the reach of foreign contact. Actuated by these reasons, the leaders who met to deliberate on the steps demanded by the crisis same to a decision which, adventurous as it then seemed, has since proved no less wise than bold. They resolved to migrate in a body far  beyond the boundaries of the United States, and to interpose a thousand miles of wilderness between themselves and the civilized world. In the fastnesses of the Rocky Mountains, the Alps of North America, they determined to seek that freedom, civil and religious, which was denied them by their countrymen. In a hymn composed for the occasion, they express this Phocaean resolution as follows:

"We'll burst off all our fetters, and break the Gentile yoke;

For long it has beset us, but now it shall be broke.

No more shall Jacob low his neck;

Henceforth he shall be great and free

In Upper California.

Oh, that's the hand for me!

Oh, that's the land for me!" — (Hymns, 353.)

Their decision was announced to the Saints throughout the world by a General Epistle, which bears date January 20, 1846. It was also communicated to their hostile neighbors, who agreed to allow the Mormons time to sell their property, on condition that they should leave Nauvoo before the ensuing summer. A pioneer party of sixteen hundred persons started before the conclusion of winter, in the hope of reaching their intended settlement in time to prepare a reception for the main body by the close of autumn. Agricultural operations were commenced almost the instant they reached the shores of the Salt Lake. "The cheerfulness, intelligence, and zeal exhibited on all sides," it has been justly said, "were truly admirable. The world has never seen swifter, more active, more glad- hearted colonists than these singular Saints. It would be unfair to shut our eyes to such facts. In judging Mormonism, we must keep these constantly in view to prevent us from forming mere abstract and theoretical decisions, which will not in the least affect the future of Mormonism." Brigham himself arrived in the valley July 24, 1847, and the main body of the Mormons in the autumn of 1848. The Salt Lake City was soon founded; public buildings, including a tabernacle, or temporary place for public worship, promptly built; manufactories and shops were also soon reared, an emigration fund established, and in a little while settlers poured in from all parts of Europe and America; and perhaps a greater amount of physical comfort was enjoyed here than in any part of the world. As early as March, 1849, a convention was held at Salt Lake City, and a state organized under the name of Deseret, a word understood by the Mormons to signify " the land of the honey-bee" (Ether, Book of Mormon, chapter 1, § 3, page 518).

A Legislature was elected, and a Constitution framed and sent to Washington. Congress, however, refused to recognize the new state, and in September organized the country occupied by the Mormons into the Territory of Utah, of which Brigham Young was appointed governor by president Fillmore. District judges were also appointed by the federal government, buts these were looked upon with great suspicion and mistrust by the Saints, who finally drove them out of the country in 1851, and openly defied and subverted the laws of the United States. In 1852 the "celestial law of marriage," authorizing polygamy, was promulgated and at once acted upon, notwithstanding that in 1845 the heads of this self-same religious body had deemed it prudent to put forth a formal denial of any such phase of faith or practice in the following words: "Inasmuch as this Church of Christ has been reproached with the crimes of fornication and polygamy, we declare that we believe that one man should have but one wife, and one woman but one husband, except in the case of death, when either is at liberty to marry again."

In 1853 the cornerstone of the great Temple, the plan of which, with all its details, was "revealed" to president Young, was laid, so sure felt the Mormons that they had finally reached a spot where they could defy all opposition, and enjoy unmolested their most extravagant religious or social notions. The United States government had no disposition to interfere with these, but it felt itself outraged in the removal of its officers, and in 1854 a United States colonel arrived at Salt Lake City to become the successor of president Young as governor of the territory. This officer, however, encountered so much opposition that he found it expedient, after wintering in Salt Lake City without receiving the governorship, to formally resign his post, and he removed with his battalion of troops to California. No wonder that Young declared in a sermon to his people, "I am and will be governor, and no power can hinder it until the Lord Almighty says, 'Brigham, you need not be governor any longer.'" During the next three years the collisions between the United States officers and the Saints became more and more frequent, and in the spring of 1856 the whole of the former were forced to flee from the territory. A new appointment was finally made in 1857 by the Washington government, and the appointee, accompanied by 2500 picked United States troops, sent to enforce order and submission to the United States laws.

The Mormons were greatly exasperated against the federal government by this action, but were finally overawed; and after a proclamation granting pardon to all Mormons guilty of treachery, etc., the Saints submitted, and permanent peace was established. In 1871 some of the Mormon leaders  were indicted under the United States laws against bigamy, in order to force the Mormons to abandon the institution of polygamy. More recently president Young himself has been indicted, and mainly for the self-same purpose, though avowedly on a charge of conspiracy and murder, and has escaped trial only because of some informality or uncertainty respecting the constitution of the court. By the Saints this result is looked upon as of providential interference. The proposition, it is asserted, has been semi- officially made, as from him, to abandon polygamy, on condition that the United States government recognize the legitimacy of children heretofore born of polygamous marriages. This does not seem, however, in harmony with their printed declarations in very recent times. The Mormons in these assert their resolve to resist to the death all attempts to put down polygamy, and their firm belief that God will work miracles for them, as for his ancient saints, the Jews. (See Millennial Star, volume 32, passim, esp. page 328. Comp. Rae, Westward by Rail, page 116.) Mr. T.B.H. Stenhouse, formerly a Mormon elder and missionary, and editor of a Mormon paper, has issued a history of Mormonism, whose revelations of the internal workings of Mormonism are made impressive by the calmness and moderation of his language, and the official and indisputable evidence which he has with assiduity gathered to sustain his revelations. He insists upon it that the Mormons are not really in favor of polygamy, and will gladly give it up if they can be made to see that it is not an essential religious ordinance. By others, however, equally well informed, it is rumored that Brigham Young is preparing for another exodus of the entire community to regions yet more remote from the incursion of civilization, which has so completely changed the character of Salt Lake City in the last five years.

It will be borne in mind that in 1869 the Pacific Railroad opened up the country, so that it is no longer cut off from civilization. Gentiles take up their residence in Salt Lake City freely, and have not the fear of their lives which was formerly, justly or unjustly, entertained; missionaries are preaching the Gospel of Jesus Christ in the midst of the people, and there is no dread of any power able to stop them. Several Protestant Christian churches have been organized there (1872), and a recent movement among the Mormons themselves, begun in 1869, and denominated as a body the "Church of Zion," and recently re-christened "The Liberal Institute," repudiates the authority of Brigham Young and the hierarchy; and though, like all reactions from priestly authority, its tendency is unmistakably towards flagrant infidelity, for it advocates freedom of thought and action, it is nevertheless a sign of the weakening of  the entire system. See Rae, Westward by Rail, page 157 sq.; Ollivant, A Breeze from the Great Salt Lake, pages 82-90; Stenhouse, chapter 55 sq.

II. Sacred Writings of the Mormons. —

(1.) Their most important publication is of course the Book of Mormon, a work which, as it professes to be a new and more recent revelation than the Bible, is placed above the latter in import and value. Indeed, it really constitutes the Mormon Bible. In its published form it is a duodecimo volume of 563 pages of small print. (The edition here referred to came to us from Mr. Young himself, and was printed at Salt Lake City in 1871.) It is divided, in imitation of the Old Testament, into fifteen books, of unequal length, bearing the names of their supposed authors-Nephi (comp. 2Ma 1:36), Jacob, Enos, and the like-and professing to have been written (see page 619) at different periods, each book being divided into chapters and numbered paragraphs. We insert a list of contents for fuller information:

FIRST BOOK OF NEPHI.

Language of the Record. Promises to the Gentiles.

Nephi's Abridgment.

Two Churches. Lehli's Dream.

The work of the Father to commence.

Lehi departs into the wilderness.

A man in white robes Nephi slayeth Laban. (John).

Sariah complains of Lehi's Vision.

Nephites come to knowledge.

Contents of the brass plates.

Rod of Iron. Ishmael goes with Nephi.

The sons of Lehi take wives.

Nephi's brethren rebel, and bind him.

Director found (ball).

Nephi broke his bow.

Lehi's dream of the tree, rod, etc.

Directors work by faith.

Ishmael died.

Messiah and John prophesied of.

Lehi and Nephi threatened.

Nephi commanded to build a ship.

Olive Branches broken off.

Nephi's Vision of Mary.

Nephi about to be worshipped by his brethren.

Do. the Crucifixion of Christ.

Do. darkness and earthquake.

Ship finished and entered.

Great abominable church.

Dancing in the ship.

Discovery of the promised land.

Nephi bound; ship driven back.

Bible spoken of.

Arrived on the promised land.

Book of Mormon and Holy Ghost promised.

Plates of ore made.

Other books come forth.

Zenos, Neum, and Zenock.

Bible and Book of Mormon one.

Isaiah's Writings.

Holy One of Israel.

SECOND BOOK OF NEPHI.

Lehi to his sons.

Christ shall show himself.

Opposition in all things.

Signs of Christ, birth and death.

Adam fell that men might be.

Joseph saw our day.

Whisper from the dust, book sealed up.

A choice seer.

Writings grow together.

Priestcraft forbidden.

Prophet promised to the Lamanites.

Sealed book to be brought forth.

Joseph's prophecy on brass plates.

Three witnesses behold the book.

Lehi buried.

The words [read this, I pray thee].

Nephi's life sought.

Nephi separated from Laman.

Seal up the book again.

Temple built.

Their priests shall contend.

Skin of blackness.

Teach with their learning and deny the Holy Ghost. Priests, etc., consecrated.

Make other plates.

Rob the poor.

Isaiah's words (by Jacob).

A Bible, a Bible.

Angels to a devil.

Men judged of the Books.

Spirits and bodies reunited.

White and a delightsome people.

Baptism.

No kings upon this land.

Work commenced among all people.

Isaiah prophesieth.

Rod of the stem of Jesse.

Lamb of God baptized.

Seed of Joseph perish not.

Baptism by water and Holy Ghost.

Law of Moses kept.

BOOK OF JACOB.

Nephi anointed a king.

A righteous branch from Joseph.

Nephi died.

Nephites and Lamanites.

Lamanites shall scourge you.

More than one wife forbidden.

Another branch.

Wild fruit had overcome.

Trees, waves, and mountains obey us.

Lord of the vineyard wept.

Branches overcome the roots.

Jews looked beyond the mark.

Wild branches plucked off.

Tame olive-tree.

Sherem the Antichrist.

Nethermost part of the vineyard.

A sign, Sherem smitten.

Enos takes the plates from his father.

Fruit laid up against the season.

THE BOOK OF ENOS.

Enos, thy sins are forgiven.

Records threatened by Lamanites.

Lamanites eat raw meat.

THE BOOK OF JABOM.

Nephites waxed strong.

Fortify cities.

Lamanites drink blood.

Plates delivered to Omni.

THE BOOK OF OMNI.

Plates given to Amaron.

Corialntumr discovered.

Plates given to Chemish.

His parents came from the Tower.

Mosiah warned to flee.

Zarahemla discovered.

Plates delivered to King Benjamin.

Engravings on a stone.

THE WORDS OF MORMON.

False Christs and Prophets.

BOOK OF MOSIAH.

Mosiah made king, and received.

Beggars not denied. Sons and daughters.

The plates of brass, sword, and director.

Mosiah began to reign. Ammon, etc., bound and imprisoned.

King Benjamin teacheth the people. Limhi's proclamation.

Their tent-doors towards the temple.

Twenty-four plates of gold. Seer and Translator.

Coming of Christ foretold.

RECORD OF ZENIFF.

A battle fought.

King Limhi baptized.

King Lamanl died.

Priest and teachers labor.

Noah made king. Alma saw an angel.

Abinadi the prophet.

Alma fell (dumb).

Resurrection.

King Mosiah's sons preach to the Lamanites.

Alma believed Abinadi.

Abinadi cast into prison and scourged with fagots.

Translation of Records.

Plates delivered by Limhi.

Waters of Mormon.

Translated by two stones.

The daughters of the Lamanites stolen by King People back to the Tower.

Records given to Alma.

Noah's priests.

Judges appointed.

Records on plates of ore.

King Mosiah died.

Last tribute of wine.

Alma died.

Lamanites' deep sleep.

Kings of Nephi ended.

THE BOOK OF ALMA.

Nehor slew Gideon.

Anti-Nephi-Lehies removed to Jershon, called Ammolites.

 Amlici made king.

 Amlici slain in battle.

 Amlicites painted red.

 Tremendous battle.

  Alma baptized in Sidon.

 Antichrist, Korihor.

 Alma's preaching.

 Korihor struck dumb.

 Alma ordained elders.

 The devil in the form of an angel.

 Commanded to meet often.

 Alma saw tan angel.

 Korihor trodden down.

 Amulek saw an angel.

 Alma's mission to Zoramites.

 Lawyers questioning Amulek.

 Rameumptom (holy stand).

 Coins named.

 Alma on hill Onidah.

 Zeezrom the lawyer.

 Alma on taith.

 Zeezrom trembles.

 Prophecy of Zenos.

 Election spoken of.

 Prophecy of Zenock.

 Melchizedek's priesthood.

 Amulek's knowledge of Christ.

 Alma and Amulek stoned.

 Records burned.

 Charity recommended.

 Prison rent.

 Same spirit possess your body.

 Zeezrom healed and baptized.

 Believers cast out.

 Nehor's desolation.

 Alma to Helaman.

 Lamanites converted.

 Plates given to Helaman.

 Flocks scattered at Sebus.

 24 plates and directors.

 Ammon smote off arms.

 Gazelem, a stone (secret).

 Ammon and King Lamoni.

 Liahona, or compass.

 King Lamoni fell.

 Alma to Shiblon.

 Ammon and the Queen.

 Alma to Corianton.

  King and Queen prostrate.

 Unpardoilable sin.

 Aaron, etc.

 delivered.

 Resurrection.

 Jerusalem built.

 Restoration.

 Preaching in Jerusalem.

 Justice in punishment.

 Lamoni's father converted.

 If Adam took the tree of life.

 Land Desolation and Bountiful.

 Mercy rob justice.

 Moroni's stratagem.

 Anti-Nephi-Lehies.

 Slaughter of Lamanites.

 General council.

 Moroni's speech to Zerahemnah.

 Swords buried.

 1005 massacred.

 Prophecy of a soldier.

 Lamanites perish by fire.

 Lamanites' covenant of peace.

 Slavery forbidden.

 Alma's prophecy 400 years after Christ.

 Ammoron's answer.

 Lamanites made drunk.

 Dwindle in unbelief.

 Moroni's stratagem.

 Alma's strange departure.

 Helaman's epistle to Moroni.

 Amalickiah leadeth away the people, destroyeth the church.

 Helaman's stratagem.

 Mothers taught faith.

 Standard of Moroni.

 Lamanites surrendered.

 Joseph's coat rent.

 City of Antiparah taken.

 Jacob's prophecy of Joseph's seed.

 City of Cumeni taken.

 200 of the 2000 fainted.

 Fevers in the land, plants and roots for diseases.

 Prisoners rebel, slain.

  Manti taken by stratagem.

 Amalickiah's plot.

 Moroni to the governor.

 The king stabbed.

 Governor's answer.

 Amalickiah marries the Queen, and is acknowledged king.

 King Pachus slain.

 Cords and ladders prepared.

 Nephihah taken.

 Fortifications by Moroni.

 Teancum's stratagem; slain.

 Ditches filled with dead bodies.

 Peace established.

 Moronihah made commander.

 Amalickiah's oath.

 Pahoran appointed judge.

 Helaman dies.

 Army against king-men.

 Sacred things; Shiblon.

 Amalickiah slain.

 Moroni died.

 Ammoron made king.

 5400 emigrated north.

 Bountiful fortified.

 Ships built by Hagoth.

 Dissensions.

 Sacred things committed to Helaman; Shiblon died.

 2000 young men.

 Moroni's epistle toAmmoron.

THE BOOK OF HELAMAN.

Pahoran died.

Alma and Nephi surrounded with fire.

Pahoran appointed judge.

Kishkumen slew Pahoainln.

Angels administer.

Pacumeni appointed judge.

Cezoram and son murdered.

Zarahemla taken.

Gadianton's robbers.

Pacumeni killed.

 Gadianton's robbers destroyed.

Coriantumr slain.

Lamanites surrendered.

Nephi's prophecy.

Heliaman appointed judge.

Gadianton's robbers are judges.

Secret signs discovered, and Kishkumen stabbed.

Chief judge slain.

Gadianton fled.

Seantum detected.

Emigration northward.

Keys of the kingdom.

Cement houses.

Nephi taken away by the spirit.

Many books and records.

Helaman died.

Famine in the land.

Nephi rmade judge.

Gadianton's band destroyed.

Nephites become wicked.

Famine removed.

Nephi gave the judgment-seat to Cezoram.

Samuel's prophecy.

Tools lost.

Nephi and Lehi preached to the Lamanites.

Two days and a night, light.

Sign of the crucifixion.

8000 baptized.

Samuel stoned, etc.

Angels appeared.

BOOK OF NEPHI.

Lachoneus chief judge.

The Twelve taught the multitude.

Nephi receives the Records.

Nephi's strange departure.

Baptism, HolyGhost, and fire.

No darkness at night.

Disciples made white.

Lamranites became white.

Jesus came, second time.

 Giddianhi to Lachoneus.

Faith great.

Gidgiddoni chief judge.

Christ breaks bread again.

Giddianhi slain.

Miracle, bread and wine.

Zemnarihah hanged.

Gentiles destroyed (Isaiah).

Robbers surrendered.

Zion established.

Mormon abridges the Records.

From Gentiles, to your seed.

Sign, Father's work commenced.

Church began to be broken up.

He shall be marred.

Government of the land destroyed.

Gentiles destroyed (Isaiah).

New Jerusalem built.

Chief judge murdered.

Work commenced among all the tribes.

Divided into tribes.

Nephi raised the dead.

Isaiah's words.

Sign of the Crucifixion.

Saints did arise.

Cities destroyed, earthquakes, darkness, etc.

Malachi's prophecy.

Faith tried by the Book of Mormon.

Law of Moses fulfilled.

Christ appeared to Nephites.

Children's tongues loosed.

The dead raised.

Print of the nails.

Baptism and Holy Ghost.

Nephi and others called.

All things commonl Baptism commanded.

Christ appeared third time.

Doctrine of Christ.

Moses's Church.

Christ the end of the law.

Three Nephites tarry.

 Other sheep spoken of.

The Twelve caught up.

Blessed are the Gentiles.

Change upon their bodies.

Gentile wickedness on the land of Joseph.

Disciples raise the dead.

Zarahemla rebuilt.

Isaiah's words fulfilled.

Other disciples ordained in their stead.

Jesus healed the sick.

Christ blessed children.

Nephi died; Amos kept the Records in his stead.

Little ones encircled with fire.

Amos died, and his son Amos kept the Records.

Christ administered the sacrament.

Prisons rent by the three.

Christ taught his disciples.

Secret combinations.

Names of the Twelve.

Amaron hid Records.

BOOK OF MORMON.

Three disciples taken away.

Mormon repented of his oath and took command.

Mormon forbidden to preach.

Coming forth of Records.

Mormon appointed leader.

Records hid in Cumorah.

Samuel's prophecy fulfilled.

230,000 Nephites slain.

Mormon makes a Record.

Shall not get gain by the plates.

Lands divided.

The Twelve shall judge.

These things shall come forth out of the earth.

Desolation taken.

Women and children sacrificed.

The state of the world.

Miracles cease, unbelief.

Mormon took the Records hid in Shim.

 Disciples go into all the world and preach.

Language of the Book.

BOOK OF ETUER.

Twenty-four plates found.

Jared murdered, and Akish reigned in his stead.

Jared cried unto the Lord.

Jared went down to the valley of Nimrod.

Names of animals.

Poisonous serpents.

Deseret, honey-bee.

Riplakish's cruel leign.

Barges built.

Morianton anointed king.

Decree of God, choice land.

Poisonous serpents destroyed.

Free from bondage.

Four years in tents at Moriancumer.

Many wicked kings.

Moroni on Faith.

Lord talked three hours.

Miracles by Faith.

Barges like a dish.

Moroni saw Jesus.

Eight vessels, sixteen stones.

New Jerusalem spoken of.

Etuer cast out.

Lord touched the stones.

Records finished in the cavity of a rock.

Finger of the Lord seen.

Jared's brother saw the Lord.

Secret combinations.

War in all the land.

Two stones given.

King Shared murdered by his High-priest; the High priest was murdered by Lib.

Stones sealed up.

Went aboard of vessels.

Furious wind blew.

344 days' passage.

Lib slain by Coriantumr.

Orihah anointed king.

 Dead bodies cover the land, and none to bury them.

King Shule taken captive.

Shule's son slew Noah.

2,000,00 of men slain.

Jared carries his father away captive.

Hill Ramah.

Cries rend the air.

The daughter of Jared danced.

Slept on their swords.

Coriantumr slew Shiz.

Jared anointed king by the hand of wickedness.

Do. fell to the earth.

Records hid by Ether.

BOOK OF MORONI.

Christ's words to the Twelve. Sufferings of women and children. Manner of Ordination. Order of Sacrament. Cannot recommend them to God. Order of Baptism. Faith, Hope, Charity. Moroni to the Lamanites. Baptism of little children. 420 years since the Sign. Women fed on their husbands' flesh. Records sealed up (Moroni). Gifts of the Spirit. Daughters murdered and eat. God's Word shall hiss forth.

With the history, as will be noted from the synopsis furnished above, are mixed up long exhortations, visions, parables, religions meditations. These are in language imitating that of the English Bible, and some 300 passages, including large portions of Isaiah, the Sermon on the Mount, and some verses of St. Paul's Epistles, bear such strong resemblance that non- Mormon critics claim these passages to be directly copied, sometimes with slight variations which do not improve the sense (see Stenhouse, pages 538-543). The narrative, as a whole, is most tedious; there is not a trace of elevated, poetic, or religious feeling. The style is that of an uneducated person, glaring grammatical errors appearing on nearly every page, besides gross absurdities and anachronisms. Beyond the assertions that the book is  the work of inspired writers teaching true religion, and that revelations, miracles, and gifts of tongues are ever with the faithful, few of the doctrinal peculiarities of Mormonism can be gleaned from it. Materialistic notions of the Deity are hinted at (Ethler, chapter 1, § 8, pages 521, 522), and infant baptism is forbidden (Moroni, chapter 8:§ 2, page 557), but with these exceptions it is free from heretical statements or novel dogmas. It asserts the perpetuity of miracles in the Church, and on this account the Irvingites were induced to send a deputation in the early stages of Mormonism to express their sympathy with Joseph Smith. It is also most explicit in its condemnation of polygamy and freemasonry. It will be remembered from the account furnished by Mr. Pratt of the early history of this strange work, that the original copy, engraved on golden plates, was in a tongue then unknown to the world, and that by the aid of the "Urim and Thummim"; the English version was obtained. According to the Mormon authority, the book was placed in Smith's hands in the reformed Egyptian language, and we are also told that the way in which Smith translated was as follows: He sat behind a blanket hung across the room to keep the sacred records from profane eyes, and read off, by the help of his "Urim and Thummim," to Oliver Cowdery, of whom we have had occasion to speak before, who wrote down what the invisible "Prophet" gave as a translation, Smith himself being, as he confesses, but a "poor writer." A farmer by the name of Martin Harris supplied Smith with the necessary funds to get the work printed. But before he so supplied Smith he went to New York to consult the late Prof. Anthon regarding the correctness of the Prophet's translation, and took with him a copy of the characters on one of the plates.

The Mormons assert that the professor declared the characters to be Egyptian, Chaldaic, Assyrian, and Arabic, and asked to see the original (Pearl of Great Price, page 45). But, according to Gentile authority, Prof. Anthon pronounced the extract furnished him to consist "of all kinds of crooked characters, disposed in columns, and evidently prepared by some person who had before him at the time a book containing various alphabets. Greek and Hebrew letters, crosses and flourishes, Roman letters, inverted or placed sideways, were arranged and placed in perpendicular columns, and the whole ended in a rude delineation of a circle divided into various compartments decked with various strange marks, and evidently copied after the Mexican calendar given by Humboldt, but copied in such a way as not to betray the source whence it was derived," and warned Harris against being the victim of roguery (Letter in Mackey, pages 32-34). A facsimile alleged to be identical with that shown to Prof. Anthon, is published in the  Millennial Star (15:540), and is here reproduced. It will be noticed by the philological student that these characters have no resemblance to any existing ones, and are like nothing else but the scratches made by children for amusement when they begin to learn writing. Harris, however, lost not his faith by Prof. Anthon's persuasions, and, returning to Smith, continued to assist the preparation of the English version of the Book of Mormon until about 116 pages had been completed. The MS. of these Harris one day took to his house to show to his wife, probably to satisfy her that the money which he was furnishing for Smith's support, and which he was expecting to supply for its publication, was well-spent. Herself a non- believer, she connived with others for the secret removal of the MS. On this the "Prophet" produced a "revelation" ordering him not to retranslate the portion lost in the English version, lest the wicked, finding the two translations to differ, should scoff at God's work (Doctr. and Cov. 26, page 178 sq.). Shortly after Harris was moreover superseded in his position as scribe by Oliver Cowdery, but he remained faithful to Smith; and when the work was ready for publication he furnished, as we have stated, all needed pecuniary aid, having even, in obedience to a revelation (Doctr. and Cov. 44, 3, pages 194-5), sold his farm to procure means for this purpose. In 1830, finally, the Book of Mormon appeared, accompanied, as has been stated above by Mr. Pratt, with a declaration from eleven persons that they had seen the original plates from which this version had been prepared. This statement was necessary, as these were the only persons so privileged. No other human being has ever seen them. Like Macpherson's Ossianic MSS.. they have never been forthcoming, however loudly demanded, and of late years all knowledge of them has become traditional. The Mormons declare that no one else was allowed to see them; and Joseph himself informs us that after he had "accomplished by them what was required at his hand,"... "according to arrangements, the messenger called for them, and he [the angel] has them in his charge until this day" (Autobiog. chapter 14).

Controversial writers against Mormonism are unanimous in discarding this whole story of angel visits and gold plates as a pure invention, and brand Joseph Smith as an impostor. Yet there seems to be no ground for such a harsh judgment. That Smith had at one time in his possession metallic plates of some kind, with engraved characters upon them, there appears no reason to doubt, if human testimony be accepted as evidence. Where and  how he got the plates which he exhibited to a number of persons, and whether the Book of Mormon is a veritable interpretation of the characters on those plates, are very different questions. Again, whether or not the narrative presented is true and of any importance to the world as a subject of faith, are still different questions. Certain it is that Mormon apologists have thus far failed to account on reasonable principles for the close resemblance of portions of their inspired writings which they claim to be taken from speeches, exhortations, and sermons said to have been delivered by ancient American prophets and apostles, who of course never saw, or could see, the English Bible as it now exists in its modern translation, and for the still more strange appearance in their writings of the errors of translation existing in the English version made 1200 years after the death of the last of these American seers (comp. Stenhouse, pages 538- 545). Besides, Gentile polemics have brought forward evidence to show that, with the exception of certain illiterate and ungrammatical interpolations bearing on religious matters, the so-called Book of Mormon was really borrowed or copied nearly verbatim from a MS. romance written by all ordained minister named Solomon Spaulding, who was born at Ashford, Conn., in 1761, and was educated at Dartmouth College (class of 1785), and who died in 1816 at Amity, Pa.

It is unnecessary to go over the arguments pro and con. Suffice it to say, that anti-Mormons generally think them conclusive, while the “Saints" consider the whole story of Spaulding's MS. romance a scandalous fabrication. There is unquestionable evidence that the said Spaulding did write something about the ancient inhabitants of America; that his MS. was intrusted for publication in 1812 to a bookseller named Paterson at Pittsburgh, Pa.; and that Spaulding dying before publication, the MS. remained in Pittsburgh, where a copy of it was made by Sidney Rigdon, then one of Paterson's compositors, but afterwards the associate of Joseph Smith in the promulgation of Mormon doctrines; and it is furthermore asserted by one of Spaulding's brothers, from his recollection of portions of the MS., that it was identical with the Book of Mormon, and that the latter was indeed the bona-fide work of his deceased brother; this statement being sustained by several of Mr. Spaulding's friends from their remembrance of the readings to which they had frequently listened. It is therefore conjectured by anti-Mormonists that Rigdon (into whose hands Spaulding's romance is supposed to have fallen for some time) gave it to his new associate to further his purposes when he joined him in 1829, and that the latter in whose soul there may have been some rude and gross religious notions and feelings devised the  ungrammatical interpolations. This theory acquires some probability from the fact that these religious passages do not refer to the Old-World faiths and the practices of an ancient ritual, but to quite modern questions, such as interested the people of Western New York about 1830. Calvinism, Universalism, Methodism, Millenarianism, Roman Catholicism are discussed, if not in name, yet in reality. But those who accept such statements as the true solution of the origin of this book must necessarily conclude that Joseph Smith was "a deliberate falsifier and wilful impostor." The most incisive writer on this subject — John Hyde, jun. (Mormonism, its Leaders and Disciples), formerly a Mormon elder — unhesitatingly announces this as his own conclusion. Yet there is no good ground for such a position if it be considered that the Book of Mormon was in preparation for publication when Smith first met Rigdon, and that he was already noted as the discoverer of the gold plates. We cite the comments on this great question by Mr. Stenhouse, who, as he was himself once a believer, is most likely to know whereof he speaks. He says:

"To conclude that there was 'wilful' imposture in the origin of Mormonism is, in an argumentative sense, to ‘take arms against a sea of troubles' to which there is no limit. There is, however, an easy solution of the difficulty respecting the origin of the book — i.e., to admit honest credulity in Joseph Smith, in the persons who 'witnessed unto the world' of that which they saw, and in all that follows in the history of the Mormon movement. Probably, if Mr. Hyde were now to write on the subject, while he would undoubtedly preserve the same powerful arguments against the divinity of the book, he would conclude that Joseph Smith was after all only an extraordinary 'spirit medium,' and had been subjected to all the vagaries and caprices of that peculiar condition. In this solution of the difficulty respecting Joseph's claims there is a perfect consistency, and it harmonizes completely with the testimony both of the orthodox and the heterodox. It admits the claim of honesty in Joseph Smith and in his 'witnesses,' and equal honesty in those who have rejected their testimony and denounced the folly of their assertions. In brief, when Joseph Smith said that he had visions, dreams, and revelations, it is best to allow that he probably had all that experience: but when he clothed his communications with the sanctity of absolute and divine truth, the acceptance or rejection of which was to be 'the salvation or damnation of the world,' it was simply tile operation and assertion of that yet uncomprehended mysterious influence that has been experienced by both good and bad men in all ages and in all countries  within the historical ken of man. With the developments which have followed, the life of the Mormon Prophet is easily understood. He was but the vehicle of 'spirit communication,' and when he erred it was not intentional imposture or deliberate fraud, but in the native honesty of his simple nature he believed too much... It does not seem possible that he could have borne up through his whole life of persecution, and have lived and died maintaining the truth of his story, if the book had been a fraud... That some of those ancient inhabitants may have made and engraved plates, and that they did so for a purpose whatever that might be is very possible. The relics of sculpture and painting suggest also the probability of engraving. Other persons besides Joseph Smith have discovered in the ground similar plates, bearing evidence of a great antiquity, and as time rolls on there may yet be many similar discoveries. There need be no difficulty, then, in accepting Joseph's story of finding the plates; it is what is claimed to be the contents of the plates that is incredible. If no living, person fabricated for Joseph Smith the Book of Mormon, and if Joseph did not use the manuscript of Solomon Spaulding, the Mormon may very properly ask, 'Who, then, was the author of the book?' To this query the Book of Abraham is the answer. (See below, 3.)

In the preceding chapter, the Prophet's 'translation' of the papyrus found with the Egyptian mummies is evidently untrue; yet Joseph Smith sat with his amanuensis, and, by 'the gift of God,' believed he was giving a truthful translation. The scientist says that the whole story is untrue; that the Prophet's version of the hieroglyphics is a perfect romance; that the hieroglyphics had no more allusion to the Abraham of Mosaic history than they had to do with Abraham the martyred president of the United States. When Joseph Smith translated the Book of Mormon by the means of his Urim and Thummim, the 'reformed Egyptian' was evidently not transformed before his eyes into the translated text, or 'the gift and power of God' used peculiarly bad English. lie gazed upon that Urim and Thummim until his mind became psychologized, and the impressions that he received he dictated to his scribe. With such a conclusion, the anachronisms of the book, the quotations from the Old and New Testaments, and the language of modern preachers and writers are accounted for. That there is such a mental condition in human life as clairvoyance, in which persons are strangely operated upon, and can mentally perceive what to the natural eye is unseen, is a belief as old as the history of man; and that, when the mind is pyschologized by a condition of its own, or by the operation of external influences, singular impressions or revelations are had, few people today  dispute. That Joseph Smith was in these experiences one of the most remarkable men that ever lived, those outside of Mormonism altogether, who knew him intimately, testify.

He believed that his gifts were divine, and his impressions were revelations from the Almighty Creator. To insist that there were deliberate imposture and deliberate falsehood at the origin of Mormonism is to challenge the veracity and honesty of the hundreds and thousands of persons who accept that faith and who testify that they know of its truth. It is more rational and consistent to admit that what such a body of people allege that they have experienced is probably true in statement, than to deny it and brand it as imposture; but it does not follow that the interpretation which any of them put upon their experience is itself true. They may be fully persuaded that they have had visions, dreams, the ministering of angels, and have heard the 'voice of God,' all witnessing to the truth of the divinity of Mormonism, for all this has been asserted again and again by very many others besides Joseph Smith — men, and women too, who have claimed to have received divine missions. Outside of all religious enthusiasm, also, there are tens of thousands of men and women — sober, reliable, and truthful in every relation and business of life with as unchangeable convictions as ever the Mormons had that they have personally experienced all these extraordinary phenomena. The trouble with the Mormons and with all this class of believers is, not in what they have experienced, but the after-interpretation that they may have put upon it... There have been multitudes of persons in the world who have believed and asserted that to them, and to them only, God gave visions, dreams, angel-visits, the power of healing the sick and 'casting out devils;' and they have declared that these were proofs of the heavenly origin of the faith which they proclaimed, and this it is that the Saints have been taught by the modern apostles to regard as special and particular to them, while it has been a peculiarity common to the religious experience of all the world, and is an evidence of nothing more than a certain condition of mind that renders such manifestations possible with persons adapted naturally to receive them... That Joseph thought Moroni and some of those ancient personages whom he mentions in his biography appeared to him is no doubt true; that they used him for their purposes Spiritualists all believe; and when the origin of some of the great religions of the world is considered, there is not much cause for wonder that those persons who have accepted Mormonism, with all its crudities, should have honestly believed it. Millions have accepted Mohammed and his visions; many millions more have lived and died in the faith of Buddha; Confucius has  swayed a spiritual empire from ages long before the Christian era; and by these and other founders of religious systems, and by manly of their disciples, visions and revelations, gifts and miraculous powers, have all been claimed" (Rocky Mountain Saints, pages 546-555).

To this solution of the question we are disposed substantially to accede, with this exception, that we would refer the mental impression of visions, revelations, etc., to the hallucinations of an excited imagination rather than to clairvoyance or any other so-called spiritual influence or communication.

It may not be out of place here to add that Joseph Smith, while discredited among his own townsmen, elicited the testimony that from an early period he was regarded as a visionary and a fanatic. This fact is of the utmost importance as affording a clew to his real character, and an explanation of that otherwise unaccountable tenacity of purpose and moral heroism displayed in the midst of fierce persecution. A mere impostor — i.e., a person who did not, in some sense or other, partly believe in his own mission, but who, on the contrary, felt that he was simply the liar and cheat that people called him would have broken down under such a tempest of opposition and hate as Smith's course excited.

(2.) The chief authority on Mormon doctrine is The Book of Doctrine and Covenants of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, selected from the Revelations of God, by Joseph Smith, president. "This work is to the Mormon Bible," says Burton (page 447 sq.), "what the Vedanta is to the Vedas, the Talmud to the O.T., the Traditions to the Gospel, and the Ahadis to the Koran — a necessary supplement of amplifications and explanations." The first edition, published in 1833, differs much from the later ones, and was subsequently suppressed. The work consists of two distinct parts: pages 1-64 contain seven lectures on faith, originally delivered before a class of elders at Kirtland, and it seems probable that they were written by Rigdon, who was really the theological founder, though he is only recognised as the literary assistant (Doctr. and Co). sec. 2). In them are some very curious statements; and it is believed that whatever there is in it of materialism was introduced by Rigdon, and with it many other strange departures from the theology of the Book of Mormon. Thus, e.g., it is inferred in the Doctr. and Cov., from Heb 11:3, that faith is "the principle of power existing in the bosom of God by which the worlds were framed, and that if this principle or attribute were taken from the Deity, he would cease to exist" (Lecture 1:13-17, page 3). Again:  "When a man works by faith, he works by mental exertion instead of physical force. It is by words, instead of exerting his physical powers, with which every being works by faith" (Lecture 7:3, page 55). Many other peculiar doctrines are here set forth. The second part, entitled Covenants and Commandments, consists of the revelations given to Smith at various times, and is evidently by a different hand from the Lectures. The style and grammar betray the editor of the English version of the Book of Mormon. The Covenants and Commandments resemble in form the Koran: both works contain divine revelations; much in both is only of temporary interest, and both afford undesigned materials for the life of their authors. But all the merits of the Koran are absent and all its defects present in the work of Joseph Smith. The revelations were given to a great number of persons, but always through the medium of Joseph Smith. They refer to various subjects: the organization, worship, and hierarchy of the Church; instructions in faith and morals, prophecies, visions, parables, interpretations of Scripture, directions to individuals about their acts, preachings, journeyings, for the promotion of the faith, and concerning the affairs and needs, spiritual and temporal, of the Church. There are also two addresses of the Prophet to the Saints in Nauvoo, delivered in writing only; minutes of the High Council (February 17, 1834); declarations of the Church on marriage and governments, and an account of the martyrdom of Joseph Smith and his brother. Those sections relating to the organization of the Church and the duties of the ministry are placed first, then the portions chiefly treating of faith and practice; lastly, those that relate mainly to individuals and to temporary circumstances.

(3.) Many other revelations, translations, prophecies, addresses, etc., of Smith were published in the periodicals of the sect, all of which are regarded as of authority. Some of these have been collected into a pamphlet, entitled The Pearl of Great Price, being a choice Selection from the Great Revelations, Translations, and Narrations of Joseph Smith (Liverpool, 1851). In this book is set forth the theory that Mormonism is the revival of the primitive religion revealed to Adam (see also Doctr. and Cov. Lecture 2, page 8 sq.; Covenants and Comn. 3:1829, page 78). A similar theory is found in the Koran. There also appears a translation, with facsimiles, of some Egyptian papyrus rolls, procured from a travelling showman. Smith declared these rolls to be written by Abraham, narrating his stay in Egypt. An eminent French Egyptologist, M. Deveria, of the Museum of the Louvre at Paris, before whom the facsimiles were laid,  showed that they represent the resurrection of Osiris, a funerary disk, and a painting from a funerary MS. This deviation of M. Deveria's translation from Smith's would naturally again lead to the supposition that the would- be prophet intentionally played off a fictitious translation as an exact rendering of the original papyri. This theory need not, however, be espoused, as has been well shown by Mr. Stenhouse: "With the Prophet's story of the supposed Book of Abraham placed side by side with the translation of the papyrus by the scientist, the reader may possibly conclude that Joseph Smith imposed upon the credulity of the Saints, and hence that the claim throughout this work that Joseph was sincere is here unsupported. The author, notwithstanding, still clings to the assertion that Joseph believed sincerely that he was inspired, and the pride with which he gave this translation to the world supports that conclusion. Had he ever doubted the correctness of his translation, he never would have given to the public the facsimile of the characters and his translation of them. Joseph Smith at this time was over thirty years of age, and had passed through too rough an experience to have risked his reputation upon anything about which he had the slightest doubt. If the translation of the scientist is correct, and it bears upon its face evidence to that effect, then Joseph was as much deceived as many others have been before and since who have laid claim to the possession of divine and supernatural powers and the receiving of revelations." Those who may be interested in these Egyptian antiquities and the variability of the two translators will do well to consult Stenhouse, pages 512 to 519. The Pearl of Great Price contains also two different accounts of the creation, both made up out of Genesis 1. A translation is given of Mat 23:39; Mat 23:24 differing from the Authorized Version in containing additions to the extent of one third, entirely unsupported by any MS. or version. There are some other fragments, absurd but unimportant, except as showing the audacity of the author. The "translations" are portions of a translation of the whole Bible, said to exist in MS., in the hands of the Mormon leaders. Some further extracts have appeared in periodicals; the text is altered to suit Mormon doctrines, and large additions made. It is asserted by the Mormons that the Authorized Version has been fraudulently corrupted, and that this "translation" alone represents the original and true form. Other revelations are also said to exist in MS., to be published when the world is ripe for them.

III. Mormon Doctrines. — The creed of the Mormonists would naturally be supposed to be embodied in the Book of Mormon. This is not the case, however. The theology as there embodied differs but little from orthodox Trinitarianism. But this is by no means the real creed of the Latter-day Saints. Indeed, it is not an easy matter to set forth exactly and clearly the principles of Mormon theology. First, there is the theory of continuous revelation abiding in the Church (see Preface to Hymn-book [1856]; Compendium of the Faith and Doctrines, pages 43-47). Secondly, Mormon theology abounds in such an extraordinary admixture of truth and superstition, of philosophy and fanaticism, that it is difficult to disentangle them and reduce them to anything like an orderly system. The only document at all resembling a creed is published in the Pearl of Great Price, page 55 sq., and in the pamphlet entitled The Rise, Progress, and Travels of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints; being a series of Answers to Questions, by Bro. George A. Smith (Salt Lake City, 1872, 8vo), pages 40, 41. It is from the pen of Joseph Smith, and was compiled by him in 1842. We insert it here in full:

"First. We believe in God, the Eternal Father, and in his Son Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Ghost.

"We believe that men will be punished for their own sins, and not for Adam's transgressions.

"We believe that through the atonement of Christ all mankind may be saved by obedience to the laws and ordinances of the Gospel.

"We believe that these ordinances are: 1, Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; 2, Repentance; 3, Baptism by immersion for the remission of sins; 4, Laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost.

"We believe that a man must be called of God, by 'prophecy, and by laying on of hands' by those who are in authority, to preach the Gospel and administer in the ordinances thereof.

"We believe in the same organization that existed in the primitive Church, viz. apostles, prophets, pastors, teachers, evangelists, etc.

"We believe in the gift of tongues, prophecy, revelation, visions, healing, interpretation of tongues, etc.  "We believe the Bible to be the Word of God, as far as it is translated correctly; we also believe the Book of Mormon to be the Word of God.

"We believe all that God has revealed, all that he does now reveal, and we believe that he will yet reveal many great and important things pertaining to the kingdom of God.

"We believe in the literal gathering of Israel and in the restoration of the Ten Tribes; that Zion will be built upon this continent; that Christ will reign personally upon the earth, and that the earth will be renewed and receive its paradisaic glory.

"We claim the privilege of worshipping Almighty God according, to the dictates of our conscience, and allow all men the same privilege, let them worship how, where, or what they may.

"We believe in being subject to kings, presidents, rulers, and magistrates; in obeying, honoring, and sustaining the law.

"We believe in being honest, true, chaste, benevolent, virtuous, and in doing good to all men; indeed, we may say that we follow the admonition of Paul, 'We believe all things, we hope all things:' we have endured many things, and hope to be able to endure all things. If there is anything virtuous, lovely, or of good report, or praiseworthy, we seek after these things."

A more perfect and complete copy is furnished by Mr. Orson Pratt, which we also insert, as it is now seldom to be reached in this detailed and explanatory form, and on many points clearly elucidates the strange views of these Saints. (See, however, Burton, pages 467-480.)

"We believe in God, the Eternal Father, and in his Son Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Ghost, who bears record of them, the same throughout all ages and forever.

"We believe that all mankind, by the transgression of their first parents, and not by their own sins, were brought under the curse and penalty of that transgression, which consigned them to an eternal banishment from the presence of God, and their bodies to an endless sleep in the dust, never more to rise, and their spirits to endless misery under the power of Satan; and that, in this awlhl  condition, they were utterly lost and fallen, and had no power of their own to extricate themselves therefrom.

"We believe that through the sufferings, death, and atonement of Jesus Christ all mankind, without one exception, are to be completely and fully redeemed, both body and spirit, from the endless banishment and curse to which they were consigned by Adam's transgression; and that this universal salvation and redemption of the whole human family from the endless penalty of the original sin is effected without any conditions whatsoever on their part: that is, that they are not required to believe, or repent, or be baptized, or do anything else, in order to be redeemed from that penalty; for whether they believe or disbelieve, whether they repent or remain impenitent, whether they are baptized or unbaptized, whether they keep the commandments or break them, whether they are righteous or unrighteous, it will make no difference in relation to their redemption, both soul and body, from the penalty of Adam's transgression. The most righteous man that ever lived on the earth, and the most wicked wretch of the whole human family, were both placed under the same curse without any transgression or agency of their own, and they both alike will be redeemed from that curse without any agency or conditions on their part. Paul says (Rom 5:18), 'Therefore, as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so, by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men onto the justification of life.' This is the reason why all men are redeemed from the grave. This is the reason that the spirits of all men are restored to their bodies. This is the reason that all men are redeemed from their first banishment and restored into the presence of God. And this is the reason that the Saviour said (Joh 12:32), 'If I be lifted up from the earth, I will draw all men unto me.' After this full, complete, and universal redemption, restoration, and salvation of the whole of Adam's race, through the atonement of Jesus Christ, without faith, repentance, baptism, or any other works; then all and every one of them will enjoy eternal life and happiness, never more to be banished from the presence of God if they themselves have committed no sin; for the penalty of the original sin can have no more power over them at all, for Jesus hath destroyed its power, and broken the bands of the first death, and obtained the victory  over the grave, and delivered all its captives, and restored them from their banishment into the presence of his Father; hence eternal life will then be theirs, if they themselves are not found transgressors of some law.

"We believe that all mankind, ill their infant state, are incapable of knowing good and evil, and of obeying or disobeying a law; and that therefore there is no law given to them, and that where there is no law there is no transgression; hence they are innocent, and if they should all die in their infant state they would enjoy eternal life, not being transgressors themselves, neither accountable for Adam's sin.

"We believe that all mankind, in consequence of the fall, after they grow up from their infant state and come to the years of understanding, know good and evil, and are capable of obeying or disobeying a law, and that a law is given against doing evil, and that the penalty affixed is a second banishment from the presence of God, both body and spirit, after they have been redeemed from the first banishment and restored into his presence.

"We believe that the penalty of this second law can have no effect upon persons who have not had the privilege in this life of becoming acquainted therewith; for although the light that is in them teaches them good and evil, yet that light does not teach them the law against doing evil, nor the penalty thereof. And although they have done things worthy of many stripes, yet the law cannot be brought to bear against them and its penalty be inflicted, because they can plead ignorance thereof. Therefore they will be judged, not by the revealed law which they have been ignorant of, but by the law of their conscience, the penalty thereof being a few stripes.

"We believe that all who have done evil, having a knowledge of the law, or afterwards in this life coming to the knowledge thereof, are under its penalty, which is not inflicted in this world, but in the world to come. Therefore such in this world are prisoners, shut up under the sentence of the law, awaiting with awful fear for the time of judgment, when the penalty shall be inflicted, consigning them to a second banishment from the presence of their Redeemer, who had redeemed them from the penalty of the first law. But, inquires the sinner, is there no way for my escape? Is my case hopeless? Can  I not devise some way by which I can extricate myself from the penalty of this second law, and escape this second banishment The answer is — If thou canst hide thyself from the allsearching eye of an omnipresent God, that he shall not find thee, or if thou canst prevail with him to deny justice its claim, or if thou canst clothe thyself with power and contend with the Almighty, and prevent him from executing the sentence of the law, then thou canst escape. If thou canst cause repentance, or baptism in water or any of thine own works to atone for the least of thy transgressions, then thou canst deliver thyself from the awful penalty that awaits thee. But be assured, O sinner, that thou canst not devise any way of thine own to escape, nor do anything that will atone for thy sins. Therefore thy case is hopeless unless God hath devised some way for thy deliverance; but do not let despair seize upon thee, for though thou art under the sentence of a broken law, and hast no power to atone for thy sins and redeem thyself therefrom, yet there is hope in thy case, for he who gave the law has devised a way for thy deliverance. That same Jesus who hath atoned for the original sin, and will redeem all mankind from the penalty thereof, hath also atoned for thy sins, and offereth salvation and deliverance to thee on certain conditions to be complied with on thy part.

"We believe that the first condition to be complied with on the part of sinners is to believe in God, and in the sufferings and death of his Son Jesus Christ to atone for the sins of the whole world, and in his resurrection and ascension on high to appear in the presence of his Father to make intercession for the children of men, and in the Holy Ghost, which is given to all who obey the Gospel.

"That the second condition is to repent — that is, all who believe according to the first condition are required to come humbly before God and confess their sins with a broken heart and contrite spirit, and to turn away from them, and cease from all their evil deeds, and make restitution to all they have in any way injured, as far as it is in their power.

"That the third condition is to be baptized by immersion in water, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, for remission of sins; and that this ordinance is to be administered by one who is called and authorized of Jesus Christ to baptize; otherwise it is illegal and  of no advantage, and not accepted by him; and that it is to be administered only to those persons who believe and repent according to the two preceding conditions.

"And that the fourth condition is to receive the laying on of hands in the name of Jesus Christ for the gift of the Holy Ghost; and that this ordinance is to be administered by the apostles or elders whom the Lord Jesus hath called and authorized to lay on hands; otherwise it is of no advantage, being illegal in the sight of God; and that it is to be administered only to those persons who believe, repent, and are baptized into this Church, according to the three preceding conditions. These are the first conditions of the Gospel. All who comply with them receive forgiveness of sins and are made partakers of the Holy Ghost. 'Through these conditions they become the adopted sons and daughters of God. Through this process they are born again, first of water and then of the Spirit, and become children of the kingdom-heirs of God-saints of the Most High — the Church of the first-born — the elect people, and heirs to a celestial inheritance eternal in the presence of God. After complying with these principles, their names are enrolled in the book of the names of the righteous.

"They are then required to be humble. to be meek and lowly in heart, to watch and pray, to deal justly; and inasmuch as they have the riches of this world, to feed the hungry and clothe the naked, according to the dictates of wisdom and prudence; to comfort the afflicted, to bind up the broken-hearted, and to do all the good that is in their power; and, besides all these things, they are required to meet together as often as circumstances will admit and partake of bread and wine, in remembrance of the broken body and shed blood of the Lord Jesus; and, in short, to continue faithful to the end in all the duties enjoined upon them by the word and Spirit of Christ.

"It is the duty and privilege of the saints thus organized upon the everlasting Gospel to believe in and enjoy all the gifts, powers, and blessings which flow from the Holy Spirit. Such, for instance, as the gifts of revelation, prophecy, visions, the ministry of angels, healing the sick by the laying on of hands in the name of Jesus, the working of miracles, and, in short, all the gifts as mentioned in Scripture, or as enjoyed by the ancient saints. We believe that inspired apostles  and prophets, together with all the officers as mentioned in the New Testament, are necessary to be in the Church in these days.

"We believe that there has been a general and awful apostasy from the religion of the New Testament, so that all the known world have been left for centuries without the Church of Christ among them; without a priesthood authorized of God to administer ordinances; that every one of the churches has perverted the Gospel, some in one way and some in another. For instance, almost every Church has done away 'immersion. for remission of sins.' Those few who have practiced it for remission of sins have done away the ordinance of the 'laying on of hands' upon baptized believers for the gift of the Holy Ghost. Again, the few who have practiced the last ordinance have perverted the first, or have done away the ancient gifts, powers, and blessings which flow from the Holy Spirit, or have said to inspired apostles and prophets, We have no need of you in the body of these days. Those few, again, who have believed in and contended for the miraculous gifts and powers of the Holy Spirit have perverted the ordinances or done them away.

"We believe that there are a few sincere, honest, and humble persons who are striving to do according to the best of their understanding; but in many respects they err in doctrine because of false teachers and the precepts of men; and that they will receive the fulness of the Gospel with gladness as soon as they hear it.

"The gospel in the Book of Mormon is the same as that in the New Testament, and is revealed in great plainness, so that no one who reads it can misunderstand its principles. It has been revealed by the angel to be preached as a witness to all nations; first the Gentiles and then to the Jews; then cometh the downfall of Babylon-thus fulfilling the vision of John, which he beheld on the Isle of Patmos (Rev 14:6-8).

"Many revelations and prophecies have been given to this [i.e., the Mormon] Church since its rise, which have been printed and sent forth to the world. These also contain the gospel in great plainness, and instructions of infinite importance to the Saints. They also unfold the great events that await this generation: the terrible judgments to be poured forth upon. the wicked, and the blessings  and glories to be given to the righteous. We believe that God will continue to give revelations by visions, by the ministry of angels, and by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, until the Saints are guided into all truth; that is, until they come in possession of all the truth there is in existence, and are made perfect in knowledge. So long, therefore, as they are ignorant of anything past, present, or to come, so long, we believe, they will enjoy the gift of revelation. And when in their immortal and perfect fate — when they enjoy 'the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ' — when they are made perfect in one, and become like their Saviour, then they will be in possession of all knowledge, wisdom, and intelligence; then all things will be theirs, whether principalities or powers, thrones or dominions; and, in short, then they will be filled with all the fulness of God. Then they will no longer need revelation.

"We believe that wherever the people enjoy the religion of the New Testament, there they enjoy visions, revelations, the ministry of angels, etc.; and that wherever these blessings cease to be enjoyed, there they also cease to enjoy the religion of the New Testament.

"We believe that God has raised up this Church in order to prepare a people for his second coming in the clouds of heaven, in power and great glory; and that then the saints who are asleep in their graves will be raised, and reign with him on earth a thousand years.

If we believe that great and terrible judgments await the nations of the wicked, and that after the message of the Book of Mormon has been sufficiently sounded in their ears, if they reject it, they will be overthrown and wasted away until the earth shall no longer be encumbered 'with them. New and unheard-of plagues will sweep through the nations, baffling the skill of the most experienced and learned physicians, depopulating whole cities and towns, and carrying off millions of wretched beings in every quarter of our globe. Nations, no longer restrained by the Spirit of God, which will cease striving in them, will rise against nations, till the whole earth, comparatively speaking, shall be filled with blood and carnage. Thrones and empires shall be cast down — new governments will be erected but to meet with the same fate. Peace shall be taken from among the nations, and it shall happen as with the Papists so with the Protestants; as With their ministers so with  the people whom they have deceived they shall all fall into the ditch and perish together because they reject the voice of the Lord from the heavens, and the voice of his servants whom he hath sent to testify against their wickedness and prepare the way of the Lord for his second coming.

"But the righteous shall escape, for the Lord shall gather them from all nations unto a land of peace, and his arms shall be stretched out over them, and his glory shall be upon them for a defence, and 'they shall be the only people under heaven that shall not be at war with one another,' for thus hath the Lord spoken.

"We believe that in this generation a house of the Lord shall be built by the Saints upon Mount Zion, and a cloud of glory shall rest upon it by day and the shining of a flaming fire by night, and that the face of the Lord will be unveiled, and the pure in heart shall see him and live. O Zion, how glorious are thy habitations, and how blessed are thy children! Many people shall come unto thee to be taught in the ways of the Lord and instructed in his paths; for out of thee shall proceed forth a perfect law which shall establish righteousness in the earth.

"We believe that the ten tribes of Israel, with the dispersed of Judah, shall soon be restored to their own lands, according to the covenants which God made with their ancient fathers, and that when this great work of restitution shall take place the power of God shall be made manifest in signs and wonders, and mighty deeds far exceeding anything that took place in their exodus from Egypt. Jerusalem will be rebuilt, together with. a glorious temple, and the Lord shall visit them also, as well as his saints in Zion. In that day the name of the Lord shall become great unto the ends of the earth, and all nations shall serve and obey him, for the wicked shall have perished out of the earth.

"We believe that all persons who wish to escape the judgments of great Babylon must come out from among both the Papists and the Protestants, for they are the whore of all the earth, and have made the nations drunk with their abominations, and are to be burned by fire; therefore woe unto that man or woman that shall stand in connection with them, for the hour of their judgement is at hand.  "And we now bear testimony to all, both small and great, that the Lord of Hosts hath sent us with a message of glad tidings — the everlasting gospel, to cry repentance to the nations, and prepare the way of his second coming. Therefore repent, O ye nations, both Gentiles and Jews, and cease from all your evil deeds, and come forth with broken hearts and contrite spirits, and be baptized in water, in the name of the. Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, for remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit, by the laying on of the hands of the apostles or elders of this Church; and signs shall follow them that believe, and if they continue faithful to the end they shall be saved. But woe unto them that hearken not to the message which God has now sent, for the day of vengeance and burning is at hand, and they shall not escape. Therefore remember, O reader, and perish not!"

The reader will notice that Mr. Pratt does not dwell at any length upon the first article, but simply restates in other words what is embodied in the Confession. Yet this very article has given rise to a most materialistic tendency, developing in some points into pantheism. The explanatory statements which they have from time to time given to this article warrant the assertion that, while they profess belief in the Trinity, their Godhead is formed on Buddhistic principles, and develops a system of anthropomorphism which has never been equalled by any heretic sect of the Christian Church, though it was approached by the Egyptian monks whom Theophilus (q.v.) anathematized in the fourth century. The Mormons explain that God was once a man, who has, however, so advanced in intelligence and power that he may now be called (comparatively speaking) perfect, infinite, etc., but that he has still the form and figure of a main; he has even "legs," as is evident (according to Mr. Orson Pratt's utterances in sermons, etc.) from his appearance to Abraham; though he has this advantage over his creatures that " he can move up or down through the air without using them." The following is an extract from one of their popular catechisms bearing on the subject: "Q. 28. What is God? A. He is a material intelligent personage, possessing both body and parts. — Q. 38. Doth he also possess passions? A. Yes; he eats, he drinks, he loves, he hates. — Q. 44. Can this being occupy two distinct places at once? A. No" (Latter-day Saints' Catechism, quoted in Morm. Illust. page 43). To the same effect we read in the Mormon Hymn-book (page 349):  "The God that others worship is not the God for me: He has no parts nor body, and cannot hear nor see."

A local residence is assigned to this anthropomorphic deity: he lives, we are told," in the planet Kolob" (Seer, page 70, and Millen. Star, 14:531). Moreover, as he possesses the body and passions of a man, so his relations to his creatures are purely human. St. Hilary of Poitiers asserts that some Arians attacked orthodoxy by the following argument: "Deus pater non erat, quia neque ei filius; nam si filius, necesse est ut et faemina sit" (Hil. adv. Const.). The conclusion thus stated as an absurdity in the 4th century the Mormons embrace as an axiom in the 19th. "In mundi primordiis, Deo erat faemina," is an article of their creed (Patr. Order, page 1, and page 15; also Seer, 1:38, 103).

No existence is "created;" all beings are "begotten." The superiority of the Mormon God over his creatures consists only in the greater poet which he has gradually attained by growth in knowledge. He himself originated in "the union of two elementary particles of matter" (Gunnison, page 49), and by a progressive development reached the human form. Thus we read that "God, of course, was once a man, and from manhood by continual progression became God; and he has continued to increase from his manhood to the present time, and may continue to increase without limit. And man also may continue to increase in knowledge and power as fast as he pleases." And again: "If man is a creature of eternal progression, the time must certainly arrive when he will know as much as God now knows" (Millen. Star. 14:386). This is in strict accordance with the following words of Joseph Smith: "The weakest child of God which now exists upon the earth will possess more dominion, more property, more subjects, and more power and glory than is possessed by Jesus Christ or by his Father; while at the same time they will have their dominion, kingdom, and subjects increased in proportion" (Mill. Star, volume 6, quoted in Morm. Illust.).

An apostle carries this view into detail as follows: "What will man do when this world is filled up? Why, he will make more worlds, and swarm out like bees from the old world. And when a farmer has cultivated his farm, and raised numerous children, so that the space is beginning to be too strait for them, he will say, My sons, yonder is plenty of matter, go and organize a world and people it" (P. Pratt, in Millen. Star, 14:663, and Seer, 1:37). This doctrine of indefinite development naturally passes into polytheism. Accordingly, the Mormon theology teaches that there are gods innumerable, with different degrees of dignity and power. It was revealed to Joseph Smith that the first verse of  Genesis originally stood as follows: "The Head God brought forth the Gods, with the heavens, and the earth" (Millen. Star, 14:455). The same prophet also tells us (ibid.) that a hundred and forty-four thousand of these gods are mentioned by St. John in the Apocalypse. Moreover, "each God is the God of the spirits of all flesh pertaining to the world which he forms" (Seer, 1:38). Young claims that it was revealed to him that the God of our own planet is Adam, who (it seems) was only another form of the archangel Michael: "When our father Adam came into the garden of Eden, he brought Eve, one of his wives, with him. He helped to make and organize this world. He is Michael the Archangel, the Ancient of Days. He is our Father and our God, and the only God with whom we have to do" (from Discourses of the Presidency, in volume 15, page 769, preached in the Tabernacle, April 9, 1852). It is curious to observe, from such examples, how easily the extremes of materialism and immaterialism may be made to meet. For here we have the rudest form of anthropomorphism connected with a theory of emanation which might be identified with that of some Gnostic and Oriental idealists. There can be no doubt that, under its present intellectual guides, Mormonism is rapidly passing into that form of practical atheism which is euphemistically termed pantheism. Thus we read in the Washington organ of the presidency that the only thing which has existed from eternity is "an infinite quantity of self moving intelligent matter. Every particle of matter which now exists existed in the infinite depths of past duration, and was then capable of self-motion" (Seer, 1:129). "There is no substance in the universe which feels and thinks, but what has eternally possessed that capacity" (ibid. page 102). "Each individual of the vegetable and animal kingdom contains a living spirit, possessed of intelligent capacities" (ibid. page 34). "Persons are only tabernacles, and truth is the God that dwells in them. When we speak of only one God, and state that he is eternal, etc., we have no reference to any particular person, but to truth dwelling in a vast variety of substances" (ibid. page 25; comp. also Stenhouse, page 484 sq.).

Christ is the offspring of the "material" union. on the plains of Palestine, of God and the Virgin Mary the latter being duly married after betrothal by the angel Gabriel. Yet he is believed to have had a previous existence, to have even made the universe out of " unformed chaotic matter as old as God," and his worship is enjoined as Lord of all (Doct. and Cov. Lecture 5:2, pages 45, 47). The Paraclete is vaguely described. He is also a member  of the Godhead, being the mind of the Father and the Son; but while the other two persons have bodies of flesh and bones, the Holy Ghost has not, but is a personage of Spirit (Compend. page 154). Yet his substance is material, and subject to the necessary laws which govern matter. He has therefore parts which are infinite and spread through all space, and so is he virtually omnipresent. The Father and the Son, as persons, are not omnipresent, but only through the Spirit (Compend. pages 140-148). He may properly be called God's minister, to execute his will in immensity. He is therefore the worker of miracles, the source of grace, and even the cause of increase, being in every person upon the face of the earth; for the "elements that every individual is made of and lives in possess the Godhead" (Young, in Compend. page 148). It would appear, however, that there is an older Trinity, that of "Elohim, Jehovah, and Michael, which is Adam." Adam, again, is declared to be the "god" of Jesus Christ; Jesus Christ the god of Joseph Smith; and Joseph Smith is now the god of this generation: but the whole affair is a mass too wild and mystical to be explained intelligently. The human intellect probably never sank into more abysmal nonsense; all that can be definitely set before the mind is that Mormons believe that by faith, obedience, holiness, any man may rise into a deity, and acquire the power of making, peopling, and ruling a "world" forever! (See Stenhouse, page 486.)

The third article, which teaches, universal salvation, is strangely elucidated regarding the future state. Thus, according to Mormon teaching, not only will the body, but all the habits, occupations, and necessities of life, be the same in the future world as in the present. One of their chief pillars tells us that "the future residence of the Saints is not an ideal thing. They will need houses for their persons and for their families as much in their resurrected condition as in their present state. In this identical world, where they have been robbed of houses and lands, and wife and children, they shall have a hundredfold" (Spencer, page 174). Another "apostle" calculates the exact amount of landed property which may be expected by the "resurrected Saints:" "Suppose that, out of the population of the earth, one in a hundred should be entitled to all inheritance upon the new earth, how much land would each receive? We answer, they would receive over a hundred and fifty acres, which would be quite enough to raise manna, and to build some splendid mansions. It would be large enough to have our flower gardens, and everything the agriculturist and the botanist want" (P. Pratt, in Milllen. Statr, 14:663). They also venture directly to contradict the words of Christ  himself, by affirming that, in the resurrection, men both marry and are given in marriage. Thus the author above quoted tells us that "Abraham and Sarah will continue to multiply, not only in this world, but in all worlds to come... Will the resurrection return you a mere female acquaintance, that is not to be the wife of your bosom in eternity? No; God forbid. But it will restore you the wife of your bosom immortalized, who shall bear children from your own loins in all worlds to come" (see Spencer, page 6; and compare Stenhouse, page 480).

We desire to call special attention also to the Mormon doctrine regarding miraculous gifts, as embodied in the seventh article of their Confession. This doctrine of the discerning of spirits led Smith into a variety of curious speculations. He teaches that the soul of man was not created, but "coexisted" equal with God. "God," he says in one of his sermons in 1853 (page 62), "never did have power to create the spirit of man at all. The very idea lessens man in my estimation. I know better!" He also holds to the transmigration of souls. Rebellious spirits descend into brute tabernacles till they yield to "the law of the everlasting gospel." The eighth article may be declared decidedly liberal; it expresses a belief that the Word of God is recorded, not only in the Bible and the Book of Mormon, but in "all other good books." As for the contradictions that exist in the first, Smith admits them, but alleges that they are "corruptions," and that they can be removed by his or any other prophet's inspired explanations. It is said that he has left an " inspired translation" of the whole Bible in MS.; but as it has never been published, we can judge it only by the occasional extracts which have been made by prophets and elders, and from these we have quoted in appropriate places.

The tenth article, though it affirms the literal gathering of Israel, the restoration of the Ten Tribes (the American Indians, who are in consequence treated with considerable humanity by the Saints), and the personal reign of Christ for one thousand years, does not, as has always been supposed, make the in-gathering at the Zion of the East, but at that New Zion on the Western continent which has been appointed under this new dispensation ushered in by Joseph Smith. And as the Jews were bidden to separate themselves from the Gentiles, and the early Christians (the ancient Saints) from the heathen, so the Latter-day Saints are now called forth from a wicked world, doomed to almost immediate destruction (before the close of this century), which is indeed already beginning, to the Zion of this continent. When the Gospel has been preached to all the  world, and the elect have been assembled at Zion, then all unbelievers will be destroyed; the kingdom of heaven will be set up on the earth, and the formal reign of Christ commence in the Western Zion. Surely no one need wonder that Joseph Smith, when he first promulgated his new faith, maintained that "one of the grand fundamental principles of Mormonism is to receive truth come whence it may" (Sermon preached July 9, 1843) Indeed their faith, if we have but distantly reached their true position, consists of a spontaneous agglomeration of tenets which, were its disciples of a more learned and philosophical body, would suggest extensive eclecticism. And Mr. Burton has well said that "the Mormons are like the Pythagoreans in their procreation, transmigration, and exaltation of souls; like the followers of Leucippus and Democritus in their atomic materialism; like the Epicureans in their pure atomic theories, their summum bonum, and their sensuous speculations; and like the Platonists and Gnostics in their belief of the Eon, of ideas, and of moving principles in element. They are Fetichists in their ghostly fancies, their Avestra, which became souls and spirits. They are Jews in their theocracy, their ideas of angels, their hatred for Gentiles, and their utter segregation from the great brotherhood of mankind. They are Christians, inasmuch as they base their faith upon the Bible, and hold to the divinity of Christ, the fall of man, the atonement, and the regeneration. They are Arians, inasmuch as they hold Christ to be 'the first of God's creatures; a perfect creature, but still a creature.' They are Moslems in their views of the inferior status of womankind, in their polygamy, and in their resurrection of the material body; like the followers of the Arabian Prophet, they hardly fear death, because they have elaborated 'continuation.' They take no leap in the dark — they spring from this sublunary stage into a known, not into an unknown world; hence also their worship is eminently secular, their sermons are political or commercial, and religion being with them not a thing apart but a portion and parcel of everyday life — the intervention of the Lord in their material affairs becomes natural and only to be expected. Their visions, prophecies, and miracles are those of the Illuminati, their mysticism that of the Druses, and their belief in the millennium is a completion of the dreams of the Apocalyptic sects. Masonry has entered into their scheme, the Demiurgus whom they worship is 'as good at mechanical inventions as at any other business.' With their later theories, Methodism, Swedenborgianism — especially in its view of the future state — and Transcendentalism are curiously intermingled. Finally, we can easily discern in their doctrine of affinity of minds and sympathy of souls the leaven of that faith which,  beginning with Mesmer and progressing through the Rochester Rappers and the Poughkeepsie Seer, threatens to extend wherever the susceptible nervous temperament becomes the characteristic of the race."

The ethical teachings of Mormonism are not distinguished by any other remarkable peculiarities than we have already had occasion to point out. The chief duty impressed upon the Saints is the prompt payment of tithings. Their official publications are strenuous in their exhortation to the fulfilment of that indispensable obligation (see Stenhouse, page 578). Next to-this cardinal virtue seems to be rated the merit of abstinence from fermented liquors and tobacco. This, however, is not absolutely insisted upon, but is only urged as a "precept of wisdom." It was enforced by Joseph, but under the present head of the Church it is asserted that intemperance is rapidly invading the Saints' households. The virtue of patriotisms is also a frequent theme of Mormon eulogy. The national colors are exhibited on every public occasion, and there seems to be every endeavor to refute the charges that Mormonism seeks secular power, and is antagonistic to the United States government, and that if statehood is ever secured to Utah, "Brigham Young's theocracy will be triumphant over the republic and the national laws." The practice of dancing must also be included in the ethical system of Mormonism. Indeed, when the Temple is completed, public dances are to form a part of the regular worship. In saltatorial as in military movements the priesthood occupy the foremost place. The president leads off, and bishops, patriarchs, and elders are to be seen figuring enthusiastically — “Not," says colonel Kane, "in your minuets or other mortuary processions of Gentiles, but in jigs and reels."

IV. Ordinances and Practices. —

1. The ordinances of the Mormon Gospel are five:

(1) Faith, which is very strangely described in the Doctr. and Cov., as already quoted. What is really required of a Saint in this respect is "faith in Joseph and his successors," and not absolute acceptance of the Scriptures, i.e., the Bible and the Mormon writings, but a "reverence" for them, and "absolute obedience" to the president and priesthood. (See § V, below.)

(2) Repentance, i.e., sorrow for sin and resolution to lead a good life.

(3) Baptism, which is administered by immersion, to none younger than eight years, that being regarded as the age at which responsibility begins  (Doctr, and Coy. chapter 22:§ 4, page 160). Infant baptism is declared to be a "solemn mockery, because little children have no sins to repent of, and are not under the curse of Adam" (Book of Mormon: Moroni, chapter 8:§2, 3, page 557). The rite is administered as follows: "The person who is called of God, and has authority of Jesus Christ, shall go down into the water with the person who has presented him or herself for baptism, and shall say, calling him or her by name, 'Having been commissioned of Jesus Christ, I baptize you in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.' Then shall he immerse him or her in the water, and come forth again out of the water" (Book of Mormon: Nephi, chapter 5, § 8, page 457; Doctr. and Cov. chapter 2, § 21, page 73). The effect of baptism, when administered to and by a qualified person, is declared to be the remission of sins, the gift of the Holy Ghost, and a title of eternal life. It is regarded as absolutely necessary to salvation; without it neither repentance nor faith avail (Doctr. and Cov. chapter 4:§ 12, page 87). A most peculiar tenet of their creed is the necessity of baptism for the dead. To supply the deficiency of those who through ignorance or other involuntary defect have died unbaptized in the Mormon faith, the practice of baptism for the dead was ordained at a very early period of Mormonism, and is incorporated as a necessary ordinance into the Book of Doctr. and Cov. (§ 105, 106). The faith is preached to the dead in Hades by departed Saints; and the benefit of baptism is obtained for them by proxy. Any believer may and should be baptized for his departed friends, relations, and ancestors to the most remote ages; and. in the perfect state, those for whom a person has been thus baptized will be added to his family and subjects (Spencer, Letters, pages 162-164; Millen. Star, 5:87 sq.; Stenhouse, page 476 sq.). To this effect the Mormon hymnist sings:

"I am Zionward bound, where a

Seer is our head,

We'll there be baptized for our friends that are dead;

By obeying this law we may set them all free,

And saviors we shall upon? Mount Zion be."

(Millen. Star, 15:143.)

The chancellor of the University of Deseret informs us that "unless this is done for the dead they cannot be redeemed" (Spencer, page 166). The same learned authority announces that Peter tells how the devout and honorable dead may be saved, who never heard the Gospel on earth. Says  he [St. Peter !], 'else why are they baptized for the dead?' (Spencer here refers incorrectly to 1Co 15:29 as the work of St. Peter.) A careful record of the persons vicariously baptized is kept by duly appointed registrars. These records are the books spoken of by St. John (Reverend 20:12), the Book of Life being a record kept in heaven to verify those kept on earth (Doctr. and Cot. chapter 106, § 6, 7, page 319).

(4) Laying on of hands for the gilt of the Holy Ghost, sometimes called baptism by fire as distinguished from baptism by water. It is usually administered immediately after baptism, of which it is regarded as the completion. By it the spirit of prophecy, the gift of tongues, and the power to work miracles are given. There have been multitudes of persons in the world who have believed and asserted that to them, and to them only, God gave visions, dreams, angel-visits, the power of healing the sick and "casting out devils;" and they have declared that these were proofs of the heavenly origin of the faith which they proclaimed, and this it is that the Saints have been taught by the modern apostles to regard as special and particular to them, while it has been a peculiarity common to the religious experience of all the world.

(5) The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was originally administered in bread and wine, as Christ himself ordained when he appeared to the Nephites (Book of Mormon: Nephi, chapter 8, § 6, page 469). But in 1833 it was revealed to Smith that "strong drinks are not for the belly, but for the washing of your bodies," and that wine was only to be used in this ordinance if it was the pure juice of the grape, and made by Mormons (Doctr. and Cov. chapter 81, § 1, page 240). Water only, therefore, is now used. The rite is administered every Sunday. The water, having been blessed, is handed around in tin cans, together with the bread (Rae, page 106).

2. Marriage is not a civil contract with the Latterday Saints, but a sacrament of the Church, and a sacred tenet of the faith. Matrimony, moreover, as practiced by the Mormons, is an institution so peculiar to themselves, they having introduced into the modern social system the polygamic system, that their marriage service is a most important rite. Mormons are in every possible way encouraged to be polygamists, and are reminded of the revelation given to the Prophet that "the rank and dignity given to the Saints in the other world is proportioned to the number of their wives and children." It is true that polygamy is not, as many suppose,  essential to their religious system, yet it has entered so largely into the marital relations of the Latter-day Saints of Utah as to give them a most obnoxious record in the sight of all other Christian religious sects. As we have seen above, in their early history the Mormons clearly rebuked polygamy (Book of Mormon: Jacob, chapter 2, page 118 sq.). From 1830 to 1843 they were monogamists; but in the latter of these years, as we have also seen, Smith obtained a revelation permitting, and even recommending, a plurality of wives. (They reject the word "polygamy," and prefer the term pluractism.) Still, pluralism does not appear to have become the general practice among the Mormons till their journey across the prairies to the valley of the Salt Lake. Since then it has been openly avowed, and defended against other sects by an appeal to Scripture. Tracts, dialogues, and hymns are circulated in its behalf. Says Stenhouse, "Tens of thousands of sermons have been preached on its divine origin; voluminous treatises have been published in its exposition, and the Mormon press has teemed with articles in its defence" (page 183). And even the "pluralistic" marriage ceremony has been published. To afford our readers a fuller understanding of the Mormon vice of "pluralism," we here insert in full the special "revelation" which they claim to have had.

"CELESTIAL MARRIAGE:

"A REVELATION ON THE PATRIARCHAL, ORDER OF MATRIMONY, ON PLURALITY OF WIVES.

"Given to Joseph Smith, the Seer, in Nauvoo, July 12, 1842.

"1. Verily, then saith the Lord unto you, my servant Joseph, that inasmnch as you have inquired of my hand to know and understand wherein I, the Lord, justified my servants Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, as also Moses David, and Solomon, my servants, as touching the principle and doctrine of their having many wives and concubines: Behold! and lo, I am the Lord thy God, and will answer thee as touching this matter: Therefore prepare thy heart to receive and obey the instructions which I am about to give unto you; for all those who have this law revealed unto them must obey the same; for behold I reveal unto you a new and an everlasting covenant, and if ye abide not that covenant, then are ye damned; for no one can reject this covenant and be permitted to enter into my glory; for all who will have a blessing at my hands shall abide the law which was appointed for that blessing,  and the conditions thereof, as was instituted from before the foundations of the world; and as pertaining to the new and everlasting covenant, it was instituted for the fulness of my glory; and he that receiveth a fulness thereof must and shall abide the law, or he shall be damned, saith the Lord God.

"2. And verily I say unto you that the conditions of this law are these: All covenants, contracts, bonds, obligations, oaths, vows, performances, connections, associations, or expectations that are not made and entered into and sealed by the Holy Spirit of promise, of him who is anointed, both as well for time and for all eternity, and that, too, most holy, by revelation and commandment, through the medium of mine anointed, whom I have appointed on the earth to hold this power (and I have appointed unto my servant Joseph to hold this power in the last days, and there is never but one on the earth at a time on whom this power and the keys of the priesthood are conferred), are of no efficacy, virtue, or force in and after the resurrection from the dead: for all contracts that are not made unto this end have an end when men are dead.

"3. Behold! mine house is a house of order, saith the Lord God, and not a house of confusion. Will I accept of an offering, saith the Lord, that is not made in my name? Or will I receive at your hands that which I have not appointed? And will I appoint unto you, saith the Lord, except it be by law, even as I and my Father ordained unto you before the world was? I am the Lord thy God, and I give unto you this commandment, that no man shall come unto the Father but by me, or by my word, which is my law, saith the Lord; and everything that is in the world, whether it be ordained of men by thrones or principalities or powers, or things of name, whatsoever they may be that are not by me or by my word, saith the Lord, shall be thrown down, and shall not remain after men are dead, neither in nor after the resurrection, saith the Lord your God; for whatsoever things remaineth are by me, and whatsoever things are not by me shall be shaken and destroyed.

“4. Therefore if a man marry him a wife in the would and he marry her not by me nor by my word, and he covenant with her so long he is in the world, and she with him, their covenant and marriage is not of force when they are dead, and when they are out of the world therefore they are not bound by any law when they are out of of the world; therefore  when they are out of the world they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are appointed angels in heavens, which angels are ministering servants, to minister for those are are worthy of a far more and an exceeding and an eternal weight of glory; for these angels did not abide my law, therefore they cannot be enlarged, but remain separately and singly without exaltation, in their saved condition, to all eternity, and from thenceforth are not gods, but are angels of God forever and ever.

"5. And again, verily I say unto you, if a man marry a wife, and make a covenant with her for time and for all eternity, if that covenant is not by time, or by my word, which is by law, and is not sealed by the Holy Spirit of promise, through him whom I have anointed and appointed unto this power, then it is not valid, neither of force, when they are out of the world, because they are not joined by me, saith the Lord, neither by my word; when they are out of the world, it can not be received there, because the anaels alod the grods are appointed there, by whom they cannot pass: they cannot, therefore, inherit my glory, for my house is a house of order, saith the Lord God.

"6. And again, verily I say unto you, if a man marry a wife by my word, which is my law, and by the new and everlasting covenant, and it is sealed unto them by the Holy Spirit of promise, by him who is anointed, unto whom 1 have appointed this power and the keys of this priesthood, and it shall be said unto them, Ye shall come forth in the first resurrection; and if it be after the first resurrection, in the next resurrection; and shall inherit thrones, kingdoms, principalities and powers, dominions, all heights and depths, then shall it be written in the Lamb's Book of Life, that he shall commit no murder whereby to shed innocent blood; and if ye abide in my covenant, and commit no murder whereby to shed innocent blood, it shall be done unto them in all things whatsoever my servant hath put upon them, in time and through all eternity, and shall be of full force when they are out of the world; and they shall pass by the angels and the gods which are set there, to their exaltation and glory in all things, as hath been sealed upon their heads which glory shall be a fullness and a continuation of the seeds forever and ever.

"7. Then shall they be gods, because they have no end; therefore shall they be from everlasting to everlasting, because they continue; then  shall they be above all, because all things are subject unto them. Then shall they be gods, because they have all power, and the angels are subject unto them.

"8. Verily, verily I say unto you, except ye abide my law ye cannot attain to this glory; for strait is the gate and narrow the way that leadeth unto the exaltation and continuation of the lives, and few there be that find it, because ye receive me not in the world, neither do ye know me. But if ye receive me in the world, then shall ye know me, and shall receive your exaltation, that where I am ye shall be also. This is eternal life, to know the only wise and true God, and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent. I am he. Receive ye, therefore, my law. Broad is the gate and wide the way that leadeth to the death; and manly there are that go in thereat; because they receive me not. neither do they abide in my law.

"9. Verily, verily I say unto you, if a man marry a wife according to my word, and they are sealed by the Holy Spirit of promise, according to mine appointment, and he or she shall commit any sin or transgression of the new and everlasting covenant whatever, and all manner of blasphemies, and if they commit no murder, wherein they shed innocent blood — yet they shall come forth in the first resurrection and enter into their exaltation; but they shall be destroyed in the flesh, and shall be delivered unto the buffetings of Satan unto the day of redemption, saith the Lord God.

"10. The blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, which shall not be forgiven in the world nor out of the world, is in that ye commit murder, wherein ye shed innocent blood, and assent unto my death afterye have received my new and everlasting covenant, saith the Lord God; and he that abideth not this law can in nowise enter into my glory, but shall be damned, saith the Lord.

"11. I am the Lord thy God, and will give unto thee the law of my holy priesthood, as was ordained by me and my Father before the world was. Abraham received all things, whatsoever he received, by revelation and commandment, by my word, saith the Lord, and hath entered into his exaltation and sitteth upon his throne.

"12. Abraham received promises concerning his seed and of the fruit of his loins — from whose loins ye are, viz. my servant Joseph — which  were to continue so long as they were in the world; and as touching Abraham and his seed, out of the world, they should continue; both in the world and out of the world should they continue as innumerable as the stars; or if ye were to count the sand upon the sea-shore, ye could not number them. This promise is yours also, because ye are of Abraham, and the promise was made unto Abraham; and by this law are the continuation of the works of my Father, wherein he glorifieth himself. Go ye, therefore, and do the works of Abraham; enter ye into my law, and ye shall be saved. But if ye enter not into my law, ye cannot receive the promises of my Father which he made unto Abraham.

"13. God commanded Abraham, and Sarah gave Hagar to Abraham to wife. And why did she do it? Because this was the law, and from Hagar sprang many people. This, therefore, was fulfilling, among other things, the promises. Was Abraham, therefore. under condemnation? Verily I say unto you, Nay; for I, the Lord, commanded it. Abraham was commanded to offer his son Isaac; nevertheless it was written, Thou shalt not kill. Abraham, however, did not refuse, and it was accounted unto him for righteousness.

"14. Abraham received concubines, and they bare him children, and it was accounted unto him for righteousness, because they were given unto him for righteousness, because they were given unto him, and he abode in my law: as Isaac, also, and Jacob did none other things than that which they were commanded; and because they did none other things than that which they were commanded; they have entered into their exaltation, according to the promises, and sit upon thrones, and are not angels, but tire gods. David also received many wives and concubines, as also Solomon, and Moses my servant, and also many others of my servants, from the becainnin of creation until this time; and in nothing did they sin save in those things which they received not of me.

"15. David's wives and concubines were given unto him of me, by the hand of Nathan my servant, and others of the prophets who had the keys of this power; and in none of these things did he sin against me, save in the case of Uriah and his wife; and therefore he hath fallen from his exaltation and received his portion; and he shall not inherit them out of the world, for I gave them unto another, saith the Lord.  "

16. I am the Lord thy God, and I gave unto thee, my servant Joseph, an appointment, and to restore all things; ask what ye will, and it shall be given unto you according to my word; and as ye have asked concerning adultery, verily, verily I say unto you, if a man receiveth a wife in the new and everlasting covenant, and if she be with another man, and I have not appointed unto her by the holy anointing, she hath committed adultery, and shall be destroyed. If she be not in the new and everlasting covenant, and she be with another man, she has committed adultery; and if her husband be with another woman, and he was under a vow, he hath broken his vow, and hath committed adultery; and if she hath not committed adultery, but is innocent, and hath not broken her vow, and she knoweth it, and I reveal it unto you, my servant Joseph, then shall you have power, by the power of my holy priesthood, to take her and give her unto him that hath not committed adultery, but hath been faithful, for he shall be made ruler over many: for I have conferred upon you the keys and power of the priesthood, wherein I restore all things, and make known unto you all things in due time.

"17. And verily, verily I say unto you, that whatsoever you seal on earth shall be sealed in heaven; and whatsoever you bind on earth, in my name and by my word, saith the Lord, it shall be eternally bound in the heavens; and whosesoever sins you remit on earth shall be remitted eternally in the heavens; and whosesoever sins ye retain on earth shall be retained in heaven.

"18. And again, verily I say, whomsoever you bless I will bless, and whomsoever you curse I will curse, saith the Lord; for I, the Lord, am thy God.

"19. And again, verily I say unto you, my servant Joseph, that whatsoever you give on earth, and to whomsoever you give any one on earth, by my word and according to my law, it shall be visited with blessings, and not cursings, and with my power, saith the Lord, and shall be without condemnation on earth and in heaven; for I am the Lord thy God, and will be with thee even unto the end of the world and through all eternity: for verily I seal upon you your exaltation, and prepare a throne for you in the kingdom of my Father, with Abraham your father. Behold, I have seen your sacrifices, and will forgive all your sins; I have seen your sicritices in obedience to that which I have  told you: go, therefore, and I make a way for your escape, as I accepted the offering of Abraham of his son Isaac.

"20. Verily I say unto you, a commandment I give unto mine handmaid, E.Emma Smith, your wife, whom I have given unto you, that she stay herself, and partake not of that which I commanded you to offer unto her: for I did it, saith the Lord, to prove you all, as I did Abraham, and that I might require an offering at your hand, by covenant and sacrifice: and let mine handmaid, Emma Smith, receive all those that have been given unto my servant Joseph, and who are virtuous and pure before me; and those who are not pure, and have said they are pure, shall be destroyed, saith the Lord God; for I am the Lord thy God, and ye shall obey my voice: and I give unto my servant Joseph that he shall be made ruler over many things, for he hath been faithful over a few things, and from henceforth I will strengthen him.

"21. And I command mine handmaid, Emma Smith, to abide and cleave unto my servant Joseph, and to none else. But if she will not abide this commandment, she shall be destroyed, saith the Lord; for I am the Lord thy God, and will destroy her if she abide not in my law; but if she will not abide this commandment, then shall my servant Joseph do all things for her, even as he hath said; and I will bless him, and multiply him, and give unto him a hundredfold in this world, of fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters, houses and lands, wives and children, and crowns of eternal lives in the eternal worlds. And again, verily I say, let mine handmaid forgive my servant Joseph his trespasses, and then shall she be forgiven her trespasses wherein she has trespassed against me; and I, the Lord thy God, will bless her and multiply her, and make her heart to rejoice.

"22. And again, I say, let not my servant Joseph put his property out of his hands, lest an enemy come and destroy him, for Satan seeketh to destroy; for I am the Lord thy God, and he is my servant; and behold! and lo, I am with him, as I was with Abraham thy father, even unto his exaltation and glory.

"23. Now, as touching the law of the priesthood, there are many things pertaining thereunto. Verily, if a man be called of my Father, as was Aaron, by mine own voice, and by the voice of him that sent me, and I have endowed him with the keys of the power of this priesthood, if he do anything in my name, and according to my law and by my word, he  will not commit sin, and I will justify him. Let no one, therefore, set on my servant Joseph, for I will justify him; for he shall do the sacrifice which I require at his hands for his transgressions, saith the Lord your God.

"24. And again, as pertaining to the law of the priesthood: If any man espouse a virgin, and desire to espouse another, and the first give her consent; and if he espouse the second, and they are virgins, and have vowed to no other man, then he is justified; he cannot commit adultery, for they are given unto him; for he cannot commit adultery with that that belongeth unto him, and to none else: and if he have ten virgins given unto him by this law, he cannot commit adultery, for they belong to him, and they are given unto him: therefore is he justified. But if one or either of the ten virgins, after she is espoused, shall be with another man, she has committed adultery, and shall be destroyed; for they are given unto him to multiply and replenish the earth, according to my commandment, and to fulfil the promise which was given by my Father before the foundation of the world, and for their exaltation in the eternal worlds, that they may bear the souls of men; for herein is the work of my Father continued that he may be glorified.

"25. And again, verily, verily I say unto you, if any man have a wife who holds the keys of this power, and he teaches unto her the law of my priesthood as pertaining to these things, then shall she believe, and administer unto him, or she shall be destroyed, saith the Lord your God; for I will destroy her; for I will magnify my name upon all those who receive and abide in my law. Therefore it shall be lawful in me, if she receive not this law, for him to receive all things whatsoever I, the Lord his God, will give unto him, because she did not believe and administer unto him, according to my word; and she then becomes the transgressor, and he is exempt from the law of Sarah, who administered unto Abraham according to the law, when I commanded Abraham to take Hagar to wife. And now, as pertaining to this law: Verily, verily I say unto you, I Will reveal more unto you hereafter; therefore let this suffice for the present. Behold, I am Alpha and Omega. Amen."

Following the revelation is this explanation: "Plurality of wives is a doctrine very popular among most of mankind at the present day. It is practiced by the most powerful nations of Asia and Africa, and by numerous nations inhabiting the islands of the sea, and by the aboriginal  nations of the great western hemisphere. The one-wife system is confined principally to a few small nations inhabiting Europe, and to those who are of European origin inhabiting America. It is estimated by the most able historians of our day that about four fifths of the population of the globe believe and practice, according to their respective laws, the doctrine of a plurality of wives. If the popularity of a doctrine is in proportion to the numbers who believe in it, then it follows that the plurality system is four times more popular among the inhabitants of the earth than the one-wife system.

"Those nations who practice the plurality doctrine consider it as virtuous and as right for one man to have many wives as to have one only. Therefore they have enacted laws, not only giving this right to their citizens, but also protecting them in it, and punishing all those who infringe upon the chastity of the marriage covenant by committing adultery with any one of the wives of his neighbor. Those nations do not consider it possible for a man to commit adultery with any one of those women to whom he has been legally married according to their laws. The posterity raised up unto the husband through each of his wives are all considered to be legitimate, and provisions are made in their laws for those children, the same as if they were the children of one wife. Adulteries; fornications, and all unvirtuous conduct between the sexes are severely punished by them. Indeed, plurality among them is considered not only virtuous and right, but a great check or preventative against adulteries and unlawful connections, which are among the greatest evils with which nations are cursed, producing a vast amount of suffering and misery, devastation and death; undermining the very foundations of happiness, and destroying the framework of society and the peace of the domestic circle.

'Some of the nations of Europe who believe in the one wife system have actually forbidden a plurality of wives by their laws; and the consequences are that the whole country among them is overrun with the most abominable practices;' adulteries and unlawful connections prevail through all their villages, towns, cities, and country places to a most fearful extent. And among some of these nations these sinks of wickedness, wretchedness, and misery are licensed by law; while their piety would be wonderfully shocked to authorize by law the plurality system as adopted by many neighboring nations.  "The Constitution and laws of the United States, being founded upon the principles of freedom, do not interfere with marriage relations, but leave the nation free to believe in and practice the doctrine of a plurality of wives, or to confine themselves to the one-wife system, just as they chose. This is as it should be: it leaves the conscience of man untrammeled, and so long as he injures no person, and does not infringe upon the rights of others, he is free by the Constitution to marry one wife or many, or none at all, and becomes accountable to God for the righteousness or unrighteousness of his domestic relations.

"The Constitution leaves the several states and territories to enact such laws as they see proper in regard to marriages, provided that they do not infringe upon the rights of conscience and the liberties guaranteed in that sacred document. Therefore if any state or territory feels disposed to enact laws guaranteeing to each of its citizens the right to marry many wives, such laws would be perfectly constitutional; hence the several states and territories practice the one-wife system out of choice, and not because they are under any obligations so to do by the National Constitution. Indeed, we doubt very much whether any state or territory has the constitutional right to make laws prohibiting the plurality doctrine in cases where it is practiced by religious societies as a matter of conscience or as a doctrine of their religious faith. The first article of the Amendments to the Constitution says expressly that 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.' Now if even Congress itself has no power to pass a law 'prohibiting the free exercise of religion,' much less has any state or territory power to pass such an act.

"The doctrine of a plurality of wives was believed and practiced by Abraham, the father of the faithful; and we find that while in this practice the angels of God frequently ministered to him, and at one time dined with him; and God manifested himself to him, and entered into familiar conversation with him. Neither God nor his angels reproved Abraham for being a polygamist, but on the contrary the Almighty greatly blessed him, and made promises unto him concerning both Isaac and Ishmael, clearly showing that Abraham practiced what is called polygamy under the sanction of the Almighty. Now if the father of the faithful was thus blessed, certainly it should not be considered irreligious for the faithful, who are called his children, to walk in the steps of their father Abraham. Indeed, if the Lord himself, through his holy prophets, should give more wives unto his servants as he gave them unto the prophet David, it would be a great  Sin for them to refuse that which he gives. In such a case it would become a matter of conscience with them and a part of their religion, and they would be bound to exercise their faith in this doctrine, and practice it, or be condemned; therefore Congress would have no power to prohibit the free exercise of this part of their religion; neither would the states or territories have power, constitutionally, to pass a law 'prohibiting the free exercise thereof.' Now a certain religious society, called Shakers, believe it to be wrong for them to marry even one wife; it certainly would be unconstitutional for either the Congress or the states to pass a law compelling all people to marry at a certain age, because it would infringe upon the rights of conscience among the Shakers, and they would be prohibited the free exercise of their religion.

"From the foregoing revelation, given through Joseph the seer, it will be seen that God has actually commanded some of his servants to take more wives, and has pointed out certain duties in regard to the marriage ceremony, showing that they must be married for time and for all eternity, and showing the advantages to be derived in a future state by this eternal union, and showing still further that if they refused to obey this command, after having the law revealed to them, they should be damned. This revelation, then, makes it a matter of conscience among all the Latter-day Saints; and they embrace it as a part and portion of their religion, and verily believe that they cannot be saved and reject it. Has Congress power, then, to pass laws 'prohibiting' the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints 'the free exercise' of this article of their religion? Have any of the states or territories a constitutional right to pass laws 'prohibitingthe free exercise of the religion' which the Church of the Saints — conscientiously and sincerely believe to be essential to their salvation? No; they have no such right.

"The Latter-day Saints have the most implicit confidence in all the revelations given through Joseph the Prophet; and they would much sooner lay down their lives and suffer martyrdom than to deny the least revelation that was ever given to him. In one of the revelations through him we read that God raised up wise men and inspired them to write the Constitution of our country, that the freedom of the people might be maintained, according to the free agency which he had given to them; that every man might be accountable to God and not to man, so far as religions doctrines and conscience are concerned. And the more we examine that sacred instrument framed by the wisdom of our illustrious fathers, the more we  are compelled to believe that an invincible power controlled, dictated, and guided them in laying the foundation of liberty and freedom upon this great western hemisphere. To this land the Mohammedan, the Hinda, the Chinese can emigrate, and each bring with him his score of wives and his hundred children, and the glorious Constitution of our country will not interfere with his domestic relations. Under the broad banner of the Constitution, he is protected in all his family associations; none have a right to tear any of his wives or his children from him. So, likewise, under the broad folds of the Constitution, the legislative assembly of the territory of Utah have the right to pass laws regulating their matrimonial relations, and protecting each of their citizens in the right of marrying one or many wives, as the case may be. If Congress should repeal those laws, they could not do so on the ground of their being unconstitutional. And even if Congress should repeal them, there still would be no law in Utah prohibiting the free exercise of that religious right; neither do the citizens of Utah feel disposed to pass such an unconstitutional act which would infringe upon the most sacred rights of conscience.

"Tradition and custom have great influence over nations. Long-established customs, whether right or wrong, become sacred in the estimation of mankind. Those nations who have been accustomed from time immemorial to the practice of what is called polygamy would consider a law abolishing it as the very height of injustice and oppression; the very idea of being limited to the one-wife system would be considered not only oppressive and unjust, but absolutely absurd and ridiculous: it would be considered an innovation upon the long-established usages, customs, and laws of numerous and powerful nations; an innovation of the most dangerous character, calculated to destroy the most sacred rights tad privileges of family associations — to upset the very foundations of individual rights, rendered dear and sacred by being handed down to them from the most remote acres of antiquity.

"On the other hand, the European nations who have been for centuries restricted by law to the one-wife theory would consider it a shocking innovation upon the customs of their fathers to abolish their restrictive laws, and to give freedom and liberty, according to the plurality system. It is custom, then, in a great decree, that forms the conscience of nations and individuals in reward to the marriage relationships. Custom causes four fifths of the population of the globe to decide that polygamy, as it is called,  is a good and not an evil practice; custom causes the balance, or the remaining fifth, to decide in opposition to the great majority.

"Those individuals who have strength of mind sufficient to divest themselves entirely from the influence of custom, and examine the doctrine of a plurality of wives under the light of reason and revelation, will be forced to the conclusion that it is a doctrine of divine origin; that it was embraced and practiced under the divine sanction by the most righteous men who ever lived on the earth: holy prophets and patriarchs, who were inspired by the Holy Ghost — who were enwrapt in the visions of the Almighty — who conversed with holy angels — who saw God face to face, and talked with him as a man talks with his friend — were 'polygamists,' that is, they had many wives, raised up many children by them, and were never reproved by the Holy Ghost, nor by angels, nor by the Almighty, for believing in and practicing such a doctrine; on the contrary, each one of these 'polygamists' received by revelation promises and blessings for himself, for his wives, and for his numerous children born unto him by his numerous wives. Moreover, the Lord himself gave revelation to different wives belonging to the same man revealing to them the great blessings which should rest upon their posterity; angels also were sent to comnrnrt and bless them; and in no instance do we find them reproved for having joined themselves in marriage to a 'polygamist.' Indeed, the Lord himself gave laws, not to prohibit 'polygamy,' but showing his will in relation to the children raised up by the different wives of the same man; and, furthermore, the Lord himself actually officiated in giving David all the wives of Saul: this occurred, too, when David already had several wives which he had previously taken: therefore, as the Lord did actually give into David's own bosom all the wives of Saul, he must not only have sanctioned 'polygamy,' but established and instituted it upon a sure foundation by giving the wives himself, the same as he gave Eve to Adam. Therefore those who are completely divested from the influence of national customs, and who judge concerning this matter by the Word of God, are compelled to believe that the plurality of wives was once sanctioned, for many ages, by the Almighty; and by a still further research of the divine oracles, they find no intimations that this divine institution was ever repealed. It was an institution not originated under the law of Moses, but it was of a far more ancient date; and, instead of being abolished by that law, it was sanctioned and perpetuated: and when Christ came to fulfil that law, and to do it away by the introduction of a better  covenant, he did not abolish the plurality system: not being originated under that law, it was not made null and void when that law was done away. Indeed, there were many things in connection with the law that were not abolished when the law was fulfilled as, for instance, the Ten Commandments, which the people under the Gospel covenant were still obliged to obey; and until we can find some law of God abolishing and prohibiting a plurality of wives, we are compelled to believe it a divine institution; and we are, furthermore, compelled to believe that if this institution be entered into now, under the same principles which governed the holy prophets and patriarchs, that God will approbate it now as much as he did then; and that the persons who do thus practice it conscientiously and sincerely are just as honorable in the sight of God as those who have but one wife. And that which is honorable before God should be honorable before men: and no one should be despised when he acts in all good conscience upon any principle of doctrine; neither should there be laws in any of these states or territories to compel any individual to act in violation to the dictates of his own conscience; but every one should be left in all matters of religion to his own choice, and thus become accountable to God, and not to his fellow-man.

"If the people of this country have generally formed different conclusions from us upon this subject, and if they have embraced religious which are more congenial to their minds than the religion of the Saints, we say to them that they are welcome to their own religious views the laws should not interfere with the exercise of their religions rights. If we cannot convince your by reason nor by the Word of God that your religion is wrong, we will not persecute you, but will sustain you in the privileges guaranteed in the great charter of American liberty: we ask from you the same generosity — protect us in tile exercise of our religious rights — convince us of our errors of doctrine, if we have ally, by reason, by logical arguments, or by the Word of God. and we will be ever grateful for the information, and you will ever have the pleasing, reflection that you have been the instruments in the hands of God of redeeming your fellow-beings from the darkness which you may see enveloping their minds. Come, then, let us reason together, and try to discover the true light upon all subjects connected with our temporal or eternal happiness; and if we disagree in our judgments, let us impute it to the weakness and imperfections of our fallen natures, and let us pity each other and endeavor with patience and meekness to reclaim from error, and save the immortal soul from an  endless death." This document was not officially promulgated at Salt Lake City until August 29, 1852 (Remy, 2:112-130), when it was given to a great conference, to be thereafter as a possession unto all the Saints (Stenhouse, page 182 sq.). The Prophet's widow at once denounced it as a forgery, and with four of her sons declaimed against it as gravely unjust to the memory of their husband and father. There seems to be, however, no ground for this protest. Mormons who knew Smith and afterwards apostatized, as well as more recent apostate Saints, insist, after a most searching inquiry, that Smith must have been the author, or the supposed "seer," of this "revelation." Says Stenhouse: "The sons of the Prophet have been very restive under the imputation of polygamous practices being attributed to their father. They have labored indefatigably in decrying polygamy, and have devoted a large share of their time, talent, ink, and paper in hostility to it, as they evidently believe it is both a great error and a great sin. But as the facts of Joseph's marital relations with 'sisters' who claim to be his 'wives,' in the Mormon sense, are overwhelming, the sons, in denying their sire's polygamy, are driven to the alternative of silently allowing the inevitable charge of practical 'free love,' ‘adultery,' or whatever others may choose to call it. At the present time there are probably about a dozen 'sisters' in Utah who proudly acknowledge themselves to be the 'wives of Joseph,' and how many others there may have been who held that relationship 'no man knoweth.'... Mrs. Emma Smith may feel justified in denying that her husband was a polygamist; for she may neither assent to the use of the term nor acknowledge the principle. But there is to the author's mind the most satisfactory evidence that Joseph Smith had 'sealed' to him a large number of women some time before his death, many of whom have stated to the author that they were 'the wives of Joseph Smith;' that 'Mrs. Emma Smith was aware of the fact,' and that it was the trouble growing out of the discovery of such relationship that called forth the revelation" (pages 185-188). We have not room here to quote further from the writings and sayings of the Saints on the subject of 'pluralism." In the article on POLYGAMY SEE POLYGAMY the Mormon position will be carefully considered. Suffice it to say here that the practice of pluralism is now carried to great lengths among the Saints, their leading men having from fifteen to forty wives each. Mr. Young is known to have nineteen "real, living wives." "How many spiritual wives he has had," says Mrs. Stenhouse (Tell it All), "it would be impossible to say. Probably he himself does not know their number. Lately, I believe, he has been making his will, and, if so, I suppose he has 'taken count of all.' He  has besides in various parts of Utah many other wives, who are all more or less provided for; but they are of little account, and he seldom or never sees them. The nineteen whom I have named form his family at home, as I may say are all under his own roof, or, at least, they live in Salt Lake City, and are known to every one of his wives" (page 290). The universal testimony of all travellers is that if the effect of polygamy has not been to corrupt the morals and deteriorate the character of the people, it has certainly degraded their physical condition. It is believed that the women submit to a yoke which they abhor because they see no escape, or that they bend to it from a mistaken sense of duty. The wives generally live apart, in some instances in separate houses. The first wife is practically recognised as the Head, though not always the favorite of the husband.

We quote from Mr. Bowles's pages, who epitomizes in a paragraph the common testimony of all observers against the polygamous practices of the Mormons of Utah: "It is a dreadful state of society to any of fine feelings and true instincts; it robs married life of all its sweet sentiment and companionship; and while it degrades woman, it brutalizes man, teaching him to despise and domineer over his wives, over all women. It breeds jealousy, distrust, and tempts to infidelity; but the police system of the Church and the community is so strict and constant that it is claimed and believed the latter vice is very rare. As I have said, we had little direct communication with the women of the Saints, but their testimony came to us in a hundred ways — sad, tragic, heart-rending. One woman, an educated, handsome person, as yet a single wife, said, with bated breath and almost hissing fury, to one of our party in some aside discussion of the subject, 'Polygamy is tolerable enough for the men, but it is hell for the women!'" Even stronger and more heart-rending is the testimony of Mr. and Mrs. Stenhouse. The latter's book, Tell it A11 (Hartford, Conn., 1875, 12mo, pp. 623), gives the story of a woman's life experience in Mormondom in such detail that it really constitutes the fullest review of pluralistic life. Her husband's work is, however, more valuable to the inquirer, as it is written more impartially and considerately. And his picture of pluralism has enough to sadden the most cold-hearted. Says he: "To assert that any true woman living in polygamy is in heart and soul satisfied and happy, is to simply libel her nature... The women are, however, not alone the sufferers by polygamy. The intelligent of the fair sex among the Mormons will readily admit this, and some even go so far as to pity their husbands, and to extend to them the genuine sympathy of their hearts,  though polygamy has been their own curse. Whatever else it has achieved, polygamy has at least been impartial with the sexes, and while it has martyred the woman, it has not failed to enslave the man... No man ever regained his senses after the act of sealing without feeling that he had fatally wounded the wife of his youth. It is a cruelty that he realizes as well as his wife, and he, the nominal but innocent cause of her wrong, seeks to assuage her sufferings by greater kindness and tenderness. But no smooth words, nor the soul-speaking affection of his eye, can heal the wound. It steals her life away, and in her true heart she curses the day she ever heard of Mormonism. For the man who realizes and shares the misery of his wife, the future life is but 'a living lie.' Were the man an angel, it would be impossible for him to act justly towards two or twenty wives, and divide to each the full measure of her rights... Polygamy may be the marital relation of the sexes in heaven; it may be the ' celestial law' of the gods -of that there is no discussion or dreaming; but one thing is certain, that it is not the true marital relation of the sexes upon the earth, and thirty years of its practice under the most favorable circumstances have stamped it as a withering curse" (pages 584-588).

Pluralism, then, which has thus far failed to gain the hearty support of the more intelligent Mormons, if we may accept Mr. Stenhouse's statement, and there seems to be no reason to gainsay that it has, reacted against the Church of the Latter-day Saints, not only socially, but also numerically; for since the promulgation of this tenet many of its converts have quitted them, and their progress has been stayed in a great measure. Says Mr. Stenhouse: "On the 1st of January, 1853, it was published in the Star. It fell like a thunder-bolt upon the Saints, and fearfully shattered the mission. The British elders, who in their ignorance had been denying polygamy, and stigmatizing their opponents as calumniators, up to the very day of its publication, were confounded and paralyzed, and from that time to the present the avenues of preaching have closed one after another, and the mission that was once the glory of the Mormon Church has withered and shriveled into comparative insignificance. The outside world misjudges the Mormon people when it imagines that polygamy was ever a favorite doctrine. Doubtless to some few it was a pleasant revelation; but it was not so to the mass of the people, for they resisted it until they were compelled to yield their opposition, or else abandon the Church in which they had faith. The statistical reports of the mission in the British Islands (June 30, 1853) show that the enormous number of 1776 persons were  excommunicated there during the first six months of the preaching of polygamy. The entire Church then numbered, men, women, and children over eight years of age, 30,690. There were forty 'seventies' and eight 'high-priests' [see § V, below, for explanation of these terms] from Utah in Britain at that time, carrying with them a powerful personal influence to help the Saints to tide over the introduction of this doctrine. These Utah missionaries were aided by a native priesthood of 2578 elders, 1854 priests, 1416 teachers, 834 deacons; and yet no less than 1776 recusants were excommunicated. That tells its own tale. That all these persons withdrew from the fellowship of the Mormon Church on account of polygamy would be an unfair inference. Still, doubtless polygamy was the great contributing cause of apostasy then, and more persons have left the Mormon communion on account of polygamy and Brigham's favorite deity, Adam (which he first preached in October of the same year), than all else put together. Few of the Mormon women have ever accepted polygamy from the assent of their judgments. They have first been led by their teachers to consider the doctrine true, and afterwards have been afraid to question it. Their fears have counselled submission... Brigham Young, with all the commanding influence of his position, could not silence the murmuring within his own domicile until he threatened to divorce all his wives, and told them that, if they despised the order of heaven, he would pray that the curse of the Almighty might be close to their heels, and follow them all the day long (Sermon, July 14, 1855, in the Bowery, Provo), and even all that violent language has not attained the end; their hearts revolt as much today, though they have schooled themselves into submission and silence" (pages 201, 202, 588).

We append the preparations and the wedding ceremony for a marriage in "pluralism" as sketched by the apostle Pratt:

"When the day set apart for the solemnization of the marriage ceremony has arrived, the bridegroom and his wife, and also the bride, together with their relatives and such other guests as may be invited, assemble at the place which they have appointed. The scribe then proceeds to take the names, ages, native towns, counties, states, and countries of the parties to be married, which he 'carefully enters our record. The president, who is the prophet, seer, and revelator over the whole Church throughout the world, and who alone holds the 'keys' of authority in this solemn ordinance (as recorded in the 2d and 5th paragraphs of the Revelation on Marriage), calls upon the bridegroom and his wife and the bride to arise, which they do,  fronting the president. The wife stands on the left hand of her husband, while the bride stands on her left. The president then puts this question to the wife:

"'Are you willing to give this woman to your husband to be his lawful and wedded wife for time and for all eternity? If you are, you will manifest it by placing her right hand within the right hand of your husband.'

"The right hands of the bridegroom and bride being thus joined, the wife takes her husband by the left arm, as if in the attitude of walking; the president then proceeds to ask the following question of the man:

"'Do you, brother' (calling him by name), 'take sister' (calling the bride by her name) 'by the right hand, to receive her unto yourself, to be your lawful and wedded wife, and you to be her lawful and wedded husband, for time and for all eternity, with a covenant and promise on your part that you will fulfil all the laws, rites, and ordinances pertaining to this holy matrimony in the new and everlasting covenant, doing this in the presence of God, angels, and these witnesses, of your own free-will and choice?'

"The bridegroom answers, 'Yes.' The president then puts the question to the bride:

"'Do you, sister' (calling her by name), 'take brother' (calling him by name) 'by the right hand, and give yourself to him to be his lawful and wedded wife for time and for all eternity, with a covenant and promise on your part that you will fulfil all the laws, rites, and ordinances pertaining to this holy matrimony in the new and, everlasting covenant, doing this in the presence of God angels, and these witnesses, of your own free-will and choice?'

"The bride answers, 'Yes.' The president then says: "'In the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and by the authority of the holy priesthood, I pronounce you legally and lawfully husband and wife for time and for all eternity; and I seal upon you the blessings of the holy resurrection, with power to come forth in the morning of the first resurrection, clothed with glory, immortality, and eternal lives; and I seal upon you the blessings of thrones, and dominions, and principalities, and powers, and exaltations, together with the blessings of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; and say unto you, Be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth, that you may have joy and rejoicing in your posterity in the day of the Lord Jesus. All these blessings, together with all other blessings pertaining to the new and everlasting  covenant, I seal upon your Heads, through your faithfulness unto the end, by the authority of the holy priesthood, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.'

"The scribe then enters on the general record the date and place of the marriage, together with the names of two or three witnesses who were present" (The Seer, page 32).

"The reader will observe that, in this ordinance of polygamic sealing, the husband and the young bride are each asked the question, are you 'doing this in the presence of God, angels, and these witnesses, of your own free- will and choice,' while the question put to the wife carefully avoids the issue that would instantly arise between her wounded, bleeding heart and the falsehood that would be forced from her trembling lips if she essayed to utter that it was of her 'own free-will and choice.' That poor 'victim' is but asked if she has been subdued and is 'willing to give this woman' to her husband'" (Stenhouse, page 587). It should be added that the Mormon president possesses the papal prerogative of annulling all marriages contracted under his sanction (Mrs. Stenhouse, page 554 sq.); a prerogative which cannot fail to prove a source of wealth and power. As to marriages celebrated without his authority, they are ipso facto void, in foro conscientice. Consequently either man or woman is at liberty to desert an unbelieving spouse and take another. Marriage, it may be stated here also, is allowed within near degrees; a man may marry two sisters, a niece, and mother and daughter, and even a half-sister.

3. Other Practices. — There appears to be no prescribed ritual for the burying of the dead, and there is but little of the true devotional element in any of the religious exercises of the Mormons. Their ordinary worship consists of prayers, with addresses, often of a very homely character, and hymns. The duties of private prayer, meditation, communion with God, self-examination, are seldom or never spoken of. "Every household," says Stenhouse, "is instructed to have morning and evening prayers. The father gathers his children around him, and all kneeling, he prays for revelation, the gifts of the Spirit for himself and family; then in turn comes every order of priesthood. 'Bless Brigham Young, bless him; may the heavens be opened unto him, angels visit and instruct him; clothe him with power to defend thy people, and to overthrow all who rise up against him; bless him in his basket and in his store, multiply and increase him in wives, children, flocks and herds, houses and lands — make him very great,' etc. After  Brigham has been properly remembered, then come his councillors, the apostles, the high-priests, the seventies, the elders, the priests, the teachers, the deacons, and the Church universal. Another divergence is made in remembrance of the president of the Conference, and the president of that particular 'branch' where the family resides, and every officer in it. All are prayed for — if the father does his duty. The power and the greatness of the 'kingdom' that is to roll on till it fills the whole earth, and subjugates all earthly and corrupt man-made governments, are specially urgent. All nations are to weaken and crumble to pieces, and Zion is to go forth in her strength, conquering and to conquer, till the priesthood shall... 'reign and rule and triumph, and God shall be our king"' (pages 557, 558). Very gross irreverence is often shown during public worship. There is in their chief town, Salt Lake City, an immense tabernacle, where their religious services are held, and where one or more of their prophets preach to them every Sabbath. "The gatherings and services," says Mr. Bowles, describing a service which he attended (Our New West, page 243), "both in speaking and singing, reminded me of the Methodist camp-meetings of fifteen or twenty years ago. The singing, as on the latter occasions, was the best part of the exercises-simple, sweet, and fervent. 'Daughter of Zion,' as sung by the large choir one Sunday morning, was prayer, sermon, song, and all. The preacher that day was apostle Richards; but beyond setting forth the superiority of the Mormon Church system, through its presidents, councils, bishops, elders, and seventies, for the work made incumbent upon Christians, and claiming that its preachers were inspired like those of old, his discourse was a rambling, unimpressive exhortation... The rite of the sacrament [of the Lord's Supper] is administered every Sunday, water being used instead of wine, and the distribution proceeds among the whole congregation, men, women, and children, numbering from three to five thousand, while the singing and the preaching are in progress. The prayers are few and simple, undistinguishable, except in these characteristics, from those heard in all Protestant churches, and the congregation all join in the Amen." (Comp. Qu. Rev. 122:486-488; Ollivant, page 54, and Appendix A, pages 119,147; Rae, page 106 sq.) When the Temple is completed, it is intended, as the founder ordered, to establish sacrifices and every ordinance belonging to the priesthood as they existed prior to Moses's day (Compend. page 177). There are also some secret ceremonies, of which very different accounts have been given. The most important of these are the "mysteries of the Endowment House," where the marriage ceremony is performed. Stenhouse tells us that "within its portals are performed all the  rites and ceremonies that hold Mormonism together," but he reveals nothing, probably because he is bound by oath so to terrestrial secrecy. He indicates, however, that the importance of these secrets has been overestimated. Mrs. Stenhouse gives a detailed description of her own experience in the Endowment House, and it Confirms the statement of an intelligent gentleman who, when interrogated shortly after passing through the house by one who had been there — "I went in expecting everything; I came out with nothing." (Those desiring full details may consult Mrs. Stenhouse, Tell it All, chapter 25.)

V. Hierarchical Organization. — Mormonism is a pure theocracy; its priesthood, who rule in matters temporal and ecclesiastical, make up about one fifth of the male members. They are recognised because of the declaration made by prophet Smith as "the channel through which the Almighty commenced revealing his glory at the beginning of the creation of this earth, and through which he has continued to reveal himself to the children of men to the present time, and through which he will make known his purposes to the end of time" (Compend. page 176). They are divided into various orders. The highest is the First Presidency, composed of three, harmonious in representation upon the earth with "the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost" in heaven, and the successors of Peter, James, and John in the Gospel Church. Of these, the first is primus inter parses. He is elected by the whole body of the Church and possesses supreme authority. "Throughout all Mormondom," says Stenhouse, "the highest rank of the priesthood is sacred, and all councillors are but aids. The theory is that a president is nearer to 'the throne' than his councillors, and though the latter may speak and diffuse their measure of light, at the moment the president is ready to decide what should be done, the Lord will give him direction" (page 560). The second office in point of dignity is that of Patriarch, whose sole duty is to administer blessings. He is appointed by the Church for life. Then follows the council of "The Twelve," whose functions are of great practical importance. They ordain all other officers, elders, priests, teachers, and deacons; they baptize, administer the sacraments, and take the lead in all meetings. Next come the Seventies (of whom there are many). They are under the direction of the "Twelve Apostles," and are the great propagandists, missionaries, and preachers of the body. The fifth order is that of High-priests, composed usually of men  advanced in years. Their duty is to officiate in all the offices of the Church when there are no higher officers present. After these come the Bishops, who are "overseers" of the Church chiefly in secular matters, attending to the registration of births, marriages, and deaths, the support of "literary concerns" (such as newspapers and magazines), house-visiting, and the settlement of private grievances. The duties of the Elders are not very precise; they are charged with the conduct of meetings, and exercise a general surveillance over the Priests, who correspond to the "fixed ministry" of other sects; i.e., they preach, exhort, and expound the Scriptures. The lowest orders are the Teachers and Deacons; the former are simply assistants to the priests, elders, and bishops, and act as catechists; the latter are Church-collectors, treasurers, etc.

The whole priesthood is divided into two classes. the Melchizedek and the Aaronic. To the first belong the offices of apostle, seventy, patriarch, high-priest, and elder; to the second, those of bishop, priest, teacher, and deacon. The latter can be held only by "literal descendants of Aaron," who are pointed out by special revelation. Besides these office-bearers, there is also the Standing High Council, to settle difficulties among believers. This consists of eighteen (at first twelve) highpriests, appointed by ballot, with one or three presidents, being the first president alone, or with his assessors. After the evidence has been heard, and the accusers, accused, and a certain number of councillors, from two to six, according to the gravity of the case, have spoken, the president gives his decision, and calls on the other members to sanction it. Sometimes a case is reheard; in special difficulties recourse is had to revelation. Every "stake" and separate church is governed by its own "High Council," with a similar constitution and procedure, and with an appeal to the Supreme High Council. General affairs are managed by Conferences, held April 6 in each year. At these, which sometimes last several days, the first presidency and other office- bearers are sustained in office by vote, always unanimous, of the meetings; vacancies are filled, reports on various subjects are read, prayers are offered, addresses delivered, hymns and anthems sung, etc. (see Mill. Star, passim; Burton, page 367 sq.; Qu. Rev. pages 122, 488). "This great net- work of priesthood, which covers everything. and the influence of which permeates everything," says Stenhouse, "is the key to the power of their president over the Saints in Zion. 'Through the priesthood he can sway them at his will... As seen in all the Conference minutes, the people are, by their own free voting, made responsible for everything that is done, and when once they have [as they are obliged to do by fear of persecution or  excommunication], by uplifted hand before heaven, expressed their wish, it becomes their duty and obligation to sustain it" (page 566). In theory, the Mormons recognise the right of private judgment; in fact, the attempt to exercise that right has always been hazardous.

The whole duty of a Mormon consists in thinking and doing as he is told, even as regards his most private and personal affairs. The president may order or forbid a man to marry; a bishop may at any time enter any Mormon's house, and issue what orders he pleases. All Saints are compelled to deal only at the authorized shops and stores, which are managed on the cooperative principle for the benefit of the Church. By means of a constant system of espionage any breach of rules is promptly noticed, and if it be persisted in the offender is cut off from the Church. Persons are even excommunicated without any reason assigned, and, on complaining, are told that their crime will in due time come to light; it being held that if any man fails in obedience to the priesthood in any respect he must have committed some great crime, whereby he has lost the Spirit of God (Ollivant, pages 86, 87). Indeed, all the arrangements at Utah are admirably suited to maintain obedience. Every means are adopted to prevent any but the chief men from accumulating money; so that while a man can live from hand to mouth in some comfort, he cannot save anything. The majority, therefore, are virtually dependants in Utah (Ollivafit, pages 47, 101). If any man secedes, or is cast out, all Mormons are forbidden to have any intercourse with him, even to give him food or shelter; and sometimes violence, even to death, has been used. All "Gentiles" are suspected, and every means are used to keep them away (see Rae, pages 118-120; Fraser's Mago June, 1871, page 692).

VI. Propagandism, etc. — Missions are a great feature of Mormonism. Any member of the priesthood is liable to be sent, at the will of the president on a sudden impulse, at short notice to "preach the gospel to the Gentiles." “Joseph Smith, the prophet," says Pres. George A. Smith, "enjoined upon the twelve apostles that they should preach the gospel to all the nations of the earth, and wherever they could not go to send the same, that all nations might be faithfully warned of the restoration of the everlasting gospel in all its purity and fulness for the salvation of mankind, and the near advent of the Messiah, preparatory to the introduction of his reign of righteousness upon the earth" (Ans. to Questions, page 30). The  zeal and activity of these emissaries, though it has been much exaggerated, is still remarkable. The Mormon presidents are good judges of character, and it seems to be their plan to select the restless and enterprising spirits, who, perhaps, may threaten disturbance at home, and to utilize their fanaticism, while they flatter their vanity, by sending them as representatives of the Church to distant fields of labor. "From the youth in his teens," says Stenhouse, "to the elder in hoary age, all the brethren are subject to be 'called on mission' at any time, and in such calls no personal conveniences are ever consulted. Should a merchant be wanted for a 'mission,' his business must be left in other hands. and his affairs be conducted by other brains; so with the artisan, the mechanic, the farmer, and the ploughboy — they must in their way do the best they can. Seed- time or harvest, summer or winter, pleasure or important work — nothing in which they are engaged is allowed to stand in the way. If poor, and the family is dependent upon the outgoing missionary, that must be no hinderance — the mission is given, he has to go, and the family 'trusts in the Lord,' and in the tender mercies of the bishop!" (page 568). Their method of establishing a mission in a foreign country is as follows.

Among their converts, taken at random from the mixed population of the Union, there are natives to be found of every nation in Europe. They select a native of the country they wish to attack, and join him as interpreter to the other emissaries whom they are about to despatch to the land of his birth. On arriving at their destination, the missionaries are supported by the funds of the Church till they can maintain themselves out of the offerings of their proselytes. Meanwhile they employ themselves in learning the language and circulating tracts in defence of their creed, and then sit down to the weary task of translating the Book of Mormon. By this process they have formed churches in Great Britain, France, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Iceland, Germany, Palestine, the Pacific Isles, Italy, Switzerland, Malta, Gibraltar, South Africa, Australia, and the Sandwich Islands; and, besides these, they have also sent missionaries to Siam, Ceylon, China, Hindostan, the West Indies, Guiana, and Chili. The Book of Mormon has been published in French, German, Italian, Danish, Polynesian, and Welsh. Besides various tracts which are circulated by these missionaries, they have established regular periodicals in English, German, French, Welsh, and Danish. We should observe, however, that of the missions above enumerated, those to Great Britain, the Icelandic countries, and the Sandwich Islands have alone been really successful. In England they  preached first in the summer of 1837, and at their April Conference in 1841 there was represented a total of 5184 persons baptized. Of these, 106 were ordained elders, 303 priests, 169 teachers, and 63 deacons. Besides these, 800 souls had emigrated to "build up Zion at Nauvoo." In Denmark, at the beginning of 1853, they possessed 1400 baptized converts, and had also despatched 297 more to Utah. In the Sandwich Islands they baptized thousands before their mission had been established twenty months. These proselytes were all previously Christians, converted from heathenism. The other foreign missions have as yet only succeeded in making a very small number of proselytes. In Great Britain, as we have seen above, the promulgation of the doctrine of "pluralism" has seriously checked the progress of Mormonism. Of the converts made from 1840 to 1854 in the different missions, 17,195 emigrated to this country to "strengthen Zion." Up to 1860 about 30,000 Mormons had come, and from that time to the present there have probably been 25,000 more, making a contribution to America of a round 55,000 souls. And yet these figures do not even distantly convey the spread of Mormonism in Europe. The very sons of the apostles and prophets testify, on their return to Utah from European missions, that "they never knew what Mormonism was... till they went abroad to preach... It is especially the British mission, with latterly the Scandinavian, that has built up Utah" (Stenhouse, page 11). The Mormons, the world over, are estimated at no less than 300,000 souls, 125,000 of whom live in Utah territory.

Several schisms have taken place, but they have thus far but very inconsiderably affected "the Church of the Latter-day Saints." The first departure from the main body was occasioned in 1852 by the widow and sons of the founder of Mormonism on the publication of the revelation authorizing polygamy, the genuineness of which they denied. They bear the title of "The Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints," and have their head-quarters at Nauvoo. Their chief feature is the rejection of "pluralism," and all that gathers about that practice. Neither do they approve of the political schemes of Brigham Young and the leaders of the Church in Utah. Joseph Smith, the son of the Prophet is regarded by them as the true living head of the Church, and under his direction they have established themselves in the place pointed out by their founder as the site of the "New Zion." Their number which is inconsiderable, will probably be largely increased soon, if polygamy is not abandoned in Utah. "Young Joseph" is peculiarly "favored" with "visions," and "visits of angels," and  "gifts of tongues," "interpretations," and "powers of healing;" and these worshippers "cast out" all the devils that come in their way. Some of their elders and prophets have been in Utah, and there "added numbers to the New Church, and shook the faith of many more in Brigham" (Stenhouse, page 629). Another branch of the Church has recently established itself at Independence, Missouri, they regarding this place as the supposed site of the New Jerusalem. But this branch only counts an insignificant membership. The most powerful opposition to Mormonism came out of its own midst in the beginning of 1869, when a large number of influential Saints quitted the main body, and formed themselves into an independent organization in Utah, and right in Salt Lake City itself. They first assumed the name of "Church of Zion," and have been holding religious services in a hall built by Young for his own disciples, beginning December 19, 1869. "Of all the apostasies from the Mormon Church," says Stenhouse, "this was the most formidable, and has done more damage to the position of Brigham Young than all of them put together. The preaching of the 'reformers' [as they were called] first shook the people's confidence in the Prophet; and, as they travelled further, it has led many of them out of Mormonism altogether" (page 643; comp. page 630 sq.). The leading "reformers," who were originally distinguished as advocates of freedom of thought and action, as opposed to the despotism of the priesthood, have since become zealous propagators of spiritualistic views; but, as they are all of a superior class, they have had liberality enough not to seek to carry their companions with them, and, while the movement has been subject to more or less change since it first started, there still remains enough to characterize it as the beginning of a "liberal" Christian Church. The Church structure which they have erected, first christened "Church of Zion," has been changed to "The Liberal Institute," and there lecturers, male and female, of every shade of opinion in. religion, politics, or science, can speak for the edification of Saint and sinner. "The Liberal Institute," says Stenhouse, " is the Faneuil Hall of Utah, and from its platform will go forth facts of history and science that will work in a few years a grander revolution among the Saints than would the presence of ten thousand troops, or any other movement that could possibly be construed into ‘persecution.' "

VII. Literature. — The publications of the Saints are very numerous. A pretty full account of their work in this direction is furnished by Mr. Stenhouse in an Appendix (2) to his work, page 741 sq. Mr. Burton has  also compiled a list, and both these should be consulted by any seeking detailed information regarding Mormonism. See, however, especially, A Compendium of the Faith and Doctrines of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latterday Saints (1857); Letters exhibiting the most prominent Doctrines of the Church, etc., by Elder Orson Spencer (5th ed. 1866); Sacred Hymns and Spiritual Songs for the Church, etc. (12th ed. 1863); Tracts, chiefly those by Orson Pratt; The Millennial Star, a periodical published for a while at Liverpool (15 volumes up to 1853); The Evening and Morning Star, edited by W.W. Phelps (1832, 1833); Times and Seasons, founded and published at Nauvoo (1843 sq.); The Seer, edited by Orson Pratt, and published at Washington; Deseret News, published at Salt Lake City, being the official paper of Mormondom; Voice of Warning to all Nations, by Parly P. Pratt; Bennet, Mormonism Exposed (Boston, 1842); Kane, The Mormons (1850); Mackay, The Mormons (4th ed. Lond. 1851); Chandlers, A Visit to Salt Lake; Burton, City of the Saints; an Expedition to the Valley of the Great Salt Lake of Utah, etc., with an authentic Account of the Monrmon Settlement, etc., by Howard Stansbury, of the U.S.A. (Phila. 1852); Lieut. Gunnison, History of the Mormons (Phila. 1852); Ferris, Utah and the Mormons — unfavorable to the Saints, but full of valuable information (N.Y. 1854); Hyde, Mormonism, its Leaders and Designs (N.Y. 1857), an expose by a former Mormon elder; Tucker, Origin, Rise, and Progress of Mormonism (N.Y. 1867); and the latest and best, Stenhouse, The Rocky Mountain Saints (N.Y. 1873), whose book we have had occasion to refer to so frequently. See also travels like Remy's Journey to Great Salt Lake City, Dixon's New America, Rae's Westward by Rail, and Ollivant's Breeze from the Great Salt Lake. Among periodical articles, see Revue des deux Mondes, September 1853, February 1856, September 1859, April 1861; Edinb. Rev. of 1854, page 185 sq.; Quart. Rev. April 1867; Fraser's Mag. volumes 3 and 4, new series, June and July 1871; Good Words, June 1866; Blackwood's Mag. 1867; Brit. Qu. Rev. January 1862; London Rev. March 1854, art. 4; July 1862, art. 3; North British Rev. August 1863, volume 8; Princeton Rev. January 1862, art. 2; Christian Examiner, January to May 1858; Littell's Living Age, 1852, 1854, and 1856. See Additional Note on page 991 of this vol.

## Mornay, Philip Duplessis De[[@Headword:Mornay, Philip Duplessis De]]

             SEE DU PLESSIS.

## Morning[[@Headword:Morning]]

             (properly בֹּקֶר, boker, Gen 1:5; πρωϊvα, Mat 21:18), the early part of the day, after sunrise.

The break of day, שִׁחִר, shachar, was at one period of the Jewish polity divided into two parts, in imitation of the Persians; the first of which began when the eastern, the second when the western division of the horizon was illuminated. The authors of the Jerusalem Talmud divided it into four parts, the first of which was called in Hebrew אילת השׁחר, aijeleth ha-shachar, or "the dawn of day," which is the title of Psalms 22. The Hebrews, like most simple people, were accustomed to early rising ( הַשְׁכַּיםGen 19:27, etc.), as is still the Oriental custom (Hackett, Illustrations of Scripture, page 115 sq.). SEE AFTERNOON; SEE DAY; SEE HOUR.

## Morning Hymn[[@Headword:Morning Hymn]]

             In the Apostolical Constitutions mention is made of a hymn for the morning, which is there, however, called the morning prayer. Other writers term it the hymn, the angelical hymn, and the great doxology. It ran in these words: "Glory be to God on high, on earth peace, good will towards men.. We praise thee, we laud thee, we bless thee, we glorify thee, we worship thee by the great High Priest, thee the true God, the only begotten, whom no one can approach, for thy great glory. O Lord, heavenly king, God the Father Almighty: Lord God, the Father of Christ, the immaculate Lamb, who taketh away the sin of the world, receive our prayer, thou that sittest upon the cherubims. For thou only art holy, thou only, Lord; Jesus, the Christ of God, the God of every created being, and our King. By whom unto thee be glory, honor, and adoration." This hymn was used daily in the ancient morning service, and is still used in the modern Greek Church.

## Morning Lecture[[@Headword:Morning Lecture]]

             SEE LECTURE.

## Morning Sacrifice[[@Headword:Morning Sacrifice]]

             SEE DAILY OFFERING.

## Morning Service[[@Headword:Morning Service]]

             it would appear from the Apostolic Constitutions, was regularly performed in the early Christian Church. The order observed was as follows: "It began with the sixty-third psalm (according to our arrangement), 'O God, thou art my God; early will I seek thee.' After this followed the prayers for the several orders of catechumens, energumens, candidates for baptism, and penitents. When these were sent away, there followed the prayers which on the Lord's-day began the communion service. After the prayer for the whole state of the Church was ended, the deacon exhorted the people to pray, thus: 'Let us beg of God his mercies and compassions, that this morning and this day, and all the time of our pilgrimage, may be passed by us in peace and without sin; let us beg of God that he would send us the angel of peace, and give us a Christian end, and be gracious and merciful unto us. Let us commend ourselves, and one another, to the living God, by his only-begotten Son.' Immediately after this common prayer of the deacon and people together, the bishop offered 'the morning thanksgiving,' in the following words: 'O God, the God of spirits and of all flesh, with  whom no one can compare, and who art above all need, that givest the sun to govern the day, and the moon and the stars to govern the night, look down now upon us with the eyes of thy favor, and receive our morning thanksgivings, and have mercy upon us. For we have not spread forth our hands to any strange god. We have not chosen unto ourselves any new god among us, but thou, the eternal and immortal God: O God, who hast given to us our being through Christ, and our well-being through him also vouchsafe by him to make us worthy of everlasting life, with whom unto thee be glory, honor, and adoration, in the Holy Ghost, world without end. Amen.' After this the deacon bade them bow their heads, and receive the bishop's benediction in the following form: 'God, faithful and true, that showest mercy to thousands and ten thousands of them that love thee; who art the friend of the humble and defender of the poor; whose aid all stand in need of, since all things serve thee; look down upon this thy people, who bow their heads unto thee, and bless with thy spiritual benediction; keep them as the apple of an eye; preserve them in piety and righteousness, and make them worthy of everlasting life, through Jesus Christ thy beloved Son, with whom with thee be glory, honor, and adoration, in the Holy Ghost, now and forever, world without end. Amen.' The deacon then dismissed the congregation with the usual form — 'Depart in peace.'

## Morocco[[@Headword:Morocco]]

             (or MAROCCO), called by the natives Maghreb-el-Aksa, i.e., "the extreme west," an empire or sultanate in the north-west of Africa. is bounded on the E. by Algeria, on the N. and W. by the Mediterranean Sea and Atlantic Ocean, and on the S. by a line which runs from Cape Nun (Lat. 283 45' 43" N.) in an easterly direction through the Sahara to the Algerian frontier, in long. 2° E. It includes at the present day the former kingdoms of Maghrib, Fez, and Tafilelet, covering 190,560 English square miles, with a population of about 6,00,000, according to Behm (Geographisches Jahbuck, 1866).

The inhabitants, like those of Barbary (the entire country of North Africa, from Egypt to the Atlantic Ocean, and from the Mediterranean to the Greater Atlas) in general, consist of Moors, Berbers, Arabs, Negroes, and Jews, with various intermixtures between these races. The Arabians, who have kept their identity notwithstanding the long. period of time they have dwelt in the country, are mostly given to cultivation of the land; indeed, they are about the only agriculturists of the country. They dwell mainly in  the valleys. The Moors (q.v.) are the most numerous in the cities, and are the dominant race in Morocco, numbering about 4,000,000; next to them are the Berbers, or Amaziyehs, who amount to about 3,000,000, and include the Berbers of the Riff coast and the Shelluks of the Great Atlas. Very few Europeans reside in Morocco. The state of civilization is very low, and many of the Amaziyehs are complete savages. Excepting the Jews and the few Europeans, the whole population is Mohammedan. The negroes, numbering only about 20,000, were generally brought into the country as slaves from Soudan, until the abolition of the African slave- trade.

The country is generally mountainous, the Atlas range traversing it in several parallel chains from the southwest to north-east, and sending numerous spurs to both the coast country and the desert. There are, however, many level tracts throughout Morocco, especially at its western and eastern extremities, and on the borders of the desert. Morocco is divided into four territories-Fez, Morocco, Suse, and Tafilelet. For convenience of administration, the empire is subdivided into thirty-three governments or districts ("ammala"), each under the superintendence of a "caid," whose chief duty it is to collect the imposts; but the semi- independent tribes are ruled by their own chiefs, and scarcely acknowledge the authority of the sultan. The government is purely despotic, and in the absence of written laws the will of the sultan and his subordinates decides everything. The public officials eke out their allowances by practicing extortion on those under their charge, and are in turn plundered by their superiors. The sovereign of Morocco, called by Europeans emperor, is known among his subjects as sultan, and assumes the titles of Enii ul- mumenin, or "Prince of the Believers," and Khalietallah-fi chalkihi, or "Vicegerent of God upon Earth." The title is hereditary in the male line, but does not necessarily descend to the eldest son. The revenue of the emperor consists of a tenth upon every article of consumption, as allowed by the Koran; an annual tax upon the Jews; custom-house and excise duties; tributes exacted from his own subjects, foreign states, and European merchants, in the form of presents; which last articles form the chief source of his income. The duties and tributes are so frequently changed that it is impossible to estimate their annual amount with any degree of certainty.

Among the chief products of the country are wheat, barley, rice, maize, durra, and sugar-cane; and among fruits, the fig, pomegranate, lemon, orange, and date are common; while cotton, tobacco, hemp, etc., are  largely produced both for home use and export. Morocco is rich in mineral treasures; plentiful supplies of copper are obtained at Teseleght, near the source of the Assaker, and gold and silver occur in several places. Iron, antimony, lead, tin, and rock-salt, the last three in considerable quantity, are also found. Owing to the character of the country and its thin population (thirty-five to the English square mile), the country is much infested with wild animals. Lions, panthers, hyenas, wild-boars, and various kinds of deer, gazelles, etc., abound in suitable localities, and occasional devastations are committed by locusts. Ostriches are found in Tafilelet. The Moorish horses, formerly so famous, are now much degenerated. The breeding of sheep, oxen, goats, camels, mules, and asses forms an important item of national industry. Oxen and bulls are chiefly employed in field labor.

The only industrial arts prosecuted to any considerable extent are the manufacture of caps, fine silk, and leather. In the production of the last article the Moroccans far surpass Europeans. There is an important caravan trade between Morocco and Soudan, and also with Mecca and the Levant. The intercourse with Algiers has in very recent times become a source of great trouble, and there is danger of war between France and Morocco unless the emperor's subjects shall hereafter prove more considerate of French interests. The Jews of Algeria, who largely control the caravan trade, have been very unkindly treated, and their complaints have been made the subject of special diplomatic service, the end of which is not yet (April 1875). Education consists in learning to read, write, and recite portions of the Koran, and this quantum of education is pretty generally diffused among the people; but the art of printing is unknown, and the arts and sciences are at a very low ebb.

The religion of Morocco was no doubt Christian until, in the 7th and 8th centuries, the Saracens overran it, and made converts of the native population. SEE AFRICA, in volume 1, page 94. Since this changed condition Morocco has been faithful to the Moslem faith. Yet toleration is granted in some measure to any sect which does not teach a plurality of gods; and on proper application is permitted to appropriate a place for public worship. There are Roman Catholic establishments in Morocco, Mequinez, Mogadore, and Tangier, but the number of communicants is not much over 200. Protestants are scarcely known in the country, and thus far no missionary efforts have been made in this part of Africa. Until 1814 Christians were frequently held as slaves, but since the power of France  asserted itself on the African coast this abuse has terminated. Some of the practices of the natives are very peculiar. Thus through all the country there are buildings of an octagonal form called Zawiat, or sanctuaries, with an unenclosed piece of ground attached to each for the interment of the dead. In these places is a priest or saint, who superintends divine service and the burial of the dead, and who is often applied to as arbiter in disputes. In these consecrated places the wealthy inhabitants often deposit their treasures for security, and criminals find ,protection against the hands of justice. Polygamy is practiced in the country generally. The emperor himself supports a large harem, but has one superior wife, who is sultaness, and three other wives. Besides these he has a large number of concubines. Many of these are Moorish women, as the Moors consider it an honor to have their daughters in the harem; some of them European slaves; several are negresses: in all there are usually from sixty to one hundred, besides their slaves and domestics. Priestesses, who are so far learned as to read and write, are employed to teach the younger part of the harem to repeat their prayers, and to instruct the older females in the principles of their religion. The other religious institutions of the empire are so similar to those of most Mohammedan countries as to render a separate account of them altogether superfluous. SEE MOHAMMEDANISM.

The history of Morocco is, generally speaking, similar to that of the rest of Northern Africa (q.v.) down to the end of the 15th century. About that time it was formed into a monarchy, and, notwithstanding internal divisions, enjoyed considerable prosperity, and the confines of the empire were extended as far as Timbuctoo. This empire fell to pieces, and was succeeded in 1647 by that of the Sherifs of Tafilelet, who conquered both Morocco Proper and Fez, and united the whole country under one government. This is the present ruling dynasty. In the middle of the 17th century the empire of Morocco embraced part of the present province of Algeria, and extended south as far as Guinea, where it came into collision with the Portuguese settlements. Since the commencement of the 19th century the rebellions of the wild mountain tribes, the disturbances in Algeria, and difficulties with foreign states, caused by the aggressions of the Riff pirates, have greatly retarded the well-conceived measures of the various rulers for the development of the resources and increase in the civilization of Morocco. In 1817 piracy was prohibited throughout Morocco. In 1844 Morocco took part in the war of Abd-el-Kader against the French, in the course of which Tangier was bombarded and Mogadore  occupied; but peace was concluded in the same year. In 1851 and 1856 complications took place with France concerning some French vessels which had been plundered by the Riff pirates, but in each case compensation was given by the sultan. In 1859 the Spanish government, smarting under a series of similar outrages, demanded compensation, and also an apology for an insult to the Spanish flag at Ceuta; and on the sultan's disclaiming all responsibility for these acts, war was declared by Spain October 22, 1859. A short invasion brought the sultan to terms on March 25, 1860, and a treaty was accordingly signed April 27, 1860, by which the sultan ceded great commercial and social advantages to Spaniards. Christianity was by special treaty afforded many advantages also, but of course they are confined to Roman Catholics. As a consequence of these treaties a mission-house was opened at Fez, which promises to do something, but has as yet accomplished very little for the conversion of natives to Christianity. See Specchio geografico e statistico dell' imperio di Marocco (Genoa, 1833); Calderon, Cuadro geografico, stadistico, historico, e politico del imperio de Marrucos (Madrid, 1844); Renou, Description geographique de l'empire de Maroc (Paris, 1846); Augustin, Marokko in seinen geographischen, historischen, religiosen, politischen, etc., Zustanden (Pesth, 1845); Rohlf, "Reiseberichte" in Petermann's Mittheilungen (1863-65).

## Morocco, Samuel Israeli Of[[@Headword:Morocco, Samuel Israeli Of]]

             a Jewish convert to Christianity, and an author of considerable distinction, who lived at the close of the 11th century, is said to have come to Toledo from Fez, in Africa, about the year 1085, where he became a convert to Christianity. Before his conversion was completed he addressed a letter to rabbi Isaac, a Jew in the kingdom of Morocco in which he says, "I would fain learn of thee, out of the testimony of the law and the prophets, and other Scriptures, why the Jews are thus smitten. Is this a captivity wherein we are, which may be properly called the perpetual anger of God, because it has no end; for it is now above a thousand years since we were carried captive by Titus? And yet our fathers, who worshipped idols, killed the prophets, and cast the law behind their back, were punished only with a seventy-years' captivity, and then brought home again. But now there is no end of our calamities, nor do the prophets promise any." This famous epistle, אגרת, which was originally written in Arabic, and gives in twenty- seven chapters an ample refutation of Jewish objections to the Christian  faith, was translated from the Hebrew into the Latin by the Dominican Alfonso de Buen Hombre in 1329, under the title, Tractatulus multum utilis ad convincendum Judaeos de errore suo, quem habent de Messia adhuc venturo, et de observantia legis Mosaiae, and often since, and has been inserted in the Bibliotheca Patrum, 18:1519; into Italian by G.A. Brunati (Trident. 1712); into German by W. Link (Altenburg, 1524), and inserted in Luther's works, 5:567-583; and often since; by E. Trautmann (Goslar, 1706); by F.G. Stieldorff (Trier, 1833); into English by Th. Calvert, under the title, Demonstration of the true Messiah, by R. Samuel, a converted Jew (s.1.e.a.). A Spanish translation of this letter still remains in MS. in the library of the Escurial. Soon after his conversion rabbi Samuel appears to have returned to Morocco, whence his surname, and there to have held a conference on religion with a learned Mohammedan, of which his account, still in MS., is also to be found in the library of the Escurial. Comp. Furst, Bibl. Judaica, 2:152 sq.; De Rossi, Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei, page 208 (Germ. transl. by Hamberger); Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 3:1100-1106; Da Costa, Israel and the Gentiles, page 311; Adams, History of the Jews, 2:40. (B.P.)

## Morone, Giovanni[[@Headword:Morone, Giovanni]]

             an Italian prelate of considerable note for the illustrious part he took in the Reformatory movement of the 16th century, and for the noble efforts he made to uphold the lustre of the Roman Catholic Church, was born at Milan, January 25, 1509, and descended from a noble family. His father, count Girolamo Morone, is of historic celebrity from the efforts he made to free his country (Milan) from the yoke of Charles V, and for his subsequent devotion to imperial interests. During his younger years Giovanni Morone was carefully instructed at home, and afterwards sent to the University of Padua to pursue his more serious studies. There his talents and assiduous application procured him honors which enrolled his name among the chief philosophers and jurists. In 1529 Morone finally took orders, and, though yet a youth, his unusual attainments rapidly secured him friends and position, and in the year following he was elevated to the bishopric of Modena. He was also in the same year selected by Paul III as papal nuncio to the emperor Ferdinand, and in that capacity did most excellent service to the Romish cause. He was instrumental in preparing the way for a council of the German princes for a final settlement of all religious differences, and did everything in his power to prevent a rupture in the Church. Yet it must not be inferred that he was so conciliatory as to ignore his own personal  convictions.

Determined to sustain the papal cause, he was yet in favor of reformatory measures, and succeeded in persuading both parties to give him their confidence because he acted conscientiously. He never feared to do or say what he thought right. Thus in 1540, when, on account of the plague, the Diet was to be removed from Spires to Hagenau, Morone hesitated not to make a most energetic protest, and in consequence was finally recalled to give an account of himself at Rome. His explanations must have been satisfactory to Paul III, for in 1541 Morone was again on his way to Germany to attend the Spires Diet, and in 1542 he attended the Diet at Ratisbon, where all hope of union between Protestants and Romanlists was entirely extinguished. Yet, notwithstanding the failure of reconciliation, Morone's services found acknowledgment at Rome, and he was this same year presented with the red hat. He was also sent, together with Parisio and Pole, as papal representative to the nominal opening of the Council of Trent (November 1542).

His consummate knowledge of affairs pointed to him as the proper person for papal envoy when, the Tridentine Council having failed to secure the support of the German princes and theologians, another Diet was called at Spires by the emperor in 1544. This was a most difficult task. Charles V, just returned from the Low Countries, seeing clearly that the successful issue of his war against Francis I of France was possible only if he had the German princes unitedly in his favor, graciously yielded everything in ecclesiastical matters, and this conciliatory position made of course no light work for the papal representative. Cardinal Morone was too sagacious not to perceive how the Protestant princes would take courage now, and move forward to a platform from which it would hereafter be difficult to dislodge them. He failed to influence the emperor as he desired, yet his faithfulness to the papal cause was universally acknowledged, and when he returned to Rome the legation of Bologna, then become vacant by the death of Contarini (q.v.), was conferred on Morone. In 1550 he gave up the bishopric of Modena, that diocese having during his absence become greatly distracted by the spread of Reformatory opinions.

Whatever secret modifications his own views had undergone, he was not prepared, nor had he ever intended, to contaminate himself with the odious name of heretic; and therefore, rather than suffer his diocese to be spoken of as one alien to the faith, he promptly gave it up altogether. He had earnestly tried, immediately on his return from Germany, to rally his clergy around a common confession of faith, so liberal in its inception and construction that all might endorse it; but he had failed to unite them by this measure. Several of the most learned  theologians deserted the territory rather than perjure themselves in any manner. The academicians were specially remiss in submission, and Morone finally wrote to Rome for permission to withdraw the paper, "as they had assured him of the sincerity of their devotion to the Roman Catholic Church, and had entreated that suspicion might not be cast on their faith by obliging them to subscribe" (Life of Paleario, 2:28). The papal answer proved unfavorable in more than one respect. The pope, thinking Morone too indulgent, which no doubt was true, for he himself believed the doctrine of justification as held by the Lutherans, had appointed six cardinals to examine the condition of this Italian diocese. Morone, naturally enough offended at such a want of confidence in his integrity and competency, had almost then resolved to withdraw altogether from the diocese, had not the governor's entreaties prevailed, and he been induced to continue its spiritual head at least for a while longer. But the continued spread of Reformatory opinions, and his own indisposition to punish men for conscience' sake, so long as they avowed obedience to the pope of Rome as their spiritual head, finally led him to forsake the diocese. altogether, and Foscarari, a Dominican friar, and a man of great talent and virtue, became his successor. The latter did not live to quit the diocese under such favorable auspices, but was taken from the episcopal mansion to the heretic's prison (Life of Paleario, 2:45). Morone, however, lost nothing by forsaking the diocese of Modena, for he was by the duke of Milan presented with the bishopric of Novara. In 1549 Morone's friend at Rome, pope Paul III, died. and the next incumbent of the papal chair became Julius III. He was not warmly attached to our cardinal, yet at least esteemed him, and in 1555, when the Diet of Augsburg was to convene to discuss important religious topics, Morone was selected as the representative of Rome. Scarcely, however, had the cardinal reached Augsburg when the news of the sudden death of his pope was brought him, and he was obliged to turn back to Rome. He was now instrumental in elevating Marcello II, and hoped for reformation and purification in the Church. But this good man lived only a short time, and again the papal conclave was convened. The most prominent candidate was Caraffa, the inquisitor; a man of harshness of character, and not highly esteemed by Morone.

The two had not been on very favorable terms for some time. Caraffa had suspected Morone of heresy, and the cardinal, in turn, had thought the inquisitor hypercritical and inhumane in the exercise of his official functions. Yet, moved by the sentiments of a generous mind, Morone, after all. cast his influence in the conclave for Caraffa (believing  thereby to disarm his enmity), and thus helped to create him Paul IV. No sooner, however, was Caraffa elevated to the papal dignity than he at once conspired with Morone's enemies, and the cardinal was accused of leaning to the doctrines of the Reformers, and imprisoned in San Angelo to pass examination on his religious opinions. The only proofs of the heretical opinions of Morone are to be found in the articles of accusation drawn up against him. Vergerio, bishop of Capo d'Istria, who had left Italy, published these articles, with scholia on each article. No one was better acquainted than Vergerio with the facts treated of under the several heads. Though this little book came out anonymously, it bears marks of its origin. Printing being then comparatively in its infancy, each printer and the place of his habitation were pretty well known by the form of his types. Vergerio lived a good deal at Tubingen after he left Italy, and it is thought that these articles were sent to him, and that he printed them in despite of the Church of Rome. (A copy of these articles may be found in the Life of Paleario, 2:309-312.) Notwithstanding the ready acuteness of the inquisitors, the answers of Morone prevented their finding any proof against him of heresy, and he was declared innocent. But after the inquisitors had pronounced cardinal Morone free from all heretical taint, and Paul IV had given orders for his liberation, he refused to go out of prison unless the pope publicly declared he had been unjustly accused. This Paul could not be persuaded to do, and Morone remained in prison till the death of that pope in 1559. On this occasion, after some discussion among the cardinals, he was liberated, and allowed to sit in the conclave which elected cardinal De' Medici pope, who took the name of Pius IV, and after the elevation of this prelate to the papal chair Morone was reinstated in his former influential position.

In 1562 the cardinal was sent as papal legate to the emperor Ferdinand, and in the year following Morone became the presiding officer of the Council of Trent, and continued as such during all the important sessions of this ecclesiastical council. From the very beginning of his work at Trent he played a most important part, and exerted a most salutary influence for the Romish cause. He was conciliatory in speech and action, and intimated to the council that he came by orders of the pope "to establish the articles of faith, correct abuses. and promote the peace of nations, in so far as was consistent with the dignity and authority of the Holy See." This position seems not to have been warranted, however, by the views entertained at Rome; for it is now quite clearly revealed that the pope was determined to refuse the reforms desired by the common clergy and the people of Germany, and that Pius IV was at the time enjoying the promise of Spain's  support in case Ferdinand ignored the papacy, and went over to the Protestants. Yet Morone must certainly have had the appearance of truth in his own dealings with the emperor, as that sovereign, in a meeting with Morone at Innsbruck in 1563, granted nearly all the favors he asked for, and even gave his sanction to an early discontinuance of the council, which was brought about this very year, December 4. SEE TRENT, COUNCIL OF.

Morone's services could not be too highly estimated at Rome. He had brought the council which threatened so much mischief to the papal cause to a close without any diminution of the pontifical authority, and had even left the Inquisition in a more enviable position than it had occupied previously. "All," says Ranke, "ended at last in a prosperous issue. That council which had been so vehemently called for and so long avoided; after being twice dissolved, shaken by so many of this world's storms, and when convened for the third time, anew beset with perils, was now closed amid the general concord of the Roman Catholic world." On his return to the Eternal City the cardinal was therefore made dean of the cardinal college, and intrusted with diplomatic missions whenever the services of an acute and trustworthy messenger were needed. Upon the death of Pius IV, in 1566, Morone came very near being elected Pope. Unfortunately for Italy, sterner counsels prevailed, and the inquisitor, cardinal Alessandrino, was raised to the papal chair. We have no means of ascertaining what were Morone's feelings when he saw the power of the Inquisition, from which he had suffered so much, again seated on the papal throne. Morone died December 1, 1580, at Rome, and was buried in the church of the Minerva. His peculiar life prevented much literary activity, and there remain from his pen only some letters to cardinals Pole and Cortese, and some of his orations. See Schelhorn, Amoenitates Literarice, 12:537 sq.; Tiraboschi, Lett. Ital. 7:260; Young, Life and Times of Paleatrio (Lond, 1860, 2 volumes, 8vo), 2:307-314; Fisher, Hist. Ref. pages 393, 406; Wessenberg, Die Grossen Kirchenversammlungen des 15 u. 16 Jahrh. 3:147 sq.; North Brit. Rev. January 1870, art. 8, page 284 sq.; Ranke, Hist. of the Papacy, 1:109 sq., 227, 247 sq. (J.H.W.)

## Moroni (Anna)[[@Headword:Moroni (Anna)]]

             SEE JESUS, HOLY CHILD, Congregation of the Daughters of.

## Morosino, Giulto[[@Headword:Morosino, Giulto]]

             (originally Samuel Nachmnias), a Jewish convert to Romanism, was a native of Thessalonica. In Venice, where he settled, he first received a favorable impression of the truth of Christianity by being present at a public dispute between two of his nation — one of whom had renounced Judaism, respecting the accomplishment of Daniel's prophecy of the seventy weeks. In this dispute Simone Luzzatto (q.v.), the celebrated rabbi of Venice, was chosen arbitrator. Luzzatto's explanation was, "I beseech you to permit us to be silent and shut up our books, for if we proceed to examine the prophecies any further we shall all become Christians. It cannot be denied that in the prophecy of Daniel the coming of the Messiah is so clearly manifested that the time of his appearance must be allowed to be already past; but whether Jesus of Nazareth be the person, I cannot determine." This speech closed the debate, and made such a deep impression upon Samuel and his brother Joseph that they both formed the design of renouncing Judaism. Gratz, the Jewish historian, says that Nachmias either misunderstood or perverted Luzzatto's expression (sit!), but the fact is that a few months after, upon reconsidering the subject seriously and calmly, both brothers embraced Christianity. and were openly baptized November 22, 1649, Nachmias assuming the name of Giulio Morosino. while his brother took the name of Ottavio. Ten years later he was called to Rome by pope Clement IX. who invested him with the office of librarian at the Vatican library, and this position he held until his death in 1687. Morosino wrote, Via delle fide monstrata a gli Ebrei (Rome, 1683), in which he appeals to the Jews no longer to be bound to observe the ceremonies, but to embrace the doctrines of the Gospel. See Kalkar. Israel u. d. Kirche (Hamburg, 1869), page 82 sq.; Basnage, Histoire des Juifs (Engl. transl. by Taylor), page 725; Adams, History of the Jews, 2:76 sq. (Boston, 1812); Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 3:1128; Gratz. Gesch. d. Juden, 10:164; Bartolocci, Biblioth. Rabbin. 3:756; Fiirst, Bibl. Jud. 2:39; 3:8. (B.P.)

## Morozzo, Guiseppe[[@Headword:Morozzo, Guiseppe]]

             an Italian prelate. descended from an ancient and noble family, was born in March, 1758, at Turin. Under the tuition of the abbot of Aligre, who later became bishop of Pavia, Morozzo was made doctor of theology in 1777, and finished his studies at Rome in the ecclesiastical academy, where Litta, Caracioli, Pacca, and Emmanuele di Gregori were his fellow-students. Pope Pius VI nominated him successively apostolic prothonotary, vice-  legate of Bologna, governor of Perugia and Civita Vecchia. He was a competitor for the papal see in the conclave which resulted in the election of Pius VII, and after the accession of the new pope was by him sent as ambassador to the king of Etruria. In 1802 Morozzo received the title of archbishop of Thebes in partibus, and was appointed secretary of the Congregation of Bishops. In 1808 he went to Paris with the difficult mission of adjusting the contentions which had arisen between the pope and the emperor (Napoleon I); but, becoming aware that his efforts were futile, he retired to Turin. In 1816 he was created cardinal, and in 1817 made bishop of Novara. He died March 22, 1842. He published Statistics of the patrimony of St. Peter (Rome, 1797), and a Eulogy on cardinal Bobba (Turin, 1799, 4to).

## Morpurgo, Simeon Ben-Joshua-Moses[[@Headword:Morpurgo, Simeon Ben-Joshua-Moses]]

             a Jewish writer of note, was born at Gradiska in 1681; studied at Padua, and graduated as doctor of medicine. In 1709 he was ordained by Leon Briele rabbi of Mantua, and in 1721 he was called to the rabbinate at Ancona, where he died in 1740. He wrote, שות שמש צדקה, a collection of legal decisions (2 parts, Venice, 1742, 1743): עיוֹ הדעת, The Tree of Knowledge, a commentary on the ethical work of Jedaja Penini, entitled Bechinat Olam (Venice, 1704): — an approbation to Isaac Norzi's עטור בכורי קציר(ibid. 1715, 1717). Comp. Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:391; Wolf, Biblioth. Hebr. 3:1160; Jocher, A llgem. Gelehrten Lex. s.v.

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

             one of the fathers of that branch of American Methodism known as the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at New York November 22, 1747. His mother was a devout follower of Mr. Wesley, and a member of the pious band led by Philip Embury. Thomas lived in most exciting times, and when the war for freedom broke out he early took to arms for republican life. He held successively the commissions of captain and major, and gained honorable distinction on the field. In 1785 Thomas Morrell was deeply impressed with his relation to God and the Church, and determined to enter the ministry. He joined Conference in 1787, and was stationed at Trenton Circuit, N.J. In 1788 he was preacher in charge in New York, with Robert Cloud as associate, and the following year their labors were blessed with a great revival. The same year he was ordained elder, and continued in that city five years. He was sent to Philadelphia in 1794-5; here taken sick, and  not entirely well until 1799; next to Baltimore for two years; and in 1802-3 restationed at New York for two years. After this Mr. Morrell was never stationed out of Elizabethtown, N.J., but continued to labor regularly sixteen years until 1822, when he preached usually every Sabbath, and at least once a day, until January 1833. After this failing health obliged him to desist from pulpit labor, and he only preached occasionally. He died August 9, 1838. Father Morrell was a man of vigorous mind, and well endowed naturally for the work to which he felt himself called. He had fine preaching talents, and discharged the duties of his office with great acceptability and success. He was bold, earnest, and scrupulously faithful in all things. His name, usefulness, and devotedness to Christ's Church are remembered and honored. See Meth. Quar. Rev. 1841, page 325; Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, volume 7; New Jersey Conf. Memorial; Minutes of Ann. Conf. 2:669.

## Morren, Nathaniel[[@Headword:Morren, Nathaniel]]

             a Presbyterian divine, noted as the author of valuable Biblical works, flourished in the first half of our century at Edinburgh, Scotland. He was born in 1798, and died in 1847. Morren published, Annals of the Church of Scotland from 1739 to 1776 (Edinb. 1835, 2 volumes, 8vo): — Biblical Theol. volume 1, Rule of Faith (1835); and a translation of Rosenmuller's Biblical Geog. of Central Asia Minor, Phoenicia, and Arabia (1836-37, 2 volumes, 12mo). After his death his Sermons were published with a Memoir (1848, cr. 8vo). See Lowndes, Brit. Lib. page 711; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.

## Morrill, David Lawrence[[@Headword:Morrill, David Lawrence]]

             a noted American physician, who distinguished himself also as a politician, figured at one time as minister of the Gospel and religious author. He was born in Epping, N.H., June 10, 1772. After receiving a good academic and medical education, he established himself in practice at Epsom in 1793; but in 1800 began to study theology, and in 1802 accepted a call to the Congregational Church in Goffstown, N.H., where he preached for nine years. He then resumed the practice of medicine from 1807 to 1830. He was at the same time also engaged in political life, and played no unimportant part in the passing history of New Hampshire. From 1817 to 1823 he was United States senator; and was governor from 1824 to 1827. He died at Concord, January 28, 1849. Dr. Morrill was connected with  many of the charitable, medical, and agricultural associations of his time. He published several sermons, orations, and controversial pamphlets, and was for some years after abandoning public office editor of the New Hampshire Observer, a religious newspaper.

## Morris, Anthony[[@Headword:Morris, Anthony]]

             a Quaker preacher of some note, was born about 1654 in England, and emigrated to this country about 1680. He settled in New Jersey, and finally removed to Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. In 1701 he began to preach, and through fidelity in the exercise of his gift his communications were sound and edifying. Having a prospect of much religious labor, he circumscribed his worldly affairs, and devoted his time chiefly to the holy cause he had espoused. He travelled in the work of the ministry in most of the North American provinces, and in the year 1715 he visited Great Britain. He died August 23, 1721. See Janney, Hist. of Friends, 3:202.

## Morris, Francis A., D.D[[@Headword:Morris, Francis A., D.D]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, son of bishop Morris, was born at Marietta, Georgia, September 3, 1817. He graduated from the old Augusta College in 1836; studied law, was admitted to the bar in 1838, and practiced successfully in Texas; was converted in 1842; taught languages two years in St. Charles College, Missouri; in 1845 joined the Missouri Conference, in which and in the Louisville Conference (1851-60) he filled important stations until his death, in 1882. See Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M.E. Church South, 1882, page 143.

## Morris, Francis M[[@Headword:Morris, Francis M]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Middle Tennessee about the year 1830; came to Kentucky in the fall of 1851, and was licensed to preach in 1852. He joined the Kentucky Conference in 1853, and was sent to Murray Circuit; in 1854, to Obion Circuit; in 1855, to Bryansburg Circuit; in 1856, to Ripley Circuit; in 1857, to Maury Circuit; in 1858, to Wesley Circuit; in 1859, to La Grange Circuit; in 1860 and 1861, to Brownsville Circuit; in 1862 and 1863, to Mount Zion Circuit; in 1864, to Salem Circuit, but was prevented from going to his work by the troubles of war then existing; in 1865, to Dresden Circuit, but was prevented from reaching it by the great floods, which swelled all the rivers of West Tennessee at that time; in 1866. to Fulton Station, where he died, February 13, 1867. Mr. Morris was a man beloved and useful, and a fervent and zealous preacher, his ministry being greatly blessed to the Church and the world. See Minutes of the Meth. Epis. Ch., South, 1867, s.v.

## Morris, Gouverneur[[@Headword:Morris, Gouverneur]]

             an eminent statesman and orator, who was born at Morrisania, near the city of New York, in 1752, was educated at Columbia (then King's) College, and licensed to practice law in 1771; and thereafter held several prominent civic positions, among these, in 1777, representing the people of New  York in the Continental Congress, and in 1787 was a member of the convention which framed the Constitution of the United States. He also represented the American republic in France. He is stated by Thomas Jefferson to have been a disbeliever in Christianity. But this is a mistake; or, if at one time true, his views altered. He delivered two months before his death (which occurred in 1835) an address to the Historical Society, in which he points out the superiority of scriptural history to all other history. He regarded religious principle, indeed, as necessary to national independence and peace. "There must be something more to hope than pleasure, wealth, and power. Something more to fear than poverty and pain. Something after death more terrible than death. There must be religion. When that ligament is torn, society is disjointed and its members perish." See Allen, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Sparks, Amer. Biog. s.v.

## Morris, John G., D.D[[@Headword:Morris, John G., D.D]]

             an American Lutheran divine of note, was born at York, Pennsylvania, in 1803, and was educated at Dickinson College, Pennsylvania (class of 1823); then studied theology at Princeton Theological Seminary, and in 1826 entered the Lutheran ministry. He was at once called as pastor to the First Lutheran Church in Baltimore, and for six years (1859-65) of another Lutheran Church in the same city. He was the first librarian of the Peabody Institute at Baltimore; he founded a seminary for young ladies at Lutherville, and was active in several other public enterprises. He was editor of the Lutheran Observer from 1831 to 1832, and co-editor of the Year-book of the Reformation (1844). He published several translations of German theological works (1824-26), and wrote himself, Popular Exposition of the Gospels (Balt. 1840, 2 volumes, 8vo): — Life of John Arndt (1853): — The Blind Girl of Wittenberg (1856, 12mo): — Catharine de Bora; or Social and Domestic Scenes in the House of Luther (1856, 12mo), etc. Dr. Morris also gave much time to studies in natural science, especially entomology, and became quite prominent in this field. He was acknowledged as an American authority, and was honored in various ways by the Smithsonian Institute and other associations. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Putnam's Magazine, Feb. 1856, page 217. (J.H.W.)

## Morris, John Piper[[@Headword:Morris, John Piper]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Devon, England, January 30, 1846. His early life was spent in Canada under the pious training of his father, who was himself a local minister of the Wesleyan Church. Young Morris was converted at seventeen, and soon after became convinced that he was called of God to preach. While preparing for the ministry his health was impaired, and he was advised to go South. After his arrival at Charleston, S.C., he decided at once to enter the ministry, and supplied a vacancy in the village of Summerville. In 1862 he was received on trial in the South Carolina Conference, and appointed to Aiken. In 1867 he was ordained deacon, and appointed to Darlington; but his health failing, he was obliged to give up all work. He died January 24, 1868. See Min. of Ann. Conf. of the Meth. Epis. Church, South, 1868, page 214.

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

             an English Baptist divine, flourished as pastor of a London congregation in the first half of the eighteenth century. He is believed to have been born about 1685. He died in 1755. Ivimey speaks of him as "a sensible, pious, and learned man," and that he was "in habits of intimacy with the excellent Dr. Johnson, who esteemed him for his modesty and ability" (History of the English Baptists). He published several of his Sermons (Lond. 1722, 8vo; 1743, 8vo; 1757, 8vo), which were admired for their solidity, and prove him to have been a man of more than ordinary talent. His influence in the English metropolis was considerable in his day and generation.

## Morris, Judah[[@Headword:Morris, Judah]]

             a Jewish convert to Protestant Christianity, was a native of Italy, and emigrated to this country about 1835. He was for a time instructor in Harvard University. He died in 1855. He published a Hebrew Grammar, and some religious books.

## Morris, Robert Desha, D.D[[@Headword:Morris, Robert Desha, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Washington, Kentucky, August 22, 1814. He graduated from Augusta College in 1834, and from Princeton Theological Seminary in 1838; was ordained pastor at Newtown, Pa., in the latter year; removed to Ohio in 1856; in 1859 became president of the Female College at Oxford, and died there, November 3, 1882. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1883, page 35.

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

             a Presbyterian lay worker in colonial days, flourished near the middle of last century in Hanover, Va. He was a man of singularly earnest and devoted spirit, and did much to advance the interests of Presbyterianism in Virginia. His house was a resort for those "who were dissatisfied with the  preaching of the parish incumbents, and anxious to enjoy the privilege of listening on the Sabbath to the reading of instructive and devotional works on religion." He was himself reared in the Anglican establishment, but by accident becoming acquainted with Presbyterian works — among them Boston's Fourfold State — he embraced that Calvinistic confession, and soon gathered about him others who, like him, chose rather to subject themselves to the payment of the fines imposed by law than to attend church where they felt that they could not be profited. The little band of lay workers, as yet never under the instruction of a Presbyterian pastor, but nevertheless greatly interested in Presbyterian doctrine, and unconsciously its adherents even, first met every Sabbath alternately at each other's houses to read and pray. But as their number increased they regularly gathered at Mr. Morris's house, until at length that dwelling-house was too small to contain the people. and it was determined "to build a meeting- house," "merely for reading," as Mr. Morris himself adds. This house of worship was afterwards designated "Morris's Reading-room," and was the starting-point of Presbyterianism in Virginia. From Hanover Mr. Morris was frequently called to different places in the state to instruct the inquiring, and, complying with their invitations, went out and spread the interest in distant parts. As they increased in numbers the Established Church made complaint against them to the governor, and they were called up for trial, but they were promptly discharged when it was found that their creed was that of the Kirk. SEE PRESBYTERIANISM. See also Gillett, Hist. of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, 1:111- 120; Anderson, Hist. of the Colonial Church, 3:229 sq. (J.H.W.)

## Morris, Sarah[[@Headword:Morris, Sarah]]

             a Quaker preacher, the daughter of Anthony Morris, himself a Quaker preacher, was born at Philadelphia in 1704; preached in New Jersey, Maryland, and Long Island; went to Rhode Island in 1764; and travelled through Great Britain, preaching in many places, in 1772-73. She died in Philadelphia October 24, 1775. Possessing a superior mind, combined with a social and cheerful disposition, she proved an efficient helper to her people.

## Morris, Susanna[[@Headword:Morris, Susanna]]

             a Quakeress noted as an efficient preacher of the doctrines of her sect, was born about 1682. But little is accessible to us regarding her personal  history. She labored in the work of the ministry for nearly forty years both in this country and in Europe, where she visited England, Ireland, and Scotland. She died April 28, 1755. She was a devout Christian, and a firm adherent to her people, whom she dearly loved. See Janney, Hist. of the Religious Society of Friends, 3:336.

## Morris, Thomas Asbury, D.D[[@Headword:Morris, Thomas Asbury, D.D]]

             a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and for many years the senior officer of the episcopal cabinet, a man of indomitable energy and great love for the Christian cause, in which he proved a most efficient workman, was born in Kanawha County, Virginia, April 28, 1794. His parents, while he was yet a youth, removed to Charlestown, West Virginia, and it was for some time his home. The educational facilities of that period, and especially of that region, were extremely limited. It was the good fortune of the Morris family, however, to enjoy the advantages of a good grammar- school, organized by William Paine, an educated Englishman, near the homestead, when Thomas was about sixteen years of age. His oldest brother, Edmund, held the clerkship of Cabell County, in which the family resided, and Thomas, at the age of seventeen, became a deputy in the office, a position which he held until he was about twenty years of age. While discharging the duties of this office, and when greatly broken down in health, and somewhat depressed in spirits, he was drafted into a company of militia, to perform a six-months' tour in the North against the British and Indians. They met at the court-house, shouldered their muskets, and took up their line of march to join a regiment forming at Point Pleasant, to re-enforce the main army near the Canada line. The father of Young Morris was so affected by his son's frail and youthful appearance and his feeble health that after the company had started he procured a substitute, overtook the young soldiers their second day out, and procured a discharge for his slender and delicate boy.

The early religious training of bishop Morris was in the Baptist Church, of which both his parents were pious and exemplary members. He grew up, however, without giving much thought to the subject of personal religion until he was about eighteen years of age. In his twentieth year he made a profession of religion, and at the same time began to ponder seriously the question whether Providence was not leading him to cast in his lot with the people called Methodists. Against this course many considerations pleaded powerfully: he had been trained in another communion, his prejudices were deeply rooted, the Methodists in that region were feeble and persecuted, but the result of a  careful comparison of their doctrines and polity with the New Testament which he instituted at this time was a fixed, unalterable determination to unite with them as the people of his choice. He was shortly after admission to membership in the Church licensed to preach, and was received as a travelling preacher into the Ohio Conference in 1816. In 1818 he was ordained deacon by bishop George, and elder in 1820 by bishop Roberts. Though in a large measure self-educated, because an affliction of the eve restricted his studies in early manhood, he yet labored most acceptably in the pastoral work in various parts of Kentucky, Tennessee, and Ohio till 1834, when he was deemed cultured enough to be intrusted with the literary management of a paper, and was placed in the editorial chair of the then newly-established Western Christian Advocate, a religious and literary weekly, which two years after its commencement numbered 8000 subscribers — certainly a successful enterprise for the times. In 1836 the General Conference, held that year at Cincinnati, where he resided, elected him to the episcopal office. He now really entered a field for which he was specially fitted, and gained a most enviable reputation not only in his own denomination, but throughout the Christian Church.

In 1864 declining health and the infirmities of age obliged him to ask for relief, and he was less heavily taxed. In 1868, at the General Conference in Chicago, he sought and obtained permission to be withdrawn from episcopal visitation duties, and led a rather quiet life until his death, September 2, 1874. Only a few days before this he had addressed a loving missive to the members of the Cincinnati Conference (bearing date August 27), saying, among other noble Christian words, "I am no longer able to go in and out before you, to sit in your councils and take part in your deliberations, yet my heart and sympathy are with you, and for Zion's prosperity my tears shall fall and my prayers ascend until my release is signed, and I go to join the Church triumphant in the skies." Bishop Morris was a man of great uniformity and simplicity. He was noted in his Church for the quiet power and prudent skill with which he discharged the episcopal duties. His death occurring about the same time as that of the bishop of Winchester — Dr. Charles Sumner (q.v.) — the New York Methodist took occasion to institute a comparison between the two bishops, and thus concludes in favor of bishop Morris: "This man had done more in his time for the extension of Christianity than a whole bench of English prelates. He had assigned to their places of labor not less than 30,000 ministers, had traversed this country to the outer edge of its civilization over and over again; had preached sermons innumerable, and only ceased to labor when labor  became physically impossible. Nor was his pen idle. He was one of the founders of a great paper, which is still in existence. He issued volumes from the press, which are models of vigorous, idiomatic English. And all this fruitful work was done in the most unpretending way.

Bishop Morris never thought of himself as a great actor in the world's affairs, a great preacher, or a great writer. The beauty of his character was that he never appeared to think of himself at all; his work was before him, and he did it; and that was the end of the matter." Bishop Morris's only works of any special import are a volume of sermons, and a miscellany, consisting of essays, biographical sketches, and notes of travel. Of the former, about 15,000 copies have been sold; the latter has been but sparsely circulated. "His style was epigrammatic, clear, and forcible. His printed sermons were characterized by simplicity, pith, directness, lucid arrangement, and earnest and practical enforcement of the truth. They have been useful and popular. As a presiding officer he was the beau ideal of a Methodist bishop. He had rare practical wisdom, quick and accurate judgment, and inflexible decision. He acted no superiority, put on no prelatical airs, and never felt that his office lifted him above the fellowship and sympathy of his brethren" (Marlay). As a pulpit orator, the bishop was quite noted in the prime of his life. His delightful evangelical discourses abounded in pithy sentences, and gratified thousands of hearers as they fell from his lips. See Marlay, Life of Bishop Morris (N.Y. 1875, 12mo); Meth. Qu. Rev. July 1875, art. 3; Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1874; N.Y. Christian Advocate, September 1874; Men of the Time, s.v.; Drake, Dict. of Amer. Biog. s.v.

## Morris-dance[[@Headword:Morris-dance]]

             a peculiar and fantastic species of dance, constituting the chief enjoyment at parochial festivals in England, was commonly practiced in the Middle Ages, and continues to the present day among the country people in different parts of England. Its origin is ascribed to the Moors, though the genuine Moorish dance (the fandango of the present day) bears little resemblance to it. The chief performer was the hobbyhorse, so called from the light frame of wicker-work which was fastened around its body, and supplied with a pasteboard head and neck, so as to give it the appearance of a man on horseback. Bells were also attached to its ankles, and the great art consisted in so moving the feet as to produce a rude kind of concord. The other principal actors, after a fashion, personified the characters of Maid Marian, the Queen of the May, Robin Hood, Friar Tuck, the Fool,  etc.; and the performance was accompanied by rude music and the clashing of swords and staves.

## Morrison, John Hunter, D.D[[@Headword:Morrison, John Hunter, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Wallkill Township, Orange Co., N.Y., June 29, 1806. He studied at Bloomfield Academy, N.J.; graduated from Princeton College in 1834; and from the theological seminary there in 1837; and was ordained the same year. Soon after, he sailed for India, and thenceforward his whole ministerial life was spent in the foreign missionary work, in connection with the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions, including two brief visits to his native land. During one of these, in 1863, he was elected moderator of the General Assembly. It was at his suggestion, while in India, that the first week of January was set apart for united prayer for the conversion of the world to Christ. He lived and labored successively at Allahabad, Agra, Sabathu, Simla, Ambala, Lahore, Rawal Pindi, Dehra Doon, and died at the last-named place, Sept. 16,1881. Dr. Morrison was a man of rare devotion to his work. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1882, page 36.

## Morrison, John W[[@Headword:Morrison, John W]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Chester County, South Carolina, in 1811; was educated in the Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.; studied theology under the late Rev. Hugh MacMillan, of Xenia, Ohio, and was licensed and ordained in 1841, as pastor of the Thorn Grove Presbyterian Church, in Bloom, Cook County, Indiana. This was his only charge. At the close of twenty-five years of pastoral duty he resigned this position to accept the agency in behalf of the freedmen, feeling, as he expressed it, "that the education of that people was the work to which God now calls the Church and the nation." He continued to labor as an agent until he died, January 5, 1867. Mr. Morrison was a man of great integrity, of noble disposition, and of untiring effort in the service of Christ. He was an accurate classical scholar, a critical and profound expositor of Scripture, and an earnest and affectionate preacher. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1868, page 391.

## Morrison, John, D.D[[@Headword:Morrison, John, D.D]]

             a Scotch divine, noted as a hymnologist also, was born in the County of Aberdeen in 1749. He studied for the ministry, and in 1780 entered upon his pastoral duties over the parish of Canisbay, Caithness-shire. He was one of the committee of the General Assembly for revising the Church Paraphrases, and himself contributed some of the best renderings. Of these, the 19th, "The race that long in darkness pined," and the 30th, "Come, let us to the Lord our God," have been generally adopted by the churches. In his early life he contributed verses to the Edinburgh Weekly Magazine, over the signature of "Musarus." He also published the second and fourth books of Virgil's Eneid, translated into English verse (1787). He died at Canisbay, June 12, 1798.

## Morrison, Jonas S[[@Headword:Morrison, Jonas S]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Plattsburg, N.Y., March 11, 1836; was converted at the age of sixteen years; licensed to preach in 1857, and in the same year joined the Southern Illinois Annual Conference; was appointed junior preacher on Collinsville Circuit; next year he was stationed at Main Street, Alton City; and thereafter  successively at Chester, Gillespie, two years; Litchfield, Brighton, Highland, Carlyle, two years; Greenville, Gillespie; and, lastly, as presiding elder of Alton District. He died October 18, 1871. "The traits of his character were strongly marked. As a Christian and a minister of the Lord Jesus Christ, he exemplified the purity of the one and the fidelity of the other. He-rather lived than professed religion, and proved his ministry by the practical sympathy that carries the consolations of Christ to the abodes of poverty, of sickness, and of bereavement. His pulpit ministrations were characterized by clearness, by fidelity to the Scriptures, by an adaptation of the truth to his hearers, and by a manner which demonstrated his own interest in his theme. Love for the Church was with him an absorbing passion." See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1872, page 137.

## Morrison, Levi R[[@Headword:Morrison, Levi R]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Mecklenburg County, North Carolina, July 3, 1805. His early educational advantages were very limited, and he had to struggle with poverty and its attendant trials and perplexities. He studied his Bible and such books as he was able to secure, and exercised his gifts as a speaker; was licensed in 1831, and began his labors in Spring Creek and Smyrna churches, Tennessee. In 1836 he was ordained, and became pastor of the churches at Sparta and McMinnville, Tennesee. He subsequently labored at Mars Hill, Tennesee, Glade Spring, Virginia, North Prairie and Springfield, Missouri. His life was that of a toiling pastor and home missionary. He died December 28, 1867. Mr. Morrison was a man of most amiable character, of strong and vigorous intellect, a very acceptable preacher, and greatly blessed in his labors. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1868, page 346.

## Morrison, Robert E[[@Headword:Morrison, Robert E]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, October 12, 1800. When seventeen years of age he united with the Presbyterian Church; but eight years afterwards, being brought into intimate relations with Methodists, he united with the Methodist Episcopal Church. He preached under the presiding elder for three years, and in 1833 was received into the Philadelphia Conference, and appointed to Chester Circuit, Pennsylvania, where he labored very acceptably for two years. In 1835 he was appointed to Tuckerton Circuit, N.J. The necessities of the case requiring it, he was removed and appointed to Haddonfield. In 1836-7 he travelled Swedesborough Circuit. Here great success crowned his efforts. In 1838-9 he labored in Pemberton; in 1840-1 in Long Branch; in 1842-3 in Pennington; in 1844-5 in Allentown; and in 1846 at Crosswicks. A throat difficulty compelled him to take a supernumerary relation, and locating at Hightstown, N.J., he became one of its most respected citizens. For a number of years he was president of Hightstown Bank. He died August 30, 1873. Mr. Morrison, being studious, acquired a large store of knowledge, and became a good thinker. Though not a graduate of any literary institution, he read Latin, Greek, and  Hebrew, and was quite at home in mathematics. He was also a thorough student of divinity. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1874, page 37.

## Morrison, Robert, D.D[[@Headword:Morrison, Robert, D.D]]

             a distinguished English missionary to China, the first Protestant missionary to that country, and holding the same relation to it as Vanderkemp to Africa or Williams to the South Seas, was born of humble but respectable parentage at Morpeth, Northumberland, January 5, 1782. After receiving some elementary instruction in English, writing, and arithmetic, in a school conducted by a maternal uncle at Newcastle, he was apprenticed at a very early age to his father, who was then engaged in last-making. But so devoted had the boy become to his books that he spent his leisure in close study. "For the purpose of securing a greater portion of quiet retirement,"  says his widow, "he had his bed removed to his workshop, where he would often pursue his studies until one or two in the morning. Even when at work, his Bible or some other book was placed open before him, that he might acquire knowledge or cherish the holy aspirations of spiritual devotion while his hands were busily occupied in the labors of life." Amid such disadvantages Morrison hesitated not to commence a course of religious reading and study, and in 1801 was ready to study Hebrew, Latin, and theology under the superintendence of a Presbyterian minister of the town, by whom he was so much liked that Morrison was, in 1803, introduced by him to the committee and tutors of the Independent Theological Academy at Hoxton, as a fit person to be received into that institution to study theology.

Morrison was admitted, and had not long been an inmate of the institution before he decided to devote himself to the missionary cause in heathen lands. Though his friends dissuaded him from such a step, he yet felt it his duty to devote the talent given him as Providence seemed unmistakably to point it out to him; and in May, 1804, he offered his services as a missionary to the London Missionary Society, was promptly accepted, and now removed from Hoxton to the Mission College at Gosport. In August, 1805, he commenced the study of Chinese under a native teacher. In January 1807, he was ordained as a missionary, set out at once for China, and in September of the same year arrived at Canton. Before leaving England. Mr. Morrison had procured from the British Museum a Harmony of the Gospels and the Pauline Epistles, translated into Chinese by an unknown Roman Catholic missionary; and the Royal Asiatic Society lent him a manuscript Latin and Chinese dictionary. His moderate knowledge of Chinese inclined him to mingle at once among the natives, and having perhaps studied the customs of Roman Catholic missionaries, adopted, like them, the prevailing usages of diet, dress, and manners. He handled chop-sticks, coiled up his hair in form, and let his nails grow. But he soon saw the folly of this extreme conformity, and assumed a distinctive European character and aspect. He rapidly acquired the mastery of the Chinese, and how greatly his knowledge of the language was esteemed is apparent in that, though a minister, he was in 1808 appointed translator to the East India Company's factory at Canton. In 1810 the Acts of the Apostles in Chinese, which he had brought with him, were printed, after he had carefully revised and amended the text. In 1811 a Chinese grammar, which he had prepared about three years before, was sent to Bengal to be printed; but, after many delays, it did not issue from the press until 1815, when it was printed at Serampore, at the expense of  the East India Company. In 1812 the Gospel of St. Luke in Chinese was printed; and by the beginning of 1814, the whole of the New Testament being ready for the press, the East India Company sent out a press and- materials and a printer to superintend the printing of the work. In 1813 the London Missionary Society had sent out the Reverend (afterwards Dr.) Milne to assist Morrison, and together these two Christian scholars now proceeded with the translation of the Old Testament. In 1815 the Book of Genesis and Psalms were printed, and by 1818 this great work of translating the Bible into Chinese was completed. The translation of the Scriptures, the great object of Dr. Morrison's life, was given to the world "not as a perfect translation."

Dr. Morrison says he studied "fidelity, perspicuity, and simplicity;" "common words being preferred to classical ones." The authorized English version was followed. Dr. Morrison always explicitly stated that the Chinese manuscript in the British Museum was "the foundation of the New Testament;" which, he says, "I completed and edited." It is no disparagement of Dr. Morrison to assert that his work required revision; it was a first version into the most difficult language in the world. The translators contemplated the improvement of their work at some future period, "expecting that they should be able to sit down together and revise the whole." This expectation was never realized; Dr. Milne died in 1822, and the correction of errors and the verbal alterations made by Dr. Morrison were not of great importance.

Towards the latter part of his life Dr. Morrison became more and more confirmed in the necessity of a thorough revision, and he anticipated the probability of this being effected by his son, who, however, on the death of his father, was selected to succeed him as the translator to the Superintendents of British Trade at Canton, and could not therefore devote his time to this object. From 1810 to 1818 the British and Foreign Bible Society had voted the sum of £6000, at seven different times, to assist in the printing and publication. The Old Testament formed 21 volumes, 12mo. The Book of Job and the historical books were translated by Dr. Milne, and the other portions by Dr. Morrison. Of the New Testament, Dr. Morrison translated the four Gospels, and from Hebrews to the end. Besides this great work, Dr. Morrison was also engaged on a Chinese Dictionary, which he completed in 1816, and it was printed by the East India Company, at a cost of £15,000, in 1821. Nor must it be supposed that he ever lost sight of the great missionary work intrusted to his charge while assuming so many other engagements. He constantly preached, and in every way possible sought out the native population, and in 1814 was gratified with his first  convert, Tsae-ako, who died in 1818. Believing that the Chinese could be reached better through educational channels, he caused an Anglo-Chinese college to be founded at Malacca; gave £1000 for the erection of buildings, and £100 annually for its support. In 1824 he visited England, and remained home nearly two years.

He was received everywhere with great distinction, and was even honored with a reception by king George IV, to whom Morrison presented a copy of the Scriptures in Chinese. He had brought home with him a Chinese library of 10,000 volumes, and labored earnestly to awaken an interest among his countrymen for Chinese literature. In this he moderately succeeded. In 1826 he again set sail for China, and now even more assiduously devoted himself to the missionary work. His time he mainly occupied in preaching, translating, and superintending the distribution of printed works for the conversion of the Chinese. In 1832 he felt so encouraged with the prospects of an early harvest for his many years of toil as to write to his friends in England: "I have been twenty-five years in China, and am beginning to see the work prosper. By the press we have been able to scatter knowledge far and wide." In the midst of these occupations Dr. Morrison died at Canton, August 1, 1834, preserving unimpeached until death the consistency, efficiency, and benevolence of the Christian missionary.

Dr. Morrison certainly achieved great things in China. The compilation of his dictionary in the vernacular language of that country was a Herculean task, which none but a man of the greatest strength of intellect and energy of purpose could have accomplished. Along with that he completed a Chinese version of the Old and New Testaments, which, in the opinion of all the learned men of Europe, was deemed utterly beyond the power of any single person. Nor were his exertions for the Chinese confined solely to literary works. He went about doing good. "He endeavored," says his biographer, "in the employment of such expedients as he could command, to relieve the wants, to mitigate the sufferings, and heal the diseases of the poor and suffering Chinese around him. In order to secure to the natives the means of a liberal and religious education, as well as to furnish facilities to foreigners to prosecute the study of the Chinese language, he projected the establishment of the Anglo-Chinese college." His whole life and works snow the activity and energy and comprehensiveness of his mental endowments, as well as the Christian benevolence of his heart. His office was that only of a pioneer who prepared the way for the evangelization of China. But with the instruments which his zeal and indefatigable industry  put into the hands of the Evangelical churches, the preliminary obstacles have been removed, and the way prepared for carrying on the work of direct Christian instruction. His coadjutor, Dr. Milne, who died some time before, said of Morrison that "his talents were rather of the solid than the showy kind; adapted more to continued labor than to astonish by sudden bursts of genius; and his well-known caution fitted him for a station where one false step at the beginning might have delayed the work for ages." It may serve to give an idea of the exertions of Dr. Morrison and his colleagues to state that from 1810 to 1836, 751,763 copies of works, consisting of 8,000,000 pages, were printed in the Chinese and Malay languages at Canton, Malacca, Batavia, Penang, and Singapore. This includes 2075 complete Chinese Bibles, 9970 New Testaments, and 31,000 separate portions of Scripture in Chinese. See Memoirs of the Life and Correspondence of Robert Morrison, D.D., compiled by his Widow, to which is appended A Critical Essay. on the Literary Labors of Dr. Morrison, by the Rev. S. Kidd, professor of Chinese in the University College (Lond. 1839, 2 volumes, 8vo); Aikman, Cyclop. of Christian Missions, page 102 sq.; Eclectic Review, 4th series, 7:176; Philadelphia Museum, 37:94; Remusat, in Journal des Savans for 1824.

## Morrow[[@Headword:Morrow]]

             (מָחָר, machar', αὔριον). SEE PROCRASTINATION.

## Morrow, Richard H[[@Headword:Morrow, Richard H]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Huntingdon County, Pennsylvania, January 13, 1823. In early youth he was hopefully converted, and determined to preach the Gospel. He obtained his preparatory education in the academy at Academia, and graduated at Jefferson College, Pennsylvania, in 1851, after which he engaged for some time as teacher in the Milnwood Academy at Shade Gap, Pennsylvania. He studied theology at Alleghany and Princeton seminaries, graduating at the latter in 1854; was licensed by the Presbytery of Huntingdon, and in 1855 ordained and installed pastor of the church at Cedar Rapids, Iowa, where he continued to labor until compelled by declining health to resign his charge, in April, 1859. He died June 10, 1859. Mr. Morrow was a plain and practical preacher, his style giving evidence of fine culture. He was humble, consistent, devoted, possessing in an eminent degree the happy faculty of gaining the friendship and esteem of all who knew him. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1861, page 98.

## Morrow, Thomas, D.D[[@Headword:Morrow, Thomas, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Greenville District, S.C., July 31, 1805. He graduated from Centre College, Kentucky in 1830; studied one year each in Princeton Theological Seminary and Union Seminary, Virginia; was engaged in the Creek Indian mission from 1833 to 1837, and thereafter as an evangelist, organizing churches in Alabama and Mississippi, and at times (1860-61, 1867-74) as superintendent of public- schools in Morgan County. He died at Hartsells, Alabama, March 12, 1885. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1885, page 22.

## Morrow-Mass Priest[[@Headword:Morrow-Mass Priest]]

             is the name of the priest who said early mass, morrow being equivalent to morning. — Walcott, Sac. Archceol. s.v.

## Mors Peccatorum[[@Headword:Mors Peccatorum]]

             (the death of sins), an expression used by Tertullian and other writers to describe the efficacy of baptism, in allusion to Rom 6:4; Col 2:12.

## Morse[[@Headword:Morse]]

             is the technical term for the clasp of a cope or pectoral.

## Morse, Abner[[@Headword:Morse, Abner]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Medway, Massachussetts, September 5, 1793, and was educated at Brown University, class of 1816. He decided to enter the ministry, and sought further preparation for this important work at Andover Seminary, where he graduated in 1819. He then became pastor at Nantucket, Mass.; subsequently at Bound Brook, N.J., and later removed to Indiana, where he became a professor of natural science, a department of study in which he had greatly interested himself. He attained to considerable distinction as a scientist, and published several genealogical works. He died at Sharon, Mass., May 16, 1865. See New England Hist. and Genealog. Register, 19:371;, Drake, Dict. of Amer. Biog. s.v.

## Morse, Asahel[[@Headword:Morse, Asahel]]

             a minister of the Baptist Church in America, who distinguished himself in the Revolutionary period of this country's history, was born in the north parish of New London, now called Montville, Connecticut, November 10, 1771. He received his early educational training from his father, Joshua Morse, also a minister, who preached in the vicinity where Asahel was born until death cut short his ministrations in 1795. At nineteen Asahel had progressed sufficiently in his studies to teach country schools and earn sufficient to defray the expenses of his education at more advanced institutions of learning. In 1782 he was converted, and decided to enter the ministry, feeling himself specially called to the work. He preached a while near his own home, then labored in Winsted. In 1802 the Baptist church in Stratfield, Connecticut, called him as their pastor, and he removed thither in 1803. In 1807 he accepted an appointment as missionary to the Upper Canada Indians, and while in this position endured many hardships. He was faithful to his task, and made converts not only among the Indians, but also among the white people of that region, and greatly strengthened his denomination there. In 1810 he was invited and went to preach at Suffield, Conn., one of the best Baptist churches in New England. But Mr. Morse by no means confined his labors to this church. He went much about the country, and everywhere endeavored to encourage religious life and to secure followers for the Baptist society. In 1832 he became pastor of the Second Baptist Church in Colebrook, Connecticut. In 1836 he returned to Suffield, and there died, June 10, 1838. During his illness he manifested the utmost confidence in the doctrines he had preached, and frequently said  that he relied upon Christ for salvation. See Baptist Memorial, 3 (1844), 234 sq., 272 sq., 293 sq.

## Morse, David Sanford[[@Headword:Morse, David Sanford]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born about the year 1793. He first chose the legal profession, but was converted at the age of twenty-five, turned aside to the ministry, and devoted the remainder of his life to this sacred work. He died in Austerlitz, Columbia County, N.Y., December 21, 1871. See Appleton's Annual Cyclop. 1871, page 592.

## Morse, Frank Currier[[@Headword:Morse, Frank Currier]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Hopkinton, N.H., February 23, 1835. His youth was spent in Newbury, N.H., till the age of seventeen, when he was sent to the Baptist Academy in New London, N.H. He afterwards went to study at Lowell, and while there was converted. Feeling called to the ministry, he entered the Wesleyan University in 1857, and graduated in the regular course in 1861, and at once joined the New England Conference. He was stationed at Blanford. In 1862 he enlisted in the army, and held the position of chaplain during his three years of service. In 1865 he acted as "supply" in Leyden, Mass., and filled this charge for two years. His heath failing him, he moved West, hoping a change might benefit him, but died in Kansas, January 14, 1871.

## Morse, Intrepid, D.D[[@Headword:Morse, Intrepid, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was rector of St. Paul's Church, in Steubenville, Ohio, for many years, until 1865, when he removed to Gambler. He died February 15, 1866. See Prot. Episc. Almanac, 1867, page 101.

## Morse, Jedediah, D.D[[@Headword:Morse, Jedediah, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister of note, was born August 23, 1761, in Woodstock, Conn. He graduated at Yale College in 1783, entered the ministry in 1785, and was chosen tutor in Yale in 1786. In October he changed places with the Reverend Abiel Holmes, pastor in Midway, Georgia, where he preached about six months, when he returned North, and, after preaching in several places, was ordained pastor of the First Congregational Church in Charlestown, Massachusetts, April 30, 1789, and held this charge till 1820, when, having received a commission from J.C. Calhoun, secretary of war, to visit several Indian tribes, he spent two winters in his observations, the report of which was published in 1822. He died in New Haven, June 9, 1826. Dr. Morse published the first American work on geography, in 1784 (passing through many editions in this country and abroad, and after his death it was enlarged and improved by his son). He also wrote A Compendious History of New England, in company with  E. Parish; D.D. (1804): — a pamphlet, The true Reasons on which the Election of a Hollis Professor of Divinity in Harvard College was opposed at the Board of Overseers (1804): — An Appeal to the Public on the Controversy respecting the Revolution in Harvard College (1814); and a number of occasional sermons and addresses. From 1790 to 1821 he published twenty-five of his sermons and addresses. Dr. Morse was also much occupied in religious controversy; in upholding the orthodox faith of the New England churches against the assaults of Unitarianism, and was so earnest in these labors as to seriously impair his health. In 1804 he was active in enlarging the Massachusetts General Association of Congregational Ministers. He was also a prominent actor in the establishment of the theological seminary at Andover, especially by his successful efforts to prevent the threatened establishment of a rival institution at Newbury, projected by the Hopkinsians, and to effect a union between them and other Calvinists on their common symbol, the Assembly's Catechism. The articles of this union, which still constitute substantially the basis of the Andover Seminary, were signed in his own study in Charlestown, in the night of November 30, 1807, by himself, Dr. Samuel Spring, and Dr. Eliphalet Pearson. Morse participated in the organization of the Park Street Church in Boston in 1808, when all the Congregational churches in the city, except the Old South Church, had abandoned the primitive faith of the fathers of New England. In 1805 he started a religious magazine, The Panoplist, of which he was the sole editor for five years. Dr. Morse was universally esteemed for his piety and learning, and is acknowledged to have been one of the most,eminent ministers of his day in New England. He was distinguished alike for the versatility of his powers and the wide extent of his influence, and was almost equally well known on both sides of the Atlantic. See. Spragtte Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, ii, 247; — Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Morse, Joshua[[@Headword:Morse, Joshua]]

             SEE MORSE, ASAHEL.

## Morse, Richard Cary[[@Headword:Morse, Richard Cary]]

             an American Presbyterian minister, noted as a religious journalist, and son of Jedediah Morse, was born June 18, 1795, at Charlestown, Massachusetts. At the age of nine he was sent to Phillips's Academy,  Andover, to prepare for admission to college, and entered Yale College in 1808. He graduated in 1812, the youngest member of his class. The year immediately following his graduation. he spent in New Haven, being employed as the amatuensis of president Dwight, and living in his family, and thus enjoyed an association invaluable to an man, and by which, no doubt, Mr. Morse was greatly profited. In 1814 he entered the theological seminary at Andover, and, having passed through the regular three years' course, was licensed to preach in 1817. The winter immediately succeeding his licensure he spent in South Catblina as a supply of the Presbyterian church on John's Island. He became, however, early impressed with the idea that he had not the requisite natural qualifications for the ministry, and therefore silently retired from it, though his whole life was a continued act of devotion to the objects which the ministry contemplates. On his return to New England he became associated with his father for some time in a very successful geographical enterprise; and in the spring of 1823 enlisted with his brother in another enterprise still more important — the establishing of the New York Observer, of which he was associate editor and proprietor for the remainder of his life, and during this long period contributed largely to its columns, especially by translations from the French and German. He died, while abroad on a visit to recuperate his health, at Kissingen, Germany, September 22, 1868. Under the ordering of a wise and gracius Providence, his circumstances from the very beginning of life acted upon him as a benign influence. What his early training was may be inferred from his distinguished parentage, and his intimate association with Dr. Dwight. And, indeed, during his whole life his associations, whether viewed in respect to near relationship or general acquaintance, were fitted to develop and mature both the intellectual and moral man. His Christian character shone conspicuously in all his life. He not only had a strong conviction of the truth of the Gospel, but a high appreciation of the system of evangelical doctrine. He became at an early period a communicant in the Church, and his whole subsequent life was worthy of his Christian profession. See New York Observer, November 5, 1868; and the Jubilee Year-book of that paper for 1873. (J.H.W.)

## Morse, Sidney Edwards[[@Headword:Morse, Sidney Edwards]]

             an American religious journalist, brother of the preceding, was born at Charlestown, Massachusetts, February 7, 1794, and was educated at Yale College, which he entered at eleven years of age, and was graduated at fourteen, with a class many of whom lived to a great age and became  famous in various departments of professional life. He studied theology at Andover and law at Litchfield, but at sixteen began his apparently predestinated life-work by writing for a Boston newspaper. Afterwards, when a number of clergymen about Boston, among them his own father, determined to try the experiment of a religious newspaper, and the Boston Recorder was projected, young Morse was chosen to conduct it. A few years later (in 1823) he established, in connection with his brother Richard the New York Observer, which perhaps during the whole of Sidney E. Morse's administration as its senior editor, that is, till 1858, as the ablest religious paper in the country, as it was the pioneer of its class of periodicals. He died December 23, 1871, at his residence in New York. Mr. Morse had a clear and logical mind, wide culture, and a tireless spirit of investigation. He was acknowledged to be a man of broad and catholic views, though eminently conservative in his temperament, and of strong convictions, to which he rendered the most complete loyalty. He was uniformly calm and kind, and not without charity for those with whom he differed on many of the great moral movements of the age, and lived and died having faith in humanity and in God. Few men have had so long a career — for he was engaged in public life sixty years — and fewer yet have ever enjoyed in so rich a measure the reverence of associates and the respect of the great public. He will be especially remembered in coming time as the founder of the New York Observer, in the conduct of which he was for nearly forty years actively engaged. From his mind and spirit, probably more than from any other, the religious press of the present day has received its best characteristics, and if new papers now surpass their venerable predecessor — which but few do — they owe their success in no small degree to the inspiration of his genius. Like his distinguished brother, Prof. S.F.B. Morse, he always took an active interest in science, and especially in those branches which relate to geography and exploration, and was engaged until interrupted by his last illness in perfecting an invention for exploring, the depths of the ocean. He had been writing on this favorite subject until a late hour a week before his death. His best-known works are A New System of Modern Geography (1823), A North American Atlas, and a series of general maps. For several years the sales of the two first- mentioned works averaged 70,000 copies annually, and more than 500,000 copies of the first-named have been printed. See Appleton's Annual Cyclopedia, 1871, page 532; New York Observer, December 1871; North Amer. Rev. January 1823, pages 176-181; Observer Jubilee Year-book, 1873. (J.H.W.)

## Morsel[[@Headword:Morsel]]

             (prop. פִּת, a bit, especially of food, Rth 2:14, etc.; βρῶσις ', Heb 12:16; in the plur. crumbs, Lev 2:6, etc.; and so of a piece of ice or hail, Psa 147:17; once [1Sa 2:36] incorrectly for כַּכָּר, kikkcar', a circle or "loaf' of bread, as elsewhere). SEE BREAD.

## Morsell, Joshua, D.D[[@Headword:Morsell, Joshua, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born in 1815. He graduated from the Alexandria Theological Seminary in 1843, was rector of Grace Church, City Island, N.Y., and died there, December 16, 1883.  O

## Morss, James, D.D[[@Headword:Morss, James, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born at Newburyport, Massachusetts, October 25, 1779. After acquiring the rudiments of an education at the public schools of his native town, he commenced to learn the joiner's trade; but in his seventeenth year entered Harvard College, and graduated in 1800. He taught the grammar-school in Brookline after leaving college, and began the study of theology. Soon after, he was employed as lay-reader at Cambridge, and some time later completed his theological course under bishop Bass. He was ordained deacon, July 3, 1803; became assistant to the bishop in St. Paul's Church; in November following rector; and died in that position, April 26, 1842. Among his literary remains are a number of published sermons, addresses, etc. See Sprague, Annals of the Ames. Pulpit, 5:492.

## Morta(i)gne, Walter Of[[@Headword:Morta(i)gne, Walter Of]]

             a noted scholastic of the 12th century, who embraced the realistic views in: philosophy, flourished as bishop of Laon, and died in 1174. He is best known as a logician, and is mentioned by John of Salisbury as the chief representative of the doctrine that "the same objects, according to the different condition (status) in which they are considered — i.e., according as our attention is desired to their differences or to their likeness, to the indifferences or the consimile in them — were either individuals, or species, or genera" (Metalog. 2:17). This doctrine is spoken of by the same author as no longer maintained by any one in his time. See Ueberweg, Hist. Philos. 1:387, 398.

## Mortal[[@Headword:Mortal]]

             (or DEADLY, as the Anglican theologians prefer to call it) sin is, according to Roman Catholicism, the worst form of sin, thus distinguishing in grade of sin, and recognizing as moderate and pardonable sin, under the name of venial, all such acts of transgression as are not likely to bring eternal punishment on the sinner. According to Peter Dens, the eminent Roman Catholic theologian, whose dicta the Church has accepted as authoritative, mortal sin (Lat. peccatum) is that which of itself brings spiritual death to the soul, inasmuch as of itself it deprives the soul of sanctifying grace and charity, in which the spiritual life of the soul consists; and venial sin (Lat. vitium) that which does not bring spiritual death to the soul, or that which does not turn it away from its ultimate end, or which is only slightly repugnant to the order of right reason.

Protestants dissent from this view, and indeed visit it with their condemnation, on the ground that this distinction respecting sins tends to immorality and laxity of life. That sins differ in magnitude they concede to be the doctrine of the Scriptures (e.g. Christ declared the sin of Judas to be greater than that of Pilate. This appears also in the case of the servant who knew the will of his master and did it not. This difference, indeed, is  conspicuous in the judgment of the degrees and expressions of anger in calling men Raca, "vain," or yuwpi, "fool," and also in Christ's comparing some sills to gnats and others to camels; and in his mention of the "many stripes," and in the "greater condemnation" spoken of by James). Yet the Scriptures also declare that "the wages of sin is death." Therefore, though Protestants, like the Christians of the apostolic and patristic Church, distinguish between greater and less sins (graviora et leviora), and hold that a knowledge of this distinction is important in considering the discipline which the early Christians exercised, they yet hold that the early Church did not think any sins to be venial, but deemed all to be mortal (whenever we find the expressions venial and mortal applied to sins by Augustine and others, these appear to be simply a reference to such sins as require penance and such as do not); and therefore now maintain on this question that all sins are punishable as God may determine, even with everlasting destruction from the presence of God and the glory of his power. They assign for such view the following reasons:

"(i.) Every sin is an offence against God's law, and therefore is deadly and damnable on account of the claims of divine justice; for though sins may be divided into greater and less, yet their proportion to punishment is not varied by their temporal or eternal consequences, but by greater and less punishments.

"(ii.) The law of God never threatens, nor does the justice of God inflict, punishment on any except the transgressors of his law; but the smallest offences are not only threatened, but may be punished with death; therefore they are transgressions of divine law.

"(iii.) Every sin, even that apparently insignificant, is against charity, which is the end of the commandment.

"(iv.) When God appointed expiatory sacrifices for sin, though they were sufficient to show that there existed a difference in the degree of it, yet, because 'without shedding of blood there is no remission,' all manner of sin has rendered the offender guilty and liable to punishment; for 'cursed is every one that continueth not in all things written in the book of the law to do them.' No sin was recognized as venial in the covenant which God entered into with our first parents, for there was no remission; and without the death of Christ there could be none afterwards; therefore, if any sin be venial or pardonable, it is only through the death of Christ and the grace of God; and as God pardons  all upon the condition of faith and repentance, and none otherwise, it must follow that, although sins differ in degree, they vary not in their essential character. The man who commits sin at all must die, if he repent not; and he who repents in time and effectually will be saved. 'The wages of sin is death;' of sin indefinitely, and consequently of all sin." See Elliott, Delin. of Roman Catholicism, page 229.

There is, however, a class of Protestants who go so far as to teach that, "while mortal sins are punishable eternally, venial or deadly sins are punishable by God's fatherly chastisements in this life;" and in the same way, as regards the pardon of sin, that "while mortal sins are only forgiven through a direct act of absolution, venial sins are forgiven by renewal of grace (especially in the Eucharist); each mode of pardon .presupposing a degree of penitence conformable to the. degree of sin." Such is the teaching of the Highs-Churchmen of the Anglican establishment, the Ritualists of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and the High Lutherans. See the articles SEE SATISFACTION; SEE SIN.

## Mortality[[@Headword:Mortality]]

             subjection to death, is a term not only thus used, but signifies also a contagious disease which destroys great numbers of either men or beasts. Bills of mortality are accounts or registers specifying the numbers born, married, and buried in any parish, town, or district; and these are kept in Great Britain generally, and its colonial possessions. In general, they contain only these numbers; and even when thus limited are of great use, by showing the degrees of healthiness and prolificness and the progress of population in the place where they are kept. They should become common also in this country, the clergy keeping really the only trustworthy account of a town's people.

## Mortar[[@Headword:Mortar]]

             [for building] stands in the Auth. Vers. for two Heb. words: חֹמֶר(cho'mer, prop. red "clay," as sometimes rendered), cement, of lime and sand (Gen 11:3; Exo 1:14), also potter's clay (Isa 41:25; Nah 3:14); עָפָר(aphar', prob. whitish "dust," as usually rendered), mud or clay, used as a cement in the walls of buildings (Lev 14:42; Lev 14:45). In Eze 13:10 the expression occurs, "One  built up a wall, and lo, others daubed it with untempered mortar" (there is no word in the original answering to this last), which the Targum and the Vulgate seem to understand not of plaster, but of the cement used in uniting the materials of a wall, rendering it "clay without straw," clay and straw, well mixed together, being understood to have been the ordinary cement of Eastern buildings. There is no doubt that the Hebrews sometimes plastered their walls; and that kind of plaster now most common in the East is made with the same materials as the cob-walls, sun-dried bricks and mortar, namely, clay and straw mixed together, the straw such as they give to their cattle, chopped and beaten small, and serving the same purpose as the ox-hair which our plasterers mix with their plaster. This requires to be well tempered, which is generally done by long-continued treading or beating (Kitto, Pict. Bible, note ad loc.). SEE BRICK.

Mr. Rich, speaking of the Birs Nimroud at Babylon, says, "The fire-burned bricks of which it is built have inscriptions on them, and so excellent is the cement, which appears to be lime-mortar, that it is nearly impossible to extract one Whole." SEE DWELLING. "Omitting iron cramps, lead, SEE HANDICRAFT, and the instances in which large stones are found in close apposition without cement, the various compacting substances used in Oriental buildings appear to be: (1) bitumen, as in the Babylonian structures; (2) common mud or moistened clay; (3) a very firm cement compounded of sand, ashes, and lime, in the proportions respectively of 1, 2, 3, well pounded, sometimes mixed and sometimes coated with oil, so as to form a surface almost impenetrable to wet or the weather. SEE PLASTER.

In Assyrian, and also Egyptian brick buildings, stubble or straw, as hair or wool among ourselves, was added to increase the tenacity (Shaw, Trav. page 206; Volney, Trav. 2:436; Chardin, Voy. 4:116). If the materials were bad in themselves, as mere mud would necessarily be, or insufficiently mixed, or, as the Vulgate seems to understand (Eze 13:10), if straw were omitted, the mortar or cobwall would be liable to crumble under the influence of wet weather. (See Shaw, Trav. page 136, and Gesenius, Thesaur. page 1515, s.v. תָּפֵּלa word connected with the Arabic tufal, a substance resembling pipe-clay, believed by Burckhardt to be the detritus of the felspar of granite, and used for taking stains out of cloth; Burckhardt, Syria, page 488; Mishna, Pesach, 10:3.) Wheels for grinding chalk or lime for mortar, closely resembling our own machines for the same purpose, are in use in Egypt (Niebuhr, Voy. 1:122, pl. 17; Burckhardt, Nubia, ) pages 82, 97, 102, 140; Hasselquist, Trav. page 90)." SEE MASON.

Modern Orientals have several materials for mortar superior  to bitumen. These consist of three kinds of calcareous earth found abundantly in the desert west of the Euphrates. The first, called niura, is, in present use, mixed with ashes, and employed as a coating for the lower parts of walls in baths and other places liable to dampness. Another, called by the Turks karej, and by the Arabs jus, is also found in powder mixed with indurated pieces of the same substance and round pebbles. This forms even now the common cement of the country and constitutes the mortar generally found in the burned brickwork of the most ancient remains. When good, the bricks cemented by it cannot well be detached without being broken, while those laid in bitumen can easily be separated. The third sort, called borak, is a substance resembling gypsum, and is founding large lumps of an earthy appearance, which, when burned, form an excellent plaster or whitewash. Pure clay or mud is also used as a cement; but this is exclusively with the sun-dried bricks (Kitto, Pict. Bible, note on Gen 11:3). SEE CLAY; SEE LIME.

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

             [for pulverizing] is the rendering of מְרֹכָה(medokah', something for beating), Num 11:8; also of מִכְתֵּשׁ(nzaktesh', lit. a pounder, applied also to a "hollow" or socket, e.g. of a tooth, Jdg 15:19), Pro 27:22, an instrument for comminuting grain or other substances, by means of a pestle, in place of the later invention or mill (q.v.). In the representation of the various processes of preparing bread on the paintings of the tombs of ancient Egypt, it will be found that the mortar was similarly employed, and the form of the pestle and mortar is there given, and the manner of using them in pounding articles in large quantities. Their mortars were probably blocks of wood, similar to those employed in India. The pestles were different from those now generally employed, but the manner of use, by men striking them alternately, was the same. "Certain persons were also employed in the towns of Egypt, as at the present day in Cairo and other places, to pound various substances in large stone mortars; and salt, seeds, and other things were taken in the same manner by a servant to these shops, whenever it was inconvenient to have it done in the house. The pestles they used, as well as the mortars themselves, were precisely similar to those of the modern Egyptians; and their mode of pounding was the same; two men alternately raising ponderous metal pestles with both hands, and directing their falling point to  the centre of the mortar, which is now generally made of a large piece of granite, or other hard stone, scooped out into a long, narrow tube to a little more than half its depth.

When the substance was well pounded, it was taken out and passed through a sieve, and the larger particles were again returned to the mortar, until it was sufficiently and equally levigated; and this, and the whole process here represented, so strongly resembles the occupation of the public pounders at Cairo that no one who has been in the habit of walking in the streets of that town can fail to recognise the custom, or doubt of its having been handed down from the early Egyptians, and retained without alteration to the present day" (Wilkinson, Anc. Eg. 2:166). "The simplest and probably most ancient method of preparing corn for food was by pounding it between two stones (Virgil, AEn. 1:179). Convenience suggested that the lower of the two stones should be hollowed, that the corn might not escape, and that the upper should be shaped so as to be convenient for holding. The pestle and mortar must have existed from a very early period. The Israelites in the desert appear to have possessed mortars and handmills among their necessary domestic utensils.

When the manna fell they gathered it, and either ground it in the mill or pounded it in the mortar till it was fit for use (Num 11:8). So in the present day stone mortars are used by the Arabs to pound wheat for their national dish kibby (Thomson, Land and Book, 1:134). Niebuihr describes one of a very simple kind which was used on board the vessel in which he went from Jidda to Loheia. Every afternoon one of the sailors had to take the durra; or millet, necessary for the day's consumption, and pound it 'upon a stone, of which the surface was a little curved, with another stone which was long and rounded' (Descr. de l'Arab. page 45). Among the inhabitants of Ezzehhoue, a Druse village, Burckhardt saw coffee-mortars made out of the trunks of oak-trees (Syria, pages 87, 88). The spices for the incense are said to have been prepared by the house of Abtines, a family set apart for the purpose, and the mortar which they used was, with other spoils of the Temple, after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, carried to Rome, where it remained till the time of Hadrian (Reggio, in Martinet's Hebr. Chrest. page 35). Buxtorf mentions a kind of mortar (כּוּתָּשׁ, kuttash) in which olives were slightly bruised before they were taken to the olive-presses (Lex. Talm. s.v. כתש). From the same root as this last is derived the maktesh of Pro 27:22, which probably denotes a mortar of a larger kind in which corn was pounded: 'Though thou bray the fool in the mortar among the bruised corn with the pestle, yet will not his folly depart from him.' Corn may be separated from its husk  and all its good properties preserved by such an operation, but the fool's folly is so essential a part of himself that no analogous process can remove it from him. Such seems the natural interpretation of this remarkable proverb.

The language is intentionally exaggerated, and there is no necessity for supposing an allusion to a mode of punishment by which criminals were put to death by being pounded in a mortar. A custom of this kind existed among the Turks, but there is no distinct trace of it among the Hebrews. The Ulemas, or body of lawyers, in Turkey had the distinguished privilege, according to De Tott (Mem. 1:28, Eng. tr.), of being put to death only by the pestle and the mortar. Such, however, is supposed to be the reference in the proverb by Mr. Roberts, who illustrates it from his Indian experience. 'Large mortars are used in the East for the purpose of separating the rice from the husk. When a considerable quantity has to be prepared, the mortar is placed outside the door, and two women, each with a pestle of five feet long, begin the work. They strike in rotation, as blacksmiths do on the anvil. Cruel as it is, this is a punishment of the state: the poor victim is thrust into the mortar, and beaten with the pestle. The late king of Kandy compelled one of the wives of his rebellious chiefs thus to beat her own infant to death. Hence the saying, 'Though you beat that loose woman in a mortar, she will not leave her ways;' which means, Though you chastise her ever so much, she will never improve' (Orient. Illustr. page 368)." "We do not infer from the above passage in Proverbs that the wheat was pounded to meal instead of being ground, but that it was pounded to be separated from the husk. The Jews probably had no rice, but there are several passages from which we may gather that they used wheat in the same way that rice is now used — that is, boiled up in pillaus, variously prepared.

In fact, we have partaken of wheat thus employed in the remote mountains where rice could not be obtained, or only at a price which the villagers could not afford; and it is also so used among the Arabs, forming a very palatable and nutritive food. For this purpose it is necessary that, as with rice, the husk should be previously disengaged from the grain; and if we suppose that this object was attained with wheat, by a similar treatment with that to which rice is now subjected, the present text may be very satisfactorily explained. There are men, and even women. who gain their bread by the labor of husking rice, which they generally perform in pairs. Their implements consist of a rude wooden mortar, formed of a block hollowed out; pestles, about five feet long, with a heavy block of wood at the upper end; and a sieve for sifting the pounded grain. They carry these utensils to the house where their services are  required, and, if men, strip to the skin (except their drawers), and pursue their labor in a shady part of the court-yard. When two work together, they commonly stand opposite each other, and strike their pestles into the mortar alternately, as blacksmiths strike their iron. Sometimes, however, one pestle alone acts, and the laborers relieve each other, the relieved person taking the easier duty of supplying the mortar, and removing and sifting the cleaned grain. From the weight of the pestle, the labor of pounding is very severe, and the results of the process are but slowly produced" (Kitto, Pict. Bible, note on Pro 27:22). SEE PESTLE.

## Mortar (3)[[@Headword:Mortar (3)]]

             a broad bowl of brass, latten, or copper, either with a pricket for a thick lighted taper, or else filled with a mixture of perfumed wax and oil, ill which a broad wick was kept burning both at festivals and funerals.

## Mortar, Holy[[@Headword:Mortar, Holy]]

             the term applied to mortar used in cementing altar stones in churches and in Roman Catholic establishments, is made with holy water.

## Mortera, Saul Ha-Lewi[[@Headword:Mortera, Saul Ha-Lewi]]

             a Jewish divine of note, was born about 1596 in Germany; studied at Venice and France; and settled at Amsterdam as rabbi of the Sephardim, or Spanish Jews, where he founded in 1643 the academy Keter Tora. When Elias Montalto died, Mortera was sent to Paris to convey the corpse of Montalto for interment in Amsterdam. He died in 1660. Mortera is noted, moreover, as having been the teacher of the famous Baruch Spinoza. Of his works the following are worthy of notice: his Gibeath Shaul (שָׁאוּלגַבְעִת), a collection of Sermons (Amst. 1645), and a polemical work, entitled תּוֹרִת משֶׁה, The Divine Providence of God towards Israel, impugning Romanism so severely that it could never be printed. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:391; De Rossi, Dizionario (Ger. transl.), page 234 sq.; Bibl. Jud. Antichr. page 72 sq.; Rodriguez de Castro, Bibl. Rabb. Span. 1:573; Lindo, Hist. of the Jews in Spain, p. 368; Kayserling, Sephardim, page 201, 206, 254; Gesch. d. Juden in Portugal, p. 275-310; Jost, Gesch. d. Juden. u.s. Seklten, 3:232 sq.; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 9:525; 10:9, 10, 11, 141, 169, 176; Zunz, Monatstage (Berlin, 1872), page 7. (B.P.)

## Mortgage[[@Headword:Mortgage]]

             (עָרִב, arab', Neh 5:3, to pawn anything), a lien upon real estate for debt (Gesenius reads the passage, "we must pawn our houses"); in 1Sa 17:18 rendered " pledge," and in Pro 17:18 " surety,"  whence עָרָבוֹן, arabon, "anything given as a pledge or promise" (Gen 38:17-18; Gen 38:20). Gesenius thinks the word was probably introduced as a commercial term, from the Hebrew or Phoenician language, into the Greek and Latin, as ἀῤῥαβών, and arrhabo, in the signification of earnest, or purchase-money. SEE LOAN.

## Mortification (1)[[@Headword:Mortification (1)]]

             is a term generally applied, in theological parlance, to certain voluntary inflictions of pain or acts of self-denial, which are supposed by those that employ them to have a meritorious efficacy, or at least a salutary moral influence on the sufferer. Wherever these austerities have been practiced, it is easy to trace erroneous views of Christian truth. This is apparent in the system of monkery and asceticism which at so early a period overspread the Church. Every religion of man's devising, or mixed and modified by man's corruptions, will be found to place religious excellence more in self- inflicted sufferings than in moral duties; to prize more that mortification which consists in voluntary endurance of pain and privation than that which consists in the habitual subjugation of sinful passions. It will ordinarily be found that the prevalence in any religion of general laxity of morals and of severe austerities will keep pace with each other. The greater the merit attached to self-inflicted sufferings by certain devotees, the greater will be the indulgence for neglect of moral duties; and the stricter the requirement of fasts and mortifications at certain seasons, according to prescribed regulations, the less the general restraint at other times. The religion of Christ inculcates habitual self-control, a readiness and firmness in the discharge of each appointed duty, however painful; which is a self-denial more difficult to the natural man than even habitual austerities. The mortification of sin in believers is a duty enjoined in the sacred Scriptures (Rom 8:13 : "For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die [μέλλετε ἀποθνήσκειν]; but if ye through the Spirit do mortify [θανατοῦτε] the deeds of the body, ye shall live;" Col 3:5 : "Mortify [νεκρώσατε] therefore your members which are upon the earth"). It consists in breaking the league with sin, declaration of open hostility against it, and strong resistance to it (Eph 6:10, etc.; Gal 5:24; Rom 8:13). The means to be used in this work' are not macerating the body, seclusion from society, or our own resolutions; but the Holy Spirit is the chief agent (Rom 8:13), while faith, prayer, and dependence are subordinate means to this end. The evidences of  mortification are not the cessation from one sin, for that may be only exchanged for another, or it may be renounced because it is a gross sin, or there may not be an occasion to practice it; but if sin be mortified, we shall not yield to temptation; our minds will be more spiritual; we shall find more happiness in spiritual services, and bring forth the fruits of the Spirit. See Owen On the Mortification of Sin, and on the Holy Spirit, chapter 8, book 4; Charnock's Works, 2:1313; Bryson's Sermons on Romans 8, page 97, etc.; Farrar, Eccles. Dict. s.v. SEE SELF-DENIAL.

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

             in Scotch law, is a term used to denote lands given for charitable or other public uses. When lands are so given, they are in general formally conveyed to the trustees of the charity, to be held blench, or in feu. When mortifications are given in general to the poor, without naming particular trustees, they fall under the administration of the Court of Session. By the statute of 1633, c. 6, it was declared unlawful to alter any mortifications, and the managers were rendered liable to be called to account for malversation. Any person entitled to the benefit of the fund can pursue actions of this kind,

## Mortimer, John Hamilton[[@Headword:Mortimer, John Hamilton]]

             an English artist of high repute in his day, who gave himself largely to ecclesiastical and Biblical subjects, was born in 1741 of humble parentage, and was the youngest of four children. Having acquired a taste for drawing from an uncle who was an itinerant portrait-painter, he was at about the age of eighteen placed under Hudson, who had been the instructor of Reynolds. With him, however, he did not continue long; but, after having studied a while in the gallery of the duke of Richmond, Mortimer began to make himself known by his productions. One of his earliest works, founded on an incident in the life of Edward the Confessor, painted in competition with Romney, obtained from the Society for the Encouragement of Arts a premium of fifty guineas, and another, presenting St. Paul preaching to the Britons, one hundred guineas. He was further distinguished by the notice and friendship of Reynolds, which friendship has been attributed, not to the sympathy, but to the opposition of their tastes in art. Mortimer was no colorist, and but an indifferent portrait-painter, although he produced many admirable heads and likenesses in black and white chalk. His talent lay in design, and in wild and fantastic quite as much as in historical subjects. He  designed The Brazen Serpent in the great window of Salisbury Cathedral, and the cartoons for that in Brazenose College. He died February 4, 1779, and was buried in the church at High Wycombe, near the altar where is his painting of St. Paul preaching to the Britons. See Engl. Cyclop. s.v.; Spooner, Dict. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

## Mortimer, Thomas, D.D[[@Headword:Mortimer, Thomas, D.D]]

             an English divine. who was born near the opening of our century, flourished at London as minister of Gray's Inn, and died in 1849. He' published Lectures on the Influence of the Holy Spirit (Lond. 1824, 8vo), which Bickersteth pronounces "evangelical, practical, and edifying," and several series of his Sermons (Lond. 1822, 8vo; 1825, 8vo). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.

## Mortmain[[@Headword:Mortmain]]

             (from French mort, "dead," and main, "hand," which in turn from Latin mortua manu, i.e., in the dead hand) is the technical term of a series of Anglican statutes dealing with the lands of corporate bodies, especially ecclesiastical. The most probable origin of the term is that given by Coke, that "the lands were said to come to dead hands as to the lords, for that by alienation in mortmain they lost wholly their escheats, and in effect their knights' services, for the defence of the realm, wards, marriages, reliefs, and the like, and therefore was called a dead hand, for that a dead hand yieldeth no service." In the latter part of the Middle Ages the Roman Catholic Church, which had acquired a strong hold in England, came to own very largely the real estate of the country, until at one time it owned fully one third of all the English landed estate, which thus paid no taxes. By 1215 it had obtained so large a part of the real estate that it practically disabled the government from raising the necessary means to pay its expenses. To put a stop to this evil, a clause was introduced into the Magna Charta forbidding gifts of land to religious houses. This was the first statute of mortmain, and declares " that if any one shall give land to a religious house, the grant shall be void, and the land forfeited to the lord of the fee." But when the Romish Church, which had no interest in state affairs, saw itself thus suddenly cut short in its expansion of power and wealth, it found a way to evade the law by taking, instead of a fee-simple title to the land, leases for a thousand years.

To meet this evasion of the intent of the law, the state, in the reign of Edward I, passed the statute De  Religiosis, which restrained people at the time of their death, or otherwise, from giving or making over any lands or rents to churches or religious houses without the king's leave being first obtained. This was rendered extremely necessary by the fact that the king's exchequer had been impoverished to the utmost by the accumulation of landed property in the hands of ecclesiastical bodies, and protection of the state interests, especially in view of the evasions of the Church. But even this provision failed to meet the case. The wily churchmen found a way to evade compliance with this law by a collusive action brought in court for each piece of real estate the Church wished to get title of. In this way an individual entirely under control of the Church would take the title to the property and occupy it; then the religious corporation would bring a suit of ejectment against him, claiming that the title in the property was in the Church, -and that he was illegally keeping the Church out of it.

The tenant, being in collusion with the Church, would make no defence, and a decree on default would be taken, adjudging the property to the Church; then they would hold it by a decree of court called a recovery. Thus the statute of the Edward I was completely evaded and the state circumvented. Another statute, the 13 Edward I, was passed, prohibiting religious corporations from taking either by gift, purchase, lease, or recovery. Priestly ingenuity, however, in a short time succeeded in meeting also this provision, and for its evasion introduced into England from the Roman law the doctrine of uses, by which the title of real estate would be in another; but he would hold it to the uses of a religious house, so that the religious corporation would get all the benefit of the real estate, the naked title standing only in the individual. This practice was shielded under a royal charter of license, which (as e.g. by 17 Car. II, c. 3) enacted, "Every owner of any impropriations, tithes, or portions of tithes, in any parish or chapelry, may give and annex the same, or any part thereof, unto the patronage or vicarage of the said parish church or chapel where the same do lie or arise; or settle the same in trust for the benefit of the said parsonage or vicarage, or of the curate or curates there successively, where the parsonage is inappropriate and no vicar endowed, without any license or mortmain." The evil became so oppressive that finally the 15 Richard II was enacted to head off the priests from swallowing up the fruits of the lands under their new doctrine imported from Italy of uses and trusts. But again priestcraft gained the upper hand, and by the 23 Henry 8, c. 10, it was enacted, "That if any grants of lands or other hereditaments should be made in trust to the use of any churches, chapels, churchwardens, guilds, fraternities, etc., to  have perpetual obits, or a continual service of a priest forever, or for sixty or eighty years, or to such like uses and intents, all such uses, intents, and purposes shall be void; they being no corporations, but erected either of devotion or else by the common consent of the people; and all collateral assurances made for defeating this statute shall be void, and the said statute shall be expounded most beneficially for the destruction of such uses as aforesaid." Even this provision failed to cover the case; and at last, in 1736, the celebrated statute of George II was passed, which effectually put an end to all evasions of ecclesiastical taxation.

Perhaps even it, would have been insufficient to cope with Romish cunning, but the dethronement of the Roman Catholics from their former predominance as an ecclesiastical body no doubt greatly contributed to a successful issue in the question. It was the confiscation of Church property in the reign of Henry VIII that paved the way for a successful issue of the provisions sought for in the statutes of mortmain. The statute of mortmain as enacted under George II, which is entitled, "An Act to restrain the Disposition of Lands, whereby the same become inalienable" is now the leading English act. It forbids the gift of money or lands to charitable uses except by deed operating immediately, and without power of revocation, formally executed and enrolled in chancery at least six months before the donor's death. This provision was made especially to prevent priests and others from importuning a dying man to convey his land for charitable purposes. Hence, though a person can, in England, up to the last hour of his life, if possessing sufficient knowledge of what he does, devise by will all his land to individuals absolutely, it is otherwise if he intend to give the land to trustees for a charitable purpose, as to build a church, or school, or hospital. The statute of mortmain, 9 George II, c. 36, reciting that public mischief had greatly increased by many large and improvident dispositions made by languishing and dying persons to charitable uses, to take place after their deaths, to the disinheritance of their lawful heirs, enacts that in future no lands or sums of money to be laid out in land shall be given to any person or body, unless such gift or conveyance shall be made or executed in presence of two witnesses twelve months before the death of the donor or grantor, and be enrolled in the Court of Chancery within six months after the execution. Therefore a person on death-bed cannot in England give land, or money to buy land, for a charitable purpose. It can only be done in the life of the donor, at least twelve months before his death; and the property must be completely alienated, so that he has no further control over it. The deed must have a present operation, and must not reserve any life-interest to the  donor; it must be done at once and forever. The policy of this statute has sometimes been questioned, and several well-known modes of evading the statute have been adopted from time to time.

The act has been held to apply only to land locally situated in England: and hence, if the land is situated in Scotland, or the colonies, or abroad, a will conveying it for charitable purposes will receive effect. In Scotland the mortmain act has no application; but the reason for this is that the common law of Scotland contains a similar check on the alienation of land on death-bed, and which, in some respects, has a universal application. Several acts have been passed since 9 George II, c. 36, as already stated, for exempting various bodies from the operation of that act. These acts chiefly apply to the Established Church. The statute 58 George 3:c. 45, amended by 59 George 3:c. 134, and 2 and 3 William 4:c. 61, is intended to promote the building of new churches in populous places in England and Wales. The law 43 George 3:c. 107, was passed to exempt decrees and bequests to the governors of Queen Anne's Bounty. By 12 and 13 Victoria, c. 49, § 4, grants of land for sites of schools, not exceeding five acres, are voted; and there are other more recent modifications.

In the United States the English mortmain laws have not in general been adopted or recognised, except in Pennsylvania; and in that state, by an act passed in 1855, bequests, devises, or conveyances, for religious or charitable uses, may be valid if made by deed or will at least one calendar month before the death of the testator or alienor. In New York, by a statute enacted in 1848, gifts to charitable corporations by will must be made two months before the testator's death; and by another enacted in 1860 any person having a husband, wife, child, or parent, is precluded from bequeathing more than one half of his clear estate to any society, association, or corporation. In Georgia, in like manner, a gift to charitable uses by will is made void if the testator has a wife or issue living, unless made ninety days before his death. In other states the checks to the acquisition of real estate by corporate bodies are such as are imposed by their charters, or by the general laws under which they have become incorporated. These limit their property to an amount sufficient for their natural uses, and whenever corporations come into the possession of more than is thus demanded or authorized, a special act of legislation is necessary to legalize such possessions; excepting, however, the transfer of landed estate in liquidation of indebtedness by the grantor, yet such possessions can be held only until they can be properly disposed of by sale.  Roman Catholics generally evade the statues by holding their property in the bishop's name, thus constituting it his own estate, though they use it for ecclesiastical purposes. See Coller, Eccles. Hist. (see Index in volume 9); Milman, Lat. Christianity (see Index in volume 8); Baxter, Ch. Hist. page 283; Elliott, Delineation of Romanism, pages 173, 296; Chambers, Cyclop. s.v.; Amer. Cyclop. s.v.; Eadie, Eccles. Cyclop. s.v.; Coke, First Part of the Institutes of the Laws of England (Phila. 1853, 2 volumes, 8vo), 1:99, 112; Blackstone, Commentaries on the Laws of England (Phila. 1863, 2 volumes, 8vo), book 1:479; book 2:268; book 4:108, 424, 426,441.

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

             an early New England divine, was born in Cornwall, England, in 1626; was educated at Oxford University, of which he was a fellow; entered holy orders, and was at first a Royalist, but becoming a Puritan, was ejected from Blisland for his nonconformity in 1662. He had established an academy at Newington Green, and continued at its head for twenty years. Among his pupils was Defoe, the author of Robinson Crusoe. Being much annoyed by the bishop's court, Morton felt obliged to leave the country, and in 1686 emigrated to New England, and settled in Charlestown. Mass., where he held a position till his death, which occurred April 11, 1698. He was well esteemed by his contemporaries, and acknowledged to be a man of eminent learning. He wrote a number of religious works, among which is The Ark, its Loss and Recovery. See Drake, Dict. of Amer. Biogr. s.v.

## Morton, James Douglas, Earl of[[@Headword:Morton, James Douglas, Earl of]]

             a Scotch nobleman, who figures quite notably in the secular as well as ecclesiastical history of his country, was the second son of Sir George Douglas of Pittendriech, and in 1553 succeeded, in right of his wife, Elizabeth, daughter of the third earl, to the title and estates of the earldom. His father was a most ardent adherent to the cause of the Reformation, and very early he also favored the same cause, and was a friend of king Henry VIII in the designs of that monarch in reference to Scotland. His name, however, does not often appear in the public transactions of the period; and although in 1557 he was one of the original Lords of the Congregation, he seems yet to have been afraid of the consequences, in a personal point of view, of casting off the queen-regent, from whom he had already received considerable favors, and therefore held a rather doubtful and irresolute course. It was for this reason that Sadler, the English envoy,  describes Morton as “a simple and fearful man." The death of the queen- regent, however, completely changed the man. He now boldly came forward and avowed himself unequivocally a Protestant. Sworn a privy councillor in 1561, he was appointed lord high chancellor of Scotland, January 7, 1563, in the place forfeited by the earl of Huntly, who had been the great head of the Roman Catholic party in Scotland. He had, however, only been in office a few years when he was obliged to quit it; for, having been one of the chief conspirators against Rizzio, the Italian secretary of queen Mary, on his assassination, March 9, 1566, he fled with his associates to England, and remained there until, through the interest of the earl of Bothwell, he obtained his pardon from the queen. Bothwell, unprincipled as he was, no doubt helped Morton because he hoped, in turn, to be obliged; and no sooner was the earl reinstated in favor with the queen than Bothwell opened to him the plot which he meditated for the murder of Darnley, expecting, of course, Morton's ready acquiescence. In this, however, Bothwell was mistaken; Morton refused to concur. But neither did he inform Darnley of the plot, nor take any measures to prevent its being executed; and he was one of those who subscribed the famous bond to protect Bothwell against the charge of being concerned in the murder, and to use every endeavor to promote his marriage with the queen. Yet when this latter event took place, and when Bothwell became odious to the nation, Morton was the great leader in opposition to him; and it was to the castle of his relative, the lady of Lochleven, that Mary was conducted when she delivered herself up at Carbery Hill.

When Mary was securely lodged in this place of confinement, the earl of Murray was made regent of the kingdom, and Morton reinstated in the office of lord chancellor. He continued in this situation during the regencies of Murray, Lennox, and Mar, and was indeed a principal actor in all matters of importance which took place in their time; and on Mar's death, at the end of the year 1572, Morton was himself appointed regent of the kingdom. While in the regency Morton played an important part for the ecclesiastical history of Scotland. The court and the Kirk were at this time involved in much controversy, because the former was bent upon the introduction of the episcopacy. The conflict had begun previous to the death of Knox (November 1572), for the purpose of securing to the Church the revenues of the episcopal sees; and a convention of superintendents and other, ministers favorable to the design had been held in Leith in August 1572, and had declared that the titles of bishop and archbishop should be restored, provided that with the restoration of titles no greater authority was delegated than was possessed  by the superintendents, and that they be elected by the ministers of the respective dioceses. The primary object was to prevent the property passing into the hands of the nobles and courtiers. But the General Assembly, which convened shortly after the convention, condemned the innovation, and hence arose a conflict with the regent, who favored the action of the convention which he had been instrumental in calling. He had himself an interest in the successful issue of this movement; he cared less for the Church's interest than he did for his own, his object being ostensibly to place these bishops in positions to draw the income of the benefice, but really to secure for himself and other nobles a larger part of the revenues from those ecclesiastics whom he should help to elevate to such stations; and hence these episcopal incumbents were called tulchaan bishops — a tulchan being a calfskin stuffed with straw, which the country people set up beside a cow to induce her to give her milk. The bishop, it was said, had the title, but my lord had the milk. This conflict between the tulchan episcopacy and the Church establishment, supported by legal enactments, continued until the close of the earl's regency, when it was brought to a successful termination for the Kirk's interests by the efforts of that worthy follower of John Knox, the learned and resolute and noble-souled Andrew Melville (q.v.). SEE SCOTLAND, CHURCH OF.

In this struggle with the Kirk, as well as in secular affairs, Morton displayed great vigor and ability, yet at the same time his ambition, his avarice, and rapacity, and his general want of principle, became apparent to all; he was now at once feared and hated; and finding himself becoming odious to the nation, and knowing that the young king, James VI, desired to assume the reins of government, Morton finally resigned the regency in March 1578. Subsequently obtaining possession of the castle of Stirling, with the person of the king, he recovered his authority, and by the help of queen Elizabeth retained it for some time; but at length the king's new favorite, captain Stewart, who, as Robertson says, shunned no action, however desperate, if it led to power or favor, charged him in the king's presence with being accessory to the murder of Darnley, and thus procured Morton's incarceration. Elizabeth used every endeavor in favor of Morton, but the greater the solicitude which she showed for his safety, the more eagerly did his enemies urge his destruction; and being carried by captain Stewart, then earl of Arran, into Edinburgh, he was, on June 1, 1581, brought to trial, found guilty, and condemned to death. When that part of the verdict was read which, besides finding that he had concealed, found that he was also accessory to the murder, he repeated the words with vehemence, and then exclaimed, " God  knows it is not so." The next morning, speaking of the crime for which he was condemned, he admitted that on his return from England, after the death of Rizzio, Bothwell had informed him of the conspiracy against Darnley, which the queen, as he told him, knew of and approved, but he had no hand in it. And as to revealing the plot, “To whom," said he, "could I reveal it? To the queen? She was aware of it. To Darnley? He was such a babe that there was nothing told to him but he would tell to her again; and the two most powerful noblemen in the kingdom, Bothwell and Huntly, were the perpetrators. I foreknew and concealed the plot, but as to being art and part in its execution, I call God to witness I am wholly innocent." When his keepers told him that the guards were attending, and all was in readiness, he replied, "I thank my God, I am ready likewise." On the scaffold his behavior was calm, his countenance and voice unaltered, and after some time spent in acts of devotion, he was beheaded by the instrument called the Maiden, June 3, 1581. See Froude, Hist. of England, 7:306 sq.; 8:250 sq.; 10:53 sq.; 11:96, et al.; Burke, Peerage of England; Burton, Hist. of Scotland; Robertson, Hist. of Scotland; Spottiswood, Hist. of the Chnurch of Scotland, 2:171-195; Butler, Manual of Eccles. Hist. 2:550-553; English Cyclopacdia (Biographical Department, volume 4: s.v.).

## Morton, John[[@Headword:Morton, John]]

             an English cardinal and archbishop, one of the most noted characters of the history of England during the Middle Ages, figuring prominently in the political history of Europe, was eldest son of Richard Morton, of Milbourne St. Andrews, in Dorsetshire, and was born at Bere in that county in 1410. He received his primary education at the Benedictine abbey of his native place, and thence went to Baliol College, Oxford, to study canon and civil law; and after having become master of arts, went to London, and practiced law in the Court of Arches, retaining, however, all the time his connection with the university. In 1453 he was made principal of Peckwater Inn, having been previously ordained. In 1450 he was appointed subdean of Lincoln, and in 1458 he was collated to the prebend of Fordington with Writhlington, in the cathedral of Salisbury, which he resigned in 1476. In the same year he was installed prebendary of Covingharp, in the cathedral of Lincoln. In 1472 he was collated by archbishop Bourchier to the rectory of St. Dunstan's-in-the-East, London; and the same year also to the prebend of Isledon, in the cathedral of St. Paul, which he exchanged in the following year for that of Chiswick. In 1473 he was appointed master of the rolls, and in 1474 archdeacon of Winchester and Chester. In the following year he became archdeacon of Huntington and prebendary of St. Decuman, in the cathedral of Wells. In April 1476, he was installed prebendary of South Newbald, in the metropolitan church of York, and archdeacon of Berkshire; and in January following he was made also archdeacon of Leicester. Rarely were appointments bestowed so liberally upon any one as upon Morton. But the reason is easily found. While yet practicing as an advocate in the Court of Arches, his eminent qualities were a matter of general comment, and brought him to the notice of cardinal Bourchier, who, besides conferring many of the above preferments on him, had introduced him to Henry VI, by whom he was made one of the privy council. To this unfortunate prince Morton adhered with so much fidelity, while others deserted him, that even his successor, Edward IV, admired and recompensed his attachment, took him into his council, and was principally guided by his advice. He also in the same year, 1478, made him bishop of Ely and lord chancellor of England; and at his death he appointed him one of his executors.

On this account, however. he was considered in no favorable light by the protector, .afterwards Richard III, and he was marked as one whose life was required to give peace to the sovereign. Accordingly, when Morton and others assembled in the Tower, June 13, 1483, to consult about the coronation of Edward V, the bishop, with archbishop Rotheram and lord Stanley, were taken into custody, as known enemies to the measures then in agitation. Morton's execution was expected by everybody. His numerous friends, however, made bold, particularly those at the University of Oxford, and these learned men addressed king Richard "in the most courteous language of which their Latinity was capable in behalf of their imprisoned patron; and praised him and apologized with such success that the king relented so far as to direct his being sent to Brecknock, in Wales, to be in charge of the duke of Buckingham" (Williams). He was accordingly sent to the castle of Brecknock, but thence made his escape to the Isle of Ely, and soon after, disguising himself, went to the Continent, to Henry, earl of Richmond. It is said that the plan of marrying Elizabeth, the eldest daughter of Edward IV, to Henry, and thus, by joining the white rose with the red, effecting a coalition between the jarring parties of York and Lancaster, was originally suggested by Morton. In 1485 the word came to Morton, then in Flanders, that his enemy had been dethroned, and with it an invitation for his attendance upon the coronation of the new king, afterwards Henry VII. He returned forthwith, easily got his attainder reversed, and was at once  admitted into the :confidence of his new royal master, who was no sooner seated on his throne than he made Morton one of his privy council; and on the death of cardinal Bourchier in 1486, secured his election to the archbishopric of Canterbury, a position which he honored, and in which he accomplished much for the good of his country.

Williams thus sums up his official character and conduct (Lives of the English Cardinals [Lond. 1862, 2 volumes, 8vo], 2:167 sq.):

"In the performance of his ecclesiastical duties Morton took high ground. To a considerable extent he favored the pretensions of the papal court, but while doing so exercised a vigilant superintendence over the Anglican establishment, and maintained a severe discipline. The objects with which the principal religious houses of a mixed charitable and religious order had been founded were gradually lost sight of; and the great abbeys and priories throughout the country, with a few honorable exceptions, had become so notorious for the luxurious and depraved living of the fraternities, as to excite satirical attacks from both clergy and laity. The archbishop of Canterbury, knowing the scandalous practices that existed in his own diocese, as well as in others, was anxious to remedy so grave an evil. He heard the reports of various persons likely to be well informed on the subject, and then sent to Rome for instructions. He was well aware that without die support from the highest quarter no amelioration of the disease, which he knew to be eating like a leprosy into the Church, could be effected. The immorality of the English clergy had become so flagrant in the last quarter of the fifteenth century that the primate readily procured the pope's authority for a visitation. He proceeded from one to another of the monasteries and abbeys, and laid the result before a provincial synod. His exposure of folly and profligacy produced no great effect upon the assembly; admonitions and cautions Were bestowed upon the great offenders, but the swarm of clerical roysterers, sportsmen, and swashbucklers were scarcely at all interfered with judicially. The severest thing done was the sending around to religious houses a written address dilating on the scandalous lives that many priests were living, and exhorting them to reform.

"The state of things was atrocious enough apparently to have caused the bones of the English pope to stir in his crave with indignation. Ample provocation had been given for the extreme exercise of the powers granted by the head of the Church thus disgraced and outraged; but archbishop  Morton presently found that he had commenced a task which he had neither the power nor the courage to complete. Probably he was made aware that the abbot William had influential friends in England as well as in Rome, as such delinquents could always secure, and that his proper punishment was impossible; or discovered that St. Alban's was only one of the many establishments in England in which prodigality and profligacy flourished — in short, that the evil was too formidable to be grappled with successfully by him. So no further step was taken in the reformation that even then had become imperative in the opinion of right-minded Catholics. Several attempts had previously been made to check clerical foppery, but with scarcely any result. The archbishop made a strenuous effort at reform in this direction, threatening with sequestration those who offended by assuming the extravagances of fashion adopted by the laity. Priests were prohibited wearing hoods, with fur or without, doubled with silk, or adorned with a horn or short tail, or having camllet about the neck. They were not to array themselves with sword or dagger, or with decorated belts, but were to walk abroad in their proper crowns and tonsures, showing their ears.

"A most remarkable document was the bull of Pope Innocent VIII, published in 1489, stating that the English clergy were for the most part dissolute and reprobate, and giving authority to the primate for their correction and reformation. The latter was earnest in the cause, for he got the pope's bull backed by an act of Parliament for the sure and likely reformation of priests, clerks, and religious men, culpable, or by their demerits openly reputed of incontinent living in their bodies, contrary to their order, and directed punishment to be awarded to fornication, incest, or any other fleshly incontinency (Statutes at Large, 2:65). The king took special interest in this praiseworthy movement, and encouraged the primate to go through with his work. With the cooperation of pope, king, and Parliament, he increased his exertions, and proceeded with all the state he could assume, in accordance with his exalted spiritual and temporal offices, to make visitation after visitation at Rochester, Worcester, and Salisbury, twice; Lichfield and Coventry, Bath and Wells, Winchester, Lincoln, and Exeter. While he corrected abuses, he collected money, as he found the offenders ready to

"'Compound for sins they were inclined to,

By damning those they had no mind to.'"

That Morton found favor in the eyes of his king is evident, inasmuch as he made this archbishop also lord chancellor. In a council of his suffragans, which the archbishop held in February, 1486, at St. Paul's, in London, the corruptions in the Anglican Church were further considered, and measures adopted to deepen the religious fervor of the people. It was also provided that "every bishop of the province shall cause a service and six masses to be said for the soul of a departed bishop, within a month from the time of their hearing of his death." Some measures adopted by this council were made the subjects of attack. Among other arrangements it was provided that ecclesiastics should not preach against the papacy or against any ecclesiastical officers before the lay people. Morton's intent, no doubt, was to favor and please the papacy in so far as was at all consistent with the end he desired to attain. He certainly did not mean to check any reforms. Thus he provided that if any spiritual person behaved himself wickedly, the ordinary was to be informed; and if the ordinary did not correct such offender, the archbishop was to be appealed to; and, finally, if he did not punish the delinquent, then it was the said prelate's will that the preachers generally should declaim against him.

In 1493 Morton, after repeated and urgent requests of the English king, was created a cardinal by pope Alexander VI. The few years that remained him for activity he employed in the work to which he had dedicated his life. He instituted and promoted reforms in the Church wherever his keen eye could detect their need. He also labored assiduously to advance the interests of his royal master, and even went so far as to urge upon the pope the canonization of Henry VI. He failed in this, but succeeded in securing the canonization of Anselm, which he had also desired. He died, according to the Canterbury Obituary, Tuesday, 16 kal. Oct.; but according to the Register of Ely, September 15, 1500. Leland says that cardinal Morton employed the fortune he possessed in building and repairing Church property at Canterbury, Lambeth, Maidstone, Allington Park, Charing, Ford, and Oxford; it is said also that he repaired the canon-law school, assisted in the building of the divinity school, and the rebuilding of St. Mary's Church. In February 1494, he was elected chancellor of the University of Oxford, in which year, Fuller says, he greatly promoted the rebuilding ;of Rochester bridge. Among other public-spirited enterprises which his liberality conduced to execute, was the famous cut or drain from Peterborough to Wisbeach, a tract of upwards of twelve miles across a fenny country, which proved a great benefit to his diocese and to the  public, and was completed entirely at his expense. This is still known by the name of Morton's Leame. "Cardinal Morton," says Williams, "has left solid claims on the respect of posterity; but more enduring than his benevolent bequests, and his useful buildings and improvements, have been his labors to effect a reformation in the Church. They were not productive of much immediate result, but helped materially to bring about the vigorous movement which was successful in the following reign. His investigations proved beyond the possibility of doubt that the evils of the papal system had nearly reached their limit" (page 190). Cardinal Morton was the patron of Sir Thomas More, who eulogized him in his Utopia. The Life of King Richard III, sometimes attributed to More, is believed to have been written by Morton; and if Morton did not himself write the Life, it seems to be quite clear that More (who was in early life a page in Morton's house) must have derived part of his information directly from the archbishop., See Tanner, Bibl. Brit. Lib. pages 532, 533; Bentham, Hist. of Ely (Cambr. 1771), pages 179-181; Budden, Life of John Morton (1607); Hook, Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury, volume 5; Williams, Lives of the English Cardinals, volume 2, chapter 7; Collier, Eccles. Hist. (see Index in volume 8).

## Morton, Nathaniel[[@Headword:Morton, Nathaniel]]

             an American writer on ecclesiastical history, and one of the Plymouth colonists, was born in England in 1612, and came to this country with his father in 1623. In 1645 he was made secretary of the colony, and continued to hold that office until his death, June 28, 1685. He is noted as the author of New England's Memorial, or a brief Relation of the most memorable and remarkable Passages of the Providence of God manifested to the Planters of New England, etc., compiled chiefly from the MSS. of his uncle, William Bradford, and the journals of Edward Winslow, and including the period from 1620-1646 (Cambridge, 1669, 4to; 2d ed. Boston, 1721, 12mo; 3d ed. Newport, 1772; 5th ed., with notes by Judge Davis, 1826; 6th ed., with notes by the Congregational Board, 1855, 8vo). He also wrote in 1680 a brief Eccles. Hist. of the Plymouth Church, in its records, preserved in Ebenezer Hazard's Historical Collections. See Chancellor Kent, Course of English Reading (1853), page 15; North Amer. Rev. 46:481 sq.; Winthrop, New England (1853), 1:94; Bacon, Genesis of the New England Churches (1875), pages 199, 475.

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

             an English prelate noted for his learning and prudence, was born at York in 1564. He was a relative of cardinal Morton, but a Protestant. In 1582 he was sent to St. John's College, Cambridge University, and after graduation was chosen a fellow (in 1592). He lectured for a while at his alma mater on logic, and about 1599 became chaplain to the earl of Huntingdon, and made himself conspicuous in attempts for the recalling of such of the Protestants as had become recusants during the reign of bloody Mary. During the plague of 1602 also Morton distinguished himself by great charity and resolution. In 1603 he went abroad as chaplain to, lord Eure, ambassador to Germany and Denmark, and while in those countries availed himself of the valuable literary advantages brought within his reach. In 1606 he was made chaplain to king James I, and given the preferment of the deanery of Winchester. He was also at this time made a fellow of the newly-established college at Chelsea, whose aim was to defend Protestantism from the assaults of the Romanists. In 1615 Morton was elevated to the episcopate, and given the see of Chester; was transferred to that of Lichfield and Coventry in 1618, and in 1632 to that of Durham, which he held with great reputation until the opening of the Long Parliament, when the strong prejudices against the episcopate vented themselves also against Morton, and he had to endure many annoyances and trials. He was finally deposed from his office when the bishoprics were dissolved, but was granted a pension of £800, which he never enjoyed. He removed to the house of the earl of Rutland, and later to the seat of Sir Henry Yelverton, at Easton Mauduit, in Northamptonshire, and there he died, September 22. 1659. His funeral sermon was preached by Dr. John Barwick, afterwards dean of St. Paul's, and printed at London in 1660, under the title ΙΕΡΟΝΙΚΣ, or the Fight, Victory, and Triumph of St. Paul, accommodated to the Right Rev. Father in God, Thomas, late Lord Bishop of Ducresme. Morton was a man of very great learning, piety, hospitality, charity, liberality, temperance and moderation. He converted several persons of learning and distinction from the Romish religion. He published several works, chiefly controversial, and written against the papists, from 1603 to 1653. Among these, the best are Apologia Catholica (Lond. 1605- 6, 2 parts, 4to): — An exact Discovery of Romish Doctrine in the Case of Conspiracy and Rebellion (ibid. 1605, 4to); deals with the Powder Plot conspiracy: — A Catholicke Appeale for Protestants out of the Confessions of the Romane Doctrines (ibid. 1610, fol.): — Causa regia  (1620, 4to); this is a refutation of Bellarmine's treatise, De offcio principis Christiani: — Of the Institution of the Sacrament by some called the Mass (1631 and 1635, fol.): — Confessions and Proofs of Protestant Divines (Oxf. 1644, 4to): — Ezekiel's Wheels (1653, 8vo). He had an intimate acquaintance and correspondence with most of the learned men of his time, and was a great friend and patron of the noted Swiss savant Casaubon, who spent some time in England under king James. Shortly before his death, the bishop was engaged in a lively controversy on his position regarding the episcopal succession. In 1657 there had been published a book at Rome, entitled A Treatise of the Nature of Catholic Faith and Heresy, in which it was asserted that "in the beginning of the Long Parliament, when some Presbyterian lords presented to the upper house a certain book to prove that the Protestant bishops had no succession nor consecration, therefore were no bishops, and had no right to sit in Parliament; bishop Morton replied against the book in behalf of himself and his brethren, and endeavored to prove succession from the last Roman Catholic bishops, who ordained the first Protestant bishops at the Nag's Head, in Cheapside." The bishop took decided exception to such a version, and insisted that he had no faith in the verity of the Nag's Head consecration, and preferred not to endorse it. See Life of Thomas, bishop of Durham, by Dr. John Barwick (1660, 4to); also Richard Baddily and John Naylor, Life of Thomas Marton (1669, 8vo); Biogr. Brit. s.v.; Genesis Biogr. Dict. s.v.; Soamtes, Ch. Hist. Elizabethan Period; Perry, Ch. Hist. (see Index in volume 3). (J.H.W.)

## Mortuarian[[@Headword:Mortuarian]]

             SEE MORTUARY.

## Mortuary[[@Headword:Mortuary]]

             (derived from mors, death) is, in British ecclesiastical law and usage, a gift which is offered to the minister upon the death of one of the parishioners. It was anciently the usage, Selden tells us, to bring the mortuary to the church with the corpse; whence it took the name of corse-present, a name which shows that the payment of the mortuary was once voluntary, though so early as in the reign of Henry III we find that the custom was established. The mortuary was given by way of compensation for the tithes and offerings which the deceased had failed to pay in his lifetime, and for the salvation of his soul. In the reign of Henry VIII the custom was found  to be the cause of great exactions on the part of the clergy, and of expensive litigation. Accordingly the statute 21 Henry 8:c. 6, was passed, by which it is enacted that mortuaries shall be taken in the following manner, unless where less or none is due by the custom, viz.: for every person who does not leave goods to the value of tell marks, nothing; for every person who leaves goods to the value of ten marks and under thirty pounds, 3s. 4d.; if above thirty and under forty pounds, 6s. 8d.; if above forty pounds, of what value soever the goods may be, 10s., and no more. It is enacted further that no mortuary shall be paid on the death of a married woman, nor for any child, nor for any one that is not a housekeeper, nor for any wayfaring man; but such wayfaring man's mortuary shall be paid in the parish to which he belonged. This is the statute which regulates mortuaries at the present day (see Blackstone, Commentaries, 2:424; Burns, ecclesiastical Law, title "Mortuary"). The purpose and mode of paying mortuaries anciently are given by Spelmani. He says, "A mortuary was thus paid: the lord of the fee had the best beast of the defunct, by way of a heriot, for the support of his body against secular enemies; and the parson of the parish had the second, as a mortuary for defending his soul against his spiritual adversaries.

Prior to the Reformation in Scotland, the popish priest, after a parishioner's death, claimed a cow and the corpse-cloth, or uppermost cloth — apparently the coverlet of the bed of the deceased. Forret, vicar of Dollar, had gained some new light, and began to preach to the people, and refuse also this customary present. Being summoned on suspicion of Lutheranism before the bishop of Dunkeld, the following colloquy took place:

"Bishop. 'My joy dean Thomas! I am informed that you preach the epistle or gospel every Sunday to your parishioners, and that you take not the cow nor the uppermost cloth from your parishioners, which thing is very prejudicial to the churchmen; and therefore, myjov dean Thomas, I would you took your cow and your uppermost cloth, as other churchmen do, or else it is too much to preach every Sunday, for in so doing you may make the people think that we should preach likewise. But it is enough for you, when you find any good epistle or any good gospel that setteth forth the liberty of the Holy Church, to preach that and let the rest he.'

"The Martyr. Thomas answered, 'My lord, I think that none of my parishioners will complain that I take not the cow nor the uppermost cloth, but will gladly give me the same, together with any other thing that they  have; and I will give and communicate with them anything that I have; and so, my lord, we agree right well and there is no discord among us. And whereas your lordship saith it is too much to preach every Sunday, indeed I think it is too little, and' also would wish that your lordship did the like.'

"Bishop. 'Nay, nay, dean Thomas,' saith my lord, 'let that be, for we are not ordained to preach.'

"Martyr. Then said Thomas, 'Whereas your lordship biddeth me to preach when I find any good epistle or a good gospel, truly, my lord, I have read the New Testament and the Old, and 'all the epistles and the gospels, and among them all I could never find an evil epistle or an evil gospel; but if your lordship will show me the good epistle and the good gospel, and the evil epistle and the evil gospel, then I shall preach the good and omit the evil.'

"Bishop. Then spake my lord stoutly, and said, 'I thank God that I never knew what the Old and New Testament was [and of these words rose a proverb which is common in Scotland, Ye are like the bishop of Dunkeldene, that knew neither new nor old law]; therefore, deaf Thomas, I will know nothing but my portnese and my pontifical. Go your way, and let be all these fantasies; for if you persevere in these erroneous opinions, ye will repent it when you may not mend it.'

"Martyr. 'I trust my cause to be just in the presence of God, and therefore I pass not much what do follow thereupon.' "

Forret was burned at Edinburgh in 1539. See Fox, Book of Martyrs; Eadie, Eccles. Cyclop. s.v.; Hook, Eccles. Diet. s.v.; Walcott, Sacred Archoeology, s.v. SEE TAXES.

## Morus, Samuel Frederic Nathaniel[[@Headword:Morus, Samuel Frederic Nathaniel]]

             a distinguished German Lutheran divine, was born at Lauban, in Upper Lusatia, November30, 1736. He received his first education from his father, who was professor in the grammar-school at Lauban, and in 1754 Samuel went to study philosophy and theology in the University of Leipsic, where he was a devoted pupil of Ernesti, and under the guidance of this celebrated master of exegetical theology laid the foundations of his future usefulness and renown. He soon distinguished himself by his learning and his sound judgment, and became successively at his alma mater professor of philosophy in 1768, and of the Greek and Latin languages in 1771. After  the death of his beloved teacher, Ernesti, in 1782, Morus was appointed to fill his place as professor of theology. His learning, activity, and sound judgment rendered him eminently fitted for that position, which he retained until his death, November 11, 1792. It was as a teacher rather than as a writer that the influence of Morus was chiefly felt. His works are mostly posthumous publications, issued under the editorship of men who had been his pupils, one of whom fairly estimates the position of Morus when he says that the science of hermeneutics "ab Ernestio reformata," was "a Moro exculta et dilucidius explicata." He left valuable editions of various classical authors, commentaries on most of the books of the N.T., and other books of value. Among these, the most important are Vita J.J. Reiskii (Leips. 1776, 8vo): — Epitome Theologiae Christianae (Leips. 1789, 8vo; transl. into German by Schneider, 1795).

This manual of theology went through several editions, and was long used as a text-book of dogmatics in several universities. It is a work highly commended by Hagenbach in his Hist. of Doctrines, 2:383; and by J. Pye Smith, First Lines of Christian Theology, page 39 sq.: — Commentarius exegetico- historicus in Mori Epitomen (Halle, 1797-98, 2 volumes, 8vo), published after his death by C.A. Hempel: — Praelectiones in Lucae Evangelium, ed. C.A. Donat (Leips. 1795, 8vo): — Recitationes in Evangelium Joannis, ed. Th. J. Dindorf (Leips. 1808, 8vo): — Versio et explicatio Actorum Apostolum, eld. G.J. Dindorf (Leips. 1794): — Praelectiones in Epistolam Pauli ad Romanos; cum ejusdem versione Latina locorumque quorundam N.T. dificiliorum interpretatione, ed. I.T.T. Holzapfel (Leips. 1794, 8vo): — Acroases in Epistolas Paulinas ad Galatas et Ephesios (Leips. 1795): — Praelectiones in Jacobi et Petri epistolas, ed. C.A. Donat (Leips. 1794): — Praelectiones exegeticae in tres Joannis epistolas cum nova earundem paraphrasi Latina, cura C.A. Hempel (Leips. 1797, 8vo): — Akademische Vorlesungen uber die theologische Moral (Leips. 1794-95, 3 volumes, 8vo), published by F.T. Voigt: — Dissert. theologicae et philologicae (Leips. 1787-94, 2 volumes, 8vo; transl. into German by Rtichel, Leips. 1793-94): — Super hermeneutica Novi Testamenti Acroases academicae (Leips. 1797-1802, 2 volumes, 8vo), published by H.K.A. Eichstaedt. This work may be best described as lectures upon the Institutes of Ernesti. A collection of his sermons was published at Leipsic in 1786. See Autobiographie von Morus, in Beyer, Magazin fur Prediger, volume 5, art. 2; Recitatio de Moro, habita a Christiano Dan. Beckio (Leips. 1792); Hopfner, Ueber d. Leben u.d. Verdienste d. verewigten Morus (1793); Weisse, Museum fur sachsische  Gesch. 1:26 sq.; Kahnis, Hist. Germana Protestantism; Schlichtegroll, Nekrolog. d. Deutschen, 1792, 1:304 sq.; Hoefer, Nouv. B. Biog. Generale, 36:697; Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 10:19; Meusel,. Gelehrten- Lexikon, s.v. (J.H.W.)

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

             SEE MORE, SIR THOMAS.

## Morvillier, Jean De[[@Headword:Morvillier, Jean De]]

             a French prelate, was born of noble and distinguished parentage at Blois December 1, 1506. He early decided to enter holy orders, and therefore received careful training, and after filling various minor positions, was made successively dean of Bourges and Evreux, abbot of St. Pierre de Melun and BourgeMoyen, and was finally designated by king Henry II for the bishopric of Orleans, and confirmed in this see by the pope, April 21, 1552. This is, however, not the complete list of his benefices; he possessed many others, the functions of these being performed by vicars or proxies. Entirely taken up with service to the king, he appeared rarely even in his bishopric. One of his few visits to Orleans gave occasion to a strange controversy; it was in November 1552. He was more of a gentleman than of an ecclesiastic, and, according to court fashion, wore a long beard. This exercised the canons of Orleans to such an extent that in a chapter they resolved unanimously that the lord bishop must divest himself of this uncanonical ornament at the earliest moment possible. He received the summons, but did not comply. Hence new complaints, another refusal of obedience, judicial pleadings, quotations from the common law, and great tumult in Orleans. This grave and stormy dispute lasted nearly four years. Finally, thinking that the cause of his beard was lost, he appealed to the king for intervention. In 1556 the king notified the canons of Orleans in writing that he had the intention of sending J. Morvillier to foreign countries, "in quibus necessaria erat barba," and thus the contest terminated. It was J. Morvillier who in 1560 received Francis II and his consort, Mary Stuart, in Orleans. In 1561 he attended the colloquy at Poissy, and in 1562 the council at Trent. In 1564 he resigned the bishopric of Orleans in favor of his nephew, Mathurin de la Saussaye. From 1568 to 1570 we find him keeper of the seals of France, succeeding the celebrated L'Hopital. On his return from a journey to Poitiers he was at Tours attacked by a sickness, which cut short his life, October 23, 1577. During  thirty-five most turbulent years Morvillier stood in high esteem and favor at the French court, where his moderation and suavity, no less than his skill in transacting diplomatic affairs, won and retained him friends and adherents. See Gallia Christiana, 8, col. 1485; Martin, Hist. of France; Jager, Hist. de l'Eglise Catholique en France depuis son originejusq'au Concordat de Pie VII (Paris, 1863-66, 13 vols.), volume 11; Wessenberg, Gesch. d. Kirchl. Conferenen, 3:483; North Brit. Rev. January 1870, page 266.

## Morzillo, Sebastian Fox[[@Headword:Morzillo, Sebastian Fox]]

             a Spanish philosopher, was born about 1523 at Seville; and, after studying at the high schools of his own country, went to France, and finally finished his studies at the University of Louvain (Belgium), and applied himself with particular care to the history of the quarrels of the Platonicans and Peripatetics. At the early age of nineteen he published a treatise on philosophy. Philip II called him home as preceptor for his son Don Carlos. but on his voyage to enter on his charge of the infante the vessel was wrecked and he perished (1560). Contemporary authors have bestowed on him great praise. Vossius calls him "philosophum prsestantissimum et doctissimum." Notwithstanding his untimely death, we have several valuable works from him: In topica Ciceronis Paraphrasis et scholia (Anvers, 1550, 8vo): — De Inmitatione, sive de informandi styli ractione (ibid. 1554 8vo): — In Platonis Timaeum commentarius (Basle 1554, fol.): — Compendium ethices philosophiae ex Platone, Aristotele aliisque autoribus collectuon (ibid. 1554, 8vo): — De natura Philosophiae, seu de Platonis et Aristotelis consensione lib. v. (Louvain, 1554, 8vo Paris, 1560, 1589, 8vo; Lyons, 1622, 8vo), which latter work, according to Boivin, "is perhaps the best and most solid that has been written on this subject," though he adds that the subject has not been treated exhaustively: — De Usu et Exercitatione Dialecticae; De Demonstratione; De Juventute, De Honore (Basle, 1556, 8vo): — De Regno et regis Institutione lib. iii (Antwerp, 1556, 8vo): — In Phaedonem (Basle, 1556. fol.): — De Historiae Institutione (Antwerp, 1557, 1564, 8vo).

## Mosaic[[@Headword:Mosaic]]

             (Lat. Musicum), ornamental work formed by inlaying small pieces, usually cubes, of glass, stone, etc. It was much used by the Romans in floors and on the walls of houses, and many specimens which have been discovered are rendered exceedingly beautiful by the introduction of different-colored  materials, and are made to represent a variety of subjects with figures and animals; others are of coarser execution, and exhibit only such patterns as frets, guilloches, foliage, etc.

In the Middle Ages this kind of work continued to be used in Italy and some other parts of the Continent, and was applied to walls and vaults of churches; in England it was never extensively employed, though used in some parts of the shrine of Edward the Confessor, on the tomb of Henry III, and in the paving of the choir at Westminster Abbey, and Becket's crown at Canterbury, where curious patterns may be seen. Mosaic-work is still executed with great skill by the Italians.

## Mosaism[[@Headword:Mosaism]]

             a term of late used to designate the system of religion instituted by Jehovah through the agency of Moses, and maintained by the subsequent theocracy of the Old Testament. This, so far as its history is concerned, has been treated under the heads JUDAISM and MOSES, and as formulated in the sacred code, it has been analyzed and summed up under LAW OF MOSES. It remains to consider it as regards its essential purpose, its interior spirit, and its practical operation. With this view we shall here briefly discuss it.

I. As a Sequel to the Patriarchal Dispensation. — We pass over the divine economy of Eden as a brief and ideal scheme, adapted only to a state of moral perfection no longer existing, and proved to be inadequate to resist even outward temptation to wrong. We likewise dismiss the antediluvian probation as having equally demonstrated the incompetency of human nature to retain traditional piety, or even to preserve a tolerable degree of virtue. The race born of the germ rescued from the deluge must be trained under closer restrictions and by a more palpable embodiment of divine authority. This was measurably secured by the successive heads of the Shemitic family, each in his turn acting as a representative of heaven in his twofold function of priest and medium of revelation. In the Abrahamic Church it was more fully realized by a formal recognition of the several patriarchs as special plenipotentiaries of God to his chosen people. Many important defects, however, still existed under that arrangement for religious discipline, which Mosaism' was intended to supply.

1. A written constitution was required to prevent uncertainty, discrepancy, and oblivion of the principles of moral truth and practice. This was  furnished by the Pentateuch, with its historical introduction and statutory detail.

2. A prescribed form of worship was needed to obviate the casual and irregular methods hitherto prevalent, and ever prone to recur, and especially in order to preclude all human contrivances and corrupt observances. This was effected by the Levitical cultus, with its hereditary caste, imposing apparatus, and solemn festivals.

3. A territorial patrimony was essential to give "a local habitation and a name" to the favorites of heaven, and to preserve their lineage from contamination and disintegration, as well as from the dissipation of migratory habits. This was attained by the permanent title in the Promised Land, where their Hebrew forefathers had been merely nomadic tenants. This, too, was calculated to develop the refining influences of home, neighborhood, and clan, with all their literary, social, and domestic amenities.

4. A living ministry was continuously provided in the person of the prophets, to keep alive the idea of theocratic sovereignty, to fan the flame of national devotion, and to guard against the varying dangers and degeneracies to which any polity, however well devised and balanced, must be exposed in the lapse of centuries.

These are the main provisions of Mosaism as distinguished from the dispensation that immediately preceded it, and to these all the particulars of miracle and vision, and angelic and political machinery, were subordinate. While it possessed these advantages, it yet exhibited the following marked deficiencies as compared with the more perfect era that was to follow.

II. Mosaism an Introduction to Christianity. — The apostle Paul, who was pre-eminently qualified to judge of this relation, in a single term emphatically characterizes it as that of a paedagogue (παιδαγωγός, not "schoolmaster" or tutor, but the servant who took the children to school), to lead us to Christ (Gal 3:24). This was, indeed, the legitimate function of Mosaism, as the same apostle makes clear in numerous other passages (see especially Rom 10:4; Heb 10:9). The first and most necessary inference from this fact, of course, is the comparative imperfection of the earlier as compared with the later dispensation. But before we proceed to detail the defects which called for this supersedure, we invite attention to another inference not. so frequently noted, but  equally significant. It is this, that as Judaism contained the germ of Christianity, it was essentially identical with it in at least the rudimentary principles. Indeed, true religion everywhere and in all ages is substantially the same, however it may differ in its manifestation and development. It consists in earnest devotion to God, and is more or less pure according to the direction and intensity which circumstances give to the sincere worshipper. All else is accessory or subordinate. Hence the Psalms have retained under Christianity their place as a manual of religious experience which they held under Judaism; and the Christian Church has adopted all the deeper and more central elements of the Hebrew Scriptures. The Lord's Sermon on the Mount is an admirable commentary on this point, showing how the Gospel is but an extension and refinement of the Law; and on more than one other occasion he summarized the latter as but a crystallization around the core of love (Mat 19:19; Mat 22:37), an exposition which his apostles universally followed (Rom 13:9; Gal 5:14; Jam 2:8; 1Jn 4:21).

A writer in the Christian Review for January 1874, in noticing Paul's view of Mosaism as compared with Christianity, reduces the characteristics of the former to the following points:

"1. Governmental authority expressed in statute.

2. The authority so expressed a rule of life.

3. Penalty following infraction.

4. Its entire force is from without. It seeks to accomplish nothing by establishing a principle within.

5. It is utterly inflexible, and knows no mercy.

6. Its righteousness is perfect obedience to the things which are written."

The writer "does not claim for this analysis that it is exhaustive, or that the points are so well put as they might have been." It would be easy, we think, to criticise them. But we give them with the general remark, that while they are in the main correct, they relate to Mosaism simply as a scheme of law. This is doubtless the most important aspect of that dispensation; but it has other traits, especially in its practical workings, and as modified or supplemented by the prophetical teachings (comp. 1Sa 15:22; Pro 21:3; Isa 58:3-6; Hos 6:6, etc.). To some of these we may recur; but under this head we propose to take a view of certain marked features in which it resembled while yet it differed from  Christianity. This will particularly illustrate the mission of Jesus as a prophet like Moses (Deu 18:18).

1. Doctrinally. — We need not here recapitulate the tenets of Mosaism in detail; it will be sufficient to note the salient points of its belief, especially those in which Christianity is most conspicuously an advance upon it.

(1.) The Trinity. — This is perhaps the greatest doctrinal stumbling-block in the way of the reception of the Gospel among the Jews from the earliest times (Joh 8:58-59; Joh 10:33; Mat 26:65) to the present day. Yet not a few hints, at least, of the plurality of persons in the Godhead are afforded in the Old Testament. Not to dwell upon the doubtful sense of the, pluralform of Elohim [see Gou], or the conferences in the divine consessus implied in the frequent use of the plural we by the Deity (Gen 1:26; Gen 3:22; Gen 11:7, etc.), we may fairly cite in evidence of our position the plain allusions not seldom made to the divinely eternal and omnific Spirit (Gen 1:2; Gen 6:3, etc.), and to the still more palpable theophanies of the Logos, common under the older dispensation, as the angel Jehovah (Gen 18:17 sq.; Gen 19:16; Gen 22:15-16; Gen 32:24 sq.; Jos 5:15; Jdg 13:15 sq.; Dan 3:25, etc.). We have not space to develop at length this important distinction between the Jewish and the Christian creeds, but the above facts will suggest its fundamental and undeviating import.

(2.) Mediation. — This under the Mosaic system was effected only by the intervention of a human priesthood, with a vast array of ceremonial apparatus and parade. Under the Christian economy, on the other hand, the human soul is taught to come directly to God for pardon of its sins. Yet here likewise there is a close analogy in the person of the Redeemer, who is at once Victim and Intercessor. The practical influence, however, of the recourse by the Jewish penitent to the Levitical arrangements, with the necessity of a prescribed sacrifice, at a special place in a particular manner, and above all by the instrumentality of a public functionary, must have been immense in keeping out of the popular mind the immediate responsibility of each human being to its offended Maker and God. In this respect Romish and Greek Catholicism has gone back to "the weak and beggarly elements" of Judaism, and the exaltation of prelatical and priestly authority invariably tends in the same direction. The apostle Paul everywhere enters his most vigorous and emphatic protest against these assumptions as a corruption of  the whole evangelical scheme. The Epistle to the Hebrews, especially, is a prolonged argument on this topic.

(3.) Immortality. — The survival of the soul after the dissolution of the body is not expressly taught in the Old Testament, but it is continually implied, and not obscurely intimated in the references to the spirits of the departed (e.g. "gathered unto his fathers," i.e., in the world of shades), and in the anticipation of meeting in the other world (e.g. 2Sa 12:23; Ecc 12:7). Jesus proved this point to the confusion of the Jewish sceptics of his day (Mat 22:32). But the doctrine of the resurrection of the body likewise is so allied to, that of the immortality of the soul, that the later Jews appear to have inferred it from the few hints dropped to that effect in their Scriptures (especially, perhaps, from Job 19:25-27; Psa 16:10; Isa 26:19; Dan 12:2), for the Pharisees and Talmudists entertained it as a settled portion of the orthodox faith. Yet it was so far reserved for Christ to establish and illustrate this glorious truth by his own revival from the grave, and his explicit declarations (e.g. Joh 11:25), that he may justly be said to have “brought life and immortality to light."

2. Socially and Politically. — Here, too, a few points, must suffice by way of characterization.

(1.) Marriage. — In no particular, perhaps, is modern civilization more distinguished from the cultured nations of antiquity, as well as from modern Paganism and Mohammedanism, than in the delicate regard for woman which it has enforced. But this is chiefly due to the moral influence of Christianity, and is directly traceable to the restoration by our Saviour of marriage to its pristine monogamic condition (Mat 19:3-12). Here likewise the Gospel appears as much superior to the Mosaic law as the latter does to heathenism. The last tolerated almost indiscriminate licentiousness, and the mythologies of Greece and Rome added the example of a profligate religion with indescribable orgies. But Mosaism, although it restrained, still did not abolish concubinage, and thus left the female sex measurably enthralled by traditionary degradation. To its credit, however, it must be said that it never (except in the limited and late example of the Essenes) ran into the morbid prurience of celibacy, which has entailed severe evils upon corrupt forms of Christianity.

(2.) Exclusiveness. — The Jew was hereditarily a bigot. Territorially, ecclesiastically, and commercially his position by the Mosaic economy was  an isolated one and that reserve and suspicion of foreigners which was originally a safeguard against idolatry, became at length a turbulent, odious, and anti-humanitarian trait of national character. The Hebrew word for the outside nations (גּוֹי) acquired a sense of proscription, and "Gentile" was regarded by the Israelite as nearly synonymous with "dog." Christianity, on the contrary, "broke down this middle wall of partition," and taught that all men are brethren, alike made by the common Father, and equally redeemed by the one Saviour. Zerubbabel encouraged sectarianism (Ezr 4:3); Jesus rebuked it (Luk 9:55). With the Hebrews circumcision was a test of caste, and is hence contrasted with the essence of Christianity (Gal 5:2). So liberal is the genuine spirit of the latter, that no greater reproach or inconsistency, perhaps, in modern times is found among its professors than a similar refusal of fraternity on the ground of some ceremonial or ordinational peculiarity.

(3.) Patriotism. — This partook largely of the above clannish feeling engendered by Mosaism. Rome was not more jealous of the rights of citizenship than was Judaism. "Thou shalt love thy fellow [Jew], and hate thy enemy [the Gentile]," was the interpretation put by the Israelites in general upon the Mosaic code. True, this was a perversion of its spirit, which repeatedly enjoins the largest charity towards aliens (Exo 23:9; Lev 19:33; Deu 10:18. etc.), but it was the natural result of the Hebrews' history and training. Hence the Jewish passion for independence, and hence, too, the ambition that nurtured a literal interpretation of the glowing pictures in the Old-Testament prophecies concerning the ultimate aggrandizement of the nation. Christianity, on the other hand, renounced at the outset all pretensions to political power (Joh 18:36), and enjoined an absolute humility and submission little calculated to awaken patriotic ardor. Indeed, the early Christians were compelled to regard themselves as "pilgrims and strangers" on earth, and they transferred to the Church and to heaven their former attachment to countrymen and fatherland. At the same time their philanthropy became both more intense and more cosmopolitan; and this depth as well as expansion of patriotism in the truest sense has ever since, with the most earnest Christians, refused to be limited to the accidents of birthplace. The essential brotherhood of all mankind is a principle with which Christianity is slowly leavening the world, and the millennial glory will be but the universal realization of the idea.

3. Spiritually. — The analogy between Mosaism and Christianity, as we have sketched it, has, it will be perceived, been gradually opening into contrast. This is most apparent in this the highest range of significance of either economy. It is here that the earlier structure intended to serve but as the scaffolding for the final edifice is seen to be but an obstruction that needed to be removed when the grand temple was finished. We name, as before, but a few leading particulars.

(1.) Regeneration. — The absolute necessity of this change of the moral affections, when propounded by our Lord to Nicodemus, as a prime condition at the very entrance of the Christian career, struck the Jewish ruler as a novelty, if not absurdity. Yet, as the Great Teacher's retort of equal surprise at his hearer's ignorance implies, there are intimations, neither few nor indistinct, of such a change in Old Testament characters (1Sa 10:6; Psa 51:10, etc.). Even the sense of divine adoption, attendant upon the new birth, is plainly indicated, though under a different name (Gen 5:24; comp. Heb 11:5). Nevertheless there can be no doubt that the mass of saints under the Jewish economy knew little about the spiritual experience which is the privilege of every child of God since the fuller dispensation of the Holy Spirit (Mat 11:11). The improvement in the religious state and conduct of the apostles after the memorable Pentecost is of itself an evidence and exemplification of this. The highest possible difference in the attitude and sentiments of believers towards God before this event is expressed by our Lord in one word as an advance from service to friendship (Joh 15:15; comp. Jam 2:23); thenceforth it was a transition to sonship (Joh 1:12), with all the perquisites of the immediate pledge (Gal 4:6), and the future reversion (Rom 8:16-17). It is to be feared that too many professing Christians of the present day rest in the condition of legalism (Rom 8:15), without rising to the privilege of spiritual liberty (Gal 4:7). A religion of forms, however sincere and consistent, without the regenerating power, is but a relapse to Mosaism (Gal 5:1)

(2.) Worship. — In nothing, perhaps, was the revolution from the Mosaic law to that of Christianity more striking than in the abandonment of the pompous ritual of the former for the simple devotion of the latter. True, the services of the Synagogue had prepared the way for those of the Church, and indeed formed their model. But so strong a hold upon the imagination and the heart of the Jews had the Temple and its pageantry  made, that even after the adoption of the Christian faith most of the Hebrew converts of the apostolic age continued to maintain the Mosaic observances in addition to those of their new relation. The great axiom propounded by our Lord at Jacob's well that God's nature requires a spiritual worship (Joh 4:24), struck the key-note of a fundamental reform in the very basis act of all religion. Alas that this truth should ever have been again overlaid by the mummeries of form! The bane of true worship is formalism. Not alone amid the gorgeousness of Catholicism, or of semi-Romish ritualism, does this insidious influence display itself; the baleful tendency lurks likewise in the sanctimonious tones of Puritanism and the cant of Pietism, and even under the demure garb of Quakerism. An effort is constantly required to keep from reverting to the deadness of the letter (Rom 7:6).

(3.) Holiness. — This, the crowning purpose of both the Mosaic and the Christian schemes, was very differently expressed and effected by them respectively. In the former it meant simply an external and formal dedication (קדשׁ) of a person or animal, or a valuable article, objectively considered, to Jehovah, as a token of its separation and interdiction thenceforth from secular uses. In the latter it signified an internal and actual consecration (ἃγιος)of the human spirit, subjectively regarded, to the glory of God, but yet to be employed in all the legitimate words and works of useful life. There was thus a cardinal, if not radical distinction in the nature and manifestation of sanctity as sought and attained by the Jew and the Christian. No mere form of words, like a magical spell, no opus operatum, can avail to free the. heart from the sense and love of sin (Heb 10:1). Indeed, the Mosaic law provided no sacrifice as an atonement for spiritual offences, such as pride, anger, selfishness, lust, etc.; but only for outward infractions of certain ceremonial prescriptions. It is a fact not commonly understood, that wilful and presumptuous sins have no remedy or means of expiation under the Levitical code. Heart sins, and even outbreaking crimes — violations, for instance, of any of the Ten Commandments — were purposely excluded from the category of compoundable misdemeanors. Hence, after David had committed adultery he did not offer a sacrifice to ease his conscience of the guilt (Psa 51:16-17). There was no way in such cases for relief but by an extra- Mosaic recourse to the general mercy of God, directly dispensed to the penitent — in short, by an anticipation of the Gospel scheme of gratuitous pardon for the sake of Another (Psa 51:1-3). In like manner Mosaism  of itself made no provision for the effectual reformation of the sinner by the removal, or even the control, of his depraved nature and wicked tendencies. This was too sacred a precinct for even the unsandalled foot of the great lawgiver to venture upon.

It was silently reserved as the province of the Holy Spirit, whose function as the Sanctifier was even then prophetically recognised (Psa 51:11). Yet with all this borrowed light added to the boasted vantage of the only written revelation hitherto vouchsafed to man (Rom 2:17-24; Rom 3:1-2), Pharisaism and Rabbinism, the final twin offspring of Mosaism, were such a mockery of righteousness, though claiming superlative saintship, as alone could stir the gentle spirit of the Redeemer to indignant protest (Mat 15:3-14) and bitter invective (Matthew 23). The tender-hearted Revelator, too, found no language to describe the central seat of, its worship but as "the city which is spiritually called Sodom and Egypt" (Rev 11:8), and branded its expatriated sanctuary as "the synagogue of Satan" (Rev 2:9; Rev 3:9). No man knew better by sad experience the hollowness of its pretensions than the apostle who had been "a Hebrew of the Hebrews;" for amid the glare which its Sinaitic flashes threw upon his natural conscience he cried out in an agony of despair, "O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from this body of death?" and he ever afterwards characterized it as "a yoke of bondage," and applied to it not only severe refutation, but likewise caustic irony (e.g. "the concision," Php 3:2). Once more we are compelled to repeat the lament that a nominal Christianity should have reproduced the same spurious sainthood and the same blind truckling to an assumed oral law. The 19th century of our Lord has witnessed the insane blasphemy of a pseudo-infallibility as a culmination of abominations that have emanated from the "mother of harlots." Drunk with the blood of the saints, she is the melancholy and shocking successor of the adulterous apostasy (Matthew 17:39) which was not content till it had entailed upon itself (Mat 27:25) the guilt of the murder of-its greatest Benefactor. Such is the outcome of all "Holiness" not grounded in a radical renewal of the moral nature by the Spirit of Christ which first breathed the conscious soul into man.

III. In Contrast with Heathenism. — In this aspect, which is the really just point of view, Mosaism shines with its true lustre. We name under this head likewise a few only of the most prominent particulars.

1. Monotheism. — The whole Judaic system was a standing protest against polytheism, as the most stringent of its precepts were against the idolatry  constantly associated with the heathen multiplication of divinities. It may safely be averred that the doctrine of the unity of God was original with the Abrahamic, and specially the Jewish race. Mohammedanism, the only form of false faith that holds it, borrowed it directly from the Jews. We have not space to develop the multiform influences growing out of this cardinal tenet of all true religion; some of them are specified below, and for others we refer to POLYTHEISM SEE POLYTHEISM . SEE MONOTHEISM.

2. Scrupulousness. — The vast moral superiority of Mosaism over heathenism is seen most conspicuously, perhaps, in the stern sense of right which it cultivated. The Greeks and Romans, with all their philosophical acumen, can hardly be said to have possessed or been actuated by a conscience, as we understand the term. There was a frivolity, a deep- seated scepticism, which led them to look upon sin as a venial affair, and to hold in contempt that tenderness of moral sensibility upon which conscientiousness depends. Among Oriental nations, with all their veneration for various deities, the case was, if possible, still worse; for the perception of right and wrong was so blunted by the grossness of their religions as to preclude any consistent probity or even virtue. The picture which Paul draws (Rom 1:21 sq.) of the degraded immorality of the heathen world in its ripest day reveals a reeking rottenness revolting to common decency; but shocking as are the disclosures, his pen blushed to tell even half the abominations.

The licentiousness, debauchery, drunkenness, violence, cruelty, and treachery of the age were absolutely beyond description in any page fit for the public eye. The word utterly abandoned is the only one that at all approaches the depth of depravity into which the whole Gentile world was sunk. The Jews, it is true, were not universally pure. Many sad rebukes by our Savior, as earlier many severe castigations from the prophets, attest the prevalence of but too much corruption in every age. Yet a high sense of loyalty to God, of personal accountability to him, of public and private honor, of obligation to truthfulness and integrity generally prevailed as a distinguishing trait of the Hebrew nation. Above all they prized and clung to their creed and institutions with a tenacious conviction that nerved them to brave all obloquy and opposition. Few if any heathen thought enough of their religion to die for it, or cared enough for its sanctions to forego any considerable gratification in order to meet its prohibitions. The Jew, on the contrary, gloried in martyrdom for his faith, and submitted to the most onerous privations in the observance of its requirements. The very stiffness  of its unaesthetic simplicity, the coldness and sternness of its behests, the multiplicity and minuteness of its enactments, and the rigidity of its penalties, schooled its votaries into a Puritanic conscientiousness, which, indeed, often degenerated into morbid punctilio and puling casuistry, but in more robust and generous spirits has never been excelled in moral heroism, at least in the line of fortitude (Heb 11:33-38). Even amid the convulsive throes of their expiring commonwealth, sublime examples of daring and devotion, actuated by a mistaken but intense zeal for their imperilled polity, are recorded by Josephus. This esprit du corps, if we may so style it, for which the adherents of Mosaism have ever been proverbial, differs from the mere bravery of heathendom in being sustained by a religious fervor based upon the most earnest conviction that it was heaven's cause for which they were contending. The paradox of a misguided but superlatively dominant conscience (Rom 10:2) was exhibited in the case of Saul of Tarsus, who thought he was doing God service (Act 26:9) while he was perpetrating acts for which, when enlightened by the halo from the skies, which taught him that love is the highest duty (1 Corinthians 13), he ceased not to his dying day to feel the keenest remorse (1Co 15:9; 1Ti 1:15).

3. Freedom from Superstition. — As a result of this single eye to the glory of a supreme God, Mosaism was calculated to deliver its followers from those chimerical fears and goblin doubts which continually haunt the votaries of polytheism and daimonism. The Jew was not distracted by uncertainty at which of many often contradictory shrines he should pay his homage, nor any uncertainty as to whether his God was able or willing to heed and answer his petition. No ghostly horrors veiled his cultus. nor mystic rites overshadowed his introduction into the divine presence. There were no subordinate imps or questionable demi-gods that might thwart the higher designs, nor any petty envy in the bosom of a jealous deity. True, there was Satan and his host of fallen angels against him; but he believed that these were mere creature powers, tethered (Job 1:12; Job 2:6) by the Almighty with whom he was in covenant, and therefore harmless while he maintained that allegiance. There was no peopling by his imagination of every brook and dale and hill and wood with naiads and nymphs and fauns and satyrs of superhuman power and antihuman whim. There were for him no lucky and unlucky days, no capricious auguries and enigmatic oracles, no conjuring spells and omens of fortune. There was no blind fate, but everything was in the hand of an all-wise, beneficent Creator, Upholder,  and Ruler. This gave a nobility, a magnanimity, an expansiveness to his views of life and destiny, which raised him out of the puerile calculations and belittling aspirations, the undefined guesses and terrors that took up so large a share of the heathen's time and attention. True, he had his festal and his fasting seasons, his routine of sacrifice and ceremony but these were all fixed and conclusive, and were grounded on some clear historical or prophetical principle, so that they enlisted his intelligent interest. It was the hair-splitting technicalities of the rabbins that introduced bewilderment of mind and morals into the later Judaism. The driveling trash of the Talmud is an excrescence upon Mosaism. Such fables and endless distinctions were a fashion worthier of heathenism (Tit 3:9).

4. Sublime Views of the Future World. — We have already touched upon this theme, but for another purpose; its importance and pertinence here call for a special notice. To a thoughtful mind, the destiny of the soul beyond the grave is a most momentous consideration. Hence pagan philosophy has exercised its most earnest efforts to solve the problem, but in vain. The pall that covers the bier was to them an impenetrable veil. Socrates and his most spiritual disciples, Plato, and Cicero, could only conjecture the fate of the human spirit. True, all religions hold to a future retribution, and this implies a survival of the soul after death. Yet this view was so beclouded with mythological poetry and metaphysical speculation, that the passage into eternity was truly "a leap in the dark" even to the most cultivated heathen. The light of revelation alone could pierce the gloom that shrouded the spirit as it passed away from consciousness and observation. The bare fact of immortality might indeed be guessed — or rather, perhaps, the surmise was a trace of the pristine truth of Eden. But the circumstances of that state, especially the possibility and conditions of happiness in the future world, were even a more absorbing question; for continued existence without this assurance would hardly be deemed a real boon. On this point it is evident that the Jew never had any doubt; and hence he was ready to meet death cheerfully and even gladly.

We repeat that martyrs could not have been possible without the faith which the Bible — whether of the Old or the New Testament-inspired. Mosaism, so far as we know, furnished the first written revelation of God's will to man, and the first authentic clew to man's origin, moral relations, and final destiny. This gave the believer in the Mosaic code, with its concomitants and sequents, an immense advantage over Gentile theosophists and religionists of however high a grade. He could not only walk more securely in the path well-  pleasing to heaven, but he knew assuredly that it would, if persevered in, at length conduct him thither in everlasting bliss. Even the dawning beams of that celestial illumination enabled Enoch, Noah, Melchizedek, Job, and doubtless many other ante-Mosaic, but not extra-Hebraic saints to tread with firm and elastic step that sacred road, and Christianity is but the noontide blaze of the same effulgence, from the one great Sun of Righteousness which shone with a clear and steady, but plot yet full lustre, on the horizon of Mosaism (Psa 84:11).

## Mosaylima[[@Headword:Mosaylima]]

             SEE MOHAMMEDAN SECTS,

## Moscato, Judah[[@Headword:Moscato, Judah]]

             a noted physician and rabbi at Mantua, where he died in the year 1580, is the author of an important commentary on the Kozari of the celebrated Jehudah ha-Levi ben-Samuel (q.v.), קוֹל יְהוּדָה, The Voice of Judah (Venice, 1594). He also wrote, under the title of נְפוּצוֹת יְהוּדָה, The Dispersed of Judah, fifty-two lectures on diverse matters (Venice, 1589; republished at Warsaw, 1871). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:391 sq.; De Rossi, Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei, s.v.; Zunz, Gottesdienstliche Vortraige (Berlin, 1832), page 432.

## Moschabeans[[@Headword:Moschabeans]]

             is the name of a Mohammedan sect who believe that God is literally what the Koran describes him to be. They are a sort of Anthropomorphites. It is certain that the vulgar Mohammedans are ignorant enough to imagine that God has hands, feet, eyes, and ears; some of them even hold that he has a thick, black beard, with a great many other imaginary attributes. See Broughton, Bibliothecar Historico-Sacra, page 143.

## Moschampar, Georgius[[@Headword:Moschampar, Georgius]]

             (Γεωργιός ὁ Μοσχάμπαρ), a noted Eastern ecclesiastic, flourished towards the close of the 13th century. He was a friend and contemporary of George of Cyprus, patriarch of Constantinople. Moschampar took a leading part in opposition to the doctrine of the Latin Church on the procession of the Holy Spirit, and to the distinguished advocate of that Church, Joannes Beccus or Veccus. He seems, however, to have had little  weight with his own party. He published several treatises in opposition to Veccus, to which the latter ably replied; but neither the attacks of the one nor the answers of the other seem to be preserved. There is a letter of Moschampar to his friend George of Cyprus, printed in the life of the latter, which was published by J. F. Bernard de Rubeis (Venice, 1753). See Pachymerius, Hist. 1L8; Allatius, Graec. Orthodox. 2:3, 9, 10; Fabricius, Bibl. Graec. 3:46, 47, comp. 8:53, 54; Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Mythol. s.v.

## Mosche, Gabriel Christian Benjamin[[@Headword:Mosche, Gabriel Christian Benjamin]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Grossen-Erich, in the principality of Schwarzburg-Sondershausen, March 28, 1723. He studied at Jena, and for some time assisted his father in the ministry. In 1748 he was preacher at Erfurt, and lecturer at the university, in 1759 superintendent at Arnstadt. in 1773 preacher at Frankfort-on-the-Main, and died Feb. 8,1791. He published, De Anno Sexagesimo Judaeis Sicro (Jena, 1744): — De Summa Summi Numinis Sapientia in Dilectu Legatorum (Erfurt, 1750): — Commentatio de Contenplatione Mortis Atque Resurrectionis Jesu Christi Erga Honminis Amor (ibid. 1758): — De Reditu Christi in Vitanm (Arhstadt, 1759): — Triplex Gloriae Calestis Magnsitudo (ibid. 1768), besides a number of sermons and ascetical works. See Doring, Die deutschen Kanzelredeer des achtzehnten und neunizehnten Jahrhunderts, s.v.; Winer, Handbascl der theol. Lit. 1:192; 2:196, 291. (B.P.)

## Moschi[[@Headword:Moschi]]

             is the name given to an ancient people of Asia, south of the Caucasus, whose territory at the time of Augustus was divided between Colchis, Tiberia, and Armenia, and from whom a mountain range, extending from the Caucasus to the-Antitaurus, received the name of the Moschi Mountains. Their name, in the early classical writers, frequently appears coupled with that of the Tibareni, and the two tribes are generally identified with the Meshech (q.v.) and Tubal (q.v.) of Scripture.

## Moscholatry[[@Headword:Moscholatry]]

             SEE CALF-WORSHIP.

## Moschus[[@Headword:Moschus]]

             (Μόσχος), or, as Photius calls him, Josanes, the sona of Maloschus, surnamed Ε᾿γκρατής, or, what appears to be a corruption rather than translation of that epithet, Eviratus, was born about 550, and was at first a monk in the monastery of St. Theodosius of Jerusalem. He afterwards lived among the anchorites in the desert on the banks of the Jordan, and subsequently: filled the office of canonarchus in the convent of St. Saba. After visiting a large number of monasteries in Syria and Egypt, he, together with his friend Sophronius, afterwards patriarch of Jerusalem, came to Alexandria, where they enjoyed the sincere friendship of John the Almsgiver (q.v.), one of the best of the patriarchs of the Eastern Church, who esteemed them as fathers in Christ, obeying them in all things. After preaching at Alexandria for some time, Moschus travelled to Cyprus, Samos, and finally to Rome, attacking everywhere the heresy of Severus Acephalus. At Rome he applied himself, in connection with his friend and colaborer, Sophronius, to the composition of a work giving an account of the life of the monks of that age down to the time of Heraclius. It is  dedicated to Sophronius and John of Damascus; and Nicephorus assigned Sophronius himself as the author from which it has been supposed that it was in reality mainly his work, though the name of Joannes Moschus was allowed to stand as that of the writer. It is, however, more probable that Moschus and Sophronius were co-laborers in this work as well as in their missionary journeys.

The work was entitled Λειμών or Λειμωγάριον, or Νεὸς παράδεισος, and is still better known under the title of Prsatum Spirituale. In that edition it is divided into 219 chapters. Photius speaks of it as consisting of 304 διηγήματα, but mentions that in other manuscripts it was divided into a larger number of chapters. In compiling it Moschus did not confine himself to giving the results of his own observations, but availed himself of the labors of his predecessors in the same field. His narratives contain a plentiful sprinkling of the marvellous. "The style of the work," as Photius says, "is mean and unpolished;" but nevertheless it contains some valuable facts in regard to doctrines, heresies, Church- discipline, and especially monachism of those times. Moschus died at Rome, and Bollandus gives A.D. 620 as the date of his decease. The above-mentioned work was first published in an Italian translation, and incorporated in several collections of lives of the saints. The Latin, translation of Ambrosius Camaldulensis is in the seventh volume of Alovsius Lipsomannus (Venice, 1558). It appeared in Greek and Latin in the second volume of the Auctarium Bibl. Patrum Ducaeanum (Paris, 1644, 1654). See Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biogr. and Mythol. s.v.; Fleury, Hist. Eccles. ad an. 614 sq.; Sardagne, Indic. P.P. (Ratisb. 1772); Photius, Cod. Page 199; Fabricius, Bibl. Greca, 5, cap. 16; 8:201 sq.; 10:124; Voss, De Hist. Graec. 2:220; Hamburger, Zuverldssige Nachrichten, 3:469; Saxe, Onomast. litt. 2:67; Kurtz, Handbuch d. allgem. Kirchengesch. 1:2, 499; Basse, Grundriss d. christ. Litt. 1:190 sq.; Du Pin, Nouvelle Bibl. des Auteurs Eccles. 11:57 sq.; Ceillier, Hist. des Auteurs Sacres, 17:610 sq.

## Moscorovius, Hieronymus[[@Headword:Moscorovius, Hieronymus]]

             a Polish Unitarian writer of note, flourished towards the close of the 16th or about the opening of the 17th century. He was a nobleman and a lay worker in the Church. He is supposed to have died about 1625. He is distinguished especially as the joint author (with Valentine Schmalz, a Socinian minister) of the larger Socinian Catechism, which was published in the Polish tongue (1605, 12mo). It was translated into Latin under the title: Catechesis Ecclesiarum, quae in regno Polon. et magno ducatu  Lithuaniae et aliis ad istud regnum pertinentibus provinciis affirmant, neminen alium praeter patrem domini nostri J.C. esse illum unum Deum Israelis, hominem autem illum, Jesum Naz., qui ex virgine natus est, nec alium praeter aut ante ipsum, Dei filium unigenitumn et agnoscunt et confitentur (Ravoc. 1609, 12mo): a new edition, together with a refutation, was published by G.L. Oeder (Francf. and Leips. 1739, 8vo); here the questions are for the first time numbered. This Catechism was ordered to be burned by the Parliament of England in 1652. It was translated, with notes and illustrations, and a sketch of the history of Unitarianism, by Thomas Rees (Lond. 1818). See extracts in Gieseler, Eccl. Hist. 4:367 sq. Concerning other editions, which also contain other confessions of faith adopted by the Socinians (the Confessio Fidei drawn up by Job, Schlichting, 1646, 8vo), comp. Winer, Handbuch der theol. Literatur, 2:25 sq. See also Hagenbach, Hist. Doct. 2:212.

## Moscow[[@Headword:Moscow]]

             (Russ. Moskwa), the ancient capital of Russia, and formerly the residence of the czars, and situated in a highly cultivated and fertile district on the Moskva, 400 miles south-east of St. Petersburg, is not only "the very personification of the ecclesiastical history of Russia," as Stanley speaks of it (East. Ch. page 424), but has acquired a stronger hold over the religious mind of a larger part of Christendom than is probably exercised by any other city except Jerusalem and Rome. It must, therefore, be briefly considered here. Just as the Jew delights to call Jerusalem "the holy Zion," the Russian points with pride to this central city of his empire as "our holy mother Moscow;" and the lower classes, not content with this, even go so far as to name the road which leads to it "our dear mother, the great road from Vladimir to Moscow" (Haxthausen, Researches in Russia, 3:151). In one word, Moscow is a very Russian Rome. Not that Christianity was first proclaimed here for the Russians (this was done at Kief), but because it is the ultimate and permanent seat of the Russian primates (since 1325), and contains within its walls the Kremlin (Russ. Kreml), "that fortress surrounded by its crusted towers and battlemented walls," in which are united all the elements of the ancient religious life of Russia. The city abounds in churches and convents. Of the former it is said to have 400, all of the orthodox Greek faith, with the exception of the English and Roman chapels, a German and a French chapel, two or three Armenian chapels,  and a Turkish mosque. It has convents also by the hundreds, counting many of the "white clergy." See Scheutzler, Moscow (St. Petersb. and Par. 1834) ; Prime, The Ahambra and the Kremlin (N.Y. 1874, 12mo); Clarke, Travels in Russia, Tartary, and Turkey (Aberd. 1848, 12mo), chapter 4-9; Ackerman, Historical Sketch of Moscow; Harper's Monthly, volume 26; Blackwood's Magazine, 1855, January page 8. SEE RUSSIA. (J.H.W.)

## Moscow, Council Of[[@Headword:Moscow, Council Of]]

             (Concilium Moscoviense). Several of these were held in the interests of the Russian Church from time to time, ever since the establishment of the metropolitan see of Moscow in l1320. (See below.) Of these councils, the most important are the following:

I. Held about 1500, and presided over by the metropolitan Simon, when it was decreed that monasteries for men and for women should be separated; monks were forbidden to perform divine service, and widower clerks to consecrate the holy mysteries in the latter; unworthy clerks were sentenced to be degraded; and all payments on account of ordination were forbidden.

II. Held in 1551, under czar John the Terrible. It was attended by all the Russian bishops and the metropolitan of Moscow; Macarius presided. The czar himself opened the synod by a speech, in which he exhorted the bishops to use all the understanding, knowledge, and ability each one possessed in their deliberations; promising that he would be ready to join and support them in correcting what was amiss, or in confirming what was well established, according as the Holy Spirit should direct them. He then put them in mind that in the year in which he was crowned he had charged all bishops and hegumens to collect the lives of the saints of their various dioceses or monasteries, and that twenty new names had been in consequence glorified as saints in the Church. The council then repeated and confirmed the decree, ordering that the memory of these saints should be celebrated in the Church. After this the czar required of the council a reply to various questions relating to the external and internal discipline of the Church; whereupon they delivered a long answer, divided into one hundred chapters, which caused this assembly to be known ever after by the name of "the Council of the Hundred Chapters." These chapters appear not to have been signed by any Russian bishop, nor to have been submitted to the oecumenical patriarch for approval; and it is curious that Macarius himself, who presided at the council, makes no mention of it in his Books  of the Genealogies, in which he relates the history of affairs both in Church and State. These chapters give countenance to some superstitious customs and local errors, which in after-years produced lamentable schisms. In this council, moreover, the correction of the Church books, which was afterwards actually performed by the patriarch Nikon, was first proposed.

III. Held in the palace of the czar at Moscow in 1655, by the czar Alexis; Nikon. the patriarch of Moscow, presiding. The object of the council was the correction of the liturgy, etc., of the Russian Church. Nikon, soon after his appointment to the patriarchate, had his attention drawn to the great alterations which had crept into the service-books then in use, which in many places, and even in the creed itself, differed from the ancient Greek and Slavonic copies; he therefore induced the czar to convoke this council, at which the following metropolitans, Macarius of Novgorod, Cornelius of Kazan, Jonah of Rostoff, Silvester of the Steppes, and Michael of Servia, were present, together with three archbishops and one bishop. The unanimous decision of the council was that "the new books should be corrected by the old Slavonic and Greek MSS., and that the primitive rule of the Church should in all things be adhered to." This decision was confirmed in a council of Greek bishops, convened at Constantinople by the patriarch Paisius, whose judgment the Russian bishops had requested. Upon this the czar and the patriarch procured an immense number of MSS. and books from Mount Athos, by means of which and other assistance the revision of the Russian service-books was completed.

IV. Held in 1677 to select a successor to Nikon, the patriarch, who, having by intrigues of his enemies fallen into disgrace with the czar Alexis, who had formerly been his great friend and patron, had in a moment of irritation abruptly renounced the patriarchate, and by this step had given rise to such disorders in the Church that Alexis, in order to re-establish peace, was obliged to invite the Eastern patriarchs to form a court for his trial, and if possible for his dismissal, in order to make legal the appointment of a new incumbent in the patriarchate. Besides the Eastern patriarchs, Macarius of Antioch and Paisius of Alexandria, there were present at this council four Russian metropolitans, viz. Pitirim of Novgorod, Laurentius of Kazan, Jonah of Rostoff, and Paul of the Steppes; six Greek metropolitans, viz. those of Nicsea. Amasia, Iconium, Trebizond,Varna, and Scio; the metropolitans of Georgia and Servia; six Russian and two other archbishops; and, lastly, five bishops, and fifty  archimandrites, hegumens. and archpriests, besides monks and others. Before this council Nikon was solemnly cited to appear, "and thus it came to pass," says Stanley, "that the most august assembly of divines which Russia had ever witnessed met for the condemnation of the greatest man whom the Eastern hierarchy had produced in modern times." The trial was in the hall of Nikon's own palace. He appeared before the council like a person having made every preparation as for death, yet would he not brook treatment as a cast-out, and went in his character of patriarch, with his cross borne before him; and finding no place prepared for him upon a level with the seats of the Eastern patriarchs, he refused to sit at all, and during all his trial remained standing. His accusation was read, with tears, by Alexis himself; it was to the effect that he had, by his unlawful retirement and capricious conduct, been the cause of grievous evils and disorders in the Church. A week was spent in deliberating upon his case, and in searching for precedents which had occurred in the Church of Constantinople; after which Nikon was summoned before the council in its third session. Having heard his accusation read, sentence was passed upon him, to the effect that he should be degraded, retaining only the rank of a monk, and that he should pass the rest of his life in penance in a remote monastery. One voice only, that of an excellent bishop, Lazarus of Chernigoff, was raised in opposition to this cruel judgment. See Blackmore's Mouravieff. Hist. of the Russian Church, pages 92, 103, 204, 227; Stanley, Lect. on the East. Church, page 480 sq.; Strahl, Beitrage zur Russischen Kirchengesch. vol. 3 and 4; Landon, Dict. of Councils, s.v. SEE NIKON.

## Moscow, Metropolitan See Of[[@Headword:Moscow, Metropolitan See Of]]

             was established by St. Peter, the 25th metropolitan of Russia, in 1320. As early as 891 a metropolitan had been appointed to that country, and until 1240 their episcopal centre was at Kief. But the terrible invasion of the Tartars, which burst over the country at the beginning of the 13th century, caused the metropolitan see to be established at Vladimir in 1299, whence its final removal to Moscow. All this time the metropolitan was confirmed by the Oriental Church; yet until the middle of the 15th century almost all the metropolitans of Moscow were members of the Church of Rome, and favorable towards a reunion of the Eastern and Western churches. Peter (1318-26), Theognost (1326-53), and Alexis (1354-78) zealously labored for this end. Indeed, Alexis was originally within the Romish communion, united himself with it, and edited a liturgy and form of service which  obtained the endorsement of the pope. In 1380, however, the metropolitan Pimen (called the pseudo-metropolitan) made strong efforts against the possibility of union with Rome, but failed to carry his point. His successor, Cyprian (1380-1406), than whom there was no more ardent friend of the Roman Church, undertook to unite the whole Russian Church with Rome. He had several conferences with Jagello, the king of Poland, and Witout, the grand-duke of Lithuania, the result of which was the reunion of the Lithuanian churches with the Roman Church. This reunion, however, never obtained the assent of the people. After Cyprian's death, Photias tried again to dissever the Russian Church from Rome. But grand-duke Witout and the bishops of Southern Russia opposed him energetically, and at a meeting of a synod (1414) they denounced him as a heretic, and nominated Gregory Jamblak metropolitan of Moscow.

At this same time also the metropolitan seat of Russia was divided into the metropolitanate of Kief and of Moscow, Kief ruling the southern episcopacies and Moscow the northern ones. The real reason for this division was the leaning of the Kief party to Rome; and while in later years Moscow was decidedly opposed to the Church of Rome, Kief was its warm friend and ally. This division was brought to an end in 1437, when Joseph, patriarch of Constantinople, consecrated the learned Isidore of Thessalonica metropolitan of all Russia. Isidore is well known in Church history as one of the principal movers of the Council of Florence (1439), whose sole object was the reunion of the Greek with the Latin Church. He was highly esteemed by pope Eugenius IV, who created him cardinal of Russia in 1441. He returned to Moscow, but miserably failed in his zealous efforts of reunion. The people were so enraged against him that the grand-duke Wasilj III had to imprison him. In 1443 he escaped and fled to Rome, where he died in 1463. This persecution of Isidore led to a new division between Kief and Moscow, and the Roman Catholic bishops of Lithuania in 1474 elected Michael, bishop of Smolensk, as metropolitan of Kief, and henceforth the two metropolitan sees remained intact. The northern part stood again under the metropolitan of Moscow, while the southern part belonged to the metropolitan of Kief. They were, moreover, divided in sentiment, the former favoring strict adherence to the Eastern Church, the latter leaning strongly towards Rome; and thus matters, remained until 1520, when the Kief party abandoned the hope of union with Rome. The seeds of dissension, however, took root in the Russian Church, and the fruits were manifest in the following century, finally resulting in the establishment of the independent metropolitanate. See Strahl, Russ. Kirchengesch. volume  2; Neale, Introd. Hist. Holy East. Ch. 1:55 sq., 283 sq.; Stanley, Lect. on the East. Ch. page 435 sq. SEE RUSSIAN CHURCH.

## Mosellanus, Peter[[@Headword:Mosellanus, Peter]]

             an eminent German scholar of the time of the Reformation, was born in the little village of Proteg, on the Moselle in 1493. His family name was Schade, but after the literary fashion of the age he changed it to Mosedlanus. His parents were honest and pious, and in easy circumstances. He was educated at Cologne, and distinguished himself by uncommon precocity of mind, and graduated as master of arts in 1514. In the following year he began to lecture at Freiberg, and published several learned works. He took rank at once among the very first Greek and Latin scholars of the age, and in 1517, after the death of Richard Crocius, was called to Leipsic as professor of Greek and Latin literature. The year following he applied to Luther and Spalatin for the then vacant professorship of Greek at the Wittenberg University, but Melancthon was chosen in preference to him, and Mosellanus remained at Leipsic. With the study of Greek and Roman literature he combined a careful and reverent study of the Bible in the original. This, in connection with the influence of his friends, Luther, Camerarius, Melancthon, Hessus, and others, predisposed him favorably to the great movement of the Reformation. He was decidedly the most popular teacher of the university, and attracted students from every direction, and was twice chosen rector. At the personal request of prince George, he opened the Leipsic Disputation(1519) between Eck and Luther with a most excellent address — "Oratio de ratione disputandi, praesertim in re theologica." With the leaders of the Reformation he. remained ever after in constant communication, and was, greatly beloved by them for his scholarship and suavity of manners. Luther called him an Erasmian, because of his close application to classical studies notwithstanding the excitement of the time in which he flourished. These labors of Mosellanus in behalf of the revival of classical literature in Europe were arduous and extremely important, and a full list of his philological works may be found in Vite Germanorum philisophorum a Melchiore Adamo (Francf. 1705), page 26 sq. He died, while yet scarcely more than a youth in age though hoary with learning, Feb. 17, 1524. See Hallam, Introd. to the Literature of Europe, i, 188; De Wette, Luther's Bliefe, 2:542; Viti Lud. A. Seckendorf Commentarius historicus et apologet. de Lutheranismo (Leips. 1694, 1696); Loscher, Vollstandige Reformations-Acta et Documenta (Leips. 1729), 3:567 sq.

## Moser, Johann Jacob[[@Headword:Moser, Johann Jacob]]

             a distinguished German Protestant jurist and hymnologist, noted for his efforts in behalf of the Church in her relation with the State, was born at Stuttgard, January 18, 1701. He studied law in the University of Tubingen, where he graduated in 1720, and was the very same year appointed extraordinary professor. As he had, however, but a small audience there, he went in 1721 to Vienna. The emperor and the vice-chancellor, count of Schonborn, offered him a very prominent position on condition that he should abjure the Lutheran doctrines, but he steadfastly refused. On his return to his country, he was accused of having given to the emperor information concerning affairs which the duke of Wiirtemberg desired should remain secret. In 1724 he returned to Vienna, and was still better received than the first time, the count of Schonborn presenting him a pension, and intrusting him with divers works concerning jurisprudence.  Recalled to Stuttgard in 1726, Moser was appointed counsellor of the regency, and the following year professor of jurisprudence in the ducal college of T'tibingen. Annoyed, however, by the jealousy of several of his colleagues, he resigned in 1732. In 1733, duke Charles Alexander taking the reins of government, he was again made counsellor. In 1736 the king of Prussia made him privy counsellor and professor of jurisprudence at the University of Frankfort-on-the-Oder. In 1739 he resigned also this position in consequence of some disputes with his colleagues, and retired into private life at Ebersdorf. During the eight years he stayed there he was employed by several princes on highly important missions; thus in 1741 he represented the elector of Treves in the long discussions which preceded the election of emperor Charles VII. In 1747, after refusing to approve the religious changes introduced by count Zinzendorf, he accepted the arch- chancellorship of Hesse Homburg, on the condition that he should be allowed to carry out his liberal views concerning government and political economy; and when this privilege was subsequently taken from him, he resigned his office and settled at Hanau, where he founded, in 1749, a professional school for young men destined for administration service.

He afterwards became the legal adviser of Wurtemberg; and having in that capacity opposed the arbitrary measures of the prime minister, he was arrested July 12, 1759, and retained five years in prison, without judgment. Liberated by the Aulic Council in September 1764, he resumed his functions, in which he continued six years longer, and then retired from official life. He died at Stuttgard September 30, 1785. Among his works and pamphlets, numbering over five hundred volumes, covering, besides legal subjects, also the department of practical religion, especially hymnology, those of his writings deserve special mention which have more or less relation to ecclesiastical law and humanitarian objects; such are: Merkwurdige Reichshofrath Conclusa (Francf. 1726, 8 volumes, 8vo): — Bibliotheca juris publici (Stuttg. 1729-1734, 3 volumes 8vo): — Miscellanea juridico-historica (Francf. 1729-1730, 2 volumes, 8vo): — Grundriss d. heutigen Staatsverfassung von Deutschland (Tubing. 1731, 8vo; six editions since): — Einleitung in den Reichshofraths-Process (Francf. 1733-1737, 4 volumes, 8vo): —Syntagma dissertationum Jus publicum Germanicum illustrantium (Tubing. 1735, 4to): — Corpus juris evangelicorum ecclesiasticum (Zullichau, 1737-1738, 2 volumes, 4to): — Altes deutsches Staatsrecht (Nuremb. 1737-1754, 53 parts, 4to): — Alte u. neue Reichshofraths Conclusa in causis illustribus (Francf. 1743-1746, 3 parts, 8vo): — Opuscula academica selecta Juris capita explicantia  (Francf. 1745, 4to): — Deutsches Staatsarchiv (Francf. 1751-1757, 13 parts, 4to): — Neues deutsches Staatsrecht (Stuttg. 1766-1772, 20 volumes, 4to, with 3 volumes of supplement [Francf. 1781-1782, 3 volumes, 4to], and an Index, 1775): — Vermischte Nachrichten v. reichsritterschaftlichen Sachen (Nuremb. 1772, 6 parts, 8vo): — Beitrage zu reichsritferschqftlichen Sachen (Ulm, 1775, 4 parts, 8vo): — Abhandlungen uber verschiedene Reichsmaterien (Ulm, 1772-1778, 5 volumes, 4to): — Reichsstadtisches Magazin (Ulm, 1774-1775, 2 volumes, 8vo): — Neueste Geschichte der unmittelbaren Reichsritterschaft (Ulm, 1775-1776, 2 volumes, 8vo); — Erlauterung des Westphalischen Friedens (Erlangen, 1775-1776, 2 parts, 4to): — Versuch des neuesten europaischen Volkerrechts in Friedens-und Kriegszeiten (Francf. 1777-1780,10 volumes, 8vo): — Betrachtungen uber die Wahlcapitulation Josephs II (Francf. 1778, 2 volumes, 4to): — Beitrage zu dem neuesten europaischen Volkerrechte (Tubing. 1787, 5 parts, 8vo), etc. See Lebensgeschichte Mosers (autobiography [Francf. 1777-1783], 4 parts, 8vo); Ledderhose, Aus dem Leben J.v. Moser's (2d ed. 1852); Grtineisen, in Piper's Kirchen-Kalender, 1852; Weidlich, Nachrichten von jetztlebenden Rechtsgelehrten, volume 2; Hirsching, Hist. lit. Handbuch; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 10:32; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 36:719; Bullet. Theol. October 1869, page 310. (J.H.W.)

## Mosera[[@Headword:Mosera]]

             (Heb. Mose-rah', מוֹסֵרָה, prob. i.q. מאֹסֵר, a band [but the טךנאל הךס not local, as it has the tone; it is apparently fem.]; Sept. Μοσεράv.r. Μισαδαϊv), the thirty-ninth station of the Israelites in the desert, between Jaakan and Gudgodah (Deu 10:6); evidently at the foot of Mount Hor, since Aaron is said to have died there (comp. Num 33:37-38). The name appears in the plur. form MOSEROTH, as an earlier station of the Israelites, in the inverse order (Num 33:30-31). SEE EXODE. It may probably be identified with the small fountain et-Tayibeh, at the bottom of the pass er-Rubay, leading to the western ascent of Mount Hor (Robinson's Researches, 2:583). This spring in the wady is quite choked with sand, but there is fine water in the ravines higher up the hill- side, where the Bedouin pitch their tents. Schwarz is entirely astray in locating it (Palest. page 213) at Wady el-Muzeiriah, in the heart of the western desert (Robinson, 1:277). Burckhardt vaguely suggested Wady Musa, or the valley of Petra; but this has no probability. Rowlands, in  Fairbairn's Dictionary, contends at length for Jebel Madurah, nearly in the middle of the desert plateau; but in this he is evidently influenced by his theory of the location of Kadesh.

## Moseroth[[@Headword:Moseroth]]

             (Heb. Moseroth', מוֹסֵרוֹת, prob. femn. plu. for מאֹסֵר, a band; Sept. Μασουρούθ), the thirty-first station of the Israelites, between Hashmonah and Bene-jaakan (Num 33:30-31); doubtless the same elsewhere (Deu 10:6) called MOSERA SEE MOSERA (q.v.).

## Moses[[@Headword:Moses]]

             the great Jewish prophet and lawgiver, and the founder, we may say, under God, of the Hebrew nation and religion (Euseb. Prcep. Ev. 7:8; comp. Philo, V. Mos. 1:80). His importance in Biblical history justifies a somewhat extended biography here. In preparing it, we have to depend chiefly upon the Scriptural notices and references.

I. The Name. — This in Heb. is משֶׁה, Mosheh', signifying, according to Exo 2:10, drawn out, i.e., from the water, as if from מָשָׁה, to draw out; but in that case the form would be active, drawing out; and it is hardly probable that the daughter of Pharaoh would have given him a Hebrew name. This, therefore (as in many other instances, Babel, etc.), is probably the Hebrew form given to a foreign word. Hence the Alexandrine Jews (Philo, Vit. Mos. 1:4) assigned it an Egyptian origin, from mo, water (mou, or mos; Copt. mo), and ouses (Copt. ushe), saved, i.e., "water-saved;" see Jablonski, Opusc. 1:152. This is the explanation given by Josephus (Ant. 2:9, 6; Apion, 1:31), and confirmed by the Greek form of the word adopted in the Sept. and other writings, and thence in the Vulgate. Brugsch, however (L'Histoire d'Egypte, pages 157, 173), renders the name Mes or Messon=child, being that borne by one of the princes of Ethiopia under Rameses II. In the Arabic traditions the name is derived from his discovery in the water and among the trees; "for in the Egyptian language mo is the name of water, and se is that of a tree" (Jalaladdin, page 387). Clem. Alex. (Strom. 1, page 343) derives Moses from "drawing breath." In an ancient Egyptian treatise on agriculture cited by Chwolson (Ueberreste, etc., page 12, note) his name is given as Monios. For other etymologies, see Gesenius, Thes. Heb. page 824. His original Hebrew name is said to have been Joachimn (Clem. Alex. Stron. 1, page 343). The Sept.,  Josephus, Philo, and the most ancient MSS. of N.T., give the Greek form as Μωϋσῆς (declined Μωϋσέως, or Μωϋσεῖ or Μωϋσῇ, Μωϋσέα,or Μωϋσῆν); other editions, however, have Μωσῆς, as in Strabo, 16:760 sq. (see Winer, Grammat. N.T. page 52); the Vulg. gives Moyses (declined Moysi, gen. and dat.; Moysen, ace.); the Rec. Text of the N.T. and Protestant versions, Moses-Arabic, Musa; Numenius (ap. Euseb. Prcep. Ev. 9:8, 27), Movaalo'; Artapanus (ibid. 27), Mctiraog; Manetho (ap. Joseph. c. Ap. 1:26, 28, 31), Osarsiph, i.e., (Osiri-tef?) "saved by Osiris" (Osburn, Monumental Egypt); Chaeremon (ib. 32), Tisithen. In Scripture he is entitled "the man of God" (Psalms 90, title; 1Ch 23:14); "the slave of Jehovah" (Num 12:7; Deu 34:5; Jos 1:1; Psa 105:26); "the chosen" (Psa 106:23).

II. His Biography. — The materials for this are the following: a. The details preserved in the last four books of the Pentateuch. b. The allusions in the prophets and Psalms, which in a few instances seem independent of the Pentateuch. c. The Jewish traditions preserved in the N.T. (Act 7:20-38; 2Ti 3:8-9; Heb 11:23-28; Jud 1:9); and in Josephus (Ant. 2:3, 4), Philo (Vita Moysis), and Clemens Alexandrinus (Strom.). d. The heathen traditions of Manetho, Lysimachus, and Chamremon, preserved in Josephus (c. Ap. 1:26-32), of Artapanus and others in Eusebius (Praep. Ev. 9:8, 26, 27), and of Hecatreus in Diod. Sic. 40; Strabo, 16:2. e. The Mussulman traditions in the Koran (2:7, 10, 18, 20, 28, 40), and the Arabian legends, as given in Weil's Biblical Legends; D'Herbelot (s.v. Moussa), and Lane's Selections, page 182. f. The fragmentary apocryphal books of Moses (Fabricius, Cod. Pseud. V.T. 1:825):

(1) Prayers of Moses,

(2) Apocalypse of Moses,

(3) Ascension of Moses. e.g.

In modern times his career and legislation have been treated by Warburton, Michaelis, Ewald, Bunsen, and others.

The life of Moses, in the later period of the Jewish history, was divided into three equal portions of forty years each (Act 7:23; Act 7:30; Act 7:36). This agrees with the natural arrangement of his history into the three parts of his Egyptian training, his exile in Arabia, and his government of the Israelitish nation in the wilderness and on the confines of Palestine.

1. His Parentage, Birth, and Education. — The immediate pedigree of Moses is as follows:

LEVI --> Gerahon. + Kohath + Merari.

Amram to Jochebed --> Hur to Miriam. + Aaron to Elisheba + MOSES to Zipporah

Aaron to Elisheba --> Nadab + Abinu +Eleazar +Ithamar.

Moses to Zipporah --> Gershom + Eliezer.

Eleazar --> Phinehas.

Gershom --> Jonathan.

In this genealogy, as in all the others given of the same period, there is an interval of four to six generations (Browne, Ordo Sceclorum, page 301 sq.). In the Koran, by a strange confusion, the family of Moses is confounded with the Holy Family of Nazareth, chiefly through the identification of Mary and Miriam, and the third chapter, which describes the evangelical history, bears the name of the "Family of Amram." Although little is known of the family except through its connection with this its most illustrious member, yet it was not without influence on his after-life. The fact that he was of the tribe of Levi no doubt contributed to the selection of that tribe as the sacred caste. The tie that bound them to Moses was one of kinship, and they thus naturally rallied around the religion which he had been the means of establishing (Exo 32:28) with an ardor which could not have been found elsewhere. His own eager devotion is also a quality, for good or evil, characteristic of the whole tribe. The Levitical parentage and Egyptian origin both appear in the family names. Gershom, Eleazar, are both repeated in the younger generations. Moses and Phinehas (see Brugsch, Hist. de Egypte, 1:173) are Egyptian. The name of his mother, Jochebed, implies the knowledge of the name of Jehovah in the bosom of the family. It is its first distinct appearance in the sacred history. Miriam, who must have been considerably older than himself, and Aaron, who was three years older '(Exo 7:7), afterwards occupy that independence of position which their superior age would naturally give them.

Moses was born B.C. 1738, and, according to Manetho (Josephus, Ap. 1:26; 2:2), at Heliopolis, in the time of the deepest depression of his nation  in the Egyptian servitude. Hence the Jewish proverb, "When the tale of bricks is doubled, then comes Moses." His birth (according to Josephus, Ant. 2:9, 2, 3, 4) had been foretold to Pharaoh by the Egyptian magicians, and to his father Amram by a dream — as respectively the future destroyer and deliverer. The pangs of his mother's labor were alleviated so as to enable her to evade the Egyptian midwives. The story of his birth is thoroughly Egyptian in its scene. The beauty of the new-born babe in the later versions of the story amplified into a beauty and size (Josephus, ib. 1:5) almost divine (ἀστεῖος τῷθεῷ, Act 7:20; the word ἀστεῖος is taken from the Sept. version of Exo 2:2, and is used again in Heb 11:23, and is applied to none but Moses in the N.T.)induced the mother to make extraordinary efforts for its preservation from the general destruction of the male infants of Israel. For three months the child was concealed in the house. Then his mother placed him in a small boat or basket of papyrus-perhaps from a current Egyptian belief that the plant is a protection from crocodiles (Plutarch, Is. and Os. page 358) — closed against the water by bitumen. This was placed among the aquatic vegetation by the side of one of the canals of the Nile. SEE NILE.

The mother departed as if unable to bear the sight. The sister lingered to watch her brother's fate. The basket (Josephus, ib. 4) floated down the stream. The Egyptian princess came down (after the custom of her country, which allowed more freedom to females than is now common in the East) to bathe in the sacred river, or (Josephus, Ant. 2:9, 5) to play by its side. Her attendant slaves followed her (see Wilkinson, Anc. Ey. 2:389). She saw the basket in the flags, or (Josephus) borne down the stream, and dispatched divers after it. The divers, or one of the female slaves, brought it. It was opened, and the cry of the child moved the princess to compassion. She determined to rear it as her own. The child refused the milk of Egyptian nurses (Josephus). The sister was then at hand to recommend a Hebrew nurse. The child was brought up as the princess's son, and the memory of the incident was long cherished in the name given to the foundling of the water's side — whether according to its Hebrew or Egyptian form. (See above.) The child was adopted by the princess. Tradition describes its beauty as so great that passers-by stood fixed to look at it, and laborers left their work to steal a glance (Josephus, Ant. 2:9, 6). His foster-mother (to whom the Jewish tradition gave the name of Thermuthis, Josephus, Ant. 2:9, 5; Artapanus, Praep. Ev. 9:27, the name of ierrhis, and the Arabian traditions that of Asiat, Jalaaddin, page 387) was (according to Artapanus, Eusebius, Praep. Ev. 9:27) the daughter of Palmanothes, who was reigning  at Heliopolis, and the wife of Chenephres, who was reigning at Memphis. In this tradition, and that of Philo (V.M. 1:,4), she has no child, and hence her delight at finding one. Many attempts have been made in modern times to identify the Pharaoh into whose family Moses was thus introduced, but different Egyptologists have varied widely as to his name and relative position, according to their several chronological and historical schemes. SEE EGYPT.

The latest and most plausible effort in this direction is that of Osburn (in the Jour. of Sac. Lit. July 1860, page 257 sq.), who argues from a number of striking coincidences with the monumental records that it must have been no less than Sesostris-Rameses, the famous architectural monarch of the 19th dynasty, whose son Amenephthis, dying soon after his accession, was succeeded by a sister, Thonoris (in that case the foster- mother of Moses), who again, after a long reign, was succeeded by her nephew, Sethos II, the latter having already been associate king in Upper Egypt. This last then, if we might trust these precarious synchronisms, would be the Pharaoh of the exode (q.v.).

From this time for many years Moses must be considered as an Egyptian. In the Pentateuch this period is a blank, but in the N.T. he is represented as "educated (ἐπαιδεύθη) in all the wisdom of the Egyptians," and as "mighty in words and deeds" (Act 7:22). The following is a brief summary of the Jewish and Egyptian traditions which fill up the silence of the sacred writer. He was educated at Heliopolis (comp. Strabo, 17:1), and grew up there as a priest, under his Egyptian name of Osarsiph (Manetho, ap. Josephus, c. Ap. 1:26, 28, 31) or Tisithen (Chaeremon, ib. 32). He was (according to these accounts) taught the whole range of Greek, Chaldee, and Assyrian literature. From the Egyptians especially he learned mathematics, to train his mind for the unprejudiced reception of truth (Philo, V.M. 1:5). "He invented boats and engines for building-instruments of war and of hydraulics — hieroglyphics — division of lands" (Artapanus, ap. Euseb, Prcep. Ev. 9:27). He taught Orpheus, and was hence called by the Greeks Musseus (ib.), and by the Egyptians Hermes (ib.). He taught grammar to the Jews, whence it spread to Phoenicia and Greece (Eupolemus, ap. Clem. Alexand. Strom. 1, page 343). He was sent on an expedition against the Ethiopians. He got rid of the serpents of the country to be traversed by turning basketfuls of ibises upon them (Josephus, Ant. 2:10, 2), and founded the city of Hermopolis to commemorate his victory (Artapanus, ap. Euseb. 9:27). He advanced to Saba, the capital of Ethiopia, and gave it the name of Meroe, from his adopted mother Merrhis, whom  he buried there (ib.). Tharbis, the daughter of the king of Ethiopia, fell in love with him, and he returned in triumph to Egypt with her as his wife (Josephus, ib.). See D.W. Moller, De Mose philosopho (Altorf, 1707); Adami, Exerc. exeg. page 92 sq.; Brucker, Hist. phil. 1:78; J.G. Walch, Observ. N.T. (Jen. 1727), page 62 sq.

2. Period of Moses's Retirement. — The nurture of his mother is probably the unmentioned link which bound him to his own people, and the time had at last arrived when he was resolved to reclaim his nationality. Here again the N.T. preserves the tradition in a more distinct form than the account in tie Pentateuch. "Moses, when he was come to years, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter; choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season; esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures" — the ancient accumulated treasure of Rhampsinitus and the old kings — "of Egypt" (Heb 11:24-26). In his earliest infancy he was reported to have refused the milk of Egyptian nurses (Josephus, Ant. 2:9, 5), and when three years old to have trampled under his feet the crown which Pharaoh had playfully placed on his head (ib. 7). According to the Alexandrian representation of Philo (V. M. 1:6), he led an ascetic life, in order to pursue his high philosophic speculations. According to the Egyptian tradition, although a priest of Heliopolis, he always performed his prayers, in conformity with the custom of his fathers, outside the walls of the city, in the open air, turning towards the sun-rising (Josephus, Apion, 2:2). Tile king was excited to hatred by the priests of Egypt, who foresaw their destroyer (ib.), or by his own envy (Artapanus, ap. Euseb. Praep. Ev. 9:27).

Various plots of assassination were contrived against him, which failed. The last was after he had escaped across the Nile from Memphis, warned by his brother Aaron, and when pursued by the assassin he killed him (ib.). The same general account of conspiracies against his life appears in Josephus (Ant. 2:10). All that remains of these traditions in the sacred narrative is the simple and natural incident that seeing an Israelite suffering the bastinado from an Egyptian, and thinking that they were alone, he slew the Egyptian (the later tradition, preserved by Clement of Alexandria, said, "with a word of his mouth"), and buried the corpse in the sand (the sand of the desert then, as now, running close up to the cultivated tract). The fire of patriotism which thus turned him into a deliverer from the oppressors, turns him in the same story into the peace-maker of the oppressed. See J.F. Mayer, Utrum Moses Egyptium juste interfecit (Viteb. 1685); Hoffmann,  Moses just. Egyptii percussor (Hal. 1776). It is characteristic of the faithfulness of the Jewish records that his flight is there occasioned rather by the malignity of his countrymen than by the enmity of the Egyptians. So in St. Stephen's speech it is this part of the story which is drawn out at greater length than in the original, evidently with a view to showing the identity of the narrow spirit which had thus displayed itself equally against their first and their last Deliverer (Act 7:25-35). But his spirit was yet too rash and vindictive to fit him for being the meek and patient instrument of the Divine purposes. The discovery, too, of the servile and treacherous temper of his own compatriots disheartened him. He needed the bracing as well as the purifying discipline which years of calm reflection and peaceful self-culture alone could give in order to make him the cool, firm, and independent leader of a popular movement.

Moses fled into Midian, B.C. 1698. Beyond the fact that it was in or near the peninsula of Sinai, its precise situation is unknown. Arabian tradition points to the country east of the Gulf of Akaba (see Laborde). Josephus (Ant. 2:11, 1) makes it "by the Red Sea." There was a famous well ("the well," Exo 2:15) surrounded by tanks for watering the flocks of the Bedouin herdsmen. By this well the fugitive seated himself "'at noon" (Joseph. ib.), and watched the gathering of the sheep. There were the Arabian shepherds, and there were also seven maidens, whom the shepherds rudely drove away from the water. The chivalrous spirit (if we may so apply a modern phrase) which had already broken forth in behalf of his oppressed countrymen, broke forth again in behalf of the distressed maidens. They returned unusually soon to their father, and told him of their adventure. Their father was a person of whom we know but little, but of whom that little shows how great an influence he exercised over the future career of Moses. It was Jethro, or Reuel, or Hobab, chief or priest ("Sheik" exactly expresses the union of the religious and political influence) of the Midianitish tribes. Moses, who up to this time had been "an Egyptian" (Exo 2:19), now became for a long period, indicated by the later tradition as forty years (Act 7:30), an Arabian. He married Zipporah, daughter of his host, to whom he also became the servant and shepherd (Exo 2:21; Exo 3:1).

The blank which during the stay in Egypt is filled up by Egyptian traditions can here only be supplied from indirect allusions in other parts of the O.T. The alliance between Israel and the Kenite branch of the Midianites, now first formed, was never broken. SEE KENITE.

Jethro became their guide  through the desert. If from Egypt, as we have seen, was derived the secular and religious learning of Moses, and with this much of their outward ceremonial, so from Jethro was derived the organization of their judicial and social arrangements during their nomadic state (Exo 18:21-23). Nor is the conjecture of Ewald (Gesch. 2:59, 60) improbable, that in this pastoral and simple relation there is an indication of a wider concert than is directly stated between the rising of the Israelites in Egypt and the Arabian tribes, who, under the name of "the Shepherds," had recently been expelled. According to Artapanus (Euseb. Praep. Ev. 9:27), Reuel actually urged Moses to make war upon Egypt. Something of a joint action is implied in the visit of Aaron to the desert (Exo 4:27; comp. Artapanus, ut sup.); something also in the sacredness of Sinai, already recognised both by Israel and by the Arabs (Exo 8:27; comp. Joseph. Ant. 2:12, 1).

But the chief effect of this stay in Arabia was on Moses himself. It was in the seclusion and simplicity of his shepherd-life that he received his call as a prophet. The traditional scene of this great event is in the valley of Shoeib, or Hobab, on the north side of Jebel Musa. Its exact spot is marked by the convent of St. Catharine, of which the altar is said to stand on the site of the Burning Bush. The original indications are too slight to enable us to fix the spot with any certainty. To judge from the indications given in the Bible (Exo 4:27; Num 10:30), Jethro must have resided southeast of that mountain (Keil, 2:325; Antonini Placent. Itinerar. c. 37; Acta Sanct. Maji, 2:22). It is remarkable that the time of the calling of Moses in the mount of God was contemporaneous with the extraordinary spirit of prayer among the oppressed nation in Egypt (Exo 2:23). The call itself was at "the back" of "the wilderness" at Horeb (Exo 3:1); to which the Hebrew adds, while the Sept. omits, "the mountain of God." Josephus further particularizes that it was the loftiest of all the mountains in that region, and the best for pasturage, from its good grass; and that, owing to a belief in its being inhabited by the Divinity, the shepherds feared to approach it (Ant. 2:12, 1). Philo (V.M. 1:12) adds that it was "a grove" or "glade." Upon the mountain was a well-known briery shrub or tree (הִסְּנְה, the seneh, A.V. "a bush" — the definite article may indicate either "the particular celebrated tree," sacred perhaps already, or "the tree" or "vegetation peculiar to the spot"), usually thought to have been the acacia or the thorn-tree of the desert, spreading out its tangled branches, thick set with white thorns, over the rocky ground; but perhaps  only a bramble, or some one of the bristly plants with which the desert abounds. Comp. Reichlin-Meldeg, Mos. Gesch. v. brennenden Dornbusch (Frieb. 1831). SEE SHITTIM; SEE THORN.

It was this bush which became the symbol of the divine Presence, in the form of a flame of fire in the midst of it, in which the dry branches would naturally have crackled and burned in a moment, but which played around it without consuming it. In Philo ( V.M. 1:12) "the angel" is described as a strange but beautiful creature. Artapanus (Euseb. Pr. Ev. 9:27) represents it as a fire suddenly bursting from the bare ground, and feeding itself without fuel. But this is far less expressive than the Biblical image. Like all the visions of the divine Presence recorded in the O.T. as manifested at the outset of a prophetical career, this was exactly suited to the circumstances of the tribe. It was the true likeness of the condition of Israel-in the furnace of affliction, yet not destroyed (comp. Philo, V.M. 1:12). The place too, in the desert solitude, was equally appropriate, as a sign that the divine protection was not confined either to the sanctuaries of Egypt or to the Holy Land, but was to be found with any faithful worshipper, fugitive and solitary though he might be. The rocky ground at once became "holy," and the shepherd's sandal was to be taken off no less than on the threshold of a palace or a temple. It is this feature of the incident on which St. Stephen dwells as a proof of the universality of the true religion (Act 7:29-33). The call or revelation was twofold —

(1.) The declaration of the Sacred Name expressed the eternal self- existence of the one God. The name itself, as already mentioned, must have been known in the family of Aaron. But its grand significance was now first drawn out. SEE JEHOVAH.

(2.) The mission was given to Moses to deliver his people. The two signs are characteristic-the one of his past Egyptian life, the other of his active shepherd life. In the rush of leprosy into his hand is the link between him and the people whom the Egyptians called a nation of lepers (Josephus, Apion, 1:26). (The Mussulman legends speak of his white shining hand as the instrument of his miracles [D'Herbelot]. Hence "the white hand" is proverbial for the healing art.) In the transformation of his shepherd's staff is the glorification of the simple pastoral life, of which that staff was the symbol, into the great career which lay before it. The humble yet wonder- working book is, in the history of Moses, as Ewald finely observes, what the despised cross is in the first history of Christianity. In this call of Moses, as of the apostles afterwards, the man is swallowed up in the cause.  Yet this is the passage in his history which, more than any other, brings out his external and domestic relations.

Moses returned to Egypt from his exile, B. C. 1658. His Arabian wife and her two infant sons were with him. She was seated with them on the ass (the ass was known as the animal peculiar to the Jewish people from Jacob down to David). He apparently walked by their side with his shepherd's staff. (The Sept. substitutes the general term τὰ ὑποζύγια) On the journey back to Egypt a mysterious incident occurred in the family; which can only be explained with difficulty. The most probable explanation seems to be that at the caravansary either Moses or Gershom (the context of the preceding verses [Exo 4:22-23] rather points to the latter) was struck with what seemed to be a mortal illness. In some way, not apparent to us, this illness was connected by Zipporah with the fact that her sos had not been circumcised — whether in the general neglect of that rite among the Israelites in Egypt, or in consequence of his birth in Midian. She instantly performed the rite, and threw the sharp instrument, stained with the fresh blood, at the feet of her husband, exclaiming, in the agony of a mother's anxiety for the life of her child — "A bloody husband thou art, to cause the death of my son." Then, when the recovery from the illness took place (whether of Moses or Gershom), she exclaimed again — "A bloody husband still thou art, but not so as to cause the child's death, but only to bring about his circumcision." So Ewald explains the narrative (Geschichte, volume 2, part 2, page 105), taking the sickness to have visited Moses. Rosenmuller makes Gershom the victim, and makes Zipporah address Jehovah, the Arabic word for "marriage" being a synonym for "circumcision." It is possible that on this story is founded the tradition of Artapanus (Euseb. Pr. Ev. 9:27), that the Ethiopians derived circumcision from Moses. It would seem to have been in consequence of this event, whatever it was, that the wife and her children were sent back to Jethro, and remained with him till Moses joined them at Rephidim (Exo 18:2-6), which is the last time that she is distinctly mentioned. In Num 12:1 we hear of a Cushite wife who gave umbrage to Miriam and Aaron. This may be — (1) an Ethiopian (Cushite) wife, taken after Zipporah's death (Ewald, Gesch. 2:229); (2) the Ethiopian princess of Josephus (Ant. 1:10, 2; but that whole story is probably only an inference from Num 12:1); (3) Zipporah herself, which is rendered probable by the juxtaposition of Cushan with Midian in Hab 3:7. The two sons also sink into obscurity. Their names, though of Levitical origin, relate  to their foreign birthplace. Gershom, "stranger," and Eliezer, "God is my help," commemorated their father's exile and escape (Exo 18:3-4). Gershom was the father of the wandering Levite Jonathan (Jdg 18:30), and the ancestor of Shebuel, David's chief treasurer (1Ch 23:16; 1Ch 24:20), Eliezer had an only son, Rehabiah (1Ch 23:17), who was the ancestor of a numerous but obscure progeny, whose representative in David's time — the last descendant of Moses known to us — was Shelomith, guard of the consecrated treasures in the temple (1Ch 26:25-28).

After this parting Moses advanced into the desert, and at the same spot where he had had his vision encountered Aaron (Exo 4:27). From that meeting and cooperation we have the first distinct indication of Moses's personal appearance and character. The traditional representations of him in some respects well agree with that which we derive from Michael Angelo's famous statue in the church of St. Pietro in Vinculi at Rome. Long, shaggy hair and beard is described as his characteristic equally by Josephus, Diodorus (1, page 424), and Artapanus (κομήτης, ap. Euseb. Praep. Ev. 9:27). To this Artapanus adds the curious touch that it was of a reddish hue, tinged with gray (πυῤῥάκης, πολιός). The traditions of his beauty and size as a child have already been mentioned. They are continued to his manhood in the Gentile descriptions. "Tall and dignified," says Artapanus (μάκρος, ἀξιωματικός) — "Wise and beautiful as his father Joseph" (with a curious confusion of genealogies), says Justin (36:2). But beyond the slight glance at his infantine beauty, no hint of this grand personality is given in the Bible. What is described is rather the reverse. The only point there brought out is a singular and unlooked-for infirmity: "O my Lord, I am not eloquent, neither heretofore nor since thou hast spoken to thy servant; but I am slow of speech and of a slow tongue... How shall Pharaoh hear me, which am of uncircumcised lips?" (i.e., slow, without words, stammering, hesitating; Sept. ἰσχνόφωνος καὶ βαρύγλωσσος); his "speech contemptible," like St. Paul's — like the English Cromwell (comp. Carlyle's Cromwell, 2:219) — like the first efforts of the Greek Demosthenes. In the solution of this difficulty which Moses offers we read both the disinterestedness, which is the most distinct trait of his personal character, and the future relation of the two brothers. "Send, I pray thee, by the hand of him whom thou wilt send" (i.e., "make any one thy apostle rather than me"). In outward appearance this prayer was granted. Aaron spoke and acted for Moses, and was the permanent  inheritor of the sacred staff of power. But Moses was the inspiring soul behind; and so as time rolls on, Aaron, the prince and priest, has almost disappeared from view, and Moses, the dumb, backward, disinterested prophet, is in appearance what he was in truth — the foremost leader of the chosen people.

3. Moses's Public Career. — Thus, after the solitude of pastoral life, where he was appointed to ripen gradually for his high calling, he was now unexpectedly and suddenly sent back among his people, in order to achieve their deliverance from Egyptian bondage. Overruled and encouraged by the above remarkable interview with Jehovah, he resumed his journey into Egypt, where neither the dispirited state of the Israelites nor the obstinate opposition and threatenings of Pharaoh were now able to shake the man of God. Supported by his brother Aaron, and commissioned by God as his chosen instrument, proving, by a series of marvellous deeds, in the midst of heathenism, the God of Israel to be the only true God, Moses at last overcame the opposition of the Egyptians (Exodus 5-12). According to a divine decree, the people of the Lord were to quit Egypt, under the command of Moses, in a triumphant manner. The punishments of God were poured down upon the hostile people in an increasing ratio, terminating in the death of the firstborn, as a sign that all had deserved death. See Bauer, Hebr. Myth. 1:274 sq., and Ausfuhrl. Erklda. der altest. Wundergeschichte, 2:174 sq.; Rosenmuller, Morgenl. 1:275 sq., and Schol. 1:2; J. Bryant, Observ. on the Plagues inflicted on the Egyptians (Lond. 1794); L. Bertholdt, De reb. a Mose in AEgypt. gestis (Erl. 1795); Eichhorn, in the Comment. Soc. Gott reg. 4:35 sq. The formidable power of paganism, in its conflict with the theocracy, was obliged to bow before the apparently weak people of the Lord. The Egyptians paid tribute to the emigrating Israelites (Exo 12:35), who set out laden with the spoils of victory. See Harenberg, in the Biblioth. Brem. 7:624 sq.; Kanne, Biblische Untersuch. 2:267 sq.; Hengstenberg, Pent. 2:520 sq.; Justi, Ueb. die den Aegypt. abgenommen Gerathe (Frckf. 1771); Augusti, Theul. Blatter, 1:516 sq.; Zeibich, Vern. Betracht. II, 1:20 sq.). B.C. 1658. The enraged king vainly endeavored to destroy the emigrants. Moses, firmly relying upon miraculous help from the Lord, led his people through the Red Sea into Arabia, while the host of Pharaoh perished in its waves (Exodus 12-15). SEE RED SEA, PASSAGE OF.

After this began the most important functions of Moses as the lawgiver of the Israelites, who were destined to enter into Canaan as the people of  promise, upon whom rested the ancient blessings of the patriarchs. By the instrumentality of Moses, they were appointed to enter into intimate communion with God through a sacred covenant, and to be firmly bound to him by a new legislation. Moses, having victoriously repulsed the attack of the Amalekites, marched to Mount Sinai, where he signally punished the defection of his people, and gave them the law as a testimony of divine justice and mercy. From Mount Sinai they proceeded northward to the desert of Paran, and sent spies to explore the Land of Canaan (Numbers 10-13). On this occasion broke out a violent rebellion against the lawgiver, which he, however, by divine assistance, energetically repressed (Numbers 14-16). The Israelites frequently murmured, and were disobedient during about forty years. In a part of the desert of Kadesh, which was called Zin, near the boundaries of the Edomites, after the sister of Moses had died, and after even the new generation had, like their fathers, proved to be obstinate and desponding, Moses fell into sin, and was on that account deprived of the privilege of introducing the people into Canaan (Num 19:12). He was appointed to lead them only to the boundary of their country, to prepare all that was requisite for their entry into the land of promise, to admonish them impressively, and to bless them. It was according to God's appointment that the new generation also, to whom the occupation of the country had been promised, should arrive at their goal only after having vanquished many obstacles. Even before they had reached the real boundaries of Canaan they were to be subjected to a heavy and purifying trial. It was important that a man like Moses should have been at the head of Israel during all these providential dispensations. His authority was a powerful preservative against despondency under heavy trials. Having in vain attempted to pass through the territory of the Edomites, the people marched around its boundaries by a circuitous and tedious route. Two powerful kings of the Amorites, Sihon and Og, were vanquished. Moses led the people into the fields of Moab over against Jericho, to the very threshold of Canaan (Numbers 20-21). The oracles of Balaam became, by the instrumentality of Moses, blessings to his people, because by them they were rendered conscious of the great importance of having the Lord on their side. Moses happily averted the danger which threatened the Israelites on the part of Midian (Numbers 25-31). Hence he was enabled to grant to some of the tribes permanent dwellings in a considerable tract of country situated to the east of the River Jordan (Numbers 32), and to give to his people a foretaste of that well-being which was in store for them. Moses made excellent preparations for the  conquest and distribution of the whole country, and concluded his public services with powerful admonitions and impressive benedictions, transferring his government to the hands of Joshua, who was not unworthy to become the successor of so great a man. B.C. 1618. For details of these incidents, SEE EGYPT; SEE EXODE; SEE LAW; SEE PASSOVER; SEE PLAGUE; SEE SINAI; SEE WANDERINGS; SEE WILDERNESS.

4. Moses's Death. — In exact conformity with his life is the account of his end. The book of Deuteronomy describes, and is, the long, last farewell of the prophet to his people. It took place on the first day of the eleventh month of the fortieth year of the wanderings, in the plains of Moab (Deu 1:3; Deu 1:5), in the palm-groves of Abila (Josephus, Ant. 4:8, 1). SEE ABEL-SHITTIM. He is described as 120 years of age, but with his sight and his freshness of strength unabated (Deu 34:7). The address from chapter 1 to chapter 30 contains the recapitulation of the law. Joshua was then appointed his successor. The law was written out, and ordered to be deposited in the ark (chapter 31). The song and the blessing of the tribes conclude the farewell (chapters 32, 33).

Then came the mysterious close. As if to carry out to the last the idea that the prophet was to live not for himself, but for his people, he is told that he is to see the good land beyond the Jordan, but not to possess it himself. The sin for which this penalty was imposed on the prophet is difficult to ascertain clearly. It was because he and Aaron rebelled against Jehovah, and “believed him not to sanctify him," in the murmurings at Kadesh (Num 20:12; Num 27:14; Deu 32:51), or, as it is expressed in the Psalms (Psa 106:33), because he spoke unadvisedly with his lips. It seems to have been a feeling of distrust. "Can we (not, as often rendered, can we) bring water out of the cliff?" (Num 20:10; Sept. μὴ ἐξάξομεν, "surely we cannot"). The Talmudic tradition, characteristically, makes the sin to be that he called the chosen people by the opprobrious name of "rebels." He ascends a mountain in the range which rises above the Jordan valley. Its name is specified so particularly that it must have been well known in ancient times, though, owing to the difficulty of exploring the eastern side of the Jordan, the exact location has until recently been unidentified. SEE NEBO. Hence it is called by the specific name of the Pisgah (q.v.). It was one of those summits apparently dedicated to different divinities (Num 23:14). Here Moses took his stand, and surveyed the four great masses of Palestine west of the Jordan — so far as it could be discerned from that height. The view has passed  into a proverb for all nations. In two remarkable respects it illustrates the office and character of Moses. First, it was a view, in its full extent, to be imagined rather than actually seen. The foreground alone could be clearly discerned: its distance had to be supplied by what was beyond, though suggested by what was within, the actual prospect of the seer. Secondly, it is the likeness of the great discoverer pointing out what he himself will never reach. To English readers this has been made familiar by the application of this passage to lord Bacon, originally in the noble poem of Cowley, and then drawn out at length by lord Macaulay.

"So Moses, the servant of Jehovah, died there in the land of Moab, according to the word of Jehovah, and he buried him in a 'ravine' in the land of Moab, 'before' Beth-peor — but no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day... And the children of Israel wept for Moses in the plains of Moab thirty days" (Deu 34:5-8). This is all that is said in the sacred record. Jewish. Arabian, and Christian traditions have labored to fill up the detail. "Amid the tears of the people — the women beating their breasts, and the children giving way to uncontrolled wailing — he withdrew. At a certain point in his ascent he made a sign to the weeping multitude to advance no farther, taking with him only the elders, the high- priest Eliezar, and the general Joshua. At the top of the mountain he dismissed the elders and then, as he was embracing Eliezar and Joshua, and still speaking to them, a cloud suddenly stood over him, and he vanished in a deep valley. He wrote the account of his own death [so also Philo, V.M. 3:39] in the sacred books, fearing lest he should be deified" (Josephus, Ant. 4:8, 48). "He died in the last month of the Jewish year" — in the Arabic traditions, the 7th of Adar (Jalaladdin, page 388). After his death he is called "Melki" (Clem. Alex. Saroin. 1, page 343).

The grave of Moses, though studiously concealed in the sacred narrative, in a manner which seems to point a warning against the excessive veneration of all sacred tombs (see Jud 1:9), and though never acknowledged by the Jews, is shown by the Mussulmans on the west (and therefore the wrong) side of the Jordan, between the Dead Sea and St. Saba (Stanley, S. and P. page 302). There is some reason, however, to conclude from the appearance of Moses with Elijah on the Mount of Transfiguration (Luk 9:30-31) that he was honored with an anticipatory resurrection. See Bauer, Hebr. Gesch. 1:337 sq.; J.A. Schmid, De Morte M. (Helmst. 1703); Abbt, Ob Gott Moses begraben (Hal. 1757); J.G. Drasde, De morte ac sepultura Mosis (Viteb. 1784); Recherches sur  la sepulture de Moise, in the Bibl. raisonn. 31:243 sq.; Donauer, De corpore Mosis (Ratisb. 1682); Hech, De Mosis corpore (Jen. 1653); Reusmann, Moses resuscitatus (Gotting. 1747); Rohling, Moses' Abschied (Jena, 1867); J.J. Muller, De morte Mosis (Jena, 1710); Rathlef, De corpore Mosis (Hann. 1733); Zeibich, Von dem Grabe Mosis (Gera, 1758); Heyden, De Mosis resurrectione (Hal. 1723); Dansville Review, September 1861.

III. Character, Work, and Writings of Moses. — It will be best to confine ourselves here to such indications of these as transpire through the general framework of the Scripture narrative, or appear in traditions and profane accounts.

It is important to trace his relation to his immediate circle of followers. In the exodus he takes the decisive lead on the night of the flight. Up to that point he and Aaron appear almost on an equality; but after that Moses is usually mentioned alone. Aaron still held the second place, but the character of interpreter to Moses which he had borne in speaking to Pharaoh withdraws, and it would seem as if Moses henceforth became altogether, what hitherto he had only been in part, the prophet of the people. Another who occupies a place nearly equal to Aaron, though we know but little of him, is Hur, of the tribe of Judah, husband of Miriam and grandfather of the artist Bezaleel (Josephus, Ant. 3:2, 4). He and Aaron are the chief supporters of Moses in moments of weariness or excitement. His adviser with regard to the route through the wilderness, as well as in the judicial arrangements, was, as we have seen, Jethro. His servant, occupying the same relation to him as Elisha to Elijah, or Gehazi to Elisha, was the youthful Hoshea (afterwards Joshua). Miriam always held the independent position to which her age entitled her. Her part was to supply the voice and song to her brother's prophetic power.

But Moses is incontestably the chief personage of the history, in a sense in which no one else is described before or since. In the narrative, the phrase is constantly recurring, "The Lord spake unto Moses," "Moses spake unto the children of Israel." In the traditions of the desert, whether late or early, his name predominates over that of every one else: "The Wells of Moses" on the shores of the Red Sea; "the Mountain of Moses" (Jebel Mufsa) — near the convent of St. Catharine; the Ravine of Moses (Shuk Mfusa) — at Mount St. Catharine; the Valley of Moses (Wady Mfisa) — at Petra. "The Books of Moses" are so called (as afterwards the Books of Samuel), in all  probability, from his being the chief subject of them. The very word "Mosaism" has been in later times applied (as the proper name of no other saint of the O.T.) to the whole religion. Even as applied to tessellated pavement ("Mosaic," Musivum, μουσαϊκόν) there is some probability that the expression is derived from the variegated pavement of the later Temple, which had then become the representative of the religion of Moses (see an essay of Redslob in the Zeitschrift der Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesells. 14:663).

It has sometimes been attempted to reduce this great character into a mere passive instrument of the divine Will, as though he had himself borne no conscious part in the actions in which he figures, or the messages which he delivers. This, however, is as incompatible with the general tenor of the scriptural account as it is with the common language in which he has been described by the Church in all ages. The frequent addresses of the Divinity to him no more contravene his personal activity and intelligence than in the case of Elijah, Isaiah, or Paul. In the N.T. the Mosaic legislation is expressly ascribed to him: "Moses gave you circumcision" (Joh 7:22). "Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, suffered you" (Mat 19:8). "Did not Moses give you the law?" (Joh 7:19). "Moses accuseth you" (Joh 5:45). Paul goes so far as to speak of him as the founder of the Jewish religion: "They were all baptized unto Moses" (1Co 10:2). He is constantly called "a prophet." In the poetical language of the O.T. (Num 21:18; Deu 33:21), and in the popular language both of Jews and Christians, he is known as "the Lawgiver." The terms in which his legislation is described by Philo (V.M. 2:1-4) are decisive as to the ancient Jewish view. He must be considered, like all the saints and heroes of the Bible, as a man of marvellous gifts, raised up by divine Providence for a special purpose; but as led, both by his own disposition and by the peculiarity of the revelation which he received, into a closer communion with the invisible world than was vouchsafed to any other in the Old Testament.

Such a marvellous character was not exempted from the most virulent attacks of that criticism called the Rationalismus vulgaris, which at one time threatened to devour every fragment of antiquity. The history of Moses was considered merely a tissue of contradictory statements, till Voltaire (in Questions sur l'Encyclopedie, § 127) boldly called his very existence in question. The exodus of Israel, of which Moses was the sole instrument, was deprived of its strictly historical basis. Goethe wantonly reduced the forty years' wandering to two years. Most of the halting-places  named in the books of Exodus and Numbers were deemed unhistorical, and the whole chain of events was said to be purely mythical. De Wette (Kritik der israelitischen Geschichte), Gramberg (Religionsideen), Vatke (Biblische Theologie),Von Bohlen (Commentar zum Buche Genesis), and George (Judische Feste) combine to reduce the whole to a fable. Even the best substantiated acts of Moses — such as the construction of the tabernacle, the founding of an hereditary priesthood, the appointment of cities of refuge were assumed to have been stripped of every vestige of historical veracity. The finding of the Law (2Ki 22:8) was said to prove nothing of its Mosaic authorship, because the Egyptian priests pretended to have become possessed of the books of Hermes in the same way. The tables of stone, as evidence of the historical activity of Moses, were said to be no evidence, because no mention is made of them at the revelation of the Decalogue (Exodus 20), but only on a later occasion, in chapter 22. The testimony of their existence (1Ki 8:9) in the days of Solomon was thought not worthy to be depended upon, because the author lived after the destruction of Jerusalem! By such frivolous assertions Nork finds himself authorized (see Hebraisch-chaldaisch-rabbinisches Worterbuch) to resolve the character of Moses into a mythical personage; and to reduce the marvellous exodus, and the subsequent journey through the wilderness, to a level with the mythological conquests of Osiris or those of Bacchus, in each of whom personifications of the solar year were recognised. Moses is contrasted with Bacchus, whose grandfather Kadmus placed him in an ark and exposed him to the ocean (see J.J. Miiller, De Mose in Bacchum converso [Jena, 1667]). The 600,000 fighting men in Israel are assumed to be so many stars, which ancient astronomers believed to exist. The wonder-working rod of Moses was considered to be as pure a fiction as the serpent-rod of Hermes.

The passage of the Red Sea by Moses and his followers was regarded as a striking parallel to some of the details of Bacchus's expedition to India (Nonnus, 20:253). Bacchus also smites the Hydaspes with a rod, and passes over dry-shod (Nonnus, 23:115, 124,156-188; 24:41). Even the smiting of the rock by Moses is compared to a myth recorded in Euripides (Bacch. 5:703); to Bacchus smiting a rock — not indeed in his own person, but by the instrumentality of his priestess, who wielded the thyrsus- rod with a similar result of water flowing from it. These attempts to neutralize history are quoted simply as literary curiosities, and they show by what methods it was thought possible to establish the mythical origin of  the Jewish commonwealth. But as the historical veracity of the Gospel history can alone account for the existence and subsistence of Christianity, so the past and present influence of the Mosaic constitution can only be explained by the strictly historical character of its beginnings.

1. There are two main characters in which Moses appears, namely, as a Leader and as a Prophet. The two are more frequently combined in the East than in the West. Several remarkable instances occur in the history of Mohammedanism: Mohammed himself, Abd-elKader in Algeria, Shamyl in Circassia.

(a.) As a Leader his life divides itself into the three epochs of the march to Sinai, the march from Sinai to Kadesh, and the conquest of the trans- jordanic kingdoms. Of his natural gifts in this capacity we have but few means of judging. The two main difficulties which he encountered were the reluctance of the people to submit to his guidance and the impracticable nature of the country which they had to traverse. The patience with which he bore their murmurs is often described at the Red Sea, at the apostasy of the golden calf (the eccentric Beke contends that the idol was a cone, and not a calf [The Idol in Horeb, Lond. 1871]), at the rebellion of Korah, at the complaints of Aaron and Miriam (see below). The incidents with which his name was specially connected both in the sacred narrative and in the Jewish, Arabian, and heathen traditions were those of supplying water when most wanted. This is the only point in his life noted by Tacitus, who describes him as guided to a spring of water by a herd of wild asses (Hist. 5:3). In the Pentateuch these supplies of water take place at Marah, at Horeb, at Kadesh, and in the land of Moab. That at Marah is produced by the sweetening of waters through a tree in the desert; those at Horeb and at Kadesh by the opening of a rift in the "rock" and in the "cliff;" that in Moab by the united efforts, under his direction, of the chiefs and of the people (Num 21:18). (See Philo, V.M. 1:40.) An illustration of these passages is to be found in one of the representations of Rameses II (contemporary with Moses), in like manner calling out water from the desert rocks (see Brugsch, Hist. de l'Eg. 1:153). Of the first three of these incidents, traditional sites, bearing his name, are shown in the desert at the present day, though most of them are rejected by modern travellers. One is Ayun Musa, "the wells of Moses," immediately south of Suez, which the tradition (probably from a confusion with Marah) ascribes to the rod of Moses. Of the water at Horeb, two memorials are shown: one is the Shuk Musa, or "cleft of Moses," in the side of Mount St. Catharine; and the  other is the remarkable stone, first mentioned expressly in the Koran (2:57), which exhibits the twelve marks or mouths out of which the water is supposed to have issued for the twelve tribes (Stanley, Syr. and Pal. page 46,47; also Wolff, Travels, page 125, 2d ed.). The fourth is the celebrated "Sik," or ravine, by which Petra is approached from the east, and which, from the story of its being torn open by the rod of Moses, has given his name (the Wady Mfisa) to the whole valley. The quails and the manna are less directly ascribed to the intercession of Moses. The brazen serpent that was lifted up as a sign of the divine protection against the snakes of the desert (Num 21:8-9) was directly connected with his name down to the latest times of the nation (2Ki 18:4; Joh 3:14). Of all the relics of his time, with the exception of the ark, it was the one longest preserved. SEE NEHUSHTAN.

The route through the wilderness is described as having been made under his guidance. The particular spot of the encampment was fixed by the cloudy pillar; but the direction of the people, first to the Red Sea and then to Mount Sinai (where he had been before), was communicated through Moses, or given by him. According to the tradition of Memphis, the passage of the Red Sea was effected through Moses's knowledge of the movement of the tide (Euseb. Praep. Ev. 9:27). In all the wanderings from Mount Sinai he is said to have had the assistance of Jethro. In the Mussulman legends, as if to avoid this appearance of human aid, the place of Jethro is taken by El Khudhr, the mysterious benefactor of mankind (D'Herbelot, s.v. Moussa). On approaching Palestine the office of the leader becomes blended with that of the general or the conqueror. By Moses the spies were sent to explore the country. Against his advice took place the first disastrous battle at Hormah. To his guidance is ascribed the circuitous route by which the nation approached Palestine from the east, and to his generalship the two successive campaigns in which Sihon-and Og were defeated. The narrative is told so shortly that we are in danger of forgetting that, at this last stage of his life, Moses must have been as much a conqueror and victorious soldier as Joshua.

(b.) His character as a Prophet is, from the nature of the case, more distinctly brought out. He is the first as he is the greatest example of a prophet in the O.T. The name is, indeed, applied to Abraham before (Gen 20:7), but so casually as not to enforce our attention. But in the case of Moses it is given with peculiar emphasis. In a certain sense he appears as the center of a prophetic circle, now for the first time named.  His brother and sister were both endowed with prophetic gifts. Aaron's fluent speech enabled him to act the part of prophet for Moses in the first instance; and Miriam is expressly called "the Prophetess." The seventy elders, and Eldad and Medad also, all "prophesied" (Num 11:25-27). But Moses (at least after the exodus) rose high above all these. The others are spoken of as more or less inferior. Their communications were made to them in dreams and figures (Deu 13:1-4; Num 12:6). But "Moses was not so." With him the divine revelations were made "mouth to mouth, even apparently, and not in dark-speeches, and the similitude of Jehovah shall he behold" (Num 12:8). In the Mussulman legends his surname is Kelim Allah, "the spoken to by God." Of the especial modes of this more direct communication four great examples are given, corresponding to four critical epochs in his historical career, which help us in some degree to understand what is meant by these expressions in the sacred text. SEE PROPHET.

(1.) The appearance of the divine Presence in the flaming acacia-tree has already been noticed. The usual pictorial representations of that scene — of a winged human form in the midst of the bush — belong to Philo (V.M. 1:12), not to the Bible. No form is described. "The angel'' or "messenger": is spoken of as being "in the flame." On this it was that Moses was afraid to look. and hid his face in order to hear the divine voice (Exo 3:2-6). SEE BURNING BUSH.

(2.) In the giving of the Law from Mount Sinai, the outward form of the revelation was a thick darkness, as of a thunder-cloud, out of which proceeded a voice (Exo 19:19; Exo 20:21). The revelation on this occasion was especially of the name of Jehovah. Outside this cloud Moses himself remained on the mountain (Exo 24:1-2; Exo 24:15), and received the voice, as from the cloud, which revealed the Ten Commandments, and a short code of laws in addition (Exodus 20-23). On two occasions he is described as having penetrated within the darkness, and remained there successively for two periods of forty days, spent in seclusion and fasting (Exo 24:18; Exo 34:28). On the first occasion he received instructions respecting the tabernacle, from " a pattern showed to him" (Exo 25:9; Exo 25:40; Exodus 26, 27), and respecting the priesthood (Exodus 28-31). Of the second occasion hardly anything is told us (see Ortlob, De jejunio Mosis [Lips. 1702]). But each of these periods was concluded by the production of the two slabs or tables of granite containing the successive editions of the Ten Commandments (Exo 32:15-16). On the first of the two  occasions the ten moral commandments are undoubtedly those commonly so called (comp. Exo 20:1-17; Exo 32:15; Deu 5:6-22). On the second occasion some interpreters (taking the literal sense of Exodus' 34:27, 28) hold that they were the ten (chiefly) ceremonial commandments of Exo 34:14-26; but they were evidently the same as before. The first are expressly said to have been the writing of God (Exo 31:18; Exo 32:16; Deu 5:22); with respect to the second, the phraseology is ambiguous (" he wrote," Exo 34:28), and hence some have held them to be merely the writing of Moses-contrary, however, to the language of Exo 34:1. SEE LAW OF MOSES.

(3.) It was nearly at the close of those communications in the mountains of Sinai that an especial revelation was made to him personally, answering in some degree to that which first called him to his mission. In the despondency produced by the apostasy of the molten calf, he besought Jehovah to show him "his glory." The wish was thoroughly Egyptian. The same is recorded of Amenoph, the Pharaoh preceding the exodus. But the divine answer is thoroughly Biblical. It announced that an actual vision of God was impossible. "Thou canst not see my face; for there shall no man see my face and live." He was commanded to come absolutely alone. Even the flocks and herds which fed in the neighboring valleys were to be removed out of the sight of the mountain (Exo 33:18; Exo 33:20; Exo 34:1; Exo 34:3). He took his place on a well-known or prominent rock ("the rock") (Exo 33:21). The cloud passed by (Exo 33:22; Exo 34:5). A voice proclaimed the two immutable attributes of God, Justice and Love, in words which became part of the religious creed of Israel and of the world (Exo 34:6-7). The importance of this incident in the life of Moses is attested not merely by the place which it occupies in the sacred record, but by the deep hold that it has taken of the Mussulman traditions and the local legends of Mount Sinai. It is told, with some characteristic variations, in the Koran (7:139), and is commemorated in the Mussulman chapel erected on the summit of the mountain, which from this incident (rather than from any other) has taken the name of the Mountain of Moses (Jebel Musa). A cavity is shown in the rock as produced by the pressure of the back of Moses when he shrank from the divine glory (Stanley, S. and P. page 30). See Stemler, De Mose Jehovam a tergo vidente (Lips. 1730). SEE SINAI.

(4.) The fourth mode of divine manifestation was that which is described as commencing at this juncture, and which continued with more or less uniformity through the rest of his career. Immediately after the catastrophe  of the worship of the calf, and apparently in consequence of it, Moses removed the chief tent outside the camp, and invested it with a sacred character under the name of "the Tent or Tabernacle of the Congregation" (Exo 33:7). This tent became henceforth the chief scene of his communications with God. He left the camp, and it is described how, as in the expectation of some great event, all the people rose up and stood every man at his tent door, and looked gazing after Moses until he disappeared within the tent. As he disappeared the entrance was closed behind him by the cloudy pillar, at the sight of which the people prostrated themselves (Exo 33:10). The communications within the tent are described as being still more intimate than those on the mountain. "Jehovah spake unto Moses face to face, as a man speaketh unto his friend" (Exo 33:11). He was apparently accompanied on these mysterious visits by his attendant Hoshea (or Joshua), who remained in the tent after his master had left it (Exo 33:11). All the revelations contained in the books of Leviticus and Numbers seem to have been made in this manner (Lev 1:1; Num 1:1).

It was during these communications that a peculiarity is mentioned which apparently had not been seen before. It was on his final descent from Mount Sinai, after his second long seclusion, that a splendor shone on his face, as if from the glory of the divine Presence. It is from the Vulgate translation of "ray" (קרן), "cornutam habens faciem," that the conventional representation of the horns of Moses has arisen. See Zeibich, De radiante Mosisfacie (Gera, 1764). The rest of the story is told so differently in the different versions that both must be given. (1.) In the A.V. and most Protestant versions Moses is said to wear a veil in order to hide the splendor. In order to produce this sense, the A.V. of Exo 34:33 reads, "and [till] Moses had done speaking with them" — and other versions, "he had put on the veil." (2.) In the Sept. and the Vulgate, on the other hand, he is said to put on the veil, not during, but after, the conversation with the people-in order to hide, not the splendor, but the vanishing away of the splendor; and to have worn it till the moment of his return to the divine Presence in order to rekindle the light there. With this reading agrees the obvious meaning of the Hebrew words, and it is this rendering of the sense which is followed by Paul in 2Co 3:13-14, where he contrasts the fearlessness of the apostolic teaching with the concealment of that of the O.T.: "We have no fear, as Moses had, that our glory will pass away."

(5.) There is another form of the prophetic gift in which Moses more nearly resembles the later prophets, namely, as a writer. We need not here determine (what is best considered under the several books which bear his name, SEE PENTATEUCH, etc.) the extent of his authorship, or the period at which these books were put together in their present form. He is also traditionally connected with the first draft at least of the book of Job (q.v.). Eupolemus (Euseb. Pracep. Ev. 9:26) makes him the author of letters. But of this the Hebrew narrative gives no indication. There are two portions of the Pentateuch, and two only, of which the actual writing is ascribed to Moses: 1st, the second edition of the Ten Commandments (Exo 34:28); 2d, the register of the stations in the wilderness (Num 33:1). But it is clear that the prophetical office, as represented in the history of Moses, included the poetical form of composition which characterizes the Jewish prophecy generally. These poetical utterances, whether connected with Moses by ascription or by actual authorship, enter so largely into the full Biblical conception of his character that they must here be mentioned.

[1.] "The song which Moses and the children of Israel sung" (after the passage of the Red Sea, Exo 15:1-19). It is unquestionably the earliest written account of that event; and, although it may have been in part, according to the conjectures of Ewald and Bunsen, adapted to the sanctuary of Gerizim and Shiloh, yet its framework and ideas are essentially Mosaic. It is probably this song to which allusion is made in Rev 15:2-3 : "They stand on the sea of glass mingled with fire... and sing the song of Moses, the servant of God."

[2.] A fragment of a war-song against Amalek (Exo 17:16):

"As the hand is on the throne of Jehovah,

So will Jehovah war with Amalek

From generation to generation."

[3.] A fragment of a lyrical burst of indignation (Exo 22:18):

"Not the voice of them that shout for mastery,

Nor the voice of them that cry for being overcome,

But the noise of them that sing do I hear."

[4.] Probably, either from him or his immediate prophetic followers, the fragments of war-songs in Num 21:14-15; Num 21:27-30, preserved in the  "book of the wars of Jehovah," Num 21:14; and the address to the well, Num 21:16-18.

[5.] The song of Moses (Deu 33:1-29), setting forth the greatness and the failings of Israel. It is remarkable as bringing out with much force the idea of God as the Rock (Deu 32:4; Deu 32:15; Deu 32:18; Deu 32:30-31; Deu 32:37). The special allusions to the pastoral riches of Israel point to the transjordanic territory as the scene of its composition (Deu 32:13-14).

[6.] The blessing of Moses on the tribes (Deu 33:1-29). If there are some allusions in this psalm to circumstances only belonging to a later time (such as the migration of Dan, Deu 33:22), yet there is no one in whose mouth it could be so appropriately placed as in that of the great leader on the eve of the final conquest of Palestine. This poem, combined with the similar blessing of Jacob (Genesis 49), embraces a complete collective view of the characteristics of the tribes. See Vock, Mosis canticum cygneum (Nordl. 1861); Kamphausen, Das Lied Mosis erklbart (Leips. 1862).

[7.] The 90th Psalm, "A prayer of Moses, the man of God." The title, like all the titles of the Psalms, is of doubtful authority and the psalm has often been referred to a later author. But Ewald (Psalmen, page 91) thinks that, even though this be the case, it still breathes the spirit of the venerable lawgiver. There is something extremely characteristic of Moses in the view taken, as from the summit or base of Sinai, of the eternity of God, greater even than the eternity of mountains, in contrast with the fleeting generations of man. One expression in the psalm, as to the limit of human life (seventy, or at most eighty years), in Psa 90:10, would, if it be Mosaic, fix its date to the stay at Sinai. Jerome (Adv. Ruffin. 1:13), on the authority of Origen, ascribes the next eleven psalms to Moses. Cosmas (Cosmogr. 5:223) supposes that it is by a younger Moses of the time of David.

How far the gradual development of these revelations or prophetic utterances had any connection with Moses's own character and history, the materials are not such as to justify any decisive judgment. His Egyptian education must, on the one hand, have supplied him with much of the ritual of the Israelitish worship. The coincidences between the arrangements of the priesthood, the dress, the sacrifices, the ark, etc., in the two countries, are decisive. On the other hand, the proclamation of the unity of God, not merely as a doctrine confined to the priestly order, but communicated to  the whole nation, implies distinct antagonism, almost a conscious recoil against the Egyptian system. The absence of the doctrine of a future state (without adopting to its full extent the paradox of Warburton) proves at least a remarkable independence of the Egyptian theology, in which that great doctrine held so prominent a place. Some modern critics have supposed that the Levitical ritual was an after-growth of the Mosaic system, necessitated or suggested by the incapacity of the Israelites to retain the higher and simpler doctrine of the divine unity — as proved by their return to the worship of the Heliopolitan calf under the sanction of the brother of Moses himself. There is no direct statement of this connection in the sacred narrative; but there are indirect indications of it sufficient to give some color to such an explanation. The event itself is described as a crisis in the life of Moses, almost equal to that in which he received his first call. In an agony of rage and disappointment he destroyed the monument of his first revelation (Exo 32:19). He threw up his sacred mission (ib. 32). He craved and he received a new and special revelation of the attributes of God to console him (Exo 33:18). A fresh start was made in his career (Exo 34:29). His relation with his countrymen henceforth became more awful and mysterious (Exo 32:35). In point of fact, the greater part of the details of the Levitical system were subsequent to this catastrophe. The institution of the Levitical tribe grew directly out of it (Exo 32:26). The inferiority of this part of the system to the rest is expressly stated in the prophets, and expressly connected with the idolatrous tendencies of the nation. "Wherefore I gave them statutes that were not good, and judgments whereby they should not live" (Eze 20:25). "I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices" (Jer 7:22). Other portions of the law, such as the regulations of slavery, of blood-feud, of clean and unclean food, were probably taken, with the necessary modifications, from the customs of the desert-tribes. But the distinguishing features of the law of Israel, which have remained to a considerable extent in Christendom, are peculiarly Mosaic the Ten Commandments; and the general spirit of justice, humanity, and liberty that pervades even the more detailed and local observances is equally indicative of a new aera in legislation.

The prophetic office of Moses, however, can only be fully considered in connection with his whole character and appearance. "By a prophet Jehovah brought Israel out of Egypt, and by a prophet was he preserved"  (Hos 12:13). He was, in a sense peculiar to himself, the founder and representative of his people; and in accordance with this, complete identification of himself with his nation is the only strong personal trait which we are able to gather from his history. "The man Moses was very meek, above all the men that were upon the face of the earth" (Num 12:3). The word "meek" is hardly an adequate reading of the Hebrew term עָנָו, which should be rather "much enduring;" and, in fact, his onslaught on the Egyptian, and his sudden dashing of the tables on the ground, indicate rather the reverse of what we should call "meekness." It represents what we should now designate by the word "disinterested." All that is told of him indicates a withdrawal of himself, a preference of the cause of his nation to his own interests, which makes him the most complete example of Jewish patriotism. He joins his countrymen in their degrading servitude (Exo 2:11; Exo 5:4). He forgets himself to avenge their wrongs (Exo 2:14). He desires that his brother may take the lead instead of himself (Exo 4:13). He wishes that not he only, but that all the nation were gifted alike: "Enviest thou for my sake?" (Num 11:29). When the offer is made that the people should be destroyed, and that he should be made "a great nation" (Exo 32:10), he prays that they may be forgiven — "if not, blot; me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written" (Exo 32:32). His sons were not raised to honor. The leadership of the people passed, after his death, to another tribe. In the books which bear his name, Abraham, and not himself, appears as the real father of the nation. In spite of his great preeminence, they are never "the children of Moses."

2. In the O.T. the name of Moses does not occur so, frequently after the close of the Pentateuch as might be expected. In the Judges it occurs only once — in speaking of the wandering Levite Jonathan, his grand-son. In the Hebrew copies, followed by the A.V., its, has been superseded by "Manasseh," in order to avoid, throwing discredit on the family of so great a man. SEE MANASSEH, 2. In the Psalms and the Prophets, however, he is frequently named as the chief of the prophets.

In the N.T. he is referred to partly as the representative of the law-as in the numerous passages cited above-and in the vision of the transfiguration, where he appears side by side with Elijah. It is possible that the peculiar word rendered "decease" (ἔξοδος) — used only in Luk 9:31, and in 2Pe 1:15, where it may have been drawn from the context of the transfiguration was suggested by the exodus of Moses. As the author of  the Law, he is contrasted with Christ, the Author of the Gospel: "The law was given by Moses" (Joh 1:17). The ambiguity and transitory nature of his glory is set against the permanence and clearness of Christianity (2Co 3:13-18), and his mediatorial character ("the law in the hand of a mediator") against the unbroken communication of God in Christ (Gal 3:19). His "service" of God is contrasted with Christ's sonship (Heb 3:5-6). But he is also spoken of as a likeness of Christ; and as this is a point of view which has been almost lost in the Church, compared with the more familiar comparisons of Christ to Adam, David, Joshua, and yet has as firm a basis in fact as any of them, it may be well to draw it out in detail.

[1.] Moses is, as it would seem, the only character of the O.T. to whom Christ expressly likens himself Moses wrote of me" (Joh 5:46). It is uncertain to what passage our Lord alludes, but the general opinion seems to be the true one — that it is the remarkable prediction in Deu 18:15; Deu 18:18-19 — "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee, from thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken... 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. And it shall come to pass that whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him." This passage is also expressly quoted by Stephen (Act 7:37), and it is probably in allusion to it that at the transfiguration, in the presence of Moses and Elijah, the words were uttered, "Hear ye him." It suggests three main points of likeness:

(a.) Christ was, like Moses, the great Prophet of the people-the last, as Moses was the first. In greatness of position none came between them. Only Samuel and Elijah could by any possibility be thought to fill the place of Moses, and they only in a very secondary degree. Christ alone appears, like Moses, as the Revealer of a new name of God-of a new religious society on earth. The Israelites "were baptized unto Moses" (1Co 10:2). The Christians were baptized unto Christ. There is no other name in the Bible that could be used in like manner. SEE PROPHET.

(b.) Christ, like Moses, is a Lawgiver: "Him shall ye hear." His whole appearance as a Teacher, differing in much besides, has this in common with Moses, unlike the other prophets, that he lays down a code, a law, for  his followers. The Sermon on the Mount almost inevitably suggests the parallel of Moses on Mount Sinai.

(c.) Christ, like Moses, was a Prophet out of the midst of the nation-" from their brethren." As Moses was the entire representative of his people, feeling for them more than for himself, absorbed in their interests, hopes, and fears, so, with reverence be it said, was Christ. The last and greatest of the Jewish prophets, he was not only a Jew by descent, but that Jewish descent is insisted upon as an integral part of his appearance. Two of the Gospels open with his genealogy. "Of the Israelites came Christ after the flesh" (Rom 9:5). He wept and lamented over his country. He confined himself during his life to its needs. He was not sent "but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Mat 15:24). It is true that his absorption into the Jewish nationality was but a symbol of his absorption into the far wider and deeper interests of all humanity. But it is only by understanding the one that we are able to understand the other; and the life of Moses is the best means of enabling us to understand them both.

[2.] In Heb 3:1-19; Heb 12:24-29; Act 7:37, Christ is described, though more obscurely, as the Moses of the new dispensation-as the Apostle, or Messenger, or Mediator of God to the people-as the Controller and Leader of the flock or household of God. No other person in the O.T. could have furnished this parallel. In both the revelation was communicated partly through the life, partly through the teaching; but in both the prophet was incessantly united with the Guide, the Ruler, the Shepherd. SEE MEDIATOR.

[3.] The details of their lives are sometimes, though not often, compared. Stephen (Act 7:24-28; Act 7:35) dwells, evidently with this view, on the likeness of Moses in striving to act as a peacemaker, and in being misunderstood and rejected on that very account. The death of Moses, especially as related by Josephus (ut sup.), immediately suggests the ascension of Christ; and the retardation of the rise of the Christian Church till after its Founder was withdrawn gives a moral as well as a material resemblance. But this, though dwelt upon in the services of the Church, has not been expressly laid down in the Bible.

In Jud 1:9 is an allusion to an altercation between Michael and Satan over the body of Moses. It has been endeavored (by reading Ι᾿ησοῦ for Μωϋσέως) to refer this to Zec 3:2. But it probably refers to a lost apocryphal book, mentioned by Origen, called the "Ascension or  Assumption of Moses." The substance of this book is given by Fabricius, Cod. Pseudoepigraphus Vet. Test. 1:839-844. The "dispute of Michael and Satan" probably had reference to the concealment of the body to prevent idolatry. Gal 5:6 is by several later writers said to be a quotation from the "Revelation of Moses" (Fabricius, ibid. 1:838). SEE REVELATIONS, SPURIOUS.

In later history the name of Moses has not been forgotten. In the early Christian Church he appears in the Roman catacombs in the likeness of St. Peter, partly, doubtless, from his being the leader of the Jewish, as Peter of the Christian Church, partly from his connection with the rock. It is as striking the rock that he appears under Peter's name. In the Jewish, as in the Arabian nation, his name has in later years been more common than in former ages, though never occurring again (perhaps, as in the case of David, and of Peter in the papacy, from motives of reverence) in the earlier annals, as recorded in the Bible. Moses Maimonides, Moses Mendelssohn, Mfisa the conqueror of Spain, are obvious instances. Of the first of these three a Jewish proverb testifies that "from Moses to Moses there was none like Moses." Numerous traditions, however, as might have been expected, and as has repeatedly been indicated above, have been current respecting so celebrated a personage. Some of these were known to the ancient Jews, but most of them occur in later rabbinical writers (comp. Philo, De Vita Mosis, c. 3; Joseph. Ant. 2:9 sq.; Bartolocci, Bibliotheca Rabbinica, 4:115 sq.). The name of Moses is celebrated among the Arabs also, and is the nucleus of a mass of legends (comp. Hottinger, Historia Orientalis, p. 80 sq.; Abulfeda, Anteislam. page 31). These Mussulman traditions are chiefly exaggerations of the O.T. accounts. But there are some stories independent of the Bible. One is the striking story (Koran, 18:65-80) on which is founded Parnell's Hermit. Another is the proof given by Moses of the existence of God to the atheistic king (Chardin, 10:836, and in Fabricius, p. 836). The Greek and Roman classics repeatedly mention Moses (see Grotius, De verit. rel. Chr. 1:16; Hase, in the Biblioth. Brem. 6:769 sq.), but their accounts contain the authentic Biblical history in a greatly distorted form. See the collection of Meier, Judaica, seu veterum Scriptorum profanorum de Rebus Judaicis Fragmenta (Jenue, 1832); also those from Tacitus, by Muller, in the Stud. u. Krit. 1843, pages 893-8. There are, likewise, as above intimated, traditionally ascribed to Moses several apocryphal books, as "an Apocalypse, or Little Genesis," the "Ascension or Assumption of Moses," and the "Mysterious Books of  Moses," supposed to have been fabricated in the early ages of Christianity (see Fabricius's Codex Pseudoepigrcuphus Vet. Testamenti, and Whiston's Collection of Authentic Records, 1:449-65). Lauth (Moses der Ebrder, Munich, 1859) thinks he has discovered traces of the history and name of Moses in two of the Leyden papyri written in the hieratic character (comp. Heath, The Exodus Papyri, Lond. 1855).

Concerning the life and work of Moses, compare also Warburton, On the Divine Legation of Moses; Hess, Geschichte Mosis (Zurich, 1778); Niemeyer, Charakteristik der Bibel, 3:23 sq.; Hufnagel, Moseh wie er sich selbst Zeichnet (Frckf. 1822); Nork, Leb. Mos. (Lips. 1838); Ewald, Isr. Gesch. 2:32 sq.; Schreiber, Allgem. Religionslehre, 1:166; Kitto, Daily Bible Illustrations, volume 2; Hunter, Sacred Biography; T. Smith, Hist. of Moses (Edinb. 1859); Breay, Hist. of Moses (Lond. 1846); Townsend, Character of Moses (Lond. 1813, 2 volumes, 4to); Boss, Hist. of Moses (Edinb. 1837); Anderson, Life of Moses (Lond. 1834); Plumtre, Hist. of Moses (Lond. 1848); Drasde, Comparatio Mosis et Homeri (Viteb. 1788); Hagel, Apologie des Moses (Sulzbach, 1828); Moller, De Mose Philosopho (Alt. 1701); Schumann, Vita Mosis (Lips. 1826); Reckendorf, Das Leben Mosis, (Leips. 1867); Clarke, Ten Great Religions (Bost. 1871), page 409 sq.; also the dissertations referred to by Furst, Bib. Jud. 2:393 sq.

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

             is the name of several patriarchs of the Armenian Church. —

1, was born about 400 at Manazgerd. After entering the service of the Church he rose rapidly to distinction, and in 457 became patriarch. He was very much disliked for his extreme abnegation of all patriotic feelings, and complete submission to Feroze, king of Persia, who then ruled Armenia.  Moses was severe upon those who took exception to his rule, and imprisoned many ecclesiastics and episcopal dignitaries. He died in 465. —

2, surnamed Eghivartetsi, after his native place, was born in 510. He also made his way rapidly to ecclesiastical distinctions after entering the service of the Church, and finally, in 551, mounted the throne of St. Gregory. He is the founder of a new calendar, which was used by the Armenians for several centuries. Nothing else of importance is to be noted during his rule of the Armenian Church. He died in 594 at Tovin. —

3, surnamed Dathevatse, was born at Khodaran about 1580. In his youth he chose a secluded life, and entered the monastery of Dathev, whence his surname. He was chosen to the patriarchate in 1629. He died in 1633 at Echmiajin. See St. Martin, Memoires historiques sur l'Armenie; Neale, Hist. of East. Ch. (Armenia).

## Moses Albelda[[@Headword:Moses Albelda]]

             (called also BEN-JACOB), a Jewish theologian of some note, flourished in the beginning of the 16th century as rabbi of the Jews of Salonica in Thessalonica. He wrote a number of works in the department of dogmatic and Biblical theology, among which special mention is due to his דרשׁ משׁה, a homiletical Commentary on the Pentateuch, accompanied by several occasional homilies (Ven. 1603, folio): — תמיד עולה, or Disquisitions on the Books of the Law, partly exegetical and partly philosophical (Ven. 1526, 1601, fol.).

## Moses Botarel[[@Headword:Moses Botarel]]

             (or Botarelo), a Jewish writer of Spanish birth, who flourished in the 15th century, is the author of a commentary on the famous Book Jezirah (q.v.), entitled פֵּרוּשׁ סֵפֶר יְצַירָה, which he wrote for a Christian scholar, Maestro Juan, in 1409, and wherein he praises philosophy, speaks of Aristotle as of a prophet, and maintains that philosophy and the Kabbalah propound exactly the same doctrines, and that they only differ in language and in technical terms. In this commentary Moses Botarel shows how, by fasting, ablutions, prayer, and invocation of divine and angelic names a man may have such dreams as shall disclose to him the secrets of the future, and quotes in confirmation of his opinions such ancient authorities as Rab. Ashi, Saadia Gaon, Hai Gaon, etc., whom the Kabbalah claims as its great  pillars. Botarel's commentary was first published with the text of the Book Jezira and other commentaries (Mantua, 1562; Zolkiew, 1745; and in Grodno, 1806, 1820). Moses also wrote a work entitled מַשְׁפָּט עֵין, on astrology, redemption, and prophecies. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:128; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 8:106, 107; Ginsburg, The Kabbalah, page 122; Jellinek, Biograph. Skizzen. volume 2; Mose Botarel, in L.B. des Or. 1846, No. 12; Job. Steudner, Mos. Botarel de mysterio Trinitatis (Lat. vers. et illustr. [reprinted in his Die judische ABC-Schule, page 27]); Cassel, Leifadenfur jud. Gesch. u. Literatur. page 75. (B.P.)

## Moses Chorenensis[[@Headword:Moses Chorenensis]]

             surnamed "the father of poets and savans," an Armenian theologian, flourished in the 5th century. He was a nephew of Mlsrop (q.v.), and besides being trained by that learned man, enjoyed all the educational advantages which he could secure at Alexandria, where he spent seven years in study under Cyril Alexandrinus, and others equally renowned. He next visited Rome, Athens, and Constantinople, and returned home after  years of closest application in those great centres of learning. He entered the service of the Church, and was shortly promoted to the bishopric of Bagrevand. During the rule of the Persians over his native country he refused to occupy any ecclesiastical positions, and retired to the wilderness. He died at the advanced age of 120. His works are numerous. Among his ablest are the History of Anrmenia, written in 481 by request of prince Sabak, which covers the history of that country down to A.D. 441, and a Manual of Rhetoric. He also devoted much time to the writing of hymns, and many of these are still retained in the divine service of the Armenian Church. An edition of his works, excepting only fragments and hymns, was published at Venice in 1843. See Neale, Hist. of the Eastern Church (Armenia); Aschbach, Kirchen-Lexikon, 4:278; Jahrbuch deutsch. Theol. 1868, volume 4. (J.H.W.)

## Moses Cordovero Ben-Jacob[[@Headword:Moses Cordovero Ben-Jacob]]

             (also called Re. mak = רמק, from the acrostic of his name, קורדואירו, R. Moses Cordovero), a Jewish savant, was born at Cordova in 1522, studied the Cabala under his brother-inlaw, Solomon Alkabaz, and very soon became so distinguished as a Cabalist and author that his fame travelled to Italy, where his books were greedily bought. Cordovero represents the Cabala in its primitive state, since he is chiefly occupied with its scientific speculations, or the speculative Cabala (קבלה עיונית), as can be seen from the following specimen of his lucubrations on the nature of the Deity. "The knowledge of the Creator is different from that of the creature, since in the case of the latter knowledge and the thing known are distinct, thus leading to subjects which are again separate from him. This is described by the three expressions cogitation, the cogitator, and the cogitated object. Now the Creator is himself knowledge, knowing, and the known object. His knowledge does not consist in the fact that he directs his thoughts to things without him, since in comprehending and knowing himself he comprehends and knows everything which exists. There is nothing which is not united with him, and which he does not find in his own substance. He is the archetype of all things existing, and all things are in him in their purest and most perfect form; so that the perfection of the creatures consists in the support whereby they are united to the primary source of his existence, and they sink down and fall from that perfect and lofty position in proportion to their separation from him" (Pardes Rimmonim, 55 a). He died in 1570. Moses wrote an introduction to the Cabala, entitled A Sombre or Sweet Light, or אוֹר נֶעֵָרב(first published in Venice, 1587, then in Cracow, 1647, and in Fiirth, 1701): — The Book of Retirement, or סֵפֶר גֵּרוּשַׁין, Cabalistic reflections and comments on ninety-nine passages of the Bible (Venice, 1543): — The Sacrifices of Peace, or שְׁלָמַים זַבְחֵי, a Cabalistic exposition of the Prayer-book (Lublin, 1613): — The Plant of Deborah, תֹּמֶר דְּבוֹרָה, ten chapters on ethics in the Cabalistic style (Venice, 1589; Livorno, 1794); but his principal work is the Garden of Pomegranates, or פִּרְדֵס רַמּוֹנַים, which  consists of thirteen sections or gates (שערים), subdivided into chapters, and discusses the Sephiroth, the divine names, the import and signification of the letters, etc. (Cracow, 1591). Excerpts of it have been translated into Latin by Bartolocci, Bibl. Migagna Rabbin. 4:231 sq.; and Knorr von Rosenroth, Tractatus de Anima ex libro Pardes Rimmonim, in his Cabala Denudata (Sulzbach, 1677). For the other works of Cordovero, see Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:187 sq. See also Steinschneider, Catal. Libr. Hebr. in Bibl. Bodleiana, col. 1793, etc.; De Rossi, Dizionario (Germ. transl.), page 87 sq.; Etheridge, Introd. to Hebr. Literat. page 359; Ginsburg, The Kabbalah, page 132 sq. (Lond. 1865); Finn, Sephardin, page 307 sq.; Lindo, The Jews in Spain, page 359; Basnage, Hist. of the Jews (Taylor's transl.), page 703; Jost, Gesch. d. Juden u.s. Sekten, 3:137 sq.; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 9:444; Zunz, Zur Gesch. u. Liferatur, page 294; Die Mf- onatstage, page 35 (Berlin, 1872). (B.P.)

## Moses Of Satanow[[@Headword:Moses Of Satanow]]

             SEE SATANOW.

## Moses The Punctuator[[@Headword:Moses The Punctuator]]

             (ר משה הגקרן), or the Cantor (חזן), a Jewish exegetist, lived in London about the middle of the 13th century, and is noted as the author of the well-known Treatise embodying the rules about the points of the Hebrew Scriptures, called דרכי הניקוד והנגינות, or כללי הניקוד, also in the MSS. הוריית הקורא. Excerpts of this treatise, made by Jacob ben- Chayim, were first printed with the Massora in the Rabbinic Bible (Venice, 1524-25), and since in all the editions of the Rabbinic Bible. The treatise has also been published separately with a short commentary by Zebi ben- Menachem (Wilna, 1822), and with corrections and German notes by Frensdorff (Hanover, 1847). Those who recognise the real importance of the Hebrew vowel-points and accents will find in this unpretentious treatise a useful guide. R. Moses was thoroughly acquainted with and quotes the grammatical and exegetical writings of his predecessors, as Chayug, Rashi, Ibn-Ganach, Ibn-Ezra, Parchon, etc. See Steinschneider, Bibliographisches Handbuch, page 95; Zunz, Zur Geschichte und Literatur, page 111; Ginsburg, in Kitto, Bibl. Cyclop. s.v.

## Moses bar-Cepha[[@Headword:Moses bar-Cepha]]

             an Eastern prelate distinguished as an author, flourished as bishop of Bethchino, near Mosul, towards the close of the 9th century. According to Assemani (Bibl. Orient. 2:218-19) Moses barCepha died February 12, 903. He is noted for his compilation of the long Syro-Jacobite Liturgy, which Neale speaks of as "not without its beauty, especially in the intercessory portions." See Cave, Hist. Lit. 2:91; Renaudot, Hist. Lit. 2:390; Neale, Introd. East. Church, 1:329.

## Moses ben-Chanoch[[@Headword:Moses ben-Chanoch]]

             a Hebrew savant who flourished in Spain in the second half of the 10th century, although not known in Jewish literature by his writings, holds, nevertheless, a very prominent place in the history of Jewish learning, since he must be regarded as its propagator on Spanish soil. While the famed Jewish academies of Persia and Pumbedita existed, the Jews of Spain respected them as the head of the Hebrew nation, and referred every weighty point or legal difference to their decision. Notwithstanding the distance and the dangers of the voyage, they sent their sons to them for the study of the law and for education. But as soon as the Persian dynasty had gained the caliphate, it commenced persecuting the Jews, and, without regard to the flourishing state which literature had attained in those academies, it expelled the Jews from Babylon, closed the renowned Jewish colleges, and dispersed their illustrious teachers. Four of these learned men, of whom R. Moses was one, fell into the hands of a Spanish corsair about the year A.D. 950, who was despatched by Abderahman from Cordova to cruise in the sea of the Grecian Archipelago. The wife of Moses accompanied him in his voyage.

The high-minded woman, dreading defilement, looked to her husband for advice, asking in Hebrew whether  those drowned at sea would be resuscitated at the resurrection. He answered her with the verse of the psalm. "The Lord said, I will bring again from Bashan, I will bring again from the depths of the sea." On hearing this, to save her honor, she plunged into the sea and perished. Moses was brought as a slave to Cordova, and redeemed, though his quality was unknown, by a Jew. One day he entered the college clad as a slave, in a scanty sackcloth. The discussion was on a difficult passage of the treatise Joma (day of atonement). After listening for some time, he explained it so satisfactorily to all the students present that R. Nathan, the president of the college, rose from his seat, and said, "I am no more judge; yon slave in sackcloth is my master, and I am his scholar." The very same day Moses was installed by acclamation as head of the community, and with him the foundation of Jewish learning was laid in Spain. The fame of his acquirements spread throughout Spain and the West. Numbers flocked from all parts to receive instruction from him, and thus through this man "the light of learning, which, by the rapid progress of the iron age of Judaism in Babylonia, by the extinction of the authority of the Prince of the Captivity, the dispersion of the illustrious teachers, and the final closing of the great schools, seemed to have set forever, suddenly rose again in the West in renewed and undiminished splendor." Moses ben-Chanoch died in 1104. See Gratz, Geschichte d. Juden, 5:310 sq.; Jost, Geschichte d. Juden u.s. Sekten, 2:400; Dessauer, Geschichte d. Israeliten, page 281 sq.; Braunschweiger, Geschichte d. Juden in den romanzischen Staaten, page 22 sq.; Basnage, Hist. of the Jews, page 606 (Engl. transl. by Taylor); Milman, Hist. of the Jews, 3:156 sq.; Da Costa, Israel and the Gentiles, page 250 sq.; id. Hist. of the Jews in Spain, page 55 (Engl. transl. by E.D.G.M. Kirwan, Cambridge, 1851); Lindo, Hist. of the Jews in Spain and Portugal, page 45 sq.; Smucker, Hist. of the Modern Jews, page 112; Etheridge, Introduction to Hebrew Literature, page 244 sq.; Finn, Sephardim, page 150 sq.; S. Seckler, in Jewish Messenger, 1874 ("Some Jewish Rabbis"), art. 15. (B.P.)

## Moses ben-Jacob[[@Headword:Moses ben-Jacob]]

             SEE MOSES ALBELDA.

## Moses ben-Mocha Of Palestine[[@Headword:Moses ben-Mocha Of Palestine]]

             or Tiberias, a Jewish writer of some note, flourished towards the close of the 6th century. He developed and amplified the interlineary system of vocalization (מנוקד, למטה טעסהתחחון), called the Tiberian (נקוד טיברני), which has for centuries been adopted both by the Synagogue and the Church in all the pointed editions of the Hebrew Scriptures. Like his father, R. Moses also wrote Massoretic glosses both in the margin of the Codd. and in separate works, entitled ספרי נקוד.

## Moses ben-Nachman[[@Headword:Moses ben-Nachman]]

             SEE NACHMANIDES.

## Moses ben-Shesheth[[@Headword:Moses ben-Shesheth]]

             a Jewish interpreter of the Bible, who deserves to be ranked among the ablest exegetists of his people, flourished during the 12th century in Spain and Italy. But little is accessible regarding his personal history. His works, however, remain, and they are masterpieces, whether treating of Hebrew grammar, Old-Testament lexicography, or the Jewish Scriptures. His ablest and most valuable work, A Commentary upon the Books of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, was recently brought out in England from a Bodleian MS., with an English translation and notes by S.R. Driver (Lond. 1872, cr. 8vo). In this work Moses ben-Shesheth confines himself almost exclusively to the discussion of grammatical and lexicographical difficulties, and avoids all haggadic exposition. His interpretations are mostly rational, sometimes novel, and show throughout the independent thinker, guided only by  grammatical rules. The great value of such old grammarians is now more and more appreciated; and the remark of Munk, "that the profound works of Gesenius and Ewald may still be improved by the dicta of such a man as Ibn-Ganach," may be applied also to our author. The work before us consists rather of notes on the prophets, and seems to have been originally an extra-commentary to another more extended one, as many difficult passages and words in Jeremiah and Ezekiel are passed over without any remark, which could not have escaped the attention of rabbi Moses. The author knew the works of Ibn-Ganach, R. Jehudah Chayug, and Moses Kimchi, whom he often quotes; but he never alludes to R. David Kimchi, more celebrated than his brother Moses, nor to Rashi, although he frequently agrees with them. It is to be hoped that Mr. Driver will continue the good work begun thus auspiciously, and give us any other of rabbi Moses's works now buried in MS. form in the Bodleian Library. A sketch of his life also will be appreciated.

## Moses de Coucy Ben-Jacob Ben-Chayim[[@Headword:Moses de Coucy Ben-Jacob Ben-Chayim]]

             (hak-Kohen ben-Chananel), the most celebrated Jewish preacher of the Middle Ages, was born at Coucy, not far from Soissons, cir. A.D. 1200. He severely reprobated a custom then prevalent of marrying strange women. He often preached on that subject, and at last had the good fortune to be heard, for many sent away the Gentile wives they had married. He travelled much in Spain and France, and taught the law, which seemed to have been neglected by a good many of his co-religionists. He died in 1260. Moses is the author of a very highly esteemed work, called the Major Book of the Commandments (סֵפֶר מַצְוֹת גָּדוֹל, called סמג, Seo mag, from its initials). This work on the commandments and prohibitions consists of sermons which he delivered on his journeys through the south of France and Spain (1235-1245), the design of which was to confirm his brethren in the ancient faith, since the orthodox religion of the Jews was at that time undermined by the philosophy of Maimonides. The work which propounds the six hundred and thirteen precepts was first printed before 1480; then in Soncino, 1488; and in Venice, 1522,1547, etc. An abridgment of the Major Book was made by Isaac de Corbeil, A.D. 1277, entitled סֵ מצְוֹת קָטֹן(called סמ ק, Semak, from the initials of its title), the Minor Book of the Commandments, and is divided into seven parts, for the seven days of the week. It was first published at Constantinople, 1510, then at Cremona, 1556, with glosses, etc., and at Cracow, 1596, etc. See First, Bibl. Judaica, 1:189 sq., 186; De Rossi,  Dizionario (Germ. transl.), page 172; Steinschneider, Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibl. Bodleiana, col. 1795-1798, col. 1103; Lindo, Hist. of the Jews in Spain, page 80 (where the name is written "Micozzi"); Basnagre, Hist. of the Jews (Eng. transl.), page 659; Ginsburg, in Levitas, Massoreth ha-Massoreth, p. 249 sq., note (Lond. 1867); Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 7:54, 62-64, 105, 119; Jost, Gesch. d. Juden u.s. Sekten, 3:33; Carmoly, La France Israelite, page 100 sq.; Da Costa, Israel and the Gentiles, page 255; Zunz, Zur Gesch. u. Literatur, pages 83, 127, 143. (B.P.)

## Moses de Leon[[@Headword:Moses de Leon]]

             (ben-Shem-Tob), a Jewish philosopher, poet, and theologian of repute, was born at Leon about 1250, and died at Arevolo, A.D. 1305. He is best known as the author of the Cabalistic book called the Sohar, which he first published and sold as the production of R. Simon b.-Jochai. We do not agree with Etheridge, who states that "the opinion that ascribes it (viz. the Sohar) as a pseudo-fabrication to Moses de Leon in the 13th century has, I imagine, but few believers among the learned on this subject in our own day," for Moses's wife and daughter admitted that he was the author of it, as will be seen from an account of it in the Book Juchassin (pages 88, 89, 95, ed. Filipawski, London, 1857), which Ginsburg (Kabbalah, page 99) gives in the following abridged form: When Isaac of Akko, who escaped the massacre after the capture of this city (A.D. 1291), came to Spain and there saw the Sohar, he was anxious to ascertain whether it was genuine, since it pretended to be a Palestinian production, and he, though born and brought up in the Holy Land, in constant intercourse with the disciples of the celebrated Cabalist, Nachmanides, had never heard a syllable about this marvellous work.

Now Moses de Leon, whom he met in Valladolid, declared to him with a most solemn oath that he had at Avila an ancient copy, which was the very autograph of Rabbi Simon ben-Jochai, and offered to submit it to him to be tested. In the mean time, however, Moses de Leon was taken ill on his journey home, and died at Arevolo, A.D. 1305. But two distinguished men of Avila, David Rafen and Joseph de Avila, who were determined to sift the matter, ascertained the falsehood of this story from the widow and daughter of Moses de Leon. Being a rich man, and knowing that Moses de Leon left his family without means, Joseph de Avila promised that if she would give him the original MS. of the Sohar from which her husband made the copies, his son should marry  her daughter, and that he would give them a handsome dowry; whereupon the widow and daughter declared that they did not possess any such MS.; that Moses de Leon never had it, but that he composed the Sohar from his own head, and wrote it with his own hand. Moreover, the widow candidly confessed that she had frequently asked her husband why he published the production of his own intellect under another man's name, and that he told her "that if he were to publish it under his own name nobody would buy it, whereas under the name of R. Simon ben-Jochai it yielded him a large revenue." Now this account is confirmed by the fact that the Sohar contains whole passages which Moses de Leon translated into Aramaic from his other works, as the learned Jellinek has clearly proved in his very elaborate and learned essay, Moses ben-Shem-Tob de Leon, und sein Verhaltniss zum Sohar, pages 21-36. Moses de Leon also wrote a book on the soul and its destiny, entitled נֶפֶשׁ הִחָכְמָה, i.e., the Soul of Wisdom (Basle, 1608): —the Weight of Wisdom, מַשְׁקִל הִחָכְמָה, which contains the sayings of various philosophers, which he ably criticises: סֵפֶר הִשֶּׁם, on the ten Sephiroth and the thirty-two ways of Wisdom: — מַשְׁכִּן הָעֵדוּת, On Hell and Paradise: — סֵ רַמּוֹן, The Book of Pomegranates, composed in 1287, which is a Cabalistic explanation of the Mosaic precepts. See Furst, Bibl. Judaica, 2:232; De Rossi, Dizionario (Germ. transl.), page 177; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden (Leips. 1873), 7:216-234; Lindo, Hist. of the Jews in Spain, page 113; Finn, Sephardim, page 303 sq.; Steinschneider, Jewish Literature, page 113; Etheridge, Introd. to Hebr. Literature, pages 276, 314; Ginsburg, The Kabbalah, page 90 sq.; Ueberweg, Hist. of Philosophy (Morris's transl. N.Y. 1872), 1:417; A. Jellinek, Moses ben-Shem-Tob, u.s. Verhaltniss zum Sohar (Leips. 1851); Jost, Gesch. d. Juden. u.s. Sekten, 3:78; Cassel, Leitfaden zur jud.Gesch. u. Literatur (Leips. 1872), page 71. (B.P.)

## Moses ha-Cohen Ben-Samuel Gikatilla[[@Headword:Moses ha-Cohen Ben-Samuel Gikatilla]]

             (also called Ibn-Gikatilla), a noted Jewish writer, flourished at Cordova near the opening of the 12th century. He was a pupil of the celebrated Ibn- Ganach, and is known to have been one of the most extensive commentators and grammarians, though, unfortunately for Biblical learning, none of his works seem to be extant. Only fragments of his are preserved in the writings of other commentators, which reveal him to have been a superior scholar and master of Biblical lore. Unlike most of the interpreters of his time, he endeavored to explain away all the Messianic prophecies of the O.T. (comp. Aben-Ezra on Isaiah xi), and assigned the authorship of some psalms to the Babylonian captivity (comp. Aben-Ezra on Psalms 43), at the time when both the Synagogue and the Church believed that the whole Psalter proceeded from David. Like Ibn-Saadia, he frequently departed from the Masoretic division of the text. Thus למכביר, at the end of Job 36:31, he took over to על כפיםin the following verse; i.e., "He giveth meat in abundance, covering the hands with light" (comp. also Habakkuk 3). The influence which this critic must have exercised upon contemporary and subsequent expositors of the Bible may be judged of from the fact that the eminent Aben-Ezra quotes his work so largely. He is generally quoted by Aben-Ezra as הכהן הספרדי ר משה, R. Moses haCohen ha-Sephardi, i.e., the Spaniard; or משה הכהן ר, R. Moses ha-Cohen; or ר משה הספרדי, R. Mose haSephardi; or simply רמשה, R. Mose. These different appellations must be borne in mind by the student of Hebrew exegesis to identify this celebrated commentator.  Dr. Ginsburg, in his article on Gikatilla in Kitto, 2:129, gives a list of the places where his writings are quoted by commentators. It is more complete than the list furnished by Dukes, Beitrage zur altesten Auslegung (Stuttg. 1844), 2:180 sq.

## Moses ha-Darshan[[@Headword:Moses ha-Darshan]]

             (i.e., the Expositor) OF NARBONNE, a rabbi noted as a pulpit orator of more than usual influence and power as well as an exegete of the O.-T. Scriptures, flourished in France in the second half of the 11th century. He- was the teacher of Nathan the Jew, who is noted as another great light of the Jewish pulpit, and wrote a number of valuable commentaries, among which a commentary on the Pentateuch, resting largely on the Midrashic lore, is the most widely circulated and esteemed. His greatest work is a commentary on the Hebrew Scriptures, which is alternately quoted by the respective names of משה הדרשן פרושי רExpositions of R. Moses the Expositor, בראשית רבה, the Great Bereshith, Bereshith Rabba Major, and Bereshith Rabba R. Mose ha-Darshan, and which has not as yet come to light. Copious and numerous fragments of it. however, are given by Rashi in his commentaries on Gen 35:8; Gen 48:7; Num 8:7; Num 7:18-23; Num 11:20-21; Num 15:14; Num 19:22; Num 26:24; Num 26:36; Num 28:19; Num 32:24; Num 32:42; Num 33:1; Deu 21:14; Deu 27:24; Jos 5:9; Psa 40:2; Psa 60:4; Psa 62:12; Psa 68:17; Psa 80:6; Pro 5:19; Pro 26:10; Job 36:1; by Raymond Martin in his Pugio Fidei (Par. 1651, Leips. 1687), both in the original Hebrew and in a Latin translation; by Porchert in his Victoria adversus impios Hebrceos (Paris, 1520) ; by Joshua Lorki, or Hieronymus de Santa Fide, as he was called after embracing Christianity, in his Hebrceomastix (Frankfort-on- the-Main, 1602); and by Galatin in his De Arcanis Catholicae veritatis (Basle, 1550). These fragments, which are exceedingly important contributions to the history of interpretation in the Middle Ages, show that R. Moses strove to explain the words and the context, and that he interspersed his literal expositions with ancient Haggadas, as well as with the interpretations of the sages of olden days. See Zunz, Die Gottesdienstlichen Vortrsge der Juden, pages 286-293; Ginsburg, in Kitto,  Bibl. Cyclop. s.v.; Etheridge, Introd. to Hebrew Lit. page 248; Jost, Gesch. d. Judenthumzs, 2:388; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden. volume 8.

## Moses ibn-Ezra Ben-Jacob Of Granada[[@Headword:Moses ibn-Ezra Ben-Jacob Of Granada]]

             a Jewish writer of note, was born in Spain about 1070, and was descended from a family which once held noble rank in Jerusalem. He was equally celebrated as a learned Talmudist and a professor of Greek philosophy. Although, like his brother poets, he excelled in sacred song, he also tuned his. lyre as an inhabitant of the West, and sang at times of love, but more often in praise of the beauties of nature. He was a contemporary of the celebrated rabbi Jehudah ben-Samuel ha-Levi (q.v.), who bestowed due meed of praise upon him and some other members of his noble and learned family. As a poet, Moses ibn-Ezra won the honor of being considered one of the most finished Hebrew writers. His works are remarkable not only for the intrinsic excellence of the matter, but for the purity, sweetness, and aesthetic grace of their style. Alexander von Humboldt, in his Cosmos, 2:119, praises Moses ibn-Ezra's sublime description of natural scenery. The Selichoth, or penitential hymns, are greatly esteemed by the Jews, who give to Ibn-Ezra the epithet of Hassalach (הִסִּלָח), or "the Selichoth poet" par excellence. He died about 1139. Moses ibn-Ezra wrote זְמַרוֹת וְתִחֵנוּנַים, Hymns for Festival and other Occasions, in the Sephardim Ritual: — Dirvan R.M. ben-Ezra, a collection in 2 parts, miscellaneous and religious: — סֵ הִתִּרְשַׁישׁ, also סֵ עִנָק; this poem is called Tarshish from the number of its stanzas, 1210, expressed by the numerical value of the letters תרשיש :— סֵ עִרֻגִּת הִבּשֶֹׁם, The Garden of Spices, on the philosophy of religion, in 7 parts: — תּוֹכָחָה, a penitential poem. He also wrote on eloquence and poetry, with an Arabic paraphrase; also a philosophical treatise, still unprinted. Extensive specimens of his writings are given in L. Dukes's Moses ibn Ezra (Altona, 1839). See also Sachs, Religiose Poesie der Juden in Spanien, pages 69-82, 310-319; Kampf, Nichtandalusische Poesie Andalusischer Dichter (Prague, 1858), pages 213-240; Zunz, Synagogal Poesie, pages 21, 133, 228-230. See also Fiirst, Biblioth. Judaica, 1:257 sq.; Gratz, Gesch. der Juden, 6:123-127; Braunschweiger, Die Juden in den roman. Staaten, pages 62-64; Finn, Sephardim, page 174; Lindo, Jews in Spain, page 55; Da Costa, Israel and the Gentiles, page 291; Margoliouth, Modern Judaism Investigated, page 243; Etheridge, Introd. to Hebrew Literature, page 351 sq.; Zunz, Literaturgesch. z. Synagogalen Poesie, pages 210, 412, 585, 614;  Nachtrag dazu, pages 8, 33; Jost, Geschichte d. Judenthums u. s. Sekten, 2:414 sq.; Dukes, Rabbinische Blumenlese, page 58; Delitzsch, Zur Gesch. d. Jud. Poesie, 45, 168; Gratz, Leket Schoschanim Blumenlese neuhebr. Dichtungen (Breslau, 1862), page 56 sq.; De Rossi, Dizionario (Germ. transl.), page 11; Kimchi, Liber Radicum (ed. Biesenthal et Lebrecht, Berlin, 1847), page 36. (B.P.)

## Moses, Ascension Or Assumption Of[[@Headword:Moses, Ascension Or Assumption Of]]

             SEE REVELATIONS, SPURIOUS.

## Moses, Books Of[[@Headword:Moses, Books Of]]

             SEE PENTATEUCH.

## Moses, Law Of[[@Headword:Moses, Law Of]]

             SEE LAW OF MOSES.

## Moshabbehites[[@Headword:Moshabbehites]]

             or Assimilators, a heretical sect of the Mohammedans; so called because they hold to a resemblance between God and his creatures, supposing him to be a figure composed of members or parts, each spiritual or corporeal, and capable of local motion, of ascent and descent, etc. Some of this sect believe that the divine nature may be united with the human in the same person, for they grant it possible that God may appear in a human form, as Gabriel did; and to confirm this opinion, they allege Mohammed's words "that he saw the Lord in a most beautiful form, and Moses talking with God face to face." See Broughton, Bibliotheca Historico-Sacra, 2:144.

## Mosheim, Johann Laurenz von[[@Headword:Mosheim, Johann Laurenz von]]

             a German theologian noted as an ecclesiastical historian of great merit, was born of a noble family at Lubeck, October 9, 1694. He was educated at the Gymnasium of Lubeck and the University of Kiel, where, shortly after the completion of his studies in 1718, he succeeded Albert zum Felde as professor of philosophy in 1719. In 1723, at the invitation of the duke of Brunswick, he became professor of theology in the University of Helmstadt, where he remained until 1747; when, after having at various times refused several tempting offers from the high schools of Leipsic, Dantzic, Kiel, and others, he was appointed to the professorship of theology at Gottingen and the chancellorship of the university. Here his  lectures on theology attracted all classes of students. He died September 9, 1755. He was thrice married. By his first wife he had two sons and one daughter, and by his third wife one daughter, afterwards duchess of Noailles. Mosheim is regarded as the most learned Lutheran theologian of his time. With a superior classical education he combined a thorough knowledge of the English, French, and Italian languages and their literature, and was such a master of the purest German that he was esteemed one of the founders of modern German pulpit literature. The whole number of Mosheim's works is 161. He himself printed at Helmstadt in 1731 a catalogue raisonnee of the works which he had brought out up to that time. Among his theological works, special attention is due to one on Bible morality, entitled Sittenlehre der Heiligen Schrift (new ed. continued by J.P. Miller, Helmst. 1770-78, 9 volumes, 8vo).

But his most important contributions to theological literature are his ecclesiastical histories, of which his best known work is the Institutiones Historice Ecclesiasticae, Antiquioris et Recentioris, libri iv. It is written in Latin, and was first published in 2 volumes, 12mo in 1726, and the enlarged edition, in composing which he examined the original authorities, was published in 4to in 1755, just before his death. Another edition was published in 1764, with an account of Mosheim's writings by Miller, one of his pupils. It was translated into German by Von Einem and by J.R. Schlegel. Schlegel's translation is the better, and is enriched with valuable notes. It has also been translated into French, Dutch, and English. The first English version was made in 1764 by Dr. Maclaine, but is very unfaithful. Dr. Mclaine's professed object was to improve Mosheim's style, by adding words and rounding off periods. His alterations and additions constantly express his own sentiments instead of Mosheim's, and sometimes flatly contradict the author. SEE MACLAINE. In 1832 a faithful translation, with valuable notes, was published by Dr. Murdock, of New Haven, Conn., of which there are many reprints; revised, N.Y. 1839. Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History extends from the birth of Christ to the beginning of the 18th century. Each century is treated separately, under the two heads of external and internal history. The internal history comprises "prosperous events," or the extension of the Church by the efforts of its public rulers and private members, and “calamitous events," such as persecutions and infidel attacks. The internal history includes the history, 1, of the Christian doctors; 2, of the doctrines and laws of the Church; 3, of its ceremonies and worship; 4, of heresies. This arrangement is open to several objections, of which the chief are that it is too artificial; that what Mosheim calls external and  internal history constantly run into each other (and indeed it is not easy to understand how any part of the history of a community can be said to be "external" to it); and, lastly, it imposes on the historian the necessity of deciding what no human mind can decide, namely, what events are prosperous and what calamitous to the Church. But the work of Mosheim is open to a graver objection. He has not treated his subject with the proper spirit of pious interest, though his own orthodoxy is undoubted. Nevertheless, his deep knowledge, his patient research, his general candor and impartiality, and his philosophical spirit, entitle Mosheim to a place among the best Church historians.

His works gave an impulse to the study of Church history in Germany, which has produced, among other works, those of Pfaff, Baumgarten, Walch, Semler, Schrockh, Henke, Schmidt, Neander, etc. Of these, that of Schrockh, a pupil of Mosheim, is the fullest, extending to 45 volumes, 8vo. "In his Ecclesiastical History," says Hagenbach — certainly a most competent critic — "Mosheim has labored with a candor which grants to all who differ from him an impartial presentation of their views, and insures justice to all; he has subjected their systems to a thoroughly scientific treatment, and in this he has been very happily likened to Melancthon." The most discriminating estimate of Mosheim seems to us to be that of Hase, who says: "Mosheim, conscious of historical talents, with a power of combination always bold, and sometimes extravagant, and an acquaintance with men in various and friendly relations, is universally acknowledged to have been a master of ecclesiastical historical writing" (Ch. Hist. page 9). Mosheim's other important works on Church history are his tract, De Rebus Christianorumn ante Constantinum (Helmst. 1753), and Infstitutiones Historice Christiance Majores (1739), which is a full Church history of the first century: — Dissertationes ad Hist. Ecclesiasticam pertinentes (new ed. Altona, 1767, 2 volumes): — and Versuch einer unparteiischen Ketzergeschichte (Helmst. 1746-48, 2 volumes). Among his other works are a Latin translation, with notes, of Cudworth's Systema Intellectuale (Jena, 1738): — six volumes of Sermons (1747). Mosheim's interpretations of Scripture are found in his Observationes Sacrae (Amsterdam, 1721); his Cogitationes in N.T. locc. select. (Hannov. 1726); his Erklarung des I. Br. an d. Corinther (1741, new ed. by Windheim, 1762); his Erkl. d. beyden Br. an d. Timoth. (1755); and in his volumes of sermons, Heilige Reden. His exegesis is usually broad and learned, and betokens good-sense and sound erudition. Mosheim was greatly distinguished as a preacher.

His style was formed on the model of the English and French preachers,  Tillotson and Watts, Saurin, Massillon, and Flechier. He has been compared to Fdnelon for the graces of his style. His talents were of a very high order, his learning was immense, and his character was exemplary. Says one: "In depth of judgment, in extent of learning, in purity of taste, in the passion of eloquence, and in a laborious application to all the various branches of erudition and philosophy, he had certainly very few superiors." "Mosheim's noble character," says Hagenbach (German Rationalism, page 75), "is just as lovely as his learning was thorough and comprehensive. There is almost no domain of theology which he did not live to adorn and bless... In the study of morals he, for a time at least, created an epoch, and in the history of German pulpit eloquence a new period dates from him. He has been termed the German Tillotson, the German Bourdaloue. What Michaelis wanted in fine taste was largely present in Mosheim, and gave to all his learned works, as well as to his sermons, an indescribable charm. Mosheim in faith was thoroughly orthodox, yet mild and patient towards others, and in this respect really unlike many of that school." We think Hagenbach, however, goes too far when he calls Mosheim also "the father of modern Church history;" as such no one deserves to be named except the learned and sainted Neander. He it was who first treated ecclesiastical history as it should be treated. SEE NEANDER. See Doring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschl. d. 18ten u. 19ten Jahrh. volumes 2 and 4; Gessner, Memoria J.L. Moshemii (1755); Lucke, Narratio de Moshemio (1837); Rossler, Ueber Mosheim als Prediger; Sachs, Geschichte der Predigt. v. Mosheim bis Schleiermacher (Heidelberg, 1866); Dowling, Introd. Eccles. Hist. p. 192,193; Schaff, Ch. Hist. i, 22, 223, ad passim; Kahnis, German Protestantism, page 118; Bibl. Sacra, January 1851, page 68; Christ. Remembr. 1862, page 46.

## Mosheim, Ruprecht von[[@Headword:Mosheim, Ruprecht von]]

             a German religious enthusiast, was born in the first half of the 15th century. He believed himself commissioned of God to unite the four systems of religion-Papacy, Lutheranism, Zwinglianism, and Anabaptism-prevalent during the Reformatory period, and to lay the foundation of a new Jerusalem. He rejected all prevailing creeds as antiChristian, and prayed for another reformatory movement that might unite all followers of Jesus. To further this end he also entered into negotiations with the evangelical theologians, Osiander and Venatorius, in 1539. But these negotiations were soon broken off. On the part of Romanists he was disliked from the first, for he was severe upon the immoral conduct of the clergy, the  withholding of the cup, and the sale of indulgences. This brought him into conflict also with the emperor Ferdinand, in whose presence he hesitated not to deliver an oration against the papacy. He also went to Vienna to speak to the papal nuncio Morone, in order to get an interview with the pope; but instead of being afforded an opportunity to go to Rome, he was called by order of emperor Ferdinand before the authorities of the convent at Hazenau, and accused of heresy. The prince elector of Mentz had his work De monarchia et renascentia Christiance fidei examined, and the ecclesiastical judge condemning him guilty of heresy, Mosheim was put into prison, and there died in 1544.

## Moshier, Absalom[[@Headword:Moshier, Absalom]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in the early part of the present century. He was first employed in secular occupations, but after his conversion he preached for many years under the presiding elder, and in 1857 entered the Black River Conference, and was stationed at Antwerp; in 1858 and 1859, at De Peyster; in 1860-61, at Rensselaer Falls; in 1862- 63, at Waddington; in 1864, at Richville; in 1865-66, at Redfield. In 1867, his health failing him, he was superannuated. He died in Hampden, Ohio, June 9, 1869. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1870, page 136.

## Moslems[[@Headword:Moslems]]

             a name derived from the Arabic verb salama, to be devoted to God, and applied to those who believe in the Koran, and who, in the Mohammedan sense, form the body of the faithful.

## Mosollam[[@Headword:Mosollam]]

             (Μοσόλλαμος, Vulg. Bosoramus), a Graecized form (1Es 9:14) of the MESHULLAM SEE MESHULLAM (q.v.) of the Heb. text (Ezr 10:15).

## Mosollamon[[@Headword:Mosollamon]]

             (same as preced. Μοσόλλαμος v.r. Μεσολάβων, Vulg. Mosolamus), a Graecized form (1Es 8:44) of the MESHULLAM SEE MESHULLAM (q.v.) of the Heb. text (Ezr 8:16).

## Mosque[[@Headword:Mosque]]

             (Spanish mesquida, French mosqude, Arabic masjed, "a house of prayer," from sajada, "to bend, bow, adore") is the name applied in English to any Mohammedan house of worship; the larger houses of worship are called by Moslem "jami" (places of assembling) or "culliyet" (cathedrals). The first  mosque was founded by Mohammed at Medina, part of the work being done by his own hands. The site was a grave-yard shaded by date-trees, which was selected by the Prophet because his camel knelt opposite to it on his public entry into the city. The edifice was square and capacious, the walls of earth and brick, and the roof supported by the trunks of palm-trees and thatched with palm-leaves. It had three doors. A part of the building was assigned as a habitation to the poor among the faithful who had no other homes. In this mosque Mohammed was buried; and though the original edifice was long ago replaced by a larger structure, the temple still bears the name of Masjed el-Nebi, "the Mosque of the Prophet" (see Wellsted, City of the Caliphs, 1:257 sq., 303 sq.). The most sacred mosque is the great temple of El-Hamram at Mecca, enclosing the Kaaba (q.v.). For many centuries the mosques were fashioned after this one. It consists of a large court enclosed by colonnades, with a fountain in the centre, where ablutions are made before prayer. On the side towards Mecca the colonnade is deeper. In the centre of this side is a niche (mihrab), surmounted by a vaulted arch; by the side of the mihrab is the menber, or preacher's chair or pulpit; at one or more corners of the court rise minarets (q.v.), from which the faithful are called to prayers. The form of the oldest mosques, which next to those mentioned are supposed to be those located at Jerusalem (known as Omar's mosque) and Cairo, is evidently derived from that of the Christian Basilica, the narthex being the origin of the court with its arcade, and the eastern apse, representing the principal buildings of the mosque, facing Mecca. The original forms, however, became obliterated in the progress of Mohammedan architecture, and the mosques, with their arcaded courts, gateways, domes, and minarets, became the most characteristic edifices of Saracenic art. Wherever the Mohammedan faith prevailed, from Spain to India, beautiful examples of these buildings exist. The architectural notions of the different countries seem to have exerted an influence upon the Moslems, for these mosques differ in the various countries. Thus in India the mosques have many features in common with the temples of the Jainas, while in Turkey they resemble the Byzantine architecture of Constantinople.

Since the Turkish domination was established in Constantinople, the mosques have generally been built after the general type of Santa Sophia (q.v.), having a Greek cross as the basis of their plan, and being enclosed instead of hypaethral. Everywhere the dome is one of the leading and most  beautiful features of the mosques, which commonly consist of porticos surrounding an open square, in the centre of which is the tank or fountain for ablution. In the south-east is a kind of pulpit (member) for the imarm; and in the direction in which Mecca lies, SEE KEBLAH, there is a niche (mihrab), towards which the faithful are required to pray. Opposite the pulpit there is generally a platform (dikkeb) surrounded by a parapet, with a desk bearing the Koran, from which portions are read to the congregation. In the imperial mosques at Constantinople there is a tribune (makswra), at the opposite side from the menber and the mihrab, reserved for the sole use of the sultan. In front of the mihrab is often another tribune (khftab), from which the Imam (q.v.) pronounces prayer, and an elevated square platform (mastabah) from which criers repeat the calls to prayer. The imperial mosque of Achmed in Constantinople is the only mosque that has six minarets, except the temple of ElHamram in Mecca, to which Achmed built a seventh minaret, to quiet the complaint that he was attempting to outvie that holy sanctuary.

Many of the mosques are adorned with all the charms of the Saracenic and Moorish architecture, having texts and passages from the Koran intertwined among the delicate ornamentation, to lead the minds of the faithful while waiting for the hour of public prayer. The Turkish mosques are generally quite plain in their interior ornamentation, though often very stately and grand in their exterior architectural effect. It is not customary for women to visit the mosques, and if they do they are separated from the male worshippers. The utmost solemnity and decorum are preserved during the service, although in the hours of the afternoon (when there is no worship) people are seen lounging, chatting, even engaged in their trade, in the interior of the sacred building. On entering the mosque, the Moslem takes off his shoes, carries them in his left hand, sole to sole, and puts his right foot first over the threshold; he then performs the necessary ablutions, and finishes by putting his shoes and any arms he may have with him upon the matting before him. The congregation generally arrange themselves in rows parallel to that side of the mosque in which is the niche, and facing that side. The chief officer of a mosque is the Nazir (q.v.), under whom are two imams. There are, further, many persons attached to a mosque in a lower capacity, as Mueddins (q.v.), Bowwabs (door-keepers), etc., all of whom are paid, not by contributions levied upon the people, but from the funds of the mosque itself. The revenues of mosques are derived from  lands. With many of the larger mosques there are hospitals connected, and public kitchens, in which food is prepared for the poor.

To every mosque is also attached a school, in which reading of the Koran, at least, is taught; to every imperial mosque is attached a college, and to the mosque of El-Azhan, in Cairo, is attached the great Mohammedan university of the world, which is attended by several thousand students from all parts of the Mohammedan world. To the imperial mosques in Constantinople are attached not only colleges, but also libraries, hospitals, asylums for the poor, khans for travellers, baths, and a small cemetery, with the tomb of the founder. The spacious courts containing these extensive benevolent and charitable establishments are adorned with trees and shrubbery and fountains. The whole is supported by endowments left by the sultan whose name they bear. Travellers, orphans, widows, and minors also find here a refuge, where they can leave their treasures, the sacredness of the place alone being sufficient protection. The former rigor by which unbelievers were excluded from mosques under penalty of death has been of late years relaxed in some places.

The finest specimens extant of Moslem architecture are thought to be the mosque at Mecca, the mosque of Omar at Jerusalem (see Spencer's Egypt and the Holy Land, Letter X), and the mosque at Medina, which three are considered also as peculiarly holy. The Jami Masj d, or Great Mosque, at Delhi (see preceding page). built by Shah-Jehan in 1631-37, is generally considered the noblest building ever erected for Mohammedan worship. (G.F.C.)

## Mosquito Territory[[@Headword:Mosquito Territory]]

             (or Mosquitia). SEE NICARAGUA.

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

             an Anglican prelate of some note, nephew of the following, flourished in the second half of the last century. He was educated at Caius College, Oxford, where he was afterwards fellow, and entered holy orders about the middle of last century. After filling many important livings, among them the rectory of St. James's and St. George's, London, the archdeaconry of Colchester, etc., he was finally elevated to the episcopate in 1766, and appointed to the see of St. David's, from which he was transferred to the see of Bath and Wells in 1774. He died in 1802. He wrote, Evidence of the  Resurrection Cleared (Lond. 1744 and 1749, 8vo); and published many of his sermons in several series (Lond. 1750, 4to; 1756, 4to; 1764, 4to; 1769, 8vo; 1769, 4to; 1772, 4to; 1776, 4to). A son of his, of like name, also figured prominently in the Church. He was bishop of Oxford from 1807 until his death in 1811. He published only a Fast Sermon (Lond. 1798, 4to).

## Moss, Robert, D.D[[@Headword:Moss, Robert, D.D]]

             an English divine of distinction, was born of estimable parentage at Gillingham, in Norfolk, in 1666. He was educated first at Norwich school, then at Benet College, Cambridge, in 1682; made there B.A. and fellow in 1685, and B.D. in 1690; and entering holy orders, acquired great reputation both as a disputant and preacher. He was preacher to the Society of Gray's Inn, London, in 1698, and assistant preacher to Dr. Wake at St. James's, Westminster. in 1699. He was also sworn chaplain, in three succeeding reigns, to king William, queen Anne, and George I; and being one of the chaplains in waiting when queen Anne visited the University of Cambridge, April 5, 1705, he was then created D.D. In 1708 he was invited by the parishioners of St. Lawrence Jewry, on the resignation of dean Stanhope, to accept their Tuesday lecture, which he held till 1727, and then resigned it on account of his growing infirmities. In 1712, on the death of Dr. Roderick, he was nominated by the queen to the deanery of Ely, which was the highest but not the last promotion he obtained in the Church; for in 1714 he was collated by Robinson, bishop of London, to Gliston, a small rectory on the eastern side of Hertfordshire. The gout deprived him of the use of his limbs for some of the last years of his life, and he died March 26, 1729. His character may be seen in the preface to the eight volumes of his Sermons, which has usually been attributed to Dr. Snape, and has even been ascribed to him by Mr. Masters in his History of Benet College; but the credit of it has lately been transferred to Dr. Zachary Grey, who is now definitely known to have been the editor, and to have also written a Life of the dean, which has, however, never been published. He left no works of interest to us besides his sermons, He wrote a number of poems, among which the best are, In doctissimi Sherlocci librum nuper editum de usu ac fine doni prophetici, necnon praedictionum maxime memorabilium per continuatum ab initio usque saeculorum seriem (1726): — A brief and easy Paraphrase upon the triumphal Song of Moses, Exodus, chapter 15, from Exo 15:1 to Exo 15:20 : — A Lenten Thought. See Gener. Biog. Dict. s.v.; Hook, Eccles. Biogr. s.v.; Nichols,  Anecdotes of Bowyer, page 78; Lond. Gentleman's Magazine, 73:1138. (J.H.W.)

## Mossom, Robert[[@Headword:Mossom, Robert]]

             a learned Irish prelate, who flourished in the second half of the 17th century, was born about the opening of that aera; entered holy orders, and, being a stanch royalist, suffered much in the civil wars; but on the Restoration was made dean of Christ-church, Dublin, with which he held the bishopric of Londonderry, where he died in 1679. His works are, The Preacher's Tripartite (Lond. 1637, 1657,1685, fol.): — Variae colloquendi Formulae: — Narrative of George Wild, Bishop of Derry (Lond. 1665, 4to): — Zion's Prospect in its First View. He also published some of his sermons, of which Bickersteth (Christian Student) says that they are "spiritual and evangelical." See Harris's Ware's Ireland.

## Motazilites[[@Headword:Motazilites]]

             SEE MOHAMMEDAN SECTS,

## Mote[[@Headword:Mote]]

             (κάρφος, something dry), any small dry particle, as of chaff, wood, etc. (Mat 7:3-5; Luk 6:41-42). Small faults or errors in others, discovered through the magnifying medium of prejudice, are likened by our Lord in these passages to a speck or splinter in the eye, which the censorious are fond of detecting, though guilty of more serious offences themselves, aptly compared to a beam (δοκός) (see Winckler, in Animadvers. Philol. 3:803 sq.). The proverb was a familiar one with-the Hebrews (see Buxtorf, Lex. Rabb. col. 2080). SEE EYE.

## Motett[[@Headword:Motett]]

             a term applied to two different forms of Church musical composition. 1. A sacred cantata, consisting of several unconnected movements, as a solo, trio, chorus, fugue, etc. 2. A choral composition, generally also of a sacred character, beginning with an introduction in the form of a song, perhaps with figurative accompaniment; after which follow several fugue subjects, with their expositions, the whole ending either with the exposition of the last subject, a repetition of the introduction, or a special final subject. A motett differs in this respect from a double or triple fugue, that the subjects never appear simultaneously, but are introduced one after the other. In one  form of the motett, the successive phrases of an entire chorale are treated as so many fugal subjects. The subject is taken from the psalms or hymns of the Church. "Motett" seems to have been originally synonymous with anthem, and was then probably accompanied only by the organ, which is now no longer the case in Roman Catholic churches, all kinds of musical instruments being used in it.

## Moth[[@Headword:Moth]]

             (עָשׁ, ash, so called from its causing garments to fall in pieces, Job 4:19; Job 13:28; Job 27:18 : Psa 39:11; Isaiah 1, 9; Isa 51:8; Hos 5:12; Sept. and Vulg. everywhere [except in the Psalms, where they have ἀράχνη, aranea] render σής, tinea; like the N.T., Mat 6:19-20; Luk 12:23; with which may be compared the Heb. סָס, sas, from its leaping, Isa 51:8; Sept. σής, Vulg. tinea, Auth. Vers. "worm;" the word σής also occurs in the term σητόβρωτος, "moth-eaten," Jam 5:2), the name of a well-known insect, which, in its caterpillar state, is very destructive to clothing. The tribe of moths is called by naturalists Phalcena, and is said to contain more than 1500 species. Linnaeus, under the order Lepidoptera, genus Phalenaa, gives the species of moths — Tinea tapetzella, T.pellionella, and T. recurvaria sarcitella — as peculiarly destructive to woollen clothes, furs, etc. The egg of the moth, being deposited on the fur or cloth, produces a very small, shining insect, which immediately forms a house for Itself by cuttings from the cloth. It eats away the nap, weakens or destroys the thread, and finally ruins the fabric. Moths fly abroad only in the evening and night, differing in this respect from the tribe of butterflies, which fly only by day.

Some of the species of moths feed on the leaves of plants. The "moth" par eminence is an insect of the order Lepidoptera, which possess four wings covered with minute tessellated scales, and of the tribe Nocturna, in which the antennue (or "horns") are drawn out to a fine point. The genus Tinea in this division consists of small species, with the fore-wings long and narrow, and the head covered with coarse hairs. It includes a large number of species, several of which are noted for their destructiveness to clothes, woollen stuffs, furs, specimens of natural history in museums, and corn in granaries. The most pertinacious are T. pellionella and T. tapetzella, which feed on cloth; and these, from their abundance, and from their minuteness enabling  them to penetrate into drawers and wardrobes, are but too well known in every household The identity of this with the Biblical insect is apparent from the terms by which it is rendered in the Sept. (comp. Theophrast. Hist. plant. 1:16) and Vulg. (comp. Pliny, Nat. Hist. 11:41). "The following allusions to the moth occur in Scripture-to its being produced in clothes: 'For from garments cometh a moth' (Sir 43:13); to its well- known fragility: 'Mortal men are crushed before the moth' (Job 4:19), which words really mean (so the Sept.) 'Like as (לַפְנֵי, comp. 1Sa 1:10) the moth is crushed' (comp. Plautus, Cistell. 1:1, 73); but others take the phrase actively, 'As a moth consumes clothing' (so the Vulg.).

The allusion to 'the house of the moth' (Job 27:18) seems to refer plainly to the silky, spindle-shaped case, covered with detached hairs and particles of wool, made and inhabited by the larva of the Tinea sarcitella; or to the felted case or tunnel formed by the larva of the Tinea pellionella; or to the arched gallery formed by eating through wool by the larva of the Tinea tapetzella. References occur to the destructiveness of the clothes-moth: 'As a garment that is moth-eaten' (Job 13:28); 'The moth shall eat them up' (Isa 50:9); ' The moth shall eat them up like a garment' (Isa 51:8);' I will be to Ephraim as a moth,' i.e., will secretly consume him (Hos 5:12); comp. Mat 6:19-20; Luk 12:33; Jam 5:2, metaphorically; and Sir 19:3 — 'Moths and worms shall have him that cleaveth to harlots,' but the better reading is σήπη, 'rottenness.' Since the 'treasures' of the Orientals, in ancient times, consisted partly of ‘garments, both new and old' (Mat 13:52; and comp. Jos 7:21; Jdg 14:12), the ravages of the clothes-moth afforded them a lively emblem of destruction.

Their treasures also consisted partly of corn laid up in barns, etc. (Luk 12:18; Luk 12:24); and it has been supposed that the βρῶσις, translated 'rust,' joined with the σής ' in Mat 6:19-20, refers also to some species of moth, etc., probably in the larva state, which destroys corn. Kuiunol says the 'curculio, or corn-worm,' the larva of the Tinea granella, is injurious to corn. Compare the Roman phrase blatta et tinea. Moths, like fleas, etc., amid other more immediate purposes of their existence, incidentally serve as a stimulus to human industry and cleanliness; for, by a remarkable discrimination in her instinct, the parent moth never deposits her eggs in garments frequently overlooked or kept clean. Indeed, the most remarkable of all proofs of animal intelligence is to be found in the larvae of the water-moth, which get into straws, and adjust the weight of their case so that it can always float: when too heavy they add a piece of straw or wood, and when too light a bit of gravel  (Transactions of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, 1:42)." "The Tinea pellionella. the larva of which constructs a portable case out of the substance on which it feeds, and is very partial to feathers, certainly occurs in Asia Minor, and we may safely conclude that it and biselliata (an abundant species often found in horse-hair linings of chairs) will be found in any old furniture-warehouse at Jerusalem." A detailed account of the habits of these insects may be found in Rennie's Insect Architecture (Lond. 1857), page 220 sq. SEE WORM.

## Mothe le Vayer, Francois De La[[@Headword:Mothe le Vayer, Francois De La]]

             a French sceptical philosopher, was born at Paris in 1586, was so well educated that he was a favorite of the great cardinal ministers Richelieu and Mazarin, and was appointed through their favor counsellor of the state and tutor to the duke of Anjou, brother of king Louis XIV. La Mothe was a moral and temperate man — by no means a common case at the French court of that period. He became so interested in the study of history that he abandoned everything for it, and so generally esteemed as he that was as crowned with distinctions in all circles which he entered. In 1639 he was made a member of the Academy. La Mothe was nearly fifty years old before he published his first work: yet, once entered into the authors' lists, he contributed something regularly every year until his death in 1672. He fought with wit and satirical humor against the life led by the court, and the licentiousness to which the people of that century gave their sanction. In his philosophy he inclined to scepticism, applying the arguments of the ancient sceptics especially to theology, limiting the latter to the sphere of simple faith. He exemplified his views in his work De la Vertu des Paiens, ou Cinq dialogues faits a l'imitation des anciens par Horatius Turbero (Mons, 1671, 12mo; 1673, 8vo; and a new edition, Augmentee d'une refutation de la philos. sceptique ou preservatif contre le Pyrrhonisme par Mr. J.M. Kahle [Berlin, 1704, 2 volumes, 8vo]).

In the first dialogue he defends scepticism in the style of Sextus with much show of learning. He treats of the variety and contradictions of human opinions, morals, and habits, wherefrom he comes to deduct the doctrine that there is nothing certain, and for the welfare in common not even a common binding law of  morals. In his second dialogue he speaks about the variety of nourishment and beverage and the different customs at repasts; of the conception of love, and takes ground in favor of what would now amount to the doctrine of free love, which he calls his sacred and divine philosophy. He recommends in his third dialogue a philosophic solitary life. The fourth dialogue contains a satirical praise of the ass, aiming thus sarcastically to reprimand the folly of his century. His fifth dialogue treats of the several religions, and he comes therein to the conclusion that there cannot be anything certain obtained by it; but he speaks here only in regard to the religion of reason, and says that positive religion possesses the principles of faith in revelation, which can be only gotten by God's grace, and must ever be above all reason. Mr. Arnauld, the learned theologian, answered La Mothe in a tract entitled De la Necessity de la Foi en Jesus Christ, which ably refutes the foolish reasonings of La Mothe, and yet treats the author with great consideration, as he deserved. La Mothe died in 1672. The rest of his works are of very little importance; they were published by his son at Paris in 1653; 2d ed. 1669; 3d ed. (3 volumes, fol.) in 1684. This last edition is the most complete. Yet the best edition was got up in Germany at Dresden (1756-59, 14 volumes, 8vo). See ]tienne, Essai sur La Alothe le Vayer (1849); Bayle, Hist. Dict. s.v.; Hallam, Introd. to Lit. Hist. (see Index in volume 2, Harper's edition). (J.H.W.)

## Mothe, Pierre Lamber De La[[@Headword:Mothe, Pierre Lamber De La]]

             SEE LAMOTHE.

## Mother[[@Headword:Mother]]

             ( אֵם, em, a primitive word; Gr. μήτηρ; but mother-in-law is חָמוֹת, chamoth'; once חֹתֶנֶת, chothe'neth, Deu 27:23; Gr. πενθερά). "The superiority of the Hebrew over all other contemporaneous systems of legislation and of morals is strongly shown in the higher estimation of the mother in the Jewish family, as contrasted with modern Oriental, as well as ancient Oriental and classical usage. SEE WOMAN. The king's mother, as appears in the case of Bathsheba, was treated with especial honor (1Ki 2:19; Exo 20:12; Lev 19:3; Deu 5:16; Deu 21:18; Deu 21:21; Pro 10:1; Pro 15:20; Pro 17:25; Pro 29:15; Pro 31:1; Pro 31:30)" (Smith). "When the father had more than one wife, the son seems to have confined the title of 'mother' to his real mother, by which he distinguished her from the other wives of his father. Hence the source of Joseph's peculiar interest in Benjamin is indicated in Gen 43:29 by his being ' his mother's son.' The other brethren were the sons of his father by other wives. Nevertheless, when this precision was not necessary, the  step-mother was sometimes styled mother. Thus Jacob (Gen 37:10) speaks of Leah as Joseph's mother, for his real mother had long been dead. The step-mother was, however, more properly distinguished from the wombmother by the name of 'father's wife.' The word mother' was also, like FATHER, BROTHER, SISTER, employed by the Hebrews in a somewhat wider sense than is usual with us. It is used of a grandmother (1Ki 15:10), and even of any female ancestor (Gen 3:20); of a benefactress (Jdg 5:7), and as expressing intimate relationship (Job 17:14).

In Hebrew, as in English, a nation is considered as a mother, and individuals as her children (Isa 1:1; Jer 1:12; Eze 19:2; Hos 2:4; Hos 4:5); so our 'mother-country,' which is quite as good as 'father-land,' which we seem beginning to copy from the Germans. Large and important cities are also called mothers, i.e., 'mother- cities' (comp. metropolis, from the Greek), with reference to the dependent towns and villages (2Sa 20:19), or even to the inhabitants, who are called her children (Isa 3:12; Isa 49:23). 'The parting of the way, at the head of two ways' (Eze 11:21), is in the Hebrew 'the mother of the way,' because out of it the two ways arise as daughters. In Job 1:21 the earth is indicated as the common mother, to whose bosom all mankind must return.'" The term is also applied to a city as the parent or source of wickedness and abominations; as "Babylon the Great, the mother of harlots " (Rev 17:5). The Church, as the Bride, is spoken of as the mother of believers (Isa 49:14-22; Isa 56:8-12; Psa 87:5-6; Gal 4:22; Gal 4:21); and the sentiment, at once so mild and so tender, which unites the mother to her child is often alluded to in the sacred volume to illustrate the love of God to his people (Isa 44:1-8; Isa 56:6-12; 1Co 3:1-2; 1Th 2:7; 2Co 11:2). SEE CHILD.

## Mother Goddess[[@Headword:Mother Goddess]]

             (Latin, Mater dea). The pagans gave the name of mother to certain goddesses-of the first rank, particularly to Cybele, Ceres, Juno, and Vesta. Cicero speaks of a famous temple erected in the city of Engyum, in Sicily, to the Great Mother, or simply The Mothers. Concerning this temple, the Engyans entertained a strange superstition. It was confidently affirmed that certain goddesses, called The Mothers, frequently appeared there. They relate a story of one Nicius, a man of wit, and a considerable person of the city, who had frequently laughed at this pretended apparition. One day, as he was haranguing in public, he fell down, roared like a madman, and rent his clothes in pieces. Upon this he was thought possessed by the furies, and every one acknowledged the vengeance of the injured goddesses. However, it was found afterwards that this was only a pretended delirium, and an expedient to deliver himself out of the hands of his persecutors, who had thoughts of destroying him, under pretence of punishing him for his impiety in denying the apparition of The Mothers; for, being suffered to  go out of the city, he made his escape to the Roman general Marcellus. In that temple were shown javelins and brazen helmets, with inscriptions which made some believe that Murunes and Ulysses had consecrated these to the goddesses styled The Mothers. See Broughton, Bibliotheca Historico-Sacra, 2:145.

## Mother of God[[@Headword:Mother of God]]

             The Virgin Mary is sometimes so styled by Christians of all denominations. There is, however, a disicplination to the use of this expression because Romanists have given to Mary a place which the Scriptures do not warrant us in assigning her. "The Virgin Mary," says Pearson (On the Creed), "is frequently styled the Mother of Jesus in the language of the evangelists, and by Elisabeth, particularly, the mother of her Lord, as also by the general consent of the Church, because he that was born of her was God (Deipara); which, being a compound title, begun in the Greek Church, was resolved into its parts by the Latins, and so the Virgin was plainly named the Mother of God." Protestants admit that the Virgin Mary is the mother of God, but protest against the conclusion that she is on that account to be treated with peculiar honor, or to be worshipped; for this expression is used not to exalt her, but to assert unequivocally the divinity of her Son: he whom she brought forth was God, and therefore she is the bringer forth or mother of God. The term was first brought prominently forward at the Council of Ephesus, when it was deemed necessary by the Church to prevent giving Mary a station above that of her Son Jesus the Christ. In the Protestant world there is among the common people a hesitancy to the use of it, "because," as Hook has well put it, "by the subtlety of the Romish controversialists, it has been so used, or rather misused, as to make it seem to confer peculiar honor and privileges upon the Virgin Mary. The primitive Christians, like ourselves, were contented with speaking of the Virgin as 'the mother of my Lord;' and this phrase sufficed until, as we have seen, heretics arose who understood the word Lord in an inferior sense, and then it became necessary to assert that God and Lord, as applied to our blessed Saviour, are synonymous terms. And sound theologians will still occasionally use the term Mother of God, lest Nestorianism should be held  unconsciously by persons who wish to be orthodox; and people forget the great truth expressed by Paul that 'God purchased the Church with his own blood; and that Christ is over all, God blessed forever."' See, however, the article MARIOLATRY SEE MARIOLATRY in this Cyclopcedia, volume 5.

## Mother of God, Congregation of the[[@Headword:Mother of God, Congregation of the]]

             a monastic order instituted about 1574 at Lucca, in Tuscany, by John Leonardi. Their purpose is to save the lost of all conditions by any and all spiritual means, as the preaching of the Gospel, catechetical instruction, and visiting. They especially aim to reach the sick and the dying, and make the hospitals their principal fields of labor. Their founder was particularly devoted to the mother of Christ, and he provided in the constitution of the order that every day at 1 P.M. the litanies of the Holy Virgin be recited, and other like religious devotions be paid to her memory. The order was approved by pope Clement VIII in 1595, and confirmed by pope Paul V. Pope Gregory XV, anxious to spread the order throughout Italy, permitted its members to take the three monastics vows. Their dress is very much like the common monastic garb. See Hist. du Clerge seculier et regulier (Amst. 1716), 3:123-125.

## Mother-Church[[@Headword:Mother-Church]]

             (Latin, Matrix Ecclesia) is a term which has been used in various significations. The ancient Christians used this denomination of a Church in different senses. First, they understood by it an original Church, planted immediately by some one of the apostles, and from which others were afterwards derived and propagated. In this sense the Church of Jerusalem is called the mother of all churches in the world by the second General Council of Constantinople; and Aries was the mother-church of France, because supposed to be planted by Trophimus, the apostles' missionary, and first bishop of that place. Secondly, a mother-church denotes a  metropolis, or the principal church of a single province; as in some of the African canons, where matrix is sometimes used for the primate's see, to which the other bishops were to have recourse for judgment and decision of controversies. But, thirdly, most commonly it signifies a cathedral, or bishop's church, which was usually termed the Great Church, the Catholic Church, and the Principal See, in opposition to the lesser tituli, or parish churches, committed to simple presbyters. Ecclesia matrix, or mother- church, is opposed to dicecesana, or diocesan church; though by their ambiguity they are often confounded, and mistaken for one another. See Broughton, Bibliotheca Historico-Sacra, 2:145.

## Mothering Sunday[[@Headword:Mothering Sunday]]

             (or Midlent Sunday), supposed to be the day on which, in popish times, people visited the mother-church and made their annual offering. In more recent times children and servants in England obtain leave to visit their parents on this day. This custom, according to some, originated in this Sunday being the Dominica Refectionis, or Sunday of Refreshment, the gospel for the day being the record of the miraculous banquet to the five thousand in the desert. On that day the guests used to eat frumenty, consisting of whole grains of wheat, boiled in milk, and sweetened and spiced.

## Motive[[@Headword:Motive]]

             that which moves, excites, or invites the mind to volition. It may be one thing singly, or many things conjointly. Some call it a faculty of the mind, by which we pursue good and avoid evil. Aristotle defiles motive thus: "The deliberate preference by which we are moved to act, and not the object for the sake of which we act, is the principle of action; and desire and reason, which is for the sake of something, is the origin of deliberate preference" (Ethic. lib. 6, cap. 2). Kant distinguishes between the subjective principle of appetition, which he calls the mobile or spring (die Triebfeder), and the objective principle of the will, which he calls motive or determining reason (beweggrund); hence the difference between subjective ends, to which we are pushed by natural disposition, and objective ends, which are common to us with all beings endowed with reason (Willm, Hist. de la Philosoph. Allemande, 1:357). This seems to be the difference expressed in French between mobile and motif. "A motive is an object so operating upon the mind as to produce either desire or aversion" (lord Kames, Essay on Liberty and Necessity). "By motive," says Edwards (Inquiry, part 1, § 2), "I mean the whole of that which moves, excites, or invites the mind to volition, whether that be one thing singly. or many things conjunctly. Many particular things may concur and unite their strength to induce the mind; and when it is so, all together are, as it were,  one complex motive... Whatever is a motive, in this sense, must be something that is extant in the view or apprehension of the understanding, or perceiving faculty.

Nothing can induce or invite the mind to will or act anything any further than it is perceived, or is in some way or other in the mind's view; for what is wholly unperceived, and perfectly out of the mind's view, cannot affect the mind at all." Hence it has been common to distinguish motives as external or objective, and as internal or subjective. Regarded objectively, motives are those external objects or circumstances which, when contemplated, give rise to views or feelings which prompt or influence the will. Regarded subjectively, motives are those internal views or feelings which arise on the contemplation of external objects or circumstances. In common language, the term motive is applied indifferently to the external object and to the state of mind to which the apprehension or contemplation of it may give rise. The explanation of Edwards includes both. Dr. Reid (Correspondence prefixed to his Works, page 87) said that he "understood a motive, when applied to a human being, to be that for the sake of which he acts, and therefore that what he never was conscious of can no more be a motive to determine his will than it can be an argument to determine his judgment." "This is Aristotle's definition (τὸ ἔνεκα ου) of end or final cause; and as a synonyme for end or final cause the term motive had been long exclusively employed" (Sir Wm. Hamilton). In Dr. Reid's Essays on the Active Powers he says, "Everything that can be called a motive is addressed either to the animal or the rational part of our nature." Here the word motive is applied objectively to those external things which, when contemplated, affect our intelligence or our sensitivity. But in the very next sentence he has said, "motives of the former kind are common to us with the brutes." Here the word motive is applied subjectively to those internal principles of our nature — such as appetite, desire, passion, etc. — which are excited by the contemplation of external objects, adapted and addressed to them. But, in order to a more precise use of the term motive, let it be noted that, in regard to it, there are three things clearly distinguishable, although it may not be common nor easy always to speak of them distinctively.

These are, the external object, the internal principle, and the state or affection of mind resulting from the one being addressed to the other. For example, bread or food of any kind is the external object, which is adapted to an internal principle which is called appetite, and hunger or the desire for food is the internal feeling, which is excited or allayed, as the circumstances may be, by the presentment of the external object to the internal principle. In  popular language, the term motive might be applied to any one of these three; and it might be said that the motive for such an action was bread, appetite, or hunger. But, strictly speaking, the feeling of hunger was the motive; it was that, in the preceding state of mind, which disposed or inclined the agent to act in one way rather than in any other. The same may be said of motives of every kind. In every case there may be observed the external object, the internal principle, and the resultant state or affection of mind; and the term motive may be applied, separately and successively, to any one of them; but, speaking strictly, it should be applied to the determining state or affection of mind which arises from a principle of human nature having been addressed by an object adapted to it; because it is this state or affection of mind which prompts to action. The motive of an agent, in some particular action, may be said to have been injury, or resentment, or anger meaning by the first of these words the wrong behavior of another; by the second, the principle in human nature affected by such behavior; and by the third, the resultant state of mind in the agent. When it is said that a man acted prudently, this may intimate that his conduct was in accordance with the rules of propriety and prudence; or that he adopted it after careful consideration and forethought, or from a sense of the benefit and advantage to be derived from it. In like manner, when it is said that a man acted conscientiously, it may mean that the particular action was regarded not as a matter of interest, but of duty, or that his moral faculty approved of it as right, or that he felt himself under a sense of obligation to do it. In all these cases the term motive is strictly applicable to the terminating state or affection of mind which immediately precedes the volition or determination to act. To the question, therefore, whether motive means something in the mind or out of it, it is replied that what moves the will is something in the "preceding state of mind. The state of mind may have reference to something out of the mind.

But what is out of the mind must be apprehended or contemplated — must be brought within the view of the mind, before it can in any way affect it. It is only in a secondary or remote sense, therefore, that external objects or circumstances can be called motives, or be said to move the will. Motives are, strictly speaking, subjective — as they are internal states or affections of mind in the agent. Motives may be called subjective, not only in contradistinction to the external objects and circumstances which may be the occasion of them, but also in regard to the different effect which the same objects and circumstances may have, not only upon different individuals, but even upon the same individuals, at different times. A man  of slow and narrow intellect is unable to perceive the value or importance of an object when presented to him, or the propriety and advantage of a course of conduct that may be pointed out to him, so clearly or so quickly as a man of large and vigorous intellect. The consequence will be that, with the same motives (objectively considered) presented to them, the one may remain indifferent and indolent in reference to the advantage held out, while the other will at once apprehend and pursue it. A man of cold and dull affections will contemplate a spectacle of pain or want without feeling any desire or making any exertion to relieve it; while he whose sensibilities are more acute and lively will instantly be moved to the most active and generous efforts. An injury done to one man will rouse him at once to a frenzy of indignation, which will prompt him to the most extravagant measures of retaliation or revenge; while in another man it will only give rise to a moderate feeling of resentment. An action which will be contemplated with horror by a man of tender conscience will be done without compunction by him whose moral sense has not been sufficiently exercised to discover between good and evil. In short, anything external to the mind will be modified in its effect according to the constitution and training of the different minds within the view of which it may be brought. Not only may the same objects differently affect different minds, but also the same minds, at different times or under different circumstances. He who is suffering the pain of hunger may be tempted to steal in order to satisfy his hunger, but he who has bread enough and to spare is under no such temptation. A sum of money which might be sufficient to bribe one man would be no trial to the honesty of another. Under the impulse of any violent passion, considerations of prudence and propriety have not the same weight as in calmer moments. The young are not so cautious, in circumstances of danger and difficulty, as those who have attained to greater age and experience. Objects appear to us in very different colors in health and in sickness, in prosperity and in adversity, in society and in solitude, in prospect and in possession. It would thus appear that motives are in their nature subjective, in their influence individual, and in their issue variable.

There are two points which render this interesting topic of metaphysical philosophy or psychology also an important one in theology. See WILL.

1. The Extent to which Motives control Volition. — On this question there are essentially two theories.

(a) That the will itself determines the force or prevalence of the motives. This is not done by any previous volition, but in the act of choosing among the various motives, i.e., in selecting between the different courses to which these motives prompt. This is the only theory that leaves the will absolutely free, and fully vindicates moral character. For Cicero has long since observed that "if the things which move the will are not in our own power, then neither our actions nor our volitions are free, and there is no room for praise or blame." SEE LIBERTY.

(b) That the motives control the will, so as to produce volitions according to their relative force. This is argued, either (1) on the materialistic (i.e., physical or mechanical) ground alleged by Hobbes, Collins, and others, that there is a natural law regulating unerringly and necessarily these processes, external and oftentimes independent of the subject himself; or (2) on the basis of a moral necessity, assumed by Edwards and his followers, whereby the actual mental condition of the subject (i.e., his desires, etc.) dictates the direction of the volitions. On the other hand, consciousness, no less than Scripture (e.g. especially Rom 7:15-23), most unequivocally declares that we are capable of selecting a course contrary to our most urgent inclinations, and conscience pronounces us guilty because we suffer our evil passions to overcome our will. Did not our judgment (otherwise called conscience or the moral sense) thus step in to cast a weight into the scale, and, moreover, were not the prevenient grace of God ever ready to aid us "both to will and to do" what is right, it might indeed remain doubtful whether the will of fallen creatures at least could freely determine in the presence of violent emotion or habitual predilection. SEE INABILITY.

The phrase "the strongest motive" contains an ambiguity which has led to great confusion in this controversy. If those who use it merely mean those inducements which are usually most efficacious in moving men, then it is irrelevant to the present issue, because some persons at all times, and all persons at some times, are proof against those influences which are most sure to incite other individuals or under other circumstances. So proverbially is this the case that human conduct is of all things the most uncertain to predict in particular cases. If, On the other hand, as is more exact, the phrase is employed to designate those considerations which are so peculiarly adapted to the mental state of the person at the time as to effect an inclination of the will accordingly, then there still remains this fallacy in the expression, namely, that the strength of the motives really  depends upon the moral condition of the subject himself, of which condition the will itself forms a large (indeed a preponderating) element. Hence we term persons "obstinate," "stubborn," "headstrong," "self- willed," etc., or the reverse. SEE VOLITION.

2. The doctrine that "the character of the motives determines the moral quality of an act" would be more correctly stated thus: "The purpose of the actor determines his moral character in any given case." There is hardly any specific act (unless perhaps we except idolatry) which may not be praiseworthily performed under certain circumstances and for right ends. Thus homicide may be murder or execution in altered cases; sexual connection is the legitimate privilege of matrimony or the illicit indulgence of licentiousness; the use of the name of God may be either a lawful oath, or devout prayer, or profanity, according to the intent of the invocation. Nor is this axiom tantamount to the maxim condemned in Scripture (Rom 3:8), and justly scouted under the popular name of "Jesuitism," that "the end justifies the means." Not only the end in view, but all the means employed to accomplish that end, must be tested with the same scrupulous care by a comparison with the identical standard of rectitude, the revealed will of God, by which alone the moral quality of the motive of him who seeks to effect the one or make use of the other is to be ultimately and surely determined. Thus while the intention of the party acting vindicates or condemns him in the act, the propriety of the act itself is to be tried by a more unerring external tribunal. Hence also a crime or good act meant, but (through unavoidable hinderance) not executed, is, in the eve 'of divine justice, accounted as guilt or virtue (Mat 5:22; Mat 5:28; 2Co 3:12; 1Jn 3:15). SEE MORALS.

See Edwards, On the Will, pages 7, 8, 124, 259, 384; Toplady, Works, 2:41, 42; Buck, Theol. Dict. s.v.; Hamilton, Metaphysics, page 692 sq., 129, 556 sq.; Watson, Theological Institutes, 2:439 sq,; Krauth's Fleming's Vocabulary of Philos. s.v.

## Mott, William F[[@Headword:Mott, William F]]

             an American philanthropist of some fiote, was born in New York City in 1818. Mr. Mott commenced life with moderate means, but, being honest and of frugal habits, amassed an ample fortune, which he spent for the relief of the poor and needy. He made large contributions to the philanthropic institutions of his native place; among them, to the City Dispensary, the House of Refuge, the Colored Orphan Asylum, and  Woman's Hospital. He was an active member of the Society of Friends. He died in New York in 1867.

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

             The Motu is a dialect spoken by the natives round Port Moresby, New Guinea, hence it is also called the Port Moresby or New Guinea dialect. The Reverend J. Chalmers translated the first three gospels, and of these the gospel of Mark has been carefully revised by the Reverend W.G. Lawes, and an edition of five hundred copies was printed at Sydney during the year 1881 by the New South Wales Auxiliary to the British and Foreign Bible Society. Mr. Lawes, who is preparing other portions for the press, says concerning the gospel of Mark: "This is the first portion of the Scriptures translated into any language of south-east New Guinea. The  Dutch missionaries at Doreby, at the extreme north-west of the island, I think, translated a portion into the language spoken there, but, with that possible exception, this is the beginning of the work of translation on New Guinea." From the report of the British and Foreign Bible Society for 1883, we learn that the gospel of Mark, which has been circulated, is more widely read than was expected. The gospels of Matthew and Luke were also revised by Mr. Lawes, and printed at Sydney in 1882, while the gospel of John, which he translated himself, was published in 1884. (B.P.)

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

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Perry County, Pennsylvania, August 16, 1817. He graduated at Jefferson College, Pennsylvania; studied theology in the Western Seminary, Alleghany, Pennsylvania; was licensed by Carlisle Presbytery in 1848, and in 1849 was ordained and installed pastor of the church at Cold Spring, N.J. He subsequently served the churches of Madison and Adams's Mill, Muskingum County, Ohio, and near Warrenton, Fauquier County, Virginia, and lastly the Nealsville and Darnestown churches, in Montgomery County, Md. He died November 1, 1864. Mr. Motzer was a scriptural and edifying preacher, an untiring and affectionate pastor, and a kind and true friend. He felt a deep interest in the mental and religious training of the young, and the interests of the parochial school were very dear to his heart. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, page 131.

## Moulding[[@Headword:Moulding]]

             a general term applied to all the varieties of outline or contour given to the angles of the various subordinate parts and features of buildings, whether projections or cavities, such as cornices, capitals, bases, door and window jambs and heads, etc. The regular mouldings of Classical architecture are, the Fillet, or list; the Astragal, or bead; the Cyma reversa, or ogee; the Cyman recta, or cynma; the Cavetto; the Ovolo; the Scotia, or trochilus; and the Torus: each of these admits of some variety of form, and there is considerable difference in the manner of working them between the Greeks and Romans. (See those terms.) The mouldings in classical architecture are frequently enriched by being cut into leaves, eggs, and tongues, or other ornaments, and sometimes the larger members have running patterns of honeysuckle or other foliage carved on them in low relief; the upper moulding of cornices is occasionally ornamented with a series of projecting lions' heads.

In medieval architecture the diversities in the proportions and arrangements of the mouldings are very great, and it is scarcely possible to do more than point out a few of the leading and most characteristic varieties.

In the Norman style the plain mouldings consist almost entirely of rounds and hollows, variously combined, with an admixture of splays, and a few fillets. The rich mouldings, however, are very various, one of the most marked being the constant recurrence of mouldings broken into zigzag lines, and forming what is called the Zigzag or Chevron moulding: it has not been very clearly ascertained at what period this kind of decoration was first introduced, but it was certainly not till some considerable time after the commencement of the style; when once adopted, it became more common than any other ornament. A series of grotesque heads placed in a hollow moulding, called Beak-heads, with their tongues or beaks lapping over a large bead or torus, was also very common. The Hatch moulding is also not uncommon, and is found early in the style, as it can be cut conveniently without the aid of a chisel, with the pick only. The other favorite mouldings of the Norman style are the Billet mouldings, both square and round, the Lozenge, the Nail-head, the Pellet, the Chain, the Cable, and the Rose, of all which illustrations are here given. There may  also be mentioned the Star, the Billeted Cable, the Nebule, the Studded, the Indented, the Scalloped, the Fir-cone, the Double Cone, the Dovetail, the Embattled, the Open Heart, and the Antique.

In the Early English style the plain mouldings become lighter, and are more boldly cut than in the Norman; the varieties are not very great, and in arches, jambs of doors, windows, etc., they are very commonly so arranged that if they are circumscribed by a line drawn to touch the most prominent points of their contour it will be found to form a succession of rectangular recesses. They generally consist of alternate rounds and hollows, the latter very deeply cut, and a few small fillets; sometimes also splays are used: there is considerable inequality in the sizes of the round mouldings, and the larger ones are very usually placed at such a distance apart as to admit of several smaller between them; these large rounds have frequently one or more narrow fillets worked on them, or are brought to a sharp edge in the middle, the smaller rounds are often undercut, with a deep cavity on one side (e e), and the round and hollow members constantly unite with each other without any parting fillet or angle. The ornamental mouldings in this style are not numerous, and they are almost invariably placed in the hollows; the commonest and most characteristic is that which is known by the name of Dog-tooth ornament, which usually consists of four small plain leaves united so as to form a pyramid; these ornaments are commonly placed close together, and several series of them are frequently introduced in the same suite of mouldings; the other enrichments consist chiefly of single leaves and flowers, or of running patterns of the foliage peculiar to the style.

The plain mouldings in the Decorated style are more diversified than in the Early English, though in large suites rounds and hollows continue for the most part to prevail; the hollows are often very deeply cut, but in many instances, especially towards the end of the style, they become shallower and broader; ovolos are not very uncommon, and ogees are frequent; splays also are often used, either by themselves or with other mouldings;  fillets placed upon larger members are abundant, especially in the early part of the style, and a round moulding, called the Scroll-moulding, with a sharp projecting edge on it, arising from one half being formed from a smaller curve than the other, is frequently used, and is characteristic of Decorated work; when used horizontally the larger curve is placed uppermost: there is also another moulding, convex in the middle and concave at each extremity, which, though sometimes found in the Perpendicular style, may be considered as generally characteristic of the Decorated. Fillets are very frequently used to separate other members, but the rounds and hollows often run together, as in the Early English style. The enrichments consist of leaves and flowers, either set separately or in running patterns, figures, heads, and animals, all of which are generally carved with greater truth than at any other period; but the ball-flower, which belongs especially to this style, and a variety of the four-leaved flower, are the commonest.

In the Perpendicular style the mouldings are generally flatter and less effective than at an earlier period.

One of the most striking characteristics is the prevalence of very large and often shallow hollows; these sometimes occupied so large a space as to leave but little room for any other mouldings: the hollows and round members not unfrequently unite without any line of separation, but the other members are parted either by quirks or fillets. The most prevalent moulding is the ogee, but rounds, which are often so small as to be only beads, are very abundant; and it is very usual to find two ogees in close contact, with the convex sides next each other. There is also an undulating moulding, which is common in the abacus and dripstones, peculiar to the Perpendicular style, especially the latter part of it; and another indicative of  the same date, which is concave in the middle and round at each extremity, is occasionally used in door-jambs, etc. In Perpendicular work small fillets are not placed upon larger members, as in Decorated and Early English; splays also are much less frequent. The ornaments used in the mouldings are running patterns of foliage and flowers; detached leaves, flowers, and bunches of foliage; heads, animals, and figures, usually grotesque; shields, and various heraldic and fanciful devices; the large hollow mouldings, when used in arches or the jambs of doors and windows, sometimes contain statues with canopies over them;

## Mouldy[[@Headword:Mouldy]]

             The word נקֻּדַיםnikkudim' (Jos 9:5), refers, as Gesenius remarks, rather to crumbs of bread, and, instead of, as in our version, "all the bread of their [the Gibeonites'] provision was dry and mouldy," he reads, "all the bread of their travelling provision was dry, and had fallen into crumbs." SEE BREAD.

## Moulin (Lat. Molinaeus), Pierre du (1)[[@Headword:Moulin (Lat. Molinaeus), Pierre du (1)]]

             a French Protestant divine of great note for his opposition to the Romanists, especially the Jesuits, was born at Buhy, in the Vexin, October 18, 1568. He studied first at the Protestant school in Sedan, and next at the English high school at Cambridge, from which university he removed, after a four-years' stay, to accept the professorship of philosophy at Leyden. This professorship he held for five or six years, and had several disciples who afterwards became famous; among the rest, Hugo Grotius. He read lectures upon Aristotle, and disciplined his scholars in the art of disputing, of which he made himself so great a master that he was always the scourge  and terror of the papists. Scaliger was very much his patron, and when Du Moulin published his Logic at Leyden in 1596 was so gracious as to say of the epistle prefatory, "Haec epistola non est hujus aevi." In the divinity schools he also taught Greek, in which he was extremely well skilled, as appears from his book entitled Novitas Papismi, in which he exposes cardinal Perron's ignorance of that language. In 1599 he returned to France, and became minister at Charenton, near Paris, and chaplain to Catharine of Bourbon, the king's sister, and then the wife of Henry of Lorraine.

It is generally believed that Catharine's faithfulness to the Protestant cause is due to Du Moulin's influence. On the assassination of Henry IV, Da Moulin charged the guilt of that detestable deed upon the Jesuits, which produced a violent controversy between him and some of that society. Cotton, a Jesuit, then chaplain at court, was vainly struggling to free the Society of Jesus from the imputation which had been generally placed upon it that Ravaillac had been incited by them and their doctrines to this bloody deed, and finally even published a book in defence of the order. Du Moulin, however, believing the Jesuits guilty, replied in his Anti- Cotton, or a Refutation of Father Cotton, wherein is proved that the Jesuits were the real authors of that execrable parricide. In 1615, James I, who had long been in correspondence with Du Moulin by letters, invited him to England; but his Church would not suffer him to go till he had given a solemn promise in the face of his congregation that he would return to them at the end of three months.

The king received him with great affection; took him to Cambridge at the time of the commencement, where he was honored with a doctor's degree; and at his departure from England presented him with a prebend in the church of Canterbury. On his return to France, Du Moulin had again innumerable disputes with the Jesuits; and when they found that nothing was to be done with him in this way, they made use of others. They tried to bring him over to them by the promise of great rewards; and they attempted more than once his life, so that he was obliged at length always to have a guard. In 1617, when the United Provinces desired the Reformed churches of England, France, and Germany to send some of their ministers to the Synod of Dort, Du Moulin and three others were deputed by the Gallican Church, but were forbidden to go by the king upon pain of death. In 1618 he had an invitation from Leyden to fill the divinity chair, which was vacant, but he refused it. In 1620, when he was preparing to go to the National Synod of the Gallican Church, baron Herbert of Cherbury, then ambassador from Britain at the court of France, asked him to write to king James, and to urge him, if  possible, to undertake the defence of his son-in-law, the king of Bohemia. Du Moulin declined the office; but the ambassador, knowing his interest with James, would not admit of any excuse. This brought him into trouble, for it was soon after decreed by an order of Parliament that he should be seized and imprisoned for having solicited a foreign prince to take up arms for the Protestant churches. Apprised of this, he secretly betook himself to the ambassador Herbert, who, suspecting that his letters to the king were intercepted, advised him to fly, as the only means of providing for his safety. Du Moulin finally went to Sedan, and there accepted the divinity professorship and the ministry of the Church, both which he held till the time of his death, which occurred March 10, 1658. In 1623, when cardinal Perron's book was published against king James, Du Moulin took a journey into England, and at the king's instigation answered it in a work published at Sedan, after the death of James, under the title of Novitas Papismi, sive Perronii confutatio, reqgisque Jacobi, sed magis sacrce veritatis defensio. A list of Du Moulin's works, to the number of seventy-five, is given by Aymon (Synodes de France, 2:273). He also published many of his sermons. He was a violent opponent of Arminianism, and attacked Amyraldus (q.v.) bitterly in his De Moses Amyraldi Libro judicium. His most important works are, The Buckler of the Faith, or a Defence of the Confession of the Reformed Churches in France against M. Arnoux, the Jesuit (3d ed. Lond. 1631, 4to): — Le Combat Chretien (8vo): — Anatomie de la Messe (Sedan, 1636, 12mo). See Nicholls, Calvinism and Arminianism compared, 1:224; Bates, Vitae, page 697 sq.; Sax, Onomasticon, 4:179; Haag, La France Protestante, 4:420; Schweizer, Centraldogmemn, 2:225 sq., 564 sq.; Ebrard, Dogmactik, volume 1, & 43; Vinet, Histoire de la Predication parmi les Reformes en France au 17me siecle (Par. 1860).

## Moulin (Lat. Molyncus), Charles du[[@Headword:Moulin (Lat. Molyncus), Charles du]]

             a celebrated French lawyer, and a convert to Protestantism, was born of a noble family at Paris, in 1500, and studied at the University of Paris and at Poictiers and Orleans. He became advocate of Parliament in 1522. He embraced the Protestant religion, first as a Calvinist, and afterwards became a Lutheran. He was imprisoned at the instigation of the Jesuits, became equally obnoxious to the Calvinists, and ultimately returned to the communion of the Church of Rome. He died in 1566. His works were published in 5 volumes, fol. (Paris, 1681); among them are Collatio et unio quatuor evangelistarum, eorum serie et ordine (1596, 4to).

## Moulin, Pierre du (2)[[@Headword:Moulin, Pierre du (2)]]

             son of the preceding, and noted as a most enthusiastic Calvinist, was born in 1600 at Paris, and graduated at Leyden; but going afterwards to England, obtained, like his father, a prebend at Canterbury, and was one of the chaplains to king Charles II. He died in 1683. He was the author of The Peace of the Soul: — Clamor Regii Sanguinis, which, being anonymous, was attributed by Milton to Alexander More: — and A Defence of the Protestant Church. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Haag, La France Protestante, 4:430.

## Moulinie, Charles Tienne Francois[[@Headword:Moulinie, Charles Tienne Francois]]

             a Swiss Protestant theologian, was born July 23, 1757. He studied at his birthplace, Geneva, and was ordained in 1781. In 1793 he was' pastor at Saconnet, in 1794 at Dardagny, and from 1795 to 1829 at Geneva. He died August 3, 1836. Moulinie was a prolific writer, who left seventeen volumes in manuscript to the library of the ministers' association at Geneva. Of his published works are to be mentioned, Lait de la Parole (1789), a catechism: — Notice sur les Livres Apocryphes de l'Ancien Testament (1828). See Gautier, — Notice sur la Vie et les Ecritis de M. le Pasteur Moulinie, in the Chretien Evangelique of Lausanne, 1866, page 535 sq., 648 sq.; Henri de Goltz, Geneve Religieuse au dix-neuvieme Siecle, page 122; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Moullah[[@Headword:Moullah]]

             SEE MULLAH.

## Moultan (or Wuch or Ooch) Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Moultan (or Wuch or Ooch) Version Of The Scriptures]]

             This dialect is spoken north of Sindh, between the Indus, Chenaub, and Gharra rivers. There exists a version of the New Test. in that dialect, which was printed at Serampore in 1819. (B.P.)

## Mound[[@Headword:Mound]]

             (Lat. mundus) is a term in heraldry, designating a globe surmounted with a cross (generally) pattee. As a device, it is said to have been used by the emperor Justinian, and to have been intended to represent the ascendency of Christianity over the world. The royal crown of England is surmounted by a mound, which first appears on the seal of William the Conqueror, though the globe without the cross was used earlier.

## Mount[[@Headword:Mount]]

             (Isa 29:3; Jer 6:6, etc.). SEE SIEGE.

## Mount Ephraim[[@Headword:Mount Ephraim]]

             SEE EPHRAIM.

## Mount Lebanon, Christians Of[[@Headword:Mount Lebanon, Christians Of]]

             SEE MARONITES.

## Mount Of Corruption[[@Headword:Mount Of Corruption]]

             (2Ki 23:13). SEE CORRUPTION.

## Mount Of Piety[[@Headword:Mount Of Piety]]

             SEE MONTES PIETATIS.

## Mount Of The Amalekites[[@Headword:Mount Of The Amalekites]]

             (הִר הָעֲמָלֵקַי; Sept. ὄρος τοῦ Α᾿μαλήκ; Vulg. Mons Amalech), a place near Pirathon, in the tribe of Ephraim (Jdg 12:15), apparently so called from some branch of that Canaanitish clan settled there (comp. Jdg 5:14, שָׁרְשָׁם בִּעֲמָלֵק מַנַּי אֶפְרִיַם, from Ephraim [came those] whose seat [was] by Amalek, A.V. "out of Ephraim was there a root of them against Amalek"). SEE AMALEKITE.

## Mount Of The Congregation[[@Headword:Mount Of The Congregation]]

             (הִר מוֹעֵד, mountain of the assembly, namely, of the gods), a place mentioned in the words of the king of Babylon, Isa 14:13. called " mount of the congregation," is prob. the Persian mountain el-Burj (comp. Gr. πύργος, a town, Germ. burg), called by the Hindius Meru, situated in the extreme north, and, like the Greek Olympus, regarded by the Orientals as the seat of the gods (see Asiat. Researches, 6:448; 8:350 sq.; Hyde, De relig. Persar. page 102). SEE CONGREGATION.

## Mount Of The Valley[[@Headword:Mount Of The Valley]]

             (הִר הָעֵמֶק; Sept. ὁ ὄρος Ε᾿νάθ v.r. Ε᾿νάκ; Vulg. Mons contnallis), a district on the east of Jordan, within the territory allotted to Reuben (Jos 13:19), containing a number of towns, such as Heshbon, Dibon, etc. The “valley" in question appears to have been the Ghor, or that of the Jordan (Jos 13:27); and hence the "mount" indicated was doubtless the hilly region immediately adjoining the northern end of the Dead Sea, where the towns mentioned were situated.

## Mount Olivet, Congregation Of[[@Headword:Mount Olivet, Congregation Of]]

             SEE MONTOLIVEITIANS.

## Mount or Mountain[[@Headword:Mount or Mountain]]

             (properly הִר, har, from its swelling form; with its cognate forms, הֶרֶר, hearer, and הָיָר, harar'; Gr. ὄρος; also Chald. טוּר, tur, from their rocky nature, Dan 2:35; Dan 2:45 : but סֹלְלָה, solelah', "mount," Jer 6:6; Jer 32:32; Jer 33:4; Eze 4:2; Eze 17:17; Eze 21:22; Eze 26:8; Dan 11:15; elsewhere "bank," 2Sa 20:15; 2Ki 19:32; Isa 37:33, is a nound or rampart, such as is thrown up by besiegers against a city; and מֻצָּב, mutsab', "mount," in Isa 29:3, is a station of troops or military post, as occupied for purposes of besieging or a campaign. See WAR. In the New Testament the word mount or mountain is confined almost exclusively to representing Opog. In the Apocrypha the same usage prevails as in the N.T., the only exception being in 1Ma 12:36, where 'mount' is put for ὕψος, probably a mound, as we should now say, or embankment, by which Simon cut off the communication between the citadel on the Temple mount and the town of Jerusalem. For this Josephus [Ant. 13:5,11] has τεῖχος, a wall" [Smith]. SEE FORTIFICATION. Another term, designating an individual mountain, is בָּמָה, bamah', a height or "high place;" generally a lesser eminence, like גַּבְעָה, gibah', a "hill," etc.). The term often occurs in connection with a proper name, or as the specific title of some particular mountain, e.g. Mount Sinai, Mount Tabor, Mount Lebanon, Mount of Olives, etc., which see in their alphabetical order. The phrase "mountain of God" (הִר הָאלֵַֹהים) is spoken of Mount Sinai, as the place where the law was given (Exo 3:1; Exo 4:27; Exo 18:5); of Mount Zion (Psa 24:2; Isa 2:3), which is  also often called God's holy mountain (mostly הִר קָדְשַׁיand קדְשׁוֹ, "mountain of my" or "his holiness," the suffix referring to God, as if immediately annexed to the former noun, or perhaps to be rendered correctly, "mountain of my sanctuary") (Isa 11:9; Isa 56:7; Isa 57:13; Psa 2:6; Psa 15:1; Psa 43:3; Oba 1:16; Eze 20:40), more fully "mountain of the Lord's house" (Isa 2:2); of the mountain of Bashan (Psa 68:16), as being very high; also in the plur. of the Holy Land itself, as being generally mountainous (Isa 14:25; Isa 49:11; Isa 65:9). See Walch, De deo Hebraeorum montano (Genesis 17:46). The term is also used collectively, "mountains," i.q. mountainous region, e.g. of Seir (Jos 14:12), of Judah (Jos 15:48), etc.; and especially (with the art. הָהָר, the mountain, κατ᾿ ἐξοχήν) of the high mountainous tract extending nearly through Palestine, between the plain on the sea-coast and the valley of the Jordan (Gen 12:8; Jos 9:1); or more specifically "the mountains of Judah," i.e., the same tract south of Jerusalem (Num 13:29; Deu 1:2); the "hill-country" (ὀρεινή) of Luk 1:39; also the mountainous region east of the Dead Sea (Gen 14:20; Gen 19:17; Gen 19:19; Gen 19:30). See Macfarlane, Mountains of the Bible (Lond. 1848, 1856). SEE HILL.

Palestine is a hilly country (Deu 3:25; Deu 11:11; Eze 34:13; comp. Exo 15:17; 1Ki 20:23; see Hasselquist, Trav. page 148), divided into two natural portions by the deep depression of the Jordan from north to south. The mountain ranges which overspread it are connected on the north with Lebanon. East of the Jordan, Antilebanon terminates with the spur called Jebel Heish, a fruitful hilly district extending westward thence to the abrupt margin of the Sea of Gennesareth; while south of the intersection of the country from east to west by the river Hieromax the hills rear themselves afresh for several leagues, being traversed by wadys (watercourses) which run towards the Jordan, and interrupted by ravines and narrow passes, and continue in the form of moderately high, fertile plateaus that do not clearly descend to a level till they reach the River Arnon, the boundary of the ancient transjordanic territory; southward of the deep, rocky vale of this stream, which was the key of Palestine in this region from the east, they still stretch away in connection with the mountains of Arabia Petraea, this entire chain sloping eastward, first into the fruitful meadows of the modern Hauran, and farther south into the Arabian desert, but westward bounded by rocky steeps along the Jordan (Volney, Trav. 1:226). West of the Jordan, a mountainous  region extends from Lebanon and Antilebanon far down southwesterly into Galilee, where in the south-west, opposite Ptolemais, it ends in a ridge, terminating beyond the Kishon in the promontory of Carmel; while in the interior among the highlands it forms the high plain of Jezreel, and on the east descends by a series of terraces to the Sea of Gennesareth: this portion contains its most fruitful districts, endowed with a rich Alpine vegetation, for although the northern and north-western parts are mostly inclement, and their cultivation almost impossible, especially in the rocky tracts, yet the south-western section is an alternation of fine valleys and choice pasture-lands (Hasselquist, page 176). From the elevated plain of Jez'reel, or Esdraelon, rises the almost isolated peak of Tabor, as a limit of the northern mountain-chain on this side of Jordan. Southerly this plain is shut in by hills, which, in moderate heights and in directions only lately accurately investigated by Robinson, overspread the greater part of ancient Samaria; beyond this growing more precipitous and rocky (Maundrell, Trav. page 88; Volney, Trav. 2:225 sq.), although they are everywhere interspersed with fruitful valleys and plains.

The mountain ranges, which only admit communication with the sea-side by means of the intersecting passes and ravines, extend into Judaea several miles north of Jerusalem, and cover the greater part of this division of Palestine likewise, the hills becoming higher south of the metropolis. Stretching towards the south- east, they terminate in steep walls near the Dead Sea, and so join the sides of the deep Arabah; but in the south-west they somewhat abruptly bound the (tolerably high) hilly plain el-Tih, which connects Palestine with Arabia Petraea. Westerly the mountains of middle and southern Palestine nowhere extend to the sea, but gently slope into plains, which grow continually wider farther south; towards the Jordan, however, they fall off ruggedly into the Ghor (Volney, Trav. 1:226), only at Jericho leaving a large amphitheatre-like level. Their greatest expansion from east to west is nowhere more than ten to fifteen miles, and in the vicinity of Hebron scarcely more than seven miles (Volney, Trav. 2:243). The principal composition of all the Palestinian hills is limestone (of the Jura formation), occasionally with strata of chalk (whence the numerous caves), and, as is a frequent accompaniment of this latter, the hilly levels, especially in the east, are strewn with flint stones (see Schubert, Reise, 3:108). Only in the north- east, from the boundaries of the Lebanon formation to the Hieromax, extends a basaltic region (Seetzen, 18:335), which has scattered its columns and blocks as far as the western shore of the Sea of Gennesareth (comp. Ritter, Erdk. 2:315; Richter, Wallfahrt, page 60; Schubert, Reise,  3:222, 237, 260). At the southern extremity of the Dead Sea a salt- mountain uplifts itself, about three leagues in extent. The height of the mountains of Palestine is not great (Hasselquist, Trav. page 148), but has only been measured by the barometer. The southern hills rise to a perpendicular elevation of about 2400 feet, and run at this elevation as far northward as Shechem; above this they sink to about 1750 feet, and grow still more insignificant towards the plain of Jezreel. Northward of this, the land of Galilee becomes again more lofty, especially in comparison with the Sea of Gennesareth, which lies 535 feet below the level of the Mediterranean (Schubert, 3:231). The altitude of Lebanon is estimated at 10,000 feet. The mountains of Gilead are higher than the cisjordanic, being about 3000 to 4000 feet in height. (See Raumer, Beitrage z. bibl. Geographie, page 12 sq.; Reland, Palaest. page 346.) For particular hills, SEE CARMEL; SEE EPHRAIM; SEE LEBANON; SEE OLIVET; SEE TABOR, etc.

The mountainous regions of Palestine not only served the inhabitants as places of defence against hostile incursions and of refuge from oppressive masters, but the hills by careful cultivation and terracing nearly doubled the arable soil (Pro 27:25; Psa 147:8; Son 8:14; Jer 21:5; 2Ch 26:10; Eze 34:14; Joe 3:18, etc.); although quarries were but seldom opened in them for building-stone, and as it seems never mined for the supply of metals. SEE PALESTINE. The frequent occurrence throughout the Scriptures of personification of the natural features of the country is very remarkable. With perhaps four exceptions, all these terms are used in our own language; but, in addition, we speak of the "crown," the "instep," the "foot," the "toe," and the "breast" or "bosom" of a mountain or hill. "Top" is perhaps only a corruption of kopf, "head." Similarly we speak of the " mouth" and the " gorge" (i.e., the "throat") of a ravine, and a " tongue" of land. Compare, too, the word col, "neck," in French. The following are, it is believed, all the words used with this object in relation to mountains or hills:

1. HEAD, ראֹשׁ, rosh, Gen 8:5; Exo 19:20; Deu 34:1; 1Ki 18:42; (A.V. "top").

2. EARS, אִזְנוֹת, aznoth, in Aznoth-Tabor, Jos 19:34; possibly in allusion to some projection on the top of the mountain. The same word is perhaps found in UZZEN-SHERAH.

3. SHOULDER, כָּתֵkatheph, in Deu 23:12; Jos 15:8; Jos 18:16 ("side"); all referring to the hills on or among which Jerusalem is placed. Jos 15:10, "the side of Mount Jearim."

4. SIDE, צִד, tsad (see the word for the "side" of a man in 2Sa 2:16; Eze 4:4, etc.), used in reference to a mountain in 1Sa 23:26; 2Sa 13:34.

5. LOINS or FLANKS, כַּסְלֹת, kisloth, in Chisloth-Tabor, Jos 19:12. It occurs also in the name of a village, probably situated on this part of the mountain, Hak-Kesulloth, הִכְּסֻלּוֹת, i.e., the "loins" (Jos 19:18). SEE CHESULLOTH.

6. RIB, צֵלָע, fsela, only used once, in speaking of the Mount of Olives, 2Sa 16:13, and there translated "side," ἐκ πλευρᾶς τοῦ ὄρους.

7. BACK, שְׁכֶם, sheknm, probably the root of the name of the town Shechem, which may be derived from its situation, as it were on the back of Gerizim.

8. THIGH, יְרֵכָה, yerkeah (see the word for the "thigh" of a man in Jdg 3:16; Jdg 3:21), applied to Mount Ephraim, Jdg 19:1; Jdg 19:18; and to Lebanon, 2Ki 19:23; Isa 37:24; used also for the "sides" of a cave, 1Sa 24:3.

9. The word translated " covert" in 1Sa 25:20 is סֵתֶר, sether, from סָתִר), "to hide," and probably refers to the shrubbery or thicket through which Abigail's path lay. In this passage "hill" should be "'mountain."

The Chaldee טוּר, tur, is the name still given to the Mount of Olives, the Jebel et-Tur.

See the Appendix to professor Stanley's Sinai and Palestine, § 23, also pages 249 and 338, note. SEE TOPOGRAPHICAL TERMS.

In the symbolical language of Scripture, if the allegory or figurative representation is taken from the heavens, the luminaries denote the governing body; if from an animal, the head or horns; if from the earth, a mountain or fortress-and in this case the capital city or residence of the governor is taken for the supreme power. (See Wemyss, Clavis Symbolica,  pages 309-316.) When David says, "Lord, by thy favor thou hast made my mountain to stand strong" (Psa 30:7), he means to express the stability of his kingdom. In like manner the kingdom of the Messiah is described under the figure of a mountain (Isa 2:2; Isa 11:9; Dan 2:35), and its universality by its being the resort of all nations, and by its filling the whole earth. The mystic mountains in the Apocalypse denote kingdoms and states subverted to make room for the Messiah's kingdom (Rev 6:14; Rev 16:20; comp. Psa 46:2). The Chaldeean monarchy is described as a mountain in Jer 51:25; Zec 4:7; and the Targum illustrates the idea by substituting the word "fortress" in the former text. In this view, then, a mountain is the symbol of a kingdom, or of a capital city with its domains, or of a king, which is the same. Mountains are frequently used to signify places of strength, of what kind soever, and to whatsoever use applied (Jer 3:23). Eminences were very commonly chosen for the sites of pagan temples: these became places of asylum, and were looked upon as the fortresses and defenders of the worshippers, by reason of the presence of the false deities in them. On this account mountains were the strongholds of paganism, and therefore in several parts of Scripture they signify idolatrous temples and places of worship (Jer 2:23; Eze 6:2-6; Mic 4:1; comp. Deu 12:2; Jer 2:20; Jer 3:16; Eze 6:3). These temples were also built like forts or towers, as appears from Jdg 9:46; Jdg 9:48-49. (See Gesenius, Comment. on Isaiah 2:316 sq. Gramberg, Die Religionssideen des A.T. pref. page 15 sq.) SEE HIGH PLACE. For the various eminences or mountain districts to which the word har is applied in the O.T., SEE ABARIM; SEE AMANA; SEE OF THE AMALEKITES; SEE OF THE AMORITES; SEE ARARAT; SEE BAALAH; SEE BAAL-HERMON; SEE BASHAN; SEE BETHEL; SEE BETHER; SEE CARMEL; SEE EBAL; SEE EPHRAIM; SEE EPHRON; SEE ESAU; SEE GAASH; SEE GERIZIM; SEE GILBOA; SEE GILEAD; SEE HALAK; SEE HERES; SEE HERMON; SEE HOR; and for those to which tor is prefixed, SEE HOREB; SEE ISRAEL; SEE JEARIM; SEE JUDAH; SEE MIZAR; SEE MORIAH; SEE NAPHTALI; SEE NEBO; SEE OLIVET, or SEE OLIVES; SEE PARAN; SEE PERAZIM; SEE SAMARIA; SEE SEIR; SEE SEPHAR; SEE SHAPHER; SEE SINAI; SEE SION, SEE SIRION, or SEE SHENIR (all names for Hermon); SEE TABOR; SEE ZALMON; SEE ZEMARAIM; SEE ZION.

## Mountagu(e) [or Montagu(e)], Richard[[@Headword:Mountagu(e) [or Montagu(e)], Richard]]

             a learned English prelate, distinguished for his knowledge of primitive Christianity, was born at Dorney, Buckinghamshire, April 13, 1578, and was educated at Eton and at King's College, Cambridge University, of which he was afterwards a fellow. He took holy orders, and quickly rose to distinction. In 1617 he was made archdeacon of Hereford, in 1620 canon of Windsor, and in 1628 was elevated to the episcopate and made bishop of Chichester. In 1638 he was transferred to the see of Norwich. He was an ardent friend of archbishop Laud, and thus was led to write against the Puritans, and to defend the cause of the king and his sacerdotal companion. He therefore became a favorite at court, and the transfer to Norwich is said to have been prompted by Laud, who wished to acknowledge the valuable services of Mountague. Unfortunately, however, this prelate was not only an opponent to Puritanism, but a leaner towards Romanism; and it was even asserted by the moderate churchmen who opposed Laud's course that Mountague was aiming to carry the king, his court and his primate, bodily over to Rome, and to go there himself. He was also a devoted Arminianist, and thus the Calvinists likewise upbraided him, and left no opportunity unimproved against him. He died at Norwich, April 13, 1641. Bishop  Mountague's literary labors are valuable, especially in the field of ecclesiastical antiquities. He assisted Savile in his edition of St. Chrysostom; edited Gregory Nazianzen's In Julianum Invectivae Duae, etc., also Photi Epistolae, and Eusebii Demonstratio, and published several learned theological works and controversial tracts. Among the former are, Analecta Ecclesiasticarum Exercitationum (Lond. 1622): — Apparatus ad Origines Ecclesiasticas (Oxf. 1635, fol.): — De Originibus Ecclesiasticis, etc. (Lond. 1636, fol. 1641): — De Vita Christi Originum Ecclesiasticarum, pars posterior (1640): — The Acts and Monuments of the Church before Christ Incarnate (1642, fol.) — contents: State of the Church before Christ Incarnate; the Prophecies of Jacob and Daniel concerning Messias; the Sibyls; Reign of Herod in Judea; State of Judaea under the Romans; the Succession of the High-priesthood; State of the Jews in Spirituals; their Heroes; the Ancestors and Parents of our Savior. In 1841, 12mo, appeared bishop Mountague's Articles of Inquiry, with a Memoir (q.v.). See Genesis Dict. s.v.; Biog. Brit. s.v.; Fuller's Worthies and his Church Hist. book 11; Heylin, Life of Archbishop Laud, book 2; Harwood, Alumni Etonenses; Hallam, Constit. Hist. of Eng. (7th ed. 1854), 2:62, 69, 70; Collier, Ecclesiastes Hist. 8:7 sq. (J.H.W.)

## Mountain[[@Headword:Mountain]]

             SEE MOUNT.

## Mountain Of The Amorites[[@Headword:Mountain Of The Amorites]]

             (הִר הָאֵֹמרַי; Sept. ὄρος τοῦ Α᾿μοῤῥαίου; Vulg. Mons Amorrhcei), specifically mentioned, Deu 1:19-20 (comp. 44), in reference to the wandering of the Israelites in the desert. It seems to be the range which rises abruptly from the plateau of et-Tih, running from a little S. of W. to the N. of E., and of which the extremities are the Jebel Araif en- Nakah westward, and Jebel el-Mukrah eastward, and from which line the country continues mountainous all the way to Hebron. SEE AMORITE. The particular spot where the Israelites encountered it seems to have been at the present Nukb es-Sufeh. SEE EXODE.

## Mountain, George Jehoshaphat[[@Headword:Mountain, George Jehoshaphat]]

             a noted American ecclesiastic, son of the following, was born in Norwich, England, July 27, 1789, and was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he graduated in 1810. He entered holy orders in 1813, and was appointed evening lecturer in his father's cathedral. In 1814 he was nominated rector of Fredericton, New Brunswick, and in 1817 rector of Quebec and bishop's official. In 1821 he became archdeacon, and in 1825, during a mission to England, he received the degree of D.D. On his return, bishop Stuvard appointed him his examining chaplain, and in 1835 he was sent to England on business connected with the question of the clergy reserves. While there he was appointed bishop of Montreal, and given the entire charge of the Episcopal Church in Lower Canada. He continued to administer the dioceses of Quebec and Montreal till 1850, when he assumed the title of bishop of Quebec. In 1844 he visited the missions on Red River, and furnished a description of his journeys in Songs of the  Wilderness (Lond. 1846). He died in Quebec, January 8, 1863. He was the founder of Bishop's College, Lennoxville, and of the Church Society, spending most of his income for these institutions and for charitable purposes. Some time before his death he declined the dignity of metropolitan of Canada. He published Sermons and Addresses, and a Journal of a North-west American Mission (Lond. 1843). See Am. Church Rev. 1863, page 156.

## Mountain, Jacob[[@Headword:Mountain, Jacob]]

             an Anglican prelate, was born in Norfolk, England, in 1750. He was a descendant of the celebrated Montaigne; his own grandfather was a great- grandson of the French essayist, and was exiled from France during the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. Mountain was educated at Caius College, Cambridge, class of 1774, became fellow in 1779, and, entering holy orders, held important livings in England, among them those of St. Andrew's, Norwich, of Buckden, and of Holbeach, as well as a stall in Lincoln Cathedral. Mr. Pitt was intimately acquainted with him, and that statesman interested himself in the ecclesiastical promotion of his friend, so that in 1793 Mr. Mountain was made bishop of Quebec. He was the first Protestant prelate in the Canadas. He died near Quebec, June 16, 1825. "Bishop Mountain promoted the formation of missions and the erection of churches in all the more populous townships, which he regularly visited — even when age and infirmity rendered so vast and fatiguing a circuit a most arduous and painful undertaking."

## Mountain-Men[[@Headword:Mountain-Men]]

             SEE MEN, THE; SEE SCOTLAND, CHURCH OF.

## Mourges, Mathieu[[@Headword:Mourges, Mathieu]]

             SEE MORGUES.

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

             a French Jesuit noted for his profound erudition, was born at Auvergne about 1642. He became royal professor of mathematics and rhetoric in the Academy of Toulouse, and died there in 1713. Among his best works are, A Parallel between Christian Morality and that of the Ancient Philosophers: — An Explanation of the Theology of the Pythagoreans;  and others of a secular character. See Feller, Dict. historique, s.v.; Moreri, Grand Dict. Hist. s.v.

## Mourn[[@Headword:Mourn]]

             (represented by numerous Heb. and several Gr. words). Orientals are much more demonstrative in the signs of grief than natives of Western countries, as is evinced especially by two marked features:

a. What may be called its studied publicity, and the careful observance of the prescribed ceremonies. Thus Abraham, after the death of Sarah, came, as it were in state, to mourn and weep for her (Gen 23:2). Job, after his misfortunes, "arose, and rent his mantle (meil), and shaved his head, and fell down upon the ground on the ashes" (Job 1:20; Job 2:8); and in like manner his friends "rent every one his mantle, and sprinkled dust upon their heads, and sat down with him on the ground seven days and seven nights" without speaking (Job 2:12-13). We read also of high places, streets, and house-tops as places especially chosen for mourning, not only by Jews, but by other nations (Isa 15:3; Jer 3:21; Jer 48:38; 1Sa 11:4; 1Sa 30:4; 2Sa 15:30).

b. The comparative violence of Oriental mourning — oftentimes, indeed, assumed for effect, and even at times artificial or venal, is evident in several of the forms which Eastern grief assumes. Many of these acts, of course, as being natural, are common to all times and countries, but others are somewhat peculiar. Most of them are spontaneous, being simply the uncontrollable language of emotion; others are purely matters of habit. Yet both these classes of manifestation have their significance and uses, and are not therefore altogether arbitrary. It is not difficult, however, to ascertain the philosophy of mourning. Potter thinks that it consisted in receding as much as possible from ordinary customs and manners, in token that an extraordinary event had happened, and observes that such is the diversity of human customs that the signs of mourning in some nations coincide with those of joy in others (Archceologia Grceca [Lond. 1775], 2:194, 195). Although, no doubt, many modes of mourning are conventional, and originated in caprice, yet there would seem to be physical reasons for certain forms which have so widely and permanently prevailed. We will endeavor to digest the information furnished on this subject by the Scriptures, and contemporaneous as well as modern Writers, referring to  other articles for details on minor or collateral particulars. See Geier, De Hebraeorum Luctu (2d ed. Lips. 1666). SEE GRIEF.

I. Occasions. —

1. Instances of mourning for the dead are most numerous in Scripture. Abraham mourns for Sarah (Gen 23:2); Jacob for Joseph (Gen 37:34-35); the Egyptians for Jacob (Genesis 1, 3-10); the house of Israel for Aaron (Num 20:29), for Moses (Deu 34:8), and for Samuel (1Sa 25:1); David for Abner (2Sa 3:31; 2Sa 3:35); Mary and Martha for their brother Lazarus (John 11); and "devout men" for Stephen (Act 8:2). These are a few examples out of many. SEE BURIAL.

2. Instances of mourning on account of calamities are not few; for example. Job under his multiplied afflictions (Job 1:20-21; Job 2:8); Israel under the threatening of the divine displeasure (Exo 33:4); the Ninevites in view of menaced destruction (Jon 3:5); the tribes of Israel when defeated by Benjamin (Jdg 20:26), and many others. The Lamentations of Jeremiah are illustrative of this point.

3. Mourning in repentance is illustrated by the case of the Ninevites adduced above; by the Israelites on the day of atonement, latterly called the fast (Lev 23:27; Act 27:9), and under the faithful preaching of Samuel (1Sa 7:6); by many references in the Psalms, and the predicted mourning in Zechariah (Zec 12:10-11). On the mourning for Adonis (Eze 8:14), SEE TAMIUZ.

II. Modes. —

1. Weeping appears either as one chief expression of mourning, or as the general name for it. Hence when Deborah, Rebecca's nurse, was buried at Bethel under an oak, the tree was then at least called Allon-bachuth, the oak of weeping (Gen 35:8). The children of Israel were heard to weep by Moses throughout their families, every man in the door of his tent (Num 11:10; comp. 14:1; 25:6). So numerous are the references to tears in the Scriptures as to give the impression that the Orientals had them nearly at command (comp. Psa 6:6). The woman washed our Lord's feet with her tears (Luk 7:38; comp. Sir 28:17). Men, as well as women, wept freely, and even aloud. "Lifted up his voice and wept" is an ordinary mode of expression. Giving vent to them is well known to be one  of the physical alleviations of profound sorrow. It is so universal a sign of mourning that we need not detain the reader with further instances or illustrations, except to remark that the Egyptian monuments have not failed to depict the tears upon the faces of mourners. SEE WEEPING.

2. Loud lamentation is usually and naturally associated with weeping as a sign of grief (Rth 1:9; 1Sa 2:4; 2Sa 3:31; 2Sa 13:36). Nor are Orientals content with mere sobs: their excitableness appears in howls for grief, even amid the solemnities of worship (Joe 1:13; Mic 1:8, etc.). The Egyptians have ever been renowned for the vociferation of their grief; "there was a great cry in Egypt at the death of the first-born" (Exo 12:30). Crying aloud certainly diverts the attention from anguish of mind or body, and the value of moans and shrieks is well known in severe surgical .operations. But in addition to the wail of woe by the immediate bereaved, hired performers were often engaged to swell the lamentation with screams and noisy utterances; and this not merely at the funeral, but immediately after the decease. The first reference to professional mourners occurs in Ecc 12:5 : "The mourners (הִסּוֹפְדַים) go about the streets." (The root of this word, observes Gesenius, signifies "a mournful noise," and he adduces Mic 1:8; Jer 22:18; Jer 34:5). They are certainly alluded to in Jer 9:17-20 : "the mourning women" (probably widows; comp. Psa 78:64; Act 9:39). Another reference to them occurs in 2Ch 35:25 (comp. Josephus, War, 3:9, 5). The greater number of the mourners in ancient Egypt were women, as in the modern East. Mourning for the dead in the East was conducted in a tumultuous manner (Mar 5:38). Even devout men made great lamentations (Act 8:2). Akin to this usage was the custom for friends or passers-by to join in the lamentations of bereaved or afflicted persons (Gen 1:3; Jdg 11:40; Job 2:11; Job 30:25; Job 27:15; Psa 78:64; Jer 9:1; Jer 22:18; 1Ki 14:13; 1Ki 14:18; 1Ch 7:22; 2Ch 35:24-25; Zec 12:11; Luk 7:12; Joh 11:31; Act 8:2; Act 9:39; Rom 12:15). So also in times of general sorrow we find large numbers of persons joining in passionate expressions of grief (Jdg 2:4; Jdg 20:26; 1Sa 28:3; 1Sa 30:4; 2Sa 1:12; Ezr 3:13; Eze 7:16; and the like is mentioned of the priests Joe 2:17; Mal 2:13). Clamor in grief is referred to by Job (Job 19:7; Job 20:28): it is considered a wicked man's portion that his widow shall not weep at his death (Job 27:15). Upon Job's recovery from his afflictions, all his relatives and  acquaintances bemoan and comfort him concerning his past sufferings; which seems to have been a kind of congratulatory mourning, indulged in order to heighten the pleasures of prosperity by recalling associations of adversity (Job 42:11). SEE LAMENTATION.

3. Personal Disfigurement. — In all the other acts expressive of grief the idea of self-mortification seems to prevail, whether by injuries to the person or neglect of it, by mean clothing, by unusual and humiliating attitudes, or other marks of individual abasement, intended chiefly for the public eye. Some of the more violent forms have perhaps a natural, if not a remedial or alleviating character. Shaving the head may be a dictate of nature to relieve the excited brain. Plucking the hair is well calculated to assuage the action of some particular organs, to which the sensations of the individual may be a sufficient guide. Beating the breast may relieve the heart, oppressed with a tumultuous circulation. Cutting may be the effect of nature's indication of bleeding. Tearing and rending seem to palliate nervous irritation, etc. But the greater part of the practices under this head have their origin in custom, or some supposed fitness to a state of grief. Among the particular forms observed the following may be mentioned:

a. Rending the clothes (Gen 37:29; Gen 37:34; Gen 44:13; 2Ch 34:27; Isa 36:22; Jer 36:24 [where the absence of the form is to be noted]; 41:5; 2Sa 3:31; 2Sa 15:32; Jos 7:6; Joe 2:13; Ezr 9:5; 2Ki 5:7; 2Ki 11:14; Mat 26:65, ἱμάτιον; Mar 14:63, χιτών). SEE CLOTHING.

b. Dressing in sackcloth (Gen 37:34; 2Sa 3:31; 2Sa 21:10; Psa 35:13; Isa 37:1; Joe 1:8; Joe 1:13; Amo 8:10; Jon 3:8, man and beast; Job 16:15; Est 4:3-4; Jer 6:26; Lam 2:10; 1Ki 21:27). SEE SACKCLOTH.

c. Ashes, dust, or earth sprinkled on the person (2Sa 13:19; 2Sa 15:32; Jos 7:6; Est 4:1; Est 4:3; Jer 6:26; Job 2:12; Job 16:15; Job 42:6; Isa 61:3; Rev 18:19). SEE ASHES.

d. Black or sad-colored garments (2Sa 14:2; Jer 8:21; Psa 38:6; Psa 42:9; Psa 43:2; Mal 3:14, marg.). SEE COLOR.

e. Removal of ornaments or neglect of person (Deu 21:12-13; Exo 33:4; 2Sa 14:2; 2Sa 19:24; Eze 26:16; Dan 10:3; Mat 6:16-17). See NAIL.

f. Shaving the head, plucking out the hair of the head or, beard (Lev 10:6; 2Sa 19:24; Ezr 9:3; Job 1:20; Jer 7:29; Jer 16:6). SEE HAIR.

g. Laying bare some part of the body: Isaiah himself naked and barefoot (Isa 20:2), the Egyptian and Ethiopian captives (ib. Isa 20:4; Isa 47:2; Isa 1:6; Jer 13:22; Jer 13:26; Nah 3:5; Mic 1:11; Amo 8:10). SEE NAKED.

h. Fasting or abstinence in meat and drink (2Sa 1:12; 2Sa 3:35; 2Sa 12:16; 2Sa 12:22; 1Sa 31:13; Ezr 10:6; Neh 1:4; Dan 10:3; Dan 6:18; Joe 1:14; Joe 2:12; Eze 24:17; Zec 7:5, a periodical fast during captivity; 1Ki 21:9; 1Ki 21:12; Isa 58:3-5; Isa 24:7; Isa 24:9; Isa 24:11; Mal 3:14; Jer 36:9; Jon 3:5; Jon 3:7 [of Nineveh]; Jdg 20:26; 2Ch 20:3; Ezr 8:21; Mat 9:14-15). SEE FASTING.

i. In the same direction, diminution in offerings to God, and prohibition to partake in sacrificial food (Lev 7:20; Deu 26:14; Hos 9:4; Joe 1:9; Joe 1:13; Joe 1:16).

k. Covering the " upper lip," i.e., the lower part of the face, and sometimes the head, in token of silence; specially in the case of the leper (Lev 13:45; 2Sa 15:30; 2Sa 19:4; Jer 14:4; Eze 24:17; Mic 3:7).

l. Cutting the flesh (Jer 16:6-7; Jer 41:5). SEE CUTTING (in the flesh).

m. The sitting or lying posture in silence indicative of grief (Gen 23:3; Jdg 20:26 : 2Sa 12:16; 2Sa 13:31; Job 1:20; Job 2:13; Ezr 9:3; Lam 2:10; Isa 3:26); also bowing down the head (Lam 2:10), and lifting up the hands (Psa 141:2; Lam 1:17; Ezr 9:5). SEE ATTITUDE.

Some of these outward expressions of mourning were usual among the heathen, but forbidden to the Israelits, e.g. making cuttings in the flesh (Lev 19:28), which seems to have been a custom of the votaries of Baal (1Ki 18:28); "making baldness between the eyes for the dead" (Deu 14:1), i.e., shaving the eyebrows and eyelids, and the fore-part of the head, which was, no doubt, an idolatrous custom. The priests were forbidden to "defile themselves for the dead" by any outward  expression of mourning, except for their near relatives (Lev 21:1); and the high-priest even for these (Lev 21:10-11), under which restriction Nazarites also came (Num 6:7).

4. Formal Celebrations. — Besides and in connection with the funeral there were certain still more public usages indicative of grief, as noticed in the Scriptures:

(1.) Mourning for the dead in the earliest times was confined to the relatives and friends of the deceased; but in later times hired mourners, both men and women, were employed. Thus we are told that the "singing men and singing women spake of Josiah in their lamentations" (2Ch 35:25). In accordance with this the Lord says to the JeWs, when threatening heavy judgments for their sins-judgments calling for universal mourning: "Call for the mourning women that they may come,... let them make haste, and take up a wailing for us" (Jer 9:17). At first, most probably, hired mourners were called in to help to swell the tide of real sorrow. but afterwards they became a mere formal pageant, demanded by pride and custom rather than sorrow. (See above.) Mourning for the dead became a profession, learned and paid for, like any other; and the practice of it often became very boisterous and tumultuous. Hence we read of the "minstrels and people making a noise" in the house of Jairus (Mat 9:23), giving one the idea of a scene resembling an "Irish wake." SEE MINSTREL.

(2.) On such occasions neighbors and friends provided food for the mourners (2Sa 3:35; Jer 16:7; comp. Eze 24:17); this was called "the bread of bitterness," "the cup of consolation." See Garman, De pane lugentium (Vitemb. 1708). In later times the Jews had a custom of giving bread to the poor at funerals, and leaving it for their use at tombs, graves, etc., which resembles the Roman visceratio (Tob 4:17; Sir 30:8). Women went to tombs to indulge their grief (Joh 11:31).

(3.) The period of mourning varied. In the case: of Jacob it was seventy days (Gen 1:3); of Aaron (Num 20:29) and Moses (Deu 34:8), thirty; a further period of seven days in Jacob's case (Genesis , 10); seven days for Saul, which may have been an abridged period in time of national danger (1Sa 31:13).  Excessive grief in the case of an individual may be noticed in 2Sa 3:16; Jer 31:15; and the same hypocritically in Jer 41:6.

The first complete description of mourning for the dead occurs in 2Sa 3:31-35, where David commands Joab and all the people that were with him to rend their clothes, gird themselves with sackcloth; and mourn for Abner; and David himself followed the bier, and they buried Abner in Hebron; and the king lifted up his voice and wept at the grave of Abner, and all the people wept, and David fasted two days, and wrote a lamentation for the deceased. Elegies were composed by the prophets on several disastrous occasions (Eze 26:1-18; Eze 27:1-36; Amo 5:1, etc.). The incident of Jephthah's daughter is too uncertain to afford any index to the modes of mourning at that aera. It appears that she was allowed two months to bewail her virginity with her companions, and that the Jewish women of that country went somewhere yearly to lament or celebrate her (Jdg 11:37-40). SEE JEPHTHAI.

III. Illustrations of these Scriptural Usages from Contemporary and Later Sources. —

1. Similar practices are noticed in the Apocryphal books:

a. Weeping, fasting, rending clothes, sackcloth, ashes or earth on head (1Ma 2:14; 1Ma 3:47; 1Ma 4:39; 1Ma 5:14; 1Ma 11:71; 1Ma 13:45; 2Ma 3:19; 2Ma 10:25; 2Ma 14:15; Jdt 4:10-11; Jdt 8:5-6; Jdt 9:1; Jdt 14:19 [Assyrians]; 10:2, 3; 3Ma 4:6; 2Es 10:4; Esth. 14:2);

b. Funeral feast with wailing (Bar 6:32 : also Tob 4:17; see in reproof of the practice, Augustine, Civ. D. 8:27);

c. Period of mourning (Jdt 8:6; Sir 22:12 [seven days, so also perhaps 2Es 5:20]; Bel and Dragon, verse 40);

d. Priests ministering in sackcloth and ashes, the altar dressed in sackcloth (Jdt 4:11; Jdt 4:14-15);

e. Idol priests with clothes rent, head and beard shorn, and head bare (Bar 6:31).

2. In Josephus's writings, these notices are in the main confirmed, and in some cases enlarged:

a. Tearing hair and beating breast (Ant. 16:7, 5; 15:3,9);

b. Sackcloth and ashes (Ant. 20:6,1; 19:8, 2; Wis 2:12; Wis 2:5); clothes rent (Wis 2:15; Wis 2:4);

c. Seven days' mourning for a father (Ant. 17:8, 4; War, 2:1, 1) for thirty days (War, 3:9, 5);

d. Those who met a funeral required to join it (Rev 2:26; see Luk 7:12, and Rom 12:15);

e. Flute-players at a funeral ( War, 3:9, 5).

3. The Mishna prescribes seven days' mourning for a father, a mother, son, daughter, brother, sister, or wife (Bartenora, on Moed Kat. 3:7). Rending garments is regularly graduated according to the degree of relationship. For a father or mother the garment was to be rent, but not with an instrument, so as to show the breast; to be sewn up roughly after thirty days, but never closed. The same for one's own teacher in the law, but for other relatives a palm breadth of the upper garment to suffice, to be sewn up roughly after seven days and fully closed after thirty days (Moed Kat. 3:7; Shabb. 13:3; Carpzov, App. Bib. page 650). Friendly mourners were to sit on the ground, not on the bed (see Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. on Joh 11:19). On certain days the lamentation was to be only partial (Moed Kat l.c.). For a wife there was to be at least one hired mourner and two pipers (Kefuboth, 4:4).

4. When we turn to heathen writers we find similar usages prevailing among various nations of antiquity. Herodotus, speaking of the Egyptians, says, "When a man of any account dies, all the womankind among his relatives proceed to smear their heads and faces with mud. They then leave the corpse in the house, and parade the city with their breasts exposed, beating themselves as they go, and in this they are joined by all the women belonging to the family. In like manner the men also meet them from opposite quarters, naked to the waist and beating themselves" (Herod. 2:85). He also mentions seventy days as the period of embalming (ibid. 86). This doubtless includes the whole mourning period. Diodorus, speaking of a king's death, mentions rending of garments, suspension of sacrifices, heads smeared with clay, and breasts bared, and says men and women go about in companies of 200 or 300, making a wailing twice a dayεὐρύθμως μετ᾿ ὠδῆς. They abstain from flesh, wheat bread, wine, the bath, dainties, and in general all pleasure; do not lie on beds, but lament as for an only child during seventy-two days. On the last day a sort of trial was held of  the merits of the deceased, and, according to the verdict pronounced by the acclamations of the crowd, he was treated with funeral honors, or the contrary (Diod. Sic. 1:72). Similar usages prevailed in the case of private persons (ibid. 91, 92). The Egyptian paintings confirm these accounts as to the exposure of the person, the beating, and the throwing clay or mud upon the head; and women are represented who appear to be hired mourners (Long, Eg. Ant. 2:154-159; Wilkinson, Anc. Eg. 2:356-387). Herodotus also mentions the Persian custom of rending the garments with wailing, and also cutting off the hair on occasions of death or calamity. The last, he says, was also usual among the Scythians (Herod. 2:66; 8:99; 9:24; 4:71).

Lucian, in his discourse concerning Greek mourning, speaks of tearing the hair and flesh, and wailing, and beating the breast to the sound of a flute, burial of slaves, horses, and ornaments as likely to be useful to the deceased, and the practice for relatives to endeavor to persuade the parents of the deceased to partake of the funeral-feast (περίδειπενον) by way of recruiting themselves after their three days' fast (De Luctu, 2:303, 305, 307, ed. Amsterdam). Plutarch mentions that the Greeks regarded all mourners as unclean, and that women in mourning cut their hair, but the men let it grow. Of the Romans, in carrying corpses of parents to the grave, the sons, he says, cover their heads, but the daughters uncover them, contrary to their custom in each case (Quaest. Rom. 7:74, 82, ed. Reiske). Greeks and Romans both made use of hired mourners, preficae, who accompanied the funeral procession with chants or songs (Horace, Ars Poet. 429). Flowers and perfumes were also thrown on the graves (Ovid, Fast. 6:660; Trist. 5:1,47; Plato, Legg. 7:9). The preficae seem to be the predecessors of the "mutes" of modern funerals.

5. With the practices above mentioned, modern Oriental customs in great measure agree. D'Arvieux says Arab men are silent in grief, but the women scream, tear their hair, hands, and face, and throw earth or sand on their heads. The older women wear a blue veil and an old abbe by way of mourning garments. They also sing the praises of the deceased (Trav. pages 269, 270). Niebuhr says both Mohammedans and Christians in Egypt hire wailing women, and wail at stated times (Voy. 1:150). Burckhardt says the women of Atbara, in Nubia, shave their heads on the death of their nearest relatives, a custom prevalent also among several of the peasant tribes of Upper Egypt. In Barbary on a death they usually kill a sheep, a cow, or a camel. He also mentions wailing women, and a man in distress besmearing his face with dirt and dust in token of grief (Nubia, pages 176,  226, 374). Speaking of the Arab tribes of Upper Egypt, he says, "I have seen the female relations of a deceased man dance before his house with sticks and lances in their hands, and behaving like furious soldiers" (Notes on Bed. 1:280). Shaw says of the Arabs of Barbary, after a funeral the female relations during the space of two or three months go once a week to weep over the grave and offer eatables (see Sir 30:18). He also mentions mourning women (Trav. pages 220, 242). "In Oman," Wellsted says, "there are no hired mourning women, but the females from the neighborhood assemble after a funeral and continue for eight days, from sunrise to sunset, to utter loud lamentations" (Trav. 1:216). In the Arabian Nights are frequent allusions to similar practices, as rending clothes, throwing dust on the head, cutting off the hair, loud exclamation, visits to the tomb, plucking the hair and beard (1:65, 263, 297, 358, 518; 2:237, 354,409).

They also mention ten days and forty days as periods of mourning (1:427; 2:409). Sir J. Chardin, speaking of Persia, says the tombs are visited periodically by women (Voy. 6:489). He speaks also of the tumult at a death (ibid. 482). Mourning lasts forty days: for eight days a fast is observed, and visits are paid by friends to the bereaved relatives; on the ninth day the men go to the bath, shave the head and beard, and return the visits, but the lamentation continues two or three times a week till the fortieth day. The mourning garments are dark-colored, but never black (ibid. 481). Russell, speaking of the Turks at Aleppo, says, "The instant the death takes place, the women who are in the chamber give the alarm by shrieking as if distracted, and are joined by all the other females in the harem. This conclamation is termed the wulwaly (Heb. יָלִל, Gr. ὀλολύζω, ἀλαλάζω, Lat. ejulo, ululo, an onomatopoetic word common to many languages. See Gesen. page 596; Schoebel, Anal-Constit. page 54; and Russell, volume 1, note 83, chiefly from Schultens): it is so shrill as to be heard, especially in the night, at a prodigious distance. The men disapprove of and take no share in it; they drop a few tears, assume a resigned silence, and retire in private. Some of the near female relations, when apprised of what has happened, repair to the house, and the wulwaly, which had paused for some time, is renewed upon the entrance of each visitant into the harem" (Aleppo, 1:306). He also mentions professional mourners, visits to the grave on the third, seventh, and fortieth days, prayers at the tomb, flowers strewn, and food distributed to the poor. At these visits the shriek of wailing is renewed; the chief mourner appeals to the deceased, and reproaches him fondly for his departure. The men make no change in their dress; the women lay aside their jewels, dress in their plainest garments,  and wear on the head a handkerchief of a dusky color. They usually mourn twelve months for a husband and six for a father (ibid. 311, 312). Of the Jews he says the conclamation is practiced by the women, but hired mourners are seldom called in to assist at the wulwaly. Both sexes make some alteration in dress by way of mourning. The women lay aside their jewels, the men make a small rent in their outer vestment (ibid. 2:86, 87). Lane, speaking of the modern Egyptians, says, “After death the women of the family raise cries of lamentation called welweleh or wilwai, uttering the most piercing shrieks, and calling upon the name of the deceased, 'Oh, my master! Oh, my resource! Oh, my misfortune! Oh, my glory' (see Jer 22:18). The females of the neighborhood come to join with them in this conclamation: generally, also, the family send for two or more neddabehs, or public wailing women. Each brings a tambourine, and beating them they exclaim, 'Alas, for him.' The female relatives, domestics, and friends, with their hair dishevelled, and sometimes with rent clothes, beating their faces, cry in like manner, 'Alas, for him!' These make no alteration in dress, but women, in some cases, dye their dress, head-veils, and handkerchiefs of a dark-blue color. They visit the tombs at stated periods" (Mod. Eg. 3:152, 171, 196). Wealthy families in Cairo have in the burial-grounds regularly furnished houses of mourning, to which the females repair at stated periods to bewail their dead.

The art of mourning is only to be acquired by long practice, and regular professors of it are usually hired on the occasion of a death by the wealthier classes (Mrs. Poole, Englishw. in Egypt, 2:100). Dr. Wolff mentions the wailing over the dead in Abyssinia (Autobiog. 2:273). Pietro della Valle mentions a practice among the Jews of burning perfumes at the site of Abraham's tomb at Hebron (see 2Ch 16:14; 2Ch 21:19; Jer 34:5; P. della Valle, Viaggi, 1:306).

The customs of the. North American Indians also resemble those which have been described in many particulars. as the howling and wailing, and speeches to the dead; among some tribes the practice of piercing the flesh with arrows or sharp stones, visits to the place of the dead (Carver, Travels, page 401; Bancroft, Hist. of the United States, 2:912; Catlin, N.A. Indians, 1:90). The former and present customs of the Welsh, Irish, and Highlanders at funerals may also be cited as similar in several respects, e.g. wailing and howling, watching with the corpse, funeral entertainments ("funeral baked meats"), flowers on the grave, days of visiting the grave (Brand, Pop. Antiq. 2:128, etc.; Harmer, Obs. 3:40). One of the most  remarkable instances of traditional customary lamentation is found in the weekly wailing of the Jews at Jerusalem at a spot as near to the Temple as could be obtained. SEE JERUSALEM. This custom, noticed by St. Jerome, is alluded to by Benjamin of Tudela, and exists to the present day. (Jerome, Ad Sophon. 1:15; Ad Paulam, Ep. 39; Early Trav. in Pal. page 83; Raumer, Palastina, page 293; Martineau, Eastern Life, page 471; Robinson, 1:237.) SEE FUNERAL.

## Mourners[[@Headword:Mourners]]

             SEE FLENTES; SEE PENITENTS.

## Mourning, Christian[[@Headword:Mourning, Christian]]

             — Among the early Christians all immoderate grief for the dead was considered inconsistent with Christian hope; and hence the custom which prevailed among the Jews and Romans of hiring women to make lamentation at funerals was severely reprobated. There was not, however, the indulgence of any stoical apathy, but a becoming sorrow was evinced by Christians. Strong disapprobation of the practice of wearing black is expressed by some of the fathers; nevertheless it became prevalent, especially in the East. Some Christians imitated the heathen custom of repeating the mourning on the third, seventh, and ninth days, and some even added others. In the Apostolical Constitutions, the author takes notice of the repetition of this funeral-office on the third, ninth, and fortieth days; he says: "Let the third day be observed for the dead with psalms and lessons and prayers, because Christ on the third day rose again from the dead; and let the ninth be observed in remembrance of the living and the dead; and also the fortieth day, according to the ancient manner of the Israelites' mourning for Moses forty days." On the anniversary days of commemorating the dead they were accustomed to make a common feast or entertainment, inviting both clergy and people, but especially the poor, the widows and orphans, that it might be not only a memorial to the dead, but, according to Origen, "an odor of a sweet smell to God." SEE FUNERAL MOURNING-WEEDS, a particular dress worn during a certain period to express grief, especially for the decease of friends.

The usages in this respect have varied much at different times and in different countries. Among the Jews, the duration of mourning for the dead was generally seven, but sometimes protracted to thirty days; and the garments were torn or squalid, or consisted of sackcloth (q.v.). The Jews of our day observe mourning ceremonies to a very considerable extent prescribed by the traditions of the rabbins. On the loss of a very near relative they seclude themselves from society for eight days, praying all waking hours for the safety of the soul of the departed friend, and every year the day of decease  is observed as a day on which prayer for the departed must be observed. Among the Greeks, the period was thirty days, except in Sparta, where it was limited to ten. The relatives of the deceased secluded themselves from the public eye, wore a coarse black dress, and in ancient times cut off their hair as a sign of grief. Among the Romans, the color of mourning for both sexes was black or dark blue under the republic; under the empire, the women wore white, black continuing to be the color for men, who did not cut off the hair or beard as in Greece. Men wore their mourning only a few days; women a year, when for a husband or parent. The time of mourning was often shortened by a victory or other happy public event, the birth of a child, or the occurrence of a family festival. A public calamity, such as a defeat, or the death of an emperor or person of note, occasioned a public mourning, which involved a total cessation of business, called Justitium. In modern Europe, the ordinary color for mourning is black; in Turkey, violet; in China, white; in Egypt, yellow; in Ethiopia, brown. It was white in Spain until 1498. White is supposed to denote purity; yellow, that death is the end of all human hopes, as leaves when they fall, and flowers when they fade, become yellow; brown denotes the earth, whither the dead return; black, the privation of life, as being the privation of light; blue expresses the happiness which it is hoped the deceased enjoys; and purple or violet, sorrow on the one side and hope on the other, as being a mixture of black and blue. .Mourning is worn of different depth, and for different periods of time, according to the nearness of relationship of the deceased. On the death of a sovereign or member of the reigning house, a court mourning is ordered; and in many countries it is usual at the same time to recommend the adoption of a general mourning. In Scotch law, if a husband die, whether solvent or insolvent, the widow will be entitled to a preferred payment out of the assets for mournings suitable to his rank. The same privilege applies to mournings for such of the children as are to assist at the funeral (Chambers). The propriety of following the customs prevalent on this point has been of late very extensively called in question by Christians. Many individuals and religious bodies have objected against it:

1, that it is a useless ceremony;

2, that it involves needless expense, especially to the poor;

3, that the bustle of preparing it interferes with the moral and religious purposes of affliction. SEE GRIEF.

## Mouse[[@Headword:Mouse]]

             (עִכְבָּר, akbar', according to Bochart, Hieroz. 1:1017, a compound of the Chald. עֲכִל, to devour, and בִּר, afield, from its ravages; but according to Gesenius, Thes. Heb. page 508, from the Arab. for swift digger; Gr. μῦς), by which especially the field-mouse (Mishna, Moed Katon, 1:4) — a species, on account of its voracity and rapid increase, very injurious to crops (Aristotle, Anim. 6:37; Strabo, 3:165; AElian, Anim. 6:41; Pliny, 10:85; comp. Russell, Aleppo, 2:59) — appears to be designated in 1Sa 6:4 sq. SEE HEMORRHOID. It was an unclean animal (Lev 11:29), in which passage, however, all the species of the genus mus are doubtless included (Bochart, Hieroz. 2:429 sq.). But in Isa 66:7, a different creature seems to be denoted, apparently some esculent species of glis. or dormouse (see Varro, R.R. 2:15); or perhaps the leaping variety of mouse, mus jaculus, or jerboa, which is designated in Arabic by a name corresponding to the Heb. akbar, although this animal has often been identified with the Heb. shaphan, or "coney." SEE MOLE.

It is likely that the Hebrews extended the acceptation of the word akbar in the same manner as was the familiar custom of the Greeks, and still more of the Romans, who included within their term mus insectivore of the genus sorex, that is "shrews;" carnivora, among which was the Mustela erminea, "stoat" or "ermine," their Mnusponticus; and in the systematic order Rodentia, the mnusidce contain Myoxus flis, or fat dormouse; Dipus jaculus, or Egyptian jerboa; Mus, rats and mice properly so called, constituting several modern genera; and cricetus, or hamster, which includes the marmot or Roman Mus Alpinus. In the above texts, those in 1 Samuel 6 apparently refer to the shorttailed field-mouse, which is still the most destructive animal to the harvests of Syria (see William of Tyre, Gesta Dei, page 823), and is most likely the species noticed in antiquity and during the crusades; for, had they been jerboas in shape and resembled miniature kangaroos, we would expect William of Tyre to have mentioned the peculiar form of the destroyers, which was then unknown to Western Europe; whereas, they being of species or appearance common to the Latin  nations, no particulars were required. But in Leviticus and Isaiah, where the mouse is declared an unclean animal, the species most accessible and likely to invite the appetite of nations who, like the Arabs, were apt to covet all kinds of animals, even when expressly forbidden, were no doubt the hamster and the dormouse; and both are still eaten in common with the jerboa by the Bedouins, who are but too often driven to extremity by actual want of food. The common field-vole, often called the short-tailed field-mouse, is the campagnol of the French, and the Arvicola agrestis of modern zoologists. It is about the size of the house-mouse, to which it bears a general resemblance, but is easily distinguished by its larger head, its short ears and tail, its stouter form, and its reddish color, no less than by its habits (Fairbairn). "Of all the smaller rodentia which are injurious, both in the fields and in the woods, there is not," says Prof. Bell (Hist. Brit. Quad. page 325), "one which produces such extensive destruction as this little animal, when its increase, as is sometimes the case, becomes multitudinous." The ancient writers frequently speak of the great ravages committed by mice. Herodotus (2:141) ascribes the loss of Sennacherib's army to mice, which in the night-time gnawed through the bow-strings and shield-straps. See generally Bochart, Hieroz. 2:448 sq.

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

             (called also Philippe Mus and Philippe Mussche), a Belgian prelate and historian, was born about 1215 at Ghent, in East Flanders, and, after having taken holy orders, successively became canon (1242) and chancellor of the cathedral of Tournay, and in 1274 bishop of that city. He died at Tournay, December 24, 1281 or 1283. Mouskes is the author of a rhyned chronicle, containing in 31,286 French verses the whole history of France, from the elopement of the fabulous Greek Helen with the Trojan prince Paris (the then usual beginning of such a narrative) up to the year A.D. 1242. There is only one MS. of this poem known, and it is at present preserved in the National Library at Paris, marked as No. 9634, small folio, written on parchment in two columns. It was published at Brussels (1836- 38, 2 volumes, 4to) under the auspices of the baron De Reiffenberg, who enriched the work with an introduction, a commentary, and appendices, all of which show much research and scholarship. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Mouson, Ecclesiastical Council Of[[@Headword:Mouson, Ecclesiastical Council Of]]

             (Concilium Mosomense). Two such were held in the 10th century. The first, held January 13, 948, was composed of Ruotbert, archbishop of Treves, his suffragans, and some other bishops, who, when thus assembled, decreed that AnFtaud should keep possession of the see of Rheims; and that Hugo, who refused to appear at the council, as he had previously refused at Verdun, should be deprived of it until he should appear before the general council (appointed to be held August 1) and justify himself. See Conc. Verdua, 947; Labbe, Conc. 9:622.

Another was held June 2, 995. It was called by pope John XV, who was offended at the deposition of Arnulphus and the election of Gerbert (afterwards pope Sylvester II) to the see of Rheims, and therefore sent Leo, abbot of St. Bonifacius, into France as his legate, who assembled this council. No other prelates, however, attended but the archbishop of Treves, and the bishops of Verdun, Liege, and Munster, all of them from Germany. The legate took his seat in the midst of them, and archbishop Gerbert, being the party accused, was placed opposite to him. Gerbert defended himself with eloquence, and declared that he had been raised to the archbishopric without his own concurrence. The sentence of the council was that he should abstain from the exercise of his archiepiscopal and sacerdotal functions until the matter should have been brought before the Synod of Rheims, convoked for the following Jilvy. It, however, was not held so early, and while Hugh Capet lived Gerbert remained archbishop, and Arnulphus a prisoner at Orleans. See Labbl, Cone. 9:747.

## Mouth[[@Headword:Mouth]]

             (prop. פֶּה, peh; Gr. στόμα), besides its ordinary applications, was used in the following idiomatic phrases by the Hebrews (see Gesenius, Heb. Lex. s.v,): "Heavy-mouthed," that is, slow of speech, and so translated in Exo 4:10; " smooth mouth" (Psa 55:21), that is, a flattering mouth; so also "a mouth of deceit" (Psa 109:2). The following are also remarkable phrases: "To speak with one mouth to mouth," that is, in person, without the intervention of an interpreter (Num 12:8; comp. 1Ki 8:15; Jer 32:4); "With one mouth," that is, with one voice or consent (Jos 9:2; 1Ki 22:13; 2Ch 18:12); "With the whole mouth," that is, with the utmost strength of voice (Job 19:16; Psa 66:17); "To put words into one's mouth," that is,  to suggest what one shall say (Exo 4:15; Num 22:38; Num 23:5; Num 23:12; 2Sa 14:19, etc.); "To be in one's mouth" is to be often spoken of, as a law, etc. (Exo 13:9; comp. Psa 5:10; Psa 38:15). The Hebrew also says, "upon the mouth," where we say, and indeed our translation says, in or into the mouth (e.g. Nah 3:12); that which is spoken is also said to be "upon the mouth," where we should say, "upon the lips" (as in 2Sa 13:32). "To lay the hand upon the mouth" is to be silent (Jdg 18:19; Job 21:5; Job 40:4; comp. Pro 30:32), just as we lay the finger on the mouth to enjoin silence. "To write from the mouth of any one" is to do so from his dictation (Jer 36:4; Jer 36:27; Jer 36:32; Jer 45:1). The word of God, or, literally, " the word that proceeds out of his mouth," signifies the actions of God's providence, his commands, whereby he rules the world, and brings all things to his purpose (Isaiah 4:11). To "inquire at the mouth of the Lord" is to consult him (Jos 19:14). To "set their mouth against the heavens" is to speak arrogantly, insolently, and blasphemously of God (Psa 73:9). "He shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked," are expressions which denote the sovereign authority and absolute power of the Messiah (Isa 10:4). (See Wemyss, Clavis Symbolica, s.v.) The mouth, as the organ of speech, also signifies the words that proceed out of it, which in the sacred style are the same as commands and actions, because they imply the effects of the thoughts; words and commands being the means used to communicate decrees to those who are to execute them. Instances of this abound in Scripture, in various shades of application; but few of them are preserved in translation. Thus (Gen 45:12), "according to the commandment of Pharaoh," is in the original, "according to the mouth of Pharaoh" (comp., among numerous other examples, Num 3:16; Job 39:27; Ecc 8:2). Hence, for a person or thing to come out of the mouth of another is to be constituted or commanded to become an agent or minister under a superior power; this is frequent in the Apocalypse (Rev 16:13-14; Rev 1:16; Rev 11:4-5; Rev 12:15; Rev 9:19). The term mouth is not only applied to a speech or words, but to the speaker (Exo 4:16; Jer 15:19), in which sense it has a near equivalent in our expression "mouthpiece."

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

             a French composer of Church music, flourished in the 16th century. He was first brought into notice about the opening of that age under the reign of Louis XII. Under Francis I he enjoyed royal protection and support, and  as musical director of the royal chapel Mouton was encouraged to bring out his own compositions. He wrote considerably, and some of his productions were suffered dedication to pope Leo X. Mouton died before 1532. His Masses are justly celebrated. Five of these were published by Petrucci in 1508. Several of his compositions are preserved at Rome and Munich. His motets and madrigals are also circulated. As a composer, Mouton possessed more than the usual attainments. He was master of music as a science. His compositions are simple and natural, and betray the hand of a skilful artist. See Burney, Genesis Hist. of Music; Forkel, Gesch. d. Musik; Fites, Biographie Universelle des Musiciens; Patria, Hist. de l'Art musical en France.

## Mouton, Jean Baptiste Sylvain[[@Headword:Mouton, Jean Baptiste Sylvain]]

             a noted French ecclesiastic and devoted adherent to the Jansenistic movement, was born in 1740 at Charite-surLoire. Having entered the service of the Church, he ardently devoted himself to bring about ecclesiastical reforms, and zealously embraced the Jansenistic cause as one sure to result favorably for the purity of the Church. He was, however, persecuted on that account. and finally quitted his native country and went over to Holland, and there labored with the Jansenists until his death, June 13, 1803, at Utrecht. He published Nouvelles Ecclesiastiques, first at Paris and afterwards at Utrecht. See Qudrard, La France Litteraire, s.v.; Mordri, Dict. Hist. s.v.

## Movable (and Immovable) Feasts[[@Headword:Movable (and Immovable) Feasts]]

             The feasts kept in the Christian Church are called movable and immovable, according as they fall, always on the same day in the calendar in each year, as the saints' days; or depend on other circumstances, as Easter. and the feasts calculated from Easter. The Book of Common Prayer contains several tables for calculating Easter, and the following rules to know when the movable feasts and holy-days begin: Easter Day, on which the rest depend, is always the first Sunday after the full moon which happens upon or next after the twenty-first day of March; and if the full moon happens upon a Sunday, Easter Day is the Sunday after. Advent Sunday is always the nearest Sunday to the feast of St. Andrew, whether before or after.

Septuagesima            Nine Weeks

Sexagesima   Sunday          Eight Weeks before

Quinlquagesimna is           Seven Weeks Easter.

Quadragesima            Six Weeks

Roogation Sunday        Five Weeks

Ascension Day is        Forty Days after

Whit Sunday       Seven Weeks Easter.

Trinity Sunday          Eight Weeks

SEE FEASTS.

## Movers, Franz Karl[[@Headword:Movers, Franz Karl]]

             a German Roman Catholic theologian and Orientalist, was born, of humble but honorable parentage, at Kosfeld, Rhenish Prussia, July 17, 1806. Franz Karl studied Orientalia and theology at Minster; was ordained priest; in 1830 became vicar at Rath, near Deutz; in 1833 priest at Berkum, near Godesberg, and there remained until 1839, when he was appointed professor of Old-Testament theology in the Roman Catholic faculty of Breslau University, which office he held till his death, Sept. 28,1856. His principal work, Die Phonizier, presents a comprehensive view of Phoenician history. The first volume (Breslau, 1840) treats of the religion and the divinities of the Phoenicians; the second volume bears the title of Das Phonizische Alterthum, and is divided into parts, embracing the political history (1849) and the colonial history (1850) of that nation. He further enriched this field of knowledge by the publication of two volumes of Phoenician texts (1845-47), and wrote the article Phonicier for Ersch u. Gruber's Encyklopadie (§ 3, volume 24). Among his other works worth mentioning are, Kritische Untersuchungen i. d. Alttestamentliche Chronik (Bonn, 1834): — De utriusque recensionis vaticiniorum Jeremiae indole et origine (Hamb. 1837): — Loci quidam historie Veteris Testamenti illustrati (Bresl. 1843): — Zustand der katholisch-theol. Facultat an der Universitat Brieslau (1847). He was also a frequent and esteemed contributor to the periodical literature of Germany, especially the philosophical and theological quarterlies; among which that of his own Church, the Zeitschriftfur Philosoph. u. Katholische Theologie, enjoyed a very large number of valuable articles. (J.H.W.)

## Mowes, Heinrich[[@Headword:Mowes, Heinrich]]

             a Lutheran clergyman who flourished in Germany in the early part of this century, was settled near Magdeburg, Prussia. His life was marked by severe afflictions, which he bore with heroic faith. He died in 1831. He will  be known to the English reader principally from his triumphant hymn, "Hallelujah! I believe," translated in Hymns from the Land of Luther.

## Mowing[[@Headword:Mowing]]

             (גֵּז, gez, Vulg. tonsio, Amo 7:1; the Sept. reads Γώγ ὁ βασιλεύς, either from a various reading or a confusion of the letters זand ג), a word signifying also a shorn fleece, and rendered in Psa 72:6, "mown grass." As the great heat of the climate in Palestine and other similarly situated countries soon dries up the herbage itself, hay-making in our sense of the term is not in use. The term "hay," therefore, in the Prayer-book version of Psa 106:20, for עֵשֶׂב, is incorrect; A.V. "grass." So also Pro 27:25, and Isa 15:6. The corn destined for forage is cut with a sickle. The term קֹצֵר, A.V. "mower," Psa 129:7, is most commonly in A.V. "reaper," and once, Jer 9:22, "harvestman." SEE REAPING.

The "king's mowings," Amo 7:1, i.e., mown grass, Psa 72:6, may perhaps refer to some royal right of early pasturage for the use of the cavalry. Comp. 1Ki 18:5. See Shaw, Trav. page 138; Wilkinson, Anc. Eg. abridgm. 2:43, 50; Early Trav. page 305; Pietro d. Valle, Viasgi, 2:237; Chardin, Voy. 3:370; Layard, Nin. cand Bab. page 330; Niebuhr, Descr. de l'Arab. page 139; Harmer, Obs. 4:386; Burckhardt, Notes on Bed. 1:210. SEE GRASS.

## Moya, Don Mattheo[[@Headword:Moya, Don Mattheo]]

             a Spanish theologian, was born in 1607 at Moral, in the diocese of Toledo. Admitted into the Society of Jesus, he taught theology in Alcala and Madrid, became confessor to the duke of Ossuna. when the same was sent to Sicily, and received a like position with queen Mary Anne of Austria, widow of Philip IV. He became somewhat notorious by his Opusculum singularia universae fere theologiae moralis complectens adversus quorumdam expostulationes contra nonnullas Jesuitarum opiniones morales (Palermo, 1657, 4to), published under the pseudonyme of "Amadeus Guimenius," in which he attempted to justify the Jesuits for the laxity of their morals. This treatise was subsequently reprinted in Valentia, Madrid, and Lyon (the latter edition, 1664, in 4to). The Sorbonne, February 5, 1665, denounced it as shameful, scandalous, imprudent, detestable, and as containing propositions which should be entirely  eliminated from the Church and human memory. Pope Alexander VII annulled this condemnation in 1666; but when the Parliament appealed from it as error and abuse, and the Sorbonne maintained its right to pass censure on the books, and forbade the Jesuits to teach any of Mova's maxims, the pope changed his tactics, and reproved the Spanish theologian, and delivered his work to the Inquisition, which put it into the Index. Innocent XI, in 1688, condemned it to be burned. Pater Moya not only submitted to the pontifical authority, but even furnished himself a reprint of his book with refutations, and died in old age, probably satisfied with the mischief he had done. Among the writings which it provoked, an anonymous publication, La morale des Jesuites justement condamnee dans le livre du P. Moya Jesuite (Paris, 1681, 12mo), contains an almost complete summary of the controversial arguments. See Richard et Giraud, Biblioth. Sacree, s.v.; Antonio, Biblioth. Nova Hispana, s.v.

## Moyer, Lady Rebecca[[@Headword:Moyer, Lady Rebecca]]

             is noted as the foundress of a course of lectures in defence of the orthodox view of the Trinity. SEE LECTURES, MOYERS. She was the wife of Sir Samuel Moyer, of the parish of St. Andrew, Holborn, in the County of Middlesex, England, who died in 1716. Lady Moyer herself died about 1720, and the foundation of the lectures she thus provided for in her will:

"My now dwelling-house in Bedford Row, or Jockey Field, I give to my dear child Eliza Moyer, that out of it may be paid twenty guineas a year to an able minister of Goul's Word, to preach eight sermons every year on the Trinity and divinity of our ever blessed Saviour, beginning with the first Thursday in November, and to the first Thursday in the seven equal months, in St. Paul's, if permitted there, or, if not, elsewhere, according to the discretion of my executrix, who will not think it any incumbrance to her house. I am sure it will bring a blessing on it, if that work be well and carefully carried on which in this profligate age is so neglected. If my said daughter should leave no children alive at her death, or they should die before they come to age, then I give my said house to my niece, Lydia Moyer, now wife to Peter Ralrtop, Esq., and to her heirs after her, she always providing for that sermon, as I have begun, twenty guineas every year."

There is a list of the preachers of this lecture, down to the year 1740-1, at the end of Mr. John Berriman's Critical Dissertation on 1Ti 3:16 (which is the substance of the lectures he preached), and it is regarded as  the ablest in the course. There is also in a copy of that book in Sion College Library a continuation of the list in MS., by Mr. John Berriman, to the year 1748. In the year 1757 they were preached by Mr. William Clements, librarian of Sion College, but he did not publish them till 1797. In the year 1764, or thereabouts, the preacher was Benjamin Dawson, LL.D., who printed them under the title of An Illustration of several Texts of Scripture, particularly wherein the Logos occurs (1765). Dr. Thomas Morell, author of the Thesaurus Graece Poeseos, is supposed to have been the last. One of these lectures Dr. Morell published without his name in April 1774. It was written against Lindsay, and entitled The Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity Justified. Mr. Watts, recently librarian of Sion College (to whom the reader is indebted for the information here given), says Hook (Ch. Dict. s.v.), heard him preach one of them in January, 1772. As we have already stated under LECTURES SEE LECTURES, the Moyer foundation was only supported for about half a century. (J.H.W.)

## Moyne, Le[[@Headword:Moyne, Le]]

             SEE LEMOINE.

## Moysey, Charles Abel[[@Headword:Moysey, Charles Abel]]

             an English divine quite noted as an able defender of the Trinitarian doctrine, flourished in the first half of this century. He was archdeacon of Bath, and enjoyed other clerical distinctions. In 1818 he held the appointment of Bampton lecturer, and treated of Unitarianism (Oxf. 1818, 8vo). He died about 1870. He published several of his sermons (Bath, 1822, 8vo), and lectures on Romans (Lond. 1820, 8vo) and St. John's Gospel (Oxf. 1821-23, 2 volumes, 8vo).

## Moza[[@Headword:Moza]]

             (Heb. Motsa', מוֹצָא, a going forth, as often), the name of two men.

1. (Sept. Μοσά v.r. Ι᾿ωσά.) The second of the three sons of Caleb by one of his concubines, Ephah (1Ch 2:46). B.C. ante 1618.

2. (Sept. Μαισά, also Μασά v.r. Μασσά.) The son of Zimri and father of Binea, among the posterity of king Saul (1Ch 8:36-37; 1Ch 9:42-43). B.C. considerably post 1037.

## Mozah[[@Headword:Mozah]]

             (Heb. Motsah', מֹצָה, i.q. Moza, an issuing of water, but with the art.; Sept. Μωσά v.r. Α᾿μωσά, Α᾿μώκη),. a city of the tribe of Benjamin, mentioned between Chephirah and Rekem (Jos 18:26). A place of this name is mentioned by the rabbins (Mishna, Sukkah, 4:5) as situated ''below Jerusalem," at a spot whither the worshippers went down for the willow branches used at the feast of Tabernacles (Reland, Palest. page 903). To this the Gemara adds, "the place was a Colonia (קולניא), that is, exempt from the king's tribute" (Buxtorf, Lex. Tah. col. 2043), which other Talmudists reconcile with the original name by observing that Motsah signifies an outlet or liberation, e.g. from tribute. Bartenora, who lived at Jerusalem, and now lies in the "valley of Jehoshaphat" there, says (in Surenhusius's Mishna, 2:274) that Motsah was but a short distance from the city, and in his time retained its name of Colonia. Hence 'Schwarz infers (Palest. pages 127, 128) that the site is that of the modern Kulonieh, a village about three miles west of Jerusalem (Robinson, Res. 2:146), containing ancient walls (Scholz, Reise, page 161). "Interpreting the name according to its Hebrew derivation, it may signify 'the spring-head' — the place at which the water of a spring gushes out (Stanley, S. and P. App. § 52). The interpretations of the rabbins, just quoted, are not inconsistent with the name being really derived from its having been the seat of a Roman colonia. The only difficulty in the way of the identification is that Kulonieh can hardly be spoken of as 'below Jerusalem' — an expression which is most naturally interpreted of the ravine beneath the city, where the Bir Eyub is, and the royal gardens formerly were. Still there are vestiges of much vegetation about Kulonieh, and when the country was more generally cultivated and wooded, and the climate less arid than at present, the dry river-bed which the traveller now crosses may have flowed with water, and have formed a not unfavorable spot for the growth of willows. SEE CULON.

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

             is probably represented by the modern Khurbet Beit-Mizza, situated one mile north of Kulonigoh (Memoirs to the Ordnance Survey, 3:17; comp., Conder, Tent Work, 1:25).

## Mozambique[[@Headword:Mozambique]]

             a territory on the east coast of South Africa, nominally belonging to Portugal, and placed under a governor-general, although the actual possessions of Portugal consist only of a few stations, and her authority in the country is inconsiderable. It extends from Cape Delgado, in lat. 100 41' S., to Delagoa Bay, 26° S., and is estimated to have an area of 380,000 square miles, settled by a population of about 350,000. The chief river, the  Zambesi, divides it into two portions — Mozambique proper on the north, and Sofala on the south. The coasts, which comprise large tracts of cultivated soil, yielding rich harvests in rice, are fringed with reefs, islands, and shoals, and between Delagoa Bay and Cape Corrientes, and from Mozambique, the principal station, to Cape Delgado, the shores are high and steep. The forests yield valuable ornamental woods; ivory is obtained from the hippopotami that haunt the marshes; and gold and copper are found and worked. The elephant, deer, and lion inhabit the jungle; crocodiles are found in the rivers, and numerous flamingoes on the coasts. The rainy season lasts from November to March. The summer heat is very great, and the climate, which is fine in the elevated tracts, is unhealthy on the low shores and the swampy districts. Besides numerous fruits and vegetables, the grains are rice, millet, maize, and wheat. Fish and turtle are caught in great quantities on the islands and reefs; pearl-fishing is a source of considerable profit, cattle, sheep, and goats are numerous, and the principal exports are grain, gold-dust, honey, tortoise-shell, cowries, gums, and amber. The natives of this country are mainly Kaffirs (q.v.), and but very few of them have any inclination to accept Christianity as exemplified by the Romanists, who are its only exponents there. In the capital of Mozambique, of like name, with a population of 8522, there are only 270 Christians reported in the census. The natives who live along the coast are called Makooas or Makoonas. They are an athletic and ugly race of people, of the most ferocious aspect and savage disposition. They are fond of tattooing their skins, and draw a stripe down the forehead along the. nose to the chin, which is crossed in a direct angle by another line from ear to ear, so as to give the face the appearance of being sewed together in four parts. They file their teeth to a point, so as to resemble a coarse saw; and suspend ornaments of copper or bone from a hole in the gristle of the nose. Their upper lip protrudes in a very remarkable degree, and this they consider as so principal a point of beauty that they endeavor to make it still longer by introducing into the centre a small circular piece of ivory, wood, or iron. They dress their hair in a very fantastic manner, some shaving one side of the head, others both sides, leaving a kind of crest from the front to the nape of the neck, while a few of them wear simply a knot of hair on their foreheads. Their females greatly resemble the Hottentot women in the curvature of the spine and protrusion of the hinder parts, and when past the prime of life are said to present the most disagreeable appearance that can be conceived. The natives are fond of music and dancing, but their tunes and motions are unvaried and monotonous. Their favorite instrument is  called ambira, which is formed by a number of thin bars of iron of different lengths, highly tempered, and set in a row on a hollow case of wood. about four inches square, and closed on three sides. It is played upon with a piece of quill; and its notes, though simple, are sufficiently harmonious, sounding to the ear, when skilfully managed, like the changes upon bells. They are armed with spears, darts, and poisoned arrows, and possess also a considerable number of muskets, which they procure from the Arabs in the northern districts, and sometimes even from the Portuguese dealers. They are formidable enemies to the settlement, and have been rendered desperate in their hostilities by the nefarious practices of the traders who have gone among them to purchase slaves. There are also many Arabs in Mozambique, but they remain steadfast in their faith to the Koran and its Prophet.

This coast had been known to the Arabs, and its ports frequented by their traders, for centuries before its discovery by Europeans, and all the information possessed by the latter on the subject was chiefly drawn from the vague accounts of Ptolemy and the Periplus of the Emrthrean sea. It was first discovered by the Portuguese in the year 1497, who found the whole of the coast in the possession of the Arabs; but the fame of its goldmines and the convenience of its ports, as resting-places for the Indian trade, led them to attempt the expulsion of the original settlers. This the Portuguese easily accomplished by their superiority in arms'; and in 1508 they had conquered Quiloa, gained a footing in Sofala, and built the fort which still stands on the island of Mozambique. They gradually encroached on the Mohammedan possessions on the River Zambesi, and about the year 1569 they completely cleared that part of the river from Arabs by putting the whole of them to death. In their attempts to reach the gold-mines of the interior, the Portuguese were not very scrupulous as to the means which they employed, and have furnished, in the history of the East, a parallel to the atrocities of their Spanish neighbors in the West. But theirs was a harder task, and the natives of Africa maintained a nobler struggle for the independence of their country than the feebler South American race; and after nearly four centuries of possession the Portuguese content themselves with acting on the defensive, occupying the coast along the line of the River Zambesi, and maintaining their influence in the country by exciting the native powers against one another. The government of Mozambique is even now in a most inefficient state, being, in most places, more in the hands of native chiefs than of the Portuguese. In former times the slave-  trade was carried on here extensively; and from 1846 to 1857 four governors-general were removed by their government for countenancing, if not actively engaging in it. The principal settlements are Mozambique, Quilimane, Sena, and Tete. The colony is divided into six districts, and is ruled by the governor-general and his secretary, assisted by a junta. The country being in the hands of a Roman Catholic government, religion and education are supervised by about twelve Roman Catholic priests, and no Protestants are tolerated in the diffusion of their creeds. It is a matter of general comment that the morality of Mozambique is at the lowest ebb, and that the Romanists are responsible for this condition. In 1873 Sir Bartle Frere visited Mozambique and the adjoining countries, and negotiated for the suppression of the slavetrade (see Livingstone, Last Journals).

## Mozarabian Liturgy[[@Headword:Mozarabian Liturgy]]

             is the name of a Christian liturgy originally in use among those Christian inhabitants of Spain, SEE MOZARABIANS, who remained faithful to their religion after the Arabic conquest. It is not apparent yet how the liturgy came to be called Mozarabian, for if the word itself were a nickname, it is not at all likely that these Christians would themselves have adopted that byname. In all probability it was connected with it at a much later date than the original introduction of this liturgy itself into Spain. Walcott (Sacred Archaeol. page 393) thinks that " it received its present title possibly from the right being a concession within the Moorish pale." Its origin is traced by some to Isidore of Seville (q.v.). SEE LITURGY, (3). Recent researches, however, would make it almost certain that it is of much more ancient origin, and that it was only completed, or, at least, established by him and the fathers of the fourth Council of Toledo (633). Roman Catholic writers go so far as to ascribe it to the apostles themselves who converted Spain (comp. Migne's Patrologia, volume 84 [Paris, 1850]). Though closely resembling the Gallican liturgy, it cannot. on the other hand, have come into Spain from Gaul, for there are differences between the two which could not be accounted for in such a case. It is consequently most likely that it originated among the Christians of Spain, but the name of its author cannot be ascertained. The uniformity of style and singleness of plan show that the greatest part at least, if not the whole, was the work of one writer. This liturgy remained in use in Spain throughout the Middle Ages, to the exclusion of the Roman Catholic form, which liberty may be accounted for by the isolated, independent position of these communities, as otherwise they would soon have been brought to yield to the influence  of Rome. As it was, they succeeded in obtaining the recognition of their liturgy by two popes — by John X in 918, and by Alexander II in 1064. About the same time, however, that the last recognition was secured at Rome the Mozarabic liturgy was silenced in Aragon to spread the Roman liturgy, and in 1074 it was suppressed for the' same reason, by Sancho III of Navarre, in Navarre, Castile, and Leon, to the great regret of the people, who consoled themselves characteristically with the proverb, "Quo volunt reges vadunt leges" (Roderic, De Reb. Hisp. 6:26). From Rome the first authoritative word for the exclusion of the Mozarabic liturgy came in the pontificate of Gregory VII (11th century). He compelled most of the Spanish churches and convents to adopt the common uniform liturgy of the Romish Church. Six Mozarabic congregations, chiefly in Leon and Toledo, were, however, permitted to retain their ancient ritual, and though it soon fell into disuse among them also, it was yet preserved long enough to save it from final destruction; and when the learned cardinal Ximenes, for the correction of the liturgies then in use, consulted all the ancient MSS. of liturgies extant. and thus came across the Mozarabic also, he became so much interested in its preservation that he caused a careful copy to be made, and it was printed for the first time in 1500. Two years later a Breviary was prepared to complete it. Both works were printed at Toledo by a German, Peter Hagenbach, and were approved by pope Julius II. The title of this compilation is, Missale Mistum secundum Regulam Beati Isidori Dictum Mozarabicum, which has, however, by some unfortunate accident, remained incomplete. A whole third of the Church-year is left out entirely. Ximenes, in the mean time, the more surely to preserve the Mozarabic liturgy, expressly founded a chapel at Toledo, with a college of thirteen chaplains, whose duty he made it to say mass according to the Mozarabic manner. This institution is still in existence.

The principal characteristics of the Mozarabic liturgy are:

1. Its festivals, which are different from those of the Roman Catholic Church; for instance, its Advent contains six Sundays, as in the ancient Milanese and in the Greek Church: this indicates a certain connection with these. There are two festivals of the Annunciation, one on March 24, as in the Roman Catholic liturgy, and the other on December 18, which they designate by the peculiar name of "Sancta Maria de la O," because at the close of this festival both clergy and laity "sine ordine voce clara O longum proferunt ad flagrans illud desiderium significandum, quo sancti omnes in  limbo, in coelo angeli totusque orbis tenebatur nativitatis Redemptoris" (see the Preface to Migne's Patrologia, page 170, D).

2. With regard to the lessons, the evangelists in this liturgy are not entirely similar; thus the lesson containing the parable of the rich man and Lazarus is placed before Lent as a sort of admonition against the riotousness prevailing at that period. But a point of much greater importance is the fact that there were not only two lessons, namely, the epistle and gospel, appointed for each great festival, but three; a lesson from the Old Testament being read before the epistle. This was taken not only from the poetical and historical books, but even from Jesus Sirach. Another remarkable fact is that between Easter and Pentecost the lesson from the Old Testament was replaced by portions of Revelation, and that from the epistles by the Acts.

3. The principal characteristic of this missale is the strong homiletic element it contains besides the liturgical. Thus, after the three Biblical lessons, and before the real offering, there was always an address to the people, specially appointed for each day of worship. These addresses are short, their tone familiar, but at the same time exegetical (as when treating of the allegorical character of Lazarus's resurrection, on the third Sunday in Lent [Migne, page 341]), while a certain rhetorical elegance (as in the mass for Easter and Ascension day) bespeaks one who was familiar with homiletic expressions. On this point there is a resemblance to the Gallican liturgy; although the latter, as given in Mabillon's edition (Paris, 1729), contains no such elements, yet the publisher says (p. 29): "Et Salvianus Massiliensis presbyter clarissimus homilias episcopis factas, Sacramentorum vero, quantas nec recorder, ait Gennadius, composuit. Quo in loco sacramentorum homiliae intelliguntur vel sermones de mysteriis sacris, inter missarum solemnia quondam ex more Gallicano recitari soliti; vel orationes seu praefationes ad missam." The part, moreover, which is specially called prefatio is, in the Western missale, called inlatio.

4. Some parts of this liturgy recall the Eastern Church, as, for instance, the repetition of three Agios after the Benedictus, while in the Roman liturgy the word Sanctus precedes it (although the Greek word occurs also in the Roman hymns of Palestrina); also the formula in the Communion, Sancta Sanctis; but particularly the division of the host into nine parts, which, like  the leaves in the Greek rite, have special names and significations, and are also to be laid and used in a certain order.

5. The Mozarabic chant has great similarity to the Gregorian, yet it is clear that here also the Spanish Church preserved some national characteristics, as is shown by tie specimens contained in Migne's edition (Preface, pages 33-36). These indicate a greater tendency to melody and a figurative style than is found in the Gregorian chant. It is named the Eugenian chant, from its author, the third archbishop of Toledo, Eugene, who, in regard to hymnology, occupies the same place in the Mozarabic Church, in opposition to Gregory, as does Isidore in the liturgical part. Further comparison between the two rites, implying that of the Breviaries, would be out of place here; we will merely remark that, as a whole, the Mozarabic liturgy is one of the most precious monuments of ancient Christianity, and is not inferior to any other liturgy in point of rich illustrations from Scripture, liturgical application of passages, nobleness of thought, etc. See Palmer, Origin. litur. volume 1, § 10, page 166 sq.; Bona, Res. Liturg. 1:11 sq.; Pinius, De Lit. Mos.; Lesleius, Mis. Mos. Pref.; Martene, De Antiqu. Eccl. Ritibus, 1:457 sq.; Christian Remembrancer, October 1853.

## Mozarabians[[@Headword:Mozarabians]]

             (MUZABABIANS, MOSTARABIANS, or MUSTARABIANS), which properly designates a people living among the Arabs, but not of' the same blood, and by the latter therefore looked upon with distrust, and even with contempt, was applied as a sort of nickname to those Christians of Spain who, under Mohammedan rule, remained faithful to their holy religion. The word is derived from Arabic Estarab, i.e., to Arabize, and as a participle (Mostarab) signifies one who has adopted the Arab mode of life. The Christians of Africa and Spain, as well as the Jews, deserved to be called Mozarabians, for they all, from fear of persecution, adopted the ways and customs of their conquerors, and in outward appearances gave themselves the air of conformity with Mohammedan life and practice. They abstained from meat, and submitted to the rite of circumcision. The modern form has lost the t (Mostarab), but has substituted z for s, thus preserving the sound, notwithstanding the change of orthography (see Ticknor, Span. Lit. 3:393).

## Mozart, Johannes Chrysostomus Wolfgang Amadeus[[@Headword:Mozart, Johannes Chrysostomus Wolfgang Amadeus]]

             one of the greatest musical composers, if not the greatest, deserves a place here for his many and valuable contributions to sacred music. He was born at Salzburg (then in Bavaria, but soon after transferred to Austria), January 17, 1756. From the earliest age Wolfgang evinced the strongest predilection for music, which induced his father, who was organist of the prince's chapel, to discontinue the instruction of others, in order to devote himself to his tuition and that of a sister about four years older. After studying the harpsichord during a year, the flights of his genius were so rapid that he exercised his own invention in original composition at the age of only five, and attempted notation, which could hardly be deciphered. When only six years of age, his performances were so remarkable that his father took him and his sister, who possessed similar gifts, to Munich and Vienna, where they obtained every kind of encouragement from the elector of Bavaria and the emperor Francis I. In 1763 the Mozart family visited Paris; and, though now only at the age of seven, Mozart surprised a party of musicians, including his father, by taking part, at sight, in a trio for stringed instruments. He also earned a great reputation as performer on the organ, and during his stay at Paris performed on the organ in the Chapelle du Roi before the whole court. While at the French capital Mozart also entered upon his career as musical author, for he there published his first two works. From Paris the Mozart family went to London in 1764, and there, according to Holmes, "the boy exhibited his talents before the royal family, and underwent more severe trials than any to which he had been before subjected, through which he passed in a most triumphant manner. So much interest did he excite in that country that the Hon. Daines Barrington drew up an account of his extraordinary performances, which was read before the Royal Society, and declared by the council of that body to be sufficiently important to be printed in the Philosophical Transactions, in the 60th volume of which it appears." In the 69th volume of the same work Dr. Burney remarks: " Of Mozart's infant attempts at music I was unable to discover the traces from the conversation of his father, who, though an intelligent man, whose education and knowledge of the world did not seem confined to music, confessed himself unable to describe the progressive improvements of his son during the first stages of infancy. However, at eight years of age I was frequently convinced of his  great knowledge in composition by his writings; and that his invention, taste, modulation, and execution in extemporary playing were such as few professors are possessed of at forty years of age." Symphonies of his own composition were produced in a public concert in London; and while there he composed and published six sonatas, and made acquaintance with the works of Handel, recently deceased. In 1765 the Mozarts returned to the Continent, and, passing through Paris, went to Holland, and at the Hague, when not more than eight years old, young Wolfgang composed a symphony for a full orchestra, on occasion of the installation of the prince of Orange. On their return to Germany shortly after, he again produced a sensation by his compositions for the religious service, and for a trumpet concert at the dedication of the Orphan House Church in Vienna, himself conducting the music in presence of the imperial court. After this the Mozarts went home to Salzburg, and Wolfgang was afforded every advantage for his musical training. He devoted himself most assiduously to the study of his art, and evinced his mastery of the subject in 1768, when, at the request of the emperor Joseph II at Vienna, he composed music to the opera-buffa La Finta Semplice, which, though never performed, was approved of by all the masters and cognoscenti of the period. In 1769 young Mozart was nominated concert-master to the archbishop of Salzburg, and thus gained a small compensation and a somewhat independent position. We do not know exactly what his salary was when first appointed, but in his twentieth year, we learn from his biographer, Mozart earned the trifling sum of $5 per annum. We do not wonder, therefore, that the artist occasionally strayed from home to earn a few additional dollars. Thus in the very year of his appointment we find him starting for Italy, where he was most rapturously welcomed. His first performance in Italy was given at Milan, where he was engaged to return and compose the first opera for the carnival of 1771. At Bologna and Florence the reception he met with was equally flattering to the young musician. At Rome Mozart arrived in Passion Week, and on Wednesday went to the Sistine Chapel, where he heard for the first time the celebrated Miserere, which was prohibited to be copied, or in any manner published, on pain of excommunication. On Good Friday the same Miserere was again performed, when Mozart was present with the MS. copy he had made from memory concealed in his hat, that he might have an opportunity of making corrections. This circumstance created an immense excitement at Rome, because the peculiarities of the Miserere were thought impossible to be expressed by musical notation; and when young Mozart, in presence  of some Sistine choristers, sang the composition in the very manner in which it was sung by those who had acquired it only after long practice, the professional singers expressed their astonishment in terms of unmeasured admiration. The fame of Mozart after this event was spread far and wide. His wonderful musical talents and power of performing on the organ were attributed to a charm which it was supposed he carried in his ring. When the pope first heard him perform he conferred upon him the order of the Golden Spur; and at Bologna he was unanimously elected a member of the Philharmonic Society, which was at that time an honor rarely conferred even upon the greatest musicians, but yet well earned by this marvellous youth, who, at the age of sixteen, was acknowledged the first claveiinist in the world, and had produced two requiems and a stabatmater, numerous offertories, hymns, and motets, 4 operas, 2 cantatas, 13 symphonies, 24 piano-forte sonatas, not to speak of a vast number of concertos for different instruments, trios, quartets, marches, and other minor pieces. In 1773 Mozart produced, among numerous other works, two Masses for the chapel of the elector of Bavaria, etc. In 1775, at the desire of the archduke Maximilian, he composed the cantata Il Re Pastore; and from that period till the year 1779 he continued to labor with his pen, though but few of its products then obtained, or ever will obtain, a celebrity at all equal to that which his subsequent productions have so justly acquired. In 1775 his fame was so completely established and so widely known that he could have made choice of engagements in all the capitals of Europe. His father preferred Paris, and therefore, in 1777, he, with his mother, set out for a second journey towards that city. The death of his mother made Paris insupportable, and he returned to his father at the beginning of the year 1779. Some time after this Mozart went to Munich, whence he went to Vienna; and in November 1779, he finally settled in the latter city, the inhabitants and manners of which were very agreeable to him; and now, having reached his 24th year, he exhibited the rare example of one who had been astonishing as a child, had disappointed not even the most sanguine hopes, and became proportionately great as a man. Whatever the precocity of the child — and in that respect as well as in any other he was unlike other noted musical composers, for though Handel and Haydn and Beethoven all gave proofs of their musical powers in boyhood, none of them showed as children that full maturity of mind which distinguished Mozart, and which only a few of those who witnessed it could appreciate-it was now in the maturity of life that he began his career as composer, and gained that celebrity which will last to all time. Mozart  was now in the service of the emperor as composer to the court; but his office was rather honorary than lucrative, and he lived by concerts, musical tours, teaching music, and the small profits derived from the sale of his published works, till an offer of a large salary made to him by the king of Prussia led the emperor to give him 800 florins a year; and though several tempting offers came to him after this time, and Mozart's pecuniary condition would i have made greater compensation very desirable, he refused to quit his emperor's side. His great opera of Idomeneo was composed in 1780, with a view to induce the family of Mademoiselle Constance Weber, afterwards his wife, to consent to the marriage, which they had declined on the ground that his reputation was not sufficiently established. This opera forms an epoch not in the composer's life only, but in the history of music. In construction, detail, instrumentation, and every imaginable respect, it was an enormous advance on all previous works of the kind, and established his reputation as the greatest musician whom the world had seen. His other principal works, composed about and after this time, are Cosi Fan Tutti: — L'Eunlevement du Serail: — Nozze de Figaro: — Don Giovanni: — Zauberflote: — Clemenza di Tito: — and last, but not least, his world renowned Requiem — one of the most perfect sacred musical compositions, if not the most perfect — in which, while the sacred character is maintained throughout, the airs have all the requisite grace and freedom, the instrumentation all the resources of modern refinement, and the whole exhibits in a perfect manner the blending of the varied powers of the orchestra with the voice, without ever allowing the former to encroach on the latter. The story of his composing the Requiem deserves mentioning here. Mozart's intense application to keep the wolf from his doors, and to avoid trouble on account of the many papers that came to him showing "res augusta domi" (warrants for debt), had brought on a state of melancholy from which nothing could arouse him, and he was full of terror at his approaching end. One day, while plunged in a profound reverie, a stranger of dignified manners was announced, who communicated the wishes of some unknown person of exalted rank that he should compose a solemn mass for the repose of the soul of one tenderly beloved, whom he had just lost. An air of mystery pervaded the interview; the composer was exhorted to exercise all his genius; and he engaged to finish his work in a month when the stranger promised to return. He disappeared, and Mozart instantly commenced writing. Day and night were uninterruptedly occupied; but he was consumed by gloomy presages, and at length exclaimed abruptly to his wife, in great agitation, "Certainly I am  composing this requiem for myself-it will serve for my own funeral." Though his strength continued to fail, his assiduity was unabated, and at length he was obliged to suspend the undertaking. At the appointed time the stranger returned. "I have found it impossible to keep my word," said Mozart; to which the stranger answered, "Give yourself no uneasiness. What longer time do you require?" Mozart replied, "Another month." The stranger now insisted on doubling the covenanted price, which he had paid down at the outset, and retired. It was in vain that Mozart endeavored to trace him, and this, conjoined with other circumstances, corroborated his belief that he was some supernatural being sent to announce the close of his mortal career. Nevertheless his labors were renewed, and the work at last was nearly completed within the stipulated period, when the mysterious stranger again returned; but Mozart was no more. He died December 5, 1791. In the intervals of his greater works, Mozart composed the majority of the orchestral symphonies, quartets, and quintets which are an almost indispensable part of the programme of every concert in the present day, besides masses as familiar in England and America as in Catholic Europe, innumerable piano-forte concertos and sonatas and detached vocal compositions, all of the most perfectly finished description. "The genius of Mozart in music," says Hogarth, "was sublime. By the number, variety, combination, and effect of his works he ranks in the highest class of modern masters. An air of delicacy and sentiment pervades the whole. Full and harmonious, they are altogether free from that meagreness and those capricious eccentricities which betray the sterility of invention too common among musicians. The taste which they exhibit shows that vulgar images were incompatible with his mind; it seems as if he knew that such a deformity is alike pernicious to science and the arts... Moiart has been most successful in gloomy passages, or those of rising grandeur; they according better with the ordinary train of his feelings. On almost all occasions he is more serious than comic in endeavoring to portray the passions; and his love, it has been remarked, is rather sentimental than sportive. However simple the theme, however intricate its variations, his return is always natural, and the finale appropriate. Perhaps the celebrity of Mozart's music partly arises from the skilful management of his finales, for they invariably leave an agreeable impression. No one has surpassed him in the suitable distribution of the parts of his concerted pieces; for, understanding the precise qualities of every different instrument, nothing is. appointed to any which is inconsistent with its character." "No composer has ever combined genius and learning in such  perfect proportions; none has ever been able to dignify the lightest and tritest forms by such profound scholarship, or at the moment when he was drawing most largely on the resources of musical science, to appear so natural, so spontaneous, and so thoroughly at his ease" (Hullah). To Haydn Mozart always acknowledged his obligations; but Haydn's obligations to Mozart are at least as great. Haydn, though born twenty-four years earlier, survived Mozart eighteen years, and all his greatest works written after Mozart's death bear manifold traces of his influence. Mozart is the first composer in whose works all signs of the old tonality disappear; he is the father of the modern school. "Mozart," says Prof. J.K. Paine, "is rightly considered as the universal master. This universality is not only evinced in his complete mastery of every form of music, from a song to a symphony, from a simple dance to a solemn requiem, but in the rare adaptation of the national peculiarities of style — Italian, French, and German — to his own individuality. It was his mission to unite harmoniously and beautify these national elements. In his immortal works European music attained its concentration for the first and only time in history" (Lectures on Music, at the Boston University, in 1874). In person Mozart did not exceed the middle size; he was thin and pale, and his health was always delicate. The expression of his countenance, without anything striking, was exceedingly variable, and rather that of an absent-minded man. His habits were awkward, and his hands had been accustomed so incessantly to the piano that they seemed incapable of application to anything requiring address. He was of a mild and affectionate disposition: his mind was not uncultivated, and the number of his works is a sufficient proof of his industry. His opinions of other composers were liberal, and he entertained the highest respect for Haydn in particular. "Believe me, sir," said he to an officious critic, who sought to demonstrate certain errors of that great master — "believe me, sir, were you and I amalgamated together, we should not afford materials for one Haydn." He was not insensible of the beauties of his own compositions; and on the very day of his decease, calling for the Requiem, he had some parts of it performed by his bedside. See Holmes, The Life of Mozart, including his Correspondence (Lond. 1845, 2 volumes, 8vo); Jahn, Mozart's Leben (Leips. 1856, 4 volumes, 8vo; 2d ed. 1867); Diring, Mozart (Leips. and Paris, 1860); Nohl, Mozart's Briefe (Salzb. 1865; English version by Lady Wallace [Lond. and N.Y. 1865, 2 volumes, 18mo]); Oubilicheff, Mozart's Leben u. Werke (Leips. 1873, 3 volumes, 8vo); Hogarth's Musical History, Biography, and Criticism (Lond. 1835, 12mo); Jiiger, Gallery of German Composers, with  Biographical and Critical Notices by E.F. Rimbault, LL.D. (Lond. 1875); For. Qu. Rev. January 1846; Blackwood's Magazine, November 1845, art. 5; Edinb. Rev. April 1836, art. 2; Edinb. Cyclop. s.v.; Chanzbers's Cyclop. s.v.; English Cyclop. s.v.

## Mozdarians[[@Headword:Mozdarians]]

             a heretical sect of the Mohammedans, followers of Isa ebn-Sobeih al- Mozdar, who held it possible for God to be a liar and unjust, pronounced as infidels those who took upon themselves the administration of public affairs, and condemned all who did not embrace his opinions as guilty of infidelity. See Broughton, Biblioth. Historico-Sacra, 2:146.

## Mozetta[[@Headword:Mozetta]]

             the technical term for a tippet worn by cardinals over a mantle, or short cloak, showing only a chain of a breast-cross. At Pisa in summer a red mozetta is worn over a rochet; at Catania the mozetta of black cloth is worn over the rochet; at Syracuse the mozetta is violet, as at Malta, where it is used with a rochet and cope; at Ratisbon it is of red silk.

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

             an American sculptor, noted for his contributions to sacred art, was born in Burlington, Vermont, August 22, 1812. He removed to New York in 1831, and was engaged in mercantile pursuits till 1845, when he retired from business, and shortly after visited Europe. Having devoted several years to the study of sculpture in Florenoe, he went to Rome, where he long resided. He died in Switzerland in October 1870. His principal works on sacred and ethical subjects are statues of Truth and Silence, in possession of the New York Mercantile Library Association; Rebecca at the Well; Esther; a group illustrating the parable of the Prodigal Son; and Jephthah's Daughter. See The American Cyclopcedia, s.v.

## Mozzi, Luigi[[@Headword:Mozzi, Luigi]]

             a learned Italian ecclesiastic, was born at Bergamo May, 26, 1746. Of a patrician family, he was admitted (1763) into the Society of Jesus. He was professor at the college of the Nobili at Milan when (1773) that order was dissolved by pope Clement XIV. Returning to Bergamo, he was charged with the examination of candidates for holy orders, and became canon and archpriest. The piety and zeal which he manifested against the Jansenists in  Italy gave him high repute; he was called to Rome, nominated apostolic missionary, and member of the Academy degli Arcadi. In 1804 he joined his confreres in the kingdom of Naples; but the Jesuits were again soon dispersed, and Mozzi found a refuge at the villa of the marquis Scotti, situated in the environs of Milan, where he died, June 24, 1813. Of the numerous writings left by him, his most important refer to the Jallsenist controversy. Thus he wrote, Jansenism by Daylight, or the Idea of Jansenism (Venice, 1781, 2 volumes, 8vo): — Brief History of the Schism of the New Church of Utrecht (Ferrara, 1785, 8vo; Ghent, 1829, 8vo): — The Fifty Reasons why the Catholic Church should be Preferred (Bassano, 1789). He published also The Plans of the Unbelievers to Ruin Religion, as Revealed in the Works of Frederick, King of Prussia (3d ed. Assisi, 1791, 8vo): — Historical and Chronological Abridgment of the most important Decrees of the Holy See regarding Brianism, Jansenzism, and Quesnellism.

## Mozzi, Marco Antonio[[@Headword:Mozzi, Marco Antonio]]

             an Italian literateur, was born at Florence, January 17, 1678; studied law and theology there, and at the same time devoted much attention to poetry and music. His skill on the mandoline procured for him frequent invitations to the ducal court of Tuscany. In 1700 he received a canonicate in his native city, and two years afterwards a position as lecturer on Tuscan literature. He was elected a member of the Academy de la Crusca, and became its archconsul. As a renowned preacher he delivered before the court in 1701 the funeral sermon on Charles II, king of Spain, and in 1703 did the like on archbishop Leon Strozzi before the metropolitan chapter. We possess of him, Sonetti sopra i nomi dati at alcune dame Florentine dalla principessa Violanta (Florence, 1705): — Istoria di S. Cresci et de' santi martyri suoi compagni, come pure della chiesa del medesimo santo posta in Volcava di Mugello (Florence, 1710, fol., with illustrations): — Discorsi sacri (Florence, 1717): — Vita di Lorenzo Bellini. in the Vite degli Arcadi; Orazione funerale del abate A.M. Salvini, in the Prose Toscane of Salvini. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

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

             The Mpongwe is spoken by a West-African tribe, for which various detached portions of the Scriptures have been translated by the missionaries of the American Board of Missions, and several editions of these portions of the Old and New Test. have been issued by the American Bible Society. (B.P.)

## Mu-tsoo-po[[@Headword:Mu-tsoo-po]]

             the Chinese tutelary goddess both of women and of sailors, and worshipped with great reverence among them. This worship was introduced some centuries ago into the Celestial empire, and so strikingly does Mu-tsoo-po resemble the Virgin Mary of the Romanists that the Chinese at Macao call her Santa Maria di China — Holy Mother of China. The sailors especially make her an object of adoration, and there are very few junks that have not an image of her on board. She is also accompanied by very dismal satellites, the executors of her behests. See Gardner, Faiths of the World, page 504; Doolittle, Social Life of the Chinese (Index in volume 2).

## Mucianus, or Mutianus[[@Headword:Mucianus, or Mutianus]]

             surnamed SCHOLASTICUS, an early ecclesiastic of some note, flourished near the middle of the 6th century A.D. He is celebrated as the translator of the 34 homilies of St. Chrysostom on the Epistle to the Hebrews, a task  performed at the request of Cassiodorus, by whom he is called "vir disertissimus." This translation is still in existence; it was published for the first time at Cologne in 1530 (8vo), and has been inserted in the Latin editions of the works of St. Chrysostom, though in the Graeco-Latin editions the translation by Hervet is generally preferred. He had previously furnished also a Latin translation of Gaudentius's Treatise on Music. See Fabricius, Biblioth. Graeca, 8:558, 559; Cassiodorus, Divin. Lect. 8.

## Mucke, August Philip[[@Headword:Mucke, August Philip]]

             a Reformed theologian of Germany, was born May 29, 1783. In 1805 he was appointed pastor of the Reformed Church in Accunm, the only Reformed congregation in Oldenburg, and celebrated his seventy-fifth anniversary in 1880. He died Feb. 13,1882, being at the time the Nestor of the Protestant clergy of Germany. He published, Die Dogmatik des 19. Jahrhunderts (Gotha, 1861): — Die heutige Unionscontroverse, etc. (Leipsic, 1872): — Dos apostolische Glaubensbekenntniss (Berlin, 1873). (B.P.)

## Mucker[[@Headword:Mucker]]

             a German epithet applied to Christian sects who make much outward display of piety, has come to be applied especially to a class of modern Adamites (q.v.) who arose at Knigsberg, East Prussia, about 1830. Their origin is attributed to the theosoph Johann Heinrich Schonherr (born at Memel in 1771, died at Konigsberg in 1826), who held dualistic and Gnostic views concerning the origin of the universe, teaching that it was caused by the mingling of two primordial beings of a spiritual and sensuous nature as Eloahs. But Schonherr was himself too good a man to stand accused of having caused the formation of a sect so fanatic and immoral as the Muckers. In truth, the philosophic fancy of this pious but eccentric student was taken hold of by two Konigsberg Lutheran clergymen named Diestel and Ebel (q.v.), who, after making profession of the exclusive kind of Christianity, gathered a circle of like-minded fanatics, and introduced shameless mysteries under the color of pietism. They elevated sexual connection into an act of worship, and designated it as the chief means of the sanctification of the flesh by which the paradisaic state was to be restored. Women of high standing in the community, some of noble birth, belonged to the Mucker circle. Three of them lived in Ebel's house, and were popularly regarded as his wives. Dixon (Spiritual Wives) tells us that Ebel held one to represent to him the principle of light (Licht-Natur), the second the principle of darkness (Finsterniss-Natur), and the third the principle of union (Unfassung). The last only was his legal wife; but it was discovered during a public trial of Ebel for the offence of immorality that she only held a subordinate place in his extraordinary household. This and like odious, licentious excesses were practiced by the Muckers generally, especially in their religious meetings, and the scandal concerning them became so great in Kinigsberg that a garden which they were wont to frequent acquired the name of the Seraphs' Grove. The subject was brought before the courts in 1839, and the result, in 1842, was that Ebel and Diestel were degraded from their offices; but upon appeal the higher  court reversed the decision, and discharged the case for want of clear proof against the accused; and it is even alleged by some who have examined the whole evidence produced that the decisions of the first court did not proceed upon a calm judicial inquiry, but were dictated by strong prejudice against the accused on account of their religious views and peculiar eccentricities; and, in particular, that the evidence gives no support whatever to the charge of licentiousness (comp. Kanitz, Auklarung nach Acten, Quellen, etc., fur Welt u. Kirchengesch. Basle and Ludwigsburg, 1862]). Mr. Dixon has directed attention to the similarity of the Mucker movement with that of the Princeites (q.v.) in England, and that of the Bible Communists or Perfectionists (q.v.) in this country, popularly known as Oneida Communists; all of which took place about the same time and in connection with revival excitement, although it may almost be regarded as certain that the originators of these movements had not even heard of each other. A class of religious enthusiasts who originated under Stephen in Saxony, and then emigrated to this country, will be treated in the article STEPHENITES SEE STEPHENITES . See Zeitschrift fiur historische Theologie, 1832; Hagenbach, Kirchengesch. volume 7 (2d ed. 1872), Lect. 26. (J.H.W.)

## Mudge, Enoch[[@Headword:Mudge, Enoch]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, and one of the pioneers of Methodism in New England, was born of religious parents at Lynn, Massachusetts, June 21, 1776. He was converted at fifteen, under the ministry of Jesse Lee; entered the itinerancy in 1793, and labored assiduously; in 1796 he travelled, instead of the presiding elder, in Maine; in 1799 poor health obliged him to locate at Orrington, Maine, where he resided till 1816. While there he was twice chosen state representative, and had much to do with the passage of the "Religious Freedom Bill." At the end of this time he re-entered the itinerancy, and was stationed in Boston. He filled various charges until 1832, when he was appointed to the Seaman's Bethel at New Bedford, and there labored with signal success until 1844, when he was obliged by paralysis to retire from the active work of the ministry. He lived beloved at Lynn, and labored as his strength permitted until his death, April 2, 1850. He was the first minister that Methodism produced in New England, and his long and useful life was full of successful labor for God. He was an able and interesting preacher, and commanded universal respect and love. His published works are "a volume of excellent Sermons, and many poetical pieces of more than ordinary merit." See Minutes of  Conferences, 4:538; Stevens, Memorials of Methodism, volume 1, chapter 10; Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, volume 7.

## Mudge, John A[[@Headword:Mudge, John A]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Ohio, October 27, 1829. His parents being poor, his early education was greatly neglected. He was converted when quite young, and determined to enter the ministry. Feeling his need of a more thorough preparation, he studied for a while at the college in Berea. He joined the North Ohio Conference in 1850, and held several important positions in that Conference. He was a man eloquent in the pulpit, clear in his judgment, and diligent in his studies. He was secretary of the Conference for some time, and a delegate to the General Conference in 1872. He died October 27, 1873. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1874, page 110.

## Mudge, Thomas Hicks[[@Headword:Mudge, Thomas Hicks]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Orrington, Maine, September 28, 1815. His parents removed to Lynn, Mass., in his childhood; and being early brought under religious influence, he was converted, and united with the Church in 1829. Soon after his conversion he was seized with the desire to preach the Gospel, and in order to qualify himself for this work prepared for college at Wilbraham Academy. After going through the college course at the Wesleyan University in Middletown, Conn., where he graduated in 1840, and at the Union Theological Seminary at New York (class of 1843), he joined the New England Conference, and remained a member of it till 1857, when hie became professor of sacred literature at M'Kendree College, Lebanon, Ill. In 1859 he was transferred to the Missouri Conference, and stationed successively at Pilot Knob, Simpson Chapel, St. Louis, and Independence. At the outbreak of the rebellion he was obliged to leave the state, and sought refuge in Manhattan, Kansas, where he filled an appointment for a year; but joining the Kansas Conference, at the earnest solicitation of the Church was sent to Baldwin City. His health, however, failed, and he died there, July 24, 1862. Mr. Mudge was a close student, especially of the Word of God, and possessed much critical knowledge of the sacred text. For the exposition and illustration of it he collected, from American and foreign publishers, one of the most valuable private libraries of sacred literature in this country. His preaching was rich in thought, and pervaded  by a spirit of deep piety. Many of his brief expositions of the Scripture lessons, before his sermons, were of themselves pithy discourses of great value. He had devised large plans of usefulness through the application of his ripe scholarship to the exposition of God's Word, but the little he had written was never considered of sufficient importance for publication. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1863, page 23.

## Mudge, Zachary[[@Headword:Mudge, Zachary]]

             an eminent clergyman and educator of the Anglican communion, was born near the close of the 17th century. About 1716 he became master of a free- school at Bideford, and about 1736 rector of St. Andrew's, in Plymouth. He was after this prebend of Exeter. He died in 1769. Mr. Mudge was an intimate friend of Dr. Johnson, and is highly spoken of as a scholar and clergyman. He published A Specimen of a new Translation (of the Book of Psalms (1733, 4to): — Essay towards a new English Version of the Book of Psalms (1744, 4to); of these, Home says, "Some of his notes are more ingenious than solid:" — Church Authority (a sermon, 1748, 4to), answered in The Claims of Church Authority considered (1749, 8vo): — and several others of his sermons (Lond. 1731, 8vo; 1739, 8vo). See Boswell, Life of Johnson (ed. 1848), page 679, 686; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Mudita[[@Headword:Mudita]]

             one of the five kinds of Bhawna or meditation in which the Buddhist priests are required to engage. The mudita is the meditation of joy, but it is not the joy arising from earthly possessions. It feels indifferent to individuals, and refers to all sentient beings. In the exercise of this mode of meditation the priest must express the wish, "May the good fortune of the prosperous never pass away; may each one receive his own appointed reward."

## Mudo, el[[@Headword:Mudo, el]]

             (the Mute), an eminent Spanish painter who attained great celebrity because of his masterly delineations of sacred subjects, was born at Logrono in 1526. His real name was Juan Fernandez Naverette, or Juan Fernandez Ximenes de Naverette. He was called "el Mudo," after he had acquired distinction as a painter, from his having been deaf and dumb from his infancy. He showed a talent for art early in life, and: first studied under  Foy Vicente de Santo Domingo, a monk of the Order of Geronomytes, under whom he made such rapid progress, and exhibited so much genius, that his parents, by the advice of his instructor, sent him to Italy to study with Titian, with whom he remained several years, and thoroughly imbibed his principles and manner of coloring, so that he was called by his countrymen the Spanish Titian. He remained. in Italy twenty years, visiting all the principal cities-Rome, Florence, Naples, etc. studying the works of the most eminent painters, who entertained for him the highest respect on account of his eminent abilities, perhaps heightened by his infirmity. He had already acquired a distinguished reputation in Italy when, in 1568, he was summoned to Madrid by Philip II to paint in the Escurial, and on his arrival he was appointed painter to the king, with a pension of two hundred ducats, in addition to the price of his works. He was naturally of a delicate constitution, and he had hardly commenced his labors when a severe malady compelled him to retire, with the permission of his royal patron,. to his native place, Logrono, where he remained three years, during which time he painted four magnificent pictures, and carried them with him to Madrid in 1571.

These were the Assumption of the Virgin, the Martyrdom of St. James the Great, a St. Philip, and a St. Jerome, which were placed in the Escurial, while the artist was rewarded with five hundred ducats, besides his pension. The head of the Virgin in the Assumption is supposed to be a portrait of his mother, the Donna Catalina Ximenes, who in her youth was very beautiful. In 1575 he added four more pictures, the Nativity, Christ at the Pillar, the Holy Family, and St. John writing the Apocalypse, for which he received eight hundred ducats. In the Nativity El Mudo successfully overcame a formidable difficulty in painting — the introducing of three lights into the picture. as in the famous Notte of Correggio; one from the irradiation proceeding from the infant Jesus, another from a glory of angels above, and a third from a flaming torch. It is related that Pellegrino Tibaldi, on seeing it, exclaimed, "Oh, i belli pastori!" This exclamation gave name to the picture, and it continues to be known to this day as "The beautiful Shepherds." In 1576 he painted his famous piece of Abraham entertaining the three Angels, for which he received five hundred ducats. He now undertook a stupendous work, and was engaged to paint thirty-two pictures for the Escurial, twenty-seven of which were to be seven feet and a half in height and seven feet and a quarter in breadth, and the other five thirteen feet high and nine broad. He did not live to complete this vast undertaking; he painted eight, representing the apostles, the evangelists, and St. Paul and St. Barnabas; the others were finished by  Alonso Sanchez Caello and Luis de Carovajal. El Mudo died in 1579. His pictures are extremely inaccessible; except a small picture of the baptism of Christ in the museum at Madrid, they are buried in the royal solitude of the Escurial.

There were two other Spanish painters, of little note, called El Mudo — one PEDRO EL MUDO, and the other DIEGO LOPEZ, who must not be confounded with the illustrious Navarette.

## Mueddin[[@Headword:Mueddin]]

             SEE MUEZZIN.

## Muenscher, Joseph, D.D[[@Headword:Muenscher, Joseph, D.D]]

             an Episcopal minister, was born at Providence, R.I., December 21, 1798, of German descent. He graduated from Brown University in 1821, studied one year at Andover Theological Seminary, and was admitted to priest's: orders March 13, 1825, his first parish being South Leicester, now Rochdale, Massachusetts, where he remained until 1827, when he became rector of St. John's Church, Northampton. For two years (1831-33) he was rector of Trinity Church, Saco, Maine, and then was professor of sacred literature in. the Episcopal Seminary at Gambier, Ohio. From 1841 to 1854 he was rector of St. Paul's Church at Mt. Vernon, and remained at that place without parochial charge until his death, February 16, 1884. Dr. Muenscher had a decided musical taste, and in 1839 published Church Choir, a collection of sacred music. For several years he was editor of the Gambier Observer and the Western Episcopalian, and contributed largely to theological reviews and religious periodicals. In 1865 he published a Manual of Biblical Interpretation, in 1866 a Revised Version of the Book of Proverbs, in 1870, Orthography and Pronunciation of the English Language. See Necrology of Brown University, 1883-84. (J.C.S.)

## Muesis[[@Headword:Muesis]]

             SEE MYESIS.

## Muezzin[[@Headword:Muezzin]]

             (Mueddin) is the Arabic name of the Mohammedan official attached to a mosque, whose duty it is to summon the faithful to prayer at five different times of day and night. Stationed on one of the minarets, he chants in a peculiar manner the form of proclamation. Before doing so, however, the muezzin ought to repeat the following prayer: "O my God! give me piety; purify me: thou alone hast the power. Thou art my benefactor and my master, O Lord. Thou art towards me as I desire; may I be towards thee as thou desirest. My God! cause my interior to be better than my exterior. Direct all my actions to rectitude. O God! deign in thy mercy to direct my will towards that which is good. Grant me at the same time true honor and spiritual poverty, O thou, the most merciful of the merciful." His chant (Adan) consists of these words, repeated at intervals: "Allah is most great. I testify that there is no God but Allah. I testify that Mohammed is the apostle of Allah. Come to prayer. Come to security." ("Prayer is better than sleep" is added in the morning, at the Subh or Fegr.) "Allah is most great. There is no deity but Allah!" Besides these regular calls, two more are chanted during the night for those pious persons who wish to perform special nightly devotions. The first (Ula) continues, after the usual Adan, in this manner: "There is no deity but Allah! He hath no companion-to him belongeth the dominion-to him belongeth praise. He giveth life, and causeth death. And he is living, and shall never die. In his hand is blessing,  and he is almighty," etc. The second of these night-calls (Ebed) takes place at an hour before daybreak, and begins as follows: "I extol the perfection of Allah, the Existing forever and ever: the perfection of Allah, the Desired, the Existing, the Single, the Supreme," etc. According to an Arab tradition, the office was instituted by Mohammed himself, and the words quoted for the morning prayer were added by the first muezzin on an occasion when the Prophet overslept himself. Mohammed. approved of them, and they were ever afterwards retained in the morning call. The office of a muezzin is generally intrusted to blind men only, lest they might, from their elevation, SEE MINARET, have too free a view over the surrounding terraces and harems. The harmonious and sonorous voices of the singers, together with the simplicity and solemnity of the melody, make a strikingly poetical impression upon the mind of the hearer in the daytime; much more, however, is this the case whenever the sacred chant resounds from the height of the mosque through the moonlit stillness of an Eastern night. See Trevor, India under Moh. Rule (see Index).

## Muffler[[@Headword:Muffler]]

             (רִעִל, ra'al, a reeling, as in Zec 12:2; Sept. and Vulg. undistinguishable), a term occurring in Isa 3:19, among articles of female apparel or ornament, and thought by Gesenius (Heb. Lex. s.v.) to signify a veil, from its tremulous motion, the corresponding Arabic word denoting a similar article of dress. SEE VEIL. The margin of the Auth. Vers. has "spangled ornaments," a mere conjecture. Roberts explains the ornaments spoken of by reference to the costume of the women of India: "The 'chains,' as consisting first of one most beautifully worked with a pendant ornament for the neck; there is also a profusion of others, which go round the same part, and rest on the bosom. In making curious chains, the goldsmiths of England do not surpass those of the East. The 'bracelets' are large ornaments for the wrists, in which are sometimes enclosed small bells. The 'mufflers' are, so far as I can judge, not for the face, but for the breasts." Kitto however, accedes to the opinion .of Gesenius that the last are a species of outdoor veil (see Daily Bible Illustra. ad loc.). SEE ATTIRE.

## Mufti[[@Headword:Mufti]]

             (Arabic, expounder of the law) is the name of the chief of the Turkish ecclesiastical and judicial order. There is a mufti in every large town of the Ottoman empire. In his religious capacity he administers the property of the Church, and watches over the due observance and preservation of its rites and discipline. In his civil capacity he pronounces decisions in such .matters of dispute as may be submitted to him. The Turkish grand mufti is the supreme head of the Ulemas (servants of religion and laws), and has, together with the grand vizir (Vizir Azim), the supreme guidance of the state, nominally ruled by the sultan. He is the chief spiritual authority, and in this capacity he is also denominated Sheik-al-Islam (Lord of the Faith). The imams (priests), however, chosen from the body of the ulemas, are, from the moment of their official appointment, under the authority of the Kislar-Aga, or Chief of the Black Eunuchs. The better class of the ulemas are the teachers and expounders of the law, from among whom the mollahs and cadis are elected.

The Turkish laws have their basis in the Koran; the mufti thus, as head of the judges, acquires a spiritual authority, and so great is the' popular regard for the mufti that even the sultan himself, if he will preserve any appearance of religion, cannot, without first hearing his opinion, put any person to death, or so much as inflict any corporeal punishment. In all actions, especially criminal ones, his opinion is required by giving him a writing, in which the case is stated under feigned names, which he subscribes with the word Olur or Olmuz, i.e., he shall or shall not be punished, accompanied with these emphatic words, in which he repudiates all claims to infallibility, "God knows better." Such outward honor is paid to the grand mufti that the grand seignior himself rises up before him, and advances seven steps towards him when lie comes into his presence. He alone has the honor of kissing the sultan's left shoulder, while the prime vizir kisses only the hem of his garment. When the grand seignior addresses any writing to the grand mufti, he gives him the following titles: "To the esad, the wisest of the wise; instructed in all knowledge; the most excellent of excellents; abstaining from things unlawful; the spring of virtue and true science; heir of the prophetic doctrines; resolver of the problems of faith; revealer of the orthodox articles; key of the treasures of truth; the light to doubtful allegories; strengthened with the grace of the Supreme Legislator of mankind. May the Most High God perpetuate thy favors."  The election of the grand mufti is vested solely in the sultan, who presents him with a vest of rich sables, and allows him a salary of a thousand aspers a day, which is about five pounds sterling. Besides this, he has the disposal of certain benefices belonging to the royal mosques, which he makes no scruple of selling to the best advantage; and on his admission to his office he is complimented by the agents of the bashas, who make him the usual presents, which generally amount to a very considerable sum. It is the grand mufti's prerogative generally to gird the sultan with the sword at his ascension to the throne, a ceremony which takes place at the Mosque of Eyub, and which is equal to the ceremony of coronation. In modern days the position of mufti has lost much of its former dignity and importance. His fetwa, or decision, although attached to the imperial decrees, imparts to it but little additional weight. Nor is his own dictum in things spiritual always considered as finally binding. The only prerogative of muftis and ulemas which has hitherto remained untouched is their being exempt from bodily or otherwise degrading punishments; nor can their property ever be confiscated, but descends to their successors.

## Muggleton[[@Headword:Muggleton]]

             SEE MUGGLETONIANS.

## Muggletonians[[@Headword:Muggletonians]]

             a sect that arose in England about the year 1651, and of which the founders were John Reeve and Ludovic Muggleton (the latter born 1607, died March 14, 1697), both until 1651 obscure men. The former's profession is not at all known, and he lived but a little while after their public declaration as religionists. Muggleton was a journeyman tailor, and is depicted by his contemporaries with long, thin hair, low forehead, protruding brow, broad high cheek-bones, and what physiognomists would call the aggressive nose. These men claimed to have the spirit of prophecy, and that they had been appointed by an audible voice from God as the last and greatest prophets of Jesus Christ, and affirmed themselves to be the two witnesses of Revelation 11. Muggleton professed to be the "mouth" of Reeve, as Aaron was of Moses. They asserted a right to bless all who favored and to curse all who opposed them, and did not hesitate to declare eternal damnation against their adversaries. They favored the world with a number of publications. In 1650 Muggleton published his first paper, in which it was asserted "that he was the chief judge in the world in passing sentence  of eternal death and damnation upon the souls and bodies of men; that in obedience to his commission he had already cursed and damned many hundreds to all eternity; that in doing this he went by as certain a rule as the judges of the land do when they pass sentence according to law; and that no infinite Spirit of Christ, nor any God, could or should be able to deliver from his sentence and curse." In another paper, published later, he insisted "that he was as true an ambassador of God, and judge of all men's spiritual estate, as any ever was since the creation of the world." He also declared himself above ordinances of every kind, not excepting prayer and preaching, rejecting all creeds and Church discipline and authority.

The most remarkable of his papers is the one particularly directed to the Parliament and commonwealth of England, and to his excellency the lord general Cromwell, which was entitled A Remonstrance From the Eternal God. The consequence was that the prophets were declared " nuisances," and imprisoned in "Old Bridewell." Another remarkable publication was A General Epistle From the Holy Spirit, dated from "Great Trinity Lane, at a chandler's shop, over against one Mr. Millis, a brown baker, near Bow Lane End, London." A pretty full exposition of their doctrines they furnished in 1656 in their publication entitled The divine Looking-glass of the Third Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ, which makes the chief articles of their creed to have been confused notions of Gnostic heresies. Thus they taught that God has the real body of a man; that the Trinity is only a variety of names of God; that God himself came down to earth, and was born as a man and suffered death; and that during this time Elias as s his representative in heaven. They also held very singular and not very intelligible doctrines concerning angels and devils. The Evil One, they taught, became incarnate in Eve, and there is no devil at all without the body of man or woman; and that the devil is man's spirit of unclean reason and cursed imagination, and that this is the only devil we have now to fear. According to them the soul of man is inseparably united with the body, with which it dies and will rise again. The works of Ludovic Muggleton, with his portrait prefixed, were published in 1756, and A complete Collection of the Works of Reeve and Muggleton, together with other Muggletonian Tracts, was published by some of their modern followers in 1832 (3 volumes, 4to). A list of books and general index to Reeve's and Muggleton's works was published in 1846, royal 8vo. Among the works written against them are the following: The New Witnesses proved Old Heretics, by William Penn (1672, 4to); A true Representation of the absurd and mischievous Principles of the Sect commonly known by the  Name of Muggletonians (Lond. 1694, 4to). Muggleton succeeded in gathering a large number of followers, and at the time of his death (1697) the Muggletonians, as they called themselves, were largely scattered all over England. They subsisted in good numbers until the end of the first quarter of this century; but the census of 1851 showed no trace of them, and they are supposed to be now wellnigh extinct. In 1868 one of the most eminent of the sect in modern times, Mr. Joseph Gander, died, and the London papers then announced that with him expired the Muggletonians. He had sustained a place of worship for a few of like mind with himself. Mr. Gander is spoken of as a "sincere member of the sect called Muggletonians for upwards of sixty years." Muggleton himself lies buried in Spinningwheel Alley, Moorfields, with the following inscription over his tomb:

"While mausoleums and large inscriptions give Might, splendor, and past death make potents live, It is enough briefly to write thy name. Succeeding times by that will read thy fame; Thy deeds, thy acts, around the world resound, No foreign soil where Muggleton's not found."

See Chamberlain, Present State of England (1702), page 258; Transact. of the Liverpool Lit. and Phil. Society, 1868-70; Stoughton, Ecclesiastes Hist. of England (Ch. of the Restor.), 2:208; Evans, Dict. of Sects, etc.; Hunt, Religious Thought of England, 1:241.

## Muhlberg, Battle Of[[@Headword:Muhlberg, Battle Of]]

             SEE THIRTY-YEARS WAR.

## Muhle (or Muhlitus), Heinrich[[@Headword:Muhle (or Muhlitus), Heinrich]]

             a German theologian, was born at Bremen, March 7, 1666. He was educated at the gymnasium of his native city, but went in 1686 to Hamburg to study ancient languages, and from there to the university at Giessen, where lie studied theology. He then spent a year at Frankfort-on-the-Oder; in 1688 attended lectures at Kiel, in 1689 at Leipsic, and in 1690 at Wittenberg. He was appointed in 1691 professor of the Greek and Oriental languages, of poetry and ecclesiastical elocution, at the University of Kiel. In 1692 he made a voyage through England and Holland, and thus secured in 1695 the position of professor of theology and inspector of schools of Schreswig-Holstein. In 1697 he was appointed pastor of the city church at Kiel; but as that place did not suit him, he accepted a call in 1698 as general superintendent, chief court-preacher, and provost at Gottorf, with the title of chief counsellor of the Consistory, but had to resign this position on account of some difficulties at the court; he returned to Kiel,  and was appointed in 1724 senior of the university. He died December 7, 1733. Muhle had a dispute with the Danish superintendent-general Schwarz, who accused him of being a millenarian and a disciple of Cocceius, who had tried to cause a schism in the Schleswig-Holstein Church. Muhle was even obliged to go into court, where he reprimanded Schwarz severely; but the dispute did not end until Schwarz died. His most important works are: De Messia sedente ad dextram Dei; Dissertatio philologico-theologica ad vindicandum locum Psalm cx, 1 contra ψευδερμένειαν Judaeorum, sub moderamine D. Clodii (Gissae, 1687, 4to): —Disquisitio de origine linguarum stirpeque ac matre Graecae, latinae, et Germanicae Hebraea (Kilon, 1692, 8vo): — Duphnis, sive de obitu C. Alberti, βουκολικὸν sacrae Divi Musqetae memoriae religioso, quo par est, affectu cultuque dicatum (ibid. 1695, fol.): — Kurze Anzeige der falschen Beschuldigungen des Dr. Josua Schwarz gegen ihn (Schleswig, 1702, 8vo): — Erorterung verschiedener, jetziger Zeit erregten Materica in drei Ordinationsreden kurzlich abgehandelt, nebst einem Vorbericht von D. Schwarzens neulichst wider ihn herausgegebenen Tract. Chiliastischer Vorspiele, Principia und Chiliasmus selbstgenannt, an das sammtliche Schleswig-Holsteinische Ministerium (ibid. 1705, 8vo): — De sectae studio in ecclesia orthodoxa vitando, invitatio ad lectiones publicas in libros orthodoxae ecclesiae synmbolicos universe ac sigillatim rite instituendas (Kilon, 1712, 4to): — M. Lutheri propositiones pro declaratione virtutis indulgentiarum, qua ostenditur, quantum illae et republicae et ecclesiae nocuerint, quamque vere ac merito cum reformationi evangelicae, tum schismati in evidente enato causam ac occasionem suppeditarint (Hamburg, 1717, 4to): — De variis pontificum iisque iniquissimis adversus Caesares, reges ac principes molitionibus et ab Christi vicariis, quales se jactant, longe alienissimis, dissertatio (Kilon, 1729, 4to): — Hymnus A. Clarenbachii in Henr. Zutphaniensis, Martyris apprime celebrati, locum Meldorflium in Dithmarsiam vocati, ac Coloniae Agrippinae d. 28 September 1529, concremati, memoriae solemniter renovandae (ibid. 1733, fol.). See Doring, Gelehr. Theol. Deultschlands, 4:618-629.

## Muhlenberg, Friederich August[[@Headword:Muhlenberg, Friederich August]]

             a minister of the Lutheran Church, noted in the Revolutionary history of this country, was the second son of Dr. H.M. Muhlenberg. and was born at the Trappe, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, January 26, 1750. He was educated at Halle, in Saxony, and was ordained to the work of the ministry before his return to this country. He was pastor for a time in Lebanon County, also at New Hanover and Reading, Pennsylvania. Thence he removed to the city of New York, where he continued to reside, as pastor of the Lutheran Church, until the British entered the city. In consequence of his devotion to American principles, it was supposed if he fell into the hands of the enemy he would be the victim of cruel and vindictive treatment; he therefore removed to Pennsylvania, and took charge for a season of the Lutheran congregation in New Hanover. Having been called by the people into political life, he laid aside the duties of the ministry. In 1779 he was elected a member of the Continental Congress. He was also sent as a delegate to the state convention which assembled to ratify the new Federal Constitution, and was selected by his colleagues to preside over their deliberations. He was repeatedly chosen as a representative to Congress under the new constitution, and on two different occasions served as Speaker of the House. He was a prominent and useful statesman. He was universally esteemed, and died, greatly lamented, at Lancaster in 1812. (M.L.S.)

## Muhlenberg, Gotthilf Henry Ernest, D.D[[@Headword:Muhlenberg, Gotthilf Henry Ernest, D.D]]

             the youngest son of Dr. H. M. Muhlenberg, was born at the Trappe, Pa., November 17, 1753. He spent several years at the University of Halle in the prosecution of his studies for the sacred office. On his return to this country in 1770 he was ordained to the work of the ministry, and immediately became assistant to his father, and third minister of the United Lutheran churches in Philadelphia. He continued to occupy this position until the British obtained possession of the city. As he was threatened with the halter, because of his zealous attachment to the cause of the Revolution, he found it necessary to flee from the scene of danger. Disguised under a blanket, and with a rifle on his shoulder, he had nearly fallen into hostile hands through the treachery of a Tory innkeeper, who had intentionally directed him to take the road by which the British were approaching. Warned, however, in season, he succeeded in making his escape, and reached New Hanover in safety. Relieved for a time from  professional duties, he engaged with great zest in the study of botany, and acquired that love for this favorite pursuit which afterwards so strongly manifested itself. On the election of his brother to a civil office he succeeded him as pastor. In the year 1780 he removed to Lancaster, where he labored in the ministry with great efficiency, enjoying the uninterrupted regard of his congregation, and exercising an influence in the community which it is rarely the privilege of the most highly favored to enjoy, until his death, which occurred May 23, 1815. He was a man of vigorous intellect and extensive attainments. He was an able theologian, a good linguist, and. was distinguished as an Oriental scholar. His acquisitions in medicine, chemistry, and mineralogy were also considerable. As a botanist he had a European reputation, and was in correspondence with the most distinguished savans of the Continent. His Catalogus Plantcaum and Descriptio Uberior Graminum are well known. His Mora Lancastriensis is still in manuscript, as well as several treatises in the department of theology and ethics. (M.L.S.)

## Muhlenberg, Henry Augustus[[@Headword:Muhlenberg, Henry Augustus]]

             a minister of the Lutheran Church, noted, however, more as a statesman than as a theologian, was the son of the preceding, and was born at Lancaster, Pennsylvania, May 13, 1782. He was largely educated by his father; and, after studying theology, was ordained for the ministry, and became pastor at Reading, Pennsylvania, in 1802. Poor health obliged him to resign in 1828, and he retired to live on a farm. He was, however, not suffered long to enjoy this life, for he was chosen member of Congress in 1829, and so continued until 1838, when he was made minister to Austria, a position which he held until 1840. He also held other political offices. He was a candidate for governor of his state in 1835, and declined in 1837 the secretaryship of the navy and the mission to Russia. He published the life of his uncle, Genesis Muhlenberg (Phila. 1819).

## Muhlenberg, Henry Melchior, D.D[[@Headword:Muhlenberg, Henry Melchior, D.D]]

             the patriarch of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, was born September 6, 1711, at Einbeck, in Hanover then a free city of Germany. He was the son of Nicolas Melchior and Anna Maria Kleinschmidt, originally Saxon, but who, like many of the earlier followers of the great Reformer, having suffered severely during the Thirty-years' War, which for a time threatened the extermination of the Protestant religion in Europe, removed  to Einbeck. His father was well known in the community, and highly esteemed. He was a member of the city council, and also held a judicial appointment, from which he derived the necessary means for the support of his family. His mother was the daughter of a retired officer, and is represented as a woman of sterling good-sense, great energy, and devoted piety. Henry was early dedicated to God in Christian baptism, and was carefully instructed by his parents in the principles and duties of the Christian religion. These influences were never effaced from his mind. In his youth he laid the foundation of that character which proved so valuable in his future life. In consequence of the death of his father his studies were interrupted, and he was thrown upon his own resources for a support; but his leisure hours were faithfully devoted to the acquisition of knowledge. Nothing could repress his love of study. His early life was years of privation and toil, yet without this preparatory discipline he would probably never have acquired those habits of self-reliance and systematic effort, that strength of purpose and heroic determination, which so prominently marked his subsequent career, and contributed so much to his usefulness in this Western World.

From his twelfth till his twenty-first year young Muhlenberg toiled incessantly in his efforts to assist in the maintenance of the family, yet during the intervals of repose he improved every opportunity afforded him for mental culture. On reaching his manhood he secured the position of tutor in the school of Raphelius at Zellerfeld, and the time not officially employed he devoted to study. In the spring of 1735 he entered the University of Gittingen, where he remained for three years, triumphing over all the difficulties he encountered, and winning the confidence of his instructors. The pious teachings of Dr. Oporin, who had kindly received him into his family and employed him as an amanuensis, exerted over him a most favorable influence, awakening -in him a deeper insight into his own character, and a clearer apprehension of the plan of salvation. "By his lectures," he says, "on the total depravity of our nature I was much moved, and so convinced of my sinfulness that I loathed myself on account of my folly. I was convinced by the Word of God that till this period my understanding in spiritual things was dark; that my will was disinclined to that new life which proceeds from God; that my memory had been employed only in collecting carnal things, my imagination in discovering sinful objects for the gratification of my perverted affections, and my members by habitual use had become weapons of unrighteousness.

But as I learned to recognise sin as sin, then followed sorrow, repentance, and hatred of it — shame and humiliation on  account of hunger and thirst for the righteousness of Jesus Christ. In this state of mind I was directed to the crucified Saviour; the merits of his death gave me life; my thirst was quenched by him, the Living Spring." From this period he became a most earnest Christian. He burned with an ardent desire to do good. On his graduation at Gottingen he repaired to Halle. There he continued his studies, and taught in the Orphan House. He lived on the most intimate terms with Franke, Cellarius, and Fabricius. By their advice he was led to prepare himself for the missionary work, and Bengal was the point selected as the field of his operations. While arrangements were making to send him to India, and just after he had been solemnly set apart to the work of the ministry, a most importunate application from congregations in Pennsylvania reached Germany fir some one to supply the great spiritual destitution that existed. The attention of the faculty was immediately directed to Muhlenberg, then in his thirty-first year, as a most suitable person for the position. Cheerfully yielding to the call, and with unshaken confidence in God, he was ready to abandon the comforts of home and the society of friends, as well as the prospects of future distinction to which a mind so highly gifted might have aspired, and to settle in this remote and, at that time, wild and inhospitable region as a humble instrument for the advancement of Christ's kingdom. He reached this country in 1742.

His arrival was an occasion of great joy and inexpressible gratitude to his German brethren. The Church he found in a most wretched condition; in his own language, it was not plantata, but plantanda. There had been numerous settlements in different parts of the country, and some of them had been furnished with able and faithful ministers, but as a general thing the Lutheran population had been sadly neglected. Muhlenberg's advent therefore marks a new aera in the history of the Lutheran Church in this country. Its character soon changed; its condition gradually improved; its position was at once strengthened, and permanence given to its operations. Frequent accessions were made to the ranks of the ministry — men educated at Halle, imbued with the spirit of their Master, and wholly devoted to their work, upon whose labors the blessing of Heaven signally rested. Entering upon the discharge of his duties, Muhlenberg assumed the pastoral care of the associated churches of Philadelphia, New Hanover, and Providence, which had united in a call for a minister. These three congregations continued to form the more prominent scenes of his ministerial labors, although there was probably not an organized Lutheran church in his day in which he did not preach; and when a difficulty occurred in any congregation, his aid was always invoked,  and seldom did he fail in reconciling differences and restoring confidence. His duties, in many respects, resembled those of an itinerant bishop whose diocese extended over a large territory. Often he undertook distant and irksome journeys for the purpose of gathering together the scattered flock, preaching the Word and administering the sacraments, introducing salutary discipline for the government of the churches, and performing other kind services, in his desire to repair the waste places of Zion and promote the cause of genuine piety. The care of the churches rested upon him. He had the confidence of the people; his presence everywhere inspired hope.

His opinions were valued; his influence was boundless and unprecedented. The first three years of his ministry in this country, Dr. Muhlenberg resided in Philadelphia; the next sixteen at Providence. In 1761 he returned to Philadelphia, and remained fifteen years, the condition of things in the congregation there requiring his presence. In 1776 he resumed his charge in the country. During the War of the American Revolution, because of his devotion to the principles involved in the struggle, he excited against him the most violent opposition, and his life was often exposed to imminent peril. He was warned and entreated to remove farther into the interior from the scene of hostilities, but he always refused. He was extensively known, and his relations to the Revolution were well understood. Many took advantage of his position, and persons of all classes resorted to his house. "His home," says a contemporary "was constantly filled with fugitives, acquaintances and strangers, with the poor and hungry, noble and common beggars.

The hungry never went away unsatisfied, nor the suffering uncomforted." The last few years of his life Dr. Muhlenberg's health gradually declined. His mind, in prospect of death, was calm, sustained by a humble yet firm reliance upon the Saviour of sinners. When the summons came, with entire composure, and in confident expectation of a blissful immortality, he yielded up his spirit, and rested in the bosom of his God. His active and useful career terminated October 7, 1787. His death was the occasion of wide-spread and unaffected sorrow. The people grieved that they should no longer see his face and listen to his paternal counsels. He was the friend and father of all, and all regarded it as their duty and privilege to mourn "their father, friend, example, guide removed." In many places the bells were tolled; the churches enshrouded in mourning, and funeral sermons delivered, in grateful remembrance of the departed, and as testimonials of the respect his worth everywhere inspired. The honored remains of the patriarch peacefully rest near the church which was so long the scene of his earnest labors, and in which he so often dispensed the  symbols of the Saviour's love among the people of God, and animated them in their Christian pilgrimage by the hopes and consolations of the Gospel.

The history of Dr. Muhlenberg's life is the history of one of the noblest minds, consecrating its learning, its affections, its influence, its energies, to all the interests of the Church and of humanity, to the glory and service of that Saviour who redeemed him with his own precious blood. He possessed a combination of qualities which peculiarly fitted him for' the duties he was called to perform. Gifted by nature with the highest powers, which had been brought under the influence of the best culture; endowed with a noble heart, which had been sanctified by divine grace and disciplined in the school of affliction; and in the possession of a physical constitution which in early life had been inured to labor; with an ardent, active piety, an earnest and enthusiastic devotion to the work, nothing seemed wanting for the successful accomplishment of his mission. He was the man kindly raised up by Providence for the particular emergency required at the time in this western hemisphere. The most sanguine expectations of his success were entertained by those who selected him for the mission. These expectations were more than realized. His praise is deservedly in all the churches. He has left a name fragrant with the richest honor attainable in this life — that of a good man, sincere in his professions and upright in his conduct, widely esteemed and greatly beloved. His society was sought and his influence courted by the learned men of the day. By the special invitation of the faculty he attended the Commencement exercises of Princeton College, and from the University of Pennsylvania he received the doctorate in divinity, a distinction in those days rarely conferred, and only upon those whose claims to the honor were unquestionable. See Helmuth; Denkmal der Liebe u. Achtung, etc. (Phila. 1788); Stoever, Life of H.M. Muhlenberg (Phila. 1856) ; Evang. Qu. Rev. (Luth.) 1:390, 590. (M.L.S.)

## Muhlenberg, John Peter[[@Headword:Muhlenberg, John Peter]]

             a Lutheran minister, was the oldest son of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg, and was born at the Trappe, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, October 1, 1746. His early education was conducted by his father and Dr. Smith, of Philadelphia. In the sixteenth year of his age he, with his two brothers, was sent to Germany to be educated at the University of Halle. On his return to this country, in 1768, he was ordained a minister of the Lutheran Church, and was for a season pastor of churches in New Germantown and Bedminster, N.J. In 1772 he removed to Woodstock, Dunmore County  (now Shenandoah), Virginia, where many Germans from the Middle States had settled, and, forming themselves into a congregation, requested Dr. Muhlenberg to send them his son as their rector. These Lutherans, in consequence of the laws then existing in Virginia on the subject of Church establishment, had organized as members of the Swedish branch of the Lutheran Church, and in order that their minister might enforce the payment of tithes, it was necessary that he should be invested with episcopal ordination. Accordingly Mr. Muhlenberg repaired to England for the purpose, and in connection with Mr. White, afterwards the venerable bishop of Pennsylvania, was ordained as priest by the lord bishop of London.

He continued his labors in Virginia till 1775, when his ardent patriotism and military spirit induced him, at the solicitation of general Washington, with whom he was on the most intimate terms, to accept a colonel's commission in the army. It is said that after he had received his appointment he preached a valedictory to his congregation, in the course of which he eloquently depicted the wrongs our country had suffered from Great Britain, and then added that "there was a time for all things; a time to preach and a time to pray; but there is also a time to fight, and that time has now come." Then, pronouncing the benediction, he deliberately laid aside his gown, which had thus far concealed his military uniform, and, proceeding to the door of the church, ordered the drums to beat for recruits. Nearly three hundred men enlisted under his banner, with whom he immediately marched to the protection of Charleston, South Carolina. He was present at the battle of Sullivan's Island, and performed a conspicuous part in all our Southern campaigns. Having been promoted in 1777 to the rank of brigadier-general, he held command in the battles of Brandywine and Germantown, and shared the dangers and responsibilities of Monmouth, Stony Point, and Yorktown. He continued in the service until the close of the war, and was then promoted to the rank of major- general before the army was disbanded. After the war, under the old constitution of Pennsylvania, he was elected vice-president of the state, with Benjamin Franklin as president. He was chosen for several terms as a representative in Congress, and also served as a presidential elector. In 1801 he was selected by the Legislature of Pennsylvania as United States Senator. He was likewise honored with several executive appointments. Jefferson appointed him supervisor of the revenue for Pennsylvania, and afterwards collector of the port of Philadelphia, which office he continued to hold during Madison's administration. He retained the confidence of the government till his death, and enjoyed the esteem of the community. He  died at his residence near Gray's Ferry, Philadelphia, October 1, 1807, and was buried by the side of his father at the Trappe. See Anderson, Hist. of the Colonial Churches of Great Britain, 3:269. (M.L.S.)

## Muhlenberg, William Augustus, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Muhlenberg, William Augustus, D.D., LL.D]]

             a distinguished Protestant Episcopal clergyman, great-grandson of Dr. Henry Melchior, was born in Philadelphia, September 16, 1796. He entered the University of Pennsylvania when but fourteen years of age, and graduated in 1814. Having pursued a course of theological study, he became a clergyman in the Episcopal Church in 1817, and for five years. was assistant rector of Christ Church, Philadelphia, being associated with bishop White. In 1821 he became rector of St. James' Church in Lancaster; in 1828 principal of St. Paul's College in Flushing, L.I.; in 1846, rector of  the Church of the Holy Communion, in the city of New York; in 1858, superintendent and pastor of St. Luke's Hospital, New York (which he was largely instrumental in founding, as also the church village of St. Johnland, on Long Island), holding this office until his death, April 8, 1877. In 1824 there appeared in the Episcopal Recorder, of Philadelphia, his admirable hymn, entitled, "I would not live alway," which has been incorporated into nearly every standard church' hymn-book. Many years afterwards, when he was the editor of the Evangelical Catholic, Dr. Muhlenberg explained the circumstances of its history. He was the author of, Church Poetry (1823): — Music of the Church (1852): — The People's Psalter (1858). His life was devoted to public labors of Christian evangelism and philanthropy. See his Life and Work, by Anne Ayres (N.Y. 1880). (J.C.S.)

## Muhlhausen, Jos-Tob, Of[[@Headword:Muhlhausen, Jos-Tob, Of]]

             SEE LIPMANN.

## Muhlhausser, Carl August[[@Headword:Muhlhausser, Carl August]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born in 1825, at Kleinkems, in Baden. He studied at Heidelberg, was for some time vicar and deacon at Carlsrulie, and in 1852 pastor at Sulzfeld. In 1857 he was called as member of the ecclesiastical council to Heidelberg, but retired in 1864, when the liberal party had obtained its influence upon ecclesiastical affairs. He went as pastor to Wilferdingen, where he died January 20, 1881. Mihlhausser seemed to have been predestinated to be the leader of the Christian party of his country. Everywhere his counsel was asked for, and his work was appreciated by the Bonn University, which honored him with the doctorate of divinity. He published, Die christliche Weltanschauung ( Heilbronn, 1876): Christenthum und die Presse (ibid. eod.): — he also edited R. Rothe's Erste Brief Johannis praktisch erklart (Wittenberg, 1878). (B.P.)

## Muinscher, Wihelm[[@Headword:Muinscher, Wihelm]]

             an eminent German theologian, was born at Hersfeld March 11, 1766, where his father was metropolitan and first preacher. After studying in the gymnasium of his native city, he continued his studies at Marburg. In 1785 he became his father's assistant, and in 1789 succeeded him as preacher at Hersfeld. In 1792 he was appointed professor of theology at Marburg, and member of the consistory, which positions he held for the remainder of his life. He died July 28, 1814. Dr. Miinscher was classed by his countrymen with Michaelis, Diderlein, Planck, and others who stood on middle ground between the ancient, pure Lutheranism and the modern neology of Germany. He wrote, Handbuch der christlich. Dogmengeschichte (1797, 4 volumes), which went through three editions, and was republished under the editorship of Cl1n and Neudecker in 1832-38, at Cassel: — Lehrbuch der christlichen Kirchengesch. (Marburg, 1804): — Abriss der Dogmengeschichte (1811, and often since; published also in this country in an English dress [New Haven, 1830]): — also numerous historical articles in Henke's Magazin, Staudlin's Beitrage, and Gabler's Journal: — Priedigten (Marb. 1803): — Politische Predigten (Marb. 1813). Minscher's great work (Dogmengeschichte) is thus spoken of by C.F.L. Simon, in his Continuation of Nisselt's Guide to the Literature of Theology (§ 299): "The author has happily combined the chronological order with that of the relations of things; and the whole work is distinguished alike for the persevering, learned, and critical industry manifested in collecting the materials, and for the solidity and independence of judgment with which they are methodically arranged and agreeably expressed." He adds, "The same commendation is due to the author's Elements of Dogmatic History." Brettschneider, in his Entwickelung der Dogmatik (page 99, 2d ed.), says of the Manual, "It is to be regarded as the best work on the subject." See Wachler, Ueb. Dr. Wilhelm Munscher (Frankf. 1814); Christian Examiner and General Review, 1830 (4), page 182. (J.H.W.)

## Muir, James, D.D[[@Headword:Muir, James, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Gumnock, Scotland, April 12, 1757. After the usual course of classical and philosophical studies at the University of Glasgow, at which he graduated in 1776, he prosecuted his theological studies at Edinburgh. In 1781 he was ordained an evangelist and sent to Bermuda, in 1785 joined the New Brunswick Presbytery, and in 1789 became pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Alexandria, Virginia, where he died, August 8, 1820. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 3:516.

## Muir, John[[@Headword:Muir, John]]

             a famous Sanscrit scholar, was born at Glasgow in 1810. He studied at his native place, and in 1828 went to Bengal in the service of the East India Company, where he interested himself in the moral and religious welfare of the natives, and for this purpose published, among other works, in 1839, A Sketch of the Argument for Christianity against Hinduism, and Examination of Religions. In 1853 he returned to his native country. He died March 8, 1882, at Edinburgh. Muir's main work is Original Sanscrit Texts, on the Origin and History of the People of India, their Religion and Institutions (Lond. 1868-73, 5 volumes), which is indispensable for the student of ancient Hindu life and thought, dealing principally, as it does with the Vedic period of Indian literature. The first volume discusses the legendary accounts of the origin of the caste; the second, the primitive home of the Hindus; the third, the opinions, of Hindu writers on the Vedas; the fourth, the contrast between Vedic and later Hindu theology; and the fifth, the cosmological and mythological conceptions' of the Indians in the Vedic age. (B.P.)

## Muirhead, Andrew[[@Headword:Muirhead, Andrew]]

             a Scotch prelate, was first rector of Codzow, and next preferred to the see of Glasgow in 1455. He was one of the commissioners who went to England in 1462, in order to negotiate a truce between the two nations. He died November 20, 1473. This prelate founded the vicars of the choir at Glasgow, and beautified the cathedral. He also established a hospital, which he dedicated to St. Nicholas. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 252.

## Muis, Simeon Marotte De[[@Headword:Muis, Simeon Marotte De]]

             a French Hebraist, was born in 1587 at Orleans. Of his earlier personal history it is only known that he was canon and archdeacon of Soissons. Four years after Cayet's death (1614) he was installed professor of Hebrew in the royal college, and kept that chair until removed by death in 1644. Muis combined with the knowledge of this language solid judgment, fine discrimination, a pure, elegant, and easy style, and very extensive acquaintance with sacred history and the groundwork of religion. He had the reputation of being one of the most learned interpreters of the Scriptures. We possess of him, R. Davidis Kimchi Commentarius in Malachian, Heb. et Lat. (Paris, 1618, 4to): — In Psalmum 19 trium rabbinorum Commentarii Hebraici cum Lat. interpretat. (Paris, 1620, 8vo): — Annotationes in Psalmum 34, printed in Bellarmine's Institut. Hebraicce (1622, 8vo): — Commentarius litteralis et historicus in omnes Psalmos et selecta V.T. cantica, cum versione nova ex Hebraeo (Par. 1630, fol.; Lovan. 1770, 2 volumes, 4to); this commentary is considered one of the best in existence, and was so pronounced by Bossuet, Godeau, Gassendi, Voisin, and other Roman Catholic authorities: Assertio Veritatis, Hebraicae adversus Joannis Morini exercitationes in utrumque Samaritanorum Pentateuchum (Par. 1631, 8vo): — and, in answer to Morin's repeated charge, Exercitationes Biblicae (Par. 1633), a second defence of the Hebrew text entitled Assertio Veritatis Hebraicae altera (Par. 1634), accompanied with a Specimen variorum sacforunm, containing notes of rabbins on the most difficult passages in the Pentateuch, the book of Joshua, and the first chapters of Judges: — Castigatio Animadversionum ad Pentateuchum (Par. 1639, 8vo). The most of De Muis's writings have, after his death, been collected and published by Claude d'Auvergne (Par. 1650, fol.). See Hoefer, Nouv. iaog.  Genecra le, s.v.; Dupin, Biblioth. des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques; Niceron, Memoires, volume 32, s.v.

## Mujoz, Agidius, Anti-pope[[@Headword:Mujoz, Agidius, Anti-pope]]

             was born at the beginning of the 14th century. In consequence of the election of pope Martin V by the Council of Constance, the Church had again a chief, but notwithstanding Peter de Luna continued to play at the castle of Peniscola the part of pope. He only counted, however, a small circle of adherents. When Peter de Luna died in 1424, AEgidius Mufoz was elected anti-pope under the name of Clement VIII, and he continued in his office till July 26,1429, when he resigned. In return for his resignation, the bishopric of Majorca was given to him. SEE CLEMENT VIII; SEE MARTIN V.

Muioz, Juan Baptista, a Spanish historian and philosophical writer, was born in 1745 at Muleros, near Valencia. He was appointed professor of philosophy at the university, and disestablished Aristotelian philosophy,  which had hitherto reigned supreme in Spain. Later he became cosmographer of the Indies, and undertook by order of the king a history of America, of which he lived to publish only one volume. He died in 1799. His works of interest to the theological student are, De recto Philosophiae recentis in Theologia Usu Dissertatio: — De Scriptorum Gentilium Lectione: — Institutiones Philosophicae.

## Mulberry[[@Headword:Mulberry]]

             stands in the Auth. Vers. as the rendering of the Heb. בָּכָא (baka', regarded by Gesenius, Heb. Lex. s.v., as if from בָּכָה, to weep), or in the plur. בְּכָאַים (bekaim'); which occurs, the first in Psa 84:6, "Who passing through the valley of Baca make it a well; the rain also filleth the pools;" the second in 2Sa 5:23-24, and in 1Ch 14:14-15, where the Philistines having spread themselves in the valley of Rephaim, David was ordered to attack them from behind, "And let it be, when thou hearest the sound of a going in the tops of the mulberry-trees, that thou shalt bestir thyself." In the former of these passages the term is usually regarded as an appellative, i.q. "the valley of tears" (so the Sept. ἡ κοιλὰς τοῦ κλαυθμῶνος, Vulg. vallis lachrynmarum; SEE BACA ); but in the latter two it undoubtedly designates some tree or shrub (the Sept. has also κλαυθμῶν in 2 Samuel, but ἄπιοςin I Chronicles; the Vulg. pyrus in both places). The Jewish rabbins, with several modern versions, understand the mulberry-tree; others retain the Hebrew word. Neither the mulberry nor the pear tree, however, satisfies translators and commentators, because they do not possess any characters particularly suitable to the above passages. With regard to the mulberry, Rosenmuller justly observes (Alterth. 4, 1:247 sq.; Bibl. Bot. page 256) that this interpretation "is countenanced neither by the ancient translators nor by the occurrence of any similar term in the cognate languages"-unless we adopt the opinion of Ursinus, who (Arbor. Bib. 3:75), having in view the root of the word bakah, "to weep," identifies the name of the tree in question with the mulberry, "from the blood-like tears which the pressed berries pour forth." The mulberry-tree, moreover, appears to have another name in Scripture, namely, the "sycamine." Though there is no evidence to show that the mulberry-tree occurs in the Hebrew Bible, yet the fruit of this tree (μόρον) is mentioned in 1Ma 6:34 as having been, together with grape-juice, shown to the elephants of Antiochus Eupator, in order to irritate these animals and make them more formidable opponents to the army of the Jews. It is well known that many animals are enraged when they see blood or anything of the color of blood. SEE SYCAMINE.  Celsius (1:339) quotes Abu'l Fadli's description of a shrub of Mecca called baca. with abundant fruit, distilling a juice from its branches when cut (whence the name, i.q. tear), and of a warming property; apparently some species of Amyris or Balsamodendron. Most lexicographers are satisfied with this explanation. That plant is probably the same with the one referred to by Forskal (page 198) among the obscure plants without fructification which he obtained from Jobbe, and which he says was called baka, or ebka, with a poisonous milky sap. If this be the same as the former, both are still unknown any further, and we cannot therefore determine whether they are found in Palestine or not. As to the tree of which Abu'l Fadli speaks, and which Sprengel (Hist. rei herb. page 12) identifies with Amyris Gileadensis, Lin., it is impossible that it can denote the baka of the Hebrew Bible, although there is an exact similarity in form between the Hebrew and Arabic terms; for the Anmyridacce are tropical shrubs, and never could have grown in the valley of Rephaim, the scriptural locality for the bekaim.

"The tree alluded to in Scripture, whatever it is, must be common in Palestine, must grow in the neighborhood of water, have its leaves easily moved, and have a name in some of the cognate languages similar to the Hebrew baka. The only one answering to these conditions is that called bak by the Arabs, or rather shajrat-al-bak that is, the fly or gnat tree. It seems to be so called from its seeds, when loosened from their capsular covering, floating about like gnats, in consequence of being covered with light, silk-like hairs, as is the case with those of the willow. In Richardson's Arabic dictionary the balk-tree is considered to be the elm; but from a passage of Dioscorides, preserved by Plempius, the dirdar of the Arabians seems to be another kind of bak-tree, probably the arbor culicumn (tree of gnats) of the Latin translators of Avicenna. Now in other Arabic authors the dirdar is said to be a kind of ghurb, and the ghurb is ascertained to be the Lombardy poplar (Illust. Himal. Bot. page 344). As it seems therefore tolerably clear that the bak-tree is a kind of poplar, and as the Arabic bak is very similar to the Hebrew baka [but in the Heb. the k in the name is כ, while in the Arabic it is that which corresponds to ק], so it is probable that one of the kinds of poplar may be intended in the above passages of Scripture. And it must be noted that the poplar is as appropriate as any tree can be for the elucidation of the passages in which the name occurs. For the poplar is well known to delight in moist situations, and bishop Horne, in his Comm. on Psalms 84. has inferred that in the valley of Baca the Israelites, on their way to Jerusalem, were refreshed by plenty of water. It  is not less appropriate in the passages in 2 Samuel and 1 Chronicles, as no tree is more remarkable than the poplar for the ease with which its leaves are rustled by the slightest movement of the air; an effect which might be caused in a still night even by the movement of a body of men on the ground, when attacked in flank or while unprepared. That poplars are common in Palestine may be proved from Kitto's Palestine, page 114: 'Of poplars we only know, with certainty, that the black poplar, the aspen, and the Lombardy poplar grow in Palestine. The aspen, whose long leaf-stalks cause the leaves to tremble with every breath of wind, unites with the willow and the oak to overshadow the watercourses of the Lower Lebanon, and, with the oleander and the acacia, to adorn the ravines of Southern Palestine; we do not know that the Lombardy poplar has been noticed but by lord Lindsay, who describes it as growing with the walnut- tree and weeping-willow under the deep torrents of the Upper Lebanon.'" SEE POPLAR.

## Mulcaster, Richard[[@Headword:Mulcaster, Richard]]

             an English divine and teacher noted for his scholastic attainments, was ,a native of Carlisle, and of an old family in Cumberland. He received his earliest education on the foundation at Eton, under the celebrated Udal, whence, in 1548, he was elected scholar of King's College, Cambridge. From Cambridge he removed to Oxford, and in 1555 was chosen student of Christ Church. In the next year he was licensed to proceed in arts, and about the same time became known for his proficiency in Eastern literature. He began to teach in 1559; and on September 24, 1561, for his extraordinary attainments in philology, was appointed the first master of Merchant Tailors' School in London, then just founded. Here he continued till 1586, when he resigned; and some time after he was appointed upper master of St. Paul's School. Here he remained twelve years, and then retired to the rectory of Stanford rivers, in Essex, to which he had been presented by the queen. He held this place until his death, April 15, 1611. Several of his smaller compositions, commendatory verses, etc., are prefixed to works of his contemporaries; and Gascoigne has printed some Latin verses of his composition which were spoken before the queen at Kenilworth in 1575. His separate works were, his Positions, wherein those primitive circumstances be examined which are necessarie for the training up of Children, either for skill in theire book or health in their bodie (Lond. 1581 and 1587, 4to); to which a second part was promised: — The first part of the Elementarie, which entreateth chefely of the right writing  of the English tung (Lond. 1582, 4to); a book which Warton (Hist. English Poetry) says contains many judicious criticisms and observations on the English language: — Catechismus Paulinus; in usum Scholae Paulinae conscriptus, ad formam parvi illius Anglici Catechismi qui pueris in communi Precum Anglicarum libro ediscendus proponitur (1601, 8vo). This is in long and short verse, and, though now forgotten, was once esteemed. Mulcaster was a firm adherent to the Reformed religion; a man of piety, and a "priest in his own house as well as in the temple." See Gentleman's Magazine, volume 30; Hook, Ecclesiastes Biog. 7:388, 389; English Cyclop. s.v.; Fuller, Worthies of England, s.v.

## Mulciber[[@Headword:Mulciber]]

             (i.e. the Softener), a surname of VULCAN, the Roman god of fire. This euphemistic name of Mulciber is frequently applied to him by the Latin poets.

## Mulder, Israel[[@Headword:Mulder, Israel]]

             a Jewish writer of note, and celebrated also for his philanthropic labors among his people, flourished in Holland in recent times. He died at Amsterdam December 29, 1862. He contributed largely for the dissemination of culture among his co-religionists, and did everything in his power to elevate the Jewish people in their literary life. He also wrote much himself, and among other works published a Hebrew-German dictionary and many essays on various subjects.

## Mule[[@Headword:Mule]]

             (פֶּרֶד, pe'red, 2Sa 13:29; and often elsewhere; fem. פַּרְדָּה, piirdah', 1Ki 1:33; 1Ki 1:38; 1Ki 1:44; so called from their quick pace, or from carrying loads; but רֶכֶשׁ, rekesh, Est 8:10; Est 8:14, denotes a steed or nobler horse; "swift beast" in Mic 1:13; "dromedary" in 1Ki 4:28), a hybrid animal, the offspring of a horse and an ass (comp. Varro, De re rustica, 2:8; Pliny, 8:69; Colum. 6:36; AEsop, Fab. 140; AElian, Anim. 12:16; Strabo, 5:212). Of this animal there are two kinds: one is the produce of a he-ass with a mare; the other the produce of a she-ass and a stallion. The former is the mule, commonly so called. That in respect to swiftness the hybrid between the ass and the mare is much superior to the  hybrid between the horse and the sheass is abundantly attested (Aristot. Rhetor. 3:2; Pliny, Hist. Nat. 8:44, etc.), which is in favor of Bochart's hypothesis that mules are meant by the אֲחִשְׁתְּרָנַים., A.V. "camels" of Est 8:10; Est 8:14. SEE CAMEL.

A mule is smaller than a horse, and is a remarkably hardy, patient, obstinate, sure-footed animal, living ordinarily twice as long as a horse. These animals are mostly sterile; as distinct species of animals do not freely intermix their breed, and hybrid animals do not propagate their kind beyond at most a very few generations, and no real hybrid races are perpetuated. The claim of Anah, son of Zibeon, to the discovery of breeding mules, as asserted in the Talmuds, may be regarded as an expression of national vanity (see Bochart, Hieroz. 1:221 sq.; Dougtaei Anal. 1:41 sq.). It rests on Gen 36:24, where יֵמַם, yenzim', is rendered mules; but it more probably means water — meaning the warm springs of Callirrhoe on the eastern shore of the Dead Sea.' SEE ANAH.

There is no probability that the Hebrews bred mules, because it was expressly forbidden by the Mosaic law to couple animals of different species (Lev 19:19). But they were not forbidden to use them (Philo, Opp. 2:307); and we find under the monarchy that mules were common among the Hebrews (see also Josephus, Life, 26), and they were probably known much earlier. Even the kings and most distinguished nobles were accustomed to ride upon mules (and apparently they only), although at first they used only male and female asses (2Sa 18:9; 1Ki 1:33; 1Ki 1:38; 1Ki 1:44; 1Ki 18:5; 2Ki 5:17; 2Ch 9:24; Psa 32:9). "It is an interesting fact that we do not read of mules till the time of David (as to the yenzim, A.V. 'mules,' of Gen 36:24, see above), just at the time when the Israelites were becoming well acquainted with horses. After this time horses and mules are in Scripture often mentioned together. After the first half of David's reign, as Michaelis (Comment. on Laws of Moses, 2:477) observes, they became all at once very common. In Ezr 2:66, Neh 7:68, we read of two hundred and forty-five mules; in 2Sa 13:29, 'all the king's sons arose, and every man gat him up upon his mule.' Absalom rode on a mule in the battle of the wood of Ephraim, at the time when the animal went away from under him, and so caused his death. Mules were among the presents which were brought year by year to Solomon (1Ki 10:25).

From the above-cited Levitical law we must suppose that the mules were imported, unless the Jews became subsequently less strict in their observance of the ceremonial injunctions, and bred their mules. We learn from Ezekiel (Eze 27:14) that the Tyrians, after the time of  Solomon, were' supplied with both horses and mules from Armenia (Togarmah), which country was celebrated for its good horses (see Strabo, 11:13, 7, ed. Kramer; comp. also Xenoph. Anab. 4:5, 36; Herod. 7:40). Michaelis conjectures that the Israelites first became acquainted with mules in the war which David carried on with the king of Nisibis (Zobah) (2Sa 8:3-4). In Solomon's time it is possible that mules from Egypt occasionally accompanied the horses which we know the king of Israel obtained from that country; for though the mule is not of frequent occurrence on the monuments of Egypt (Wilkinson's Anc. Egypt. 1:386 [Lond. 1854]), yet it is not easy to believe that the Egyptians were not well acquainted with this animal. That a friendship existed between Solomon and Pharaoh is clear from 1Ki 9:16, as well as from the fact of Solomon having married the daughter of the king of Egypt; but after Shishak came to the throne a very different spirit prevailed between the two kingdoms: perhaps, therefore, from this date mules were obtained from Armenia." In latter times (eventually, at all events) the Hebrews appear to have obtained the more valuable mules from Assyria and Persia (Isa 66:20; Est 8:10; Est 8:14; comp. Ctes. Pers. 44; see Host, Marohk, page 292). We do not read of mules at all in the N.T.; perhaps, therefore, they had ceased to be imported. SEE HORSE.

Mules are represented on some of the ancient Assyrian bass-reliefs; they are seen in procession, belonging to a captured people (Layard's Nineveh, 2:323, 324). They were also ridden in battle and by kings (ibid. 2d ser. pages 446, 449). There are various breeds of mules in Syria. Some very beautiful animals are produced from high-blood Arab mares, but they are few in number, and can only be possessed by the wealthy. Burckhardt states that the breed of the Baalbek mules is highly esteemed, and that he had seen some which were worth from thirty to five-and-thirty pounds (Trav. 1:57). The more ordinary sort of mules, which are capable of carrying heavy loads, are employed in the caravans; and they are of great service for the mill and waterwheels. The domestic trade with the maritime towns and the mountains is not only carried on chiefly by mule caravans, but they are sent even to Erzerum, Constantinople, and other remote towns (Russell, Aleppo, 2:50 sq.). In these caravans the male travellers are mounted on mules lightly laden, generally the mere personal luggage of the rider. Persons of rank travel in a kind of litter, carried by two mules. Within the towns, and in short excursions, asses are generally preferred, and the mules bear the luggage. In modern times the breeding of mules in Southern  Europe and Western Asia has been greatly increased. Those of Persia are described as of large size, and of amazing strength and power of endurance. They will travel the stony and steep roads over rocky mountains, day after day, at the rate of from twenty-five to fifty miles per diem, loaded with a weight of 300 pounds. They require more food than the horse. The muleteers never remove the pack-saddles from their backs, except when cleaning or currying them. If the men find that the back has been galled, they take away some of the stuffing from the pack-saddle, where it presses on the sore part, and then put the saddle on again, experience having taught them that such sores, unless healed under the saddle, are apt to break out again. See Ugolino, De re rustica Hebr., in his Thesaur. 29, part 4, 10; Bochart, Hieroz. 1:209 sq.; Robinson, Researches, passim. See Ass.

## Mulier-Subintroducta[[@Headword:Mulier-Subintroducta]]

             (γυνὴ συνείσακτος) is a term which was used by the great Nicene Synod in a sense synonymous to the "foemina extranea," and nearly to the "focaria" and "concubina" of later times, as well as to the " agapeta" and " dilecta" of earlier date, and is by Protestants held to be simply an expression of the council against the improper female companionship of unmarried priests. Roman Catholics, however interpret it to carry the desire for the separation from all female companionship, even the wife. See Lea, Historical Sketch of Sacerdotal Celibacy in the Christian Church, pages 51-53. SEE CELIBACY.

## Mullah[[@Headword:Mullah]]

             (a title merely; SEE MOLLAH ) Firuz BENKAWUS a modern Persian ecclesiastic, noted as a poet, was born at Bombay in 1759. When only a youth he accompanied his father to Persia, and became acquainted with the rich poetical literature of that country. He then conceived the idea of composing an epic poem like Ferduisi's Chah-Nameh, taking, however, his subject from modern history. He called it George-Naizeh. It treats of the conquest of the East Indies by the English, and elevates poor George III to the character of a hero. Containing 110,000 verses, it was to extend to the battle of Punah (1816), but the author died in his native city in 1831 before he had completed it. His nephew, Mullah Rustem ben-Kaikobad, published (Bombay, 1837, 4to) a part of the first volume, with a prospectus of the whole work. The poem has since appeared complete at Calcutta (1839, 3  volumes, 4to). But these poetical labors did not only not interfere with the performance of Firuz's duties as high-priest of the Parsees, but he also devoted himself to ecclesiastical studies, and published an edition of the Desatir, or sacred writings of the ancient Persian prophets in the original tongue, etc., together with an English translation of the Desatir, and a commentary by M. Erskine (Bombay, 1818, 2 volumes, 8vo). He published two essays in response to Hachem of Ispahan, to prove that the Persian intercalar era dates not from Zoroaster, but is of more modern origin. They were both printed at Bombay, one in 1828 (1 volume fol.), the other in 1832 (4to). All his books and manuscripts Mullah Firuz bequeathed to the grand library of the Parsees,

## Mullens, Joseph, D.D[[@Headword:Mullens, Joseph, D.D]]

             an English Congregational minister, was born in London, September 2, 1820. He gave his heart to the Saviour at the age of fifteen, and joined the Church a year later. He was. educated at Coward College, and in 1841 graduated B.A. from the University of London. In 1842 he was accepted for service by the London Missionary Society. He then studied for a time in Edinburgh University. He was ordained September 5, 1843, and sailed for India on the 9th. On his arrival it Calcutta he entered the institution at Bhowanipore, and in 1846 became pastor of the native church there, in which office he continued for twenty years. He rendered important service to the society by the collection of carefully prepared statistics. In 1866 he returned to England to. assist Dr. Tidman in the foreign secretaryship of  the society. This office he held till his death. In 1870 he visited America to attend the annual meeting: of the American Board of Foreign Missions. In 1873 he visited Madagascar in the interest of the mission there. While making a journey to the heart of Africa to establish the mission at Tanyanyika. He died, July 10, 1878. Dr. Mullens is the author of, Twelve Months in Madagascar (Lond. 1873): — Vedantism, Brahmanism, and Christianity: — Religious Aspects of Hinduism: — Missions in India, and several other works on missionary subjects. See (Lond.) Cong. Yearbook, 1880, page 342.

## Mullens, William[[@Headword:Mullens, William]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Virginia in 1804. He removed with his parents to Bedford County, Tennesee, when a youth, and settled on Duck River. He joined the Church in 1820, and was licensed to preach shortly afterwards. In 1822 he joined the Tennessee Conference, and labored two years in West Tennessee. He afterwards travelled Bigbee, Duck River, Bedford, Dickson, Chapel Hill, and Lynnville circuits. His health failing him, he located for a while; but he had no sooner re-entered the work than his health gave way the second time, and he was granted a supernumerary relation, in which he continued until his death, March 18, 1870. "By nature he was a nobleman, and ever preserved his integrity of character. His sympathies were always with the afflicted, and his liberality in relieving the sufferings of others was proverbial." See Minutes of Conferences of the M.E. Church, South, 1870.

## Muller, Adam Heinrich[[@Headword:Muller, Adam Heinrich]]

             a German statesman, noted for his efforts to give the secular laws a Christian basis, was born at Berlin June 30, 1779, and studied philosophy at the University of Gottingen, where in 1800 he spoke, publicly against the French Revolution. In his journeys in later years he came to Vienna, where he turned Roman Catholic. He returned to Berlin; but not receiving an office there, he went again to Vienna, and entered the state service of Austria. He was intrusted with political missions. He went to Paris with Metternich, was afterwards consul-general in Leipsic, and was finally recalled to Vienna with the title of Counsellor of the Court. His favorite study being the fathers of the Church, he tried to give to all political and  secular relations a Christian coloring. He died January 17, 1829. His works are, Vorlesungen uber die deutsche Literatur und Wissenschaft (1807): — Von der Nothwendigkeit einer theologischen Grundlage der Staatswissenschaft und Staatswirthschaft (Leipsic, 1819): — Die Elemente der Staatskunst (Berlin, 1809): — Ueber Friedrich II (Berlin, 1810): — Die Theorie der Staatshaushaltung (Vienna, 1812): — Vermischte Schriften uber Staat, Philosophie und Kunst (Vienna, 1812). See Hurst's Hagenbach, Ch. Hist. 18th and 19th Centuries, 2:296, 324, 448; and the references in Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, 12:814, 815.

## Muller, Alexander[[@Headword:Muller, Alexander]]

             a Roman Catholic canonist of Germany, who was born at Zell in 1780, and died at Mayence in 1844, is the author of, Encyklopadisches Handbuch des gesamnten in Deutschland Kirchenrechts (Erfurt, 1829-32, 2 volumes): — Ueber die Nothwendigkeit der Reorganisation des Corpus Evangelicum (Leipsic, 1830): — Das Christenthum nach seiner Pflanzung und Ausbreitung, etc. (1831): — Hauptcharakter und Grundfehler des riimischen Katholicismus (eod.): — Febronius der Neue (1838): — Der Erzbischof von Koln in Opposition mit den preussischen Staatsoberhaupte, etc. (eod. 2 volumes). See Zuchoid, Bibl. Theol. 1:335; 2:909; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:581; 2:511. (B.P.)

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

             a German divine and Oriental scholar, greatly distinguished for his labors in illustration (of the Chinese language, was a native of Pomerania, and was born in 1630. But little is known of his personal history. He assisted Walton in his Polyglot Bible and contributed to Castell's Lexicon. He also published a Treatise on Cathay; Japanese Alphabet; Chinese Basilicon, and other works. He died in 1694.

## Muller, Georg Christian[[@Headword:Muller, Georg Christian]]

             a German theologian, was born in 1769 at Miilhausen; received his preparatory education at his native place, then went to the university at Halle; entered the ministry in 1814, and became pastor at Neumark, near Zwickau, where he died about 1830. His most noteworthy works are, Entwunf einer philosophischen Religionslehre (Halle, 1797, 8vo): — Protestantisnus und Religion; ein Versuch zur Darstellung ihres Verhiltnisses (Leipsic, 1809, 8vo): — Ueber Wissenschaft und System in der Ethik, published in vol. ii of Zeitschriftfiir Moral (Jena, 1819, 8vo).

## Muller, Heinrich (1), Dr[[@Headword:Muller, Heinrich (1), Dr]]

             a noted German divine, was born October 18, 1631, at Lubeck, a place which his parents were obliged to quit because of Wallenstein's hordes. His earliest religious impressions he received from his mother Elizabeth, to whom he was indebted, like Augustine to his mother Monica, or Chrysostom to Anthusa. Although of a feeble constitution, Muller made such progress in the school of his native place that when, in 1644, his parents:-returned to Rostock he was matriculated as a student of philosophy, though only thirteen years of age. For three years he attended the lectures of Liitkemann (q.v.), went in 1647 to Greifswalde to study theology, and was honored with the degree of magister artium. Having travelled for some time in order to enrich his store of knowledge, he returned in 1651 to Rostock, where he commenced a series of lectures, which were so highly spoken of that the magistrate appointed him archdeacon of St.Marien Kirche when hardly twenty years of age. A year later the University of Helmstadt conferred upon him the degree of doctor of divinity, his own university not acknowledging him worthy until seven years afterwards. In 1659 he was appointed professor of Greek, in 1662 he became a member of the theological faculty and pastor, and in 1671 the whole clergy unanimously appointed him as their superintendent, and this position 'he held until his death, which occurred September 13, 1675. Muller belonged to those men whom Providence had called to sow the seed of a new and fresh evangelical life in a soil which was enriched with the blood of the Thirty-Years' War, Lutheran orthodoxy, which had become weakened through constant controversies, not being sufficiently strong to successfully supplant error by truth in life as well as in faith. Christianity was to Muller not a dogma, but life, and thus he may be regarded, in connection with Job. Arndt (q.v.), Val. Andrea (q.v.), and  Chr. Scriver, as the predecessor of Spener; and like the writings of Arndt and Scriver, his own writings are read by the German people up to this day. Muller was a voluminous writer, and wrote not only in German, but also in Latin. The best known of his works are, Apostolische Schlusskette und Kraftkern (Frankfort, 1633, and often): — Evangelische Schlusskette (ibid. 1763, and often): — Evangelischer Herzensspiegel (ibid. 1679): — Himmlischer Liebeskuss (Rostock, 1659): — Kreuz, Buss- u. Betschule (ibid. 1651, and often): — Geistliche Erquickungsstunden (ibid. 1663, and often):Orator ecclesiasticus, etc. (ibid. 1659): — Conjugii clericorum patrocinium (ibid. 1665): — Harmonia Veteris Novique Test. chronologica (ibid. 1668): — Theologia scholastica (ibid. 1656). For a list of his writings, see Witte, Memoriae theologorum nostri saeculi clarissimorunt renovatae, decas xv (Frankfort, 1684), page 1891; Rottermund, Supplement zu Jicher's Gelehrten-Lexikon, 5:57. See also Koch, Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes (Stuttgard, 1868), 4:66 sq.; J.G. Russwurm, in his edition of Muller's Erquickungsstunden (Reutlingen, 1842); Bittcher, in Tholuck's Liter. Anzeiger, 1844, No. 15-18; Dr. H. Muller, eine Lebensbeschreibung von Aichel (Hamburg, 1854); Wild, Leben u. Auswahl von Miller's Schriften, in Klaiber's Evang. Volksbibliothek (Stuttgard, 1864), volume 3; Niedner, Lehrbuch der christl. Kirchengeschichte (Berlin, 1866), page 788; Bibliotheca Sacra, July 1868, page 587; Kitto, October 1853, page 208; Hase, Church Hist. page 449. (B.P.)

## Muller, Heinrich (2)[[@Headword:Muller, Heinrich (2)]]

             a German theologian, was born at Joel, near Flensburg, February 25, 1759. He studied theology and philosophy at the University of Kiel, and was called in 1786 to the position of deacon to the city church at Kiel. In 1789 he became also professor of theology and first teacher of the seminary. He finally resigned his position as minister, and became director of the seminary. He resigned the position as director of the seminary in 1805, and died February 9, 1814. A monument by his scholars was erected in 1818 in the cemetery at Kiel. His most important works are, Sammlung von Evangelien und Episteln, nebst Gebeten fur die kirchliche und hausliche Andacht. Ein Anhang zum Schleswig-Holsteinischen Gesangbuche (Kiel, 1813, 8vo): — Lehrbuch der Katechetik (Kiel, 1816): — Handbuch der Katechetik; ein Commentar iiber das Lehrbuch: Herausgegeben von C. Carstensen (Altona, 1821-23, 2 volumes, 8vo). See Doring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands, s.v.

## Muller, Heinrich Daniel[[@Headword:Muller, Heinrich Daniel]]

             a German theologian, was born at Buchenau, in Hesse-Darmstadt, September 24, 1712. He was educated at Giessen, Marburg, Halle, and Jena. In 1742 he was appointed city minister and definitor at Giessen, and in 1748 professor extraordinary of theology. In 1749 he followed a call to Echzell, in Hesse-Darmstadt, as metropolitan and pastor primarius; became in 1777 inspector of the convent of the same place, and died March 22, 1797. His most important works are, Diss. de Christo Deo magno vero et benedicto ad Tit 2:13; 1Jn 5:20; Rom 9:5 (Jenae, 1736, 4to): —Diss. inaug. de existentia Dei et revelationis ejusque criteriis (Gissae, 1739, 4to): — Disquisitio philosophica de quantitate (ibid. 1746, 4to): —Theses philosophicae (ibid. 1746, 4to): — Commentatio philosophica de systemate harmoniae praestabilitae, qua comprimis quaeritur, an libertatem tollat hoc systema? (ibid. 1746, 4to): — Progr. de Philosopho practico (ibid. 1748, 4to): — Diss. theologica de absoluto electionis et reprobationis decreto (ibid. 1749, 4to): — Diss. de incredulitate finali (ibid. 1749, 4to): — Commentario de Messia Doctore justitiae ad Joe 2:23, qua exercitium disputatorium cum selectis theologqia cultoribus instituendum significat (ibid. 1750, 4to). See Doring, Gelehr. Theol. Deutschluinds, 4:580 sq.

## Muller, Johann Baptist[[@Headword:Muller, Johann Baptist]]

             a celebrated German painter of sacred subjects, was born at Gerartsried, in Bavaria, and studied art at the Academy of Munich under Eberhard, and later under Hess. The latter he assisted in the frescos of the All Saints' Chapel, and painted independently The Baptism of Christ. From 1842 to 1849 he painted for the king of Prussia, and these works were afterwards presented to the Cologne cathedral. Later he painted many sacred subjects on altars and church windows. He died at Munich in 1869. Jeremiah upon the ruins of Jerusalem is regarded as his best oil-painting. Many of his works have been reproduced in lithography, engravings, and chromos. See Nagler, Allgemeines Kunstler-Lexikon, s.v.

## Muller, Johann Caspar[[@Headword:Muller, Johann Caspar]]

             a German Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Naumburg February 26, 1749, and was educated at Fritzlar. In 1766 he entered the gymnasium at Mentz, and afterwards studied philosophy and theology. After being admitted to the theological seminary, he was ordained, and appointed  chaplain at Heppenheim, and one year later professor at Worms, also prefect of the gymnasium, and vicar of the churches of St. Mary's and of the Holy Cross; assistant of the theological faculty, and minister of the court military hospital of St. John the Baptist. It was his pleasure to give his time entirely to study and to the duties of the Church; but the French war compelled him to leave Mentz. He returned to Mentz after the Prussians had taken possession of that place. He, however, now resigned his ecclesiastical offices, only soon after to be appointed canon of the chapter of the church of St. Peter at Fritzlar, and also of the St. John of the Amoneburg. Later he was removed to Aschaffenburg, as principal of the gymnasium and provost of the prince-electoral grammar schools. In 1804 he was appointed professor extraordinary of ecclesiastical law at Marburg; in 1806 principal of the seminary for teachers of the three Christian confessions. He died November 3, 1810. Miller had a thorough knowledge of Church history, patristic theology, and exegesis, which he evinced by his Dissertatio de Socinianis and Harmonie der vier Evangelisten, and similar works. He contributed often to the Mainzer theologische Monatsschriften, Schuderoff's Journal zur Veredlung des Prediger- und Schullehrerstandes (Jahrgang 5, Bd. 1, James 1), and several other journals. His most important works are in the department of the classics. Among these are, Titi Livii Patav. Historiarum liber primus et selecta quaedam capita, scholis Moguntinensibus adornavit (Mentz, 1780, 8vo): — Eutropii Breviarium historiae Romanae, scholis Moguntiacis in quibus Latinitatis initia docentur adornavit (ibid. 1781, 8vo): — Quinti Horatii Flacci Odae selectae, scholis Moguntiacis edidit (ibid. 1784, 8vo): — Diss. historico- theologica de ortu, vero religionis systemate, progressu, statu hodierno sectae Unitariae seu Socinianae, ac de prono e secta Protestantium ad illam transitu, quam cum thesibus ex universa theologia selectis defendit (ibid. 1784, 8vo; 2d edit. ibid. 1787, 8vo): — M.T. Ciceronis orationes selectae 9, scholiis adornavit. Editio secunda aucta et emendata (ibid. 1787, 8vo): — Der Triumph der Philosophie im 18ten Jahrhundert (Frankf. a. M. 1803, 2 volumes, 8vo): — Geschichte der Romer, for studirende und gebildete Leser, aus den Quellen dargestellt. 1ste Abtheilung vom Anfange des kleinen Staats bis zum Ende der grossen Republik (ibid. 1805, 8vo). See Doring, Gelehr. Theol. Deutschlands, s.v.

## Muller, Johann Daniel[[@Headword:Muller, Johann Daniel]]

             a German theologian, was born at Allendorf May 22, 1721, and was educated at Giessen, where he studied theology, philosophy, and ancient languages. In 1740 he was appointed rector at his native place, and acted at the same time as assistant minister of a church. In 1768 he took the position of professor of divinity at the University of Rinten, and there died,  April 30, 1794. Besides numerous dissertations in journals, he published several works, of which the most important are, Diss. in qua immortalitas anince ex principiis rationis, methodo mathematicorum demonstratur (Gissse, 1743, 4to): — Der rechte Gebrauch und Missbrauch der Vernunft bei Geheimnissen der Auferstebung der Todten insbesondere (Frankf. a.M. 1747, 8vo): — Possibilitas et certitudo resurrectionis mortuorum ex principiis rationis excitatae, methodo mathematicorum demonstrata; cum praefatione J.G. Canzii (Marburg, 1752, 8vo): — Diss. theologica de Providentia Dei ex confusione mundi demonstrata (Rinteln, 1771, 4to): — Entdeckter Kunstgrift unserer Zeiten, die Religion durch die Bibel und die Bibel durch die Religion el bestreiten (Brunsw. 1777, 8vo): — Progr. de mutilatione Dei, Scripturae, mundi et animae violatae rationis et revelationis teste (Rinteln, 1784, 4to). See Doring, Gelehr. Theol. Deutschlands, 4:585-587.

## Muller, Johann Georg (1)[[@Headword:Muller, Johann Georg (1)]]

             a Roman Catholic prelate of Germany, was born at Coblentz, October 15, 1798. He studied at different universities, took holy orders in 1821, and received the degree of doctor of theology in 1827. In the same year he was professor of Church history and canon law at the clerical seminary in Treves, in 1847 was elected bishop of Munster, and died in 1870. He published, Ueber die Aechtheit der zwei ersten Kapitel des Evangeliums  nach Matthius (Treves, 1830): — Die bildlichen Darstellungen im Sanctuarium der christlichen Kirchen (ibid. 1835). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:86, 636; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:916. (B.P.)

## Muller, Johann Georg (2)[[@Headword:Muller, Johann Georg (2)]]

             a Swiss theologian, was born at Basle in 1800, and died there in 1875, doctor and professor of theology. He published, Blicke in die Bibel, etc. (Winterthur, 1828-30; new ed. 1840): — Ueber die Texteskritik der Schriften des Juden Philo (Basle, 1839): — Des Juden Philo Buch von der Weltschopfung (Berlin, 1841): — the art. Philo in the first edition of Herzog's Real-Encyklop.: — Die messianischen Erwartungen des Juden Philo (Basle, 1870): — Erklarung des Barnabasbriefes (Leipsic, 1869). After his death Riggenbach and Orelli published Des Flavius Josephus Schrift gegen den Apion. Text und Erklisrung (Basle, 1877). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:916; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:401. (B.P.)

## Muller, Johann Georg, D.D[[@Headword:Muller, Johann Georg, D.D]]

             brother of the famous historian J.v. Muller, was born at Schaffhausen September 3, 1759. His early religious as well as secular education he received from his father, who was the minister of that place. The writings of Young and Lavater impressed him so deeply that he decided to devote himself to the study of theology. To this end he first went to Zurich and afterwards to Gottingen, which latter place, however, he soon left on account of the then prevailing neological tendency. He longed for truth. but Gittingen could not satisfy his thirst for it, and he sought for a teacher who could remove his doubts and ease his oppressed spirits. About this time Herder's name became known to the world, and Miiller betook himself to Weimar, then celebrated as the Athens of Germany. Herder received Miiller very kindly, and even took him into his house. In 1794 Muller returned to his native place, and accepted the professorship of the Greek and Hebrew languages at the collegium humanitatis, because of his feeble constitution, which prevented him from taking charge of a church. In the time of the revolution he held some high political positions, all of which he abandoned, only retaining his professorship until his death, Sept. 20,1819. In him the Church lost a true divine, a faithful witness, whose main object was to propagate principles akin to those of Herder, but in a more orthodox sense. His writings, which have mainly an apologetical value, are as follows, Philosophische Aufatze (Breslau, 1789): — Unterhaltungen mit Serena '(Winterthur, 1793-1803): — Bekenntnisse merkwuirdiger Manner von sich selbst (1791, 1795, 3 volumes): — Briefe iber das Studium der  Wissenschaften, etc. (1798; 2d ed. 1807): — Theophil, Unterhaltungen uiber die christl. Religion (1801), which treats of religion, mythology, revelation, the Old and New Testaments, and reading and explanation of the holy Scriptures: — Reliquien alter Zeiten, Sitten und Meinungen (1803-1806. 4 vols.):- Vom Glauben des Christen (1816, 2 volumes; 2d ed. 1823): — Blicke in die Bibel (1830, 2 volumes, ed. by Prof. Kirchofer, etc.). See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Theol. Universal-Lexikon, s.v.; Hurst's Hagenbach, Hist. of the Church in the 18th and 19th Cent. 2:22, 47, 409. (B.P.)

## Muller, Johann Gottgetreu[[@Headword:Muller, Johann Gottgetreu]]

             a German theologian, was born in 1701 at Calbe, in Prussia. He was educated first at his native place, then at Klosterbergen, and at the University of Halle, where he studied theology. He was appointed minister at the penitentiary at Halle in 1727, but was discharged, as he would not sanction the union of the Lutheran and Reformed churches, which was brought about by king Frederick William I of Prussia. Muller now went to Leipsic, and became there bachelor of divinity and minister of the university church. In 1739 the chief consistory secured for him a place at the "Kreuz Kirche" at Suhl. In 1745 he was appointed superintendent at Schleusingen, also assessor of the consistory. In 1750 he was appointed ephorus of the gymnasium, and died August 16, 1787. Muller possessed a thorough knowledge of ancient languages, which he shows in his programmes De scholis purgatoriis (1761, 4to) and De animantibus apocalypticis s. emblematibus ministrorum Evangelii in scholis et ecclesiis (1777, 4to). One of his most important works is Progr. Urim et Thureim scholarum (Schleusingiae, 1748, 4to). See Doring, Gelehr. Theol. Deutschlands, s.v.

## Muller, Johann Gotthard von[[@Headword:Muller, Johann Gotthard von]]

             a celebrated German engraver of sacred subjects, was born at Bernhausen, near Stuttgard, in 1747. His father, who held an official situation under the government of his native country, wished to educate Muller for the Church, but the youth showed so much ability for art in the newly established (1761) Academy of Fine Arts at Stuttgard that the prince himself urged him to follow art as his profession. Accordingly, in 1764. Muller, under court patronage, entered the school of the court-painter, Guibal, who recommended him to follow engraving, which he pursued for  six years (1770-76) at Paris under Wille, with such success that in 1776 he was elected a member of the French Academy. He was called home in the same year by duke Carl to found a school of art at Stuttgard, which, under his guidance, produced many excellent artists. In 1785 Muller was invited to return to Paris to engrave the portrait of Louis XVI, painted in 1774 by Duplessis. In 1802 Miiller was made professor of engraving in the academy at Stuttgard, where he instructed several of the best engravers of Germany during the earlier part of the 19th century, among whom his own son, Christian Friedrich, is the foremost. He was elected successively a member of the principal German academies, was presented in 1808 by the king Frederick of Wurtemberg with the Order of Civil Merit, and in 1818 was made a Knight of the Wurtemberg Crown by Frederick's successor, king William. He died at Stuttgard in 1830, and in the same year a biography of him was published in the Schwabische Meerkurs, No. 71. Miiller engraved only thirty-three plates-a small number-but some of them are large and elaborate works; they are, however, chiefly portraits. His principal sacred subjects are the Meadonna della Seggiola, for the Musee Frangais, engraved in 1804, by many considered superior to the print of the same subject by Raphael Morghen; a St. Catharine, with two Angels, after Leonardo da Vinci. See Nagler, Allgemeines Kiinstler-Lexikon, s.v.; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

## Muller, Johann Gottlieb[[@Headword:Muller, Johann Gottlieb]]

             a German theologian, who labored largely for the elevation of the masses and the spreading of holiness among the rural population of Germany, was born at Waldorf, near Lobau, October 30, 1760. He was educated at the University of Wittenberg. He was appointed in 1784 minister at Podrosche, near Muskau; in 1802 minister at Jtnkendorf and Ullersdorf, near Niesky; and in 1809 minister at Neukirch, near Bautzen, where he died, Jan. 11,1829. His most important works are, Ueber die schrecklichen Faolgen oder Wirkungen des Aufuhrs (Gbrlitz, 1793, 8vo): — Oberlausitzische Reformationsgeschichte (ibid. 1801, 8vo): — Christoph Fromman zu Lobethal, oder: Der Landmann als Christ, wie er sein sollte und ist. Esin Christliches Sittenbuch fur den lieben Bauernstand (ibid. 1803, 8vo). See Doring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands, 4:590, 591.

## Muller, Johann Stephan[[@Headword:Muller, Johann Stephan]]

             a German theologian, was born at Smalobuch, in the Black Forest, July 20, 1730, and was educated at the gymnasium at Rudolstadt and the University of Jena. In 1756 he was appointed an assistant of the philosophical faculty, and became also a member of the Latin Society at Jena, and in 1758 assessor of the consistory at Rudolstadt. In 1759 he was appointed professor extraordinary of philosophy at Jena, and in 1763 he was made professor at Giessen. He became a member of the academies of sciences at Erfurt, Frankfort-on-the-Oder, and at Giessen. In 1768 he was honored with the superintendency of the diocese of Marburg, in which place he died, October 24, 1768. His most important works are, Dubiorum utrique modo, quo procedunt Theologi in explicandas imputatione peccati Adamitici oppositorum, brevis et modesta resolutio ac utriusque istius conciliatio (Jena, 1752, 4to): — Diss. utrum doctrina de mentis materialitate hypothesis philosophica possit vocari, et quo ostenso, an illa probabilior doctrina de simplicitate animi? (ibid. 1753, 4to): — Diss. philosophica de hominis obligatione ad utendum mediis revelationis vel ante admissam illius veritatem divinam (ibid. 1755, 4to): — Diss. sententias Protestantiunt juris naturae doctorum de lege naturali a vituperationibus cel. P. Desingii defendens (ibid. 1756, 4to): — Diss. metaphysica sententiam Philosophorum Christianorum de mundi et substantianrum origine nova quadam hypothesi contra systemata Aristotelis defendens (ibid. 1757, 4to): — Die Unschuld Luther's in der Lehre von dem Zustande der Seele nach dem Tode, wider die in unsern Tagen erregte Beschuldigung, als ob derselbe ein Seelenschlafer gewesen sei, gerettet (ibid. 1757, 4to): — Dass Luther die Lehre vom Seelenschlafe nie geglaubt habe, weiter und enit den starksten Grunden erwiesen (ibid. 1759, 4to): — Diss. Quid Reformati? ab eo vix Pontiafici deflectunt in doctrina de S. Caena, quod offendunt Reformati (ibid. 1776, 4to): — De novis inter Regem Galorum et Magistratum dissensionibus quid nihi videtur (ibid. 1766, 8vo). See Doring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands, s.v.

## Muller, Johann Tobias Immanuel[[@Headword:Muller, Johann Tobias Immanuel]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born in 1804, and died August 19, 1884, at Furth, dean and Church counsellor. He edited Veit Dietrich's Hauspostille. (Nordlingen, 1845), and is best known by his edition of Das evangelische Konkordienbuch, etc. (Stuttgart, 1860 and often). (B.P.)

## Muller, Julius[[@Headword:Muller, Julius]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, and brother of Karl Ottfried (q.v.), was born at Brieg, in Silesia, April 10, 1801. He studied jurisprudence at Breslau and Gottingen, according to the wish of his father, and at both universities Muller's dissertations gained prizes, so that in 1871 the faculty at Gottingen made him doctor of laws. But the ideal of a higher life was presenting itself to his mind, and he betook himself to the study of theology at Gottingen. He soon felt that the then Gottingen theology could not satisfy him, and so returned to Breslau, in 1822, to continue his theological studies.

While Tholuck was on a visit to Breslau, Miller, at the suggestion of a friend, visited him. He afterwards carried on a correspondence with Tholuck, whose personality, rather than theology, influenced him. In the spring of 1823, Miller, by the urgent advice of Tholuck, went to Berlin, where Strauss, Neander, and Tholuck, but not Schliermacher, met the demands of his heart and mind. In 1825 he was called to the pastorate of Schonbrunn and Rosen, near Strehlen. Here he wrote his Zur Beurtheilung  der Schrift die katholische Kirche Schlesiens (Breslau, 1827). A second edition was soon called for. Soon after, he came into conflict with the ecclesiastical authorities, by refusing to introduce the new liturgy, and in May 1830, announced this as his final decision to the "consistorium." His official relations to the Church were thus endangered; but he was happily delivered from the inconvenience of a removal from his pastorate by a call, in 1831, to Gottingen, as university-preacher, with the promise of a professorship as soon as he should publish a learned book. In 1832 he commenced his academical career by publishing Lutheri de Praedestinatione et Libero Arbitrio Doctrina. He soon was made professor.

In 1834 an urgent call as professor of systematic theology to Marburg could not be refused, and when Muller preached his last sermon in Gottingen (March 1885), Lucke, in behalf of the university, presented him with the degree of doctor of divinity. The contributions which Miller made to the Studien und Kritiken after 1833 prepared the way for the work which has immortalized his name, Die christliche Lehre von der Siinde (Engl. transl. The Christian Doctrine of Sin, Edinburgh, 1877, 2 volumes), of which several editions have been published. In 1839 Muller accepted a call to Halle, where, with Tholuck, he became the chief centre of attraction to the students. In 1850 he founded, in connection with Neander and Nitzsch, the Deutsche Zeitschrift fur christl. Wissenschaft und christliches Leben, to which he contributed many valuable articles, which, for the most part, have appeared in his Dogmatische Abhandlungen (Bremen, 1870). In the summer of 1878 he resigned his professorship, and died September 27 of the same year. A provision of his will stipulated that all his manuscripts should be destroyed. His works, besides those already mentioned, are De Miraculorum Jesu Christi Natura et Necessitate (Marburg, 1839): — Lutheri et Calvini Sententiae de Sacra Coena Inter se Comparatae (Halle, 1853): — Die evangelische Union, ihr Wesen und gottliches Recht (Berlin, 1854), besides several volumes of sermons. See Schulze. Dr. Julius Miiller (Bremen, 1879); Zum Geddchtniss an Dr. Julius Miller (ibid. 1878); Kahler, Dr. Julius Miiller, der hallesche Dogmatiker (Halle, 1878); Plitt-Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Schwarz, Zur Geschichte der neuesten Theologie (3d ed.), page 363 sq.; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v.; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:917. (B.P.)

## Muller, Peter Erasmus[[@Headword:Muller, Peter Erasmus]]

             a Danish prelate, noted as a theological and antiquarian writer, was born at Copenhagen May 29, 1776. He studied at the university of that city, where in 1791 he passed his theological examination. He afterwards spent a year and a half at some of the German universities, and paid a visit of eight months to France and of three to England. After his return he attained to eminence as a scholar, wrote numerous works, was appointed professor of theology at the university in 1801, was raised to the rank of bishop in  1822, and in 1830 was appointed to the bishopric of Zealand, the highest ecclesiastical dignity in Denmark. He died September 16, 1834. His theological works on the Christian Moral System (1808), on the Grounds for Belief in the Divinity of Christianity (1810), on the Creeds of the Christian Church (1817), all in Danish, are in high esteem, but his literary reputation is chiefly founded on his essays in the department of Danish and Norse antiquarian studies. Among these, his best are, On the Importance of the Icelandic Language: — On the Rise and Decline of Icelandic Historiography: — On the Authenticity of the Edda of Snorro: — Critical Examination of the Traditional History of Denmark and Norway: — Critical Examination of the last Seven Books of Saxo Grammaticus: — land, above all, his Sagabibliothek, or Library of the Sagas (Copenh. 1817-20, 3 volumes). Bishop Muller was also the editor of a literary journal (Dansk Literatur Tidende) for many years. See Kraft of Nycrup, Altnindeligt Literaturlexicon, s.v.

## Muller, Philipp Jacob[[@Headword:Muller, Philipp Jacob]]

             a noted German-French (Alsace) theologian and philosopher, was born at Strasburg in March, 1732. He studied at the high school of his native place and at the celebrated German universities. In 1782 he became professor of philosophy at his alma mater and canon of St. Thomas, as well as president of the assembly of Strasburg pastors. He died in 1795. Muller was well versed in the Greek and Hebrew antiquities, and was a student of the exact sciences. His travels had extended his knowledge of men and things, and he therefore became a person of influence. His writings, which were mainly in the department of metaphysics and morals, helped only to confirm the reputation secured. The most interesting of his writings are, De pluralitate mundorum (1750, 4to): — De commet cio animi et corporis (1761, 4to): —Psychologia Pythagorica (1773): — De legibus naturae (1775).

## Mullion or Monyall[[@Headword:Mullion or Monyall]]

             the upright division between the lights of windows, screens, etc., in Gothic architecture. Mullions are rarely met with in Norman architecture, but they become more frequent in the Early English style, and in the Decorated and Perpendicular are very common. They have sometimes small shafts attached to them, which carry the tracery of the upper part of the windows. In late domestic architecture they are usually plain. The cut shows mullions  (a a) supporting tracery. See Chambers, Cyclop. s.v.; Parker, Glossary of Architecture, pages 155, 157.

## Mulson, John[[@Headword:Mulson, John]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in New Jersey in 1783. But little is known of his early history, save that in 1808 the family removed west of the Alleghany Mountains, and settled near Greensburg, Westmoreland Co., Pa. In the academy of that place he received a fair education; studied theology privately; was licensed and ordained in 1817; and in 1818 installed pastor of the congregations of Plain Grove and Centre, Pennsylvania. In 1838 he was relieved from the former, and gave all his attention to the latter charge, where he labored till 1859, when he resigned. He subsequently removed to London, Mercer County, Pennsylvania, where he died, December 18, 1866. Mr. Munson was a man of superior intellect. He was a great reader, especially of standard works, such as Bates, Edwards, etc. As a theologian he was able, being familiar with all the great questions in controversy between the Calvinists and Arminians. His preaching was mostly textual. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1867, page 183.

## Mumbo Jumbo[[@Headword:Mumbo Jumbo]]

             a mysterious personage frightful to the whole race of African matrons. According to the description of Mr. Wilson, "he is a strong, athletic man disguised in dry plantain leaves, and bearing a rod in his hand, which he uses on proper occasions with the most unsparing severity. When invoked by an injured husband, he appears about the outskirts of the village at dusk, and commences all sorts of pantomimes. After supper he ventures to the town-hall, where he commences his antics, and every grown person, male or female, must be present, or subject themselves to the suspicion of a guilty conscience. The performance is kept up until midnight, when Mumbo, with the agility of the tiger, suddenly springs upon the offender, and chastises her most soundly, amid the shouts and laughter of the multitude, in which the other women join more heartily than anybody else, with the view, no doubt, of raising themselves above the suspicion of such infidelity."

## Mummy[[@Headword:Mummy]]

             is a name derived from an Arabic word, mum, signifying wax, and is now applied not only to those dead bodies of men and animals in the preparation of which wax or some similar material was used, but to all those which are by ally means preserved in a dry state from the process of putrefaction. The art of embalming, by which the greater part of the mummies now existing were prepared, was practiced by the Assyrians, Persians, Ethiopians, Egyptians, and to some extent also by the Hebrews, Greeks, Romans, and on this continent by the Mexicans and Peruvians. But with greatest skill it was practiced by the inhabitants of ancient Egypt, of whom whole generations still remain preserved from decay in the vast hypogsea or catacombs in the neighborhood of Thebes and the other great cities of that country. It has been estimated that more than 400,000,000 human mummies were made in Egypt from the beginning of embalming until its discontinuance in the 7th century. The mummies which are filled with aromatics only are olive-colored; their skin is dry, flexible, and like tanned leather, and contracted; their features are distinct, and appear to be like those that existed in life; the resins which all their cavities contain are  dry, light, brittle, and aromatic; the teeth, hair, and eyebrows are generally perfect; some of them are gilded all over the body, or on the most prominent parts.

The mummies which are filled with bitumen are reddish; their skins are hard and polished, as if they had been varnished; they are dry, heavy, inodorous, and difficult to unroll; their features are but slightly altered; the hard, black, resinous substance with which they are filled possesses little odor, and they are scarcely alterable by exposure to the air. Those which have been salted, as well as thus prepared, differ little in their general appearance from those just described, but they are usually less perfect, the features being altered, and their hair having commonly fallen off: When they are uncovered and exposed to the air, a slight saline efflorescence forms upon them, which consists of different salts of soda. Those mummies which have been only salted and dried are even less perfect than the preceding. Their features are entirely destroyed: all their hair has fallen off; and both the body and the bandages by which it is enveloped fall in pieces when brought to the air, or may very easily be broken up. In many of these adipocere is formed; but in general they are hard, dry, and whitish, like dirty parchment. The bandaging, to which all the Egyptian mummies were subjected, was one of the most remarkable parts of the process. Their envelopes are composed of numerous linen bands, each several feet long, applied one over the other fifteen or twenty times, and surrounding first each limb and then the whole body. They are applied and interlaced so accurately that one might suppose they were intended to restore to the dry, shrivelled body its original form and size. The only difference in the bandages of the different kinds of mummies is in their greater or less fineness of texture; they are applied on all in nearly the same manner. All the bandages and wrappings which have been examined with the microscope are of linen. The body is first covered by a narrow dress, laced at the back and tied at the throat, or it is all enveloped in one large bandage. The head is covered by a square piece of very fine linen, of which the centre forms a kind of mask over the features. Five or six such pieces are sometimes put one over the other, and the last is usually painted or gilded in representation of the embalmed person. Every part of the body is then separately enveloped with several bandages impregnated with resin. The legs, extended side by side, and the arms, crossed over the chest, are fixed by other bandages which surround the whole body; and these last, which are commonly covered with hieroglyphics, are fixed by long, crossing, and very ingeniously applied bands, which complete the envelope. Most of the bodies are placed in this state in the catacombs; those of the  rich only are enclosed in cases. The cases are usually double, the interior being composed of boards made of several portions of linen glued together, and the exterior cut from a piece of cedar or sycamore wood. SEE EMBALMING.

The body, after being embalmed, was thus completely swathed with strips of linen (some think cotton) cloth, of various lengths and breadths, and was then enclosed in an envelope of coarse, or sometimes of fine, cloth. In Mr. Davidson's mummy, the weight of the bandages, including the outer sheet, was 29 lbs., and their total length 292 yards; and in another, Mr. Pettigrew's, the cloth weighed 35½ lbs.; and the one examined at Leeds was in no part covered with less than forty thicknesses of the cloth. The mummy as prepared presents the appearance of a large mass of cloth, somewhat resembling the general outline of the human figure. The mummy was thus prepared by the embalmers, and in this state consigned to the coffin-makers, who, in the first instance, enclosed it in a case of a strong but flexible kind of board, somewhat like papier-mache, made by gumming well together several layers of hempen or linen cloth. This was formed into the shape of the swathed mummy, which was inserted into it by means of a longitudinal slit on the under side, reaching from the feet to the head, and stitched up after the insertion of the mummy. This case is, in most instances, lined, and covered with a thin coating of plaster, with the representation of a human face on the upper part. This was then introduced into a coffin of sycamore wood, made sometimes out of one piece of wood, and either plain or ornamented within and without with representations of sacred animals or mythological subjects. Besides this there is often yet another wooden coffin, still more highly ornamented, and covered with paintings secured by a strong varnish. The upper part of both these cases is made to represent a human figure, and the sex is clearly denoted by the character of the headdress, and by the presence or absence of the beard. The last covering of all was a sarcophagus of stone, which, from its heavy additional expense, could only, it may be supposed, be used for kings and wealthy people. These stone coffins consist of two parts — a case to contain the body, formed of one piece of stone, open at the top, and a lid to fit the opening. Some of them are comparatively plain, while others — of which there are examples in the British Museum, and one, of alabaster, in the museum of Sir John Soane — are elaborately sculptured with hieroglyphics and figures of men and animals, forming not the least astonishing monuments which we possess of Egyptian industry and art. See  Wilkinson, Ancient Egyptians, 2:393 sq.; Hardwick, Christ and other Masters, 2:297; Blackwood's Magazine, 1870, 2:229 sq., 317 sq. SEE COFFIN; SEE MECHANIC.

## Mumpelgart, Colloquy Of[[@Headword:Mumpelgart, Colloquy Of]]

             A conference between Beza and Andrea, with a view to bring about the union of the Lutheran and Reformed churches, but which loses much of its importance from the fact that the two theologians acted here of their own accord, and not as representatives of their respective churches. The occasion of it was the incorporation of the territory of Mumpelgart into the duchy of Wiirtemberg by inheritance. Farel had preached the Gospel there as early as 1526, but had been driven away. In 1535 duke George of Wurtemberg had caused the Reformation to be introduced into Mumpelgart by Tossanus, a French minister. The Wiirtemberg authorities afterwards sought to introduce the Lutheran form of worship. But when, in consequence of persecution, many French Calvinists sought a refuge at Mumpelgart, they found great difficulty in being allowed to take part in the Lord's Supper, and in order to put an end to this state of things demanded a colloquy. Neither of the two theologians appointed entertained much hope of the result.

Beza had been forewarned that all such attempts had heretofore served only to embitter the strife, yet he did not consider himself free to reject the application of the exiles, while Andrea felt the less opposed to take part in a discussion presided over by a Lutheran prince. On the Lutheran side appeared Andrea and Lucas Osiander, assisted by the two political counsellors, Hans Wolf von Anweil and Frederich Schiitz; on the part of the Reformed, Beza, Abraham Musculus (pastor at Berne), Anton Fajus (deacon at Geneva), Peter Hybner (professor of the Greek language at Berne), Claudius Alberius (professor of philosophy at Lausanne), and the two counsellors, Samuel Meyer, of Berne, and Anton Marisius, of Geneva. The colloquy took place at the castle of Mumpelgart, March 21-26,1586. Beza did not succeed in arranging that a protocol of the discussion should be drawn up, and the accounts of the proceedings led subsequently to a lengthy controversy. The points of the controversy were: 1, the Lord's Supper; 2, the person of Christ; 3, images and ceremonies; 4. baptism; 5, election. Beza, who had only intended to argue on the first point, was, in spite of all his efforts, obliged to discuss them all to the last, on which, as lie had foreseen, the possibility of a compromise was still less than on the others. He declared himself ready to yield on all these points if he could be shown by Scripture to be in the wrong. Andrea, it is said,  declared from the first-like Luther at Marburg-that he would yield nothing, and that the pure doctrine was forever established by the Confession of Augsburg. Both parties afterwards gave different versions of the colloquy. The Lutherans published the Acta Colloquii Montisbelligartensis (Tubingen, 1587), and also a German translation of it, and an Epitome colloquii in 1588. Beza defended himself in the Responsio ad acta coll. M. (Geneva, 1587 and 1588; German, Heidelberg, 1588), etc. At this colloquy both parties gave each other their doctrines and principles in writing. See Schweizer, Gesch. der reformirten Centraldogmnen, 1:402 sq., 501 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 10:89. (J.N.P.)

## Mumpsimus[[@Headword:Mumpsimus]]

             is a nickname given to persons obstinate in religious matters; used by Henry VIII in Parliament, and founded on a story, related by Pace, of a priest who refused to abandon the practice of saying "quod ore mumpsimus," on the plea that he could not give up the usage of thirty years for any correction.

## Muncer[[@Headword:Muncer]]

             SEE MUNZER.

## Munch, Ernst Hermann Joseph Von[[@Headword:Munch, Ernst Hermann Joseph Von]]

             a distinguished Roman Catholic historian of Germany, was born at Rheinfelden, October 25, 1798. He studied at Freiburg, was in 1819  teacher at Aarau, in 1824 professor at Freiburg, in 1828 professor of Church history and canon law at Liege. In 1831 he accepted a call to Stuttgart as librarian to the king, and died June 9, 1841. He published, Die Heerzuge des christlichen Europa wider die Osmanen (Basle, 1822-26, 5 volumes): — Franz von Sickingen's Thaten (Stuttgart, 1827-29, 3 volumes): — Sammlung aller alteren und neueren Konkordate (1830-31, 2 volumes): — Geschichte des Monchthums (1828, 2 volumes): — Allgemeine Geschichte der katholischen Kirche (1838): — Romische Zustande und katholische Kirchenfragen (eod.): — Denkwurdigkeiten zur politischen Reformations und Sittengeschichte, etc. (1839): — Allgemeine Geschichte der neuesten Zeit (1833-35, 6 volumes). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:696, 701, 747; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:920; especially the author's Erinnerungen und Studien aus den ersten 37 Jahren eines deutschen Gelehrten (Carlsruhe, 1836-38, 3 volumes). (B.P.)

## Munchen, Nicolaus[[@Headword:Munchen, Nicolaus]]

             a Roman Catholic canonist, who died at Cologne, January 29, 1881, doctor of theology and cathedral-provost, is the author of, Ueber die Bestrafung der Geistlichen nach dem Entwurfe des Strafgesetzbuches fur Preussen (Cologne, 1848): — Die Amtsentfernung der Geistlichen (ibid. eod.): — Das kanonische Gerichtsverfahren und Strafrecht (2d ed. 1873, 2 volumes). (B.P.)

## Munchmeyer, August Friedrich Otto[[@Headword:Munchmeyer, August Friedrich Otto]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born in 1807. He studied at Gottingen and Berlin, was pastor at Katlenburg, in Hanover, and finally at Buer, near Osnabriick. He died November 7, 1882. Minchmeyer belonged to the orthodox party in the Lutheran Church, and published, Gedenkbuch fur Konfirmanden (12th ed. 1882): — Das Amt des Neuen Testaments nach des Lehre der Schrift und der Bekenntnisse (Osterode, 1853): — Das Dogma von der sichtbaren und unsichtbaren Kirche (Hanover, 1854): — Zur Kirchenregimentsfrage (ibid. 1862): — Huschke und Mejer (1864): — Die Offenbarung St. Johannis (1870): — Harfenklange (1855). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:921. (B.P.)

## Munda cor meum[[@Headword:Munda cor meum]]

             (cleanse my heart) is the technical form designating a prayer said in the high mass of Roman Catholics, after the reading of the epistle and its accompaniment. The position of the priest before the altar celebrating solemn mass is seen in the engraving below. The upper part represents Christ before Pilate. SEE MASS, and for full description of the service at mass, Barnum's Romanism, chapter 14.

## Munden, Christian[[@Headword:Munden, Christian]]

             a German Lutheran divine, was born at Burg, on the isle of Femern, August 13, 1684. He was educated at the gymnasium at Liibeck; entered in 1701 the University of Kiel, where he studied theology, and returned home in 1704; but his desire for knowledge carried him in June, 1705, to Leipsic, where he was permitted to lecture. A rumor that Saxony might become the seat of war between Sweden and Poland drove him finally to Hanover, and  he was appointed in 1708 teacher of Greek and Latin at the Gymnasium of Gottingen. In 1716 he got a position as pastor of the St. Nicholas Church in Gottingen. In 1725 he was appointed licentiate of theology at the University. of Helmstadt, and in 1727 was made professor of theology at that high school. In 1731 he was called to the pastorate of the "Barfusser Kirche" in Frankfort-on-the-Main, and there he died, August 9, 1741. He greatly distinguished himself as a pulpit orator, but made many enemies by his opposition to the Reformed Church. He was also in constant warfare with the Roman Catholics, whom he greatly weakened at Frankfort by the frequent examination of their doctrines and practices. Munden's most important works are, Diss. de הא הודיעה sive de ה demonstrativo (Lipsiae, 1706, 4to): — Progr. de litteris Hebraeis et Graecis justo habendis pretio (Gottingae, 1708, 4to): — De columna nubis et ignis commentatio, in qua primum Mosis de ea oraculum ex veris exegeseos sacrae principiis παρερμενείᾷ, recens inventa, modeste vindicatur, nec non varia Scripturae S. loca subinde illustrantur (Gosl. 1712, 8vo): — Regine et Electoralis Hannoveranae Ecclesie ministri Epistola ad Io. Fr. Buddeum de pietistarum canaracteribus (Gotting. 1724, 4to): — Progr. de incrementis studii exegetici adhuc sperandis (Helmst. 1727, 4to): — Progr. de quaestione, an operae pretium sit, theologiam, quam dicunt casuisticam, singulari studio in Academiis tradere? (ibid. 1727,4to): — Diss. exegetica moralis de ἀκριβείᾷ Christianortin practica, ad Ephesians 5 cum 15 (ibid. 1728, 4to): — Diss. exegetica prior de dedicatione Evangelii S. Lucae, cap. 1 cum 1-4 (ibid. 1728, 4to): — Progr. in fest. pasch. de virtute resurrectionis Christi ex Philippians 3, cap. x (ibid. 1729, 4to): — Disquisitio de theologia morali in institutionibus theologicis a dogmatica theologia non divellanda (ibid. 1730, 4to): — Evangelische Lehrer, als Nachfolger Christi (Frankf. a. M., 1730, 4to): — Die Schmalkaldischen Artikel, mit einem Vorberichte (ibid. 1740, 4to). See Doring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands, s.v.

## Munger, Philip[[@Headword:Munger, Philip]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in South Brimfield, Massachusetts, in 1780; was converted in 1796; entered the New England Conference in 1802; preached in the itinerancy thirty-four years; from 1836 to 1846 was either supernumerary or superannuated, and died October 19, 1846. He was a man of energy and method, very studious, and a gifted and successful preacher. He preached more than nine  thousand sermons, and wrote considerably for the Church literature. He was for many years an active trustee of the Maine Conference Seminary; and as a man, Christian, and minister was in all respects very exemplary and useful. See Minutes of Conferences, 4:150; Stevens, Memorials of Methodism, volume 1, chapter 15. (G.L.T.)

## Muni[[@Headword:Muni]]

             a Sanscrit title, denoting a holy sage, and applied to a great number of distinguished personages, supposed to have acquired, by dint of austerities, more or less divine faculties.

## Munich Manuscript[[@Headword:Munich Manuscript]]

             (CODEX MONACENSIS, designated as X of the Gospels) is a valuable folio MS. of the end of the 9th or early in the 10th century, containing the four Gospels, with serious defects, and a commentary (chiefly from Chrysostom), surrounding and interspersed with the text of all but Mark, in early cursive letter. The very elegant uncials are small and upright; though some of them are compressed, they seem to be partial imitations of very early copies. Each page has two columns of about 45 lines each. There are no divisions by τίτλοι or sections. The ink of the MS. has much faded, and its general condition is bad. From a memorandum in the beginning we find that it came from Rome to Ingolstadt, and that it was at Innspruck in 1757; from Ingolstadt it was taken to Landshut, thence to Munich. Griesbach obtained some extracts from it through Dobrowsky; Scholz first collated it, Tischendorf more thoroughly, and Tregelles completely. See Scrivener, Introd. to N.T. pagw 118 sq.; Tregelles, in Horne's Introd. 4:195 sq. SEE MANUSCRIPTS, BIBLICAL.

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

             a Protestant theologian of Geneva, was born in 1798. He studied at his birthplace; and was admitted to the ministry in 1819 on presenting De  Evangelio Primitivo. In the same year he went to Havre and then to Paris. In the latter place he made the acquaintance of Cousin, and Jean Monod. In 1825 Munier was called to Chene, in the neighborhood of Geneva, and in 1826 he commenced his lectures on the New Test. at the theological faculty at Geneva, where he was rector from 1832 to 1837. In 1853 he founded The Societe des Protestants, and took a lively interest in all matters pertaining to the welfare of the Church. His public life has been divided into three periods: from 1825 to 1847 a partisan in the Church and the academy; from 1847 to 1862 a religious conciliator; from 1862 to 1872 a laborious veteran. He died October 9, 1872. His discourses were on The Parables (1838): The Miracles (1841): — The Reading of the Bible (1850): — The Divinity of Christianity in History (1853), etc. See De la Rive, in the Journal de Geneve; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Muniment Chamber[[@Headword:Muniment Chamber]]

             i.e., an Ecclesiastical Register-house or Treasury, is a room used for the preservation of charters, fabric and matriculation rolls, terriers, and registers. At Salisbury it is detached, on the south side of the cathedral. At Chichester it was over a chapel of the transept, dedicated to the Four Virgins, and at a later date next to the chapter-house, and furnished with a sliding panel. At Winchester and New College, Oxford, it is in a tower, as at St. Martin des Champs, Clugny, and Vaux des Sernay. At Fontenelle it  was over the church-porch, as now at Peterborough. Where there was a provost, that officer kept the key. Muniments are, as it were, the defences of Church property.

## Munition[[@Headword:Munition]]

             (מְצָד, metsad', Isa 23:16; usually rendered " stronghold"), a fortress on a rocky eminence, such as those-to which David resorted for safety from Saul (1Sa 23:14); especially a "castle" or acropolis, as of Mount Zion (1Ch 11:7). SEE FORT.

In ancient times every city was located upon a naturally strong position, SEE CITY; SEE HILL, and served itself for a stronghold (עַיר בְּצוּרָה, עַיר הִמַּבְצָר); yet in the period before ;he exile among the Hebrews particular strategic points, especially on the frontier and in low and level tracts, were more strongly and systematically fortified (1Ki 15:17; 1Ki 15:22; 2Ch 8:3; 2Ch 11:5 sq.;  2Ch 14:6 sq.;  2Ch 26:6; 2Ch 27:4), in anticipation of sieges (2Ch 17:2), which, by reason of the more strenuous warfare, still oftener took place in post-exilian times (see 1Ma 4:61; 1Ma 12:35; 1Ma 13:30; 1Ma 14:33 sq. [1Ma 15:39]), when the residences of Palestine were distributed in citadels, walled towns, and open villages. First of all, strongholds were surrounded by one or more (2Ch 32:5) walls (חוֹמָה), which were sometimes very thick (Jer 51:58), and were furnished with battlements (פַּנּוֹת, 2Ch 26:15; Zep 1:16; or שְׁמָשׁוֹה, Isa 54:12), parapet, and towers (מַגְדָּלַים, 2Ch 14:7; 2Ch 32:5; 1Ma 5:65; comp. Eze 26:4; Eze 27:11; Jer 51:12; Zep 2:14; Jdt 1:3), and were closed by powerful (in Babylon iron-bound, Isa 45:2; Herod. 1:179) and strictly guarded (1Ki 4:13) gates (q.v.). Over these last were placed watch-towers (2Sa 13:34; 2Sa 18:24; 2Sa 18:33; 2Ki 9:17; 2Ch 26:9; comp. Homer, II. 3:145, 154). See, generally, 2Ch 14:7. Around the wall lay the חֵיל (2Sa 20:15; Isa 26:1; Nah 3:8; 1Ki 21:23), apparently a moat with a rampart, but according to Kimchi a small outer wall (בִּי שׁוּרָה). SEE TRENCH.

There were also watch-towers and forts (בַּירָנַיּוֹת) in the open field (2Ki 18:8, 2Ch 27:4), as well as castles in and at the cities for a final refuge (Jdg 9:51 sq.). The most important fortress of Palestine in all ancient times was Jerusalem (q.v.). Other strong castles, especially for the protection of the borders, were, in the closing period of Jewish history, Alexandrium (Josephus, Ant.  13:16, 3), Machaerus, Masada, Hyrcania (comp. Josephus, Ant. 13:16), Herodium (ib. 15:9, 4; War, 1:21, 10), etc. They were usually located on hills (Ant. 14:6, 2). Caves and chasms in rocks were the first natural fastnesses (Jdg 9:2). SEE CAVE.

The reduction (comp. צור, נצר) of strong places, to which the inhabitants retreated on the invasion of an enemy (Jer 8:14), began, after a demand to capitulate (Deu 20:10; comp. 2Ki 18:17 sq.), with the demarcation of a line of circumvolution (בָּנָה מָצוֹר, Ecc 9:14; בָּנָה דָיֵק, 2Ki 25:1; Jer 6:6; Jer 52:4; Eze 4:2; Eze 17:17, etc.), and throwing up a bank (שׁ4פִךְ סוֹלְלָה, 2Sa 20:15; 2Ki 19:32; Isaiah 27:33; Hab 1:10; Jer 6:6; Eze 4:2; Eze 17:17; Eze 26:8; 1Ma 11:20; 1Ma 13:43; comp. Josephus, Ant. 13:10, 2), and next proceeded by the employment of beleaguering engines (μηχαναί, 1 Mace. 11:20, i.e., battering-rams,

כָּרַים, Eze 4:2; Eze 21:27; comp. Josephus, War, 3:9; Vitruv. 10:19). with which a breach was effected (Eze 21:27. A description of the customary Roman machine obsidionales, which Titus used-but for a long time in vain-ins the siege of Jerusalem [Josephus, War, 5:6, 2 sq.; 9, 2; 6:2, 3, etc.], is given by Ammian. Marcel. 23:4. On the Roman aries especially, see Josephus, War, 3:7, 19). A simpler operation was to set the fort on fire, and thus destroy at once both it and the besieged (Jdg 9:49). As an example of undermining the walls, Jer 51:58 is adduced only by a gloss in the Sept. and Vulg.; in later times this process becomes clearer (Josephus. War, 2:17, 8; comp. Dio Cass. 69, 12; Veget. Mil. 4:24). The demolition of the aqueducts is once mentioned (Jdt 7:6). For defence the besieged were accustomed not only to shoot darts from the walls (2Sa 11:24), but also to hurl large stones and beams (Jdg 9:53; 2Sa 11:21; Josephus War, 5:3, 3; 6, 3), and even to pour down boiling oil (Josephus, War, 3:7, 28); in later times they used slinging- machines (חַשַּׁבֹנוֹת, 2Ch 26:15; Dio Cass. 66:41). Also by skilfully. managed sorties, which were disguised by mines (Josephus, Ant. 14:16, 2; War, 5:11, 4, etc.), they strove (especially by burning the siege- works) to break the siege (1Ma 6:3; Josephus, War, 5:6, 6; 11, 5; 6;, 6, 4), and for this purpose they watched the enemy by sentinels posted on the walls (Josephus, War, 5:2, 5).

The Israelites were enjoined to spare fruit- trees when they laid siege to a city (Deu 20:19 sq.; yet see 2Ki 3:25; comp. Michaelis, A Mos. Recht, 1:378 sq.). The  beleaguering of strongholds was sometimes carried on for a long time (so Hyrcanus was able to reduce Samaria only after an investment of a whole year, Josephus, Ant. 13:10, 3), and brought upon the besieged (even when they had provisioned themselves beforehand, 1Ma 13:3) so severe a famine (2Ki 6:25 sq.; 1Ma 6:53 sq. — but of a lack of water in besieged places there is seldom any mention [see Josephus, War, 3:7, 12; Ant. 14:14, 6], probably owing to the copious cisterns usually at hand) that they were often obliged to resort to very unusual (comp. Jdt 11:11) and even nauseous means of subsistence (2Ki 6:25; 2Ki 6:29; 2Ki 18:27; Lam 4:10; Josephus, Ant. 13:10, 2; War, 5:10, 3; 13, 7; 6:3, 3; comp. Barhebr. Chronicles pages 149, 488). But the garrison sometimes contrived ingeniously to conceal from the besiegers the food and provisions brought into the city (Josephus, War, 3:7,12). Obstinate fortresses were taken by storm (comp. 1 Mace. 5:51), and the houses were razed to the ground (Jdg 9:45; 1Ma 5:52; Josephus, Ant. 13:10, 3. Occasionally the plough was passed over the site of a captured town laid in ashes, Horace, Od. 1:16, 21; Senec. Clement. 1:26; but Mic 3:12 has no such allusion), the inhabitants massacred, manacled, and reduced to slavery (Jdg 1:25; 1Ma 5:52; comp. 2Ma 5:13 sq.; 2Ma 10:17; 2Ma 10:23). SEE SIEGE. On the other hand, the enemy usually spared such places as surrendered (1Ma 13:43 sq.). Citadels which had never been captured were called in Oriental phrase virgins (see Gesenius, Jesa. 1:736). SEE FORTIFICATION.

## Munkhouse, Richard, D.D[[@Headword:Munkhouse, Richard, D.D]]

             an English divine of some note, flourished near the opening of this century. He was vicar of Wakefield, and died about 1811. He was noted as a pulpit orator, but his sermons, of which several series have been published (Lond. 1799, 8vo; 1802, 8vo; Twenty-six Occas. Discourses, 1805, 3 volumes, 8vo; 1808, 3 volumes, 8vo; 1813, 8vo), indicate that he was not a powerful speaker, but an able writer and a good Biblical scholar. See London Monthly Review, 56, 233; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Munlk, Salomon[[@Headword:Munlk, Salomon]]

             a Jewish writer of great celebrity, one of the most famous Shemitic scholars and Orientalists of our century, was born at Gross-Glogau, in Prussian Silesia, probably in 1802, though some put it 1805 and 1807. When fifteen years of age he left his native place for Berlin, where he studied under the famous philologist Buttmann at the gymnasium of the "Gray Cloister," and then attended lectures at the university. From Berlin he went to Bonn, where the Arabic scholar Freytag lectured, and under his guidance he took up the study of Arabic. In order to complete his studies he went in the autumn of 1829 to Paris, to attend the lectures of Sylvestre de Sacy, Abel Remusat, Eugene Bournouf, and Chezy, who soon became his friends, and by whose assistance he completed his studies in the Arabic, Persian, and Sanscrit. In 1835 he visited England, and spent some time at the University of Oxford, collecting materials for an edition of Maimonides's celebrated work, Moreh Nebuchim (Guide of the Erring).

Some essays which he wrote for the Journal Asiatique and the Dictionnaire des Science philosophiques attracted the attention of the learned world, and in 1840 he was appointed deputy-keeper of the Oriental MSS. in the Royal Library of Paris. In the same year Munk was invited to accompany Sir Moses Montefiore and M. Cremieux to the. East, in behalf of the persecuted Jews of Damascus, to which he gladly consented, and secured while in Egypt many interesting MSS. in Arabic relating to the early literature of the Karaites, and other subjects of early Arabic literature. On his return he devoted himself so assiduously to his Arabic studies that he eventually lost his eyesight, and from 1852 was entirely blind. He had to relinquish his office in the library, and lived in retirement until 1865, when he succeeded M. Renan as professor of Shemitic languages in the College of France. On February 1 he delivered his inaugural address, Cours de langues, Hebraique, Chaldaique, et Syriaque. All scholars of France were elated at the appointment, even those who regretted the deposition of Renan. The clergy also, Protestants as well as Roman Catholics, hailed the choice with joy. The Union, well known for its ultramontane tendencies, which could hardly have been supposed to favor a Jewish incumbent in the chair just made vacant by a Rationalist, thus commented: "A weak, blind man, who only by the sense of touch can build up the world of his thoughts, traverses the centuries of nations, cities, idioms. What a spiritual power! He is an ornament to science, for he teaches the scholar how to love. France possesses in him the greatest philologist, and though a mysterious decision of a kind Providence has robbed him of his physical light, the renown which he has gained, and the greater name which he will yet earn, are sure to shine in splendor for all times, and the light which he has shed into the darkness of Phoenician knowledge will never die out."

But he soon after died, February 6, 1867, lamented by all who knew him. Munk was an authority in the field of Oriental languages, and his works will always be highly esteemed. His principal publications are, Reflexions sur le culte des anciens Hebreux, dans ses rapports avec les autres cultes de l'antiquite (Reflections upon the worship of the ancient Hebrews, in its connection with the other worships of antiquity) (Paris, 1833): — Notice sur Rabbi Saadia Gaon et sa version Arabe d'Isaie, etc. (ibid. 1838): — Notice sur Joseph ben-Jehoudah, etc. (ibid. 1842): — Commentaire de R. Tanhoum de Jerusalem sur le livre de Habakkuck, etc. (ibid. 1843): — L'Inscription Phanicienne de Marseille, etc. (ibid. 1847): — Palestine, description geographique, historique, et archeologique (ibid. 1845; Germ. transl. by Prof. M. A. Levy, Leipsic, 1871-72, 2 volumes): — Notice sur  Aboul-walid Merwan ibn Djana'h, etc. (ibid. 1850): — Melanges de philosophie Juive et Arabe (ibid. 1849); a part of which, the Esquisse historique de la philosophie chez les Juifs, has been transl. into German by B. Beer (Leipsic, 1852): — but Munk's chef d'oeuvre is his Moreh Nebuchin of Moses Maimonides (q.v.) in Arabic and French, with critical, literary, and explanatory notes, under the title Le guide des igares, traite de theologie et de philosophic (volume 1-3, Paris, 185 666). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:407; Frankel, Monatsschrift, 1867, pages 120-123, 453-459; Geiger, Jid. Zeitschrift, 1867, pages 1-16; Journal Asiatique, July 1867; Etheridge, Introduct. to Hebr. Literat. page 482 sq.; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 11:538, 540, 545; Jost, Gesch. d. Juden. u.s. Sekten, 3:363, 364; Cassel, Leitfadenfiur Gesch. u. Literat. pages 115, 117; Erentheil, Jidische Chanrakterbilder (Pesth, 1867, 8vo), pages 94-106; Jidisches Athenceum, page 168 sq.; Lewes, Hist. of Philos. volumr 2; Ueberweg, Hist. of Philos. 1:109 sq., 421. (J.H.W.)

## Munro, John[[@Headword:Munro, John]]

             a Scotch minister, who did much to advance in the "Far North" the interests of the Free Church of Scotland, was born in Ross-shire, about 1768, of humble but honorable parentage. John's father died while he was yet a lad, and the care of a large household was his early prospect. His mother, a pious woman, was anxious that John should follow his father's footsteps in all Christian work, and therefore devoted much of her time to his religious training. His secular educational advantages were few, and he was early obliged to learn a trade for his own and his family's support. When working as a journeyman carpenter he conceived the plan of entering the work of the holy ministry, and while residing at Aberdeen he spent his evenings in study, acquiring especially some knowledge of the languages. He finally entered the university, and after going through a course in literature and divinity was licensed to preach. In 1806 he went to Caithness to take charge of the Achreny mission, at that time including the three preaching stations of Achreny, Halsary, and Halladale, and extending over about twenty miles of hill country destitute of roads. He had labored here for ten years with great success when he was called to the Edinburgh Gaelic chapel, and, accepting the place, he occupied it until 1825, when he was presented to the parish church of Halkirk, and there he distinguished himself by great devotion to his people and close application to pulpit preparation, so that his sermons attracted all classes of society, even the most cultured, notwithstanding the deficiencies in his own culture for want of early advantages. Said one of his contemporaries: "His ministrations were highly acceptable to his hearers. They could not fail to recognise in them the instructions and exhortations of a man of God, who knew and felt the truth and loved their souls. He evidently spoke from the heart — spoke what he believed — what his own soul was full of, and was daily feeding on with delight." He died April 1, 1847, at Thurso, while in attendance on a meeting of the Presbytery of Caithness, to which he belonged. "Munro in personal appearance was not above the middle height, but of portly figure, and fair complexioned, his countenance beaming with benevolence. That  his mental power — although not his predominant feature — was uncommon was evident from the position, weight, and influence he attained in the ministerial office." See Auld, Ministers and Men of the Far North (1868), pages 74-99.

## Munsey, Thomas K[[@Headword:Munsey, Thomas K]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Giles County, Virginia, September 7, 1816. He was converted and joined the Church when eighteen years old, and had a strong desire to enter the ministry at once, but his education was so limited that he found it necessary to prepare himself for the great work. He spent one year in Emory and Henry college, and taught one year to pay his expenses. At the age of twenty-four he joined the Holstein Conference, and continued an acceptable member till his death. His first charge was the Rogersville Circuit, which contained twenty-eight appointments. His labors continued for six years, when failing health compelled him to seek rest. From this time he became a sufferer, but whenever sufficiently strong he was found laboring in the cause he loved so well. While he was on the Athens District in 1867 his health gave way entirely, and he was obliged to give up all work. He held a superannuated relation to the Conference till his death, which occurred July 4, 1872. See Minutes of Ann. Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 1873.

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

             a German theologian of the 14th century, is noted in ecclesiastical history on account of the part he took in the Sacramentarian controversy of his time. He was rector of the school in Ulm in A.D. 1385, but was ejected because of his declarations, "Corpus Christi non est Deus. Nulla creatura est adoranda adoratione qua Deus debet adorari, adoratione scillatriae: hyperdulia debetur creatures excellenti, sicut est caro Christi, b. Virgo," etc. He maintained further, "Hostia consecrata non est Deus; Deus est sub hostia consecrata, corpus ejus, sanguis et anima;" namely, "per hostiam intelligo accidentia quae sunt in pane, rotunditatem videlicet, saporem et gravitatem." He denied the propriety of calling the hostia the corpus Christi, "quia accidentia visa non sunt corpus Christi, licet intus sit corpus Christi;" therefore it was better to say, "hic esse corpus Christi sub specie panis." Munsinger, it is seen then, only objected to considering the visible bread to be Christ himself; but by no means denied that Christ should be prayed to, sub specie panis, and hence his propositions were approved by both the universities, notwithstanding that the Dominicans had ousted him as a heretic. See Flacius, Catal. testium veritatis, No. 315, and elsewhere; Schelhorn, Amienitates literarure, 8:511; 1. c. 11:222; Gieseler, Ecclesiastes Hist. 3:136, note.

## Munson, Eneas, M.D[[@Headword:Munson, Eneas, M.D]]

             a Christian physician, was born in New Haven June 24, 1734; graduated at Yale College in 1753; and, after having been a tutor, became a chaplain in the army in 1755 on Long Island. Ill health induced him to study medicine. He practiced physic at Bedford in 1756, and removed in 1760 to New Haven, where he died, June 16,1826, in high repute as a physician. Of the medical society of Connecticut he was the president. He was a man of piety from an early period of his life. At the bedside of his patients he was accustomed to commend them to God in prayer. It was with joyous Christian hope that this venerable old man went down to the dead.

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

             a Congregational minister, was born March 23, 1804, at New Sharon, Me. He graduated at Bowdoin College in 1829; and having entered the ministry with the intention of becoming a missionary, offered his services to the American Board, and was sent with the Reverend Henry Lyman to Sumatra and the neighboring isles. They sailed for Batavia June 10, 1833, in which place they remained until April, 1834, when they sailed to Nyas, thence to Tappanooly. Having obtained servants and guides, they started to visit the Batta region, but were murdered by the natives, April 28, 1834.  See Sprague, Annals Amer. Pulpit, 2:747; American Missionary Memorial, s.v.

## Munster, Protestant Revolt At[[@Headword:Munster, Protestant Revolt At]]

             SEE ANABAPTISTS.

## Munster, Sebastian[[@Headword:Munster, Sebastian]]

             a German theologian and Hebraist, who identified himself with the Reformers, but exerted an influence only as a scholar, was born in 1489 at Ingelheim, in the Palatinate. At sixteen years of age he went to Tubingen, where Stapfer and Reuchlin became his teachers. He then joined the Order of the Franciscans; but, brought in contact with Luther, he quitted the convent and embraced Protestantism. He was elected professor of Hebrew and theology at the University of Heidelberg, and subsequently at that of Basle, where he died of the plague in 1552. Besides being an eminent Hebraist, he was also an excellent mathematician; yet his erudition is hardly more praised by his contemporaries than his modesty. His tombstone bears the inscription, "Germanorum Esdras hie Straboque conditur." He was a sweet-tempered, pacific, studious, retired man, who wrote a great number of books, but never meddled in controversy; all which considered, his going early over to Luther must seem somewhat extraordinary.

And vet he was one of the first who attached himself to Luther; but he seems to have done it with little or none of that zeal which distinguished the early Reformers, for he never concerned himself with their disputes, but shut himself up in his study, and busied himself in such pursuits as were most agreeable to his humor; and these were the Hebrew and other Oriental languages, the mathematics, and natural philosophy. His works are, Biblia Hebraica Charactere Singulari apud Judeos Germanos in usu recepto, cum Latina planeque Nova Translatione, adjectis insuper e Rabbinorum Commentariis Annotationibus, etc. (Basle, 1534-35, fol.; reprinted in 2 volumes, fol. in 1546, with considerable additions and corrections). This version is considered much more faithful and exact than those of Pagninus and Arias Montanus, and his notes are generally approved, though he dwells a little too long upon the comments of the rabbins. For this version he received the appellation of "the German Esdras:" — Grammatica Chaldaica (4to): — Dictionarium Chaldaicum non tam ad Chaldaicos interpretes, quam ad Rabbinorum intelligenda Commentaria necessarium (4to): — Dictionarium Trilingue (Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, fol.): —  Captivitates Judeorum incerti autoris (Hebrew and Latin, 8vo): — Calendarium bibl. Hebr., ex Hebraeorum penetralibus editum: — Higgaion, logica R. Simeonis, Latine versa: — Institutiones Grammaticae in Hebr. linguam: — Grammatica Ebraea: — Institutio elem. Gramm. Hebr.: — Hebraicae Institutiones: — Catalogus omnium praeceptorum legis Mosaiae, quae ab Hebraeis sexcenta et octodecies numerantur, cum succincta Rabbinorum expositione et additione traditionum, etc. (Hebrew and Latin, 8vo): — Organum Uranicum; theorica omnium planetarum motus, canones (fol.): — Cosmographia Universalis (1544, fol., translated into German, French, Italian, English, Bohemian, and other languages). It is one of the first universal geographies published in modern times, and is remarkably well executed considering the age in which it was written. The author is most diffuse in treating of Germany and Switzerland. He gives a description of the principal towns, their history, the laws, manners, and arts of the people; the remarkable animals of the country; the productions of the soil, the mines, etc.; and the whole is illustrated by wood-cuts, with a portrait of the author. Munster mentions several learned men of his time who furnished him with an account of their respective countries, of Sardinia, the Illyricum, etc. He also gives specimens of several languages: — Rudimenta mathematica in duos libros digesta: — Horaologiographia (being a treatise of gnomonics). Munster also translated into Latin several works of the learned Hebrew grammarian, Elias Levita, on the Massorah and on Hebrew grammar. He also wrote notes on Pomponius Mela and Solinus. His commentaries upon several books of the Old Testament are inserted among the Critici Sacri. See Brucker, Ehrentempel der teutschen Gelehrsamkeif, page 137 sq.; Schrockh, Kirchengesch. s.d. Ref. 5:72, 92 sq.; Adam, Vite Philos. Germ. page 66 sq.; Rosenmuller, Handb. f.d. Lit. d. bibl. Kritik u. Exegese, 5:224 sq.; Gieseler, Ecclesiastes Hist. (Harper's ed.) volume 4. (J.H.W.)

## Munster, Synod Of[[@Headword:Munster, Synod Of]]

             is the name of an independent body of Irish Presbyterians, consisting of a few congregations in Dublin and the south of Ireland, who seceded from the main body of that country. They are mainly Unitarians in creed. See Killin's Reid, Hist. Presb. Ch. in Ireland, 3:468-9, 488.

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

             a German theologian, noted as a pulpit orator and scholar, was born at Liibeck March 24, 1735. He studied theology at Jena, was for a time preacher at Gotha, and eventually became celebrated as a pulpit orator in the German Church of Copenhagen, Denmark, where he removed in 1765, and as the editor of the Bekehrungsgeschichte of count Struensee, whom he had attended on the scaffold (Copenhagen, 1772; English translation, entitled A Faithful Narrative of the Conversion and Death of Count Struensee, etc., by the Reverend Mr. Wendeborn [2d ed. Lond. 1774]). Miinter wrote also a series of hymns (1772 and 1774). He died in 1793.

## Munter, Friedrich Christian Karl Heinrich[[@Headword:Munter, Friedrich Christian Karl Heinrich]]

             a theologian, Orientalist, and archaeologist who gained great celebrity in Denmark, which became his country by adoption (see preceding article), was the son of Balthasar, and born at Gotha, Germany, October 14, 1761. He studied at Copenhagen and Gottingen, and in 1786 went to Italy. After his return, towards the end of 1788, he was appointed professor of theology at Copenhagen. He became successively co-director of the Orphan House in 1805 and bishop of Zealand in 1808. He died April 9, 1830. Munter wrote a number of works of great interest to the student of ecclesiastical archaeology, and yet he must be regarded really as more important as a savant than as a theologian. He founded the Museum of Northern Antiquities at Copenhagen, and left a valuable collection of coins and archeological works. He wrote, Metrische Uebersetzung der Offenbarung Johannis (Copenh. 1784; 2d ed. 1806): — achrichten u. Sicilien (Danish, 1788; German, 1790, 2 volumes): — Die Kirchlichen Alterthumer der Gnostiker (Ausb. 1790): — Magazin fur Kirchengesch. nu. Kirchenrecht des Nordens (Altona, 1792-96, 2 volumes): — Statutenbuch d. Tempelherrn (Berl. 1794): — Venrmischte Beitrige z. Kirchengeschichte (1798): — Handbuch der altesten christlichen Dogmengeschichte (Gottlungen, 1801; by Evers, 1802, 2 volumes): — Untersuchungen u.d. Persepolitan. Inschriften (1800, 1802): — Versuch i.d. Keilformigen Inschriften in Sicilien (Copenh. 1802): — Spuren Egyptischer Religionsbegriffe in Sicilien u.d. benachbarten Inseln (Prague, 1806): — Religion d. Carthager (Copenh. 1816; 2d ed. 1821): — Antiquarische Abhandlungen (Copenh. 1816): — Miscellanea Hafnensia theologici et philologici argunmenti (Copenh. 1816-25, 2 volumes): — Recherches sur l'origine des Ordres de chevalerie de Denmare (Copenh.  1822):Kirchengesch. v. Danemark u. Norwegen (Leips. 1823-34, 3 volumes): — Sinnbilder u. Kunstvorstellungen d. alten Christen (Altona, 1825): — Der Stern der Weisen (Untersuchung uber das Geburtsjahr Cristi) (Copenh. 1827): — Religion d. Babylonier (Copenh. 1827). See his life by Mynster, first in Studien u. Krit. 1833, 1:13-53; and later in book form (Copenh. 1834). — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 10:98; Hoefer, Nonuv. Biog. Generale, 36:954; Piere, Universal-Lex. 11:544; Biblical Repos. 4:533. (J.N.P.)

## Munthe, Caspar Friedrich[[@Headword:Munthe, Caspar Friedrich]]

             a Danish scholar noted for his researches in the original of the N.T. Scriptures, flourished at Copenhagen as professor of Greek in the first half of the 18th century. He died in 1762. He wrote, Observationes philologicaea in Sacros Novi Testamenti Libros, ex Diodoro Siculo collectae (Copenh. and Leips. 1755, 8vo).

## Muntinghe, Herman[[@Headword:Muntinghe, Herman]]

             a Dutch theologian of some note, flourished as professor of theology at the University of Groningen near the opening of this century. He died April 24,1824. He was for some time pastor of the Reformed Church in Holland, but this is all we know of his personal history. As an author, however, he is well known by his Pars Theologiae Christianae Theoretica (Groning. 1801; 2d ed. 1818-22, 2 volumes, 8vo). The first volume contains a compendious system of theology; the second a succinct account of the leading controversies with regard to religious doctrine, with copious references in each to Dutch, German, and English writers. Of Dr. Muntinghe's other works, it may be sufficient to mention a Latin Outline of Church History, on the basis of Schrockh's Compendium, and a voluminous History of Mankind, to which frequent reference is made in his Theology.

## Munton, Anthony[[@Headword:Munton, Anthony]]

             an English divine, flourished near the middle of the 18th century as curate of St. Andrew's church, Newcastle. He died in 1755. He was noted in his day as a pulpit orator of great excellence and power. "Some of his sermons," says a contemporary, "would be pronounced truly excellent by every dispassionate judge." A volume of Munton's Sermons was published shortly after his death (Newcastle, 1756, 8vo).

## Muntras[[@Headword:Muntras]]

             mystic verses or incantations which form the grand charm of the Hindfi Brahmins. They occupy a very prominent place in the Hindu religion. The constant and universal belief is that when the Brahmin repeats the Muntras the deities must come obedient to his call, agreeably to the Sanscrit verse: " The universe is under the power of the deities, the deities are under the power of the Muntras, the Muntras are under the power of the Brahmins; consequently the Brahmins are gods." The Muntras are the essence of the Vedas, and the united power of Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva.

## Munus Christi[[@Headword:Munus Christi]]

             SEE CHRIST, OFFICES OF.

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

             a religious enthusiast and fanatic of the great Reformation period, was born at Stolberg, in the Harz, about 1490. Of his youth we know little beyond what he stated himself to his judges at the time of his death (Walch, Luther's Werke, 16:158), namely, that he had resided at Aschersleben, and had studied at the university in Halle, and had taken part in a conspiracy against Ernest II, then archbishop of Magdeburg. As the archbishop died in 1513, this indicates how early Munzer began to be connected with secret associations. He also manifested early a great tendency to wandering from place to place in pursuance of visionary plans. He appears to have entered the University of Leipsic soon after he left Halle; at least we find him in 1515 with the degree of "magister artium" and bachelor of theology. He then acted as head of a school at Frohsen, near Aschersleben.

In 1517 he appears as teacher in a gymnasium at Brunswick, then at Stolberg in the same year, and again at Leipsic in 1519. Next he was made chaplain and confessor of the Bernardine nunnery of Beutitz, near Weissenfels. This he left in 1520, and was made preacher of the church of St. Mary, at Zwickau, the principal church in the place. His very first sermon there (Rogation Sunday, 1520) made a deep impression, and brought him a large number of enemies as well as friends. At the breaking out of the Reformation, his unquiet spirit made him side at once with the movement. He entered into communication with Luther, and was looked upon as one of the sturdiest champions of reform. But he only understood the negative view of the Reformer's doctrines, that which overthrew the existing form of clerical life. Munzer now fearlessly attacked the mendicant orders, which were in a  state of great prosperity at Zwickau, and soon found himself involved in a bitter controversy with their defender, brother Tiburtius of Weissenfels. Both parties had adherents among the population; yet Munzer succeeded in getting the ascendency by enlisting the sympathies of the most influential citizens, who had often suffered from the pride and arrogance of the monks. Munzer, however, still showed some moderation, as he declared himself ready to submit to the decision of the bishop of Naumburg, and also addressed letters of justification to Luther. Hardly was this quarrel over (towards the middle of 1520), when Munzer became involved in another. In the same church of St. Mary to which he was attached was another priest having the same functions, and who had been installed some years before Munzer. This priest was Dr. Johann (Sylvius) Wildenauer, a native of Eger, and generally known as Egranus. He inclined also to the doctrines of the Reformation, but only accepted their humanistic conclusions, and went no further with Munzer than condemning the ignorance of the monks.

On other points he sided with the aristocracy of the town, and his private life was not above reproach. He was vain, conceited, and much given to advancing paradoxical theories. He and Munzer soon began to quarrel, and in November 1520, they had already arrived at the point of exhibiting their differences in the pulpit. The population sided with Munzer, seeing in him not only the reformer of the Church, but their defender against clerical oppression. Munzer now gave full scope to his talents as a popular orator, and, helped on by the events of the times, had great success. Among his adherents was a weaver, Nicholas Storch, who subsequently obtained some reputation. Being either already connected with the sect of Bohme, or led on by Munzer alone, Storch soon became the head of a band of fanatics who boasted of supernatural communication, and spread by means of secret conventicles. Twelve apostles and seventy-two disciples were elected, and Munzer and Storch became the heads of the society. This movement made steady progress, and by its influence Egranus was finally obliged to leave Zwickau for Joachimsthal. This, however, did not suffice to restore peace to the town. Munzer, probably dissatisfied with his subordinate position as preacher of St. Mary's, succeeded in being appointed to the church of St. Catharine. Here; in connection with a master of arts, Loner, he excited the people against a priest of Marienthal, Nicholas Hofer, who had openly attacked him. Hofer was obliged to seek safety in flight, December, 1520. Being called to account by the official of the bishop, Minzer denounced the official in the pulpit, summoning him to appear at Zwickau (January 13,  1521). In spite of the admonitions of his friends, and in simple trust to the support of the lower classes, Munzer now cast off all restraint. He caused libels against Egranus to be posted up at the doors of the churches, and was therefore dismissed by the civil authorities after they had inquired into the whole affair. He remained in town nevertheless, and caused a rising of the weavers. The authorities were obliged to take vigorous measures; fifty- five of the ringleaders were apprehended, and a large number of the others hurriedly left the town, Munzer among them. Peace was now restored in the city, the more readily as the authorities, following Luther's advice, appointed Nicholas Hausmann, previously pastor of Schneeberg, as pastor of St. Mary's church. Still Storch and his followers staved at Zwickau, and remained undisturbed until Christmas, 1521, when the zealous Hausmann caused them to be exiled from the city. Their subsequent career, under the name of "Prophets of Zwickau," in Wittenberg, is well known (on Munzer's stay at Zwickau, see Laurentius Wilhelm, Descriptio urbis Cygnece [published by Tobias Schmidt, Zwickau, 1633], pages 90, 215, 217). Munzer left Zwickau in April 1521, in company with Marcus Thoma, and travelled for a while through Central Germany (see Seidemann, Thomas Miinzer, page 122). His former career had given him some reputation, and the dissatisfied portion of the population everywhere rallied around him.

In September 1521, we find him at Saatz, where he met a large number of Moravians. The works of Luther were by that time known in Bohemia, and had awakened ardent sympathies. Munzer was warmly received, and in November, 1521, he openly published at Prague a proclamation to the Bohemians (printed in the Anabaptisticum et enthusiasticum Pantheon, 1702, and with additions in Seidemann, page 122). This proclamation affords an early glimpse of the doctrines which Muinzer subsequently unfolded in his publications.. But Prague was not a suitable field for such attempts at a radical reform, and Minzer was exiled. In the early part of 1522 he went to Wittenberg, where, under the influence of Carlstadt and the prophets of Zwickau, a complete subversion of all existing ecclesiastical relations was daily progressing (see Salig, Historie d. Augsburgischen Confession, 3:1099). Although connected with Melancthon and Bugenhagen, Munzer's feelings inclined him more towards Carlstadt's views. When Luther came to Wittenberg, Munzer felt that his labors would not be longer profitable there, and left. He appears to have soon after gone to Nordhausen, and in 1523 was married and succeeded in being appointed pastor of Alstedt, in Thuringia. The community at that place appears to have been entirely devoted to Munzer, as was also his  colleague, Simon Haseritz (on the latter, see Hagen, Deutschland's litterar. u. relig. Veuf. im Reformationszeitalter, 1844, 3:114), and he conducted worship according to his own views. A work which he published on the subject at that time still shows some moderation (Ordnung, u. berechunge des Teutschen ampts zu Alstadt durch Tomam Muntzer, etc., 1523). He retained the practice of infant baptism, with some ceremonies not commanded in Scripture. Soon after, however, he advanced further in his liturgical changes (in the Deutsch-Evangelisch Messje, Alstedt, 1524, and Deutsch Kirchenampt, etc., Alstedt). He was the first preacher to substitute the German language for the Latin in the public prayers and singing, and composed a directory for worship which was in harmony with his ideas of the Reformation. The quiet duties of a pastor not satisfying Miinzer, and being desirous to contest with Luther the leadership in the reformatory movement, Munzer determined to use all means to destroy the latter's influence; but his conduct displeased the princes who favored the Reformation under Luther, and finally, at the request of Frederick of Saxony and John of Weimar, Munzer was obliged to leave Alstedt in 1524.

He now went successively to Nuremberg, Schaffhausen, and finally to Miihlhausen in Thuringia. In the latter place he acquired great influence over the people, which he hesitated not to use for his own purposes. He had adopted mystical views, and declaiming against what he called the "servile, liberal, and half" measures of the Reformers, required a radical reformation both in Church and State, according to his "inward light." He resolved on recourse to violent means, and his cry became, "We must exterminate with the sword, like Joshua, the Canaanitish nations." He caused the authorities of this place to be superseded, the convents and richest houses of the city to be plundered, and communism to be proclaimed. "Munzer," Luther wrote to Amsdorff, April 11, 1525, "Munzer is king, and emperor of Muhlhausen, and no longer is pastor." The lowest classes ceased to work. If any one wanted a piece of cloth or a supply of corn, he asked his richer neighbor; if the latter refused, the penalty was hanging. Muhlhausen being at that time a free town, Munzer exercised his power unmolested. He was, moreover, encouraged in his course by being joined about this same time by another band of fanatics under Pfeiffer. This, and the rumor that forty thousand peasants were arming in Franconia, decided Munzer to go still further and make himself master of the situation by an appeal to the peasants of Thuringia, promising them the spoils taken from their lords. The revolt of the peasants of Southern Germany led him to imagine that the time had come to extend his  new kingdom. He had cast some large guns in the convent of the Franciscans, and now exerted himself to raise the peasantry and miners. "When will you shake off your slumbers," said he, in a fanatical address: "Arise and fight the battle of the Lord! The time is come — France, Germany, and Italy are up and doing. Up and at it! — Dran (at it!), dran, dran! Heed not the cries of the ungodly. They will weep like children — but be you pitiless. — Dran, dran, dran! Fire burns — let your swords be ever tinged with blood! — Dran, dran, dran! Work while it is day." The letter was signed "Munzer, God's servant against the ungodly," or "Thomas Munzer, with the sword of Gideon." Leaving Pfeiffer as governor at Muhlhausen, he marched towards Frankenhausen, and committed all manner of excesses in the country which he traversed. The country people, eager for plunder, flocked in crowds to his standard. Throughout the districts of Mansfeld, Stolberg, Schwarzburg, Hesse, and Brunswick the peasantry rose en masse. The convents of Michelstein, Ilsenburg, Walkenried, Rossleben, and many others in the neighborhood of the Hartz mountains or in the plains of Thuringia, were plundered. At Reinhardsbrunn, the place which Luther had once visited, the tombs of the ancient landgraves were violated, and the library destroyed.

Terror spread far and wide. Even at Wittenberg some anxiety began to be felt — the doctors who had not feared emperors nor pope trembled in presence of the madman. Curiosity was all alive to the accounts of what was going on, and watched every step in the progress of the insurrection. Melancthon wrote: "We are here in imminent danger. If Munzer be successful, it is all over with us; unless Christ should appear for our deliverance. Munzer's progress is marked by more than Scythian cruelty. His threats are more dreadful than I can tell you." The elector John, duke George of Saxony, the landgrave Philip of Hesse, and duke Henry of Brunswick finally united their forces, and sent fifteen hundred horsemen and some companies of infantry against the rebels. Muinzer's men then numbered about eight thousand. A battle was fought May 15, 1525, and the insurgents were completely defeated; according to some accounts they lost five thousand men, according to others seven thousand. Frankenhausen was taken and plundered. Munzer, discouraged, hid in a bed, feigning to be sick. He would have escaped, but a soldier having found in his travelling-bag a letter by count Mansfeld, Munzer was recognised and arrested. Being put to the torture, he revealed the names of his accomplices; was then taken to Muhlhausen, where Pfeiffer, who had sought to escape was also a prisoner, and the two, together with twenty-four other rebels, were beheaded. His  numerous writings, all of which are still extant, indicate a more than ordinary mind and will, but they betray also a great lack of sound judgment and a want of common-sense. His language is often forcibly eloquent, but all his utterances are tinged with coarseness and vulgarity. See Melancthon, Die Historie v. Thome Muntzer, etc. (1525); Christ. Guil. Aurbachii Dissertationes oratoriae de eloquentia inepta Thomae Munzeri (Wittenb. 1716); Loscher, Dissertatio de Muntzeri doctrina et factis (Leips. 1708); Strobel, Leben, Schriften u. Lehren Thoma Muntzer's (Nurnb. and Altdorf, 1795); Baczko, Thomas Munzer (Halle and Leips. 1812); Seidemann, Thomas Miinzer (Dresden and Leipsic, 1842); Leo, Thomas Munzer (Berlin, 1856); Evangel. Kirchenzeit. 1856, page 293; Kapp, Nachlese niitzlich. Reformations-Urkund. 2:613; Cyprian, Reformations-Urkunden, 2:339; Walch, Luther's Werke, 16:4 sq., 171 sq.; Frank, Ketzer-Chronik, page 187; Seckendorf, Hist. Lutheranismi, 1:118, 156, etc.; Sleidanus, De statu, etc., lib. 5:1; Arnold, Kirchen-u. Ketzerhistorie, 1740, 1:629, 674; Otting, Annales Anabaptist. 1672, pages 4, 6, 16, 42; Ranke, Deutsche Gesch. im Zeitalter d. Reform. 2:187, 192, 215, 225; D'Aubigne, Hist. of the Ref. in Germany and Switzerland, 3:207 sq.; Hardwick, Hist. Church of the Reformation, page 252 sq., page 40, n. 1 ; Hagenbach, Kirchengesch. 3 (4th ed. Leips. 1870), Lect. 20; Gieseler, Ecclesiastes Hist. volume 4 (Harper's ed.); Seebohm, Hist. Prot. Revolution, page 136, 141 sq., 150; Blackwood's Magazine, February 1847, page 385 sq.; Zeitschr. f. hist. Theologie, 1858, 1860. SEE PEASANTS WAR.

## Muppim[[@Headword:Muppim]]

             (Heb. Muppim', מֻפַּים, perh. contracted from מְעוּפַיםin the sense of flights; Sept. Μαμφίμ, v.r. Ο᾿φιμίν and Ο᾿φιμίμ, Vulg. Mophim), a person named in Gen 46:21 as one of the sons of Benjamin born before the migration into Egypt; but really a grandson born much later, being a son of Becher (q.v.), as it would seem from parallel accounts. SEE BENJAMIN. He is doubtless the same elsewhere called SHEPHUPHIAM (1Ch 8:5), SHUPHAM (Num 26:30), or SHUPPIM (1Ch 7:12). SEE JACOB.

## Muratori, Ludovico Antonio[[@Headword:Muratori, Ludovico Antonio]]

             a distinguished Italian theologian, archaeologist, and historian, was born at Vignola, near Modena, October 21, 1672. His family being in moderate circumstances, his early education was neglected. In 1685, however, he  entered the college of the Jesuits, where he distinguished himself by his rapid progress. From a very early period his predilection for historical and literary pursuits began to manifest itself; and having entered into holy orders in 1688, without, however, accepting any ecclesiastical office, his life was devoted partly to the literature of his profession, but mainly to researches in history, both sacred and profane, especially the history of his native country. He took the degree of doctor in 1692; and his reputation for learning attracting the notice of Joseph Orsi and Felix Marsigli, he was on their recommendation appointed by Charles Borromeo sub-librarian of the Ambrosian Library at Milan. In that collection Muratori discovered several inedited MSS. He made extracts from these, and published them with notes and comments, under the titles of Anecdota Latina and Anecdota Grceca (Milan, 1697-1713, 4 volumes, fol.). Some years after he was recalled to Modena by the duke Rinaldo, who gave him the situation of librarian of the rich library of the house of Este, a place which he retained for the rest of his life. After this appointment Muratori devoted himself entirely to the study of the Italian records of the Middle Ages; and after many years of assiduous labor he produced his great work, Rerum Italicarum Scriptores, ab anno aerae Christianae 500 ad 1500 (28 volumes, fol.).

The first volume of this immense collection was published at Milan in 1723, and the last appeared in 1751. Several princes and noblemen defrayed the expenses of the publication; sixteen of them contributed $4000 each. In this collection Muratori has inserted all the chronicles of Italy during the Middle Ages which he could discover, most of which were inedited, and has accompanied them with valuable commentaries. Some of the texts had already been published by Graevius in his Thesaurus Antiquitatum et Historiarum Italica, but they were mostly confined to the last century or two of the period of a thousand years embraced by Muratori. While engaged in these prodigious labors, he also carried on an active literary correspondence with the scholars of the various countries of Europe, and contributed essays not unfrequently to the principal historical and literary academies, of most of which he was a member. Muratori, however, held opinions not always in harmony with those of his contemporaries, and became involved in a quarrel with several writers by an attack upon the learned institutions of the time, and by an advocacy of the plan of a republic of the learned in a series of letters printed at Venice in 1703, under the name of Lamindo Britanio. In theology also he attempted to open a new path by his De ingeniorun moderatione in religionis negotio (first published at Paris, 1714; German,  Coblentz, 1837). It is in the interests of Hermesianism, SEE HERMES, GEORG. and was republished in Germany.

Muratori endeavors to show in this work that freedom of thought in religious matters may be tolerated, and to what degree this liberty may be exercised. But he excited the greatest tumult by his attacks against a society whose members pledged their lives to uphold the doctrine of the immaculate conception. A Jesuit, Francis Burgi, having entered into a controversy with him on this point, Muratori wrote his De superstitione vitanda, sive censura voti sanguinarii in honorem immaculatae conceptionis Deiparae. No printer dared publish this work, which appeared only in 1740 at Venice, pretending to have been printed at Milan. He followed it up by similar writings, under the alias of Ferdinandus Valdesius. Soon after, however, he reconciled himself with the Jesuits by writing the history of their missions in Paraguay, for which they showered honors upon him. He also published a collection of the Roman liturgy (Rome, 1748, 2 volumes, fol.), and opposed the principles of the Reformation in his Regolata divozioni de Cristiani, published under the name of Lamindo Britanio (Venice, 1747, and often reprinted). This work met with great success. Muratori wrote also an abridgment of his dissertations in Italian, which was published after his death: Dissertazioni sopra le Antichita Ialiane (1766, 3 volumes, 4to). He also wrote in Italian, Annali d'Italia dalprincipio dell' era volgare sino all' anno 1750 (1762, 12 volumes, 4to). It is the first general history of Italy that was published, and is a useful book of reference. It has been continued by Coppi down to our own times: Annali d'Italia in continuazione di quelli del Muratori, dal 1750 al 1819 (Rome, 1829, 4 volumes, 8vo). Another work of Muratori is his Novus Thesaurus veterum Inscriptionum (1739, 4 volumes, fol.), in which he has inserted many inscriptions unknown to Gruter. Spon, Fabretti, and other archaeologists who had preceded him. In seeking after the historical records of the Middle Ages, Muratori collected also a vast number of documents concerning the social, civil, intellectual, and political condition of Italy during that long period whose history he transcribed and commented upon, and he published the whole in seventy-five dissertations, Antiquitates Italicae medii anvi, sive Dissertationes de moribus Italici populi, ab inclinatione Romani Imperii usque ad annaum 1500 (1738-42, 6 volumes, fol.).

"I have treated first," says the author in his preface, "of the kings, dukes, marquises, counts, and other magistrates of the Italian kingdom; after which I have investigated the various forms of the political government, and also the manners of the private citizens; the freedom and franchises of some classes and the servitude of others; the laws, the judicial  forms, the military system; the arts, sciences, and education; the progress of trade and industry; and other matters of social and civil history." His work, entitled Antichita Estensi (Modena, 1710-40, 2 volumes, fol.), treats of the Fasti of the house of Este in its various branches. He also wrote several historico-political treatises in support of the rights of his sovereign, the duke of Modena, over the towns of Ferrara and Comacchio, which had been seized by the court of Rome: Questioni Comacchiesi (Modena, 1711): — Piena esposizione dei Diritti della Casa d'Este sopra la Citta di Comacchio (1712): — Ragioni della serenissima Casa d'Este sopra Ferrara (1714). Among Muratori's other works we must mention, Governo politico, medico, ed ecclesiastico della Peste (1720), written on the occasion of the plague of Marseilles, and showing the methods required to counteract it:-Difetti della Giurisprudenza (1742), in which he show's the defects of judicial forms in most countries: — Morale Filosofia (1735): — Instituzioni di publica felicita (1749): — Della regolata divozione dei Fedeli. In this last treatise Muratori, who, though sincerely pious, was too enlightened to be superstitious, combated several popular devotional practices which were merely external, and recommended in preference internal habits of self-examination and prayer. His enemies accused him of heresy. Muratori wrote to the pope, Benedict XIV, explaining his meaning, and asking for his judgment on the matter of contention. That enlightened pontiff wrote him a kind letter in answer, telling him that “those passages in his works which were not found acceptable to Rome did not touch either the dogma or the discipline of the Church; but that had they been written by any other person the Roman Congregation of the Index would have forbidden them; which, however, had not been done in the case of Muratori's works, because it was well known that he, the pope, shared in the universal esteem in which his merit was held," etc.

Muratori has been truly called the "father of the history of the Middle Ages." Subsequent historians, such as Sismondi and others, are greatly indebted to Muratori, without whose previous labors they could not have undertaken or completed their works. The character of Muratori is clearly seen in his works. Modest, though learned, indefatigable, intent upon the improvement of mankind, charitable and tolerant, sincerely religious and strictly moral, he was one of the most distinguished and yet most unobtrusive among the learned of Italy. In the studies of his own profession, as well liturgical and historical as dogmatical and even ascetical, Muratori, although he did not follow the method of the schools, was hardly less distinguished than if he had made these the pursuit of his  life. Some of his opinions were regarded with disfavor, if not directly condemned, but his honesty stands unquestioned alike by Jesuits and Ultramontanes or radical Protestants. All pay homage to his scholarship and industry and integrity. Muratori was also rector of the parish of Pomposa at Modena, but his literary occupations did not make him neglect his flock; he assisted his parishioners with his advice and his money; he founded several charitable institutions, and rebuilt the parish church. He died at Modena in 1750. All his writing. collected make up 46 vols. in folio, 34 in 4to, 13 in 8vo, and many more in 12mo. His minor works were collected and published at Arezzo in 1787, in 19 volumes, 4to. The best uniform edition of Muratori's works is that published at Venice (1790- 1810, 48 volumes, 8vo). His tomb is in the church of St. Agostino at Modena, near that of his illustrious countryman, Sigonio. His life has been written by his nephew, G.F. Muratori, Vita del celebre L.A. Muratori (1756). See Scheldoni, Elogio di L.A. Muratori (1818); Tipaldo, Biografia degli Italiani illustri, s.v.; Abbe Gouget, in Ant. Gachet d'Antigny, Memoires d'histoire, etc. (Par. 1756), volume 6; English Cyclop. s.v.

## Muratorian Fragment[[@Headword:Muratorian Fragment]]

             also spoken of as CANON OF MURATORI, is a treatise on Biblical MSS. of great importance to the history of the N.T. canon. It is believed to have been composed shortly after the production of the Shepherd of Hermas (q.v.), and therefore belongs to the second half of the 2d century. It is important, first, because of its remote antiquity, and also as an evidence as to what writings passed for canonical in the Catholic Church of that time. It enumerates as such the Gospel of Luke (as the third, the two others being presupposed), the Gospel of John, the Acts of the Apostles, thirteen Pauline epistles, a letter of Jude, two epistles of John, the Apocalypses of John and Peter, the latter, however, with contradiction asserted. The Epistles of Jacob (James) and Peter are therein omitted, also the one to the Hebrews. The epistles to the Laodicaeans and Alexandrians are rejected. The fragment was noticed by Muratori in his Antiq. Ital. medii cevi, 3:854, and has been reprinted in the Introductions to the N.T. of Eichhorn and Guericke, also by Kirchhofer and Credner. An exhaustive treatise on the subject, with the original text, and a translation of it into Greek, by Hilgenfeld, is found in the Zeitschrift fur wissenschaftliche Theologie, 1872, page 560. See also Gieseler. in Studien u. Kritiken, 1847 and 1856; Hesse, Das Muratorische Fragment untersucht u. erklart (Giessen, 1873);  Westcott, Canon of N.T. (2d ed.), page 184 sq.; Bapt. Quar. April 1868, page 282; Amer. Pres. Rev. January 1869, page 100.

## Murch, William Harris, D.D[[@Headword:Murch, William Harris, D.D]]

             an English Baptist minister, was born at Honiton, Devon, May 17, 1784. He was baptized in May, 1802, by Reverend Dr. Rippon, and united with the Carter Lane Church, London. Subsequently he became assistant pastor with the celebrated John Foster, and then sole pastor of the Church at Sheppard's Barton, Frome. In 1827 he was appointed president and theological tutor at Stepney College, London. In 1844 he resigned his post on account of ill-health, and a year afterwards became pastor of the Church in Rickmansworth, Herts, where he remained till 1851. After preaching in and around London for a few years he removed, in 1856, to Bath, where he died, July 12, 1859. See (Lond.) Baptist Hand-book, 1861, page 100. (J.C.S.)

## Murcot, John[[@Headword:Murcot, John]]

             an English divine of some note, was born near the opening of the 17th century, and was educated at the University of Oxford. He wrote largely, and yet but little is known of his personal history. He died in 1654. His most important writings were collected and published as Theolog. Treatises (1657, 4to). Wood, in his Athence Oxon., speaks of Murcot as characterized by "a forward, prating, and pragmatical precision." Thomas Manton held him highly in esteem, and speaks of him thus as a preacher: "It were pity that the sermons coming from such a warm, affectionate spirit should die away with the breath in which they were uttered: as his fruit remaineth (I hope) in the hearts of many that heard him, so is it wrapt up in these papers to preserve it from perishing and forgetfulness." See Allibone. Dict. Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.

## Murder[[@Headword:Murder]]

             (properly קֶטֶל, which, however, is rendered "slaughter" in the Auth. Ver., from קָטִל, to "kill," φόνος). The criminal law of the Israelites naturally recognised the distinction between wilful murder and accidental or justifiable homicide (Num 25:16 sq.), although in the legislative language itself the word רֹצֵח is used for both kinds of manslaughter (see especially Num 35:26; Deu 19:3, etc.). Murder was invariably visited with capital punishment (Lev 24:17; comp. Gen 9:6), without the possibility of expiation. Mere homicide (the act of בַּשְׁגּגָה מִכָּה נֶפֶשׁ, Num 35:15, or דִעִת רֹצֵחִ אֶתאּרֵעֵהוּ בַּבְלַי, Deu 4:42) was, however, liable to a forfeiture of life according to all ancient national observances. — Winer, 2:105. (See Ewald, Alterthiimer des V. Israel, pages 146-154.) SEE BLOOD- REVENGE.

The principle on which the act of taking the life of a human being was regarded by the Almighty as a capital offence is stated on its highest ground as an outrage-Philo calls it sacrilege-on the likeness of God in man, to be punished even when caused by an animal (Gen 9:5-6, with Bertheau's note; see also Joh 8:44; 1Jn 3:12; 1Jn 3:15; Philo, De Spec. Leg. 3:15, volume 2, page 313). Its secondary or social ground appears to be implied in the direction to replenish the earth which  immediately follows (Gen 9:7). The exemption of Cain from capital punishment may thus be regarded by anticipation as founded on the social ground either of expediency or of example (Gen 4:12; Gen 4:15). The postdiluvian command, enlarged and infringed by the practice of blood- revenge, which it seems to some extent to sanction, was limited by the Law of Moses, which, while it protected the accidental homicide, defined with additional strictness the crime of murder. It prohibited compensation or reprieve of the murderer, or his protection if he took refuge in the refuge- city, or even at the altar of Jehovah, a principle which finds an eminent illustration in the case of Joab (Exo 21:12; Exo 21:14; Lev 24:17; Lev 24:21; Num 35:16-18; Num 35:21; Num 35:31; Deu 19:11; Deu 19:13; 2Sa 17:25; 2Sa 20:10; 1Ki 2:5-6; 1Ki 2:31; see Philo, 1.c.; Michaelis, On Laws of Moses, § 132). Bloodshed even in warfare was held to involve pollution (Num 35:33-34; Deu 21:1; Deu 21:9; 1Ch 28:3). Philo says that the attempt to murder deserves punishment equally with actual perpetration; and the Mishna, that a mortal blow intended for another is punishable with death; but no express legislation on this subject is found in the Law (Philo, 1.c.; Mishna, Sanh. 9:2).

No special mention is made in the Law (a) of child murder, (b) of parricide, nor (c) of taking life by poison, but its animus is sufficiently obvious in all these cases (Exo 21:15; Exo 21:17; 1Ti 1:9; Mat 15:4), and the third may perhaps be specially intended under the prohibition of witchcraft (Exo 22:18; see Joseph. Ant. 4:8, 34; Philo, De Spec. Leg. 3:17, volume 2, page 315).

It is not certain whether a master who killed his slave was punished with death (Exo 21:20; Knobel, ad loc.). In Egypt the murder of a slave was punishable with death as an example afortiori in the case of a freeman; and parricide was punished with burning; but child-murder, though regarded as an odious crime, was not punished with death (Diod. Sic. 1:77). The Greeks also, or at least the Athenians, protected the life of the slave (Miiller, Dorians, 3:3, § 4; Wilkinson, Anc. Eg. 2:208, 209).

No punishment is mentioned for suicide attempted (comp. 1Sa 31:4 sq.; 1Ki 16:18; Mat 27:5; see 2Ma 14:41 sq.), nor does any special restriction appear to have attached to the property of the suicide (2Sa 17:23); yet Josephus says (War, 3:8, 5) that suicide was dealt with as crime by the Jews.  Striking a pregnant woman so as to cause abortion was punished by a fine; but if it caused her death it was punishable with death (Exo 21:23; Joseph. Ant. 4:8, 33).

If an animal known to be vicious caused the death of any one, not only was the animal destroyed, but the owner also, if he had taken no steps to restrain it, was held guilty of murder (Exo 21:29; Exo 21:31; see Michaelis, § 274, volume 4, pages 234-5).

The duty of executing punishment on the murderer is in the Law expressly laid on the "revenger of blood;" but the question of guilt was to be previously decided by the Levitical tribunal. A strong bar against the licence of private revenge was placed by the provision which required the concurrence of at least two witnesses in any capital question (Num 35:19-30; Deu 17:6-12; Deu 19:12; Deu 19:17). In regal times the duty of execution of justice on a murderer seems to have been assumed to some extent by the sovereign, as well as the privilege of pardon (2Sa 13:39; 2Sa 14:7; 2Sa 14:11 : 1Ki 2:34). During this period also the practice. of assassination became frequent, especially in the kingdom of Israel. Among modes of effecting this object may be mentioned the murder of Benhadad of Damascus by Hazael by means of a wet cloth (1Ki 15:27; 1Ki 16:9; 2Ki 8:15; see Thenius, ad loc.: Jahn, Hist. 1:137; comp. 2Ki 10:7; 2Ki 11:1; 2Ki 11:16; 2Ki 11:20; 2Ki 14:5; 2Ki 15:14; 2Ki 15:25; 2Ki 15:30).

It was lawful to kill a burglar taken at night in the act, but unlawful to do so after sunrise (Exo 22:2-3).

The Koran forbids child-murder, and allows blood revenge, but permits money-compensation for bloodshed (2:21; 4:72; 17:230, ed. Sale). — SEE MANSLAYER.

## Murder, Christian Laws Concerning[[@Headword:Murder, Christian Laws Concerning]]

             In civil law murder is termed the killing of a human being of malice aforethought, and the crime thus committed is in most countries punishable by death. In the United States there are several states in favor of life imprisonment, and in Sweden capital punishment is no longer meted out. Murder is defined by Coke thus: "When a person of sound memory and discretion unlawfully killeth any reasonable creature in being, and under the king's peace, with malice aforethought, either express or implied." Almost every word in this definition has been the subject of discussion in the  numerous cases that have occurred in the law-courts. The murderer must be of sound memory or discretion; i.e., he must be at least fourteen years of age, and not a lunatic or idiot. The act must be done unlawfully, i.e., it must not be in self-defence, or from other justifiable cause. The person killed must be a reasonable creature, and hence killing a child in the womb is not murder, but is punishable in another way. SEE INFANTICIDE.

The essential thing in murder is that it be done maliciously and deliberately; and hence in cases of hot blood and scuffling the offence is generally manslaughter only. Killing by duelling is thus murder, for it is deliberate. It is not necessary, in order to constitute murder, that the murderer kill the man he intended, provided he had a deliberate design to murder some one. Thus if one shoots at A and misses him, but kills B, this is murder, because of the previous felonious intent, which the law transfers from one to the other. So if one lays poison for A, and B, against whom the poisoner had no felonious intent, takes it and is killed, this is murder. The murderer is here regarded as hostis humani generis. "Anciently," Blackstone says, "the name of murder, as a crime, was applied only to the secret killing of another, which the word moerda signifies in the Teutonic language." Among the ancient Goths in Sweden and Denmark the whole villa or neighborhood was punished for the crime, if the murderer was not discovered. The Roman Catholic Church stands accused of encouraging murder in various instances. Though no doubt the Church has frequently been held responsible where the individual acted of his own will and accord, it is yet apparent, from various ecclesiastical actions, that the Church of Rome has taken a peculiar view of this subject. Thus the clergy (q.v.) were at times exempted from severe punishment for this crime. In England the statute for the "Benefit of Clergy" was only abolished by George IV (7 and 8, c. 28). The murder of heretics has frequently been encouraged in the Romish Church, as witness the slaughter of St. Bartholomew (q.v.). Pope Urban II stands accused beyond dispute of having encouraged murder; and in the 15th century, when those of the Romanists who desired reform urged the Council of Florence and of Constance in vain to condemn the monstrous teachings of Jean Petet (see Monstrelet, The Eight Principles of J. Petet, 51, c. 39), who in ambiguous writing had vindicated as just and lawful most foul and treacherous murder, and in this vindication laid down "principles utterly subversive of human society; principles which would let loose mankind upon each other, like wild beasts; principles in direct violation of one of the commandments of God, and in plain, bold opposition to every principle, and to the whole  religion of Christ" — the council not only did not condemn these monstrous tenets, but declared them simply "moral and philosophical opinions, not of faith," and therefore out of the province of the Church and of the council (Milman, Hist. of Latin Christianity, 7:508). In the 16th century indulgences were freely granted the clergy for murder committed, and the price fixed at $20 to the dean, and $55 to a bishop or abbot (see Barnum, Romanism, page 566). Statisticians have prepared comparative lists of the crime of murder committed in Roman Catholic and Protestant countries. We insert here one of these, as these statistics exhibit plainly the moral results of the Romish and Protestant systems. The Reverend M. Hobart Seymour gives in his Evenings with the Romanists an introductory chapter on "the moral results of the Romish system," which embodies various statistics respecting crime drawn directly from official returns in the several countries named.

There were in the Papal States in 1867, according to official (French) returns, 186 murders to each million of the population. Mr. Seymour furnishes also various statistics showing the immorality of Roman Catholic cities and countries in Europe to be decidedly greater than that of similar Protestant cities and countries, and often twice, thrice, etc., as great, and says: "Name any Protestant country or city in Europe, and let its depths of vice and immorality be measured and named, and I will name a Roman Catholic country or city whose depths of vice and immorality are lower still." Mr. Seymour's statistics, though widely published, have stood for years unimpeached. In April 1869, it is true, The Catholic World attempted to break the force of his argument by citing the case of Protestant Stockholm, which it alleged that Mr. Seymour wilfully suppressed, and where, according to it, the rate of illegitimate births to the whole number of births "is over fifty to the hundred-quite equal to that of Vienna." To this the New Englander of January 1870, replies: "It seems to us sufficient to say, first, that the statement of the Catholic World is untrue. At the time of Mr. Seymour's statement the official return of illegitimacy in Stockholm was twenty-nine percent, which is considerably less than 'over fifty to the hundred.' Secondly, that the following eleven Roman Catholic cities were worse than the notoriously worst of all Protestant cities: Paris, 33 percent; Brussels, 35; Munich, 48; Vienna, 51; Laibach, 38; Brunn, 42; Lintz, 46; Prague, 47; Lemberg, 47; Klagenfort,56; Gratz,65." The official statistics of Germany, as given in the New-Englander for January 1870, show an average of 117 illegitimate births in every 1000 births in the Protestant provinces, and of 186 in 1000 in the Roman Catholic provinces; those of Austria gave for the Roman Catholic provinces in 1866 an average of 215 illegitimate births in every 1000 births, and in the mixed provinces (containing 9 up to 83 per cent. of Roman Catholics, the remainder Protestants, Greeks, etc.) an average of 60 in every 1000. The average number of illegitimate births in every 1000 births for the various nations of Europe is as follows:

PROTESTANT. ROMAN CATHOLIC.

Denmark ................ 110 Baden .................. 162

England, Scotland, and  Bavaria ................225

Wales ................. 6    Belgium ........ ... 72

Holland (35 per c. R. C.) 40 France .............. 75

Prussia, with Saxony and     German Austria .........181

Hanover............... 83    Italy [defective] ......... 51

Sweden, with Norway ... 96   Spain [defective] ........ 55

Switzerland (41 perc.R.C.) 55

Wurtemberg (between R.  Average ........ 117

C. Baden and Bavaria). 164   or, rejecting Italy and

Average............. 88 Spain.................143

Taking the average birth-rate in Europe — 1 a year for every 28 of the population — the returns in Italy show that more than one fourth of the births fail to be registered; and the official returns for Spain are notoriously untrustworthy. It has been said that the official returns for Ireland gave only 3.8 percent of illegitimate births, and most of this in the Protestant counties; but the registrar-general complains that many births and deaths are not registered; and the comparison of 1 birth only for every 42 of the population as returned, with the average European birth-rate of 1 in 28, would imply that nearly one third of the births in Ireland are unregistered. The percentage of illegitimate births in Italy, Spain, and Ireland may therefore be much larger than the imperfect official returns indicate, and is of course untrustworthy. Other statistics of immorality are also given in the New-Englander, but we have not room to quote here further, and refer our readers interested in a comparative statement of the moral influences of Protestantism and Romanism to the periodicals cited.

## Murdock, David, D.D[[@Headword:Murdock, David, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian divine, was born in the village of Bonbill, in Dumbartonshire, Scotland, in 1801. His father was a stone-cutter, who often labored with the friends of Hugh Miller. David possessed indomitable energy, and obtained for himself a thorough and accomplished education. He graduated at Glasgow University; studied theology in the theological school of the Scottish Independents; and was licensed and ordained in Glasgow, according to the forms of the Scottish Congregationalists, about the year 1831. His first charge was the parish of Cambuslang, near Glasgow, a place memorable for the wonderful preaching of Whitefield. In 1834 he accepted an appointment from the Colonial Missionary Society as  a missionary to Canada, and on his arrival in that country he resided principally at Bath, preaching as a supply to the destitute and feeble churches of that region. In 1837, about the time of the Patriot War, he left Canada, and was settled as the successor of Dr. McMaster at Ballston Centre, N.Y.; in 1842 he accepted a call to Catskill as successor to the Reverend Dr. Porter. In 1851 he accepted a call to the First Presbyterian Church in Elmira, N.Y., where he labored until his death, June 13, 1861. Dr. Murdock was emphatically a man of the people. In the pulpit, in the lecture-room, on the platform, he was indeed pre-eminent. He was a great reader, and especially a profound scholar in the sciences. He was eminently successful as an essayist. An article by him on Canning and Chalmers, in the Presb. Quart. Review, is one of power. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1862, page 189.

## Murdock, James, D.D[[@Headword:Murdock, James, D.D]]

             one of the profoundest religious and ecclesiastical scholars of the United States, a bright ornament of the Congregational body, was born at Westbrook, Connecticut, February 16, 1776, of Irish descent. He was left an orphan at the age of fourteen; but he struggled with his fate, and finally succeeded in making his way to Yale College, where he graduated in 1797. He then took up the study of theology under the wellknown Congregational theologian, Dr. Timothy Dwight. Instead of entering at once the ministry, he decided to teach for a while, and became successively preceptor of Hopkins grammar school in New Haven, and of the Oneida Academy. now Hamilton College, at Clinton, N.Y. In January 1801, he was admitted to the ministry, and June 23, 1802, was ordained pastor over the congregation at Princeton, Massachusetts. In 1815 he removed from that place to become professor of languages in the University of Vermont. In 1819 he exchanged this position for the Brown professorship of sacred rhetoric and ecclesiastical history in the theological seminary at Andover, Massachusetts, and this post he held until 1822, when he removed to New Haven to devote himself altogether to special studies in ecclesiastical history and Oriental literature, which he prosecuted with a youthful zest beyond his fourscore years. He died at Columbus, Mississippi, August 10, 1856. Dr. Murdock did the literary world great service by his superior English version of Mosheim's Church History. He published likewise, with great acceptance, Mosheim's Commentaries on the Afff\airs of the Christians before Constantine. SEE MOSHEIM.

Dr. Murdock published a translation of the Peshito-Syriac N.T. (N.Y. 1851, 8vo). His miscellaneous  productions were numerous and able. It was his temper to make fundamental researches, and to press his investigations into original sources. While at Andover he published Two Discourses on the Atonement. Later he brought out an English version of Munscher's Elements of Dogmatic Hist. (1830), and Sketches of Modern Philos. (1842). He also edited Milman's Hist. (of Christianity (N.Y. 1841), and brought out a collection of his Sermons, one of which, on the atonement, attracted much attention. He was also a frequent contributor to periodicals, especially to the Church Review, and this well-known quarterly did itself the honor to ignore its denominational boundaries (Protestant Episcopal) and furnish a pretty full account of the doctor shortly after his decease (see below). Dr. Murdock was president of the "Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences," vice-president of the "Connecticut Philosophical Society,” and one of the founders of the "American Oriental Society." See Brief Memoirs of the Class of 1797 (Yale), by Thomas Day; Church Rev. January 1857, art. 2.

## Muret(us), Marc Anthony[[@Headword:Muret(us), Marc Anthony]]

             a celebrated Roman Catholic scholar, best known by his philosophical writings, was born at Muret, a village near Limoges, in France, April 11, 1526, of a good family. But little beyond this is known of his early life. When about eighteen we find him studying at Agens, under Scaliger, who interested himself in Muretus, and ever cherished the highest opinion of his pupil. In 1552 he delivered in the church of the Bernardins his first oration, De dignitate ac prestantia studii theologici. He was at this time teaching philosophy and law at Paris, but evidently leaning towards the sacred ministry. Accused of immoral practices, he was finally obliged to quit Paris, and he led for some time a roaming life. He went to different places, everywhere commanding for a time the respect of his followers by his vast and varied erudition, but his immoral tendencies would ever compromise him, and he was soon ignored by his associates. About 1560 Muretus found employment under cardinal Este at Rome, and from that time he is believed to have led a more regular life. In 1562 he attended his patron on a visit to Paris, and there remained, and was prevailed upon to lecture on Aristotle's Ethics, which he did with singular applause up to 1567. After that he taught civil law. In 1576 he entered holy orders, and is believed to have become both priest and Jesuit. He died June 4, 1585. He was made a citizen of Rome, probably by pope Gregory XIII, who esteemed him very highly. Muretus's theology is questioned, and he is believed to have  cherished deistical views. See Niceron, Memoires, volume 27, s.v.; Beze, Hist. Ecclesiastes 4:534; Vitrac, Eloge de Muret; New Genesis Biog. Dict. (Lond. 1798), 11:138, 141; Hallam, Introd. to the Literature of Europe (Harper's ed.), 1:247, 257, 356: Pye Smith, Outlines (of Theol. page 111. (J.H.W.)

## Murillo, Bartolom Esthban[[@Headword:Murillo, Bartolom Esthban]]

             the Titian of Spanish art, was born January 1, 1618, at Pilas, a small hamlet about five leagues from Seville. Developing at an early age a wonderful proficiency in drawing, he was placed under the instruction of his maternal uncle, Juan del Castillo, a distinguished historical painter of Seville, who was the preceptor of some of the greatest artists of the Spanish school. In 1642, Murillo, having heard of the fame of Diego Velasquez of Madrid, which at this period had reached its zenith, was filled with a desire to study under that master, and consequently journeyed to Madrid, where he presented himself before Velasquez, who, perceiving his merit, not only took Murillo into his academy, but procured for him the privilege of copying the masterpieces of Rubens, Titian, and Vandyck in the royal collection. Here he passed three years in hard study; and in 1645 he returned to Seville, where his first work was painted in fresco for the convent of St. Francis. It was a picture consisting of sixteen compartments, in one of which is his celebrated production of St. Thomas de Villanueva distributing Alms to the Sick and the Poor. At the principal altar of the same convent is a large picture of the Jubilee of the Porciuncula, representing Christ bearing his cross, and the Virgil interceding for the supplicants, with a group of angels of most extraordinary beauty. These pictures created so much enthusiasm among his countrymen that his fame was at once established, and he immediately received a commission from the marquis of Villamansique to paint a series of five pictures from the life of David, the landscape backgrounds of which were to be executed by Ignacio Iriate, an eminent landscape-painter of Seville. There was a dispute between the two artists as to which part of the pictures should be first completed, Murillo holding very rightly that the backgrounds should be first painted; to this Iriate demurred, and the consequence was Murillo undertook to do the whole himself, which he did, changing the life of David to that of Jacob, and producing the famous pictures now in the possession of the marquis de Santiago at Madrid. In the same collection are two others of his finest works, St. Francis Xavier, and St. Joseph with the young Saviour.

The cathedral of Seville contains several of his great  pictures, among which are St. Antonio with the Holy Infant, a glory of angels and a remarkably fine architectural background, the Immaculate Conception, and portraits of several archbishops of Seville. From the St. Anthony picture the figure of the saint was cut in 1874, and brought for sale to this country; but, falling into the hands of a well-informed party, it was returned, and placed where it properly belongs. The Hospital of Charity contains three admired works, Moses striking the Rock; Christ feeding the five thousand, and one of St. John supporting a poor old man, aided by an angel, upon whom the saint looks with a beautiful expression of reverence and gratitude. The altar-piece of the Conception, in the church of San Felipe Neri at Cadiz, and a picture of St. Catharine at the Capuchins, are not only noteworthy for their beauty, but the latter is considered by many as his finest work, although Murillo himself always preferred his St. Thomas de Villanueva at Seville. In the chapel of the Nuns of the Angel at Granada is one of his most celebrated pictures, representing the Good Shepherd. Space does not admit of a full list of Murillo's works, but as a painter of religious subjects he ranks hardly second to Raphael. His pictures of the Virgin, saints, Magdalens, and of Christ, are all so characteristically beautiful and refined, so pure and chaste, that he can be said to have followed no given style, though the coloring of Titian is perceptible in his works. It is a curious fact that in all Murillo's pictures of the Virgin he has never displayed her feet, which in every instance are covered with almost faultless drapery, as if the charms of the holy Mother were too sacred to be made the subject of illustration. This can be said of no other religious painter, and evinces a proof of the purity with which Murillo looked upon his art.

In 1660 Murillo founded an academy of art in Seville, and was appointed its president, in which office he continued until April 3, 1682, when he died; his death having been hastened by a fall from a scaffold while engaged in painting the St. Catharine at Cadiz. In the National Gallery of Great Britain are a Holy Family, and a St. John and the Lamb. Dulwich Gallery contains, among others, Christ with the Lamb; Mystery of the Immaculate Conception; Jacob and Rachel; Adoration of the leagi; Two Angels; and a small Immaculate Conception. The Louvre contains a considerable number; the Pinakothek of Munich has some, and in the United States there are supposed to be a few of his works also. See Enyl. Cyclop. s.v.; Scott, Murillo and the Spanish School of Paintinig (Lond. 1873, 1 volume, 4to); Stirling, Annals of the Artists of Spain; Mrs. Jameson, Legends of the Madonna (Lond. 1857, 1 volume, 8vo), pages 34, 36, 43, 46, 49, etc.; Jameson and Eastlake, History of Our Lord (Lond.  1864, 2 volumes, 8vo), 1:138, 153, 155, 167, 273, 285, 292, etc.; 2:93, 343, 380; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.; Davies, Life of B.E. Murillo (1819); Biographies of Eminent Men .from the 13th Century, volume 2; Tytler (Miss), The Old Masters (Bost. 1874), page 230; Fraser's Magazine, April, 1846; Blackwood's Magazine, 1845, 2:420; 1849, 1:73, 184; 1853, 2:103; 1870, 2:133.

## Murimuth (or Merimuth), Adam[[@Headword:Murimuth (or Merimuth), Adam]]

             an English divine of note, flourished in the second half of the 14th century successively as canon and prebend of St. Paul's, canon of Exeter, and prebend of Lincoln. He died about 1380. He published Chronica in Temporibus in two parts (part 1:1303-6; part 2:1336-80). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Muris, Jean De[[@Headword:Muris, Jean De]]

             a learned French ecclesiastic who flourished in the first half of the 14th century (about 1310-45), is noted as the author of a valuable treatise on music, which is entitled Speculum Musicae. An abridgment of this work was also published.

## Murmuring[[@Headword:Murmuring]]

             (תְּלוּנָה, Exo 16:7 sq.; γογγυσμός), a complaint made for wrong supposed to have been received. Paul forbids murmuring (1Co 10:10), as did also the wise man in the Apocrypha (Wis 1:11). God severely punished the Hebrews who murmured in the desert, and was more than once on the point of forsaking them, and even of destroying them, had not Moses appeased his anger by earnest prayer (Num 11:33-34; Numbers 12; Num 14:30-31; Num 16:3; Num 21:4-6; Psa 78:30). SEE RESIGNATION.

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

             “as a sign of disapproval or pleasure," says Walcott, "was once common in British churches." Bishop Burnet and bishop Spratt were both hummed when preaching at St. Margaret's, Westminster. Burnet sat down and enjoyed it, rubbing his face with his handkerchief; but Spratt, stretching out his hand, cried, "Peace, peace; I pray you, peace." At Cambridge a witty preacher, in the time of queen Anne, addressed his congregation at St. Mary's as "Hum et hissimi auditores." At Hereford this unseemly practice,  which greeted every person arriving late in the choir, was prohibited (Sacred Archaceology, page 394).

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

             a noted German satirist and most decided opponent of the Reformation, was born in Strasburg December 24, 1475. He early entered a Franciscan monastery, and then studied at the principal universities of Europe, devoting himself particularly to theology and philosophy, and quickly gained a reputation for ability, marred, however, by a want of earnestness and a quarrelsome disposition. At Paris he acquired the degree of A.M., and in 1506 the emperor Maximilian nominated him poeta laureatus. He lost a place in the conventual Latin school of Strasburg by his invective against Wimpfeling, and afterwards led an unsteady life, preaching for some time at Frankfort-on-the-Main (1512). At this time he battled against the clerical crimes and abuses, generally incurring the displeasure of his congregation by the coarse personalities of his sermons. He was successively expelled from Freiburg, Troves, and Venice. In 1512 he edited his Narrenbeschworung, of which his Der Schelmen Zunft (Frankfort, 1512) may be regarded as a continuation. These works, which show considerable satirical talents, are remarkable imitations of Sebastian Brandt's celebrated poem, called Narrenschif. In his Gauchmatt (Basle, 1519) he ridicules the effeminate manhood of some of his contemporaries; and in his Logica memorativa, or Chartiludium logicae, and in his Ludus studentium Friburgensium he proves himself a predecessor of the renowned pedagogue, Basedow, trying to show how logic and prosody may be studied to advantage at different games.

In 1519 he seems to have resumed his functions in the conventual school of Strasburg, and made himself conspicuous as one of the most virulent opponents of the Reformation. When Hedio and Capito were preaching at Strasburg, Murner opposed them violently (see Hottinger, Helvetische Kirchengesch. 3:145). As ambassador of the bishop of Strasburg, he afterwards attended the Diet at Nuremberg to accuse the Council of Strasburg (Sleidan, volume 4). He opposed Luther's book, An den Adel deutscher Nation, by a work of similar title, An den grossmachtigsten und durchlauchtigsten Adel deutscher Nation, dass sie den christlichen Glauben beschirmen wider den Zerstorer des Glaubens Christi, Martinum Luther, einen Verfuhrer der einfaltigen Christen. Although he translated Luther's Letter against Henry VIII, and his Babylonische Gefangenschaft from Latin into German, he rejected all his teachings entirely. He called Luther a Catilina, and received  himself the name of Lutheromastix. According to a letter of Luther to Brismann, Murner left the monastery (De Wette, 2:58). This statement, however, is incorrect. In 1523 Murner repaired to England, in compliance with an invitation from Henry VIII, but troubles in his convent compelled him to return. Some of his writings against the Reformation had already been burned by order of the Diet of Worms. To elude the vigilance of the authorities he established a press of his own, which, however, was destroyed by a mob, together with his house. He was compelled to flee to Switzerland, whence he was in time likewise expelled. His most celebrated satirical work is entitled Von dem grossen Lutherischen Narren (Strasburg, 1522; new edition by Henry Kurtz, Zurich, 1848), which was answered by Murnarus Leriethus vulgo dictus Halbnarr odes Gansprediger. The latter part of his personal history is not known, although he is supposed to have lived in misery, and to have died at Heidelberg about 1536. See Waldau, Nachricht. v. Thom. Murner Leben and Schriften; Panzer, Annales d. deutsch. Litt.; Ruchat, Histoire de la Reform. de la Suisse; Yung, Gesch. d. Refoarm. i. Strasburg, page 238 sq.; Hagen, Deutschland's liter. uand relig. Verhaltnisse im Reformatiozs-zeitalter, 2:61, 183 sq.; Hagenbach, Kirchengesch. volume 3; For. Qu. 20:74.

## Murphy, James, D.D[[@Headword:Murphy, James, D.D]]

             a minister of the (Dutch) Reformed Church, was born near Rhinebeck, N.Y., in 1788; graduated at New Brunswick Theological Seminary, 1814; and was pastor of several Reformed churches, chiefly in the valley of the Mohawk and in Herkimer County, N.Y.; and died in 1857 at Frankfort, where he was then pastor. He was an evangelical preacher of superior abilities, fond of study, and particularly of classical and scientific pursuits. His volume entitled Geology consistent with the Bible is a creditable monument of his proficiency in that department of natural science, up to the period of its date. He was prominent in the councils of the Church, and for many years was an active trustee of Union College. (W.J.R.T.)

## Murrain[[@Headword:Murrain]]

             (דֶּבֶר, de'ber, destruction, especially by a "pestilence," as the word is elsewhere rendered; plur. "plagues" in Hos 13:14), the fifth plague with which the Egyptians were visited when they held the Hebrews in bondage (Exo 9:3). SEE PLAGUES OF EGYPT.

This consisted in some distemper that resulted in a sudden and dreadful mortality among the  cattle in the field, including horses, asses, camels, oxen, and sheep. It was, however, confined to the Egyptian cattle, and to those that were in the field; for though the cattle of the Hebrews breathed the same air, and drank the same water, and fed in the same pastures, not a creature of theirs died (Exo 9:6). The Egyptian cattle that survived in the sheds, and were afterwards sent into the fields, were destroyed by the succeeding storm of fire and hail. Wilkinson has observed (Anc. Eg. 1:48, 49) that "the custom of feeding some of their herds in sheds accords with the scriptural account of the preservation of the cattle which had been 'brought home' from the field; and explains the apparent contradiction of the destruction of 'all the cattle of Egypt' by the murrain, and the subsequent destruction of the cattle by the hail (Exo 9:3; Exo 9:19-20); those which 'were in the field' alone having suffered from the previous plague, and those in the stalls or 'houses' having been preserved." In the grievous murrain, and in the grievous hail, many, if not all, the war-horses must have escaped, as they were not 'in the field,' but in the 'stables or houses' (Exo 14:27-28; Exo 15:21)." SEE STALL.

In the Description de l'Egypte (17, 126), it is said that murrain breaks out from time to time in Egypt with so much severity that they are compelled to send to Syria or the islands of the Archipelago for a new supply of oxen. It is also stated (ib. page 62) that, since about the year 1786 a disease very much diminished the number of oxen, they began to make use of the buffalo in their place for watering the fields, and the practice is continued in later times. SEE PESTILENCE.

## Murray, Alexander (1), D.D[[@Headword:Murray, Alexander (1), D.D]]

             an eminent Scotch divine, noted as an Orientalist, was born at Dunkitterick, October 22, 1775, of very humble parentage, and therefore enjoyed scarcely any educational advantages in early life. It was not till he had reached his sixth year that he was taught the alphabet of his mother- tongue. "His father" (a shepherd), says his biographer, "in that year laid out a halfpenny in the purchase of a catechism, and from the letters and syllables on the face of the book he began to teach his son the elements of learning. It was however emphatically 'a good book,' and only to be handled on Sundays or other suitable occasions; it was therefore commonly locked up, and throughout the winter the old man, who had himself been taught reading and writing in his youth, drew for his son the figures of the letters in his written hand on the board of an old wool-card with the black end of a burned heatherstem. In this way young Murray was initiated into literature; and working continually with his board and brand, he soon  became a reader and writer. The catechism was at length presented, and in a month or so he could read the easier parts of it. In the summer of 1782 he got a Psalm-book, then a New Testament, and at last a Bible, a book which he had heard read every night at family worship, which he often longed to get hold of, but which he was never allowed to open or even touch. He now read constantly, and having a good memory, he remembered well and would repeat numerous psalms and large portions of Scripture. In 1783 his reading and memory had become the wonder of the rustic circle in which he lived, and a wish began to be generally entertained that he should be sent to school." An uncle of the boy, attracted by the precocity of the youth, finally sent him to Galloway school in his ninth year. He remained there for a while only, and was then obliged to return home to help his father in the fields. In 1790, however, he found means to resume his studies, and he made his way rapidly thereafter.

In 1794, being then already master of the Greek, Latin, Hebrew, and French, which he had mainly acquired without an instructor, he was brought to the notice of the Reverend Dr. Baird, of Edinburgh. This learned gentleman interested himself in Murray, and his subsequent progress was made comparatively easy. In the course of two years he obtained a bursary, or exhibition, in the University of Edinburgh; and never relaxing in his pursuit of knowledge, he soon made himself acquainted with all the European languages, and having formed the design of tracing up all the languages of mankind to one source, he began a work by which he will be known in the literary world. But though it is distinguished by profound and various learning, it is both imperfect and posthumous. It appeared under the auspices of the Rev. Dr. Scot of Corstorphine, and is entitled A History of the European Languages, or Researches into the Affinities of the Teutonic, Greek, Celtic, Sclavonic, and Indian Nations (1813). An extensive acquaintance with these languages convinced Murray that all the European languages were closely connected; and in the work now named it was his object to show that they all derive from and may be traced to nine euphonic primitives, which primitives he states to be "ag, bag, dwag, gwag, lag, mag, nag, rag, and swag." "By the help of these nine words and their compounds," he says, "all the European languages have been formed."

The work was, however, nothing but a most desperate and unsuccessful attempt at generalization. Dr. Noah Webster says that "it presents one of the most singular medleys of truth and error, of sound observation and visionary opinions, that has ever fallen under my (Webster's) notice" (Pref. to his Dict. [ed. 1852], page 74). By the advice of his friends he prosecuted  the studies necessary for the Church; was finally ordained; and in Dec., 1806, Murray was appointed assistant and successor to Dr. Muirhead, minister of Urr, in the stewartry of Kirkcudbright, a charge to which he in 1808 succeeded as full stipendiary. He still, however, continued his philological pursuits. In 1811 an incident occurred which brought him into prominent notice as a linguist: on the recommendation of Mr. Salt, envoy to Abyssinia, he was applied to by the marquis Wellesley as perhaps the only person in the British dominions qualified to translate a letter, written in Geez, from the governor of Tigre to his Britannic majesty; and he performed the task in the most satisfactory way. The following year a vacancy occurred in the chair of Oriental languages in the University of Edinburgh, and, as suited to Murray's tastes and habits, he was invited to fill it in order to bring him to Edinburgh, where his literary labors could be both estimated and enjoyed. He was elected on the 8th of July, 1812; on the 15th the university conferred on him the degree of doctor in divinity; and on the 26th of August he was formally inducted to the chair.

He began to lecture on the 31st of October following. Soon after that he published, for the use of his students, a small work entitled Outlines of Oriental Philology (1812), which is known to have been both composed and prepared for publication after his arrival in Edinburgh: the subject indeed was perfectly familiar to him. He continued to teach his class with little interruption till the end of February or the beginning of March, his health then failing him; and he lived but a little while to enjoy the distinctions which had just come in recognition of his industry and talent. He died April 15, 1813. His body was interred in the Gray Friars' church-yard, at the north-west corner of the church. His acquirements as a linguist pointed him out to Constable, the well-known publisher, as a fit person to superintend a new edition of Bruce's Travels; and in the preparation of that work he was employed for about three years, from September 1802, Murray residing during that time chiefly at Kinnaird House, where he had access to the papers left by the traveller. He was also at different times employed in contributing to the Edinburgh Review, and other periodicals, evincing by his writings not only a superior linguistic knowledge, but also much reading and study in other fields of learning. It has been well said that, laboring under so many difficulties in early life, his acquirements were simply preparatory to the work which he might have accomplished, and that he was taken away just as he had completed the preparation for valuable work. See Chambers, Biog. Dict. of Eniment Scotchmen, div. 6, pages 72-77: Pursuit of Knowledge under Difficulties, vol. i; Scot.  Magazine, July 1812; Engl. Cyclop. s.v.; Lord Cockburn, Memoirs of his Own Time (1856), chapter 4.

## Murray, Alexander (2)[[@Headword:Murray, Alexander (2)]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in the State of New York September 2, 1806. He received a good academical education; graduated at the Associated Reformed Seminary at Canonsburgh, Pa., in 1842; was licensed and ordained in 1844 as pastor of Ohio church, and subsequently of Kerr's Creek church, in the Presbytery of the Lakes. Here he died, October 8, 1860. Mr. Murray was a man of the most ardent piety and sincerity. As a preacher he stood high in the estimation of the brethren. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1861, page 209.

## Murray, Andrew[[@Headword:Murray, Andrew]]

             a Scotch prelate, was elected bishop of the see of Ross in 1213, but refused to be consecrated. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 185.

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

             a noted Roman Catholic prelate, was born in Ireland in 1768, and educated at Salamanca, where he was ordained priest in 1790. He filled various eminent positions in the Church, and finally was elevated to the archbishopric of Dublin in 1823. During the agitation for Roman Catholic emancipation in Ireland, he supported that measure by his influence, after which he took no part in political questions. In 1831 he was joined with archbishop Whately and others in the commission for Irish education, and sanctioned the institution of the queen's colleges. He withdrew, however, on knowing the contrary pleasure of the pope. He died in 1852. He wrote The Douai and Rhenish Bible and the Bordeaux Testament Examined (Lond. 1850, 18mo). See Notice of the Life and Character of Archbishop Murray, by Reverend W. Meagher (1853, 8vo); Dublin University Magazine, 8:493.

## Murray, Edward[[@Headword:Murray, Edward]]

             an eminent English divine of recent times, was born near the opening of this century. and flourished successively as rural dean and chaplain to the bishop of Rochester; vicar of Hinsford in 1823, and of Northholt in 1836. He died in 1852. He published, Prayers and Collects translated from Calvin (Lond. 1832, 8vo): — Enoch Restitutus, or an attempt to separate from the Book of Enoch the Book quoted by St. Jude (Dublin, 1836, 8vo), a work which "displays much learning, research, and diligent inquiry" (British Magazine, July 1836, page 57).

## Murray, George, D.D[[@Headword:Murray, George, D.D]]

             a bishop of the Church of England, the second son of lord George Murray, bishop of St. David's, was born in 1784. He was educated at Christ Church, Oxford, graduating B.A. in 1806. In 1814 he was consecrated bishop of Sodor and Man, and in 1827 was transferred to the diocese of Rochester, which was then but a small bishopric, comprising ninety-six  benefices; but under the administration of bishop Murray the number was augmented to five hundred and sixty-four. He died February 16, 1860, being at the time the senior of the English bishops. He was a churchman of the old school, and held himself aloof from extremists. See Amer. Quar. Church Rev. 1860, page 184.

## Murray, James (1)[[@Headword:Murray, James (1)]]

             a Scotch divine of some note, flourished in the first half of the 18th century. He was born at Dunkeld in 1702, and educated at the Marischal College, Aberdeen; after taking his degree he was licensed for the ministry. He died in 1758. He is supposed to have preached for a time at Westminster. He published Aetheia, or a General System of Moral Truths and Natural Religion (London, 1747, 2 volumes, 12mo). See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Wilson, Dissenting Churches.

## Murray, James (2)[[@Headword:Murray, James (2)]]

             an English divine, who flourished near the middle of the last century at Newcastle, where he died in 1782, devoted himself largely to the study of secular and ecclesiastical history, and published Hist. of the Churches of England and Scotland (Newcastle, 1771, 3 volumes, 8vo): — Impartial Hist. of the present War in America (1778-80, 3 volumes, 8vo). He also collected some of his sermons, and they were published in 1819 under the title of Sermons to Asses, to Doctors in Divinity, to Lords Spiritual, and to Ministers of State (Lond. 8vo). A copy of this curious collection, which is very rare, is in the Drew Theological Seminary library (Madison, N.J.). It betrays much disaffection with the National Church establishment.

## Murray, James Stuart, Earl of[[@Headword:Murray, James Stuart, Earl of]]

             a natural son of James V, king of Scotland, deserves our attention for the part he played in the disposition of Scottish ecclesiastical affairs. He was born in 1531, and educated in France with his sister Mary, but joined the Reformers soon after her marriage with the dauphin, and became almost immediately chief of the Protestant party in Scotland. His political history is connected with the fortunes of the queen, after whose imprisonment in Lochleven castle in 1567 he was proclaimed regent, and defeated her troops at the battle of Langside, March 13, 1568. His personal history, in so far as it affects the political, social, and religious history of Scotland during the eventful reign of queen Mary Stuart, has been noticed in our articles on KNOX SEE KNOX and MARY STUART SEE MARY STUART. SEE SCOTLAND.

He was shot by James Hamilton, on the accusation that he had seduced (1570) his wife. But this accusation seems groundless; and there is every reason to believe that Hamilton acted as the executioner of a doom pronounced on him (Murray) by his enemies in secret conclave. Earl Murray was beloved by the people, and  acknowledged by his contemporaries as a pious and lofty character who labored to promote the interests of the Church, and especially of Protestantism. The Romanists, of course, hated him, and he was slandered. See Butler, Ecclesiastes Hist. 2:550; Fisher, Hist. of the Reformation, pages 359, 367, 369,373,377, 380: Froude, Hist. of England, volumes 8, 9.

## Murray, John (1)[[@Headword:Murray, John (1)]]

             an eminent divine, regarded as the founder of the Universalist denomination of Christians in America, was born in Alton, Hampshire, England, December 10, 1741. He received the careful religious training of sincerely pious parents. When he was about eleven years of age, the family removed to Ireland, and settled near Cork. His father, a member of the Established Church, a Calvinist in sentiment, but an early convert to the religious views of John Wesley, infused his own sentiments and zeal into the mind of his child. His extreme anxiety for the spiritual welfare of his son — who, very young, became the subject of hopeful conversion — and his unwillingness to allow him to pass from under his immediate guardianship, induced him to reject a proffered opportunity to give him a liberal education.

The earnestness, devotion, and ability of young Murray gave him, as he grew up, position and influence in religious circles, and he became an occasional preacher in Wesley's connection. At a later period, he formed an acquaintance with Mr. Whitefield — with whom he agreed touching the doctrine of election — and became greatly interested in his teachings. About the year 1760 Murray returned to England. Here his experiences were varied, trying, and sometimes humiliating. In a controversy with one who had embraced the religious views of James Relly, a teacher of Universalism, his own theological positions were somewhat disturbed.

At length he allowed himself to read Relly's Union; and entered upon a careful re-examination of the sacred Scriptures. He afterwards attended regularly upon Mr. Relly's preaching, and received joyfully the doctrines of Universalism as taught by him. His faith soon became decided "that Christ Jesus died for all, and that every one for whom Christ died must finally be saved" (Life, new ed. 1870, page 161). Excommunication from Mr.Whitefield's tabernacle in London naturally followed. Persecutions for opinion's sake, pecuniary embarrassments. and grief for the death of his wife and infant child, rendered him wretched. Having by a temporary devotion to business discharged all pecuniary obligations, he resolved to leave his native land and to seek retirement and  relief in America. Yet on his first arrival in the New World, led, as he undoubtingly believed, by a superintending and special Providence, he was constrained to preach, and gave his first discourse in America September 30, 1770. The service was held in a small church in an obscure place — called "Good Luck" — in New Jersey.

Thenceforward he regarded himself as called of God to teach the universal redemption of the human race through Christ, and gave himself devotedly to the work of his ministry. He labored first in New Jersey and New York. Afterwards, as he found opportunity, he preached — though often opposed and sometimes bitterly persecuted — in Newport, Providence, Boston, Portsmouth, Norwich, and other places in New England. In Gloucester, Massachusetts, where, in December 1774, he had fixed his residence, whence "to go, a preacher of the Gospel," he was falsely represented as a papist, and as a secret emissary of lord North, sent out to the rebellious colonies in the interest of an obnoxious ministry in England. Anathemas and stones followed him in the streets, and by a vote, surreptitiously obtained, he was ordered to leave the town. The interference of influential friends saved him. In May 1775, he was appointed chaplain of the Rhode Island brigade, encamped near Boston. The other chaplains petitioned for his removal, but, in utter disregard of this petition, he was confirmed by a general order, and the commander-in-chief, general Washington, honored him with marked and uniform attention. Ill-health soon obliged him to leave the army, and he returned to Gloucester, where, distinguished as a religious teacher and as a philanthropist, he was settled over a society of Universalists. In 1783 he became plaintiff in an action at law, brought to recover property belonging to individuals of his society, but taken for the use of the original parish of the town. After many delays, a final verdict was rendered for the plaintiff in June, 1786. This decision was of great significance and importance, and he afterwards rejoiced that he had been the "happy instrument to give a death wound to that hydra, parochial persecution" (Life, page 331). Believers increased, and he was largely instrumental in securing a general meeting and organizing a convention of Universalists. They met in September, 1785, in Oxford, Massachusetts, and organized under the denominational name, Independent Christian Universalists. Early in 1787 he visited his native land, where, during a brief stay, he preached in various places with great acceptance and power. He returned before the close of the year, and, in view of certain questions raised by his opponents involving his civil standing and position as an ordained minister. his ordination, regarded by some as informal, was publicly and solemnly renewed in the Gloucester  church, on Christmas-day.

In October 1788, he married Mrs. Judith S. Stevens, a widow lady of estimable character, and of considerable literary ability. In 1790 he attended a convention of Universalists in Philadelphia, and was a member of a committee to present at that time an address to general Washington, president of the United States. He improved the opportunity to visit and hold service in the little church in New Jersey, where he first delivered in America the glad message of a full and free salvation. October 23, 1793, he was installed over a society of Universalists in Boston, and became the pastor of a united and devoted people, with whom he remained during the rest of his life. October 19, 1809 he was prostrated by paralysis, which rendered him helpless, and from which he never recovered. He lived several years, a patient and hopeful sufferer, and died with the assuring words of faith on his lips, September 3, 1815. His remains were buried September 4, in the "Granary burying-ground" in Boston. From this place, on June 8, 1837, they were removed, with solemn and interesting ceremonies, to Mount Auburn, where an appropriate monument is erected to his memory. The theological opinions of Murray show the impress of early training, as well as the moulding influence of Relly's teaching. He believed in God as the "One Indivisible First Cause;" that the Creator was enrobed in humanity and became God, the Son; and that he was manifested also as a Holy Spirit of Consolation.

He believed in holy angels of different orders, in fallen angels, and in a personal devil (Works, 2:320). It was a cardinal doctrine with him that every member of the entire human family was mysteriously united to the Creator, and so to Christ, who was made the head of every man. He held in especial abhorrence the doctrine that Christ was a mere man, and taught that "God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost are no more than different exhibitions of the same self-existent, omnipresent Being" (Works, 3:223). His fundamental doctrine, as a Universalist, was that Christ literally put away the sin of the whole world by the sacrifice of himself( Works, 2:243, 270). He distinguished carefully between universal salvation and universal redemption, believing that all were redeemed, and would finally be taught of God and come to Christ; but that those who died unconverted would continue unhappy wanderers till the general judgment and restitution of all things, when the fallen angels would be placed on the left hand, the world of mankind be judged, and after all were found guilty before God, the book of life would be opened, in which all the members of the Redeemer, that is, every individual of the human family, would be found written, and, as members of Christ's body, purged by him, as the sole  means, from their sins. He taught, moreover, that an elect few embraced the truth before death, and, as saints of God, will surround the Redeemer at his second coming (Life, page 400 sq.)., His published works consist of Letters and Sketches of Sermons (Bost. 1812, 3 volumes), and an Autobiography, with a continuation by Mrs. Judith Sargent Murray (1 volume, 18th edition, Bost. 1860). The first edition of the Life was published in Boston, 1816. The last and ninth, edited by Reverend G.L. Demarest, was issued in Boston as a centenary offering in 1870. Murray is described by a contemporary as a person of middling height, with a speaking countenance and masculine features, naturally rough and stern; as having a poetical imagination, a retentive memory, warm affections, a love for all mankind, but especially for those of a religious turn of mind. In his public discourses he was artless and unaffected, but spoke with great grace of oratory, with an astonishing volubility, a good choice of words, and a great variety of expression. He had a wonderful command of the feelings of his auditors; could arouse and animate them at pleasure, or depress them with a peculiarly soft eloquence even to tears (Life, new ed. page 11). In private life he was genial and social. See Meth. Quar. Rev. October 1874, art. v; Univer. Quar. July 1872, art. 2; October 1872, art. 1, 6. SEE UNIVERSALISM. (J.P.W.)

## Murray, John (2)[[@Headword:Murray, John (2)]]

             an Irish Presbyterian minister, was born at Antrim May 22, 1742. He was educated at the university in Edinburgh, and then migrated to this country (1763), and settled first as pastor in Philadelphia in 1766; removed to Boothbay, Maine, in 1767, and remained there until 1779, when he settled as pastor over a congregation at Newburyport, Mass., and there he died, March 13, 1793. He was a man of powerful eloquence, and exerted himself zealously for the Revolutionary cause. Indeed, he acquired great ascendency over the people of his vicinity by his powers as a preacher and his patriotic activity. He published Three Sermons on Justification (1780), and Three Sermons on the Original Sin Imputed (1791). See Drake, Dict. of Amer. Biog. s.v.

## Murray, Lindley[[@Headword:Murray, Lindley]]

             an American writer on morals and education, who flourished near the opening of this century, was born at Swatara, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, in 1745. He was educated at an academy of the Society of  Friends, and on his father's removal to New York was placed in a counting-house, from which he escaped to a school in New Jersey. He then studied law, and was admitted to the bar at the age of twenty-one, and commenced a good practice. During the Revolutionary War he engaged in mercantile pursuits with such success as to accumulate a handsome fortune. His health failing, he went over to England and purchased the estate of Holdgate, near York, where he devoted himself to literary pursuits, chiefly the composition of books intended for the instruction of youth. In 1787 he published anonymously his Power of Religion on the Mind, which passed through seventeen editions. It is a selection of passages from various authors. In 1795 he issued a Grammar of the English Language, followed by English Exercises, the Key, the English Reader, Introduction and Sequel, and a Spelling-book. There can be no stronger indication how entirely the systematic study of the English language was, until recent years, neglected by scholars than the fact that Murray's Grammar was for half a century the standard text-book throughout Britain and America. Far better books are his later publications: Selections from Horne's Commentary on the Psalms (12mo), and On the Duty and Benefit of a Daily Perusal of the Holy Scriptures (1817). Mr. Murray wrote an autobiography to the year 1809, which was published after his death, which occurred at his residence, near York, England, Feb. 16, 1826. The Friends thought much of Lindley Murray, for he devoted himself to their interests, and as a member of their body did all in his power to give influence and power to them. "The humility of his deportment, and the Christian spirit that breathed through his whole conduct, endeared him to the members of York Monthly Meeting, where he served in the station of an elder, and proved to be eminently useful. His charities, both public and private, but particularly the latter, were extensive. He was deeply interested in promoting the education of the poor and the elevation of the African race." See Janney, Hist. of the Friends, 4:55.

## Murray, Nicholas, D.D[[@Headword:Murray, Nicholas, D.D]]

             an eminent Presbyterian divine, was born in Armagh County, Ireland, December 25, 1802. Both his parents and all his relatives were Roman Catholics, and trained up their families in that belief. His father dying while he was quite young, he lived with an aunt, and at eight years of age was sent from home to attend a village school, where his proficiency in the rudiments of an English education were such that in his twelfth year he was apprenticed as a merchant's clerk. In 1815 he emigrated to America, where  he entered the publishing house of Harper and Brothers, New York. in 1820 he was converted, and became a member of the Old Brick Church, then under the pastoral care of the venerable Gardiner Spring, D.D. His pastor, attracted by Murray's intellectual superiority, soon suggested his studying for the ministry. This at first was not encouraged by Murray; but in 1821 he commenced to make preparation, though still in the employ of the Harpers, and, after due fitting for a higher course of study, entered Williams College, Massachusetts; there graduated in 1826, and then accepted an agency from the American Tract Society in Washington County, N.Y., which arrangement lasted for some time. Of his services at this period, Dr. Aydelotte says: "He was indefatigable in application to the duties of his office, perfectly methodical, of rare prudence, always kind, and yet ever firm and faithful to his convictions and the interests of the society... The labors of the board were exceedingly lightened; indeed he left them little to do beyond approving his proceedings and measures." Dr. Aydelotte also speaks of his frequent manifestations of an antiRomish spirit.

He next entered Princeton Theological Seminary, where he remained until he graduated. He was licensed in 1829, and began his labors at Norristown, Pennsylvania; but afterwards accepted a commission from the Board of Domestic Missions for the valley of Wyoming, Pennsylvania, where he labored until he was ordained and installed pastor of the united congregation of Wilkesbarre and Kingston. His remarkable pulpit talents and his high promise attracted attention, and in 1833 he was given and accepted a call to the First Presbyterian Church, Elizabethtown, N.J., and there he continued to perform his life-work, declining calls to New York, Brooklyn, Boston, Cincinnati, St. Louis, and Natchez, and rejecting offers of two theological professorships. During this time, with persistent and untiring industry, he wrote much for the press, among which was a series of articles for The New York Observer, over the signature of "Kirwan," constituting those famous letters to bishop Hughes, the Roman Catholic prelate, noted as a polemic, which have made the name of "Kirwan," the nom-de-plume under which Murray wrote, a household word throughout the whole Protestant world, his writings having been translated into nearly all the living languages of the day. They present the history of the writer's progress from Romanism to Protestantism, and examine the reasons for not adhering to the Church of Rome. Luminous and sound in their expositions of truth, they not only uncover the evils of the Romish system, but present a perfectly impregnable defence of Protestantism. The vivacious style, the genial humor, biting sarcasm, anecdotes, incidents, illustration, argument,  and appeals, are blended so harmoniously that they obtained a hold on the people at large, instead of being confined to the theological student, and thus enjoyed a circulation unparalleled in religious literature. Bishop Hughes essayed to reply to the series, but broke down in the attempt, and never resumed the effort. SEE HUGHES.

Dr. Murray died at Elizabethtown, N.J., February 4, 1861. His writings are, Notes, Historical and Biographical, concerning Elizabethtown, N.J., its eminent Men, Churches, and Ministers (1844): — Letters to Bishop Hughes by Kirwan (1847-48); these have been translated into French, Spanish, Italian, German, and Tamul: — The Decline of Popery, and its Causes, pamphlet: — Romanism at Rome — Letters to the Chief Justice R. Tanzey (1852): — Men and Things as I saw them in Europe (1851-53): — Parish and other Pencillings (1857): — The Happy Home (1858); a delineation of the moral training which is essential in a home: Thoughts on Preachers and Preaching, a work which tends to elevate the standard both of preaching and hearing: — American Principles on National Prosperity, a Thanksgiving sermon preached in the First Presbyterian Church, Elizabethtown, November 23, 1854: — Dr. Murray's Dying Legacy to the People of his beloved Charge — Things Unseen and Eternal (1861). He also published many occasional sermons and addresses, and in early life contributed to The New York Literary and Theological Journal, The Christian Advocate, and other periodicals. Dr. Murray's intellect was decidedly of a marked character — clear, comprehensive, logical, and eminently practical. His style was luminous, simple, and in the highest degree sententious. He reasoned with great power and admirable clearness.

His influence pervaded the entire Presbyterian Church, and was felt especially in her various judicatories and boards, and in the theological seminary at Princeton, which he cherished with a filial affection. In 1849 he was elected moderator of the General Assembly, one of the highest honors in the gift of the Church. As a man, his winning manner, rich stores of varied information, inexhaustible fund of pertinent and striking anecdotes, and ability to accommodate himself to every variety of character, made him the master-spirit of the social circle. In person Dr. Murray was a model of manly vigor; of middle height, broad chest and shoulders, with a round, ruddy face, a broad, high forehead, and benevolent, pleasant expression of countenance, his appearance was at once attractive and commanding. As a pastor he was always at work, ready at every call; in the chamber of sickness, in the homes of the poor, among the young — everywhere he was found, and always a welcome guest. His preparations for the pulpit  were made with the greatest care, his sermons being completed as if for the press, and often far in advance of the time when they were to be delivered. His funeral was attended with every demonstration of respect and affection that could be paid to a national character. His remains were laid in the yard adjoining the church, in the midst of his children and his beloved flock. The Presbytery of which he was a member thus gave expression to its estimate of him whom they had come to look upon as its "father." "His name, his character, and his works are already on record, wide as the limits of the Church at home and abroad. His greatness was not in one grace or one idea, but in the breadth of his heart and in the scope of his powers. He was a preacher and a pastor, a presbyter and a citizen, the patron of education, the ready advocate of benevolence, and the dreaded antagonist of popery. An author of wide fame, a writer for the weekly press — all of these, with an untold correspondence, literary, fraternal, and advisory. Few men had more calls outside of his pastoral and presbyterial duties; still he was a model pastor and presbyter, always in advance in his pulpit preparation — frequent in his pastoral visitations — abounding in his visits to the sick and the poor — ever ready to help his brethren — meeting calls abroad, and side issues of benevolence. He had time for every good work, and for every duty and occasion he was competent." See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1862, page 105; Reverend Samuel A. Clark. Hist. of St. John's Church, Elizabethtown, N.J., page 387, 388; Prot. Episc. Quar. Rev. and Church Reg. April 1855, page 315; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Princeton Rev. January 1863; Meth. Qu. Rev. July 1863, page 527; 1861, page 517; Harper's Weekly, February 23, 1861; Presbyterian Reunion Memorial, volume 1837-71 (N.Y. 1870), pages 172-178; Memoirs of the Reverend Nich. Murray, D.D., by Samuel Irenmeus Prime (Harpers, 12mo).

## Murray, Richard, D.D[[@Headword:Murray, Richard, D.D]]

             an Irish divine of some note, flourished near the opening of this century at Dublin. He is the author of An Introduction to the Study of the Apocalypse, to which was added A Brief Outline of Prophetic History,froom the Babylonish Captivity to the Commencement of the 19th Century (Dublin, 1826, 8vo).

## Murray, William[[@Headword:Murray, William]]

             an English divine of Scottish parentage, was born in 1691and received his education in Scotland, but then went to England, and studied for some time at the English high schools. He entered the ministry, and preached some time at Founder's Hall, whence he removed to Birmingham, where he became pastor of a dissenting congregation. He wrote several tracts in defence of the dissenters, and likewise against the deists; but his principal and best esteemed work is his Closet Devotions. He died in Birmingham in 1753.

## Murrhone, Peter De[[@Headword:Murrhone, Peter De]]

             SEE CELESTINE V.

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

             a German theologian, was born at Stolpe, in the province of Pomerania, East Prussia, November 12, 1717. He received his preparatory training at Stolpe; then studied in Berlin in the Joachimsthal'sche Gymnasium, and was also a member of the theological seminary combined with that institution; and then studied theology at Halle for three years. He next assumed the work of a tutor at Berlin; was the year after appointed inspector of the seminary of the Joachimsthal'sche Gymnasium; in 1750 prorector of this institution; and in 1758 professor of divinity at the University of Halle, and died in that place February 15, 1795. His most prominent works are, Diss. historico-philologica de hebdomade gentilium et dierum a planetis denominatione, qua Georgio Jacobo Pauli munus Rectoris Gymnasii, quod Halo floret, gratulatur Societas anicorum litterarice (Berl. 1747, 4to): — Polyceni stratagematum Libri viii recensuit, Justi Vulteji versionem Latinam emendavit et indicen Graecum adjecit (ibid. 1756, 4to): — Diss. philosophico-theologica de origine generis humani (Halle, 1759, 4to): — Diss. exegetica de ecclesia, columna et firmamento veritatis, ad 1Ti 3:13 (ibid. 1763, 4to): — Primae lineae Encyclopcediae theologicae (ibid. 1764, 4to): — Homiletica, s. de recta eloquentice ecclesiasticae ratione libellus (ibid. 1766, 8vo): — Diss. de institutione scholastica ad diversa discentium ingenia accommodanda (ibid. 1767, 4to): — Allgemeine theologische Biblioth. 11ter bis 14te Band (Mittau, 1778-1780, large 8vo; the first four volumes were published by C.F. Bahrdt; from the 5th to the 10th by J.C.F. Schulz): — Biographia selecta, s. Memoriae aliquot virorum doctissimorum, cum  commentationibus quibusdam aliis ad historiam lifterariam spectantibus, edidit et prcefatus est (Halle, 1782, large 8vo). See Doring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands, s.v.

## Murtia or Museia Murtia[[@Headword:Murtia or Museia Murtia]]

             a surname of Venus at Rome, supposed to be identical with Myrtea, because the myrtle was consecrated to this goddess.

## Musaeus[[@Headword:Musaeus]]

             SEE MUSAUS.

## Musafia, Benjamin Dionyse Ben-Immanuel[[@Headword:Musafia, Benjamin Dionyse Ben-Immanuel]]

             a Jewish savant, celebrated also as a physician, was born about 1619. He practiced medicine with great repute at Hamburg and Gliickstadt. As an author he is noted for his treatise on Potable Gold (מֵי זָהָב). He also made additions to the Hebrew Lexicon of Nathan benJechiel (q.v.) under the title of מוּסִ הָעָיוּךְ. Besides, he compiled a dictionary entitled וֶכֶר רִב, giving the Hebrew words in seven poems for all the days of the week (Amst. 1635; Wilna, 1863). He also wrote the disputes between R. Jacob Sasportas and himself, entitled עֵדוּת בְּיִעִקֹב, the Testimony in Jacob (Amst. 1672). He commented on the Jerusalem Talmud, and studied a subject that was still more obscure and intricate, since he tried to explain the Flux and Reflux of the Sea, a treatise which he dedicated to king Christian IV of Denmark, under the title מֵי הִיִּם (Epistola Regia de maris reciprocatione [Amst. 1642]). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:408 sq.; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 10:24, 26, 202, 227, 243, 244; Jost, Gesch. d. Juden. u.s. Sekten, 3:170; Kayserling, Gesch. d. Juden in Portugal, page 298; Lindo, Hist. of the Jews in Spain, etc., page 368; Basnage, Hist. of the Jews (Taylor's transl.), page 741; De Barrios, Vida de Ishac Uziel, page 48; Cassel, Leitfaden fur Jud. Geschichte u. Literatur, page 102; Steinschneider, Bibliog. Handbuch, page 98; Delitzsch, Zur Gesch. d. Jid. Poesie (Leips. 1836), page 76; Etheridge, Introd. to Heb. Literature, page 389. (B.P.)

## Musaph Prayer[[@Headword:Musaph Prayer]]

             (תְּפַלָּה מוּס) is the name of the evening prayer of the Jewish liturgy. The sacerdotal office of the Jews is closely connected with sacrificial service. It  is indeed to be regarded partly as its accompaniment, partly as its substitute during the exile. The sacrifices (תמיד) which were offered twice a day find a correspondent usage in the morning and evening prayer. Already in the Old Testament this connection is clearly manifest, especially in the psalms dating from the exile, e.g. Psa 141:2, "Let the lifting up of my hands be as an evening sacrifice." As on festival days besides the daily morning sacrifice, a particular one was offered for the feast, it was consequent that the matins of Sabbaths and festival days in the ritual of prayers should be followed by such prayers as correspond to the special festival sacrifices. These are the Musaph prayers. They may be compared to the proprium of the church oficium. In the Musaph prayer of the ordinary Sabbath express reference is made to the Mosaic ordinance regarding the special Sabbath sacrifice (see Arnheim, Vollstindiges Gebetbuch der Israeliten [Glogau, 1839], page 205). The same applies to the Musaph prayer on the day of Reconciliation (Machsor von Heidenheim, Jom Kipurim [Sulzb. 1842], p. 113), etc. There the מוּסָפַיםare placed opposite to the תְּמַידַיםLiturgic rules concerning the Musaph prayer are given in the tract Sopherim, c. 20; fol. 40, c. 2; farther in Orach Chajimn, viz., ר פוּ (Sabbath); תק פב (New-year), etc. SEE MACHZOR; SEE TEPHILLA; SEE LITURGY.

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

             a Lutheran divine, was born at Langenwiesen, in Thuringia, February 7, 1613. His early education he received from his father, who was the minister of that place. Having been duly prepared at the gymnasium of Arnstadt, he went to Erfurt and Jena, where he first studied philosophy and humaniora, and afterwards theology. In 1642 he was appointed professor of history, and in 1646 professor of theology at Jena, which position he held until his death in 1681. Everywhere Musaus was acknowledged as a very learned man, the greatest Lutheran divine of his century, after Gerhard (q.v.) and Calixtus (q.v.). He distinguished between theology and confession, and favored the liberty of scientific theological researches. On this account he withstood, in connection with the theologians of Jena, the pretensions of Calovius (q.v.) to subscribe the Consensus repetitus fidei vere Lutheranae of 1655, but rather wrote against it. When he had finally yielded to the representations of the duke to abjure all and every syncretism (q.v.) in 1680, he published his opinion against Calovius (Hist. Syncr. pages 999- 1089), which the latter answered with his curse. Musaius's writings are all distinguished by a philosophical acumen, hence he was accused of magis  philosophari, quam quod loquatur eloquia Dei. Besides his defence of Christianity against Herbert of Cherbury, under the title of De luminis naturae et ei innixae theologiae naturalis insufficientia ad salutem (Jena, 1667), and against Spinoza, Tractatus Theologico-politicus, etc., ad veritatis lancem examinatus (ibid. 1674), he wrote Disputatio de cultu divino Enochi (Erfurt, 1634; against the Jesuit G. Holzhagen): — De baebarismis N.T. contra Grossium (Jena, 1642): — De usu principiorum rationis et philosophice in controversiis theologicis contra Vedeliunm (ibid. 1644): — Bedencken ob gute Werke nothig seien zur Seligkeit (ibid. 1650):-De resurrectione Christi ex mortuis (ibid. 1653): — Unbeweglicher Grund der Augsburgischen Confession (ibid. 1654), etc. These are all cited in Rottermund's Supplemenit to Jocher's Gelehrten-Lex. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 10:112 sq.; Buddei, Isagoge in Theol. page 1076 sq.; Gass, Gesch. der Protest. Dogmatik, 2:202, 212; Tholuck, 17ten Jahrh. Part 2, page 66. (B.P.)

## Musaus, Johann Karl August[[@Headword:Musaus, Johann Karl August]]

             an eminent German writer, was born in 1735 at Jena, and studied at that university. He was appointed minister at Eisenach, but the peasants refused to receive him as their pastor because they had seen him dance. He died in 1788. His works are all of a secular character, but are valuable in the field of belles-lettres.

## Musaus, Peter[[@Headword:Musaus, Peter]]

             brother of Johann, was born in 1620. He studied at Jena and Helmstadt, and also under George Calixtus at Rinteln in 1648. He became successively professor of philosophy and, in 1653, professor of theology. As such he took part in the Colloquy of Cassel in 1661. In 1663 he was appointed professor at Helmstadt, and in 1665 accepted a call in the same capacity to the newly established University of Kiel. He died in 1671. See Witten, Melem. theol. pages 1840-1852; Chrysander, Professores acad. Juliae, pages 187-193; Dolle, Lebensbeschreibung aller Professoren d. Theologie zu Rinteln part 2, page 275-296; Moller, Cimbria literata, part 2. pages 565-573.

## Muscat[[@Headword:Muscat]]

             SEE PERSIA,

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

             originally Meuse, a German theologian, was born in 1514 at Schneeberg, in Saxony. Having graduated in the gymnasium of his native place, he went to Leipsic, where he studied, besides the scholastics, the ancient languages and Hebrew. Here he became acquainted with the writings of the Reformation, and the study of these estranged him from his Church. Having completed his studies, he returned to his native place, where he openly declared himself for the Lutheran doctrine. In 1538 he went to Wittenberg, where he very closely joined Luther, for whose doctrine he soon developed a great zeal. "For my part, I say it openly, there has never been a greater man on earth since the times of the apostles than Luther. In this one man all the gifts of God are concentrated. Whosoever will, let him put side by side the gifts, light, reason, and knowledge of the old teachers and those of Luther respecting spiritual things, and he will soon perceive  that there is as much difference between the old teachers and Luther, as between the light of the sun and that of the moon." At the suggestion of Agricola (q.v.), the preacher to the elector of Brandenburg, he went to Frankfort in 1540, where he lectured, preaching at the same time in the church which formerly belonged to the Franciscans. In the year 1544 he was appointed pastor primarius and professor ordinarius, which positions he held until his death, September 26, 1581. He belonged to those theologians who in 1576 and a year later wrote the Torgau Book and the Concordiae Formula (q.v.), and was one of the most orthodox on this point, as he was formerly one of the most zealous against those who did not strictly adhere to Luther's doctrines. Thus he had a bitter controversy with Staniarus and Staphylus regarding the mediatorship of Christ, and especially with his colleague Prsetorius, who rather followed Melancthon. He defended the doctrine "that the law is necessary for repentance before faith, but is unnecessary to him who is born again." Besides these theological controversies, which were rather necessitated by the circumstances of those times, he had a constant fight with the magistrate of Frankfort. He published an extract of Luther's works, under the title Thesaurus (Frankf. 1573). Altogether we have of him about forty-six writings, which are all given by Spieker, Lebensgesch. des Andreas Musculus (Frankf.-on-the-Oder, 1858), page 310. See Herzog, Real- Encyklop. s.v.; Supplenent to Jocher's Gelehrten-Lex. by Rottermund, s.v.; Gieseler, Church Hist. (New York, 1863, Smith's transl.), 4:439, 483. (B.P.)

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

             SEE MEUSEL.

## Museia[[@Headword:Museia]]

             a festival with contests celebrated in honor of the Muses every fifth year at Thespiae, in Bceotia. See Gardner, Faiths of the World, page 499.

## Muserni[[@Headword:Muserni]]

             an atheistical sect among the Mohammedans who endeavored to conceal from all except the initiated their gross denial of the existence of a God. They attempted to account for the existence and growth of all things by referring to the inherent power of nature.

## Muses[[@Headword:Muses]]

             was the name employed to designate in the classic mythology those divinities originally included among the Nymphs, but afterwards regarded as quite distinct from them. To them was ascribed the power of inspiring song, and poets and musicians were therefore regarded as their pupils and favorites. They were first honored among the Thracians, and as Pieria around Olympus was the original seat of that people, it came to be considered as the native country of the Muses, who were therefore called Pierides. In the earliest period their number was three, though Homer sometimes speaks of a single Muse, and once, at least, alludes to itne. This last is the number given by Hesiod in his Theogony, who also mentions their names: Clio, Euterpe, Thaleia, Melpomene, Terpsichore, Erato, Polyhymnia, Urania, and Calliope. Their origin is differently given, but the most widely-spread account represented them as the daughters of Zeus and Mnemosyne. Homer speaks of them as the goddesses of song, and as dwelling on the summit of Olympus. They. are also often represented as the companions of Apollo, and as singing while he played upon the lyre at the banquets of the immortals. In the most ancient works of art we find only three Muses, and their attributes are musical instruments, such as the flute, the lyre, or the barbiton; it was not until the more modern ideal of Apoilo Musagetes, in the garb of the Pythian musicians, was developed that the number nine was established by several famous artists in regard to these virgins, who were in like manner clad for the most part in theatrical drapery, with fine intellectual countenances, distinguished from one another by expression, attributes, and sometimes also by attitudes.

1. Calliope, the Muse of epic poetry, is characterized by a tablet and stylus, and sometimes by a roll of papers.

2. Clio, the Muse of history, is represented either with an open roll of paper or an open chest of books.

3. Euterpe, the Muse of lyric poetry, is given a flute, and sometimes two flutes.

4. Melpomene, the Muse of tragedy, is characterized by a tragic mask, the club of Hercules, or a sword, her head is surrounded with vine-leaves, and she wears the cothurnus.

5. Terpsichore, the Muse of choral dance and song, appears with the lyre and the plectrum.

6. Erato, the Muse of erotic poetry and mimic imitation, is also characterized by a lyre.

7. Polymnia, the Muse of the sublime hymn, is usually represented leaning in a pensive or meditating attitude.

8. Urania, the Muse of astronomy, bears a globe in her hand.

9. Thalia, the Muse of comedy and idyllic poetry, is characterized by a comic mask, a shepherd's staff, and a wreath of ivy. Various legends ascribed to them victories in musical competitions, particularly over the Sirens (q.v.), and they are sometimes represented with plumes on their heads, supposed to typify such victory. In the later classic times, particular provinces were assigned to the Muses in connection with different departments of literature, science, and the fine arts; but the invocations addressed to them appear to have been, as in -the case of modern writers, merely formal imitations of the early poets. Their worship among the Romans was a mere imitation of the Greeks, and never became truly national or popular. Among the places sacred to them were the wells of Aganippe and Hippocrene on Mount Helicon, and the Castalian spring on Mount Parnassus. See Chambers's Cyclopcedia, s.v.; Smith, Dict. Greek and Roman Biogr. 2:1124 sq.; Westropp, Hand-book of Archceology, page 190 sq.

## Museum[[@Headword:Museum]]

             (Gr. μουσεῖον), originally the name given by the ancients to a temple of the Muses, and afterwards to a building devoted to science, learning, and the fine arts. The first museum of this kind was the celebrated Alexandrian Museum. SEE ALEXANDRIA.

After the revival of learning in Europe, the term museum was sometimes applied to the apartment in which any kind of philosophical apparatus was kept and used; but it has long been almost exclusively appropriated to collections of the monuments of antiquity, and of other things interesting to the scholar and man of science. In this sense it began to be first used in Italy, and probably in the case of the famous Florentine Museum, founded by Cosmo de Medici, which soon became a great and most valuable collection of antiquities. Nothing analogous to the museums of modern times existed among the ancients, the greatest  collections of statues and paintings which were made in the houses of wealthy Romans having been intended for splendor rather than for the promotion of art. The name soon ceased to be limited to collections of antiquities and sculptures and paintings; collections illustrative of natural history and other sciences now form a chief part of the treasures of many of the greatest museums, and there are museums devoted to particular branches of science. Of the museums of Britain, the British Museum is the greatest; that of Oxford, founded in 1679, is the oldest. The museum of the Vatican, in Rome, contains immense treasures in sculptures and paintings, and also in books and manuscripts. The museum of the Louvre, in Paris, that of St. Petersburg, and those of Dresden, Vienna, Munich, and Berlin, are among the greatest in the world. The usefulness of a museum depends not merely upon the amount of its treasures, but perhaps even in a greater degree upon their proper arrangement; and while great collections in the chief capitals of the world are of incalculable importance to science, its interests are also likely to be much promoted by those local museums, still unhappily not numerous, which are devoted to the illustration of all that belongs to particular and limited districts. Museums appropriated to the illustration of the industrial arts — their raw material, their machines, and their products — and of everything economically valuable, are of recent origin, but their importance is unquestionably very great. Pre-eminent among institutions of this kind in Britain are the South Kensington Museum and the Industrial Museum in Edinburgh. In recent times missionary museums have been started in the United States for the purpose of collecting all that is valuable for the proper interpretation of heathen religions, and to commemorate Christian victories over pagan idolatry.

## Musgrave, George Washington, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Musgrave, George Washington, D.D., LL.D]]

             an eminent Presbyterian minister, was born in Philadelphia, October 19, 1804. He studied at the classical academy of the Reverend Dr. Wylie, and although he did not enter college on account of ill-health, he pursued his studies privately under the tuition of Reverend Dr. Archibald Green, and finally entered Princeton Theological Seminary in 1826, and spent nearly two years there. In 1828 he was licensed by the Third Presbytery of Baltimore, and in 1830 was ordained pastor of the Third Presbyterian Church of that city. He continued there twenty-two years, laboring with great success. In 1836 he was chosen a director of Princeton Theological Seminary, and continued in that relation until the time of his death. He was also a trustee of Princeton College.

Having received the appointment of corresponding secretary of the Presbyterian Board of Publication, he resigned his pastoral charge and removed to Philadelphia. He was also corresponding secretary of the Board of Domestic Missions. He finally accepted an invitation to the pastorate of the North Tenth Street Church, Philadelphia, where he labored until 1868. Having resigned the post of corresponding secretary of Domestic Missions, he was reappointed, and continued until the board was removed to New York. He was elected moderator of the Old School General Assembly in the same year. Dr. Musgrave took a prominent part in the convention which met in Philadelphia in 1867, composed of delegates from both branches of the Presbyterian Church, the object of which was to promote the reunion of the two. He was a delegate to the First General Council of the Presbyterian Church in Edinburgh in 1879. He was also president of the Presbyterian Historical Society. Dr. Musgrave was a man of warm attachments and strong convictions, honest in his views, and fearless in maintaining them. He died at Philadelphia, August 24, 1882. See Necrol. Report of Princeton, Theol. Sem. 1883, page 22. (W.P.S.)

## Musgrave, Thomas, D.D[[@Headword:Musgrave, Thomas, D.D]]

             an English prelate of note, was the son of a draper in Cambridge, where he was born in 1788. After an elementary education he entered as student Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1806, and was fourteenth wrangler in 1810. He was then elected a fellow of his college, which position he held up to 1837. He obtained the master's degree in 1813; became lord almoner's professor of Arabic in 1821; and was senior proctor in 1831. He was also incumbent of St. Mary-the-Great, Cambridge, and bursar of his college. In 1837 Dr. Musgrave was appointed by the late viscount Melbourne bishop of Hereford, and on the death of the venerable Dr. Harcourt was translated to the archiepiscopal see of York, and thus became primate of England, a governor of the Charter-house and of King's College, Oxford, a  commissioner for building churches, and elector of St. Augustine's College, Canterbury. In his patronage as archbishop were ninety-six livings, which he dispensed most impartially and with credit to his exalted position. Archbishop Musgrave died May 5, 1860, at his residence in London. He published only several of his Sermons (1839 and 1849, 8vo).

## Mushi[[@Headword:Mushi]]

             (Heb. Mushi', מוּשַׁי, once [1Ch 6:19] מֻשַׁי, receding; Sept. ῾Ομουσεί, ὁ Μουσίμ, Ο᾿μουσί), the second of the two sons of Merari, son of Levi (Exo 6:19; Num 3:20; 1Ch 6:19; 1Ch 6:47; 1Ch 23:21; 1Ch 24:26); he had three sons (1Ch 23:23; 1Ch 24:30), whose descendants were called in common MUSHITES (Num 3:33; Num 26:58). B.C. post 1856.

## Mushite[[@Headword:Mushite]]

             (Heb. same as Mushi; Sept. Ο᾿μουσί and ὁ Μουσί; Vulg. Musites and Musi), a descendant of the Levite MUSHI (Num 3:33; Num 26:58).

## Music[[@Headword:Music]]

             (שַׁיר, shir, singing, 1Ch 15:16; 2Ch 5:13; 2Ch 7:6; 2Ch 34:12; Ecc 12:4; Amo 6:5; a song, as it is usually elsewhere rendered; Chald. זְמִר, zemar', the striking of musical instruments, Dan 2:5; Dan 2:7; Dan 2:10; Dan 2:15; Gr. συμφωνία, symphony of sound, Luk 15:25; but נְגַינָה, neginah', Lam 5:14, or מִגְגַּינָה, manginah', Lamentations 2:63, is a satirical "song;" comp. Job 30:9. SEE NEGINOTH ). This is the oldest and most natural of all the fine arts, and therefore is found among all nations, however ignorant of every other art. In elucidating the subject in this and a following article (that on MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS) we give a general treatment, referring to other heads for details on particular points.

The Hebrews were an eminently musical people. Their history is full of illustrations of this feature of their national character and life. Their literature is a monument of it; for a large portion of their poetry was conceived in the form of psalmody or sacred lyric song; and though exaggerated representations have sometimes been put forward of the perfection which musical science and art attained among them, it cannot be doubted that their musical progress and attainments went much beyond the  narrow limits which some eminent modern writers of the history of music have thought themselves warranted to assign.

1. Antiquity of Hebrew Music. —The Hebrew nation made no claim to the invention of music or musical instruments, but assigned to it an antiquity as remote as the antediluvian days of Jubal, who "was the father of all such as handle the harp and organ" (Gen 4:21). The inventor of musical instruments, therefore, like the first poet and the first forger of metals, was a Cainite. Chardin relates that the Persians and Arabians call musicians and singers Kayne, or "descendants from Cain." From the occurrence of the name Mahalaleel, third in descent from Seth, which signifies "giving praise to God," Schneider concludes that vocal music in religious services must have been still earlier in use among the Sethites (Biblischgesch. Darstellung der Hebr. Musik, page 11). It has been conjectured that Jubal's discovery may have been perpetuated by the pillars of the Sethites mentioned by Josephus (Ant. 1:2), and that in this way it was preserved till after the Flood; but such conjectures are worse than an honest confession of ignorance.

The first mention of music in the times after the Deluge is in the narrative of Laban's interview with Jacob. Moses has recorded words of Laban, the fatherin-law of Jacob, from which it appears that instruments of various kinds were already in use among the ancient family beyond the Euphrates from which the Hebrews sprang: "Wherefore didst thou flee away secretly, and steal away from me, and didst not tell me, that I might have sent thee away with mirth and with songs, with tabret and with harp?" (Gen 31:27). Whatever else, then, the posterity of Jacob may have learned from "the wisdom of the Egyptians" during their long stay in Egypt — that ancient cradle of the arts and sciences it may be assumed as certain that they were familiar with at least the rudiments of music before they went down to sojourn there, although it is reasonable to suppose that they were indebted to that ingenious and inventive people for some further progress in the art. It is a remarkable and interesting fact that their exodus from Egypt, which was their birthday as a nation, was an event celebrated by an outburst both of poetry and song. But whatever may have been its origin, and in whatever way it was preserved, the practice of music existed in the upland country of Syria; and of the three possible kinds of musical instruments, two were known and employed to accompany the song. The three kinds are alluded to in Job 21:12.  On the banks of the Red Sea, Moses and the children of Israel sang their triumphal song of deliverance from the hosts of Egypt; and Miriam, in celebration of the same event, exercised one of her functions as a prophetess by leading a procession of the women of the camp, chanting in chorus the burden to the song of Moses, "Sing ye to Jehovah for he hath triumphed gloriously; the horse and his rider hath he thrown into the sea." Their song was accompanied by timbrels and dances, or, as some take the latter word, by a musical instrument of which the shape is unknown, but which is supposed to have resembled the modern tambourine, SEE DANCE, and, like it, to have been used as an accompaniment to dancing. The expression in the A.V. of Exo 15:21, "and Miriam answered them," seems to indicate that the song was alternate, Miriam leading off with the solo, while the women responded in full chorus. But it is probable that the Hebrew word, like the corresponding Arabic, has merely the sense of singing, which is retained in the A.V. of Exo 32:18; Num 21:17; 1Sa 29:5; Psa 147:7; Hos 2:15. The same word is used for the shouting of soldiers in battle (Jer 51:14), and the cry of wild beasts (Isa 13:22), and in neither of these cases can the notion of response be appropriate. All that can be inferred is that Miriam led off the song, and this is confirmed by the rendering of the Vulg., praecinebat. The triumphal hymn of Moses had unquestionably a religious character about it, but the employment of music in religious service, though idolatrous, is more distinctly marked in the festivities which attended the erection of the golden calf. With this may be compared the musical service which accompanied the dedication of the golden image in the plains of Dura (Daniel 3), the commencement of which was to be the signal for the multitude to prostrate themselves in worship. The wild cries and shouts which reached the ears of Moses and Joshua as they came down from the mount sounded to the latter as the din of battle, the voices of victor and vanquished blending in one harsh chorus. But the quicker sense of Moses discerned the rough music with which the people worshipped the visible representation of the God that brought them out of Egypt. Nothing could show more clearly than Joshua's mistake the rude character of the Hebrew music at this period (Exo 32:17-18), as untrained and wild as the notes of their Syrian forefathers. Comp. Lam 2:7, where the war-cry of the enemy in the Temple is likened to the noise of the multitude on a solemn feast-day: "They have made a noise in the house of Jehovah as in the day of a solemn feast." The silver trumpets made by the metal workers of the tabernacle, which were used to direct the movements  of the camp, point to music of a very simple kind (Num 10:1-10), and the long blast of the jubilee horns, with which the priests brought down the walls of Jericho, had probably nothing very musical about it (Joshua vi), any more than the rough concert with which the ears of the sleeping Midianites were saluted by Gideon's three hundred warriors (Judges 7). The song of Deborah and Barak is cast in a distinctly metrical form, and was probably intended to be sung with a musical accompaniment as one of the people's songs, like that with which Jephthah's daughter and her companions met her father on his victorious return (Judges 11).

2. Golden Age of Hebrew Music. — The period of Samuel, David, and Solomon forms a new era in Hebrew music, as well as in Hebrew poetry (see Delitzsch, Comosentar uiber den Psalter, 1859-60). The simpler impromptu with which the women from the cities of Israel greeted David after the slaughter of the Philistine was apparently struck off on the spur of the moment, under the influence of the wild joy with which they welcomed their national champion, "the darling of the songs of Israel." The accompaniment of timbrels and instruments of music must have been equally simple, and such that all could take part in it (1Sa 18:6-7). Up to this time we meet with nothing like a systematic cultivation of music among the Hebrews, but the establishment of the schools of the prophets appears to have supplied this want. Whatever the students of these schools may have been taught, music was an essential part of their practice. At Bethel (1Sa 10:5) was a school of this kind, as well as at Naioth in Ramah (1Sa 19:19-20), at Jericho (2Ki 2:5; 2Ki 2:7; 2Ki 2:15), Gilgal (2Ki 4:38), and perhaps at Jerusalem (2Ki 22:14). Professional musicians soon became attached to the court; and though Saul, a hardy warrior. had only at intervals recourse to the soothing influence of David's harp, yet David seems to have gathered around him "singing men and singing women," who could celebrate his victories and lend a charm to his hours of peace (2Sa 19:35). Solomon did the same ,(Ecc 2:8), adding to the luxury of his court by his patronage of art, and obtaining a reputation himself as no mean composer (1Ki 4:32).

But the Temple was the great school of music, and it was consecrated to its highest service in the worship of Jehovah. Before, however, the elaborate arrangements had been made by David for the Temple choir, there must have been a considerable body of musicians throughout the country (2Sa 6:5); and in the procession which accompanied the  ark from the house of Obededom, the Levites, with Chenaniah at their head, who had acquired skill from previous training, plaved on psalteries, harps, and cymbals, to the words of the psalm of thanksgiving which David had composed for the occasion (1 Chronicles 15, 16). It is not improbable that the Levites all along had practiced music, and that some musical service was part of the worship of the tabernacle; for unless this supposition be made, it is inconceivable that a body of trained singers and musicians should be found ready for an occasion like that on which they make their first appearance. The position which the tribe of Levi occupied among the other tribes naturally favored the cultivation of an art which is essentially characteristic of a leisurely and peaceful life. They were free from the hardships attending the struggle for conquest and afterwards for existence, which the Hebrews maintained with the nations of Canaan and the surrounding countries, and their subsistence was provided for by a national tax. Consequently they had ample leisure for the various ecclesiastical duties devolving upon them, and among others for the service of song, for which some of their families appear to have possessed a remarkable genius. The three great divisions of the tribe had each a representative family in the choir: Heman and his sons represented the Kohathites, Asaph the Gershonites, and Ethan (or Jeduthuun) the Merarites (1Ch 15:17; 1Ch 23:6; 1Ch 25:1-6). Of the 38,000 who composed the tribe in the reign of David, 4000 are said to have been appointed to praise Jehovah with the instruments which David made (1Ch 23:5), and for which he taught them a special chant. This, chant for ages afterwards was known by his name, and was sung by the Levites before the army of Jehoshaphat, and on laying the foundation of the second temple (comp. 1Ch 16:34; 1Ch 16:41; 2Ch 7:6; 2Ch 20:21; Ezr 3:10-11); and again by the Maccabean army after their great victory over Gorgias (1Ma 4:24).

Over this great body of musicians presided the sons of Asaph, Heman, and Jeduthun, twenty-four in number, as heads of the twenty-four courses of twelve into which the skilled minstrels were divided. These skilled or "cunning" (מֵבַין, 1Ch 25:6-7) men were 288 in number, and under them appear to have been the scholars (תִּלְמַיד, 1Ch 25:8) whom, perhaps, they trained, and who made up the full number of 4000. Supposing 4000 to be merely a round number, each course would consist of a full band of 166 musicians, presided over by a body of twelve skilled players, with one of the sons of Asaph, Beman, or Jeduthun as conductor. Asaph himself appears to have played on the cymbals (1Ch 16:5), and this was the case with  the other leaders (1Ch 15:19), perhaps to mark the time more distinctly, while the rest of the band played on psalteries and harps. The singers were distinct from both, as is evident in Psa 68:25, "the singers went before, the players on instruments followed after, in the midst of the damsels playing with timbrels;" unless the singers in this case were the cymbal-players, like Heman, Asaph, and Ethan, who, in 1Ch 15:19, are called "singers," and perhaps while giving the time with their cymbals led the choir with their voices. The "players on instruments" (נֹגְנַים, nogenim), as the word denotes, were the performers upon stringed instruments, like the psaltery and harp, who have been alluded to. The " players on instruments" (חֹלְלַים, cholelim), in Psa 87:7, were different from these last, and were properly pipers or performers on perforated wind-instruments (see 1Ki 1:40). "The damsels playing with timbrels" (comp. 1Ch 13:8) seem to indicate that women took part in the Temple choir; and among the family of Heman are specially mentioned three daughters, who, with his fourteen sons, were all "under the hands of their father for song in the house of Jehovah" (1Ch 25:5-6). The enormous number of instruments and dresses for the Levites provided during the magnificent reign of Solomon would seem, if Josephus be correct (Ant. 8:3, 8), to have been intended for all time. A thousand dresses for the high-priest; linen garments and girdles of purple for the priests, 10,000; trumpets, 200,000; psalteries and harps of electrum, 40,000; all these were stored up in the Temple treasury. The costume of the Levitical singers at the dedication of the Temple was of fine linen (2Ch 5:12).

3. The Silver Age of Hebrew Music. — So we may perhaps fitly designate the period of the captivity and the restoration, as denoting that the national music was still preserved and cultivated by considerable numbers of the people, especially of the Levitical families, although much of its ancient glory and splendor had passed away. In the first anguish and dejection of their captivity, it was natural that the tribes should feel what is so touchingly expressed in Psalms 137 : that by the rivers of Babylon they should hang their harps upon the willows; and that, when required by their captors to sing them one of the songs of Zion, they should exclaim, with patriotic disdain, "How shall we sing the Lord's song in a strange land?" But by and by they would take down their harps again from the willow- boughs, and seek solace for the sorrows of their long exile in recalling the loved melodies of their native land, and the sacred psalmody of their  desolated Temple. The Babylonians, besides, were a people as fond of music as themselves. Many of their instruments are mentioned in the book of Daniel (chapters Dan 3:7; Dan 3:10; Dan 3:15); and in the long period of seventy years the Hebrew exiles must have been able to enrich their own national music by many new ideas and new instruments. It is at least certain that when "the Lord turned again the captivity of Judah," there was a fresh inspiration and outburst of sacred poetry and song: " Then was our mouth filled with laughter and our tongue with singing" (Psa 126:2). Not a few of the later parts of the Psalter are of that age, some of which are not much inferior to the best compositions of David himself; and in proof of the extent to which musical gifts were spread among the returned exiles, it may suffice to refer to the fact stated in Neh 7:67, that "they had two hundred forty and five singing men and singing women," by whom we are no doubt to understand professional as distinguished from amateur performers. Nor were the musical traditions of the Temple forgotten, or their official depositaries extinct. The Levitical families of Asaph, Heman, and Jeduthun were still numerous, and still devoted to their choral art and office. "The children of Asaph alone — the singers — were a hundred twenty and eight" (Ezr 2:41). At the foundation of the second temple, “they set the priests in their apparel with trumpets, and the Levites, the sons of Asaph, with cymbals, to praise the Lord after the ordinance of David. king of Israel" (Ezr 3:10); and when, after many interruptions, the house was at last finished and dedicated, the whole liturgical service of David's and Solomon's reigns was as far as possible restored. "They set the priests in their divisions and the Levites in their courses for the service of God which is at Jerusalem" (Ezr 6:18).

In the apocryphal book of Ecclesiasticus (chapter 1) we find an interesting reference to the musical service of the second temple in the days of Simon the high-priest, the son of Onias, "who in his life repaired the house again and took care of the Temple that it should not fall." When Simon "finished the service of the altar, by stretching out his hand to the cup and pouring out the blood of the grape at the foot of the altar, a sweet-smelling savor," "then shouted the sons of Aaron, and sounded the silver trumpets, and made a great noise to be heard for a remembrance before the Most High. Then all the people together hasted and fell down to the earth upon their faces to worship their Lord God Almighty. The singers also sang praises with their voices, with great variety of sounds was there made sweet  melody, and the people besought the Lord till the solemnity of the Lord was ended and they had finished his service."

The Talmud also contains some notices of the liturgical music of the Herodian temple. The ordinary Levitical orchestra (according to Erachin, 10a, and Tamid, 7:3), consisted of only twelve performers, provided with nine lyres, two harps, and one cymbal, with the addition, on certain days, of flutes. These musicians were stationed upon the דּוּכִן(dukan), or the ascent of several steps which led from the outer court to the court of the priests, and were placed under the leadership of the chief musician, who gave the time with "the loud-sounding cymbals." Below the steps, and at the foot of the Levites, stood the chorister boys of the same tribe who sang the refrain. The daily week-day psalm (שׁיר הקרבן) was sung in nine parts or strophes, and the pauses were marked by the trumpet-blasts of the priests. The musical service of the Herodian temple was by no means the same as that of earlier times; and if the present accentuation of the Psalter be regarded as representing the manner in which the psalms were sung or cantilated in the time of Herod, it would not suffice to give us any notion of the usage which prevailed in the days of the first temple, before the exile. Innovations upon ancient usage were from time to time introduced; and among these mention is made in the Talmud of the use of an instrument in the later temple, which would seem to have been of the nature of a wind-organ, provided with as many as a hundred different keys, and the power of which was such, according to Jerome, that it could be heard from Jerusalem to the Mount of Olives, and even farther. (See Saalschitz, Archaeologie, 1:281-284; also Appendix to the same author's Geschichte und Wirdigung der Musik bei den Hebriern.)

4. The Uses and Characteristics of Hebrew Music. — Sacred music, as in the above liturgical examples, was the most important application of the art among the Hebrews. The trumpets, which are mentioned among the instruments played before the ark (1Ch 13:8), appear to have been reserved for the priests alone (1Ch 15:24; 1Ch 16:6). As they were also used in royal proclamations (2Ki 11:14), they were probably intended to set forth by way of symbol the royalty of Jehovah, the theocratic king of his people, as well as to sound the alarm against his enemies (2Ch 13:12). A hundred and twenty priests blew the trumpets in harmony with the choir of Levites at the dedication of Solomon's temple (2Ch 5:12-13; 2Ch 7:6), as in the restoration of  the worship under Hezekiah, in the description of which we find an indication of one of the uses of the Temple music: "And Hezekiah commanded to offer the burnt-offering upon the altar. And when the burnt- offering began, the song of Jehovah began also, with the trumpets and with the instruments of David, king of Israel. And all the congregation worshipped, and the singers sang, and the trumpeters sounded; all until the burnt-offering was finished" (2Ch 29:27-28). The altar was the table of Jehovah (Mal 1:7), and the sacrifices were his feasts (Exo 23:18); so the solemn music of the Levites corresponded to the melody by which the banquets of earthly monarchs were accompanied. The Temple was Jehovah's palace, and as the Levite sentries watched the gates by night they chanted the songs of Zion; one of these it has been conjectured with probability is Psalms 134.

In the private as well as in the religious life of the Hebrews music held a prominent place. The kings had their court musicians (Ecc 2:8), who bewailed their death (2Ch 35:25); and in the luxurious times of the later monarchy the effeminate gallants of Israel, reeking with perfumes and stretched upon their couches of ivory, were wont at their banquets to accompany the song with the tinkling of the psaltery or guitar (Amo 6:4-6), and amused themselves with devising musical instruments while their nation was perishing, as Nero fiddled when Rome was in flames. Isaiah denounces a woe against those who sat till the morning twilight over their wine, to the sound of "the harp and the viol, the tabret and pipe" (Isa 5:11-12). But while music was thus made to minister to debauchery and excess, it was the legitimate expression of mirth and gladness, and the indication of peace and prosperity. It was only when a curse was upon the land that the prophet could say, "The mirth of tabrets ceaseth, the noise of them that rejoice endeth, the joy of the harp ceaseth: they shall not drink wine with a song" (Isa 24:8-9). In the sadness of captivity the harps hung upon the willows of Babylon, and the voices of the singers refused to sing the songs of Jehovah at their foreign captors' bidding (Psalms 137). The bridal processions as they passed through the streets were accompanied with music and song (Jer 7:34), and these ceased only when the land was desolate (Eze 26:13).

The high value attached to music at banquets is indicated in the description given in Sirach 32 of the duties of the master of a feast. "Pour not out words where there is a musician, and show not forth wisdom but of time. A concert of music in a banquet of wine is as a signet of carbuncle set in gold.  As a signet of an emerald set in a work of gold, so is the melody of music with pleasant wine." And, again, the memory of the good king Josiah was "as music at a banquet of wine" (Sir 49:1). The music of the banquets was accompanied with songs and dancing (Luk 15:25). So at the royal banquets of Babylon were sung hymns of praise in honor of the gods (Dan 5:4; Dan 5:23), and perhaps on some such occasion as the feast of Belshazzar the Hebrew captives might have been brought in to sing the songs of their native land (Psalms 137).

The triumphal processions which celebrated a victory were enlivened by minstrels and singers (Exo 15:1; Exo 15:20; Jdg 5:1; Jdg 11:34; 1Sa 18:6; 1Sa 21:11; 2Ch 20:28; Jdg 15:12-13), and on extraordinary occasions they even accompanied armies to battle. Thus the Levites sang the chant of David before the army of Jehoshaphat as he went forth against the hosts of Ammon and Moab and Mount Seir (2Ch 20:19; 2Ch 20:21); and the victory of Abijah over Jeroboam is attributed to the encouragement given to Judah by the priests sounding their trumpets before the ark (2Ch 13:12; 2Ch 13:14). It is clear from the narrative of Elisha and the minstrel who by his playing calmed the prophet's spirit till the hand of Jehovah was upon him, that among the camp-followers of Jehoshaphat's army on that occasion there were to be reckoned musicians who were probably Levites (2Ki 3:15). Besides songs of triumph, there were also religious songs (Isa 30:29; Amo 5:23; Jam 5:13), "songs of the Temple" (Amo 8:3), and songs which were sung in idolatrous worship (Exo 32:18).

In like manner the use of music in the religious services of the Therapeutse of later times is described by Philo (De Vita contempl. page 901 red. Frankf.]). At a certain period in the service one of the worshippers rose and sang a song of praise to God, either of his own composition or one from the older poets. He was followed by others in a regular order, the congregation remaining quiet till the concluding prayer, in which all joined. After a simple meal the whole congregation arose and formed two choirs, one of men and one of women, with the most skilful singer of each for leader; and in this way sang hymns to God, sometimes with the full chorus, and sometimes with each choir alternately. In conclusion, both men and women joined in a single choir, in imitation of that on the shores of the Red Sea, which was led by Moses and Miriam. In the Scriptures love-songs are alluded to in Psalms 45, title, and Isa 5:1. There were also the doleful songs of the funeral procession, and the wailing chant of the mourners who went about the streets, the professional קַינָה of those who were skilful in lamentation (2  Chronicles 35:25; Ecc 12:5; Jer 9:17-20; Amo 5:16). Lightfoot (Hor. Heb. on Mat 9:23) quotes from the Talmudists (Chetubh. c. 4, h. 6) to the effect that every Israelite on the death of his wife "will afford her not less than two pipers and one woman to make lamentation." The grape-gatherers sang as they gathered in the vintage, and the wine-presses were trodden with the shout of a song (Isa 16:10; Jer 48:33); the women sang as they toiled at the mill, and on every occasion the land of the Hebrews during their national prosperity was a land of music and melody. There is one class of musicians to which allusion is casually made (Sir 9:4), and who were probably foreigners — the harlots who frequented the streets of great cities, and attracted notice by singing and playing the guitar (Isa 23:15-16). (See below.)

There are two aspects in which music appears, and about which little that is satisfactory can be said: the mysterious influence which it had in driving out the evil spirit from Saul, and its intimate connection with prophecy and prophetical inspiration. Miriam "the prophetess" exercised her prophetical functions as the leader of the chorus of women who sang the song of triumph over the Egyptians (Exo 15:20). The company of prophets whom Saul met coming down from the hill of God had a psaltery, a tabret, a pipe, and a harp before them, and smitten with the same enthusiasm he "prophesied among them" (1Sa 10:5; 1Sa 10:10). The priests of Baal, challenged by Elijah at Carmel, cried aloud, and cut themselves with knives, and prophesied till sunset (1Ki 18:29). The sons of Asaph. Heman, and Jeduthun, set apart by David for the Temple choir, were to "prophesy with harps, with psalteries and with cymbals" (1Ch 25:1); Jeduthun "prophesied with the harp" (1Ch 25:3), and in 2Ch 35:15 is called "the king's seer," a term which is applied to Heman (1Ch 25:5) and Asaph (2Ch 29:30) as musicians, as well as to Gad the prophet (2Sa 24:11; 1Ch 29:29). The spirit of Jehovah came upon Jahaziel, a Levite of the sons of Asaph, in the reign of Jehoshaphat, and he foretold the success of the royal army (2Ch 20:14).

From all these instances it is evident that the same Hebrew root (נבא) is used to denote the inspiration under which the prophets spoke and the minstrels sang. Gesenius assigns the later as a secondary meaning. In the case of Elisha, the minstrel and the prophet are distinct personages, but it is not till the minstrel has played that the hand of Jehovah comes upon the prophet (2Ki 3:15). This  influence of music has been explained as follows by a learned divine of the Platonist school: "These divine enthusiasts were commonly wont to compose their songs and hymns at the sounding of some one musical instrument or other, as we find it often suggested in the Psalms. So Plutarch... describes the dictate of the oracle anciently, 'how that it was uttered in verse, in pomp of words, similitudes, and metaphors, at the sound of a pipe.' Thus we have Asaph, Heman, and Jeduthun set forth in this prophetical preparation (1Ch 25:1). Thus R. Sal. expounds the passage, 'When they played upon their musical instruments they prophesied after the manner of Elisha.' And this sense of this place, I think, is much more genuine than that which a late author of our own would fasten upon it, viz. that this prophesying was nothing but the singing of psalms. For it is manifest that these prophets were not mere singers, but composers, and such as were truly called prophets or enthusiasts" (Smith, Select Discourses, 6, chapter 7, page 238, 239 [ed. 1660]).

All that can be safely concluded is, that in their external manifestations the effect of music in exciting the emotions of the sensitive Hebrews, the frenzy of Saul's madness (1Sa 18:10), and the religious enthusiasm of the prophets, whether of Baal or Jehovah, were so nearly alike as to be described by the same word. The case of Saul is the most difficult. We are not admitted to the secret of his dark malady. Two turning-points in his history are the two interviews with Samuel, the first and the last, if we except that dread encounter which the despairing monarch challenged before the fatal day of Gilboa. On the first of these Samuel foretold his meeting with the company of prophets with their minstrelsy, the external means by which the spirit of Jehovah should come upon him, and he should be changed into another man (1Sa 10:5). The last occasion of their meeting was the disobedience of Saul in sparing the Amalekites, for which he was rejected from being king (1Sa 15:26). Immediately after this we are told the Spirit of Jehovah departed from Saul, and an "evil spirit from Jehovah troubled him" (1Sa 16:14); and his attendants, who had perhaps witnessed the strange transformation wrought upon him by the music of the prophets, suggested-that the same means should be employed for his restoration. "Let our lord now command thy servants before thee to seek out a man, a cunning player on a harp: and it shall come to pass, when the evil spirit from God is upon thee, that he shall play with his hand, and thou shalt be well... And it came to pass when the spirit from God was upon Saul, that David took a harp and played with his hand. So Saul was refreshed, and was well, and the evil spirit departed from him"  (1Sa 16:16; 1Sa 16:23). But on two occasions, when anger and jealousy supervened, the remedy which had soothed the frenzy of insanity had lost its charm (1Sa 18:10-11; 1Sa 19:9-10). It seems, therefore, that the passage of Seneca, which has often been quoted in explanation of this phenomenon, "Pythagoras perturbationes lyra componebat" (De Ira, 3:9), is but generally applicable.

On the scientific character of Hebrew music much has been written, but to very little purpose, and with extremely meagre results. The truth is that no adequate data exist to enable, us to arrive at any satisfactory conclusions upon it. The Hebrews never were in possession of any system of notation, by which their musical traditions might have been fixed, and handed down to posterity; and in the absence of this it is hopeless to attempt to determine more than a very few points of a quite general kind. Several attempts, however, have been made by ingenious and learned men to overcome this insuperable barrier by converting the accentual system of the Psalter into a musical notation. One of the earliest of these writers was Speidel (Unverwerfliche Spuren von der alten Davidischen Singkunst [1704]). Another was Anton (in Paulus's Neues Repertorium fs h biblisch. und morgenlzd. Literatur [1790-91]). The latest is Haupt (1854), who discovers in the accents viewed as marks of number, when combined with the arithmetical values of the Hebrew letters, all the notes of the diatonic scale, and sees in the series of notes thus indicated the original psalm- melodies. But however ingenious all these attempts may be, they all issue, as Delitzsch remarks, in self-illusion. For the accents, as Saalschitz urges, were not designed to serve any such musical use. 'It is plain that the Masoretes had no other object in view in devising them than the preservation of the right pronunciation and understanding of the text. If the accents set forth a melody, it was only the melody of declamation, which among southern nations approaches nearer to proper singing than among the northern peoples.

It was not the Temple music which the accents set forth, the communication of which could have no interest to the Masoretes, who were mere linguists. It would have been strange, besides, if they had made use of so many musical notes as the accents, when seven might have sufficed. Of the ancient Temple music not a trace remains, either in the text of Holy Scripture or anywhere else" (Saalschutz, Von der Form der Hebraischen Poesie, nebst einer Abhandlung uber die Musik der Hebraier, 1825). Proceeding on the same false assumption that the poetical accents were of the nature of a musical notation, Forkel, the German  historian of music, drew a conclusion very different from those of the authors now referred to. He inferred from the manifest imperfection and inadequacy of such a musical language how extremely rude and imperfect must have been the musical science and art which it represented. He concluded, in fact, that the Hebrew music was nothing more than a species of cantilation or intoned recitative, and that it never was able to advance beyond this rudimentary stage (Geschichte der Musik, 1:148). This was an absurd extreme; for how is it conceivable that a people who made such splendid progress in the art of lyric poetry, i.e., of poetry expressly designed to be married to music — to music expressive of the same emotions which were expressed in the poetry — should have lagged so far behind the other nations of antiquity in the sister science and art? See Saalschttz. On such a subject it is not safe to argue from the practice of the modern Jews (Shilte hug-gib. 2); and as singing is something so exceedingly simple and natural, it is difficult to believe that in the solemn services of their religion they stopped at the point of cantilation (Ewald, Hebr. Poesie, page 166).

The nature of the Hebrew music was doubtless of the same essential character as that of other ancient nations, and of all the present Oriental nations; consisting not so much in harmony (in the modern sense of the term) as in unison or melody (Volney, Trav. 2:325). This is the music of nature, and for a long time after the more ancient period was common among the Greeks and Romans. From the Hebrews themselves we have no definite accounts in reference to this subject; but the history of the art among other nations must here also serve as our guide. It was not the harmony of differing or dissonant sounds, but the voice formed after the tones of the lyre, that constituted the beauty of the ancient music (see Philo, Opp. 2, page 484 sq.). This so enraptured the Arabian servant of Niebuhr that he cried out, in contempt of European music, "By Allah, that is fine! God bless you!" (Reisebeschreib. nach Arabien, page 176). The whole of antiquity is full of stories in praise of this music. By its means battles were won, cities conquered, mutinies quelled, diseases cured (Plutarch, De Musica). Effects similar to these occur in the Scriptures, and have already been indicated. The different parts which we now have are the invention of modern times. SEE ALAMOTH; SEE GITTITH; SEE SHEMINITH, etc.

Respecting the base, treble, etc., very few discriminating remarks had then been made. The old, the young, maidens, etc., appear to have sung one part. The beauty of their music consisted altogether in  melody. The instruments by which, in singing, this melody was accompanied occupied the part of a sustained base; and if we are disposed to apply in this case what Niebuhr has told us, the beauty of the concerts consisted in this, that other persons repeated the music which had just been sung three, four, or five notes lower or higher. Such, for instance, was the concert which Miriam held with her musical fellows, and to which the "toph," or tabret, furnished the continued base; just as Niebuhr has also remarked of the Arabian women of the present day, "that when they dance or sing in their harem they always beat the corresponding time upon this drum" (Reisebesch. 1:181). To this mode of performance belongs the 24th Psalm, which rests altogether upon the varied representation; in like- manner, also, the 20th and 21st Psalms. This was all the change it admitted; and although it is very possible that this monotonous, or rather unisonous music, might not be interesting to ears tuned to musical progressions, modulations, and cadences, there is something in it with which the Orientals are well pleased. They love it for the very reason that it is monotonous or unisonous, and from Morocco to China we meet with no other. Even the cultivated Chinese, whose civilization offers so many points of resemblance to that of the ancient Egyptians, like their own music, which consists entirely of melody, better than ours, although it is not wholly despised by them (Du Halde's China, 3:216). A music of this description could easily dispense with the compositions which mark the time by notes; and the Hebrews do not appear to have known anything of musical notation; for that the accents served that purpose is a position which yet remains to be proved. At the best, the accent must have been a very imperfect means for this purpose, however high its antiquity. Europeans had not yet attained to musical notes in the 11th century, and the Orientals do not profess to have known them: till the 17th. On the other hand, the word סֵלָה, selah, which occurs in the Psalms and Habakkuk, may very possibly be a mark for the change of time, or for repeating the melody a few tones higher, or, as some think, for an accompaniment or after-piece of entirely instrumental music (see De Wette, Comment. ub. d. Psalm page 32 sq.; Saalschuitz, Form der Hebr. Poesie, p. 353 sq.; Ewald, Hebr. Poesie page 178 sq.). SEE SELAH. The Hebrew music is judged to have been of a shrill character (see Redslob, in Illgen's Zeitschr. 1839, 2:1 sq.), for this would result from the nature of the instruments-harps, flutes, and cymbals-which were employed in the Temple service (comp. Mishna, Erach. 2:3, 5, and 6).  The manner of singing single songs was, it seems, ruled by that of others in the same measure, and it is usually supposed that many of the titles of the Psalms are intended to indicate the names of other son-s according to which these were to lie sung (see Vensky, in Mitzler's Musikal Biblioth. 3:666 sq.; Eichhorn, Einl. 1:245; Jahn, Einl. 1:353; Gesenius, Gesch. d. Hebr. Sprache, page 220 sq.). SEE PSALMS.

## Music, Christian[[@Headword:Music, Christian]]

             Music (from μοῦσα, a muse) is produced by the human voice, and by a variety of artificial instruments. For the application of the voice to musical purposes, SEE SINGING. Musical instruments are classified as stringed instruments, wind instruments, and instruments of percussion. In some stringed instruments, as the piano-forte, the sounds are produced by striking the strings by. keys; in others, as the harp and guitar, by drawing them from the position of rest. In a third class, including the violin, viola, violoncello, and double bass, the strings are put into vibration with a bow. In wind instruments the sound is produced by the agitation of an enclosed column of air; some, as the flute, clarionet, oboe, bassoon, flageolet — instruments of wood, and the trumpet, horn, cornet-a-piston, etc., of metal, are played by the breath; in others, as the organ, harmonium, and concertina, the wind is produced by other means. In the two last-named instruments the sound is produced by the action of wind on free vibrating springs or reeds. Instruments of percussion are such as the drum, kettle- drum, cymbals, etc. Musical compositions are either for the voice, with or without instrumental accompaniment, or for instruments only. Instrumental music may be composed for one or for more instruments. The rondo, the concerto, the sonata, and the fantasia generally belong to the former class; to the latter, symphonies and overtures for an orchestra, and instrumental chamber music, including duets, trios, quartets, and other compositions for several instruments, where each takes the lead in turn, the other parts being accompaniments. Of vocal music, the principal forms may be classed as church music, chamber music, dramatic music, and popular or national music. Vocal chamber music includes cantatas, madrigals, and their modern successors, glees, as also recitatives, arias, duets, trios, quartets, choruses, and generally all forms, accompanied or unaccompanied, which are chiefly intended for small circles.

Dramatic music comprehends music united with scenic representation in a variety of ways, in the ballet, the melodrama, the vaudeville, and the opera, in. which last music supplies the place of spoken dialogue. And finally we come to consider church music, with which alone we have to deal here. It includes plain song, faux-bourdon, the chorale, the anthem, the sacred cantata, the mass and requiem of the Roman Catholic Church, and the oratorio.  Among all nations music has always formed a part of public worship. "Praise," it has been aptly said, "is the appropriate language of devotion. A fervent spirit of devotion is instinctively seeks to express itself in song. In the strains of poetry, joined with the melody of music, it finds an easy and natural utterance of its elevated emotions." Among the pagan nations of antiquity the singing of songs constituted indeed a great part of the religious worship. In all their religious festivals and in their temples they sang to the praise of their idol gods (comp. Gerbert, Musica Sacra, vol. i. Praef.; Burney, Hist. of Music). Yet no nation of antiquity made such extensive use of music in their worship as did the Hebrews (see the preceding article), especially in the time of their prosperity (Saalschutz, Gesch. u. Wisrdigung d. Tenpel-Musik d. Hebrader [Berl. 1829]). Not only in the Temple, but in their synagogues and in their dwellings the Jews celebrated God with sacred hymns. SEE PSALM. From them the use of music and choral singing was adopted by the primitive Christians (see 1Co 14:15; 1Co 14:26; Col 3:16). Says Coleman, "The singing of spiritual songs constituted from the beginning an interesting and important part of religious worship in the primitive Church" (Prel. and Rit. page 321).

I. Early Christian Usages. — Grotius insists that we have in Act 4:24-30 an epitome of an early Christian hymn; and it would appear from a close examination of other N.T. Scripture passages that even Christ himself, in his final interview with his, disciples before his crucifixion, sung with them the customary paschal songs at the institution of the sacrament, and by his example sanctified the use of sacred songs in the Christian Church (Mat 26:30). In the opinion of Miinter, the eminent Biblical archaeologist, the gift of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost was accompanied with poetic inspiration, to which the disciples gave utterance in the rhapsodies of spiritual songs (Act 2:4; Act 2:13; Act 2:47). There are also many other N.T. passages which clearly indicate the use of religious songs in the worship of God. Paul and Silas, lacerated by the cruel scourging which they had received, and in close confinement in the inner prison, prayed and sang praises to God at midnight (Act 16:25).. The use of psalms and hymns and spiritual songs is moreover directly enjoined upon the churches by the apostle as an essential part of religious devotions (Col 3:16; Eph 5:14; Eph 5:19; Jam 5:13). The latter epistle was a circular letter to the Gentile churches of Asia, and therefore in connection with that to the Church at Colosse is explicit authority for the  use of song in the religious worship of the apostolic churches (comp. Walch, De Hymnnis Ecclesiae Apostolicae).

As the Hebrews worshipped God in their homes by sacred song, so the N.T. people also did not restrict these acts of devotion to their public places of worship. In their social circles and around their domestic altars they worshipped God in sacred song; and in their daily occupations they were wont to relieve their toil and refresh their spirits by renewing their favorite songs of Zion. Persecuted and afflicted — in solitary cells of the prison, in the more dismal abodes of the mines to which they were doomed, or as wandering exiles in foreign countries — they forgot not to sing the Lord's song in the prison or the mile or the strange lands to which they were driven. In connection with the passage from Ephesians, the apostle warns those whom he addresses against the use of wine and the excesses to which it leads, with reference to those abuses which dishonored their sacramental supper and lovefeasts. In opposition to the vain songs which, in such excesses, they might be disposed to sing, they are urged to the sober, religious use of psalms and hymns and spiritual songs. The phraseology indicates, too, that they were not restricted to the use of the psalms of David, as in the Jewish worship, but were at liberty to employ others of appropriate religious character in their devotions. Says Coleman, "The Corinthians were accustomed to make use of songs composed for the occasion (1Co 14:26). And though the apostle had occasion to correct their disorderly proceedings, it does not appear that he forbade the use of such songs. On the contrary, there is the highest probability that the apostolic churches did not restrict themselves simply to the use of the Jewish Psalter. Grotius and others have supposed that some fragments of these early hymns are contained not only, as above mentioned, in Acts, but perhaps also in 1Ti 3:16. Something like poetic antithesis they have imagined to be contained in Jam 1:17; 1Ti 1:1; 2Ti 2:11-13. The expression in Revelation, 'I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last,' has been ascribed to the same origin, as has also Rev 4:8, together with the song of Moses and the Lamb (Rev 15:3), and the songs of the elders and the beasts (Rev 5:9-14). Certain parts of the book itself have been supposed to be strictly poetical, and may have been used as such in Christian worship, such as Rev 1:4-8; Rev 11:15-19; Rev 15:3-4; Rev 21:1-8; Rev 22:10-18. But the argument is not conclusive; and all the learned criticism, the talent,  and the taste that have been employed on this point leave us little else than an uncertain conjecture on which to build an hypothesis" (page 325).

The earliest authentic record on this subject is the celebrated letter from Pliny to Trajan, just at the close of the apostolic age (A.D. 103, 104). In the investigations which he instituted against the Christians of his period, he discovered, among other things, that they were accustomed to meet before day to offer praise to Christ (Epist. 10:97). The expression used is somewhat equivocal, and might refer to the ascription of praise in prayer or in song. But it appears that these Christians rehearsed their “carnen invicem" alternately, as if in responsive songs, according to the ancient custom of singing in the Jewish worship. Tertullian, only a century later, evidently understood the passage to be descriptive of this mode of worshipping God and Christ, for he says that Pliny intended to express nothing else than assemblies before the dawn of the morning for singing praise to Christ and to God (Apolog. c. 2). Eusebius also gives the passage a similar interpretation, saying that Pliny could find nothing against them save that, arising at the dawn of the morning, they sang hymns to Christ as God (Hist. Ecclesiast. 3:32). Viewed in this light, in which it is now generally viewed, it becomes evidence of the use of song in Christian worship immediately subsequent to the age of the apostles (comp. Miinter, Metrisch. Offenbar. page 25). Tertullian himself also distinctly testifies to the use of songs to the praise of God by the primitive Christians. Every one, he says, was invited in their public worship to sing unto God, according to his ability, either from the Scriptures or de proprio ingenio, "one indited by himself;" according to the interpretation of Muinter.

Whatever may be the meaning of this phrase, the passage clearly asserts the use of Christian psalmody in their religious worship. Again, he speaks of singing in connection with the reading of the Scriptures, exhortations, and prayer (De Anima, c. 9). Justin Martyr also, who lived within half a century of the apostles, and is himself credited with being the author of a work on Christian Psalmody, mentions the songs and hymns of the Ephesian Christians: "We manifest our gratitude to him by worshipping him in spiritual songs and hymns, praising him for our birth, for our health, for the vicissitudes of the seasons, and for the hopes of immortality" (Apol. 5:28). Eusebius, moreover, furnishes this important testimony of an ancient historian at the close of the 2d century: "Who knows not the writings of Irenmeus, Melito, and others, which exhibit Christ as God and man? And how many songs and odes of the brethren there are, written from the  beginning (ἀπ᾿ ἀρχῆς) by believers, which offer praise to Christ as the Word of God, ascribing divinity to him!" (Ecclesiastes Hist. 5:28). Here we have not only testimony to the use of spiritual songs in the Christian Church from the remotest antiquity, but also that there were hymn writers in the apostolic Church, and that their songs were collected for use at a very early date of the Christian Church (comp. Fabricius, Biblioth. Grceca [ed. Harl.], 7:67). These spiritual songs of the primitive Christians were almost exclusively of a doctrinal character. "In fact," says Augusti, "almost all the prayers, doxologies, and hymns of the ancient Church are nothing else than prayers and supplications to the triune God or to Jesus Christ. They were generally altogether doctrinal. The prayers and psalms, of merely a moral character, which the modern Church has in great abundance, in the ancient were altogether unknown" (Denkwirdigkeiten, 5:417; comp. Neander, Allgem. Kirchengesch. 1:523; Engl. ed. 1:304).

One such composition of the primitive Church — a hymn — has come down to us entire. It is found in the Pedagogue of Clement of Alexandria, a work bearing date about one hundred and fifty years from the time of the apostles; but it is ascribed to another, and assigned to an earlier origin. It is wanting in some of the manuscripts of Clement. It contains figurative language and forms of expression which were familiar to the Church at an earlier date; and, for various reasons, is regarded by Munter (Metrische Oftenbar. page 32) and Bull (Defensio fidei Nicaenae, § 3, chapter 2, page 316) as a venerable relic of the early Church, which has escaped the ravages of time, and still remains a solitary remnant of the Christian psalmody of that early age. It is certainly very ancient, and the earliest that has been transmitted to us ( SEE HYMNOLOGY, in volume 4, page 434, Colossians 2). A translation of it is furnished in Coleman's Ancient Christianity, pages 334-35.

Sacred music must, in the primitive Church, have consisted only of a few simple airs which could easily be learned, and which, by frequent repetition, became familiar to all. An ornate and complicated style of music would have been alike incompatible with the circumstances of these Christian worshippers and uncongenial with the simplicity of their primitive forms (comp. Augusti, Denkwiirdigkeiten, 5:288). In their songs of Zion, both old and young, men and women, bore a part. Their psalmody was the joint act of the whole assembly in unison. Such is the testimony of Hilary, A.D. 355 (Comment. in Psalms 25, page 174). Ambrose remarks that the injunction of the apostle, forbidding women to speak in public, relates not  to singing, "for this is delightful in every age and suited to every sex" (in Psalms 1, Praef. pge 741; comp. Hexcemeron, lib. 3, c. 5, pge 42). The authority of Chrysostom is also to the same effect. "It was the ancient custom, as it is still with us, for all to come together, and unitedly to join in singing. The young and the old, rich and poor, male and female, bond and free, all join in one song... All worldly distinctions here cease, and the whole congregation form one general chorus" (Hom. 11, volume 12, page 349; Hom. 36, in 1 Corinthians volume 10, page 340; comp. Gerbert, Musica Sacra, lib. 1:§ 11, for other authorities). Each member was invited, at pleasure and according to his ability, to lead their devotions in a sacred song indited by himself. Such was the custom in the Corinthian Church. Such was still the custom in the age of Tertullian, to which reference has already been made. Augustine also refers to the same usage, and ascribes to divine inspiration the talent which was manifested in this extemporaneous psalmody.

Such was the character of the psalmody of the early Church, consisting in part of the psalms of David, and in part of hymns composed for the purpose of worship, and expressive of love and praise to God and to Christ (Neander, Allgem. Kirchengesck. 1:523; Engl. ed. 1:304). Few in number, and sung to rude and simple airs, they yet had wonderful power over those primitive saints. The sacred song inspired their devotions both in the public and private worship of God. At their family board it quickened their gratitude to God, who gave them their daily bread. It enlivened their domestic and social intercourse; it relieved the weariness of their daily labor; it cheered them in solitude, comforted them in affliction, and supported them under persecution. "Go where you will,' says Jerome, "the ploughman at his plough sings his joyful hallelujahs, the busy mower regales himself with his psalms, and the vine-dresser is singing one of the songs of David. Such are our songs — our love-songs, as they are called — the solace of the shepherd in his solitude and of the husbandman in his toil" (Ep. 17, ad Marcellum). Fearless of reproach, of persecution, and of death, they continued in the face of their enemies to sing their sacred songs in the streets and market-places and at the martyr's stake. Eusebius declares himself an eye-witness to the fact that, under their persecutions in Thebais, "they continued to their latest breath to sing psalms and hymns and thanksgivings to the God of heaven" (Hist. Ecc 8:9; comp. Herder, Briefe zur Beforderung der Humanitat 7 Samml. page 28 sq.; Augusti, Denkwurdigkeiten, 5:29697; Coleman, Manual, pages 331-33).

II. Innovations. — From the 4th century onward the Christian Church greatly modified the mode of performing this part of public worship.

1. The first innovation occurred in the Syrian churches, where responsive singing was introduced, probably very early in the 4th century. Soon after it became the practice of the Eastern churches generally, and finally was transferred to the West also by St. Ambrose of Milan (A.D. 370), and was called there the Ambrosian style of music. Some critics believe responsive singing to have been practiced at a very early date. Thus it would seem from the epistle of Pliny that the Christians of whom he speaks sang alternately in responses. The ancient hymn from Clement, too, above mentioned, seems to be constructed with reference to this method of singing. There is besides an ancient but certainly groundless tradition extant in Socrates (Hist. Ecc 6:8) that Ignatius was the first to introduce this style of music in the Church of Antioch. It was certainly familiar to the Jews, who often sang responsively in the worship of the Temple. In some instances the same style of singing may have been practiced too in the primitive Church. But responsive singing is not generally allowed to have been in frequent use during the first 300 years of the Christian era. This mode of singing was then common in the theatres and temples of the Gentiles, and for this reason was generally discarded by the primitive Christians (Augusti, Denkwiirdigkeiten, 5:278).

2. The appointment of singers as a distinct class of officers in the Church for this part of religious worship, and the consequent introduction of profane music into the church, marks another alteration in the psalmody of the Church. These innovations were first made in the 4th century; and though the people continued for a century or more to enjoy their ancient privilege of all singing together, it is conceivable that it gradually was forced to die, as a promiscuous assembly could not well unite in theatrical music which required in its performers a degree of skill altogether superior to that which all the members of a congregation could be expected to possess. An artificial, theatrical style of music, having no affinity with the worship of God, soon began to take the place of those solemn airs which before had inspired the devotions of his people. The music of the theatre was transferred to the church, which accordingly became the scene of theatrical pomp and display rather than the house of prayer and of praise, to inspire by its appropriate and solemn rites the spiritual worship of God. The consequences of indulging this depraved taste for secular music in the church are exhibited by Neander in the following extract: "We have to  regret that both in the Eastern and the Western Church their sacred music had already assumed an artificial and theatrical character, and was so far removed from its original simplicity that even in the 4th century the abbot Pambo of Egypt complained that heathen melodies [accompanied as it seems with the action of the hands and the feet] had been introduced into their Church psalmody" (Kirchengesch. 2:681: comp. Scriptores Ecclesiastici, De Musica, 1 [1784], 3). Isidore of Pelusium also complained of the theatrical singing, especially that of the women, which, instead of inducing penitence for sin, tended much more to awaken sinful desires (in Biblioth. Patr. 7:543). Jerome also, in remarking upon Eph 5:19, says: "May all hear it whose business it is to sing in the church. Not with the voice, but with the heart, we sing praises to God. Not like the comedians should they raise their sweet and liquid notes to entertain the assembly with theatrical songs and melodies in the church, but the fire of godly piety and the knowledge of the Scriptures should inspire our songs. Then would not the voice of the singers, but the utterance of the divine word, expel the evil spirit from those who, like Saul, are possessed with it. But, instead of this, that same spirit is invited rather to the possession of those who have converted the house of God into a pagan theatre" (Comment. in Ep. Ephesians lib. 3, c. 5, tom. 4, page 387 [ed. Martianae]). Until the 6th or 7th century the people were not entirely excluded from participation in the psalmody of the Church, and many there were who continued to bear some part in it even after it had become a cultivated theatrical art, for the practice of which the singers were appointed as a distinct order of the Church, but it was mainly in the chorus or in responses that the people could have their part. Thus it soon came about that the many, instead of uniting their hearts and their voices in the songs of Zion, could only sit coldly by as spectators.

3. Heresy largely pervading the Church, and making rapid headway by incorporation into hymns which were the laity's property, various restrictions were from time to time laid upon the use of hymns of human composition in distinction from the inspired psalms of David; and finally the Church authorities, in order more effectually to resist all encroachments of heresy, were driven to the necessity either of cultivating and improving their own psalmody, or of opposing their authority to stay the progress of this evil. The former was the expedient of Ambrose, Hilary, Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, Augustine, etc. But the other alternative in turn was also attempted. The churches by ecclesiastical authority were  restricted to the use of the Psalter and other canonical songs of the Scriptures. All hymns of merely human composition were prohibited as of a dangerous tendency and unsuitable to the purposes of public worship. The Synod of Laodicea (A.D. 344-346, c. 59) felt itself compelled to pass a decree to that effect. The decree was not, however, fully enforced; the clergy eventually claimed the right of performing the sacred music as a privilege exclusively their own. And finally, the more effectually to exclude the people, the singing was in Latin. Where that was not the vernacular tongue, this rule was of necessity an effectual bar to the participation of the people in this part of public worship. Besides, the doctrine was industriously propagated that the Latin was the appropriate language of devotion, which became not the profane lips of the laity in these religious solemnities, but only those of the clergy, who had been consecrated to the service of the sanctuary. This expedient shut out the people from any participation in this delightful part of public worship. The Reformation again restored to the people their ancient and inestimable right. At that time the greater part of the services of the Romish Church was sung to musical notes. and on the occasion of great festivals the choral service was performed with great pomp by a numerous choir of men and boys. That abuses of the most flagrant kind had found their way into this department of Romish worship is beyond a doubt, as .the Council of Trent found it necessary to issue a decree on the subject, in which they plainly state that in the celebration of the mass, hymns, some of a profane and others of a lascivious nature, had crept into the service, and given great scandal to professors of the truth. But by this decree the council, while it arranged the choral service on a proper footing, freeing it from all extraneous matter, gave choral music also a sanction which it had hitherto wanted. From that time the Church of Rome began to display that profound veneration for choral music which it has continued to manifest down to the present day.

The Protestants at the Reformation differed on the subject of sacred music. The Lutherans in great measure adopted the Romish ritual, and retained the choral service. Some of the Reformed churches varied more widely from Rome than others. Calvin introduced a plain metrical psalmody, selecting for use in churches the version of the Psalms by Marot, which he divided into small portions, and appointed to be sung in public worship. This Psalter was bound up with the Geneva Catechism. When the Reformation was introduced into England, Henry VII, himself a musician of considerable celebrity, showed his partiality for the choral service, by  retaining it. The cathedral musical service of the Reformed Church of England was framed by John Marbeck of Windsor, in a form little different from that which is at present in use. It is a curious fact that the ancient foundations of conventual, collegiate, and cathedral churches make no provision for an organist, but simply for canons, minor canons, and choristers. The first Act of Uniformity, passed in the reign of Edward VI, allowed the clergy either to adopt the plain metrical psalmody or to preserve the use of the choral service. The musical part of queen Elizabeth's liturgy is said to have been arranged by Parker, archbishop of Canterbury. The Puritans, however, objected strongly to the cathedral rites, particularly "the tossing the Psalms from one side to the other," as Cartwright sarcastically describes the musical service; and it was regarded as inconsistent with that beautiful simplicity which ought ever to characterize the ordinance of divine worship. The assaults made by Puritans upon the musical as well as other portions of the cathedral service were answered with great ability and power by Richard Hooker in his famous work on Ecclesiastical Polity, the first four books of which appeared in 1594, and the fifth in 1597. From the date of that masterly defence of the polity of the Church of England down to the present day no material change has taken place in the musical service of that Church. The Lutheran and Episcopal churches, both in Europe and America, have also a solemn service, while the Reformed Church, including the Presbyterian and Independent, have a plain selection of melodies to which the metrical Psalms, Paraphrases, and Hymns are set. There is almost universally a precentor or leader of the sacred music in the congregation, and in some cases a select choir or band of male and female voices, while the whole congregation is expected to join in this solemn part of the devotional exercises of the sanctuary. For a number of years past, while Romish churches in Europe and America have made a gorgeous display of their musical service, which is still divided between the chants of the priests and the theatrical performances of the choir, made up altogether, as a rule, of regularly trained musicians, vocal and instrumental, who have thus perverted most effectually the devotional ends of sacred music, the Protestant churches have aroused to a more careful training of their whole congregation in the art of sacred music, that this interesting and impressive part of divine worship may be conducted both with melody of the voice and of the heart unto the Lord. See, however, for details, especially on the innovations in the Protestant churches, the influence of sacred song as  exhibited in recent times in revivals, the articles PSALMODY SEE PSALMODY and REVIVAL SEE REVIVAL .

III. Use of Instruments in the Church. — The Greeks as well as the Jews were wont to use instruments as accompaniments in their sacred songs. The converts to Christianity accordingly must have been familiar with this mode of singing; yet it is generally believed that the primitive Christians failed to adopt the use of instrumental music in their religious worship. The word ψαλλείν, which the apostle uses in Eph 5:19, has been taken by some critics to indicate that they sang with such accompaniments. The same is supposed by some to be intimated by the golden harps which John, in the Apocalypse, put into the hands of the four-and-twenty elders. But if this be the correct inference, it is strange indeed that neither Ambrose (in Psalms 1 Praef. page 740), nor Basil (in Psalms 1, volume 2, page 713), nor Chrysostom (Psalms 41, volume 5, page 131), in the noble encomiums which they severally pronounce upon music, make any mention of instrumental music. Basil, indeed, expressly condemns it as ministering only to the depraved passions of men (Hom. 4. volume 1, page 33), and must have been led to this condemnation because some had gone astray and borrowed this practice from the heathens. Thus it is reported that at Alexandria it was the custom to accompany the singing with the flute, which practice was expressly forbidden by Clement of Alexandria in A.D. 190 as too worldly, but he then instituted in its stead the use of the harp. In the time of Constantine the Great the Ambrosian chant (q.v.) was introduced, consisting of hymns and psalms sung, it is said, in the four first keys of the ancient Greek. The tendency of this was to secularize the music of the Church, and to encourage singing by a choir. The general introduction of instrumental music can certainly not be assigned to a date earlier than the 5th and 6th centuries; yea, even Gregory the Great, who towards the end of the 6th century added greatly to the existing Church music, absolutely prohibited the use of instruments. Several centuries later the introduction of the organ in sacred service gave a place to instruments as accompaniments for Christian song, and from that time to this they have been freely used with few exceptions. The first organ is believed to have been used in Church service in the 13th century. Organs were, however, in use before this in the theatre. They were never regarded with favor in the Eastern Church, and were vehemently opposed in some of the Western churches. In Scotland no organ is allowed to this day, except in a few Episcopal churches. SEE MUSIC, INSTRUMENTAL. In the English  convocation held A.D. 1562, in queen Elizabeth's time, for settling the liturgy, the retaining of organs was carried only by a casting vote. SEE ORGAN.

IV. Sacred Music as a Science. — A certain sort of music seems to have existed in all countries and at all times. Even instrumental music is of a very early date; representations of musical instruments occur on the Egyptian obelisks and tombs. The Hindui, Chinese, and Japanese music is probably what it was thousands of years ago. The Chinese, whose music practically is unpleasant to refined ears, have some sweet-toned instruments, and a notation for the melodies played on them which is sufficiently clear. Their history and fables touching the art antedate by many centuries those of classic nations. The higher style of Oriental music, which has a limited degree of melodious merit, with rhythms logically and distinctly drawn from consociation with poetry as refined and liquid as the Italian, may be found in that of India, dating also from remotest antiquity. The poetical legends of Hindostan, and indeed of all Southern Asia, rival those of China and Greece in ascribing fabulous effects to music. The Hindus consider every art as a direct revelation from heaven, and while their inferior deities communicated other arts, it was Brahma himself who presented music to mortals. The music of the Hebrews is supposed to have had a defined rhythm and melody. The Greeks numbered music among the sciences, and studied the mathematical proportions of sounds. Their music, however, was but poetry sung, a sort of musical recitation or intoning, in which the melodic part was a mere accessory. The Romans borrowed their music from the Etruscans and Greeks, and had both stringed instruments and wind instruments.

The music of modern Europe is a new art, to which nothing analogous seems to have existed among the nations of antiquity. We look therefore to the early music of the Christian Church, to whose fostering influence through several centuries the preservation and progress of art was due, for the foundation upon which the modern system is built. The early music of the Christian Church was probably in part of Greek and in part of Hebrew origin. The choral was at first sung in octaves and unisons. St. Ambrose and Gregory the Great (590-604) directed their attention to its improvement, and under them some sort of harmony or counterpoint seems to have found its way into the service of the Church. The latter was the father of the Gregorian chant, upon the broad foundation of which the music of the Church rested for several centuries. Further advances were  made by Guido of Arezzo, to whom notation by lines and spaces is due; but the ecclesiastical music had still an uncertain tonality and an uncertain rhythm. Franco of Cologne, in the 13th century, first indicated the duration of notes by diversity of form. He and John of Muris in the following century contributed greatly to the more rapid progress of sacred music. It is during their period of Christian ecclesiastical life that modern music first attained the character of an art, by which the devout heart gives utterance to its emotions. Its style was at that time serious, grand, and full of expression only when taken as a whole; and as the Church would 'not renounce the few melodies which had long been used, art could exert its power only on the harmonies by which they were embellished. The consequence was that many imitators adopted an artificial, dry, and learned kind of music, which derived all its life from some secular airs mingled with it. The Synod of Trent entreated the pope that he would devise some plan by which this state of things might be improved. Marcellus II accordingly disclosed his views to an enthusiastic young man, and soon after, under the papacy of Paul IV, Palestrina presented to the world his Missa Marcelli (1555). This was the commencement of a revolution in sacred music, which by his influence became simple, thoughtful, aspiring, sincere, and noble, but destitute of passion and tenderness. The most spiritual of all arts, it raised the heart into immediate communion with the Infinite, and, while celebrating the mystery of the divine sacrifice in the different parts of the mass to which it was especially set, it found opportunity to express and to elevate, by its various combinations of sounds, every kind of Christian feeling. The centre of this school was the papal chapel, and its last creative master was Gregorio Allegri (t 1640), whose Misermere, composed for a double choir, expresses with wonderful simplicity all the calm and profound sufferings of a Christian heart beneath the Saviour's cross.

The invention of the organ, and its use in accompanying the choral, had a large share in the development of harmony. Along with the music of the Church, and independently of it, secular music was making gradual advances, guided more by the ear than by science; it seems to have had a more decided rhythm, though not indicated as yet by bars. The airs which have become national in different countries were developments of it, but it had its chief seat in. Belgic Gaul; and the reconciliation of musical science with musical art, begun in Flanders by Josquin Depres in the 15th century, was completed in the 17th century by Palestrina and his school at Rome, and reacted eventually on the ecclesiastical style. "Mediaeval Church  music," says Prof. Paine, "did not fulfil the entire mission of the art, for it failed to embrace within its scope of expression all the nature of man, leaving out an important element of artistic representation — his earthly acts and passions. It was reserved for secular music to supply this want. Music can also express outside of the Church the highest principles of religion and morality, as they influence the sentiments and actions of men. The Reformation of the 16th century was undoubtedly the means of giving a new impulse to the cultivation of secular music, which previously had been ignored and held in contempt by the educated musicians and ecclesiastics; and in Germany the Reformation was also the source of a new style of sacred music of popular origin. During the absolute reign of mediaeval counterpoint the sense of melody which existed later in the songs of the troubadours and minnesingers, and other popular melodies of a very early date, was almost wholly lost, and consequently melody had to be discovered again, so to speak, about the year 1600. It was not the learned musicians, but mere dilettanti, who took these first steps on a new path. In Italy the increasing interest in ancient literature and art led to an ardent desire on the part of cultivated men to restore Greek tragedy. Enthusiasts painted its splendors in glowing colors. They believed that modern counterpoint could not compare with ancient music, either with respect to the simple beauty of the melody or the comprehensive clearness and rhetorical expression of the words. This idea of restoring the ancient drama and music was first advocated at the meetings of a society of scholars and artists at Florence.

The names of Vincenzio Galilei, Caccini, Cavaliere, and Peri have come down to us as associated with these feeble beginnings of the musical drama. As the result of their efforts they unfolded a new element in music, the modern recitative, out of which the air was gradually developed. It is true the heavy and monotonous recitative which the Florentine dilettanti had introduced remained for a time a doubtful experiment; yet the love for dramatic representations helped to sustain the novelty until the advent of original masters, like Monteverde, Carestini, and, above all, Alessandro Scarlatti. Under their guidance the recitative grew more flexible and expressive; the dramatic action and lyric passion of the play were heightened by means of the orchestral accompaniment, and the true arioso style of singing was formed. Finally, the air sprang into life, and the sera of beautiful and sensuous melody was fairly inaugurated." The opera, which thus appeared nearly contemporaneously with the Reformation and revival of letters (about 1600), greatly enlarged the domain of music. Italy advanced in melody, and Germany in harmony.  Instrumental music in this way came to occupy a more and more prominent place. Upon sacred music the influence of the opera was very marked. It brought about the introduction of solo singing and instrumental accompaniment into sacred music, and in consequence the strict ecclesiastical style was greatly modified. in the course of the 18th century Italian Church music had wandered so far away from the chaste ideal of Palestrina as to lose its sacred style almost wholly.

These innovations in the field of music brought about a conflict with the old ecclesiastical style, which struggled in Rome to maintain its ground. The consequence was that the school of music founded by Neri began to perform in the oratorium pieces relating to subjects from sacred history. In this way came into existence the oratorio, intermediate between the ancient and modern styles of music, and more distinctly expressive of precise characters and situations, more agreeable in its melodies, and richer in its instrumental accompaniments (comp, Hase, Ch. Hist. page 465). Not only on the Continent, but also in England, this species of sacred music made its way. During the changes introduced there in ecclesiastical music at the Restoration the school of Purcell (q.v.) had arisen. This paved the way for the oratorio, and a little later England adopted the German Handel, who was the precursor of Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, Spohr, and Mendelssohn. These masters, though they exercised their gifts in almost every noble form of musical composition, dedicated their genius especially to the pure and sublime themes of religion. Handel's forty operas are almost forgotten; his long career as a dramatic composer, however, served as an excellent school for his faculties, and his triumphs in the field of oratorio music were but the natural fruits of his previous discipline. Handel's strength of character and sincere faith rendered him fully worthy as a man, as well as an artist, to create such works as the Messiah and Israel in Egypt. These masterpieces are not mere lyric and dramatic works; they possess a grand objective and ideal character, comparable only to the greatest works of art; to the Greek drama or the romantic tragedies of Shakespeare.

But the oratorio we do not care to see regarded as the highest type and expression of modern Church music. As such the cantatas and passion music by Bach express more intensely and vividly than any other compositions a profound religious conviction. The Passion to St. Matthew has no rival in its special form. It is the most dramatic and vivid conception ill art of the trial and death of Christ. Among hundreds of similar works, this is the only music that has lived.  Here it may most appropriately be stated that all sacred music since the 16th century must be divided into two general divisions, choral and figurate music. Choral music is. in its original form, Church singing only, in which the melody is solemnly slow. It is devoid of ornament, and not bound to a strict observance of time. Figurate music is the execution of religious pieces with accompaniment of instruments, and arose from the choral melodies arranged for four or more voices, and having for their theme hymns, psalms, or passages of Scripture. From the signs or figures used in the different parts, and which were not used in choral music, this style received the name of figurate. The organ was generally used in it to conduct and assist the voice, and subsequently stringed and wind instruments were gradually added. At first the instruments were used only to give the tone to the singers. At the Reformation the Calvinistic Church entirely rejected the use of instruments. The ancient Italian masters, such as Palestrina and Orlando di Lasso, composed no instrumental music. Yet Luther introduced the custom of having chorals executed by instruments. The general use of the organ for accompaniment dates from about the year 1640. Figurate music and choir singing, as distinguished from congregational singing, appears already in the fugues and motets of the 14th century, in which, after one part had commenced the singing, it was taken up by a second, then by a third, a fourth, and finally taken up again by the first, and so on to the end.

We find it also in many compositions of the times of the Reformation, as, for instance, in the festive songs of John Eccard (t 1611). Hammerschmidt (t 1675) gave to this style a fuller development, and entitled it by the name of madrigal. In Italy, in the 16th century, the appearance of the opera, as we have seen above, was not without influence on sacred music, which gradually acquired a more secular style. Besides, this also led to the use of musical instruments in the churches. From Italy the custom was introduced into Germany by John Prmetorius (t 1621) and Henry Schitza (t 1762), and thus gave rise to the cantate, in which John Sebastian Bach particularly distinguished himself, and of which we have spoken above. By all these innovations it is believed the old solemn style of sacred music lost ground, and the oratorio itself gradually turned more to the opera. Mozart and Beethoven wrote sacred music in precisely the same style as operas. On the other hand, the Romish 'clergy did not better the position by returning to the ante-Palestinian mode of chanting mass, and this was not without a certain influence again in making the sacred music of the Protestant churches more secular. The importance of instrumental music was also on the increase; overtures and  dancing-tunes were often played on the organ before and after service. It is only with the revival of evangelical piety that a change commenced to be perceptible in sacred music it was brought about mainly by the efforts of such composers as C.F. Becker, J.C.H. Rick, G.W. Korner, and by the collection of classical pieces for the organ published by Kocher, Silcher, and Frech in 1851. The ancient figurate pieces were also remodelled by such composers as Ruick, A.W. Bach, C.G. Reissiger, Silcher, Frech, Palmer, etc. In this country Lowell Mason (q.v.) may be said to be the father of Christian Church music. He is certainly the founder of the American school of sacred song, though it should be borne in mind that our musicians, especially composers, are very largely influenced by European culture, particularly German. See Hawkins, General Hist. of the Science and Practice of Music (Lond. 1776; new ed. 1853, 2 volumes, 4to); Burney, Hist. of Music (Lond. 1776-89, 4 volumes, 4to); Forkel, Geschichte d. Musik (Leips. 1788, 2 volumes); Hullah, Hist. of Mod. Music (Lond. 1862); Fetis, Hist. generale de la Musique (Paris, 4 volumes, out, but yet unfinished); Chappell, Hist. of Music (Lond. 1874 and sq., 4 volumes); Naumann, Umgestaltung der Kirchenmusik (1852); Psalmengesang in der Evangel. Kirche (1856); Tonkunst in der Culturgesch. (1869-70); Riddle, Christian Antiquities, pages 384-391; Bingham, Origines Ecclesiasticce, page 315 sq.; Thibaut, Ueber Reinheit der Tonkunst (Heidelb. 1826); Laurenzin, Geschichte der Kirchenmusik bei d. Italienem u. Deutschen (Leips. 1856); Mansi, 29:107; Wiseman, The Offices of Holy Week (Lond. 8vo); Fink, in Zeitschrit. f. hist. Theologie, 1842; Pierer, Universal Lexikon, 9:507; Milman, Hist. of Christianity and Latin Christianity; Neander, Ch. Hist.; Schaff, Ch. Hist.; Baxter, Ecclesiastes Hist. of England, page 263; Ch. and World, 1867, art. 9; Brand, Pop. Antiquities in Great Britain, 2:267 sq.; Hardwick, Hist. of the Reformation, pages 387-389; Hase, Hist. of the Christian Church, pages 153, 465, 675; and especially Coleman, Man. of Prelacy and Ritualism, chapter 12; Lond. Qu. Rev. April 1861, art. 2; July 1871, art. 5.; October 1872, art. 1; Cath. World, March 1870, art. 3; For. Qu. Rev. 20:29 sq.; 23:121-248; Grove, Dict. of Music and Musicians (Lond. 1872-88, 2 volumes, 8vo.).

## Music, Instrumental[[@Headword:Music, Instrumental]]

             As there are many Christians who hold that the use of instrumental music in the sacred services of the Church does not find its warrant in the New- Testament Scriptures, we here append an article on this negative position.  We add a few arguments on the affirmative. Following so closely after the historical discussion furnished above, the inquiring student will be .the better able to judge for himself whether instrumentals can be used in Christian worship.

I. Against the use of instruments in Christian churches the following reasons may be urged:

1. There is no warrant in the New Testament for their use.

(a) There is no example of such by Peter, Paul, John, James, or the Master himself, nor by any others in the apostolic age; nor have we any in the first three centuries; nor until the mystery of iniquity was strongly at work.

(b) We have no command either to make or to use them. It is claimed that ψάλλοντες in Eph 5:19 requires playing on strings; but that is expressly declared to be done in the heart. (See in a following paragraph.)

(c) We find no directions, formal or incidental, for their use; while we have line upon line about singing--what to sing, when to sing, how to sing.

2. Instruments were not used in the worship of the ancient synagogue. They belonged to the tabernacle and the Temple, especially the latter; but were never in the congregational assemblies of God's people. The trumpet and other loud instruments were used in the synagogue, not to accompany the psalm, but in celebrating certain feasts (Lev 25:9; Num 10:10; Psa 81:3). There was a feast of trumpets (Lev 23:24; Num 29:1). They were used for proclamation, in going to war, in moving the camps, in assembling the congregations, as well as in triumphs, coronations, and other extraordinary occasions (Num 10:1-10; Lev 25:9; 1Ki 1:34; Joe 2:1; Jer 6:1, et al.). Such celebrations resembled our day of Independence, but were much more devotional, and withal ceremonial in their meaning. Conrad Iken tells us that the Sabbathday was introduced with blowing trumpets at the synagogues six times. At the first blast they dropped the instruments of husbandry, and returned home from the field. This was on Friday evening, as we call it. At the second blast they closed all offices, shops, and places of business. At the third blast pots were removed from the fire, and  culinary occupation was suspended. The other three blowings were to designate the line between common and sacred time. All of these uses, though connected with the worship, were entirely different from the psalmody in which they were used at the Temple: but

(a) No hint is given in Old Testament or New that instruments were ever used in the synagogue worship.

(b) Orthodox Jews do not allow the organ or any other instrument in their synagogues; only Reformed or Liberal Jews have introduced the organ and many other innovations.

(c) Archaeologists (Prideaux, Jahn, Calmet, Townsend, etc.) make no mention of instruments in the worship, while they describe minutely the furniture of the synagogue; and Hahn particularly notices the singing of the doxologies, such as Psa 72:18; Psa 68:1; Psa 96:6; and Psa 113:1. Iken gives four doxologies for the Sabbath, but no organ or harp.

3. The early Reformers, when they came out of Rome, removed them as the monuments of idolatry. Luther called the organ an ensign of Baal; Calvin said that instrumental music was not fitter to be adopted into the Christian Church than the incense and the candlestick; Knox called the organ a kist [chest] of whistles. The Church of England revived them, against a very strong protest, and the English dissenters would not touch them.

4. The instruments of the former economy were ceremonial. This is probably the chief reason for their use in the Temple. They were not merely figurative, like bread, water, wine, light; nor merely typical, like Isaac, David, Solomon, and the manna; they were figurative, typical, and ceremonial, as appears thus:

(a) They depended largely on the priesthood. The trumpet was the leading instrument-master of the whole; this belonged exclusively to the priests (Num 10:8-9; Num 31:6; Jos 6:4; 2Ch 13:12; 2Ch 13:14). The smaller instruments belonged to the Levites, whose station was adjoining the priests (1Ch 23:28; 1Ch 25:1-8). In the worship, as well as in celebrations, both were combined (1Ki 1:39-40; 1Ch 15:14-28; 2Ch 5:12, et al.). Thus all were made to depend on the priesthood.

(b) They were combined over the sacrifices (see especially Num 10:10; Num 29:1-2, etc.; 1Ch 15:26; 2Ch 7:5-6; 2Ch 29:26-28; 2Ch 30:21, etc.; Ezr 3:4-5; Ezr 3:10-11; Neh 12:43; comp. Neh 12:27; Neh 12:35-36; Neh 12:41; Neh 12:45-47).

(c) They belonged to the national worship of the peculiar people (Exo 15:20; 2Sa 6:5; 2Sa 6:15): "All the house of Israel" (1Ch 13:5; 1Ch 13:8; 1Ch 15:3; 1Ch 15:28; 2Ki 3:13-15; Psa 68:25). So it had been arranged from the first (1Ch 25:1-8), and so carried out to the last (Neh 12:45). Incidental events, as well as set forms, show the same connection: the "company" in 1Sa 10:5 were coming down from the high-place, and those in Isa 30:29 are going up to it. David's individual harp was like his songs, a preparation for the Temple; and the incident of 2Ki 3:15 was a national affair. Hence

(d), even when introduced as symbols in the Apocalypse, they are grouped with their usual ceremonial accompaniments. Trumpets are not there presented as part of the music, though prominent for other uses. 'The "harpers" have their "vials full of odors," stand with the Lamb that had been slain, are on the sea of glass, and sing the song of Moses and the Lamb. They have their Mount Zion, their twelve tribes, their city of Jerusalem, their Temple and its pillars, their seven candlesticks, ark of the covenant, altar of incense, golden censer, pot of manna, cherubim, white robes, palm-branches, with other things which have passed awav together; according to Heb 7:12, "The priesthood being changed, there is made, ἐξ ἀνάγκης (of necessity), a change also of the law." The use — valid use — of all these things ceased when Christ yielded up his spirit on the cross. The very sanctum sanctorum was thrown open when the veil was rent. The Christian Church carried her singing not from the Temple, but from the synagogue. SEE SYNAGOGUE.

5. Instrumental music is inconspatible with directions for singing given in the N.T.

(a) Heb 13:15 : "Let us offer the sacrifice of praise, that is, the fruit of the lips." This exhortation is given in terms of the O.T. (Psa 50:14; Psa 69:30-31; Psa 116:17; Hos 14:2, Sept.), yet the formal definition of praise makes it the production of the lips, not of the organ.

(b) Eph 5:19 : "Singing and making melody (ψάλλοντες, touching the chords) in the heart to the Lord." Praise requires more than the mere " talk of the lips" (Pro 14:23); but the accompaniment is not an instrument in the hand, but a living organ of some sort.

(c) Col 3:16 : "Singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord." In this passage "grace" answers exactly to — ψάλλοντες "touching the chords" in the heart; both passages harmonize in requiring something besides the voice, as do many others. But that something is not a machine in the hand. What is it? What was symbolized by all these cymbals, organs, harps, trumpets — these "things without life giving sound?" The general idea of Christian people is that they all were intended to represent grace in the heart — the working of a regenerated soul in gratitude to God. Hence the martyr's exclamation, "O for a well-tuned harp!" and the prayers of godly people for their hearts to be put in "tune." John Bunyan's account of Mr. Fearing, who was always playing on the base, with many such allusions, chime in exactly with the whole idea of acceptable worship (Joh 4:24, "in spirit and in truth;" 1Co 14:15, "I will sing with the spirit").

This idea is supported by the following considerations:

(a) In the passages above cited "grace" in one answers to "melody" in the other, and both are in the heart.

(b) This "melody," this "grace," is different from the "singing" — superadded to the "fruit of the lips."

(c) The "harps" hold the same relation to praise that the vials of "odors" do to prayer. 1Co 14:15 : "I will pray with the spirit" (Psa 141:2; Rev 5:8; Rev 8:3-4).

(d) They are eminently adapted to represent "grace" in a variety of aspects. Take the following (with the trumpet as used in proclamation we have no concern here, but with the instruments of praise):

(1) They represent grace as it deals with the deepest moving of the affections, both in sorrow and joy. In Isaiah 15, 16 we have the workings of pity, even to hopeless commiseration, winding up with this: "My bowels shall sound like a harp for Moab;" and like expresions, 63, 15; Jer 4:19; Jer 48:36; Jer 31:20, margin; comp. Jer 31:4 with Job 17:6. They combine the deepest mixture of sorrow and joy  (Gen 31:27; Ezr 3:10). The change of feeling is sometimes very sudden (Job 30:31; 1Ch 13:8-11; Rev 18:19-22). The same sound will give sorrow to one and joy to another at the same time (1Sa 18:6-9; Psa 96:9-13; Psa 98:6-9, with Rev 1:7).

(2) They represent the countless variety of gracious experiences, with their wide range of degrees and imperfections, from Bunyan's "Mr. Fearing" up through tenor, alto, and treble, with leger-line above the clouds (2Ti 4:6-8). The combinations of musical notes amount to millions of millions. The harp of a thousand strings is a low approximation to playing on the chords of the heart to the Lord.

(3) They represent grace especially in its pleasurable aspects-pleasing and being pleased (Psa 92:1-4). Godly sorrow is real sorrow; the harp has a solemn sound when played on the base. Still the power predominating, both in music and in grace, is joy (Rev 14:3; Rev 15:3). During the battle, long before the triumph, the tabret and harp are heard amid the din of war (Isa 30:32). The believer is sometimes a captive, and then he suspends his harp on the willow, because for the time he has no joy (Psa 137:2). In every case short of this he can joyfully touch the chords in the heart (Isa 38:20; Hab 3:17-19).

(4) They represent all this grace in the heart as something that has been put there (Psa 4:7). The natural melody of the soul is lost in the fall — the strings are broken: "Ye must be born again." The Ethiopian treasurer, when born of water and of the Spirit, went on his way rejoicing. Spiritual joy is not natural, but gracious; neither is it unnatural, it fits the place; it is supernatural, restoring the soul to its original, and with greater security (Isa 35:10, "Everlasting joy upon their heads"). Eze 28:13 gives some insight into this matter: "The workmanship of thy tabrets and of thy pipes," etc. There is textual difficulty here of no ordinary breadth; but whether the personage addressed be Ithobal, or Adam, or Abaddon, it illustrates the case in hand; each had the power of music concreated with him — especially Lucifer, son of the morning. There was a time when the morning-stars sang together, Apollyon with the rest. Such tabrets and pipes must have been of a spiritual nature, as they were of exquisite "workmanship" (Eph 2:10, "We are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works;" so also Gal 6:15; Gal 5:6). The new creation produces the faith which works by love, and harmonizes the music  of Moses and the Lamb (Psa 119:54; Psa 40:8; Rom 7:22; Heb 10:9). The renewed soul sings that song which no other can learn. Such a one has the melody belonging to instruments of very honorable name (1Ch 16:42; 2Ch 7:6; Rev 15:2; Isa 38:20; Hab 3:19; Psa 57:7, "My heart is prepared I will sing and ψαλ῝ῶ," Sept.).

(5) They represent grace in its perfection-the sublimity of heavenly joy. Light has its own kind of sublimity; hence we read of "the inheritance of the saints in light." Light reveals objects at a distance; music carries us away. Music is incomplete unless voice and harp go together. Ezekiel's mellifluous oratory could not be illustrated by the one without the other (Eze 33:32). The Temple music represented very fitly the joy of that house where the sweet Singer will preside, the glory of which eye hath not seen nor ear heard; it is "reserved;" yet it is "prepared" for them that love him; where song and harp and organ blend with sweet odors; while they sweep the chords of the heart to the Lord.

II. In favor of Instrumental Music for Churches, it may be replied that the above considerations, however plausible in general and often beautiful in sentiment, are rather speculative than logical. But more particularly, it is not sufficient to show that such performances were not customary or known in the sacred services of the primitive Christians; if we would authoritatively exclude them, it must be proved that the N.T. positively forbids, or by direct implication discountenances them. There are many practices of modern times which are perfectly lawful, proper, expedient, and edifying, which were not known in the earliest days of Christianity. Such an argument would reprobate Sunday-schools and numerous well- approved institutions of the present day. Our Savior and his apostles purposely left all these immaterial questions and detailed arrangements discretionary with the Church, and it is best they should so remain. Times change, and religious observances, where not absolutely prescribed, must be modified accordingly.

We might justly add, under this head, that there is no positive proof, after all, that instrumental music did not in any case accompany the songs of the early Christians. The evidence a silentio is always insecure. Indeed the reasoning above is not altogether conclusive on this very point. The presumption is certainly the other way, for it can hardly be presumed that persons who had always been accustomed to associate instrumental music  with the services of the sanctuary — as was the case at least with the Hebrews, who formed the nucleus and dominant element of the infant Church would have suddenly and totally abjured this delightful and inspiring part of divine worship under a new economy, unless there had been some express prohibition or absolute incompatibility respecting it. On the contrary, such an accompaniment has been found in all ages a decided stimulus to devotion, and a powerful auxiliary to the strains of vocal melody. It is so congenial with the spirit of Christianity that the most remarkable and sublime efforts of genius in this field have been those of Christian composers and Christian performers.

Finally, therefore, to interdict these concomitants of congregational worship is a mistake savoring of asceticism and iconoclasm. It is, moreover, a scientific blunder, as well as an aesthetic degeneration. If the O.T. saint could profitably employ instrumental music as a means of grace, why should it be denied the Christian? If David's soul took wing with celestial vigor as he strung his lyre in accord with his devout lays, why may not the modern saint refresh his soul with the ravishing harmonies of the organ? The immortal productions of Mozart and others require the full orchestra to bring out their grandest effects, and even the ordinary songs of the Church are greatly enhanced in their power over the heart when properly accompanied from the choir. The human voice itself is but one instrument of music; and the experience of the truest and purest believers in every age, whether in high or low condition, has attested the healthful and edifying influence of instrumental symphony, when duly subjected as a handmaid to sacred lyrics and vocal execution.

## Musical Instruments Of The Hebrews[[@Headword:Musical Instruments Of The Hebrews]]

             The obscurity attaching to this subject has long been felt and complained of. The rabbins themselves know no more of this matter than other commentators who are least acquainted with Jewish affairs. The older writers on the subject had no means of assisting their speculations by examining any representations of the actual instruments in use, either among the Hebrews themselves or in the neighboring nations. But much light has of late been thrown, by the discovery of Egyptian and Assyrian monuments, upon the instruments which were used by these two great peoples the nearest neighbors of the Hebrews, and with whom, at different periods of their history, they came into close and long-continued contact; and we have now the advantage of being able to infer, with a high degree  of probability, if not with absolute certainty, from these collateral examples what were the forms and powers of at least the principal instruments referred to in the Hebrew Scriptures. This recent enlargement of our knowledge, however, still leaves much room for further light, especially in regard to the precise instruments intended by particular Hebrew words. There is yet much difference of opinion among Hebrew scholars and antiquarians upon this point of primary importance; and indeed, in the absence of all direct means of identification, and of any clear and steady tradition among the Jews themselves upon the matter, it is hardly to be expected that the obscurity which still encumbers this part of the subject can ever be entirely removed. We see certain instruments different from our own in use among the modern Orientals, and we infer that the Hebrew instruments were probably not unlike these, because the Orientals change but little, and we recognise in them the peoples, and among them the habits and the manners described in the Bible. We find also many instruments presented in the sculptures of Greece and Rome, and we need not refuse to draw inferences from them, for they derived their origin from the East, and the Romans distinctly refer them to Syria (Juvenal, Sat. 3; Livy, Hist. 39:5). When, however, we endeavor to identify with these a particular instrument named by the Hebrews, our difficulty begins, because the Hebrew names are seldom to be recognised in those which they now bear, and because the Scriptures afford us little information respecting the form of the instruments which they mention.

I. Stringed Instruments. — We begin with these, because upon almost all occasions of the use of instrumental music, either in public or private, we find them. occupying the principal place; while in point of antiquity of date they were not inferior apparently to other instruments of a simpler and ruder character chief varieties of this class of instruments may be arranged as follows:

1. The כַּנּוֹר, kinnor, commonly translated in our version harp; in the Sept. κιθάρα; Chald. כַּתְרָא; Dan 3:5; Dan 3:10, קַיתְרוֹס. This is the stringed instrument ascribed to the invention of Jubal, and the only one referred to by Laban in his remonstrance with Jacob (Gen 31:27). It is mentioned among the instruments used by the sons of the prophets in their schools (1Sa 10:5); and it was the favorite instrument of David, of which he became so celebrated a master. In the first ages the kinnor was  consecrated to joy and exultation, hence the frequency of its use by David and others in praise of the divine Majesty. It is thought probable that the instrument received some improvements from David (comp. Amo 6:5). In bringing back the ark of the covenant (1Ch 16:5), as well as afterwards at the consecration of the Temple, the kinnor was assigned to players of known eminence, chiefly of the family of Jeduthun (1Ch 25:3). Isaiah mentions it as used at festivals along with the nebel; he also describes it as carried round by Bayaderes from town to town (Isa 23:16), and as increasing by its presence the joy of vintage (Isa 24:8). When Jehoshaphat obtained his great victory over the Moabites, the triumphal entry into Jerusalem was accompanied by the nebel and the kinnor (2Ch 20:27-28). The sorrowing Jews of the captivity, far removed from their own land and the shadow of the sanctuary, hung their kinnors upon the willows by the waters of Babylon, and refused to sing the songs of Zion in a strange land (Psa 137:2). Many other passages of similar purport might be adduced in order to fix the uses of an instrument, the name of which occurs so often in the Hebrew Scriptures. They mostly indicate occasions of joy, such as jubilees and festivals. Of the instrument itself the Scripture affords us little further information than that it was composed of the sounding parts of good wood, and furnished with strings. David made it of the berosh wood, or cypress ("fir"); Solomon of the more costly algum (2Sa 6:5; 2Ki 10:12); and (Gen 4:21).

The common name for all such instruments in Hebrew is נְגַינוֹת(negointh), from a root denoting to strike, like the Greek root ψάλλω, to strike, which yields in like manner ψαλτήριον, with a like general meaning. But in this genus were included a great variety of species of stringed instruments, some of which are of constant occurrence in the Old Testament; while others are limited to those books which belong to the period of the Babylonish captivity, and are to be regarded rather as Babylonian than Hebrew instruments. Keeping this distinction in view, the Josephus mentions some composed of the mixed metal called electrum. He also asserts that it was furnished with ten strings, and played with a plectrum (Ant. 11:12, 3), which however is not understood to imply that it never had any other number of strings, or was always played with the plectrum. David certainly played it with the hand (1Sa 16:23; 1Sa 18:10; 1Sa 19:9), and it was probably used in both ways, according to its size.  Kitto (Pict. Bible, note on Psa 43:4) demurs to its being regarded as a harp, and argues at great length in favor of its being a lyre; the chief difference of these two being that, while in the harp the strings were free on both sides throughout their whole length, in the lyre they were carried in part over the face of the sounding-board, and could in that part of their length only be struck on one side with one of the hands. But it is obvious that a difference of this kind was only a modification of form, and did not involve any essential difference in the principles of construction. The main principle of construction was the same in both instruments, viz. the production of differences of sound by differences in the length of the strings, whatever modifications of form might be used in order to obtain this difference of length, and whatever modifications of size and shape might be called for, when the instrument was to vary in power, and according as it was to be employed either in solo or in choir. The lyre was only a modification of the harp. Even in Greek the words κιθάρα and λύρα were anciently used convertibly, as Dr. Kitto admits; and it is highly improbable that the Hebrew word kinnor did not originally include all instruments of the harp kind, whatever might be their differences in size or shape, or subordinate arrangement.

Harps for single use would usually be made portable and light. Those intended for choral performances in the Temple service would probably be made large and powerful, so as to stand upon the ground when played instead of being carried. Some would have a larger, some a smaller number of strings, according to the degree of perfection wanted. In point of fact all these varieties are actually to be found upon the Egyptian monuments, and we see no good reason why the same generic name might not be applied to them all. The most eminent lexicographers are clearly of this mind. While Gesenius defines kinnor to be a species of harp or lyre, and Furst renders it by the single word harp, Winer expresses himself in such a way as to indicate an opinion that the Hebrew instrument so named might be either harp, lyre, or lute. Engel leans to the same opinion as Dr. Kitto, but does not appear to have added anything to the arguments by which the latter has sought to support it. "It is uncertain," he thinks (page 281), "which of the Hebrew names of the stringed instruments occurring in the Bible really designates the harp." Still he thinks also that the kinnor, the favorite instrument of king David, was most likely a lyre; although he owns in another place (page 310) "that the reasons which can be given in support" of this opinion "are certainly far from conclusive." When he urges that the kinnor was a light and very portable instrument; that king David, according to the rabbinic records,  used to suspend it during the night over his pillow; and that all its uses mentioned in the Bible are especially applicable to the lyre rather than to the harp-these considerations are all such as have already been fully met in the observations made above; and it is answer enough to them to refer the reader to the accompanying monumental illustrations, which make it plain and certain that the harps of ancient nations were extremely various in size and power, and that some of their varieties were as light and portable as the lyre itself.

The approximate illustrations of the kinnor, or harp, supplied by the Egyptian and Assyrian monuments are very copious and interesting, and we cannot err far in supposing the various modifications of the Hebrew instrument to have been substantially the same as those in use among their neighbors. The most ancient form of the kinnor was probably the bent or curved form. agreeably to the etymology of the name, which according to Furst (Hebsiasches und Chaldaiscees Handworterbuch) is derived from a root signifying to make in the shape of a bow or curve. Egyptian harps of this shape are represented in the first of the accompanying illustrations (page 764), and are remarkable for their differences of size, arrangement, and power, two of the specimens having as many as thirteen strings, one nine, and one only three; while one is light and portable, and the rest so large and heavy as to require to rest on the ground. It was by a natural transition that the curved form gave way in many cases to the triangular, such as we see in our next series of illustrations. Nearly resembling these ancient Egyptian forms of the portable harp is the shape of the ancient Persian chang and the Arabic junk of the present day; and we are disposed to agree with Engel that this triangular instrument is most likely the tirionon, or triangle, mentioned by several classical authors. "Burney," he remarks, "in his History of Music, gives a drawing of a trigonon with ten strings. He observes that it is called by Sophocles a Phrygian instrument, and that a certain musician, of the name of Alexander Alexandrinus, was so admirable a performer upon it, that when exhibiting his skill in Rome he created the greatest furore. Burney further remarks, 'The performer being a native of Alexandria, as his name implies, makes it probable that it was an Egyptian instrument upon which he gained his reputation at Rome' — an opinion which is corroborated by the discovery of the instrument shown in our engraving.

The representations, it is true, of the Grecian trigonon, given in our histories of music, exhibit it in the shape of a Greek delta, with  three bars. In the Egyptian instruments the third bar, it will be observed, is wanting; but no ancient examples have been produced of the trigonon with three bars, and the representations referred to are probably only imaginary." Perhaps we have a still nearer approximation to the Hebrew harp in the two triangular instruments from the Assyrian sculptures. These harps are of very frequent occurrence on these Oriental monuments, showing that this form of the instrument was a favorite one. One of the two represented on the following page has twenty-one strings, the other has twenty-two strings; and it is a remarkable difference of construction as compared with the Egyptian specimens that the sounding-board forms the upper part of the instrument instead of the lower, while the reader will also observe openings for the escape of the sound. The ancient harp was sometimes played with a plectrum; but in all the Egyptian and Assyrian specimens now given it will be noticed that no plectrum occurs, but the instruments are all played with the hands, as we always figure to ourselves David handling his favorite harp. This Assyrian harp is probably the nearest approximation to the harp of the royal psalmist which we shall ever be able to reach. Remembering that the kinnor is one of the instruments mentioned by Laban as in common use in the country of Aram, we cannot but suppose that the harp which was used by the descendants of Jacob bore a closer resemblance to those which are figured upon the monuments of Mesopotamia than to those of the Egyptian monuments. See HARP.

2. The נֶבֶל, nibel, probably the Greek ναβλίον (νάβλα, νάβλη, ναύλα, or νάβλας) and the Latin nablium (nablum or nabla). The word is rendered " psaltery" in the A.V., in imitation of the Sept. translation of the Psalms and Nehemiah, which renders it by ψαλτήριον, with the exception of ψάλμος in Psa 71:22, and κιθάρα in Psa 81:2. The Septuagint in the other books in which the word occurs renders it by νάβλα or, with a different ending, νάβλον. The Greek rendering ψαλτήριον evidently connects this instrument with the Chaldee פְּסִנְתְּרַיןof Dan 3:5; Dan 3:7. The first mention of it is in the reign of Saul (1Sa 10:5), and from that time forward we continue to meet with it in the O.T. It is, however, not found in the 2d chapter of Daniel, where mention is made of so many instruments; whence we may infer either that it did not exist among the Babylonians, or was known among them by another name. It was played upon by several persons in the grand  procession at the removal of the ark (1Ch 15:16; 1Ch 16:5); and in the final organization of the Temple music it was intrusted to the families of Asaph, Heman, and Jeduthun (1Ch 25:1-7); Asaph, however, was only the overseer of the nebelists, as he himself played on a different instrument. Out of the worship of God it was employed at festivals and for luxurious purposes (Amo 6:5). In the manufacture of this instrument a constant increase of splendor was exhibited. The first we meet with were made simply of the wood of the berosh (2Sa 6:5; 1Ch 13:8), others of the rarer algum tree (1Ki 10:12; 2Ch 9:11), and some perhaps of metal (Josephus, Ant. 1:8, 3), unless the last is to be understood of particular parts of the instrument.

The nebel was an instrument apparently much resembling the kinnor in its nature and properties, though considerably different in form. According to Josephus (Ant. 7:12, 13) it had twelve strings, which were played upon with the hand. One variety of it had only ten strings, and was distinguished as נֶבֶֹל עָשׂוֹר; and from an expression in Isa 22:24 — כָּלאּכְּלֵי

הִנְּבָלַים, all manner of nebel instruments — we gather that the instrument, like the harp, was used in various sizes and shapes. What its distinctive form was preserved, no doubt, in the main, in all its varieties cannot be determined with certainty. The etymology of the name, like that of kinnor, suggests a curved shape like that of a leathern bottle; but whether it was so called because the whole instrument was of this shape-like the lyre, which is occasionally described by the Latin poets as the lyra curva — or because only a part of it was thus curved, viz. the sounding-board, as in the lute or guitar, it is impossible to decide. It is here we begin to feel the difficulty before referred to of identifying the Hebrew names with particular instruments. Kitto, as already noticed, pleads strongly for identifying it with the harp, while assigning the name kinnor to the lyre; but ancient authorities are opposed to this view, and he lands himself in the difficulty of being unable to find any Hebrew name at all for the lute or guitar, which he notwithstanding admits to have been in common use along with the lyre and harp. We cannot see, moreover, that anything is gained or any difficulty removed by adopting this opinion. We prefer to leave it a doubtful question whether the nebel was a lyre or a lute, or even some other form of stringed instrument, like that, for example, represented in the above illustration, derived from the Assyrian monuments. The only certain  proof we possess of a lyre like instrument having been in use among the Hebrews is the adjoining figure upon a coin of the times of the Maccabees. That either lutes or stringed instruments resembling the Assyrian ones just alluded to were employed by the Hebrews is a matter only of probable inference, from the fact that such instruments were in common use among the neighboring nations; we have no direct proof of it. Examples of lyres of various shapes and capabilities are shown on the monuments of Egypt and Assyria. To these we may add illustrations of Assyrian and Egyptian lutes or guitars. It need only be added that the nebel of Palestine and the East must have had some considerable differences in form and properties from either the classical lyre or lute, as it was known and distinguished among the Greeks and Romans by its Oriental name, which the Greeks slightly altered into νάβλα or νάβλιον, and the Romans into nablium. SEE PSALTERY.

3. The סִבְּכָא, sabbeka, or "sackbut" of our version, is the third instrument in the list in Dan 3:5; Dan 3:7. That this was a stringed instrument is certain, for the name passed over into Greek and Latin in the forms σαμβύκη and sambuca; female performers on it from the East, called σαμβύκαι, santbucince, and sambucistrice by the classical authors, visited the cities of Europe, and found their way as far as Rome; and the instrument is described by Athenaeus (4:175; 14:633) as a harp-like instrument of four or more strings, and of a triangular form. Now it is remarkable that one of the musical instruments most frequently occurring in the Assyrian sculptures answers very closely to this description.

On comparing the instrument here represented with that exhibited in the procession above, a difference of structure will be observed, viz. that in the latter the strings seem to be carried over a bridge, which is not the case with the former. In other respects the two forms are exactly the same; and the instrument was evidently a peculiarly Assyrian one, as there is nothing resembling it to be found on the Egyptian monuments or in the sculptures of Greece and Rome. This appears to us a decisive consideration in favor of identifying it with the sackbut of Dan 3:5, rather than with the סוּמְפֹּנַוָּה(symphonia) of the same list, the word translated dulcimer in our version.  This latter name is evidently borrowed from the Greek, and as such was no doubt the name of a Greek and not a native instrument; whereas the name and the nature of the sackbut were both probably Oriental, as the instrument figured in these Assyrian sculptures indubitably was. What the synmphonia itself was it is impossible to say. It is worth mentioning that one of the musicians performing upon what we thus presume to have been the sackbut, is distinguished from the rest by a peculiar headdress, which may probably have been a mark of distinction assigned to "the chief of the musicians" at the Assyrian court, an officer who was the counter-part of the Hebrew מְנִצֵּח, such as Asaph or Jeduthun. SEE SACKBUT.

4. The גַּתַּית, gittith, a word which occurs in the titles to Psalms 8, 81, 84, and is generally supposed to denote a musical instrument. From the name it has been supposed to be an instrument which David brought from Gath; and it has been inferred from verse 10 that it was in particular use at the vintage season. If an instrument of music, it is remarkable that it does not occur in the list of the instruments assigned by David to the Temple musicians; nor even in that list which appears in Psa 81:1-2, in the title of which it is found. The supposition of Gesenius, that it is a general name for a stringed instrument, obviates this difficulty. The Sept. renders the title by ὑπὲρ τῶν ληνῶν, "upon the wine-press;" and Carpzov, Pfeiffer, and others/ follow this in taking the word to denote a song composed for the vintage or for the Feast of Tabernacles (Carpzov, Observ. Philol. super Psalmos Tres עִלאּהִגַּתּית[Helmst. 1758]; Pfeiffer, Ueber die Musik, page 32). SEE GITTITH.

5. מַנַּים. minnim, which occurs in Psa 45:8; Psa 150:4, is supposed by some to denote a stringed instrument, but it seems merely a poetical allusion to the strings of any instrument. Thus in Psa 45:8 we would read, "Out of the ivory palaces the strings (i.e., concerts of music) have made thee glad;" and so in Psa 150:4, "Praise him with strings (stringed instruments) and ugabs." SEE STRING.

6. מִחֲלִת, machalath, which occurs in the titles of Psalms 53, 88, is supposed by Gesenius and others to denote a kind of lute or guitar, which instrument others find in the minnim above noticed. The prevalence in the East of instruments of this sort would alone suggest the probability that the Jews were not without them; and this probability is greatly increased by the evidence which the Egyptian paintings offer that they were equally prevalent in ancient times in neighboring nations. The Egyptian guitar consisted of two parts: a long, flat neck or handle, and a hollow, oval body, composed wholly of wood, or covered with leather, whose upper surface was perforated with several holes to allow the sound to escape; over this body, and the whole length of the handle, extended three strings of catgut secured at the upper extremity. The length of the handle was sometimes twice, sometimes thrice that of the body, and the whole instrument seems to have measured three or four feet. It was struck with a plectrum, and the performers usually stood as they played. Both men and women used the guitar; some danced while they touched its strings (Wilkinson, Anc. Eg. 1:84-86, 123-125). SEE MAHALATH.

II. Wind Instruments. —

1. The most ancient of these was the עוּגָב, ugab, mentioned along with the kinner as the invention of Jubal (Gen 4:21). It is twice alluded to (Job 21:12; Job 30:31), and in both cases in collections which show that it was used on occasions of domestic festivity and joy. The only other place where it occurs is in Psa 150:4, where it is referred to among other instruments suitable to be employed in the praises of God. Opinion has been, and is still, much divided as to the instrument denoted by the name. Winer and Leyrer (in Herzog's Real-Encyklopadie) favor the idea that it was a species of bagpipe; and in this view they are supported by the authority of Jerome, the Targums (אֲגוּבָא), and some rabbinical writers. The Septuagint varies in its translation of the word; in Genesis rendering it by κιθάρα, in Job by ψαλμός, and in Psalms 150 by ὄργανον, the term adopted by the Vulgate, Syriac, Arabic, and most other versions, as well as by our own. But by ὄργανον we are by no means to understand the organ,  which is an instrument of no great antiquity. even if we are to suppose, as some do, that there was a rudiment of the modern organ in use in the Temple of Jerusalem in the time of Christ, an invention of which strange and evidently fabulous things are told us by the Talmud, under the name of the מִגְרֵיפָה (nagrephah).

The organum meant by the word was as old as the days of Jubal; it must, therefore, have been of a rude and simple construction, and is best understood of the so-called Pandean pipe, formed by a combination of reed-pipes of different lengths and thicknesses. In support of this view is the fact that the Pandean pipe was an instrument of Syrian or Oriental origin, and that it was of such high antiquity that the profane writers do not know to whom to ascribe it. Some refer it to Pan (Virgil, Ecclesiastes 2), others to Mercury (Pind. Od. 12, de Pallade), others to Marsyas and Silenus (Athenaeus, 4:182). This antiquity corresponds with the Scriptural intimation concerning the ugab, and justifies us in seeking for it among the more ancient instruments of the Orientals, especially as it is still common in Western Asia. Niebuhr saw it in the hands of a peasant at Cairo (Reisebeschr. 1:181); and Russell, in his Nat. Hist. of Aleppo (1:155, 156), says that "the syrinx or Pan's pipe is still a festival instrument in Syria; it is known also in the city, but very few performers can sound it tolerably well. The higher notes are clear and pleasing, but the longer reeds are apt, like the dervise flute, to make a hissing sound, though blown by a good player. The number of reeds of which the syrinx is composed varies in different instruments from five to twenty-three." The classical syrinx is usually said to have had seven reeds (Virg. Ecclesiastes 2); but we find some on the monuments with a greater number, and the shepherd of Theocritus (Id. 8) had one of nine reeds. SEE ORGAN.

2. Of almost equal antiquity was the קֶרֶן, keren, or horn, which sometimes, but not often, occurs as the name of a musical instrument (Jos 6:5; 1Ch 25:5; Dan 3:5; Dan 3:7; Dan 3:10; Dan 3:15). Of natural horns, and of instruments in the shape of horns, the antiquity and general use are evinced by every extensive collection of antiquities. It is admitted that horns of animals were at first used, and that they at length came to be imitated in metal, but were still called horns. SEE HORN.

This use and application of the word are illustrated in our "cornet." It is generally conceived that rams' horns were the instruments used by the early Hebrews; and these are, indeed, expressly named in our own and many  other versions as the instruments used at the noted siege of Jericho (Jos 6:5); and the horns of the ram are those which Josephus assigns to the soldiers of Gideon (Ant. 5:6, 5; comp. Jdg 7:16). SEE SHOSHANNIM.

3. שׁוֹפָר, shophar, which is a far more common word than keren, and is rendered " trumpet" in the Auth. Ver. This word seems, first, to denote horns of the straighter kind, including probably those of neat cattle, and all the instruments which were eventually made in imitation of and in improvement upon such horns. It is, however, difficult to draw a distinction between it and the keren, seeing that the words are sometimes used synonymously. Thus that which is called "a jobel-horn" in Jos 6:5, is in the same chapter (Jos 6:4; Jos 6:6; Jos 6:8; Jos 6:13) called "a jobel-horn trumpet" (shophar). SEE JUBILEE.

Upon the whole, we may take the shophar, however distinguished from the keren, to have been that kind of horn or horn-shaped trumpet which was best known to the Hebrews. The name shophar means bright or clear, and the instrument may be conceived to have been so called from its clear and shrill sound, just as we call an instrument a "clarion," and speak of a musical tone as "brilliant" or "clear." In the service of God this shophar or trumpet was only employed in making announcements, and for calling the people together in the time of the holy solemnities, of war, of rebellion, or of any other great occasion (Exo 19:13; Num 10:10; Jdg 3:7; 1Sa 13:3; 1Sa 15:10; 2Ch 15:14; Isa 18:3). The strong sound of the instrument would have confounded a choir of singers rather than have elevated their music. At feasts and exhibitions of joy horns and trumpets were not forgotten (2Sa 6:15; 1Ch 16:42). There is no reason to conclude that the trumpet was an instrument peculiar to the Levites, as some have supposed. If that were the case we should be unable to account for the three hundred trumpets with which Gideon's men were furnished (Jdg 7:8), and for the use of trumpets in making signals by watchmen, who were not always Levites. SEE TRUMPET.

4. The חֲצוֹצְרָה, chatsotserah, or straight trumpet, is occasionally mentioned along with the shophar, showing that these two kinds of trumpets were sometimes used together, as in Psa 98:6, "with  trumpets and sound of cornet make a joyful noise before the Lord the King" (comp. 1Ch 15:28; 2Ch 15:14). The two silver trumpets appointed by Moses to be made for the use of the priests of the tabernacle were of this construction, and were used for announcing to the people the advent of the different feasts, for signalling "the journeying of the camps," and for sounding alarms in time of war (Num 10:1-10). Their use in the sacrificial rites as a musical accompaniment was limited (Num 10:10) to certain occasions, to " their solemn days, the beginnings of their months, and the day of their gladness ;" but in the age of David and Solomon their sacrificial use was much extended, and the number provided for the use of the priests was correspondingly increased. At the dedication of the Temple as many as a hundred and twenty priests "sounded with trumpets;" and in the immensely developed ritual then introduced the part of the musical service assigned to the priests was to blow with the sacred trumpets during the offering of sacrifice, while the Levites accompanied on the other instruments of all kinds. There has been various speculation on the name; but we are disposed to assent to the conclusion of Gesenius that it is an onomatopoetic word, imitating the broken pulse-like sound of the trumpet, like the Latin taratantara, which this word would more resemble if pronounced as in Arabic, hadaderah. By many it has been identified with the modern trombone, on the assumption that the description in Num 10:2 implies that it was turned back at the end. But straight trumpets are to be seen upon the monuments both of Egypt and Assyria, and the straight silver trumpet of the Jewish Temple is distinctly figured upon the arch of Titus at Rome and on extant Jewish coins (Frolich, Anal. Syr. Proleg.). SEE CORNET.

5. The הָלַיל, halil, flute, the meaning of which is bored through, and denotes a pipe, perforated and furnished with holes. The Sept. always renders it by αὐλός, a pipe or flute. There are but five places where it occurs in the Old Testament (1Sa 10:5; 1Ki 1:40; Isa 5:12; Isa 30:29; Jer 48:36); but the Greek αὐλός occurs in the New Testament (Mat 9:23) and in the Apocryphal books (1Ma 4:54; 1Ma 9:39; Jdt 3:8). It was originally formed from the reed, by the simple contrivance of cutting a larger or smaller number of holes in one of its lengths; but it was afterwards, in the progress of the arts, more artificially made of wood, bone, horn, and ivory. It was sometimes single, and at  other times double, the two pipes uniting at top in a single mouthpiece. It would seem to have come rather late into use among the Hebrews, and probably had a foreign origin. The passages to which we have referred will indicate the use of this instrument or class of instruments; but of the form we can only guess by reference to those of the ancient Egyptians and Assyrians, which are very similar to those still in use in Western Asia. The pipe is, however, rarely introduced in the Egyptian sculptures, and does not seem to have been held in much estimation. The single pipe of the Greeks is allowed to have been introduced from Egypt (J. Pollix, Onom. 4:10; Athenaeus, Deipnos. 4), from which the Jews probably had theirs. It was- a straight tube, without any increase at the mouth, and when played was held with both hands. It was usually of moderate length, about eighteen inches, but occasionally less, and sometimes so exceedingly long and the holes so low that the player was obliged to extend his arms to the utmost. Some had three holes, others four, and actual specimens made of common reed have been found (Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. 2:309). The double pipe was formed with two such tubes, of equal or unequal lengths, having a common mouthpiece, and each played with the corresponding hand. They were distinguished as the right and left pipes, and the latter, having but few holes and emitting a deep sound, served as a base; the other had more holes, and gave a sharp sound (Pliny, Hist. Nat. 16:36). This pipe is still used in Palestine. The Scottish missionary deputation overtook, among the hills of Judah, "an Arab playing with all his might upon a shepherd's pipe made of two reeds. This was the first time we had seen any marks of joy in the land" (Narrative, page 118). SEE PIPE.

From the references which have been given it will be seen that the pipe was, among the Jews, chiefly consecrated to joy and pleasure. So much was this the case that in the time of Judas Maccabeus the Jews complained "that joy was taken from Jacob, and the pipe with the harp (κιθίρα) ceased" (1Ma 3:45). It was particularly used to enliven the periodical journeys to Jerusalem to attend the great festivals (Isa 30:29); and this custom of accompanying travelling in companies with music is common in the East at this day (Harmer, Obserematt. 2:197; to which add Tournefort, Voyage du Levant, 3:189). Athenaeus (4:174) tells us of a plaintive pipe which was in use among the Phoenicians. This serves to illustrate Mat 9:23, where our Saviour, finding the flute-players with the dead daughter of the ruler, ordered them away, because the damsel was not dead; and in this we also recognise the regulation of the  Jews that every one, however poor he might be, should have at least two pipes (חלילים) at the death of his wife (Lightfoot, Hor. Hebr. ad Mat 9:23). SEE MOURNING.

6. סוּמְפֹּנְיָה, sumponyalh, is evidently the Chald. form of the Gr. συμφωνία, rendered "dulcimer" (Dan 3:5; Dan 10:15). It is described by the rabbins as a bagpipe consisting of two shrill-toned fifes pressed through a leathern bag. Servius, in his Commentary on the AEneid, describes the symphonia as a sort of bagpipe, which agrees with the representations of Jewish writers. The bagpipe bore the same name among the Moors of Spain, and it is still called in Italy zampogna. The known antiquity of this instrument, together with its present existence in the East, appear to confirm the reference of the sumponyah to the bagpipe. The modern Oriental bagpipe is composed of a goat-skin, usually with the hair on, and in the natural form, but deprived of the head, the tail, and the feet. The pipes are usually made of reeds, terminated with tips of cows' horns, slightly curved. The entire instrument is primitively simple in its materials and construction. SEE DULCIMER.

7. There remains to be noticed a wind-instrument mentioned along with the others in Dan 3:5 — theמִשְׁרוֹקַיתָא, manshrokitha, A.V. "flute." The etymology of the name indicates that it was an instrument of the pipe class; but whether a bagpipe, a Pandean pipe, or a flute-pipe, single or double, it is impossible to determine. All these identifications have found supporters, and some have even inclined to the opinion that it was of the nature of a rudimentary wind-organ, such as was afterwards imitated and somewhat improved upon by the Temple organ before alluded to the magrephah of the Talmlud. SEE FLUTE.

III. Instruments of Percussion and Agitation. —

1. The most ancient pulsatile instrument mentioned in the O.T. is the תֹּ, toph, consisting of a narrow circle or hoop of wood or metal covered with a tightened skin, and struck with the hand. The Sept. renders the word by τύμπανον, a drum. The "timbrel" of our own version is preferable, as there can be no doubt that the instrument intended was of the same nature  and form as the timbrel or tambourine still in use in Oriental countries. The Arabs still call it dof, and the Spaniards adufe. It is mentioned as early as the days of Laban (Gen 31:27), where our version has "tabret;" and it was the instrument with which Miriam and the women of Israel accompanied and beat time to their song and dance when they sang responsively the song of Moses (Exo 15:20). Here the name in the original is the same as in Gen 31:27, though the rendering varies to "timbrel." It is also mentioned by Job (Job 21:12). Isaiah adduces it as the instrument of voluptuaries, but left in silence amid wars and desolations (Isa 24:8). The occasions on which it was used were mostly joyful, and those who played upon it were generally females (Psa 68:25), as was the case among most ancient nations, and is so at the present day in the East. It is nowhere mentioned in direct connection with battles or warlike transactions; but it is mentioned on occasions when it was more probably performed on by men (as in the bringing up of the ark, 1Ch 13:8; in worship, 1Sa 10:5; Psa 149:3; Psa 150:4), although this is by no means certain. It frequently occurs on the Egyptian monuments (Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. 2:240). There were three kinds, differing, no doubt, in sound as well as form: one was circular, another square or oblong, and the third consisted of two squares separated by a bar. They were all beaten by the were all beaten by the hand, and often used as an accompaniment to the harp and other instruments. The imperfect manner of representation does not allow us to see whether the Egyptian tambourine had the same movable pieces of metal let into the wooden frame which we find in the tambourines of the present day. Their presence may, however, be inferred from the manner in which the tambourine is held up after being struck; and we know that the Greek instruments were furnished with balls of metal attached by short thongs to the circular rim (Wilkinson, Ancient Egypt. 2:314). At mournings for the dead the tambourine was sometimes introduced among the Egyptians, and the "mournful song" was accompanied by its monotonous sound. This is still a custom of the East, and probably existed among the Jews. SEE MOURNING.

The toph was thus an instrument of the drum kind; and it is highly probable that, as other varieties of the drum,, apostle's word. It suggests the sound of a small bell rather than the clanging resonance of the cymbals. It should have been rendered clanging or clashing. The sound of these instruments  is very sharp and piercing, but it does not belong to fine, speaking, expressive music. The Hebrew instruments were probably similar to those of the Egyptians. These were of mixed metal, apparently bronze, or a compound of copper and silver, and of a form exactly resembling those of modern times, though smaller, being only seven inches or five inches and a half in diameter. The same kind of instrument is still used by the modern inhabitants of Egypt, and from them, says Wilkinson, "have been borrowed the very small cymbals, played with the finger and thumb, which supply the place of castanets in the almeh dance" (Ancient Egyptians, 3:255). The modern castanet, introduced into Spain by the Moors, is to be referred to the same source. SEE CYMBAL.

4. מְנִעִנְעַים, menaanim. This instrument is only once mentioned in Scripture (2Sa 6:5), where it stands next before cymbals in an enumeration of several instruments, and is strangely translated cornets in our version. It is singular that the example of the Vulg., which renders by the Latin sistra, was not followed by our translators in this instance, especially as the etymology of the name (rad. נוּע, to shake) suggests that it was an instrument of agitation which was denoted, the Greek σεῖστρα having an analogous derivation from adio. It was generally from eight to sixteen or eighteen inches long, and entirely of bronze or copper; movable rings and bars of the same metal being inserted in the frame, by the sharp impact of which upon the frame, when shaken in the hand, a piercing metallic sound was produced. It was sometimes inlaid with silver, gilt, or ,otherwise ornamented, and the rings were frequently made to imitate snakes, or simply bent at each end to secure them from slipping through the holes. Several actual specimens of these instruments have been found, and are deposited in the British, Berlin, and other museums (Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. 1:131-133). They are mostly furnished with sacred symbols, and were chiefly used by the priests and priestesses in the ceremonies of religion, particularly in those connected with the worship of Isis (Plut. De Isid. c. 63; Juven. 13:93; Jablonsky, Opusc. 1:306). Instruments of the same rude principle, though different form, are still in use in the military music of some modern nations.  5. שָׁלַישַׁים, shalishim. This instrument is only once mentioned, viz. in 1Sa 18:6, where it is spoken of as used by the women of Israel when they came out to meet king Saul and David. Our translators render vaguely "instruments of music," but insert in the margin "three-stringed instruments." The word more probably denoted an instrument with three sides; and as some harps were of that shape, it may probably have meant such harps. (See above, under kinnor.) We insert the name in this place because it is generally thought by recent scholars that it meant what is understood by a triangle, an instrument of percussion which Athenaeus (Deipnos. 4:175) says was derived from Syria. If so, it was possibly in use among the Hebrews, and may have been the instrument referred to in 1Sa 18:6. But, on the other hand, no figure of such an instrument of percussion has been found on any of the monuments either of Assyria, Egypt, or Greece. Like the eyvibals and sistra, it is still in use in military music, especially in the Turkish army.

6. The word "dance" is used in the A.V. for the Heb. term machol, מָחוֹל, a musical instrument of percussion, supposed to have been used by the Hebrews at an early period of their history. Some modern lexicographers, who regard machol as synonymous with rakod, רָקוֹד(Ecc 3:4), restrict its meaning to the exercise or amusement of dancing; but according to many scholars it also signifies a musical instrument used for accompanying the dance, which the Hebrews therefore called by the same name as the dance itself. The Sept. generally renders machol by χορός, "dancing;" occasionally, however, it gives a different meaning, as in Psa 30:11 (Heb. Bible, Psa 30:12), where it is translated χαρά, “joy," and in Jer 31:4; Jer 31:14, where it is rendered Συναγωγή, " assembly." The Shemitic versions of the O.T. almost invariably interpret the word as a musical instrument. On the joyous occasion when the Israelites escaped from their Egyptian pursuers, and reached the Arabian shore of the Red Sea in safety, Miriam is represented as going forth striking the תֹּ, and followed by her sisters in faith, who join in "with timbrels and dances" (Exo 15:20). Here the sense of the passage seems to be, agreeably to the A.V., that the Hebrew women came forth to dance, and to accompany their dance by a performance on timbrels; and  this is the view adopted by the majority of the Latin and English commentators. Parkhurst and Adam Clarke do not share this opinion: according to the former, machol is “some fistular wind-instrument of music, with holes, as a flute, pipe, or fife, from חל, to make a hole or opening;" and the latter says, "I know no place in the Bible where machol and machalath mean dance of any kind they constantly signify some kind of pipe." The Targumists very frequently render machol as a musical instrument. In Exo 15:20, Onkelos gives for machalath the Aramaic word חנגין, which is precisely the same employed by him in Gen 21:27 for kinnor (A.V. 'harp"). The Arabic version has for machol in most places tablun, pl. tubulun, translated by Freytag, in his Arabic Lexicon, "a drum with either one or two faces;" and the word ובמחלות(Jdg 11:34, A.V. "and with dances") is rendered by inaun, "songs." Gesenius, Furst, and others adopt for the most part the Sept. rendering; but Rosenmuller, in his commentary on Exo 15:20, observes that, on comparing the passages in Jdg 11:34; 1Sa 18:6; and Jer 31:4, and assigning a rational exegesis to their contexts, machol must mean in these instances some musical instrument, probably of the flute kind, and principally played on by women.

In the grand hallelujah psalm (150) which closes that magnificent collection, the sacred poet exhorts mankind to praise Jehovah in his sanctuary with all kinds of music; and among the instruments mentioned at the 3d, 4th, and 5th verses is found machol, which cannot here be consistently rendered in the sense of dancing. Joel Brill, whose second preface (הקדמה שניה) to Mendelssohn's Psalms contains the best treatise extant on the musical instruments mentioned in the Hebrew Bible, remarks: "It is evident from the passage, 'Praise him with the toph and the machol,' that machol must mean here some musical instrument, and this is the opinion of the majority of scholars." Mendelssohn derives machol from חלול, "hollow," on account of its shape; and the author of Shilte Haggibborim denominates it סיסטרוס, which he probably intends for κιθάρα, rather than sistrun. Some modern critics consider machalath the same with machol. Gesenius, however, translates the latter "dancing," while the former he renders "a stringed instrument," from the root חָלִל "to sing."  The musical instrument used as an accompaniment to dancing is generally believed to have been made of metal, open like a ring: it had many small bells attached to its border, and was played at weddings and merrymakings by women, who accompanied it with the voice. According to the author of Shilte Haggibborim, the machol had tinkling metal plates fastened on wires, at intervals, within the circle that formed the instrument, like the modern tambourine; according to others, a similar instrument, also formed of a circular piece of metal or wood, but furnished with a handle, which the performer might so manage as to set in motion several rings strung on a metal bar, passing from one side of the instrument to the other, the waving of which produced a loud, merry sound. SEE DANCE.

IV. The following are general or miscellaneous terms:

1. דִּחֲוָן, dachavan, Chald., rendered " instruments of music" in Dan 6:18. The margin gives “or table, perhaps lit. concubines." The last- mentioned rendering is that approved by Gesenius, and seems most probable. The translation, "instruments of music," seems to have originated with the Jewish commentators, R. Nathan, R. Levi, and Aben-Ezra, among others, who represent the word by the Hebrew neginoth, that is, stringed instruments which were played by being struck with the hand or the plectrum.

2. שַׁדָּה, shiddah, is found only in one very obscure passage (Ecc 2:8), "I gat me men-singers and women-singers, and the delights of the sons of men, musical instruments, and that of all sorts" (שַׁדָּה וְשַׁדּוֹת, shiddsh ve-shiddoth). The words thus rendered have received a great variety of meanings. They are translated "drinking-vessels" by Aquila and the Vulgate; "cup-bearers" by the Sept., Peshito-Syriac, Jerome, and the Arabic version; " baths" by the Chaldee; and "musical instruments" by David Kimchi, followed by Luther and the A.V., as well as by many commentators. By others they are supposed to refer to the women of the royal harem. But the most probable interpretation to be put upon them is that suggested by the usage of the Talmud, where שַׁידָה, shidah, denotes a "palanquin" or "litter" for women. The whole question is discussed in Gesenius's Thesaurus, page 1365.

V. Literature. — On the general subject of the music and musical instruments of the Israelites, see Martini, Storia delta Musica (Bologna, 1757), 1:4 sq.; Burney, General Hist. of Music (Lond. 1776), 1:217 sq.; Schroter, De Musica Davidica (Dresd. 1716); Hawkins, Hist. of Music; Forkel. Gesch. der Musik, 1:99 sq.; Calmet, Dissert. sur la Musique des Hebreux, annexed to his Commentary on the Psalms; Bedford, Temple Music (Bristol, 1706); Pfeiffer, Ueber die Musik der Alten Hebr. (Erl. 1799; transl. in the Amer. Bible Repository, 1835); Saalschutz, Form der Hebr. Poesie, page 329 sq.; also Gesch. und Wurdigung d. Musik bei den Hebr. (Berl. 1829); Harenberg, Comm. de Re Musica Vetus. in Misc. Lips. 9:218 sq.; Sonne, De Musica Judaeor. in sacris (Hafn. 1724); Tal, Dicht Sing und Spielkunst bes. der Hebr. (Frankf. 1706); Jahn, Biblische Archaologie; Reland, De Spoliis Temp. Hieros.; Anton, Die Melodie u. Harmonie der Alt. Hebr. in Paulus, N. Repert. 1:160 sq.; 2:80 sq.; 3:1 sq.; Shilte Haggibborim, in Ugolini Thesaur. volume 32; Contant, Traite sur la Poesie et la Musique des Hebreux (Paris, 1781); Beck, De accentuun Hebr. in Mencken, Thesaur. page 563 sq.; Abicht, Vindiciae accentuum (Lips. 1713); Excellentia musicae antiq. Hebr. (Munich, 1718); Schneider, Bibl.-gesch. Darstellung d. Hebr. Musik (Bonn, 1834); De Wette, Commentar. uber die Psalmen; Rosellini, Monumenti dell' Egitto; Wilkinson, Anc. Egyptians; Villoteau, Sur la Musique des Orientaux, in Descript. de l'Egypte; Lady M.W. Montague, Letters; Volney, Voyage en Syrie; Tournefort, Voyage au Levant; Niebuhr, Reisebeschreibung; Russell, Nat. Hist. of Aleppo; Lane, Modern Egyptians, 2:69 sq.; Thomson, Land and Book; Engel, Music of the most Ancient Nations (Lond. 1864); Hutchinson, Music of the Bible (Bost. 1863).

## Musician, Chief[[@Headword:Musician, Chief]]

             (מְנִצֵּח, menatstse'ach, i.e., the most conspicuous, i.q. leader), an officer indicated in the titles of many (53) of the Psalms and in Hab 3:10, and to be interpreted, according to Kimehi, Rashi, Aben-Ezra, and many other authorities, the precentor of the Levitical choir or orchestra in the Temple. In one late instance the name of this officer seems to be indicated (1Ch 15:21); but the first who held it appears to have been Jeduthun, in connection with his three brothers (1Ch 16:41, etc.); and the office seems to have been hereditary in the family (1Ch 16:1; 1Ch 16:3), or else the name Jeduthun became a patronymic title  for the incumbents afterwards (2Ch 35:15). In this capacity Jeduthun's "office was generally to preside over the music of the Temple service, consisting of the nebel, or nablium, the kinnor, or harp, and the cymbals. together with the human voice (the trumpets being confined to the priests). But his peculiar part, as well as that of his two colleagues. Heman and Asaph, was 'to sound with cymbals of brass,' while the others played on the nablium and the harp. This appointment to the office was by election of the chiefs of the Levites (שָׂרַים) at David's command, each of the three divisions probably choosing one. The first occasion of Jeduthun's ministering was when David brought up the ark to Jerusalem. He then took his place in the procession, and played on the cymbals. But when the division of the Levitical services took place, owing to the tabernacle being at Gibeon and the ark at Jerusalem, while Asaph and his brethren were appointed to minister before the ark, it fell to Jeduthun and Heman to be located with Zadok the priest, to give thanks 'before the tabernacle of the Lord in the highplace that was at Gibeon,' still by playing the cymbals in accompaniment to the other musical instruments (comp. Psa 150:5). In the account of Josiah's Passover in 2 Chronicles 35 reference is made to the singing as conducted in accordance with the arrangements made by David, and by persons representing Asaph, Heman, and Jeduthun, the king's seer (חֹזְה הִמֶּלֶךְ). SEE HEMAN.

Perhaps the phrase rather means the king's adviser in matters connected with the musical service. The triple division of the Levitical musicians seems to have lasted as long as the Temple, and each appears to have been called after its respective leader. At the dedication of Solomon's Temple, 'the Levites which were the singers, all of them of Asaph, of Heman, of Jeduthun,' performed their proper part. In the reign of Hezekiah, again, we find the sons of Asaph, the sons of Heman, and the sons of Jeduthun, taking their part in purifying the Temple (2Ch 29:13-14); they are mentioned in Josiah's reign, and so late as in Nehemiah's time we still find descendants of Jeduthun employed about the singing (Neh 11:17)." SEE JEDUTHUN.

## Musimoes[[@Headword:Musimoes]]

             festivals celebrated in honor of the dead among the native tribes of Central Africa. See Gardner, Faiths of the World, page 503.

## Musius, Cornelius[[@Headword:Musius, Cornelius]]

             an eminent Dutch scholar of Roman Catholic proclivities, was born at Delft in 1503. He flourished as pastor of St. Agatha during the contest between the prince of Orange and the Spanish throne for the possession of the Netherlands. He was equally esteemed for his learning and for his amiable qualities, when, on account of his religious faith, he was put to the torture, which caused his death in 1575, by De la Marck. The Romanists have charged the wicked deed to the prince of Orange and his Reformed friends. This,. however, is cruel and unjust. The prince himself, who highly esteemed Musius, shed many tears when he heard of the atrocious deed, and while the Estates of Holland were aroused to an indignation scarcely controllable, De la Marck was obliged to leave the country, notwithstanding his powerful connections. Musius wrote several religious poems, which are remarkable for their elegance and purity of style. See Brandt, Gesch. der Ref. 10:538-540; Hoofe, De Neederlandsche Historien, 7:281 sq.; Motley, Hist. of the Rise of the Dutch Republic, 2:474, 475.

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

             a Lutheran divine, great-grandfather of Johann Musaus, was born in 1529. He studied at Frankfort and Niiremberg, and when twenty years of age he  was called as pastor to Furstenwalde, and three years later, in 1552, to Crossen, and in 1554 to Breslau. In the same year the University of Wittenberg conferred upon him the degree of doctor of divinity. In 1559 he was called as superintendent to Gotha, where he remained until 1561, when he was called as professor of theology to Jena, where, however, he did not staylong on account of his collisions with Victor Strigel. In 1565 we see him at Bremen and at Schwerin; in 1566 at Gera and Thorn; in 1570 at Coburg, which place he had to leave because of his zeal against the Crypto-Calvinists. He died at Mansfeld, July 11, 1582. He wrote, Auslegung des 1 Psalms (against Schwenkfield) (Breslau, 1556): — Nuzlicher Unterricht zum ersten Gebot (Erfurt, 1557, and after): — Auslegueng des 91 Psalms (ibid. 1565): — De Bremensi editione excitata a Sacramentariis veera narratio, etc. (1562): — Katechismus-Examen (Thorn, 1569): — Predigten vom h. Abendmahl (1568): — 116 Predigten iber Genesis (Magdeburg, 1576): — Postille oder Auslegung der Episteln (1587, etc.). See Jocher, Gelehrten-Lex., Supplement, by Rottermund, s.v.; Will, Nurnbergisches Gelehrten-Lex. part 2, page 700 sq.; Strieder, Hessische Gelehrten-Gesch. part 9, page 321; Kurtz, Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte, 2:112 sq. (Mittau, 1874); Niedner, Lehrbuch d. Kirchengesch. page 712. (B.P.)

## Muskokee (or Creek) Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Muskokee (or Creek) Version Of The Scriptures]]

             The Muskokee is spoken by the Creek Indians, who possess in their vernacular the gospels of Matthew and John, the epistles of John, James, Titus, and Ephesians — all published since 1868 by the American Bible Society. In 1879 the printing of the Acts of the Apostles was commenced at the New York Bible House. (B.P.)

## Musonius Rufus, Caius[[@Headword:Musonius Rufus, Caius]]

             a Stoic philosopher of the 1st century of the Christian aera, is mentioned with praise by Tacitus (Ann. 14:59), and also by Pliny the younger, Philostratus, Themistius, and others. He was a native of Volsinii, in Etruria, and belonged to the equestrian order. He was a friend of Thrasea Psetus, Barea Soranus, Rubellius Plautus, and other Stoics, who were the victims of Nero's suspicion and cruelty. Musonius was banished to the island of Gyaros in A.D. 66, where he is said to have been visited by many Greeks for the purpose of listening to his lessons. Being recalled by Galba after Nero's death, he lived at Rome under Vespasian, who excepted him from the sentence of exile pronounced by that prince against the Stoic philosophers. This scanty information is all that we have concerning the biography of Musonius Rufus (Nieuwland, Dissertatio de Musonio Rufo, Philosopho Stoico). The time of his death is not mentioned, but he was not alive in the reign of Trajan, when Pliny speaks of his son, — Artemidorus. Musonius wrote various philosophical works, which are spoken of by Suidas as λόγοι διάφοροι φιλοσοφιας ἐχόμενοι. He reduced philosophy to the simplest moral teachings. One of his finest sayings is: "If thou doest good painfully, thy pain is transient, but the good will endure; if thou doest evil with pleasure, the pleasure will be transient, but the evil will  endure." Fragments of his works are found in Stobaeus, and have been collected and published, with the above dissertation and copious notes, under the title of C. Musonnii Ruft, Philosophi Stoici, Reliquiae, et Apophtheymata, cum Annotatione, edidit T. Venhuizen Peerlkamp, Conrector Gymnasii Harlemensis (Haarlem, 1822, 8vo). These fragments of Musonius are full of the purest morality and wisdom. See Fabricius, Bibl. Graeca, 3:566 sq.; Ritter and Preller, Historia Philosophia, pages 438-441; Ueberweg, Hist. Philosoph. 1:185, 190; English Cyclop. s.v.; Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biogr. and Mythol. s.v. Rufus; Lardner, Works (see Index in volume 10).

## Musorites[[@Headword:Musorites]]

             a superstitious sect of Jews, who are said to have reverenced rats and mice. The origin of this peculiarity is to be found in an event which is narrated in 1 Samuel 6. The Philistines had taken away the ark of the covenant and detained it in their country seven months, during which time the Lord in anger Bent a plague of mice, which destroyed the fruits of the ground. Under the dread inspired by this divine judgment upon their land they restored the ark, and by the advice of their priests and diviners they prepared as a trespass-offering to the God of Israel five golden emerods and five golden mice. Perverting the solemn incident of O.-T. history, the sect seems to have entertained a superstitious veneration for mice and rats.

## Muspel(l) or Muspel(l)heim[[@Headword:Muspel(l) or Muspel(l)heim]]

             is, in Norse mythology, the world of light and heat, situated in the south part of the universe; Niflheim, the habitation of mist and cold, being situated in the north. The inhabitants of this world are called "the sons of Muspell," among whom Sturt or Surtur is chief, and the ruler of Muspellheim, who sits on its borders bearing a flaming falchion, and at the end of the world he shall issue forth to combat, and shall vanquish all the gods, and consume the universe with fire.

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

             a French Protestant theologian,, was born at Geneva in 1627, where he also studied. theology. In 1654 he was ordained, was in 1656 minister at Lyons, and attended the national synod at Loudun (1659-1660). In 1669 he was president of the provincial synod held at Is-sur-Thil, and in 1675 he accepted a call as pastor of the French Church at London. He died in 1686. Besides two volumes of sermons and other minor works, he published Les Conformites des Ceremonies Modernes (Leyden, 1667; new ed. Amsterdam, 1744; a German transl. was published at Leipsic, 1695). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:624; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Musserin[[@Headword:Musserin]]

             is the name given to a sect of atheists in Turkey. The word signifies those who keep a secret, from the verb aserra, to conceal. Their secret is flatly to deny a deity. Many of the cadis and other educated classes in Turkey are believed to be Musserin. But mainly they are Christian renegades, who,  having for pecuniary reasons abjured the faith of their fathers, seek refuge in blank atheism, under a public profession of Mohammedanism.

## Musso, Cornelius[[@Headword:Musso, Cornelius]]

             a famous Italian pulpit orator, was born at Placentia in 1511, and, after entering holy orders, rose rapidly to distinction in the Church. He was made bishop of Bertinoro, then of Bitonto, towards the close of the 16th century. HIe distinguished himself at the Council of Trent, and seems to have enjoyed popular favor to an unusual degree, for medals were struck in his honor, and other distinctions of like character were paid him. He died at Rome January 9, 1574. He is the author of Sermons on the Creed (Venice, 1590, 4to). See Bayle, Hist. Diet. s.v.; Genesis Biog. Dict. 11:154; Musso, Vita di Cornelio Musso (1586) ; Blackwood, 1869, 1:211; Wessenberg, Die Grossen Kirchenversammlungen d. 15 u. 16 Jahrh. 3:160, 161.

## Mussulman or Mosleman[[@Headword:Mussulman or Mosleman]]

             (from Arab. Salama), the proper term for a Mohammedan. The word is equivalent to Moslem (q.v.), of which it is, properly speaking, the plural; used in Persian fashion for the singular. We need hardly add that this Arabic plural termination of " an" has nothing whatever to do with our word man, and that a further English plural in men is both barbarous and absurd.

## Mussulman-Bengali Version[[@Headword:Mussulman-Bengali Version]]

             SEE BENGALI VERSION.

## Mustapha[[@Headword:Mustapha]]

             (i.e., the chosen one) is the name by which Mohammedan tradition designates the greatest of their prophets. SEE MOHAMMED.

## Mustard[[@Headword:Mustard]]

             (σίναπι, Mat 13:31; Mat 17:20; Mar 4:31; Luk 13:19; Luk 17:6; in Talmudic Chaldee חִרְדָּל, chardal, Mishna, Shabb. 20:2, from the Syriac chardal,), a well-known pod-bearing shrub-like plant (genus Sinapis, of thirteen species, five of which are indigenous in Egypt, Descript. de l'Egypte, 19:96) that sometimes grows wild, and at other times is raised from the seed, which is employed as a condiment, being usually of the two kinds, the black and the white (see Penny Cyclopcedia, s.v. Sinapis). The Jews likewise cultivated mustard in their gardens (Mishna, Maaser. 4:6). The round kernels (Mat 13:31; Mat 17:20), which were used also by the ancients as a spice (Pliny, 19:54), passed in  Jewish phrase as an emblem for a small, insignificant object (Buxtorf, Lex. Talm. col. 822); being the smallest seed commonly gathered in Palestine, although not literally the most diminutive known. "The Lord in his popular teaching," says Trench (Notes on Parables, page 108), "adhered to the popular language" (see also the Koran, Sur. 31). The statements in Mat 13:32, that when fully grown it is the greatest of plants, and becomes a tree under which the fowls may find shelter, has been supposed to indicate a larger growth than ordinary in Western countries (see Margrave, Hist. nat. Brasil. Page 291; Bauhin, Hist. Plant. 2:855); but is confirmed by the statements of the Talmudists, one of whom describes it as a tree of which the wood was sufficient to cover a potter's shed (Talm. Hieros. Peah, 7:4), and another says that he was wont to climb into it, as men climb into a fig-tree (ib. Ketuboth, fol. 3:2; comp. Rosenmuller, Alterth. 4:105). Mr. Buckham (On the Mustard-tree of the Scriptures, 1829) cites the following from Alonzo de Orvallo's Travels in Chili (as given in Awnshaw and Churchill's Collection): "The mustard-plant thrives so rapidly that it is as big as one's arm, and so high and thick that it looks like a tree. I have travelled many leagues through mustard-groves which were taller than horse and man; and the birds built their nests in them as the Gospel mentions." The statement of Irby and Mangles has also been referred to (Lambert, in the Linncean Transactions, 17:450), that they found the mustard-plant (Sinapis nigra) growing wild between Beisan and Ajlun as high as their horses' heads. (See further in Celsii Hierobot. 2:253 sq.; Billerbeck, Flora class. page 172.) Prof. Hackett states that he was for a long time disappointed in his search for any specimens of the mustard answering to the requirements of the above texts of Scripture; but that while on his way across the plain of Akka, towards Carmel, he had the satisfaction of seeing a little forest-like field of these plants, in full blossom, from six to nine feet in height, with branches from each side of a trunk an inch or more thick; and that he actually witnessed the alighting of birds upon the stems (Illustra. of Script. Page 124). Dr. Thomson also (The Land and the Book, 2:100) says that he has seen the wild mustard on the rich plain of Akkar as tall as the horse and the rider.

Even these descriptions, however, seem hardly to come up to the ancient accounts of the plant in question. Hence the conclusion of Dr. Royle (in a paper read before the Royal Asiatic Society, March 16, 1844) has been preferred, who shows that there is a plant still known in the East by the  name of khardal (which corresponds to the rabbinical title, and is indeed the modern Arabic for "mustard"), growing near Jerusalem, but most abundantly on the banks of the Jordan and round the sea of Tiberias; its seed being employed as a substitute for mustard. The plant is the Salvadora Persica of Linnaeus (the Cissus' arborea of Forskal), a large shrub, or tree of moderate size, a native of the hot and dry parts of India, of Persia, and of Arabia. Dr. Roxburgh (Flor. Ind. 1:389 sq.) describes the berries as much smaller than a grain of black pepper, having a strong aromatic smell, and a taste much like that of garden cresses. The plant has a small seed, which produces a large tree with numerous branches, in which the birds of the air may take shelter. It is probably the tree which Irby and Mangles themselves suppose to be the mustard-tree of Scripture, rather than the ordinary shrub. They met with it while advancing towards Kerak, from the southern extremity of the Dead Sea. It bore its fruit in bunches resembling the currant; and the seeds had a pleasant, though strongly aromatic taste, nearly resembling mustard. A specimen of the tree had been brought home by Mr. W. Barker, and it had been ascertained by Messrs. Don and Lambert to be the Salvadora Persica of botanists; but both had written against its claim to be the mustard-tree of Scripture, while Mr. Frost, hearing a conversation on the subject, had supposed the tree to be a Phytolacca, and had hence maintained it to be the mustard-tree of Scripture, but without adducing proofs of any kind (Remarks on the Mustard-tree of the N.T. [Lond. 1827]; Bulletin des sciences nat. Mai, 1826, page 74; Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, ut sup.).

On the other hand, "Hiller, Celsius, Rosenmiiller, who all studied the botany of the Bible, and older writers, such as Erasmus, Zezerus, Grotius, are content to believe that some common mustard-plant is the plant of the parable. The objection commonly made against any Sinapis is that the seed grew into 'a tree' (δένδρον), or, as Luke has it, 'a great tree' (δένδρον μέγα), in the branches of which the fowls of the air are said to come and lodge. Now, in answer to the above objection, it is urged with great truth that the expression is figurative and Oriental, and that in a proverbial simile no literal accuracy is to be expected; it is an error, for which the language of Scripture is not accountable, to assert, as Dr. Royle and some others have done, that the passage implies that birds 'built their nests' in the tree; the Greek word κατασκηνόω has no such meaning, the word merely means 'to settle or rest upon' anything for a longer or shorter time; the  birds came, 'insidendi et versandi causa,' as Hiller (Hierophyt. 2:63) explains the phrase; nor is there ally occasion to suppose that the expression 'fowls of the air' denotes any other than the smaller insessorial kinds-linnets, finches, etc. and not the 'aquatic fowls by the lake-side, or partridges and pigeons hovering over the rich plain of Genesareth' which Prof. Stanley (S. and P. page 427) recognises as 'the birds that came and devoured the seed by the way-side' — for the larger birds are wild and avoid the way-side — or as those 'which took refuge in the spreading branches of the mustard-tree.' Hiller's explanation is probably the correct one; that the birds came and settled on the mustard-plant for the sake of the seed, of which they are very fond. Again, whatever the aivant may be, it is expressly said to be an herb, or, more properly, 'a garden herb' (λάχανον, olus).

As to the plant being called a 'tree' or a 'great tree,' the expression is not only an Oriental one, but it is clearly spoken with reference to some other thing; the σίναπι, with respect to the other herbs of the garden, may, considering the size to which it grows, justly be called 'a great tree,' though, of course, with respect to trees properly so named, it could not be called one at all. Now it is clear from Scripture that the σίναπι was cultivated in our Lord's time, the seed a 'man took and sowed in his field;' Luke says, 'cast into his garden:' if, then, the wild plant on the rich plain of Akkar grows as high as a man on horseback, it might attain to the same or a greater height when in a cultivated garden; and if, as lady Callcott has observed, we take into account the very low plants and shrubs upon which birds often roost, it will readily be seen that some common mustard-plant is able to fulfil all the scriptural demands. As to the story of the rabbi Simeon ben-Calaphtha having in his garden a mustard-plant into which he was accustomed to climb as men climb into a fig-tree, it can only be taken for what Talmudical statements generally are worth, and must be quite insufficient to afford grounds for any argument.

But it may be asked, Why not accept the explanation that the Salvadora Persica is the tree denoted?-a tree which will literally meet all the demands of the parable. Because, we answer, where the commonly received opinion can be shown to be in full accordance with the scriptural allusions, there is no occasion to be dissatisfied with it; and again, because at present we know nothing certain of the occurrence of the Salvadora Persica in Palestine, except that it occurs in the small tropical low valley of Engedi, near the Dead Sea, whence Dr. Hooker saw specimens, but it is evidently of rare occurrence. Mr. Ameuny says he had seen it all along the banks of the Jordan, near the lake of Tiberias and Damascus; but this statement is certainly erroneous.  We know from Pliny, Dioscorides, and other Greek and Roman writers, that mustard-seeds were much valued, and were used as a condiment; but it is more probable that the Jews of our Lord's time were in the habit of making a similar, use of the seeds of some common mustard (Sinapis) than that they used to plant in their gardens the seeds of a tree which certainly cannot fulfil the scriptural demand of being called 'a pot-herb."' Dr. Tristram likewise (Nat. Hist. of the Bible, page 472 sq.) takes strong ground in favor of the common black mustard and against the Salvadora Persica. See Kitto, Pict. Bible, note on Luk 17:6.

## Mustitani[[@Headword:Mustitani]]

             is the name of a small and obscure sect of Donatists, condemned by the three hundred and ten bishops of that schism who met at Bagai or Vaya, in Numidia, A.D. 398. See Augustine, Contra Epist. Parneniani, lib. 3, cap. 29.

## Musurus, Marcus[[@Headword:Musurus, Marcus]]

             a learned Italian ecclesiastic, was a native son the island of Candia; emigrated to Venice about the end of the 15th century, and taught Greek in that city with great success. Afterwards he proceeded to Rome, where Leo X showed him great favor, and nominated him bishop of Epidaurus, in the Morea. He had been just invested with this distinction when he died at Rome in 1517. He published the first edition of Athenseus, printed by Aldus (Venice, 1514). Musurus published also the Etymologicum Magnum Grcecum (Venice, 1499, fol.; reprinted in 1549, in 1594, and in 1710), and some Greek epigrams and other poetry, among them a poem in praise of Plato, prefixed to his edition of that ,philosopher's works, and translated into Latin verse by Zenobio Acciaioli, Carmen in Platonem (Cambridge, 1797).

## Mutevel[[@Headword:Mutevel]]

             the president or chief ruler of a Mohammedan mosque in Turkey, into whose hands the revenue is regularly paid.

## Muth, Placidus[[@Headword:Muth, Placidus]]

             a German Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Poppenhausen, near Schweinfurt, December 30, 1753; received his education at Wtirzburg and Erfurt; then entered, at the age of twenty-four, a convent near Erfurt, and  was ordained to the priesthood in 1783. In 1794 he was elected abbot of Bischofsrode and Frankenrode, under the title of Placidus the Second, and also provost at Celle. In 1797, after introducing to the prince-elector of Mentz the idea of a more thorough education in convents, he was appointed archiepiscopal counsellor; but his idea was never carried out, and he went, after the secularization of his convent, to Erfurt, where he was appointed chief counsellor of schools and government, and also director of the gymnasium at that place. He died in 1821. His most important works are, Disquisitio historico-critica in bigamiam Comitis de Gleichen, cujus monumentum est in ecclesia S. Petri Erfordiae; una cum systematica theologiae catholicae synopsi (Erfordiae, 1788, 8vo): — Ueber die Verhaltnisse der Philosophie und Theologie nach Kantischen Grundsitzen (ibid. 1791, 8vo): — Progr. de novis perantiquae Universitatis incrementis, de castris Thuringicis, quae vulgo Comitum de Gleichen dicuntur, nec non de pluribus simulacris Universitati litterarum Erfordiensi dono datis. Particula i et ii (ibid. 1812-13, 4to): — Gedachtnissfeier der Befreiung Pius VII aus der Gefangenschoft zu Fontainebleau und seine Ruckkehr in seine Staaten (ibid. 1814, 8vo). See Doring, Gelehrte theol. Deutschlands, s.v.

## Muth, Rufus[[@Headword:Muth, Rufus]]

             SEE MUTIANUS.

## Muth-labben[[@Headword:Muth-labben]]

             (Hebrew, fully, al muth labben', עִלאּמוּת לִבֵּן, upon- the death to the son; Sept. ὑπὲρ τῶν κρυφίων τοῦ νἱοῦ; Vulg. pro occultis filii; Auth. Ver. " upon Muth-labben"), a phrase occurring only in the title of Psalms 9. The following are conjectures that have been made regarding its import:

1. Perhaps the favorite opinion of modern critics, of Gesenius and De Wette among the rest, is to connect the Hebrew words so as to read 'almuth labben, "with the voice of virgins [to be sung] by boys." But, granting the lawfulness of this critical effort, there is considerable difficulty in extracting the translation desiderated. The word 'alamoth does occur in probably some such meaning (Psalms 46, title; 1Ch 15:20); and it has been preferred by critics who modify the opinion now under consideration, to the extent of arriving at this word by altering the vowel- points as well as the division of the words. SEE ALAMOTH.

Yet, after doing so, they have to face an awkward difficulty, arising from the absence  of the preposition 'al, "upon;" since they require this little word to become the first syllable of their noun. It is evident that the Sept. and Vulgate must have read עִל עֲלֻמוֹת, "concerning the mysteries," and so the Arabic and Ethiopic versions. The Targum, Symmachus (περὶ θανάτου τοῦ υἱοῦ), and Jerome (super morte filii), in his translation of the Hebrew, adhered to the received text, while Aquila (νεανιότητος τοῦ υἱοῦ), retaining the consonants as they at present stand, read al-muth as one word, עִלְמוּת, "youth," which would be the regular form of the abstract noun, though it does not occur in Biblical Hebrew. In support of the reading עלמותas one word, we have the authority of twenty-eight of Kennicott's MSS., and the assertion of Jarchi that he had seen it so written, as in Psa 48:14, in the Great Masorah. If the reading of the Vulgate and Sept. be correct with regard to the consonants, the words might be pointed thus, עִל עֲלָמוֹת, 'al 'alamoth, " upon Alamoth," as in the title of Psalms 46; and לבןis possibly a fragment of לַבְנֵי קֹרִח, libney Korach, "for the sons of Korah," which appears in the same title.

2. It has been very common to suppose that there is here the name of a person. The Jewish commentator Kimchi, according to Gesenius, mentions that some explained it, "upon the death of Labben," a person wholly unknown. But commonly the first syllable of labben has been taken to be the ordinary Hebrew prefix preposition, "to, for, concerning." The Targum renders the title of the psalm, "On the death of the man who came forth from between (בֵּין) the camps," alluding to Goliath, the Philistine champion (אַישׁ הִבֵּינִיַם, 1Sa 17:4). That David composed the psalm as a triumphal song upon the slaughter of his gigantic adversary was a tradition which is mentioned by Kimchi merely as an on dit. An old opinion, maintained at present by Furst, is that it should be translated "upon the death of Ben," who is named among the Levites appointed to preside over the music at the removal of the ark to its resting-place (1Ch 15:18), while he is not named in the narrative of the actual removal; indeed, his place seems to be filled by another Azaziah (1Ch 15:20-21); and we are reminded of the sudden death of Uzzah, when the removal was attempted on an earlier occasion Hengstenberg. however, has revived an old opinion of Grotius — originally mentioned, but not adopted, by Jarchi — that Labben is transposed for Nabal, yet not so much with reference to the individual man as with reference to " the fool," which is emphatically noticed as the meaning of his name; and he thinks the psalm  refers a good deal to the end of the wicked. Donesh supposes that Labben was the name of the man who warred with David in those days, and to whom reference is made as "the wicked" in 1Ch 15:5. Arama (quoted by Dr. Gill in his Exposition) identifies him with Saul. Jarchi says that some regarded Labben as the name of a foreign prince who made war upon the Israelites, and upon whose overthrow this song of praise was composed.

3. The word ben being the common Hebrew word for "son," and so translated in this title by the ancient versions generally, the translation has been offered, "upon the death of the son," or "upon dying in reference to the son," viz. David's son Absalom, for whom it is recorded that he wept and mourned passionately (2Sa 18:33). The renderings of the Sept. and Vulgate induced the early Christian commentators to refer the psalm to the Messiah. Augustine understands "the son" as "the only- begotten Son of God." The Syriac version is quoted in support of this interpretation, but the titles of the Psalms in that version are generally constructed without any reference to the Hebrew, and therefore it cannot be appealed to as an authority.

4. As in the case of other titles of the Psalms, this has been taken to be a musical instrument, or more commonly and probably the name of an air to which the psalm was sung. This title might then be translated, "upon dying [which has happened] to the son," or "upon 'Die for the son."' So Hupfeld, that it was the commencement of an old song, signifying "death to the son." Delitzsch adopts this sort of explanation, but translates differently, "upon 'Death makes white.' Hitzig and others regard it as an abbreviation containing a reference to Psa 48:14. According to Jarchi, "this song is of the distant future when the childhood and youth of Israel shall be made white (יתלבן), and their righteousness be revealed and their salvation draw nigh, when Esau and his seed shall be blotted out." He takes עִלְמוּתas one word, signifying "youth," and לִבֵּן= לְלִבֵּן, “to whiten." Menahem, a commentator quoted by Jarchi, interprets the title as addressed "to the musician upon the stringed instruments called Alamoth, to instruct," taking לִבֵּןas if it were לְהָבַיןor לְבוֹנֵן. The difficulty of the question is sufficiently indicated by the explanation which Gesenius hinself (Thes. page 741 a) was driven to adopt, that the title of the psalm signified that it was "to be chanted by boys with virgins' voices," i.e., in the soprano. (Comp. the briefer form, "unto death," Psa 48:9). SEE PSALMS.

## Mutianus, Rufus Conradus[[@Headword:Mutianus, Rufus Conradus]]

             a distinguished German scholar, and head of the Erfurt humanists, was born at Homburg October 15, 1471. His family name was Mudt, or Muth, but according to the literary fashion of the age he changed it to Mutianus. His parents lived in easy circumstances, and gave him a careful education. He entered the celebrated school of Alex. Hegius at Deventer, where he had for schoolfellow a youth named Gerhardus Gerhardi, who afterwards became celebrated throughout Europe as Desiderius Erasmus. Mutianus displayed so much talent at Deventer that it was predicted that some day he would be reckoned among the most learned men in Germany. When fifteen years old he entered the University of Erfurt, and in 1492 graduated as magister artium. Desirous of enjoying the best educational advantages, he then went to Italy, and took his degree as doc. jur. can. at Bologna. In 1502 he returned home, and was appointed to a very lucrative position at the ducal court of Hesse. But he soon resigned, preferring a small position at Gotha, which gave him ample time for study. He received an annual salary of sixty florins (about twenty dollars), but was so well satisfied with this modest remuneration that he could not be prevailed upon to accept another position. The inscription, "Beata tranquillitas," which he placed outside, and "Bonis cuncta pateant," which he placed inside of his house, is significant. He preferred not to publish anything except a few epigrams; but his letters, directed to his friends, are of great historic value, and show the superior critical mind of the man. They are preserved in manuscript at the Frankfort City Library, and have been in part edited by W.E. Tetzel in Supplem. historiae Gothanae (Jenme, 1704), volume 1. Mutianus was a humanist, but humanism was, in his opinion, only a means to the end. It served him as an introduction into the study of moral philosophy and theology, and, like his great contemporary, Erasmus, he placed himself in decided opposition to scholastic theology and Church abuses generally. He was one of the literary precursors of the Reformation, and as such contributed largely to prepare the minds of literary men throughout Germany for a rupture with Rome. The modest George Spalatin, jun., was an intimate friend and pupil of his; and when Spalatin was called to Wittenberg in 1508, he dismissed him thus:

"Ito bonis avibus dextro pede sidere fausto

Felix optatum carpe viator iter.

Aula patet, Spalatine! tibi tribuntur honores,

Ito praetereant qun nocitura putas."

Mutianus came into intimate connections with the Erfurt humanists, and the Erfurt scholars visited him frequently (see C. Krause, Euric. Condus. [Hanau, 1863]), esteeming him as their head and leader. He outran his generation in thought, but lagged behind it in action. He at first hailed Luther with joy, but in 1521 he withdrew his support from the Reformers. He decided to remain in the Church of Rome, and is said to have lived in such poverty that he was obliged to beg for bread. He died on Good- Friday, 1526. It has been well said that Mutianus was a Reformer until the Reformation became a fearful reality. He was a learned, ingenious, amiable, timid, irresolute man, whose soul did not partake of the energy of his intellectual faculties. See Strauss, Ulrich v. Hutten, 1:42 sq.; 2:336 sq.; Kampfschulte, Die Universitit Erfurt in ihrem VIerhaltniss zu d. Humwalismus un.d d. Reformat. (TIrves, 1858) 1:74 sq.; 2:227 sq.

## Mutianus, Scholasticus[[@Headword:Mutianus, Scholasticus]]

             SEE MUCIANUS.

## Mutilation Of Self[[@Headword:Mutilation Of Self]]

             SEE BODY, MUTILATION OF THE.

## Mutiles de Runic[[@Headword:Mutiles de Runic]]

             SEE SKOPSIS.

## Mutschelle, Sebastian[[@Headword:Mutschelle, Sebastian]]

             a German Roman Catholic theologian, was born January 18, 1749, at Altershausen, Bavaria. He was educated at Munich, entered in 1765 the Order of Jesus, and completed his education at Ingolstadt in 1776. He was then appointed vicar at Mattigkofen, and in 1779 canon of the convent of St. Veit at Freysingen, and ecclesiastical counsellor of the consistory, also school commissioner at the same place. Several difficulties into which he was drawn by publications of his made it agreeable to him to resign his clerical position, and he gave himself up to literary labors, especially the preparation of several works. He also taught privately Latin, French, and the fine arts. In this period (1784-86) he published Geschichte Jesu aus den vier Evangelisten, also Kenntniss und Liebe des Schipfers aus der Betrachtung der Geschopfe, and Bemerkunyen iuber die sammtlichen Evangelien (of this a second edition was published in 1790). In the midst of all his literary work he was surprised by the renomination to his former positions by Max Procop, count of Torring; but he yet found leisure time for literary work, and published in 1791 and 1792, Unterredung eines Vaters mit seinen Sohnen uber die ersten Grundwahrheiten der  christlichen Religion, and Christkutholischer Unterricht, wie man gut und selig werden konne. The first fruit of his thorough knowledge of Kant was his work, Ueber das sittliche Gut (1788). But again his enemies were at work to get him out of his position, and found a good opportunity to work against him, as he asked the different convents for contributions towards a continual fund for his remodelled schools. Mutschelle again resigned his position in 1793, but was appointed pastor at Baumkirchen, near Munich. This position afforded much leisure time, which he filled up by literary work. He then published Bemerkungen uber diefesttiglichen Evangelien; also Kritische Beitrage zur Metaphysik. In 1799 he was also appointed professor at the university at Munich, which position he assumed with an oration: Was soll die, Schulefiur die Welt sein? He died November 28, 1800. He has published, besides the works already mentioned, Geburts und Jugendgeschichte Jesu (Munich, 1784, 8vo): — Ueber das sittliche Gut (ibid. 1786, 2 volumes, 8vo): — Oratio ante electionem neo-Episcopi ac Principis cathedralis Ecclesiae Frisingensis, die 26 Maji habita (Frisingse, 1788, 4to): — Die heiligen Schriften des Neuen Testaments, iibersetzt (Munich, 1789-90, 2 volumes, large 8vo): — Vermischte Schriften (ibid. 1793-98, 4 volumes, sm. 8vo): — Kritische Beitrage zur Metaphysik, in einer Prii. fung der Stattlerisch-Anti-Kantischen (ibid. 1795, 8vo): — Moral theologie oder theologische Moral, vorzuglich zum Gebrauchfur seine Vorlesungen (ibid. 1801-2,2 vols. large 8vo): — Ueber Kantische Philosophie (Munich, 1799-1803). See Krug, Philosophisches Lexikon, s.v.; Doring, Gelehrte Theologen Deutschlands, 2:636-644.

## Mutter[[@Headword:Mutter]]

             (מִהְגַּים, mahgim, mutterers), in Isa 8:19, refers to the murmuring or indistinct enunciation of wizards and soothsayers in uttering their spells. SEE DIVINATION.

## Muttra[[@Headword:Muttra]]

             a sacred town of the Hindus, is the capital of a district of the same name, ninety-seven miles southsouth-east of Delhi, on the right bank of the Jumna. Access is had to the river — which is considered by the Hindus to have special sanctity — by numerous ghats, ornamented with little temples; and its banks are every morning and evening crowded by devotees of all ages and both sexes to perform their religious exercises. In Hindu mythology it is regarded as the birthplace of Krishna (q.v.). In honor of the monkey-god Hanuman, monkeys are here protected and fed, being allowed to swarm everywhere. There are also a great number of sacred bulls at large without owners.

## Mutunus[[@Headword:Mutunus]]

             a deity among the ancient Romans who averted evil from the city and commonwealth of Rome. He was identical with the Phallus or Priapus, who chiefly delivered from the power of daemons. Mutunus had a temple inside the walls of Rome, which existed until the time of Augustus, when it was removed outside.

## Mutzenbecher, Esdras Heinrich[[@Headword:Mutzenbecher, Esdras Heinrich]]

             a German theologian, was born at Hamburg March 23, 1744. He was educated at Hamburg and Gottingen, then acted for a while as tutor of the children of the baron of Steinberg. In 1774 he was appointed assistant of the ecclesiastical faculty and second minister of the university church at Gottingen, and while there he published his Philologische Bibliothek. In 1775 he was called as pastor to the evangelical church at the Hague, and in 1778 was appointed chief minister of all evangelical Lutheran congregations at Amsterdam, and in 1789 general superintendent and counsellor of the consistory of Oldenburg, where he died, December 21, 1801. His most important works are, J.C. Biel Novus Thesaurus philologicus sive Lexicon in lxx et alios interpretes et scriptores apocryphos Veteris Testamenti (Haga Comitum, 1779-80, 3 volumes, large  8vo): — Gesangbuch zur offentlichen und hauslichen Andacht fur das Herzogthum Oldenburg, nebst einem Anhange von Gebeten (Oldenburg, 1791, 8vo): — Der Kleine Katechismus Dr. Martin Luther's nach den funf Hauptstucken, mit kurzen Anmerkungen fur Lehrer und Schuler (ibid. 1797, 12mo): — Gebete (Bremen, 1801, 8vo). See Doring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands, s.v.

## Muurling, Willem[[@Headword:Muurling, Willem]]

             a Dutch theologian, who died at the Hague, December 9, 1882, doctor of theology, was professor of theology at Groningen, and one of the founders of the Groningen school. In later years he became the leader of the so- called liberal theologians.. He published, besides, a work on Practical Theology, (2d ed. 1860, 2 volumes): — Oratio de Wesseli Ganfortii: (Amsterdam, 1840), and a series of essays in the Groningen periodical Waarheid en Liefde. (B.P.)

## Muza, Ibn-Noseir[[@Headword:Muza, Ibn-Noseir]]

             SEE SPAIN.

## Muzel, Philipp Ludwig[[@Headword:Muzel, Philipp Ludwig]]

             a Reformed theologian of Germany, was born November 24, 1756, at Prenzlau, and died December 31, 1831, doctor and professor of theology,.  member of consistory, superintendent and pastor of the Reformed Church at Frankfort-on-the-Oder. He published, Ueber die Verpflichtung auf die symbolischen Bucher der evangelischen Kirche (Berlin, 1831): — Vorlesungen uber Christenthum und Deismus (Dantzic, 1794): Christophilos (Berlin, 1830): — Ueber den Glauben an die im Neuen Testament erzdihlten Wunder (Elberfeld, 1815). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:336, 385, 393, 463; 2:38; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:923 sq. (B.P.).

## Muziano, Girolamo[[@Headword:Muziano, Girolamo]]

             a distinguished Italian painter, was born at Acquafredda, near Brescia, in 1528. He painted a number of Biblical and religious subjects, one of which, the Resurrection of Lazarus, was greatly admired by Michael Angelo, who pronounced him one of the greatest painters of his time. Muziano is chiefly celebrated by his efforts to advance the art of working in mosaics, which, up to this period, was merely an ornamental art of inlaying stones, but which he perfected almost to a rivalry with painting. He was a great favorite with pope Gregory XIII, who employed him to paint a picture of St. Paul the hermit, and another of St. Anthony, for the church of St. Peter. Sixtus V also held Muziano in esteem, and intrusted to him the designs for the bass-reliefs of the column of Trajan. At the instance of this artist, pope Gregory founded the Academy of St. Luke, which Sixtus confirmed by a brief; and Muziano gave two houses to the institution. He also built the Capella Gregoriana at Rome. He died at Rome in 1590, and was buried in the church of Santa Maria Maggiore, near the spot where his picture of the Resurrection of Lazarus was placed. Many of his pictures have been engraved. His celebrated picture, Christ Washing the Feet of his Disciples, which is in the cathedral at Rheims, has been engraved by Desplaces. See Lanzi, Hist. of Painting, transl. by Roscoe (Lond. 1847, 3 volumes, 8vo), 1:417; 2:184; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts (N. Y. 1865, 2 vols. 8vo); Jameson and Eastlake, Hist. of' Our Lord (Lond. 1864, 2 volumes, 8vo), 1:361.

## Muzio (or Mutio), Girolamo Nuzio[[@Headword:Muzio (or Mutio), Girolamo Nuzio]]

             an Italian writer, noted for his opposition to the Reformation and its adherents, and hence surnamed "Malleus Hereticonsum," was born at Padua in 1496 and died in 1576. He wrote several polemical treatises  against Luther, and various other works in prose and verse, none of which are of any value in our day except as literary curiosities. See Tiraboschi, Storia della Litterature Italiana, s.v.

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

             an Italian theologian, was born in 1749, and was educated at the college at Prato. He was then ordained, and entered the Order of Jesus, but was compelled to leave it five years after, as he was appointed canon at Ferrara; he was afterwards director of the college at Parma, and finally was called by pope Pius VI to Rome to take the position as thelologiau of the Poenitentiaria. He published while there several works against the irreligiousness of his time. He was in 1809 transported to Paris by the French, on account of his opposition to the Bonapartists, and there he died in 1815. His most important works are, 11 buon uso della Logica in materia della Religione, transl. into French and Latin: — L'Emilio disingannato contra Rousseau: — Influenza de' Romani Pontefici nel governo di Roma avanti Curlo Magno: — Memorie del Giaicobinismo: — dissertationes selectae, de auctoritate Romani Pontificis in Conciliis Generalibus, etc.

## Muzzle[[@Headword:Muzzle]]

             (חָסִם, chasam', to step the nostrils, as in Eze 39:11). In the East grain is usually thrashed by sheaves being spread out quite thick on a level spot, over which oxen, cows, and younger cattle are driven, till by continued treading they press out the grain. One of the injunctions of the Mosaic code is, "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn" (Deu 25:4). From the monuments we learn that the ancient Egyptians likewise suffered the ox to tread out the corn unmuzzled. "The origin of this benevolent law," says Michaelis, "with regard to beasts, is seemingly deducible from certain moral feelings or sentiments prevalent among the people of the early ages. They thought it hard that a person should be employed in the collection of edible and savory things, and have them continually before his eyes, without being permitted once to taste them; and there is in fact a degree of cruelty in placing a person in such a situation; for the sight of such dainties is tormenting, and the desire to partake of them increases with the risk of the prohibition. Add to this that, by prohibitions of this nature, the moral character of servants and day- laborers, to the certain injury of their masters' interests, seldom fails to  become corrupted, for the provocation of appetite at the sight of forbidden gratification will, with the greater number, undoubtedly overpower all moral suggestions as to right or wrong. They will learn to help themselves without leave. Therefore when Moses, in the terms of this benevolent custom, ordained that the ox was not to be muzzled while thrashing, it would seem that it was not merely his intention to provide for the welfare of that animal, but to enjoin with the greater force and effect that a similar right should be allowed to human laborers. He specified the ox as the lowest example, and what held good in reference to him was to be considered as so much the more obligatory in reference to man." Comp. Hos 10:11; 1Co 9:9-11; 1Ti 5:18. This ancient Mosaic law, allowing the ox, as long as he is employed in thrashing, to eat both the grain and the straw, is still observed in the East. Prof. Robinson, when at Jericho, in 1838, observed the process of thrashing by oxen, cows, and younger cattle. He says, "The precept of Moses, 'Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn,' was not very well regarded by our Christian friends; many of their animals having their mouths tied up; while among the Mohammedans I do not remember ever to have seen an animal muzzled. This precept serves to show that of old, as well as at the present day, only neat cattle were usually employed to tread out the grain." SEE THRESHING.

## Mwetyi[[@Headword:Mwetyi]]

             a Great Spirit venerated by the Shekani and Bakele people in Southern Guinea. The following account of him is given by Mr. Wilson in his Western Africa: "He is supposed to dwell in the bowels of the earth, but comes to the surface of the ground at stated seasons, or when summoned on any special business. A large, flat house, of peculiar form, covered with dry plantain-leaves, is erected in the middle of the village for the temporary sojourn of this spirit, and it is from this building that he gives forth his oracular answers. The house is always kept perfectly dark. and no one is permitted to enter it except those who have been initiated into all the mysteries of the order, which includes, however, almost the whole of the adult male population of the village. Strange noises issue forth from this dark den, not unlike the growling of a tiger, which the knowing ones interpret to suit their own purposes. The women and children are kept in a state of constant trepidation; and, no doubt, one of the chief ends of the ceremonies connected with the visits of this mysterious being is to keep the women and children in a state of subordination. He is the great African  Bluebeard, whom every woman and child in the country holds in the utmost dread. Every boy, from the age of fourteen to eighteen, is initiated into all the secrets pertaining to this Great Spirit. The term of discipleship is continued for a year or more, during which period they are subjected to a good deal of rough treatment — such undoubtedly, as makes a lasting impression both upon their physical and mental natures, and prevents them from divulging the secrets of the order. At the time of matriculation a vow is imposed, such as refraining from a particular article of food or drink, and is binding for life. When Mwetyi is about to retire from a village where he has been discharging his manifold functions, the women and children, and any strangers who may be there at the time, are required to leave the village. What ceremonies are performed at this time is known, of course, only to the initiated. When a covenant is about to be performed among the different tribes, Mwetyi is always invoked as a witness, and is commissioned with the duty of visiting vengeance upon the party who shall violate the engagement. Without this their national treaties would have little or no force. When a law is passed which the people wish to be specially binding, they invoke the vengeance of Mwetvi upon every transgression; and this, as a general thing, is ample guarantee for its observance. The Mpongwee people sometimes call in thee Shekanis to aid them, through the agency of this Great Spirit, to give sanctity and authority to their laws."

## Mycalessia[[@Headword:Mycalessia]]

             a surname of the goddess Demeter, or Ceres, derived from Mycalessus, in Bceotia, where she was worshipped.

## Myconius[[@Headword:Myconius]]

             (also known as Geisshiisler, his name before he joined the Protestants), Oswald, a Swiss Protestant theologian, was born at Lucerne in 1488, and was educated at Basle. He taught for a while, accepting first a call to Zurich as director of a school; but he was only three months there when he was recalled to his native place to take charge of the high school. Taking a leading part in the new doctrine, which had just made its appearance, he was in 1523 again discharged, and returned to Zurich to his old position. When Zwingle was killed at the battle of Kappel, and the citizens of Zurich became rather careless towards theological science, Myconius returned to Basle, where he was appointed deacon at St. Alban, chief minister of the city of Basle, and professor of the New Testament. He resigned the latter position in 1541, and died October 14, 1552. Myconius was a true confessor of Zwingle's doctrine. He was largely instrumental in the publication of the Basle Confession, and for the sake of a union of all Protestant interests favored the Helvetian Confession of 1536. His tolerance towards Lutherans on their consubstantiation doctrine subjected him to many trials from the Zwinglians, who often, though unjustly, questioned his faithfulness to them. His most important works are, Narratio de vita et obitu Zwingli:—Tractatus de liberis rite educandis:- De crapula et ebrietate. See Melchior Adam, Vitce Theolog. German. (Heidelberg, 1620), p. 223 sq.; Merle d'Aubigne, Hist. of the Ref. in Switzerland; Kirchhofer, Leben 0. Myconius des Reformators (1814); Hagenbach, Leben u. Schriften der Va/ter u. Begriinder der reform. Kirche (Elberf. 1857, 8vo), 2:309-447. (J.H.W.)

## Myconius, Friedrich[[@Headword:Myconius, Friedrich]]

             an intimate friend of Luther, and one of the Reformers of the 16th century, was born at Lichtenfels, Franconia, December 26, 1491, of religious parents, and was educated at Annaberg. He joined the Franciscans at that place in 1510. While in that body he vainly strove to. satisfy the yearnings of his heart by diligent application to his monastic duties and the study of such works as Peter Lombard's Migister Seetentiarumn, the writings of Alexander of Hales, Bonaventura, Gabriel Biel, and even Lyra's Biblical commentaries. Finally, Luther's ninety-five theses fell into his hands. He at once adopted the principles therein contained. In the mean time he was successively sent to the convents of Leipsic and of Weimar in 1512, and  was ordained priest in 1516. But, since he had openly declared himself in favor of the evangelical doctrines, he had to undergo all sorts of annoyances from his superiors. He remained steadfast, however, strengthening himself by secretly reading the works of Luther in company with his convent associate Voit. Finally, his superiors contemplating his removal to Annaberg, he fled, and soon after (in 1524) appeared at Zwickau as an evangelical preacher. In the same year he was sent to Gotha by duke Johann to introduce the Reformation, and met with great success in this difficult task. He paid particular attention to the schools. In connection with Melancthon, Justus Menius, Christopher von Planitz, Georg von Wangenheim, and Johann Cotta, he made two visitations to Thuringia; in 1528 and in 1533, to improve the organization of the churches and schools. He took part also in the conferences of Marburg (1529), Wittenberg (1536), Smalcald (1537), Nuremberg, Frankfort (1539), and Hagenau (1540), in which he was often in contact with Melancthon. He was attached as theologian to the embassy sent by the elector to king Henry VIII in 1538 for the purpose of introducing the Reformation into England. On the death of duke George, Myconius, together with Cruciger, Pfeffinger, and M. Balthasar. was intrusted with the mission of introducing the Reformation into Saxony, and particularly into Leipsic. Yet he always remained especially attached to Gotha and Thuringia. In the former city he founded the afterwards celebrated gymnasium, and he used every exertion to procure for institutions of learning the necessary endowments. His health failing in 1541, he wrote to Luther that he was "sick, not unto death, but unto life." But he recovered, and, according to Luther's prayer, outlived him several months. He died April 7, 1546. Myconius was an active writer, but most of his productions were pamphlets and letters; his chronicle of Gotha was published by S. Cyprian under the title Fr. Myconii historia Reformationis (1715). Biographies of Myconius are to be found in Melchior Adam, Vitae Theologorum (Frankf. 1705, volume 1); Sagittarii Historia Gothana (Jena, 1700); Junker, Redivivus Myconius (Waltershausen, 1730); Brickner, Kirchen-u. Schulestaat d. Herzogthums Gotha (1753, I, 1:41 sq.); Ledderhose, Mykonius (Gotha, 1854); Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 10:137; Middleton, Evangel. Bwig. 1:250; Hardwick, Church History, Reformation, pages 110, 114, 119. (J.N.P.)

## Myers, Benjamin F[[@Headword:Myers, Benjamin F]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Chillicothe, Ohio, April 19, 1801. He was converted at the early age of nine years, and identified himself with the Methodists. In 1833 he was admitted into the Ohio Conference, and for ten years filled charges respectively in Wooster, Somerset, Cambridge, Newark, Granville, and Hebron. His health failing, he retired from ministerial life, and became judge of Licking County, Ohio. In 1850 he migrated to California, and in 1857 joined the California Conference, where for the next twelve years he was actively engaged in Christian work in Suttee County, Weaverville, Jackson, Coloma, Cacheville, Bodeya-Vallejo, Centreville, Woodbridge, and Linden. He was superannuated in 1869, and from that time until his death, which occurred  in Stockton, California, July 18, 1874, gave himself to the work of re- examining the structures of the Christian Church against the attacks of infidelity and scientific research. See Minutes of Annual conferences, 1874, page 112.

## Myers, Lewis[[@Headword:Myers, Lewis]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in the vicinity of Indian Fields, Colleton District, S.C. He was of German extraction. He obtained his education in an academy near Washington, Georgia, and became an itinerant preacher in 1799 in South Carolina, preaching on the Little Peedee and Anson Circuit. In 1800 he was appointed to the Orangeburg Circuit. In 1801 he was appointed to the Bush River and Cherokee Circuit, having been ordained deacon by bishop Asbury. In 1802 he was stationed in the Broad River Circuit. In 1803 he was ordained elder, and changed to the Little River Circuit. In 1804 and 1805 he was respectively at Ogeechee and Bladen circuits. In 1806 he was at Charleston. In 1807, 1808, and 1809 he was presiding elder of the Seleuda District; in 1810, 1811, 1812, and 1813, of the Ogeechee District; and in 1814, 1815, 1816, and 1817, of the Oconee District. In 1818 and 1819 he was stationed at Charleston. In 1820, 1821, 1822. and 1823 he was presiding elder of the Edisto District. In 1824 he was stationed at Georgetown. Having labored incessantly for a quarter of a century, he was appointed in 1825 as supernumerary on the Effingham Circuit, a spasmodic asthma rendering him unfit for more active work. He was finally made superannuate, and settled at Goshen, Effingham County, Georgia, where he died, November 16, 1851. From the time of his retirement from active service until his death he was busily engaged with a school, and occasionally preached. Lewis Myers was well known among the Methodists for his wise, pithy, and practical remarks. His style of preaching was direct and forcible, with very little ornament of gesture; his illustrations often bordered on the humorous, from the quaintness with which the subject was represented. See Dr. James Osgood Andrew, in Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 7:321 sq.

## Myesis[[@Headword:Myesis]]

             (μύησις, initiation), a designation of baptism among the Greek fathers, because they considered it to be the admittance of men to all the sacred rites and mysteries of the Christian religion. This term, as well as  μυσταγωγία, of frequent occurrence in the writings of Cyril of Jerusalem, was intimately connected with the secret discipline, and fell into disuse with the termination of that system.

## Myiagros[[@Headword:Myiagros]]

             a hero who was invoked at the festival of Athene, celebrated at Aliphera, as the protector against flies.

## Myles, John[[@Headword:Myles, John]]

             a minister of the Anglican establishment, who flourished during the colonial period of this country, was born in England about the latter half of the 17th century. He migrated to America, and in 1689 succeeded Mr. Radcliff as rector of the Episcopal church that is now known as King's Chapel, Boston. In 1692 he returned to England for aid for his people. In 1696 he again came to America, bringing with him much Church furniture, and several costly gifts from queen Mary and king William. He died about 1726. See Anderson, Hist. of the Colonial Church, 2:681, 682; 3:539, 540, 582, 594.

## Mylitta[[@Headword:Mylitta]]

             (perhaps = מילדת, Genitrix, "who causes to bear"), a name which, according to Herodotus (1:131), was given by the Assyrians to the goddess Aphrodite as the generative principle in nature. "She was apparently worshipped among the Babylonians, who gradually spread her worship through Assyria and Persia. She was originally, like almost every other mythological deity, a cosmic symbol, and represented the female portion of the twofold principle through which all creation bursts into existence, and which alone, by its united active and passive powers, upholds it. Mylitta is to a certain degree the representative of Earth. the mother, who conceives from the Sun Bel or Baal. Mylitta and Baal together are considered the type of the Beneficent. Procreation thus being the basis of Mylitta's office in nature, the act itself became a kind of worship to her, and was hallowed through and for her Thus it came to pass that every Babylonian woman had once in her life to give herself up to a stranger, and thereby considered her person consecrated to the great goddess. The sacrifice itself seems, especially in the early stage of its introduction among the divine rites of the primitive Babylonians, to have had much less of the repulsiveness which, in the eyes of highly cultivated nations, must be attached to it; and it was only  in later days that it gave rise to the proverbial Babylonian lewdness. Herodotus's account of this subject must, like almost all his other stories, be received with great caution" (Chambers). In Babylonia this goddess was called Beltis or Bilit, i.e., "the Lady." She is commonly represented as the wife of Bel Nimrod (Belus), and the mother of his son Nin, though she is also called the wife of her son Nin. She united the characteristics of the classical divinities Juno, Venus, and Diana. Mylitta had temples at Nineveh, Ur, Erech, Nipur, and Babylon. The Baaltis of the Phoenicians was the same in name and character. The young women of Byblos, like those of Babylon, sacrificed in her service their virginity, and gave the price they received to the temple of the goddess. The Derceto of Ascalon, the Ashera of the Hebrews, and the Ishtar of the Babylonians were kindred divinities. SEE ASHTORETI.

## Mylius, Ernst Friedlich[[@Headword:Mylius, Ernst Friedlich]]

             a German theologian, was born at Liihe June 10, 1710. He was educated by his uncle Mushard, afterwards at the gymnasium at Bremen, and it the university at Helmstadt, and finished his education in 1734 at Jena. He was appointed in 1738 minister at the " Johannes Kirche" at Verden, with which position the conrectorship of the school was combined. He accepted in 1742 a call as minister of St. Peter's Church at Hamburg, where he died, December 15, 1774. His most important works are, Entwurf heilsamer Unterweisungen oder Dispositiones der Evangelien (Hamburg, 1745-74, 8vo): — Friedenspredigt (ibid. 1750, 4to): — Der Ruf Gottes an die Sunder aus dem Feuer; eine Buszpredigt (ibid. 1750, 4to): — Auszug der Hauptsatze und Eintheilungen aus den Entwurfen heilsamer Unterweisungen fur die Jahre 1745-59 (ibid. 1759, 8vo). See Doring, Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands, s.v.

## Mylius, Georg (1)[[@Headword:Mylius, Georg (1)]]

             a noted German Lutheran divine, was born at Augsburg in 1548; studied at the universities of Strasburg, Marburg, and Tubingen, and in 1571 became pastor at Augsburg, and later was made superintendent and rector of the evangelical college. In 1584 his opposition to the Gregorian calendar made him very unpopular, and he was finally driven from the place. He went to Ulm, where he was kindly received; but he remained there only a short time, accepting in 1585 a call to Wittenberg University as professor of theology. When the Philippists gained supremacy at that high school  Mylius removed to Jena, soon, however, to turn back to Wittenberg, where he died, May 28, 1603. Mylius was an industrious student, and prepared numerous exegetical works. See Adam, Vitce Theol. Germ. (1620).

## Mylius, Georg (2)[[@Headword:Mylius, Georg (2)]]

             a German Lutheran divine, flourished in the first half of the 17th century as pastor in Brandenburg, near Kbnigsberg, East Prussia. He died in 1640. Mylius is noted as a German hymnologist. He was a true follower of the poetical school whose head was Dach (q.v.). Mylius is the author of the well-known German funeral dirge, "Herr, ich denk, an jene Zeit," etc.

## Mylne, Robert[[@Headword:Mylne, Robert]]

             an English architect, was born in 1734 at Edinburgh. His father was of the same profession. While he was studying at Rome he gained the chief architectural prize at the Academy of St. Luke. Of that academy, and of the academies of Florence and Bologna, he was chosen a member. Blackfriars' Bridge, which was begun in 1760, and completed in ten years, is his great work. He finally became surveyor of St. Paul's Cathedral, London. He died May 5, 1811.

## Mynchery[[@Headword:Mynchery]]

             is the Saxon name for a nunnery, nuns being called mynche. SEE MYNICENS.

## Myndus[[@Headword:Myndus]]

             (Μύνδος), a town on the coast of Caria,, between Miletus and Halicarnassus, the convenient position of which in regard to trade was probably the reason why we find in 1Ma 15:23 that it was the residence of a Jewish population. Its ships were well, known in very early times (Herod. 5:33), and its harbor is specially mentioned by Strabo (14, 658). It was originally a Dorian colony of Troezene, and was protected by strong walls (Pausan. 2:30, 8), so that it successfully resisted Alexander the Great (Arrian, Alex. 1:21). Its wine was famous as an aid to digestion (Athen. 1:32). Diogenes Laertius (6, 2, 57) records a bon mot of Diogenes, the cynic, of which it is the theme. Seeing, its huge gates, while the city itself was but small, he exclaimed, "Men of Myndus, shut the gates, lest the city walk out of them!" The name still lingers in the modern Mentesche, though  the remains of the city are' probably at Gumishlu, where admiral Beaufort found an ancient pier and other ruins (Smith, Dict. of Class. Geog. s.v.).

## Mynicens[[@Headword:Mynicens]]

             (Lat. mynecena, fern. of munuc; allied to moniales) is the name of a class of English monastics who flourished in 1009 and 1017, and were probably Benedictines. They differed from nuns in being of younger age, and under a rule more strict. See Walcott, Sacred Archceology, s.v.; Lea, Sacerdotal Celibacy, page 179, note.

## Mynster, Jacob Peder[[@Headword:Mynster, Jacob Peder]]

             a Danish theologian, was born at Copenhagen November 8, 1775. He was educated at the university of his native city, was employed: some time in teaching, and became in 1801 pastor in Seeland. In 1811 he was appointed assistant minister of the principal church of Copenhagen, in 1828 preacher to the court and the royal family, and in 1834 bishop of Seeland. His writings comprise a great number of sermons, dissertations introductory to the study of the New Testament, and on other Biblical subjects, and several works on doctrinal theology. His admirable Ordination Sermons and other of his works have been translated into German. An edition of his miscellaneous publications, Blandede Schriter, begun in 1852, was completed in 6 vols. in 1856. He died in Copenhagen January 30, 1854.

## Myra[[@Headword:Myra]]

             (τὰ Μύρα), one of the chief towns of Lycia, in Asia Minor (Ptol. 5:3, 6). It is "interesting to us as the place where Paul, on his voyage to Rome (Act 27:5), was removed from the Adramyttian ship which had brought him from Csesarea, and entered the Alexandrian ship in which he was wrecked on the coast of Malta. SEE ADRAMYTIUM.

The travellers had availed themselves of the first of these vessels because their course to Italy necessarily took them past the coasts of the province of Proconsular Asia (Act 27:2), expecting in some harbor on these coasts to find another vessel bound to the westward. This expectation was fulfilled (Act 27:6). It might be asked how it happened that an Alexandrian ship bound for Italy was so far out of her course as to be at Myra. This question is easily  answered by those who have some acquaintance with the navigation of the Levant. Myra is nearly due north of Alexandria, the harbors in the neighborhood are numerous and good, the mountains high and easily seen, and the current sets along the coast to the westward (Smith's Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul). Moreover, to say nothing of the possibility of landing or taking in passengers or goods, the wind was blowing about this time continuously and violently from the N.W., and the same weather which impeded the Adramyttian ship (Act 27:4) would be a hindrance to the Alexandrian (see Act 27:7; Conybeare and Howson, Life and Epistles of St. Paul, chapter 23). Some unimportant MSS. having Λύστρα in this passage, Grotius conjectured that the true reading might be Λίμυρα (Bentleii Crifica Sacra [ed. A. A. Ellis]). This supposition, though ingenious, is quite unnecessary. Both Limyra and Myra were well known among the maritime cities of Lycia. The harbor of the latter was strictly Andriace, distant from it between two and three miles, but the river was navigable to the city (Appian, B.C. 4:82)."

Myra lay about a league from the sea (in N. lat. 360 18', E. long. 30°), upon rising ground, at the foot of which flowed (a (navigable river with an excellent harbor (Andriace) at its mouth (Strabo, 14, page 665; Pliny, Hist. Nat. 32:8). In later times the emperor Theodosius raised it to the rank of the capital of Lycia (Hierocl. page 684). The town still exists, although in decay, and bears among the Greek inhabitants the ancient name of Myra; but the Turks call it Dembre (see Forbiger, Alte Geogr. 2:256). It is remarkable for its fine remains of antiquity (Leake, Asia Minor, page 183), which have been minutely described by Fellows (Discoveries in Lycia, page 169 sq.) and Texier (Descrip. de l'Asie Mineure; comp. Spratt and Forbes, Travels in Lycia, 1:131 sq.). "The tombs, enriched with ornament, and many of them having inscriptions in the ancient Lycian character, show that it must have been wealthy in early times. Its enormous theatre attests its considerable population in what may be called its Greek age. In the deep gorge which leads into the mountains is a large Byzantine church, a relic of the Christianity which may have begun with Paul's visit. It is reasonable to conjecture that this may have been a metropolitan church, inasmuch as Myra was the capital of the Roman province. In later times it was curiously called the port of the Adriatic, and visited by Anglo-Saxon travellers (Bohn's Early Travels in Palestine, pages 33, 138). Legend says that St. Nicholas, the patron saint of the modern Greek sailors, was born at Patara,  and buried at Myra, and his supposed relics were taken to St. Petersburg by a Russian frigate during the Greek revolution." SEE ASIA MINOR.

## Myrkheim[[@Headword:Myrkheim]]

             in Norse mythology, is one of the nine worlds designed as a dwelling- place of the dwarfs.

## Myrrh[[@Headword:Myrrh]]

             is the rendering in the Auth. Ver. of two Heb. and one Gr. term. 'The following account is a collective view of the subject:

1. מֹרor מוֹר, mnor, σμύρνα, doubtless from a Shemitic root (signifying to flow, or else from another expressive of its bitterness), though some of the ancients traced it to the mythological Myrrha, daughter of Cinvras, king of Cyprus, who fled to Arabia, and was changed into this tree (Ovid, Art. Am. 1:288). Myrrh formed an article of the earliest commerce, and was highly esteemed by the Egyptians and Jews, as well as by the Greeks and Romans (Pliny, 13:2; Athen. 15:688; Dioscor. 1:73), as it still is both in the East and in Europe. The earliest notice of it occurs in Exo 30:23, "Take thou also unto thee principal spices, of pure myrrh five hundred shekels." It is afterwards mentioned in Est 2:12, as employed in the purification of women; in Psa 45:8, as a perfume, "All thy garments smell of myrrh and aloes and cassia;" also in several passages of the Song of Solomon, "I will get me to the mountain of myrrh, and to the hill of frankincense" (Psa 4:6); "My hands dropped with myrrh, and my fingers with sweet smelling myrrh" (5, .); so in Psa 45:13, in both which passages, according to Rosenmuller, it is profluent myrrh. We find it mentioned in Mat 2:11 among the gifts presented by the wise men of the East to the infant Jesus, "gold and frankincense and myrrh." It may be remarked as worthy of notice that myrrh and frankincense are frequently mentioned together. In Mar 15:23 we learn that the Roman soldiers "gave him (Jesus) to drink wine mingled with myrrh, but he received it not" (see Hutten, De potu felleo, etc. [Guben. 1671]; Pipping, De potu Christo prodromo [Leips. 1688]). SEE GALL.

The apostle John (Joh 19:39) says, "Then came also Nicodemus, and brought a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about a hundred-pound weight." for the purpose of embalming the body of our Saviour. Herodotus (3:107) mentions Arabia as the last inhabited country towards the south which produced frankincense, myrrh, etc.; Theophrastus (Plant. 9:4) describes it as being produced in Southern Arabia, about Saba and Adramytta; so Pliny (12, 33), Dioscorides (1:77) and several other Greek authors (Strabo, 16:769, 782; Diodl. Sic. 5:41;  19:95). But others have not so limited its production. Celsius (Hierobot. 1:523) says it was produced in Syria, Gedrosia (Arrian, Exped. Al. 6:421), India, Ethiopia, Troglodytica, and Egypt; in which last country it was called bal (βάλ), according to Plutarch, De Iside et Osiride, page 383 (Kircher, Prod. Copt. page 175). Plutarch, however, was probably in error, and has confounded the Coptic sal, "myrrh," with bal, "an eye" (Jablonski, Opusc. 1:49 [ed. te Water]). Accordingly bol is the name by which it is universally known throughout India in the present day; and the Sanscrit name is bola, which occurs at least before the Christian aera, with several other names, showing that it was well known. But from the time of the ancients until that of Belon we were without any positive information respecting the tree yielding myrrh: he supposed it to be produced in Syria (so also Propertius [1, 2, 3] and Oppian [Halieut. 3:403]), and says (Observat. 2:80) that near Rama he met with a thorny shrub with leaves resembling acacia, which he believed to be that producing myrrh (Mimosa agrestis, Spr.). Similar to this is the information of the Arabian author, Abu'l Fadli, quoted by Celsius, who says that mour is the Arabic name of a thorny tree resembling the acacia, from which flows a white juice, which thickens and becomes a gum. The Persian authors state that myrrh is the gum of a tree common in the Mughrub, that is, the West or Africa, in Room (a general name for the Turkish empire), and in Socotra.

The Arabian and Persian authors probably only knew it as an article of commerce: it certainly is not produced in Socotra, but has undoubtedly long been exported from Africa into Arabia. It is reported that myrrh is always to be obtained cheap and abundant on the Sumali coast. Bruce had indeed long previously stated that myrrh is produced in the country behind Azab. Mr. Johnson, in his Travels in Abyssinia (1:249), mentions that "Myrrh and mimosa trees abounded ill this place" (Koranhedudah, in Adal). The former he describes as being "a low, thorny, ragged-looking tree, with bright green trifoliolate leaves; the gum exudes from cracks in the bark of the trunk near the root, and flows freely upon the stones immediately underneath. Artificially it is obtained by bruises made with stones. The natives collect it principally in the hot months of July and August, but it is to be found, though in very small quantities, at other times of the year. It is collected in small kid-skins and taken to Errur, whence the Hurrah merchants, on their way from Shoa, convey it to the great annual market at Berberah, whence great quantities are shipped for India and Arabia." When the Portuguese first entered these seas, gold dust, ivory, myrrh, and slaves formed the staple commerce of Adal. As early as the time of Arrian, in his  Periplus of the Erythraean Sea, we find myrrh one of the articles of export, with frankincense, from the coast of Adal, styled Barbaria. The Periplus mentions the myrrh of this coast as the finest of its kind, and specifies the means of conveying it to Yemen, or Sabea. There the first Greek navigators found it, and through their hands it was conveyed into Europe under the name of Sabean myrrh. Though there is no doubt that the largest quantity of myrrh has always been obtained from Africa, yet it is equally certain that some is also procured in Arabia. This seems to be proved by Ehrenberg and Hemprich, who found a small tree in Arabia, near Gison, on the borders of Arabia Felix, off which they collected pieces of myrrh, which, when brought home and analyzed, was acknowledged to be genuine (Nees v. Eisenbeck, Plant. officin. tab. 357). This is the Balsamodendron nyrsrha of botanists, which produces the myrrh of commerce; it belongs to the natural order Terebinthacece, and is a small tree found in Arabia Felix, allied to the Amyridaccece or incense-trees, and closely resembling the Amyris Gileadensis, or Balsamodendron Gileadense. SEE BALM. Its stunted trunk is covered with a light gray bark, which, as well as the wood, emits a strong balsamic odor. The characteristic gum-resin exudes in small, tear-like drops, at first oily, but drying and hardening on the bark, and its flow is increased by wounding the tree. When collected it is a brittle substance, translucent, of a rich brown color, or reddish yellow, with a strong odor and a warm, bitter taste. Myrrh, it is well known, was celebrated in the most ancient times as a perfume and a fumigator (Martius, Pharmakogn. page 382 sq.), as well as for its uses in medicine. Myrrh was burned in temples, and employed in embalming the bodies of the dead. The ancients prepared a wine of myrrh, and also an oil of myrrh, and it formed an ingredient in many of the most celebrated compound medicines (see Penny Cyclopcedia, s.v. Balsamodendron). We read in Son 1:13 of a "bundle of myrrh," as our Auth. Ver. has it; but the word צְרוֹר(tzeror), used for a purse or bag of money (Gen 42:35; Pro 7:20, etc.), may rather indicate a scent-bag, or smelling-bottle, such as is sold by modern perfumers. Mason Good, who has "casque of myrrh," observes that a casket of gold or ivory, containing some costly perfume, is still worn by the ladies of Persia suspended from their necks by an elegant chain. The terms "pure myrrh" (מָראּדְּרוֹר, mor deror', Exo 30:23) and "sweetsmelling myrrh" (מֹר צוֹבֵר, mor ober', Son 5:5) probably represent the best, or self-flowing kind (Sept. σμύρνα ἐκλεκτή;  comp. Plin. 12:35; see Dopke, Comment. v. Hopest. page 165). (For the ancient notices, see Celsii Hierob. 1:520 sq.; Bodaei a. Stapel, Comment. ad Theophrast. page 796 sq., 974).

2. לטor לוֹט, lot (so called, perhaps, from covering, being used as a cosmetic or pomatum; Gesen. Thesaur. page 748; Sept. στακτή, and Vulg. stacte), occurs only in Gen 37:25, “Behold, a company of Ishmaelites came down from Gilead with their camels bearing spicery (nekoth), and balm (tsori), and myrrh (1ot), going to carry it down to Egypt;" and in chapter 43:11 Jacob directs his sons to take into Egypt "of the best fruits in the land in your vessels, and carry down the man a present, a little balm (tsori), and a little honey, spices (nekoth), and myrrh (lot), nuts (botnim), and almonds (shekadim)." In this enumeration, in one case of merchandise, and in the other of several articles intended for a present, and both destined for Egypt, at that time a highly civilized nation, it is evident that we are to look only for such substances as were likely to be acceptable in that country, and therefore not such as were produced there, or as were more easily procurable from elsewhere than from Syria, as was the case with myrrh, which was never produced in Syria, and could not have been an article of export from thence. This difficulty has been felt by others. and various translations of lit have been proposed, as lotus (comp. Burckhardt, Arab. Spriichen, page 334), chestnuts, mastich, stacte, balsam, turpentine, pistachio nuts (Michaelis, Suppl. 4:1424 sq.). Junius and Tremellius render it ladanum, which is suitable, and appears to be correct, as an etymological connection may be traced between the words. Ladanum, or gumn ladanum, as it is often called, was known to the Greeks as early as the times of Herodotus (3:112) and Dioscorides (1:128), and bore the names of ledos and ledanon (λῆδος, λήδανον), which are very closely allied to ladun, the Arabic name of the same drug. A Hebrew author, as quoted by Celsius (Hierobot. 1:281), describes it as "an aromatic substance, flowing from the juice of a certain tree." Ladanum is described by Herodotus (3:112) as particularly fragrant, though gathered from the beards of goats, where it is found sticking.

This is explained by referring to the description of Dioscorides (1:128), from which we learn that goats, after browsing upon the leaves of the ladanurm plants, necessarily have this viscid substance adhering to their hair and beards, whence it is afterwards scraped off. Tournefort, in modern times, has given a detailed  description ( Voyage, 1:79) of the mode of obtaining ladanum, and relates that it is now gathered by means of a kind of rake with whiplike thongs, which is passed over the plants. When these thongs are loaded with the odoriferous and sticky resin, they are scraped with a knife, and the substance rolled into a mass, in which state it is called ladanuma or ladanum. It consists of resin and volatile oil, and is highly fragrant, and stimulative as a medicine, but is often adulterated with sand in commerce. The ladanum which is used in Europe is collected chiefly in the Greek isles, and also in continental Greece. It is yielded by the Cistus, known in Europe by the name of Rock Rose. It is a native of the south of Europe, the Mediterranean islands (especially Candia or Crete, whence the principal kind has derived its modern name), and the north of Africa. There are several species of Cistus, all of which are believed to yield the gum ladanum; but the species mentioned by Dioscorides is in all probability identical with the one which is found in Palestine, viz. the Cistus Creticus (Strand, Flor. Palaest. No. 289). The C. Itdanijferus, a native of Spain and Portugal, produces the greatest quantity of the ladanum; it has a white flower, while that of the C. Creticus is rose-colored. Species are also found in Judaea; and C. Creticus in some parts of Syria. Some authors have been of opinion that one species, the Cistus roseus, is more likely than any other to be the Rose of Sharon, as it is very common in that locality, while nothing like a true rose is to be found there. Ladanum seems to have been produced in Judaea, according to writers in the Talmud (Cels. 1. c. page 286). It is said by Pliny (12:37), as long before by Herodotus (3:112), to be a produce of Arabia, and as by this is probably meant Syria (comp. Pliny, 26:20), it was very likely to have been sent to Egypt both as a present and as merchandise. See Celsius, Hierobot. 1:280 sq.; Rosenmuller, Bib. Bot. page 158; Pococke, Morgenl. 2:333 sq.; Penny Cyclopedia, s.v. Ladanum.

## Myrtle[[@Headword:Myrtle]]

             (הֲדִס, hadas', so called, perhaps, from its springing up rapidly) occurs in Isa 41:19; Neh 8:15; Zec 1:8; Zec 1:10-11; and is identical with the Arabic hadas, which in the dialect of Arabia Felix signifies the myrtle-tree (Richardson, Pers. and Arabic Dict.). The myrtle is, moreover, known throughout Eastern countries under the name As, by which it is described in Arabic works; and its berries are sold in the bazaars of India under this name (Illust. Himal. Bot. page 217). The name Esther is  supposed by Simon (Bibl. Cabinet, 11:269) to be a compound of As and tur, and so to mean a flesh myrtle; and hence it would appear to be very closely allied in signification to Hadassah, the original name of Esther. Almost all translators unite in considering the myrtle as intended in the above passages; the Sept. has μυρσίνη, and the Vulg. nyrtus. The myrtle has from the earliest periods been highly esteemed in all the countries of the south of Europe, and is frequently mentioned by the poets (Virg. Ecl. 2:54). By the Greeks and Romans it was dedicated to Venus (Virg. Georg. 4:124; Ovid, Met. 9:334; 11:232; Amnor. 1:1, 29), and employed in making wreaths to crown lovers (Pliny, 15:36; Diod. Sic. 1:17); but among the Jews it was the emblem of justice. The note of the Chaldee Targum on the name' Esther, according to Dr. Harris, is, "they call her Hadassah because she was just, and those that are just are compared to myrtles." The repute which the myrtle enjoyed in ancient times it still retains, notwithstanding the great accession of ornamental shrubs and flowers which has been made to the gardens and greenhouses of Europe. This is justly due to the rich coloring of its dark-green and shining leaves, contrasted with the white starlike clusters of its flowers, affording in hot countries a pleasant shade under its branches, and diffusing an agreeable odor from its flowers or bruised leaves. It is, however, most agreeable in appearance when in the state of a shrub, for when it grows into a tree, as it does ill hot countries, the traveller looks under instead of over its leaves, and a multitude of small branches are seen deprived of their leaves by the crowding of the upper ones.

This shrub is common in the southern provinces of Spain and France, as well as in Italy and Greece; and also on the northern coast of Africa, and in Syria. The poetical celebrity of this plant had, no doubt, some influence upon its employment in medicine, and numerous properties are ascribed to it by Dioscorides (1:127). It is aromatic and astringent, and hence, like many other such plants, forms a stimulant tonic, and is useful in a variety of complaints connected with debility. Its berries were formerly employed in Italy (Pliny, 15:35), and still are so in Tuscany, as a substitute for spices, now imported so plentifully from the far East. A wine was also prepared from them, which was called myrtidatnum (Pliny, 15:37), and their essential oil is possessed of excitant properties (Pliny, 23:44). In many parts of Greece and Italy the leaves are employed in tanning leather. The myrtle, possessing so many remarkable qualities, was not likely to have escaped the notice of the sacred writers, as it is a well-known inhabitant of Judaea. Hasselquist and Burckhardt both notice it as occurring on the hills around Jerusalem. It is also found in the  valley of Lebanon. Capt. Light, who visited the country of the Druses in 1814, says he "again proceeded up the mountain by the side of a range of hills abounding with myrtles in full bloom, that spread their fragrance around," and, further on, "we crossed through thickets of myrtle." Irby and Mangles (page 222) describe the rivers from Tripoli towards Galilee as generally pretty, their banks covered with the myrtle, olive, wild vine, etc. Savary, as quoted by Dr. Harris, describing a scene at the end of the forest of Platanea, says, " Myrtles, intermixed with laurelroses, grow in the valleys to the height of ten feet. Their snow-white flowers, bordered with a purple edging, appear to peculiar advantage under the verdant foliage. Each myrtle is loaded with them, and they emit perfumes more exquisite than those of the rose itself. They enchant every one, and the soul is tilled with tine softest sensations." When the Feast of Tabernacles was celebrated by the Jews on the return from Babylon, the people of Jerusalem were ordered to "go forth unto the mount and fetch olive branches, and pine branches, and myrtle branches, and to make booths." The prophet Isaiah foretells the coming golden age of Israel, when the Lord shall plant in the wilderness "the shittah-tree, and the myrtle-tree, and the oil-tree." The modern Jews still adorn with myrtle the booths and sheds at the Feast of Tabernacles. Myrtles (Ayrtus communis) will grow either on hills or in valleys, but it is in the latter locality where they attain to their greatest perfection. Formerly, as we learn from Nehemiah (Neh 8:15), myrtles grew on the hills about Jerusalem. "On Olivet," says Prof. Stanley, "Lnothing is now to be seen but the olive and the fig tree," but Dr. Hooker says the myrtle is not uncommon in Samaria and Galilee. See Celsii Hiierobot. 2:17 sq.; Bodlei Conmm. cod Theophr. page 375 sq.; Billerbeck, Flora class. p. 122; Loudon, Arboreticum Britansmicum, 3:962; Tristram, Nut. Hist. of the Bible, page 365 sq.

## Mysia[[@Headword:Mysia]]

             (Μυσία, according to some, from the abundance of the beech-tree, μυσίς, in the neighborhood: according to others, from the Celtic moese, a marsh, showing a connection with the Danubian marshy district of Moesia; comp. Eustath. Ad Dion. Per. 809; Schol Ad Apoleon. Rhod. 1:145) a province occupying the north-west angle of Asia Minor, and separated from Europe only by the Propontis and Hellespont; on the south it joined Eolis, and was separated on the east from Bithynia by the river in Esopus. Latterly AEolis was included in Mysia, which was then separated from Lydia and Ionia by the river Hermus, now Sarabad or Jedis (Strabo, 12:562; 13:628; Pliny,  Iist. Nat. 6:32; Ptol. Geog. 5:2). It was usually divided into five parts: Mysia Minor, Mysia Major, Troas, Eolis, and Tenthrania. The greater part of Mysia was unprodutctive, being covered with mountains and marshes; but it was celebrated for the fine wheat of Assus, for quarries of the lapis Assius (which had the power of decomposing dead bodies), and for its oyster beds. It was inhabited by various tribes, mostly barbarous, until, as a part of the kingdom of Pergamus, it was ceded to the Romans, by whom it was eventually formed into a province. Paul passed through this province, and embarked at its chief port, Troas, on his first voyage to Europe (Act 16:7-8). "They had then come κατὰ τὴν Μυσίαν, and they were directed to Troas, παρελθόντες τὴν Μυσίαν; which means either that they skirted its border, or that they passed through the district without staying there. In fact, the best description that can be given of Mysia at this time is that it was the region about the frontier of the provinces of Asia and Bithynia. The, term is evidently used in an ethnological, not a political sense." See generally Rosenmuller, Bibl. Geog. 3:32; Smith's Dict. of Class. Geogr. s.v.; Mannert, Geogr. 6:3, 403; Forbiger, Handb. 2:110; Richter, Wallfahrten, page 460; Cramer, Asia Minor, 1:30. SEE ASIA MINOR.

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

             a surname of the ancient Grecian goddess Demeter, or Ceres, under which she was worshipped near Sparta. The term Mysia is also applied to a festival celebrated by the inhabitants of Pellene in honor of Demeter. This feast lasted for seven days. During the first two days the solemnities were observed by both men and women; on the third day the women alone performed certain mysterious rites throughout the night; and on the last two days the men returned to the festival, and the remainder of the time was passed in raillery and merriment.

## Myslenta, CELESTIN[[@Headword:Myslenta, CELESTIN]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born March 27, 1588. He studied at: different universities, took his degree as doctor of divinity at Giessen in 1619, was professor of theology at. Konigsberg in the same year, and died April 30, 1653. He wrote, De Sacrificiis Veteris Testamenti: — De Milysterio Trinitatis: — De Eterna Divinitate Christi: — De Christi ad Inferos Descensu Vero et Reali: — Due Quaestiones de Fide: — De Justifcatione Hsominis PeccatorisCoram Deo: — De Sacramento Baptismi: — De Ecclesia; Dei: — De Divina Nostri Prcedesiatnaione ad Vitam.. AEternam. See Witte, Memoriae Theologorum; Arnold, Historie der konigsbergischen Universitadt; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten- Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Mysore[[@Headword:Mysore]]

             SEE INDIA.

## Mystagogue[[@Headword:Mystagogue]]

             (Gr. Μυσταγωγός, from μύστης, an initiated person, and ἄγω, to lead), the name in the Greek religious system of the priest whose duty it was to direct the preparations of the candidates for initiation in the several mysteries, as well as to conduct the ceremonial of initiation. It was sometimes applied by a sort of analogy to the class of professional ciceroni, who in ancient as in modern times undertook to show to strangers newly arrived in a city the noteworthy objects which it contained (Cicero, Acts 2, In Verrem, 54, c. 59); but the former meaning is its primitive one, and formed the ground of the application of the same name in the Christian Church to the catechists or other clergy who prepared candidates for the Christian mysteries, or sacraments, of baptism, confirmation, and the eucharist, especially the last. In this sense the word is constantly used by the fathers of the 4th and 5th centuries; and ill the well- known lectures of St. Cyril of Jerusalem, although they were addressed to candidates for the mysteries, some for baptism, and some for the eucharist, it is only to the lectures addressed to the latter that the name mystagogic is applied. This distinction vas connected with the well-known Discipline of the Secret; and it appears to have ceased with the abolition or gradual disuse of that discipline. See Du Cange, Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae Graecitatis, s.v.; Suicer, Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus, s.v.; SEE MYTSTAGOGY.

## Mystagogy[[@Headword:Mystagogy]]

             (μυσταγωγία, introduction to the mysteries) is a term used in the early Christian churches of the Orient to designate either the Lord's Supper or baptism. To designate the former it is frequently found in the writings of Cyril of Jerusalem and of Theodoret. It was intimately connected with the secret discipline, but fell into disuse with the termination of that system. See Riddle, Christian Antiquities, pages 485, 547; Bingham, Antiq. of the Christian Church (see Index). SEE MYSTAGOGUE.

## Mystee[[@Headword:Mystee]]

             those who were initiated into the lesser Eleusinian mysteries (q.v.).

## Mysteries, Christian[[@Headword:Mysteries, Christian]]

             otherwise called MIRACLES AND MORALITIES, or simply "Miracle Plays," were shows in the Middle Ages representing in rude dramatic form scenes from the Scriptures and from the apocryphal gospels. They were  performed first in churches, and afterwards in the streets on fixed or movable stages. The actors were in the earliest times to which we can trace these shows generally monks, friars, and other ecclesiastics, and the aim was the religious instruction of the people by means of amusement. An examination of the inanimate fragments that remain to us of these plays is profitable only to those who can enter into the spirit of the age that called them forth, for it must be borne in mind by the intelligent inquirer that the coarse details in which they abound, and which shock our literary taste, were necessary to bring home to the people of those times the objects of their most serious and constant meditations — judgment, heaven, hell, the miracles and passion of their Lord, and the future of the soul of man. Nor must it be forgotten that the Church of the Middle Ages was not the first religious body to plant and promote religious sentiments by these means. The theatre, though the fact be singular, has taken its rise, wherever we can trace its origin, in religious sentimentalism. In Greece, from the very earliest ages to the days of Solon, religious feasts were accompanied by dances and performances.

In the early Christian Church there was no doubt a strong tendency to perpetuate the levity of the heathen practices; and to prevent the introduction of the pagan theatre in its entirety the Church may have felt itself forced to abolish these relics of an abhorred practice by providing dramatic entertainment in which subjects derived from the Old or New Testament took the place of those of mythology — means less apparent than outspoken opposition, but then believed, no doubt, equally sure to effect the purpose. This accounts for the custom which prevailed at an early date of the reading to the congregation in the time of Easter the narrative of Christ's passion, the various parts distributed among different parties. Later these readings came to be accompanied by dialogue and gestures, and probably the readers officiated in a suitable costume. Other festal days were gradually taken up with representations of these mysteries. Indeed, some curious proofs of the transition from the narrative form of the Bible to the dramatic form of the mysteries are still extant. They consist of dialogues in verse between several speakers, bound together by a narration, also in verse, which formed a part analogous to the Greek chorus. They were evidently accompanied in some degree by music, for in most ancient manuscripts each line is surmounted by its musical notation.

In time ecclesiastical dramatic representations were separated from the divine offices, and, though still performed in churches, formed a distinct part of priestly teaching, and under the name of Mysteries were acted after  the sermon. Mysteries were probably taken from Biblical, and miracle plays from legendary subjects, but this distinction in nomenclature was not always strictly adhered to. The general character of all early religious plays, whether called miracles or mysteries, was about the same. If any distinction was made, the miracles were distinguished as those which represented the miracles wrought by the holy confessors, and the sufferings by which the perseverance of the martyrs was manifested; of which kind the first specified by name is a scenic representation of the legend of St. Catharine. The mysteries, strictly so called, were representations often of great length, and requiring several days' performance, of the Scripture narrative, or of several parts of it, as, for instance, the descent of Christ into hell. We have an extant specimen of the religious play of a date prior to the beginning of the Middle Ages in the Christos Paschon, assigned, somewhat questionably, to Gregory Nazianzen, and written in the 4th century in Greek. Next come six Latin plays on subjects connected with the lives of the saints, by Roswitha, a nun of Gandersheim, in Saxony; these, though not very artistically constructed, possess considerable dramatic power and interest; they have been lately published at Paris, with a French translation. The performers were at first the clergy and choristers; afterwards any layman might participate.

The earliest recorded performance of a miracle play took place in England. Matthew Paris relates that Geoffrey, afterwards abbot of St. Albans, while a secular, exhibited at Dunstable the miracle play of St. Catharine, and borrowed copes from St. Albans to dress his characters. This must have been at the end of the 11th or beginning of the 12th century. Fitzstephen, in his Life of Thomas a Becket (A.D. 1183), describes with approval the representation in London of the sufferings of the saints and miracles of the confessors. Le Boeuf gives an account of a mystery written in the middle of the 11th century, wherein Virgil is introduced among the prophets that came to adore the Saviour; doubtless in allusion to the fourth eclogue. But there is a mystery earlier than this in the Provenial dialect, a curious mixture of Latin and the dialect of Southern France. It is on the subject of The Wise and Foolish Virgins, and probably belongs to the early part of the 11th century (comp. Demogeot, Histoire de la Litterature Francaise). Another mystery, entitled the Jeu de St. Nicholas, also of like antiquity, belongs to Northern France. Fitzstephen, in the reign of Henry II of England (born 1133, died 1189), dwells on the sacred plays acted in London representing the miracles or passions of martyrs. These plays, according to M. Raynouard (Journal des Savans [1828], page 297), were the earliest dramatic  representations, and gave rise to the mysteries. This is not probable, however, as they were even then denominated mysteries or miracles both in England and on the Continent. The truth is, as Mr. Hallam has said, that "it is impossible to fix their first appearance at any single aera" (Introd. Europ. Lit. 1:123). The fact is that in the 11th century these plays are found in favor within the walls of convents, and on public occasions and festivals, both in England and on the Continent. Thus, in the 11th century, Hilarius, a disciple of Abelard, substituted for the prose of the old ritual for the Feast of St. Nicholas a dialogue in Latin rhyme, with refrains in the Langque d'oil. A monk of St. Benoit-sur-Loire, who flourished at a later period, treated the same history in simple Latin. Both these pieces were acted in the churches for nearly a century, when Jean Bodel, of Arras, founded upon them a drama, which was written entirely in French, and which was probably acted in the public squares of Arras, or in the hall of some large dwelling. This was, in all probability, the first instance of the emancipation of the drama from the Church. The trouvrres of the 13th century followed readily in the lead of Jean Bodel. Among others we may mention Adam de la Halle, the fellow townsman of Bodel, nicknamed Le Bossu d'Arras, and the witty enemy of the monks, the satirical Rutehbeuf.

The clergy were soon altogether superseded by the laity, who formed themselves into companies and guilds to act these pieces, and every considerable town had a fraternity for the performance of mysteries. Such associations, it should be stated, however, were established in a serious spirit of piety and beneficence, without any thought of antagonism to the Church; and that the Church failed to recognize any opposition is apparent in the fact that, on the establishment of the Corpus Christi festival by Pope Urban IV, in 1264, miracle plays were made its adjuncts. The change from clergy to laity was very desirable, for one reason especially. Hitherto the plays had usually been written in Latin, and the greater part was made intelligible to the people only through pantomime. But as this was unsatisfactory, and the spectators could not always get at the player's intent, there was an obvious inducement to make use of the vernacular language. This gave import to the people's tongue, and in this way the mysteries of the 14th and succeeding centuries play no unimportant part in the development of the modern languages (comp. Schlegel, Lect. Hist. of Mod. Lit. lect. 9-11). The most celebrated, though one of the latest founded (1350), of these fraternities was the Confrerie de la Passion et Resurrection de notre Seigneur. It was composed of Paris citizens, master  masons, locksmiths, and others. The first scene of their representations was the village of St. Maur, near Vincennes. The provost of Paris refusing his license, the Confrerie applied to and received the authorization of Charles VI, who by letters patent, in 1402, gave permission to them to act "any mystery whatsoever either before the king or before his people, in any suitable place, either in the town of Paris itself or in its suburbs." Upon this they established themselves in the Hospital of the Holy Trinity, outside the Porte St. Denis. There on public holidays they gave representations of pieces drawn from the New Testament. Crowds both of clergy and laity flocked to them. The Church did all in its power to further their success, altering the hour of vespers to facilitate the attendance of the faithful at them. The Praemonstratensians, owners of the Hospital of the Holy Trinity, gladly let for them their spacious hall. The spectators sat on unwearied often until the night fell, and then the assembly broke up to meet again on the next Sunday for the continuation of the interrupted drama, which sometimes lasted for months at a time. The stage consisted of tiers of scaffolding raised one above another, the topmost tier, with its gilt balustrade, representing Paradise, and holding "chaire paree," which did duty as the throne of the Most High. "In pomp of show they far excelled our English mysteries," says Hallam; and the mixture of tragedy and comedy in the poetry appealed powerfully to the quick susceptibilities of an impressionable nation, which delights in nothing so much as in extremes and contrasts.

We have said that the laity intended no opposition to the Church, and that the clergy recognised no such opposition, and did not anticipate it; that by or even before the end of the 13th century the laity had robbed the clergy of a great part of their influence, and in the course of their 14th became the means of paralyzing it entirely. The length too, to which these performances were carried surpasses credence. No subject was deemed too sacred to be chosen as a theme, no subject too holy to be represented. Heaven was depicted, in which the Father was surrounded by his holy angels. Hell was portrayed by a dark and yawning cavern, from which issued hideous howlings, as of tormented souls; but whence also, with a curious inconsistency, came the jesters and buffoons of the sacred drama. Not only were all the Scripture characters freely introduced, but angels, archangels, Lucifer, Satan, Beelzebub, Belial, and even the three persons of the Holy Trinity. Some of these dramas lasted for a number of days, one of them covering the whole period of time from the creation of the world to  the last judgment. No wonder, then, that these plays, which were originally designed as a means of instructing the people, and were performed in the churches, rapidly degenerated until they turned into a species of scandalously irreverent buffoonery. From being employed as a means of instruction, they were thus converted into a means of amusement; from being enacted in the churches and by the clergy, they came to be performed by strolling and vagabond players on temporary and portable stages constructed on wheels. Thenceforth the theatre took a wider scope; art labored to supply the ever-increasing weakness of religious impressions; creations of the poet's fancy appeared side by side with scriptural characters; popular scenes became by degrees more common, and hence little by little arose the drama of our own day — a light amusement intended for the pastime of an idle crowd.

The 14th and 15th centuries were fertile of religious dramas in many parts of Europe, and throughout the centuries immediately following they continued in full force. In Germany they were very popular. In France they did not prevail largely after the 15th century. In Italy they were very congenial to the people, whose delight in sensible objects is so intense, and societies for their performance were formed as in France. They were largely popular in the 15th century (comp. Roscoe, Life of Lorenzo, 1:402; Hallam, Lit. 1:124, 125), and they have in some of their forms been continued for the edification and amusement of the populace quite down to our own times (Ticknor, Hist. of Spanish Lit. 1:229, foot-note 3). In Spain they were likewise common, and their origin is so remote that " it can no longer be determined" (Ticknor. 1:230). There, however, the clergy were left to play these mysteries, as is apparent from the code of Alfonso X, which was prepared about 1260, and in which, after forbidding the clergy certain gross indulgences, the law goes on to say: "Neither ought they to be makers of buffoon plays, that people may come to see them; and if other men make them, clergymen should not come to see them, for such men do things low and unsuitable. Nor, moreover, should such things be done in churches; but rather we say they should be cast out in dishonor, without punishment to those engaged in them; for the church of God was made for prayer, and not for buffoonery; as our Lord Jesus Christ declared in the Gospel that his house was called the house of prayer, and ought not to be made a den of thieves. But exhibitions there be that clergymen may make, such as that of the birth of our Lord Jesus Christ, which shows how the angel came to the shepherds, and how he told them Jesus Christ was born;  and, moreover, of his appearance when the three kings came to worship him, and of his resurrection, which shows how he was crucified and rose the third day. Such things as these; which move men to do well. may the clergy make, as well as to the end that man may have in remembrance that such things did truly happen. But this must they do decently, and in devotion; and in the great cities where there is an archbishop or bishop, and under their authority, or that of others by them deputed, and not in villages, nor in small places, nor to gain money thereby." But though these earliest religious representations in Spain, whether pantomimic or in dialogue, were thus given, not only by churchmen, but by others, certainly before the middle of the 13th century, and probably much sooner, they passed entirely out of the control of those who intended them for religious and moral purposes, and though they were continued for several centuries afterwards, still no fragment of them, and no distinct account of them, now remain to us (see Ticknor, 1:231; and compare below).

In England they continued in full force for above four hundred years — a longer period than can be assigned to the English national drama as we now recognise it. Their height of popularity was in the 15th century. Of these mysteries, two complete series, which are supposed to belong to the 15th century (Hallam, Lit. 1:124 [105]), have lately been published from ancient manuscripts, the Townley Mysteries, performed by the monks of Woodchurch, near Wakefield, and the different leading companies of that town; and the Coventry Mysteries, performed with like help of the trades in Coventry, by the Gray Friars of that ancient city. Both of these collections begin with the creation, and carry on the story in different pageants or scenes until the judgment-day. The first two have been published by the Shakespeare Society, and the other by the Surtees Society. The Townley mysteries are full of the burlesque element, and contain many curious illustrations of contemporary manners. The Coventry mysteries were famous in England. Of these, Dugdale relates, in his History of Warwickshire, published in 1656, that, "Before the suppression of the monasteries this city was very famous for the pageants that were played therein, upon Corpus Christi day (one of their ancient fairs), which occasioning very great confluence of people thither from far and near, was of no small benefit thereto; which pageants being acted with mighty state and reverence by the Grey Friers, had theatres for the several scenes, very large and high, placed upon wheels, and drawn to all the eminent parts of the city, for the better advantage of spectators, and contained the story of  the Old and New Testament, composed in the old Englishe rithme, as appeareth by an ancient MS. (in Bibl. Cotton. Vesp. D. VIII), entituled, Ludus Corporis Christi, or Ludus Coventriae." The celebrity of the performances may be inferred from the rank of the audiences; for at the festival of Corpus Christi in 1483 Richard III visited Coventry to see the plays, and at the same season in 1492 they were attended by Henry VII and his queen, by whom they were highly commended. Of them it is said, "Every company had his pagiante, or parte, which pagiantes were a highe scafolde with two rowmes, a higher and a lower, upon four wheeles. In the lower they apparelled themselves, in the higher rowme they played, being all open op the tope, that all behoulders might heare and see them. The places where they played them was in every streete. They begane first at the Abay Gates, and when the pagiante was played, it was wheeled to the High Cross before the mayor, and so to every streete; and so every streete had a pagiante playing before them, till all the pagiantes for the daye appointed were played; and when one pagiante was neere ended, worde was broughte from streete to streete, that soe the mighte come in place thereof, exceedinge orderlye, and all the streetes had their pagiane afore them, all at one time, playing together, to se which playes was great resorte, and also scafoldes, and stages made in the streetes, in those places wheare they determined to playe their pagiantes." The first mystery performed in Scotland was at Aberdeen, in 1445, and was called the Haly Blade. One was called Candlemas Day, and another Mary Magdalene. The records of the town council of Edinburgh, in 1554, contain an order to pay Walter Bynning for making, among other theatrical implements, a mitre, a fool's hood, a pair of angel's wings, two angels' hair, and a chaplet of triumph. Other and coarser scenes were enacted by the Boy-bishop (q.v.), and at the Feast of Asses (q.v.).

Out of the mysteries and miracle plays sprang a third class of religious plays called moralities, in which allegorical personifications of the Virtues and Vices were introduced as dramatis personae. These personages at first only took part in the play along with the scriptural or legendary characters, but afterwards entirely superseded them. This change from mysteries to moralities corresponded to a remarkable modification of the public mind. Reason, eager to produce and combine ideas, had been substituted for the simple, unquestioning faith of the Middle Ages. Allegory, no longer the concrete and material rendering of undisputed facts, became a work of intelligence, abstraction, and analysis. Nature, her high and undying  loveliness unguessed, appeared commonplace and insipid, and in' need of the fictitious combinations of imagination. The mind of man having shaken itself free from its old trammels, sometimes in its pride and joy abused its new-found freedom. The moralities were perhaps best promulgated in France, where a guild was established by Philip the Fair about 1303, with special privileges for. their representations. In one of such dramas, of which Demogeot furnishes an extract, the gay boon companions Eat-all, Thirst, Drink-to-you, and Salts Water, are politely invited by the rich and splendid Banquet. The ladies of the party are Daintiness, Gluttony, and Lust. The feast is all that can be desired, the guests are more than satisfied; when suddenly a band of enemies — Colic, Gout, Jaundice, Quinsy, and Dropsy — rush in and seize the assembled revellers by the leg or the throat or the stomach, as the case may be. Some are overwhelmed — some rush for succor to Sobriety, who calls Cure to help him. Banquet is condemned to death by the judge, Experience, and Diet is his executioner. The oldest- known English compositions of this kind are of the time of Henry VI; they are more elaborate and less interesting than the miracle plays. Moralities continued in fashion in England till the time of Elizabeth, and were there the immediate precursors of the regular drama. In France they were the precursors of the light play known as farce, which "may be reckoned a middle link between the extemporaneous effusions of the mimes and the legitimate drama" (Hallam, Lit. 1:26 [109]). And this seems the more natural result of the two. From such pieces as the one of which we give a synopsis above the step to farces was but a short one. Moralities could not long enchain a people on whom refinement of satirical wit is generally thrown away. The mysteries no longer made them weep — it would be well to make them laugh, and farce was invented. In Germany, especially, in the Alpine districts, they were composed and acted by the peasants. These peasant-plays had less regularity in their dramatic form, were often interspersed with songs and processions, and in their union of simplicity with high-wrought feeling were most characteristic of a people in whom the religious and dramatic element are both so largely developed. In the early part of the sixteenth century they began to partake in some degree of the comic character which has been their frequent tendency; and thus, although designed at first for the religious instruction of the people, they had long before the Reformation so far departed from their original character as to be mixed up in many instances with buffoonery and irreverence, intentional or unintentional, and to be the means of inducing contempt rather than respect for the Church and religion.  It is a mistake to suppose that the hostility of the Reformers was what suppressed these popular exhibitions of sacred subjects. The fathers of the Reformation showed no unfriendly feeling towards them. Luther is reported to have said that they often did more good and produced more impression than sermons. The most direct encouragement was given to them by the founders of the Swedish Protestant Church, and by the earlier Lutheran bishops, Swedish and Danish. The authorship of one drama of the kind is assigned to Grotius. In England, the greatest check they received was from the rise of the secular drama; yet they continued to be occasionally performed in the times of James I and Charles I, and it is well known that the first sketch of Milton's Paradise Lost was a sacred drama, in which the opening speech was Satan's address to the sun. A degenerate relic of the miracle play may yet be traced in some remote districts of England, where the story of St. George, the dragon, and Beelzebub is rudely represented by the peasantry. "In Spain," says Ticknor, "as late as 1840, something resembling a mystery of the earliest time was represented at Valencia during the shows of the Corpus Christi (comp. Lamarca, Tentro de Valencia, 1840, page 11). This, I suppose, is the dramatic entertainment which Julius von Minutoli witnessed in the Feast of the Sacrament at Valencia in 1853, and which he not only describes, but prints entire in the dialect of the country just as he heard it" (Hist. of Spanish Literature, 3:347, foot-note). In Mexico, too, the mysteries have been kept up to this day. Thus Bayard Taylor during his travels in that country, witnessed the performance of such a religious play.

But though the mysteries may still continue to be performed in Roman Catholic countries, it is nevertheless a fact that a Roman Catholic country struck the first blow for their extinction — this was done in the Roman Catholic south of Germany, where these miracle plays and mysteries had preserved most of their old religious character. They had begun to be tainted there, too, though only to a limited extent, with the burlesque element, which had brought them into disrepute elsewhere. In 1799 a manifesto was issued by the prince-archbishop of Salzburg condemning them and prohibiting their performance on the ground of their ludicrous mixture of the sacred and the profane, the frequent bad acting in the serious parts, the distraction of the lower orders from more edifying modes of instruction, and the scandal arising from the exposure of sacred subjects to the ridicule of free-thinkers. This ecclesiastical denunciation was followed by vigorous measures on the part of the civil authorities in  Austria and Bavaria. One exception was made to the general suppression. In 1633 the villagers of Oberammergau, in the Bavarian highlands, on the cessation of a plague which desolated the surrounding country, had vowed to perform every tenth year Christ's passion, out of gratitude, and as a means of religious instruction — a vow which has ever since been regularly observed. The pleading of a deputation of Ammergau peasants with Max Joseph of Bavaria saved this mystery from a general condemnation, on condition of everything that could offend good taste being expunged. It was then and afterwards somewhat remodelled, and is perhaps the only mystery or miracle play which has survived to the present day. The last performance took place in 1870 (see its photographic representation in the Album of the Passion-play of Ober-Ammergau, by J.P. Jackson, Lond. and Mun. 1873, 4to). The inhabitants of this secluded village, long noted for their skill in carving in wood and ivory, have a rare union of artistic cultivation with perfect simplicity. Their familiarity with sacred subjects is even beyond what is usual in the Alpine part of Germany, and the spectacle seems still to be looked on with feelings much like those with which it was originally conceived. What would elsewhere appear impious is to the Alpine peasants devout and edifying. The personator of Christ considers his part an act of religious worship; he and the other principal performers are said to be selected for their holy life, and consecrated to their work with prayer. The players, about five hundred in number, are exclusively the villagers, who, though they have no artistic instruction except from the parish priest, act their parts with no little dramatic power, and a delicate appreciation of character. The New-Testament narrative is strictly adhered to, the only legendary addition to it being the St. Veronica handkerchief. The acts alternate with tableaux from the Old Testament and choral odes. Many thousands of the peasantry are attracted by the spectacle from all parts of the Tyrol and Bavaria, among whom the same earnest and devout demeanor prevails as among the performers. The following are some of the principal scenes given by a late eye-witness:

"

1. The triumphal entry of Christ into Jerusalem; the children and people shouting 'Hosanna!' and strewing clothes and branches. This introduced the Saviour and the apostles, and formed in itself an admirable introduction to the whole. There were certainly no less than two hundred persons in the crowd, including seventy or eighty children.

2. The long and animated debates in the Sanhedrim, including the furious evidence of the expelled moneychangers, and later the interview with  Judas, when the contract was ratified between him and the priests by the payment of the thirty pieces of silver. Nothing could be more characteristic, real, and unaffected than these.

3. The Last Supper, and the washing of the apostles' feet. Here the table was arranged on the model of the well-known picture of Leonardo da Vinci.

4. All the scenes in which Christ was brought successively before Annas, Caiaphas, Pilate, and Herod; the ' Ecce Homo' (copied, it struck me, from Van Dyck), the scourging, etc. In some of these as many as two hundred and fifty persons were at once on the scene-infuriated mobs of priests, money-changers, Roman soldiers, etc. — and, violent as were the passions personified, there was not the least approach to rant, nor the slightest transgression into irreverence or improbability. In the course of these scenes a striking occurrence was the contrast of Barabbas — a brutal and squalid figure — with the noble form and countenance of the sacred sufferer the latter formed more after the model of those of Albert Durer than of any other painter; at least such was my impression. Both Pilate and Herod were admirably represented, but especially the former.

5. The whole long procession, at the slowest pace, from Pilate's house to Golgotha; our Lord and the thieves carrying their huge crosses; his interview with his mother and the other women of Jerusalem. This contained the legendary or traditional incident of the wiping of Christ's face by St. Veronica; but there was no attempt to show the miraculous impression of the sacred countenance on the handkerchief, which forms the point of the legend.

6. The last dreadful scene — the uprearing of the three crosses with their living burdens, and all the cruel incidents of that most cruel and lingering death" (Eadie, Ecclesiastes Cyclop. s.v.). Plays of an humble description, from subjects in legendary or sacred history, are not unfrequently got up by the villagers around Innspruck, which show a certain rude dramatic talent, though not comparable to what is exhibited at Ammergau. Girls very generally represent both the male and female characters. See, besides the authorities quoted in the article, Onesime le Rov, Etudes sur les Mysteres (Paris. 1837, 8vo), chapter 1; Edelstand du Meril, Origines du Theatre moderne (Paris. 1849, 8vo); Wright, Early Mysteries, etc. (Lond. 1838, 8vo); Collier, Hist. of Engl. Dramat. Poetry; Magnin, Les Origines du Theatre moderne (Paris, 1838); Devrient, Geschichte d. Schauspielkunst  (Leipsic, 1848); Hone, English Mysteries (Lond. 1823); Marriott, English Miracle-plays (Basle, 1856). The libretto has been published (Lond. 1890, 8vo). For monographs, see Volbeding, Index Programmatum, page 172.

## Mystery[[@Headword:Mystery]]

             (μυστήριον), a term employed in the Bible (N.T.), as well as in some of the pagan religions, to denote a revealed secret. See Grossmann, De Judaeorum arcani disciplina, SEE ESSENES (Lips. 1833-4); and on the Christian "secret discipline," the monographs cited by Volbtdiing, Index Programm. page 138 sq.

I. Etymology of the Word. — Some have thought to derive the Greek μύστηριον, from which the English mystery is plainly a transfer, from a Hebrew source, but sound philology forbids this. It is clearly a derivation, through μύστης, an initiated person, from μυεῖσθαι, to initiate, and thus ultimately from μύω, to close the eyes or mouth, i.e., to keep a secret. The derivative μυστήριον had always a reference to secrets of a religious character, and this sense is retained in the Bible.

II. Pagan Mysteries in general. — These were ceremonies in which only the initiated could participate. The practice may be obscurely traced to the early Orient, in the rites of Isis (q.v.) and Osiris (q.v.) in Egypt, in the Mithraic solemnities of Persia, and in the Greek festivals connected with the worship of Bacchus and Cybele, and may be even faintly, recognised in our day in the ceremonies of freemasonry. They consisted in general of rites of purification and expiation, of sacrifices and processions, of ecstatic or orgiastic songs and dances, of nocturnal festivals fit to impress the imagination, and of spectacles designed to excite the most diverse emotions — terror and trust, sorrow and joy, hope and despair. The celebration was chiefly by symbolical acts and spectacles; yet sacred mystical words, formulas, fragments of liturgies, or hymns, were also employed. There were likewise certain objects with which occult meanings that were imparted to the initiated were associated, or which were used in the various ceremonies in the ascending scale of initiation. The sacred phrases, the ἀπόῤῥητα, concerning which silence was imposed, were themselves symbolical legends, and probably not statements of speculative truths. The most diverse theories have been suggested concerning the origin, nature, and significance of the Hellenic mysteries. As Schunemann remarks ( Griechische AIterntiimer, 3d ed., Berlin, 1873), the very fact  that it was not permitted to reveal to the uninitiated wherein these cults consisted, what were the rites peculiar to them, for what the gods were invoked, or what were the names of the divinities worshipped, has been the cause of our extremely incomplete information in regard to them.

The oldest of the Hellenic mysteries are believed to be the Cabiric, in Samothrace and Lemnos, which were renowned through the whole period of pagan antiquity.

Though they were only less august than the Eleusinian, nothing is certain concerning them, and even the names of the divinities are known to us only by the profanation of Manaseas. (See below.) The Eleusinian were the most venerable of the mysteries. "Happy," says Pindar, "is he who has beheld them, and descends beneath the hollow earth; he knows the end, he knows the divine origin of life." They composed a long series of ceremonies, concluding with complete initiation or perfection. The fundamental legend on which the ritual seems to have been based was the search of the goddess Demeter, or Ceres, for her daughter Proserpine, her sorrows and her joys, her descent into Hades, and her return into the realm of light. The rites were thought to prefigure the scenes of a future life. The same symbol was the foundation of the Thesmophoria, which were celebrated exclusively by married women, rendering it probable that initiation was designed to protect against the dangers of childbirth. (See below.) The Orphic and Dionysiac mysteries seem to have designed a reformation of the popular religion. Founded upon the worship of the Thracian Dionysus, or Bacchus, they tended to ascetic rather than orgiastic practices. Other mysteries were those of Zeus, or Jupiter, in Crete; of Hera, or Juno, in Argolis; of Athene, or Minerva, in Athens; of Artemis, or Diana, in Arcadia; of Hector in Egina, and of Rhea in Phrygia. The worship of the last, under different names, prevailed in divers forms and places in Greece and the East, and was associated with the orgiastic rites of the Corybantes.

More important were the Persian mysteries of Mithra, which appeared in Rome about the beginning of the 2d century of the Christian sera. They were propagated by Chaldaean and Syrian priests. The austerity of the doctrine, the real perils of initiation which neophytes were obliged to encounter, the title of soldier of Mithra which was bestowed on them, and the crowns which were offered them after the combats preceding every grade of advancement, were among the peculiarities which gave to these  rites a military and bellicose character; and Roman soldiers eagerly sought initiation into them. The fundamental dogma of the Mithraic doctrine was the transmigration of souls under the influence of the seven planets, over whose operations Mithra presided. The whole fraternity of the initiated was divided into seven classes or grades, which were named successively soldiers, lions, hysenas, etc., after animals sacred to Mithra. The sacrifice of the bull was characteristic of his worship. On the monuments which have been found in Italy, the Tyrol, and other parts of Europe, inscribed Deo Mithrae Soli Invicto, Mithra is usually represented as a young man in a flowing robe, surrounded with mystical figures, seated on a bull, which he is pressing down, or into which he is plunging the sacrificial knife. A dog, a serpent, a scorpion, and a lion are arranged near him. Nothing is certain concerning the signification of this scene. After the adoption of some of the ideas connected with other religious systems, as those of the Alexandrian Serapis, the Syrian Baal, and the Greek Apollo, the Mithra worship disappeared in the 5th or 6th century. SEE MITHRA.

See Creuzer, Symbolik Mythologie (181)-12), translated into French, with elaborate annotations, by Guigniant and others (1825-36); Sainte-Croix, Recherches historiques et critiques sur les Mysteres du Paganisme, edited by Sylvestre de Sacy (1317); Seel, Die Mithra-Geheimnisse wahrend der vor- und christlichen Zeit (1823); Limbourg-Brouwer, Hist. de la Civilization morale et religieuse des Grecs (1833-41); Lajard, Recherches sur le Culte public et les Mysteres de Mithra (1847-8); Maury, Hist. des Religions de la Grace antique (1857); Preller, Romische Mythologie (2d ed. 1865); and Griechische Mythologie (3d ed. 1872); Enfield, Hist. of Philosophy, pages 20, 39, 50, 65; Puffendorf, Religio gentilium arcana (Lips. 1772); Osiander, De mysteriis Eleusiniis (Stuttgard, 1808); Ousvaroff, Sur les mysteres d'Eleusis (Paris, 1816).

III. The Grecian Mysteries in particular. — These mysteries certainly were always secret; but all Greeks, without distinction of rank or education — nay, perhaps even slaves — might be initiated (μνεῖσθαι); such was the case, for instance, in the Eleusinian mysteries. It is the remark of Josephus that "the principal doctrines of each nation's religion were made known, among heathens, only to a chosen few, but among the Jews to the people no less than to the priests." It appears that in many of these mysteries certain emblems or symbols (thence called themselves mysteries) were displayed either to the initiated, in the course of their training, or to  the people; and that the explanation of these to the initiated was the mode in which they were instructed.

The names by which mysteries or mystic festivals were designated in Greece are μυστήρια, τελεταί, or ὄργια. The name ὄργια (from ἔοργα) originally signified only sacrifices accompanied by certain ceremonies, but it was afterwards applied especially to the ceremonies observed in the worship of Bacchus, and at a still later period to mysteries. Τελετή in generalΤελετή signifies, in general, a religious festival, but more particularly a lustration or ceremony performed in order to avert some calamity, either public or private. Μυστήριον signifies, properly speaking, the secret part of the worship; but it was also used in the same sense as τελετή, and for mystic worship in general.

These mysteries in brief may be defined as sacrifices and ceremonies which took place at night or in secret within some sanctuary, which the uninitiated were not allowed to enter. What was essential to them were objects of worship, sacred utensils, and traditions with their interpretation, which were withheld from all persons not initiated.

The most celebrated mysteries in Greece were of three kinds, chiefly those of Samothrace and Eleusis, which may be briefly described as follows:

1. The Cabiria (καβείρια) were mysteries, festivals, and orgies solemnized in all places in which the Pelasgian Cabiri were worshipped, but especially in Samothrace, Imbros, Lemnos, Thebes, Anthedon, Pergamus, and Berytus. Little is known respecting the rites observed in these mysteries, as no one was allowed to divulge them. The most celebrated were those of the island of Samothrace, which, if we may judge from those of Lemnos, were solemnized every year, and lasted for nine days. Persons on their admission seem to have undergone a sort of examination respecting the life they had led hitherto, and were then purified of all their crimes, even if they had committed murder.

2. The Thesmophoria (θεσμοφόρια) were a great festival and mysteries, celebrated in honor of Ceres in various parts of Greece, and only by women, though some ceremonies were also performed by maidens. It was intended to commemorate the introduction of the laws and regulations of civilized life, which was universally ascribed to Ceres. The Attic thesmophoria probably lasted only three days, and began on the 11th of Pyanepsion, which day was called ἄνοδος or κάθοδος, because the  solemnities were opened by the women with a procession from Athens to Eleusis. In this procession they carried on their heads sacred laws (νόμιμοι βίβλοι or θεσμοί), the introduction of which was ascribed to Ceres (θεσμοφόρος), and other symbols of civilized life. The women spent the night at Eleusis in celebrating the mysteries of the goddess. The second day, called νηστεία, was a day of mourning, during which the women sat on the ground around the statue of Ceres, and took no other food than cakes made of sesame and honey. On this day no meetings either of the senate or the people were held. It was probably in the afternoon of this day that the women held a procession at Athens, in which they walked barefooted behind a wagon, upon which baskets with mystical symbols were conveyed to the thesmophorion. The third day, called καλλιγένεια, from the circumstance that Ceres was invoked under this name, was a day of merriment and raillery among the women themselves, in commemoration of Iambe, who was said to have made the goddess smile during her grief.

3. But far more important, so much so indeed as almost to monopolize the term " mystery" among the Greeks, were the Eleusinian mysteries (ἐλευσίνια), a festival and mysteries, originally celebrated only at Eleusis in Attica, in honor of Ceres and Proserpina. The Eleusinian mysteries, or the mysteries, as they were sometimes called, were the holiest and most venerable of all that were celebrated in Greece. Various traditions were current among the Greeks respecting the author of these mysteries; for, while some considered Eumolpus or Mussaus to be their founder, others stated that they had been introduced from Egypt by Erechtheus, who at a time of scarcity provided his country with corn from Egypt, and imported from the same quarter the sacred rites and mysteries of Eleusis. A third tradition attributed the institution to Ceres herself, who, when wandering about in search of her daughter, Proserpina, was believed to have come to Attica, in the reign of Erechtheus, to have supplied its inhabitants with corn, and to have instituted the mysteries at Eleusis. This last opinion seems to have been the most common among the ancients, and in subsequent times a stone was shown near the well Callichorus at Eleusis on which the goddess, overwhelmed with grief and fatigue, was believed to have rested on her arrival in Attica. All the accounts and allusions in ancient writers seem to warrant the conclusion that the legends concerning the introduction of the Eleusinia are descriptions of a period when the inhabitants of Attica were becoming acquainted with the benefits of agriculture and of a regularly constituted form of society. In the reign of  Erechtheus a war is said to have broken out between the Athenians and Eleusinians; and when the latter were defeated, they acknowledged the supremacy of Athens in everything except the mysteries, which they wished to conduct and regulate for themselves. Thus the superintendence remained with the descendants of Eumolpus, the daughters of the Eleusinian king Celeus, and a third class of priests, the Ceryces, who seem likewise to have been connected with the family of Eumolpus, though they themselves traced their origin to Mercury and Aglauros. At the time when the local governments of the several townships of Attica were concentrated at Athens, the capital became also the centre of religion, and several deities who had hitherto only enjoyed a local worship were now raised to the rank of national gods. This seems also to have been the case with the Eleusinian goddess, for in the reign of Theseus we find mention of a temple at Athens called Eleusinian, probably the new and national sanctuary of Ceres. Her priests and priestesses now became naturally attached to the national temple of the capital, though her original place of worship at Eleusis, with which so many sacred associations were connected, still retained its importance and its special share in the celebration of the national solemnities.

We must distinguish between the greater Eleusinia, which were celebrated at Athens and Eleusis, and the lesser, which were held at Agrae on the Ilissus. The lesser Eleusinia were only a preparation (προκάθαρσις or προάγνευσις) for the real mysteries. They were held every year in the month of Anthesterion, and, according to some accounts, in honor of Proserpina alone. Those who were initiated in them bore the name of Mystae (μύσται), and had to wait at least another year before they could be admitted to the great mysteries. The principal rites of this first stage of initiation consisted in the sacrifice of a sow, which the mystea seem to have first washed in the Cantharus, and in the purification by a priest, who bore the name of Hydranus ( ῾Υδρανός). The mystae had also taken an oath of secrecy, which was administered to them by the Mystagogus (μυσταγωγός, also called ἱεροφάντης or προφήτης), and they received some kind of preparatory instruction, which enabled them afterwards to understand the mysteries that were revealed to them in the great Eleusinia.

The great mysteries were celebrated every year in the month of Boedromion during nine days, from the 15th to the 23d, both at Athens and Eleusis. The initiated were called ἐπόπται or ἔφυροι. On the first day those who had been initiated in the lesser Eleusinia assembled at Athens.  On the second day the mystae went in solemn procession to the sea-coast, where they underwent a purification. Of the third day scarcely any thing is known with certainty; we are only told that it was a day of fasting, and that in the evening a frugal meal was taken, which consisted of cakes made of sesame and honey. On the fourth day the κάλαθος κάθοδος seems to have taken place. This was a procession with a basket containing pomegranates and poppy-seeds; it was carried on a wagon drawn by oxen, and women followed with small mystic cases in their hands. On the fifth day, which appears to have been called the torch day (ἡ τῶν λαμπάδων ἡμέρα), the mystee, led by the δᾷδοῦχος, went in the evening with torches to the temple of Ceres at Eleusis, where they seem to have remained during the following night. This rite was probably a symbolical representation of Ceres wandering about in search of Proserpina. The sixth day, called lacchus, was the most solemn of all. The statue of Iaccllus, son of Ceres, adorned with a garland of myrtle and bearing a torch in his hand, was carried along the sacred road amid joyous shouts and songs, from the Ceramicus to Eleusis. This solemn procession was accompanied by great numbers of followers and spectators. During the night from the sixth to the seventh day the mystae remained at Eleusis, and were initiated into the last mysteries (ἐποπτεία). Those who were neither ἐπόπται nor μύσται were sent away by a herald. The mystue now repeated the oath of secrecy which had been administered to them at the lesser Eleusinia, underwent a new purification, and then they were led by the mystagogus in the darkness of night into the lighted interior of the sanctuary (φωταγωγία), and were allowed to see (αὐτοψία) what none except the epoptue ever beheld. The awful and horrible manner in which the initiation is described by later, especially Christian writers, seems partly to proceed from their ignorance of its real character, partly from their horror of and aversion to these pagan rites. The more ancient writers always abstained from entering upon any description of the subject. Each individual, after his initiation, is said to have been dismissed by the words κόγξ, ὄμπαξ, in order to make room for other mystue.

On the seventh day the initiated returned to Athens amid various kinds of raillery and jests, especially at the bridge over the Cephisus, where they sat down to rest, and poured forth their ridicule on those who passed by. Hence the words γεφυρίζειν and γεφυρισμός. These σκώμματα seem, like the procession with torches to Eleusis, to have been dramatical and symbolical representations of the jests by which, according to the ancient  legend, Iambe or Baubo had dispelled the grief of the goddess and made her smile. We may here observe that probably the whole history of Ceres and Proserpina was in some way or other symbolically represented at the Eleusinia. The eighth day, called Epidauria (Ε᾿πιδαύρια), was a kind of additional day for those who by some accident had come too late, or had been prevented from being initiated on the sixth day. It was said to have been added to the original number of days when AEsculapius, coming over from Epidaurus to be initiated, arrived too late, and the Athenians, not to disappoint the god, added an eighth day. The ninth and last day bore the name of πλημοχοαί, from a peculiar kind of vessel called πλημοχοη, which is described as a small kind of κότυλος. Two of these vessels were on this day filled with water or wine, and the contents of the one thrown to the east, and those of the other to the west, while those who performed this rite uttered some mystical words.

The Eleusinian mysteries long survived the independence of Greece. Attempts to suppress them were made by the emperor Valentinian; but he met with strong opposition, and they seem to have continued down to the time of the elder Theodosius.

Respecting the secret doctrines which were revealed in them to the initiated, nothing certain is known. The general belief of the ancients was that they opened to man a comforting prospect of a future state. But this feature does not seem to have been originally connected with these mysteries, and was probably added to them at the period which followed the opening of a regular intercourse between Greece and Egypt, when some of the speculative doctrines of the latter country and of the East may have been introduced into the mysteries, and hallowed by the names of the venerable bards of the mythical age. This supposition would also account, in some measure, for the legend of their introduction from Egypt (Smith, Dict. of Class. Antiq. s.v.). It does seem, indeed, as if the vague speculations of modern times on the subject were an echo of the manifold interpretations of the various acts of the mysteries given by the priests to the inquiring disciple — according to the lights of the former or the latter. Some investigators, themselves not entirely free from certain mystic influences (like Creuzer and others), have held them to have been a kind of misty orb around a kernel of pure light, the bright rays of which were too strong for the eyes of the multitude; that, in fact, they hid under an outward garb of mummery a certain portion of the real and eternal truth of religion, the knowledge of which had been derived from some primeval, or,  perhaps, the Mosaic revelation; if it could not be traced to certain (or uncertain) Egyptian, Indian, or generally Eastern sources. To this kind of hazy talk, however (which we only mention because it is still repeated every now and then), the real and thorough investigations begun by Lobeck, and still pursued by many competent scholars in our own day, have, or ought to have, put an end. There cannot be anything more alien to the whole spirit of Greek and Roman antiquity than a hiding of abstract truths and occult wisdom under rites and formulas, songs and dances; and, in fact, the mysteries were anything but exclusive, either with respect to sex, age, or rank, in point of initiation. It was only the speculative tendency of later times, when Polytheism was on the wane, that tried to symbolize and allegorize these obscure and partly imported ceremonies, the bulk of which had undoubtedly sprung from the midst of the Pelasgian tribes themselves in prehistoric times, and which were intended to represent and to celebrate certain natural phenomena in the visible creation. There is certainly no reason to deny that some more refined minds may at a very early period have endeavored to impart a higher sense to these wondrous performances; but these can only be considered as solitary instances. The very fact of their having to be put down in later days as public nuisances in Rome herself speaks volumes against the occult wisdom inculcated in secret assemblies of men and women (Chambers, Cyclop. s.v.).

IV. Biblical Use of the Term "Mystery." — A most unscriptural and dangerous sense is too often put upon the word, as if it meant something absolutely unintelligible and incomprehensible; whereas in every instance in which it occurs in the Sept. or New Testament it is applied to something which is revealed, declared, explained, spoken, or which may be known or understood.

1. It is sometimes used to denote the meaning of a symbolical representation, whether addressed to the mind by a parable, allegory, etc., or to the eye by a vision, etc. Thus our Lord, having delivered to the multitude the parable of the sower (Mat 13:3-9), when the disciples asked him (Mat 13:10) why he spoke to them in parables, replied, " Unto you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but unto them which are without it is not given" (Mar 4:11); "Therefore I speak to them in parables" (Mat 13:13); "But your eyes see, and your ears understand" (Mat 13:16): here our Lord applies the term mysteries to the moral truths couched under that parable, that is, to its figurative meaning. Again, the mystery or symbolical vision of the "seven stars and of  the seven golden candlesticks" (Rev 1:12; Rev 1:16) is explained to mean "the angels of the seven churches of Asia, and the seven churches themselves" (Rev 1:20). Likewise the mystery or symbolical representation "of the woman upon a scarlet-colored beast" (Rev 17:3-6) is explained, "I will tell thee the mystery of the woman," etc. (Rev 17:7). When St. Paul, speaking of marriage, says "this is a great mystery" (Eph 5:32), he evidently treats the original institution of marriage as affording a figurative representation of the union between Christ and the Church (Campbell, Dissert. page 10, part 3:§ 9).

2. The word is also used to denote anything whatever which is hidden or concealed, till it is explained. The Sept. uses it to express רו, a secret (Dan 2:18-19; Dan 2:27-30; Dan 2:47; Dan 4:6), in relation to Nebuchadnezzar's dream, which was a secret till Daniel explained it, and even from the king himself, for he had totally forgotten it (Dan 4:5; Dan 4:9). Thus the word is used in the New Testament to denote those doctrines of Christianity, general or particular, which the Jews and the world at large did not understand till they were revealed by Christ and his apostles: Great is the mystery of godliness," i.e., the Christian religion (1Ti 3:16), the chief parts of which the apostle instantly proceeds to adduce — "God was manifest in the flesh, justified by the Spirit, seen of angels," etc. —facts which had not entered into the heart of man (1Co 2:9) until God visibly accomplished them, and revealed them to the apostles by inspiration (1Co 2:10). The apostle is generally thought here to compare the Gospel with the greater Eleusinian mysteries (for which see Diod. Sic. 4:25; Dem. 29, ult. Xen. H.G. 1:4, 14; or Leland's Advantage and Necessity of the Christian Revelation, part 1, chapters 8, 9; or Macknight's Preface to the Ephesians, § 7). Thus also the Gospel in general is called "the mystery of the faith," which it was requisite the deacons should "hold with a pure conscience" (1Ti 3:9), and the mystery which from the beginning of the world had been hid with God, but which was now made known through means of the church" (Eph 3:9); the mystery of the Gospel which St. Paul desired "to make known" (Eph 6:19); "the mystery of God, and of the Father, and of Christ," to the full apprehension or understanding of which (rather than "the acknowledgment") he prayed that the Colossians might come (Col 2:2; comp. the use of the word ἐπίγνωσις, 1Ti 2:4; 2Ti 3:7); which he desired the Colossians to pray that God would enable himself and his fellow-apostles "to speak and to make  manifest" (Col 4:3-4); which he calls "the revelation of the mystery that was kept secret since the world began, but now is made manifest and known to all nations" (Rom 16:25); which, he says, "we speak" (Corinthians 2:7), and of which the apostles were "stewards" (1Co 4:1). The same word is used respecting certain particular doctrines of the Gospel, as, for instance, "the partial and temporary blindness of Israel," of which mystery "the apostle would not have Christians" ignorant (Rom 11:25), and which he explains (Rom 11:25-32). He styles the calling of the Gentiles "a mystery which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto the holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit" (Eph 3:4-6; comp. 1:9, 10, etc.). To this class we refer the well-known phrase, "Behold, I show you a mystery (1Co 15:51): we shall all be changed;" and then follows an explanation of the change (1Co 15:51-55). Even in the case of a man speaking in an unknown tongue, in the absence of an interpreter, and when, therefore, no man understood him, although "by the Spirit he was speaking mysteries," yet the apostle supposes that the man so doing himself understood what he said (1Co 14:2-4). In the prophetic portion of his writings, "concerning the mystery of iniquity" (2Th 2:7), he speaks of it as being ultimately "revealed" (2Th 2:8). (See below.) Josephus applies nearly the same phrase, μυστήριον κακίας, a mystery of wickedness, to Antipater's crafty conduct to ensnare and destroy his brother Alexander (War, 1:24, 1); and to complete the proof that the word " mystery" is used in the sense of knowable secrets, we add the words, " Though I understand all mysteries" (1Co 13:2). The Greeks used the word in the same way. Thus Menander, μυστήριον σου μὴ κατείπης τῷ φιλῷ, "Tell not your secret to a friend" (page 274, line 671, ed. Clerici). Even when they apply the term to the greater and lesser Eleusinian mysteries, they are still mysteries into which a person might be initiated, when they would, of course, cease to be mysteries to him. The word is used in the same sense throughout the Apocrypha as in the Sept. and New Testament (Tob 12:7; Jdt 2:2; Sir 22:22; Sir 27:16-17; Sir 27:21; 2Ma 13:21); it is applied to divine or sacred mysteries (Wisd. 2:33; 6:22), and to the ceremonies of false religions (Wis 14:15; Wis 14:23). See Bibliotheca Sancta, January 1867, page 196; Whately, St. Paul, page 176; Contemp. Rev. January 1868, page 182.

V. Ecclesiastical Use of the Term. — The word "mysteries" is repeatedly applied to the Lord's Supper by Chrysostom. The eucharist was the last  and the highest point of the secret discipline, SEE ARCANI DISCIPLINA; and the name which it received on this account was retained so long as the superstitious doctrine of the miraculous presence of the body and blood of Christ gained ground. By the usage of the Christian Church it denotes the inscrutable union in the sacrament of the inward and spiritual grace with the outward and visible sign. In the early Church the term derived a still greater force from the secrecy which was observed in the administration of those ordinances. SEE SACRAMENT.

## Mystery Of Iniquity[[@Headword:Mystery Of Iniquity]]

             (τὸ μυστήριον τῆς ἀνομίας), an expression that occurs in Paul's description of the workings of an antichristian power in his own day (1Th 2:7), and the meaning of which is not clear. The attributive genitive (ἀνομίας) does not seem to be that of the agent (Theodoret), nor that of apposition (Lunemann and Alford), but simply of definition, or of the characterizing quality, i.e., the mystery of which the characterizing feature, or the active principle, was ἀνομία, or lawlessness — the antithesis of order and legality. This "mystery of iniquity" was no personality, i.e., Antichrist, or any real or assumed type of Antichrist (as Chrysostom), but all that mass of uncombined and, so to speak, unorganized lawlessness which, though as yet seen only in detail and not revealed in its true proportions, was even then (ἤδη) aggregating and energizing, and would eventually (ἐν τῷ ἑαυτοῦ καιρῷ) find its complete development and organization in the person and power of Antichrist (Ellicott, note ad loc.). SEE ANTICHRIST.

## Mystic Veils[[@Headword:Mystic Veils]]

             (ἀυφίθυρά, a folding door, because they opened in the middle) were hanging veils used in Eastern churches to conceal the chancel from the catechumens and unbelievers. They were also designed to conceal the eucharist at the time of consecration. As Christian churches were constructed after the type of the Jewish Temple, the ἀυφίθυρα represents the veil which separated the holy of holies from other parts of the Temple.

## Mystical Interpretation[[@Headword:Mystical Interpretation]]

             otherwise termed spiritual, figurative, is either tropological or anagogical, i.e., according to it words having a distinct literal sense receive either a moral or heavenly reference. Some include the allegorical under the  mystical. The mystical differs from the literal sense in this, that the meaning cannot at once be derived from the words; but the literal sense being assumed from it, and from the things signified by it, the meaning wrapped up in the words is disclosed. — Blunt, Dict. Doct. and Histor. Theol. For example, "Babylon" signifies literally a city of Chaldaea, the habitation of kings who persecuted the Hebrews, and who were overwhelmed in idolatry and wickedness. But John, in the Revelation, gives the name of Babylon, mystically, to the city of Rome. So Jerusalem is literally a city of Judaea, but mystically the heavenly Jerusalem, the habitation of the saints, etc. The "serpent" is literally or naturally a venomous reptile, but mystically the devil, the old serpent, etc. SEE INTERPRETATION.

## Mystical Pantheism[[@Headword:Mystical Pantheism]]

             SEE PANTHEISM.

## Mystical Table[[@Headword:Mystical Table]]

             a name applied by Chrysostom to the communion-table (q.v.).

## Mystical Theism[[@Headword:Mystical Theism]]

             SEE THEISM.

## Mysticism[[@Headword:Mysticism]]

             (Gr. μυστικόν), according to the strict meaning of the word, signifies a special knowledge and understanding of the mysteries from which the uninitiated are excluded. "Mysticism," says Cousin, "is the belief that God may be known face to face, without anything intermediate. It is a yielding to the sentiment awakened by the idea of the Infinite, and a summing up of all knowledge and all duty in the contemplation and love of him" (Hist. de let Philos. 1st ser. volume 2, lecon 9, 10). Mysticism, therefore, properly defined, is the science of the supernatural state of the human soul manifested in the body and in the order of visible things by equally supernatural effects. "Mysticism," as one has well said, "despairs of the regular process of science; it believes that we may attain directly, without the aid of the senses or reason, and by an immediate intuition, to the real and absolute principle of all truth, God. It finds God either in nature, and hence a physical and naturalistic mysticism; or in the soul, and hence a moral and metaphysical mysticism." Thus mysticism should be divided into two distinct branches: esoteric, or inner mysticism, and exoteric, or  outward mysticism. The first is the study of this supernatural state of the human soul, such as it has been described by saints and mystics. The obscure, unintelligible, and even absurd descriptions given by Mystics of these phenomena, reproduced even by modern theological writers, make mysticism synonymous with quietism (q.v.), and all forms of fanaticism and enthusiasm, etc.

Thus, Bretschneider says, "Mysticism is the belief in a continuous, immediate action of God on the soul, produced by special religious exercises, the effect of which is to enlighten, sanctify, and strengthen the soul. It is therefore the faith in an inward light, the neglect of the written revelation, continence, contemplation, etc." Wegscheider considers enthusiasm as a branch of mysticism, differing only in degree from fanaticism: "Omnino mysticismum prae se ferre dicuntur in, qui neglectis aut repudiatis sanae rationis legibus sensibus acrioribus et phantasiae ludibriis in religione describenda et colenda indulgentes immediatam quandam rerum divinarum perceptionem jactant. Mysticismus haud raro abit in fanaticum errorem." According to Hase, the common and principal defect of mysticism is its rejection from the domain of religious life of all human knowledge and general laws, by which indeed it does not lose its intensity of feeling, but its liberty, and, becoming liable to every kind of error, is gradually more inclined to superstition. Under the influence of the strange fancies of the imagination, it leads to enthusiasm; under that of a strong will, to fanaticism; and hinder that of the recognition of a spiritual sphere, apart from the medium of human experimental knowledge, to theosophy. The writers of the rationalistic period give ample evidence of the confusion often made between mysticism and pietism.

This error has in modern times been corrected, especially by the efforts of Nitzsch, in his System d. christlichen Lehre. Mysticism, then, in the objective sense, is the divine element imparted to man by external or internal communication (for instance, in the sacraments), and in the subjective sense it is special experience, visions, etc., subject to particular conditions and processes; for although man is by nature susceptible of and intended for the reception of divine communications, yet a certain conduct, sometimes an ascetic self-renouncement, an abstraction of partly the sensual and partly the spiritual identity, is requisite in order to render us capable of receiving and understanding these supernatural communications in this natural state of existence. It follows that, strictly speaking, every religious person, as such, is a Mystic, etc. Says Mill, "Whether in the Vedas, in the Platonists, or in the Hegelians, mysticism is neither more nor less than ascribing objective existence to the subjective creations of our  own faculties, to ideas or feelings of the mind; and believing that, by retaining and contemplating those ideas of its own making, it can read in them what takes place in the world' without" (Logic, book 5, chapter 3. § 5).

The inner life of religion is always mystical. Mysticism is a one-sided manifestation of this force. Sack also, in his Polemik (page 288), considers true mysticism as the inner portion of the Christian spiritual life, and fanatical mysticism as an exaggeration and a misconception of the reasonable views of the Church. We concede that mysticism in the proper sense, as the immediate life of the very essence of religion, is to be found in the mystery of revelation, and is in so far the very truth of religion. The soul's yearning for the invisible finds the object of its aspiration in a sacramental union with objects of its desire. Jacob's realization of the divine presence at Bethel was as the mystic ladder of communication on which the angels of God passed to and fro between earth and heaven. By a deeper generalization, Solomon saw in the wisdom of God the bond of union that connects the spirit of the universe with the Spirit of God. The religious idea had at that early date its obverse side of mystic impress. In the cognate theology of St. John the Word is the middle term between earth and heaven, and being God from the beginning, he is still the Light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world. Hence the mystic principle is inseparable from true religion, so far as it sets the Invisible before the eye of faith and enables the soul to anticipate the future for which it was created. Hence, also, the less true forms of religion have one and all embodied the mystic principle as involving the very essence of religion. Therapeutic contemplation was the obverse of Mosaic ordinance; the Cabala refined upon the Talmud; and Persian Sufism is as the spirit of which the Koran is the letter. In the Church of the 6th century the pseudoDionysian mysticism was a reaction upon the dogmatic ruling forced upon the Church by heresy; much as the mysticism of the Alombados, or Illuminati, of Spain in the 16th century was called forth by the rigid orthodoxy of the Inquisition, and Jansenistic and Quietistic tenets by Jesuitism. Mysticism has been the most usual form in which the expiring flame of religion has flickered up from its embers.

We must not forget however, that mysticism, as a special and historical religious manifestation, is all exceptional form of the inner religious life, even indicating a certain one-sided tendency in it, from which real mysticism is to be distinguished. If we consider the essence and life of religion in its general manifestation, we find it to appear as a healthy  reciprocal action of the objective consciousness of the existence of God and of self-consciousness. Thus we give the name of mysticism to the predominating relation of subjective life to God revealing himself in it, and of pietism to the predominating relation of God in the subjective life. The Mystic aims at becoming absorbed in God by contemplation, the Pietist at imparting the divine character to all his actions. In the former, the consciousness of moral personality is cast in the shade; in the latter, the rest in God, the solemn contemplation of his objective majesty, predominates. Hence the former inclines to pantheism. Where the personality is not simply spiritually sacrificed, but great importance is attached to transcendent contemplation of God, man loses with the clear perception of his own personality that also of the personality of God.

The other tendency, on the contrary, inclines to dualism, and even to polytheism, although never degenerating so far where monotheism is recognised. When man reflects in a one-sided, methodical manner on the exhibition of the divine in its subjective action, instead of acting before God with a simple consciousness of God, he is led to a lasting disunion of his consciousness; i.e., to a distinction between the idea of the divine and his life. This partiality, degenerating into morbidness, leads on the one side into mysticism, on the other into pietism. The Mystic loses his clear self- consciousness in obscure, arbitrary, ascetic, and ecstatic conceptions, or rather in a passive experience of the divine; moral piety would be the remedy. Pietism, on the contrary, loses itself in self-made subjective religious laws and self-torments; its natural remedy would be a healthy mysticism. The Mystic loses himself in God, and cherishes the desire to passively suffer God to act in him, instead of giving himself personally over to a personal God, and thus finding himself glorified; while the Pietist loses the inward presence of God because he does not liberate the feeling of his personality from subjective, egotistical limits and religious self- contemplation by subjecting it to the personality of God. Thuss, dogmatically defined, mysticism would be religion with an excessive objective tendency, or religion in the form of a central life of feeling, of immediate thought, of contemplative and intuitive knowledge, which, accompanied by an ascetic tendency, seeks principally to lose itself via negationis in the Deity. Compared with the religious and the ethical element in human life, or with the consciousness of night and that of day time, mysticism is a leaning towards the first form of consciousness. "If we were required to define mysticism," says Stowell, "we should call it the setting up of personal thoughts and feelings as the standard of truth or as  the rule of action. By mystical views of the spiritual life we understand such views of that life as are adjusted by this standard or ordered by this rule. The relation of such views to our present theme will be found in the fact that men ascribe this inward standard of truth and rule of action to the direct inspiration of the Holy Spirit. The mystical views may be regarded under different aspects, as (1) speculative, (2) contemplative, (3) imaginative, or (4) practical Speculative mysticism has found its place in the schools of philosophy and of morals; contemplative mysticism has been the resource of the meditative, the tranquil, or the enthusiastic; imaginative mysticism deludes the visionary; practical mysticism misleads the fanatic." For a historical development of mystical views, SEE MYSTICS.

## Mystics[[@Headword:Mystics]]

             are religionists who profess a pure and sublime devotion, accompanied with a disinterested love of God, free from selfish considerations; and who believe that the writings which reveal to them the story of the supernatural have a mystic and hidden sense, which must be sought after in order to comprehend their true import. Under this name some understand all those who profess to know how they are inwardly taught of God. Mystics have existed from the time when men's thoughts began to be turned inward upon themselves. "In all religious writings in which the affections come in," says a writer in the Saturday Review, "there must be, if it is real, an element more or less of what must bear the name of mysticism. It is simply the same thing as saying that there cannot be poetry without feeling, or art without insight, or affection and friendship without warmth of heart." Yet as there are false poetry and false art, and extravagant and false affections, so there is a false and mistaken direction, as well as a true and right one, of the religious affections; and it seems hardly saying too much to affirm that the mischief done to religion and to human society by the misdirection of the religious affections is, as far as we can see, out of all proportion greater than that done by intellectual error, and by the divisions created by what has been deemed intellectual error. Perhaps it is only to be paralleled in the mischief done by misdirected social affections. Intellectual error at least does not directly sap men's strength; and often, in the earnest conflict to which it leads, it provokes the force which is to overthrow it or keep it in check. But the disasters arising out of the misdirection of the religious affections have been of a more fatal nature. They include not merely all the train of evils attending on what is forced, unreal, and hollow, but the irreparable exhaustion, and weakness, and failure of tone, which succeeds  the fever of minds wound up to overstrained states of exaltation; the credulity, the mad self-conceit, and the perverse crookedness which never can be cured; and in opponents and lookers-on, influenced by the reaction of disgust, there result the scepticism, the hardness, and the mocking and cruel temper, which the sight of folly, and possibly selfishness, clothing themselves with the most august claims and taking the holiest names in vain, must inevitably call forth and confirm.

Christian mysticism declares, in the language of Pascal, that the head has reasons of its own which the reason knows not of; or, in the words of Paul, that the wisdom of God is a mystery which the natural man receiveth not (1Co 2:6-16). In this general sense nearly all Christians now recognise an element of mysticism in the Gospel; i.e., they recognise that Christian experience has depths which the natural reason cannot sound; that there are truths which the spiritual sense perceives, but which the natural sense, or reason, cannot recognise or demonstrate, though it may perceive that they are consonant with, or at least not antagonistic to, reason. It will be readily seen, however, from what we have said above, that this doctrine is liable to perversion; and, historically, it has been perverted. In a historical survey of the Mystics, we find that they embrace various classes, from those who held the orthodox doctrines of the Church, but in the form of an experience rather than as a dogma or system of philosophy, to those who not only undervalue but actually repudiate all doctrinal theology, and reduce theology from a system of truth to a dream. Yet all of them, however widely apart in many respects, agree in this, that they seek to develop in the human heart disinterestedness of love, without other motives, and profess to feel, in the enjoyment of the temper itself, an abundant reward, while passive contemplation is the state of perfection to which they aspire. They lay little or no stress upon the outward ceremonies and ordinances of religion, but dwell chiefly upon the inward operations of the mind. It is not uncommon for them to allegorize certain passages of Scripture; at the same time they do not deny the literal sense as having an allusion to the inward experience of believers. “Thus," according to them, the word Jerusalem, which is the name of the capital of Judaea, signifies, allegorically, the Church militant, morally, a believer, and, mysteriously, heaven." That sublime passage also in Genesis, "Let there be light, and there was light," which is, according to the letter, physical light, signifies, allegorically, the Messiah, morally, grace, and, mysteriously, beatitude, or the light of glory. All this appears to be harmless, yet we must be careful  not to give way to the sallies of a lively imagination in interpreting Scripture. Thus Woolston is said to have been led to reject the Old Testament by spiritualizing and allegorizing the New. That among this class of devout men there was often genuine piety, with a living faith which realized Christ within them the hope of glory, is not to be doubted. But delusion soon sprang up, and men, given to mental introversion, mistook the dreams of their own distempered imagination for realities. Sudden impressions were cherished as the illapse of the Spirit, and pictures of morbid fancy were hailed as exhibiting the odors, hues, and riches of a spiritual paradise.

The forms of thought and modes of action in which mysticism has been developed in different periods and among different nations are almost infinitely varied. Mysticism has appeared in the loftiest abstract speculation, and in the grossest and most sensuous idolatry. It has allied itself with theism, atheism, and pantheism. Vaughan, in his Hours with the Mystics, divides Mystics into three classes: the Theopathetic, the Theosophic, and the Theurgic. Under the first class, or the Theopathists, are included all those who resign themselves, in a passivity more or less absolute, to an imagined divine manifestation. The Theosophists, again, are those who form a theory of God, or the works of God, which has not reason, but an inspiration of their own for its basis. Finally, the Theurgists include all who claim supernatural powers generally through converse with the world of spirits.

Minds predisposed to mysticism have been found in every age and in every country. The earliest mysticism, that of India, as exhibited in the Bhagavat Gita, SEE HINDUISM, appears not in a rudimental and initial form, but fully developed, and as complete as it has ever manifested itself in modern Christendom. The Jewish Mystics are to be found at an early period among the ascetic Therapeutae, a sect similar to the Essenes. "The soul of man," said they, "is divine, and his highest wisdom is to become as much as possible a stranger to the body, with its embarrassing appetites. God has breathed into man from heaven a portion of his own divinity. That which is divine is indivisible. It may be extended. but it is incapable of separation. Consider how vast is the range of our thought over the past and the future, the heavens and the earth. This alliance with an upper world of which we are conscious would be impossible were not the soul of man an indivisible portion of that divine and blessed Spirit. Contemplation of the Divine Essence is the noblest experience of man; it is the only means of attaining  to the highest truth and virtue, and therein to behold God is the consummation of our happiness here." Jewish mysticism, combined with the profound philosophy of Plato, gave rise to the Neo-Platonic school, which, as shown in the teaching of Plotinus, its founder, was thoroughly mystical. The Mystic, according to this sect, contemplates the divine perfections in himself; and in the ecstatic state, individuality, memory, time, space, phenomenal contradictions and logical distinctions, all vanish.

In the Church, Mystics sprang up in its earliest days. They were to be met with in large numbers in the 2d and 3d centuries. But little is known of them historically. Their existence and influence, however, is manifest from the strange theological coloring of the writings of some Church fathers. The principles from which Christian mysticism sprang are more readily ascertained, and we are enabled to trace it back to the allegorizing exegesis of the Alexandrian school of theology, the remote source of which may be found in the writings of Philo (q.v.). The historical treatises of this writer were evidently composed for Hellenistic readers, and set forth such facts of Jewish history as were known to every child under synagogal discipline. His allegorizing treatises were addressed to that particular phase of the Jewish mind which is dimly indicated in the Proverbs of Solomon. more clearly in the writings of the Son of Sirach, and which became a rule of life in the Therapeutee of Alexandria. At Alexandria the literary Jew added the study of Plato to the teachings of the Law, and learned to qualify the anthropomorphism of the latter by the transcendental notions of the Deity conveyed in the purest form of Greek philosophy. By a natural progression the anthropopathic descriptions of the Sacred Book were spiritually interpreted as divine allegory, and in time the whole letter of the Law was regarded only as a veil that screened deep mystical truths from the vulgar gaze; σχεδὸν τὰ πάντα ἀλληγορεῖται are the words of Philo. This is the true origin of the allegorizing school of exegesis that was developed in the catechetical school of Alexandria by Clement and Origen, and continued elsewhere by Theophilus of Antioch, Hilary, Cyril of Alexandria, Ephraem Syrus, and the elder Macarius.

The number of the Mystics was not large in the Church until the 6th century, when they rapidly increased, under the influence of the Grecian writings of the pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite (q.v.), the then supposed and reputed disciple of St. Paul. It was at this time that is, shortly after the Constantinopolitan Council of A.D. 533 — that the Dionysian mystical views freely circulated, and made many converts. The Dionysians, by  pretending to higher degrees of perfection than other Christians, and practicing great austerities, rapidly advanced their cause, especially in the Eastern provinces. Dionysian opinions were set forth in the works entitled Mystical Theology, the Divine Names, the Heavenly Hierarchy, and the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy. The object of the author of these writings was to give a Platonic development and coloring to the deep mysteries of the Christian faith, and to lead the soul on by contemplative energy to adunation with the Deity. The highest attainment in Christian philosophy he teaches is to behold in spirit and to become one with God, who is neither darkness nor light, neither negative nor positive. Three steps lead to this blissful consummation: purification, illumination, and vision (ἐποπτεία)terms adopted from the various grades of Eleusinian initiation (Plut. Demetr. 26). A more direct application of the terminology of heathen mysticism was made by this writer when he gave its title to the work De Mystica Theologia. A copy of the pretended works of Dionysius was sent by Balbus to Louis the Meek in the year 824, which kindled the flame of mysticism in the Western provinces, and, filling the Latins with the most enthusiastic admiration of these new opinions, considerably influenced the thought of the Western Church of the Middle Ages. John Scotus Erigena' translated the writings of Dionysius into Latin by the command of Charles the Bald, and left them as a model, of which the St. Victoire schoolmen afterwards made use.

We have seen in the article DIONYSIUS SEE DIONYSIUS that these writings are believed to be the work of the 5th or 6th century. One of the most recent critics on this subject, Dr. Westcott (Contemp. Rev. May 1867), attributes the authorship to some writer of the Edessene school at the latter end of the 5th or commencement of the 6th century. The immediate source of Dionysian mysticism was certainly the Symposizim of Plato, in which the function of Eros is described as the medium of intimate communication between God and man; filling every void place throughout the universe, and binding together all its parts, celestial and mundane, in one compact body of love (Symposium, 202, E). Says one, the Mystics of the early Church, led on by Dionysius, "proceeded upon the known doctrine of the Platonic school, which was also adopted by Origen and his disciples, that 'the divine nature was infused through all human souls;' or that the faculty of reason, from which proceed the health and vigor of the mind, was an emanation from God into the human soul, and comprehended in it the principles and elements of all truth, human and divine." "All that exists," says Vaughan, in describing the Dionysian sentiments, "this Mystic regards as a symbolical manifestation of the  superexistent. What we call creation is the divine allegory. In nature, in Scripture, in tradition, God is revealed only in figures. This sacred imagery should be studied, but in such study we are still far from any adequate cognizance of the divine nature. God is above all negation and affirmation; in him such contraries are at once identified and transcended. But by negation we approach most nearly to a true apprehension of what he is. Negation and affirmation, accordingly, constitute the two opposed and yet simultaneous methods he lays down for the knowledge of the Infinite.

These two paths, the Via Negativa (or Apophatica) and the Via Affirmativa (or Cataphatica), constitute the foundation of his mysticism. They are distinguished and elaborated in every part of his writings. The positive is the descending process. In the path downwards from God, through inferior existences, the Divine Being may be said to have many names: the negative method is one of ascent; in that God is regarded as nameless, the inscrutable Anonymous. The symbolical or visible is thus opposed, in the Platonist style, to the mystical or ideal. To assert anything concerning a God who is above all affirmation is to speak in figure — to veil him. The more you deny concerning him, the more of such veils do you remove. He compares the negative method of speaking concerning the Supreme to the operation of the sculptor, who strikes off fragment after fragment of the marble, and progresses by diminution." These early Mystics, it may be added, denied that man could by labor or study excite this celestial flame in his breast; and therefore they disapproved highly of the attempts of those who, by definitions, abstract theorems, and profound speculations, endeavored to form distinct notions of truth, and discover its hidden nature. On the contrary, they maintained that silence, tranquillity, repose, and solitude, accompanied with such acts as might tend to extenuate and exhaust the body, were the means by which the hidden and internal word was excited to produce its latent virtues, and to instruct men in the knowledge of divine things.

They reasoned as follows: Those "who behold, with a noble contempt, all human affairs, who turn away their eyes from terrestrial vanities, and shut all the avenues of the outward senses against the contagious influences of a material world, must necessarily return to God when the spirit is thus disengaged from the impediments which prevent that happy union; and in this blessed frame they not only enjoy inexpressible raptures from that communion with the Supreme Being, but are invested also with the inestimable privilege of contemplating truth undisguised and uncorrupted in its native purity, while others behold it in a vitiated and delusive form." Dante, himself an exponent of Plato's  Symposium, perhaps drew from thence the inspiring thought of his Beatrice. The further development of the Platonic idea by the Neo- Platonists — Plotinus, Porphyry, and Proclus — is closely copied in the abstraction of the mundane from the grosser thought, and the unity of divine contemplation to which Dionysius aspired. He ploughed, as Fabriciussa says (In Vit. Procli. Proleg. 12), with the Neo-Platonic heifer (comp. Lupton, Introd. to Dean Colet's two Treatises on Dionys. 42). The great end at which he aimed was to show how, by means of an intermediate mediatorial hierarchy, man may hold communion with these celestial powers, order above order, until he reposes on the immediate contemplation of God himself. But he seems to wander beyond the pale of the Church. The celestial hierarchy in this scheme replaces the mediatorial functions of the Redeemer of mankind; he himself defines this hierarchy (Coel. Hier. 3:1) as a divine order, science and energy standing in closest connection with the attributes of the Deity; it is, in fact, an exact reflex of those attributes. The works of Dionysius were explained as genuine in a commentary by Maximus, the monk, of Constantinople, who composed also an allegorizing work on the Liturgy, with the title of Mqystagogia, very much in the spirit of the Dionysian views. This work still has a value as exhibiting the Liturgy of the Greek Church of the 7th century.

Maximus forms a middle term between the so-called Areopagite and Erigena. We find in his Scholia on Gregory of Nazianzum the same transcendental notions of the Deity and of the divine immanence in the world of matter, which only is by virtue of that immanence.

As supra-substantial (ὑπερούσιος), God has nothing in common with any known thing, but so far as the one is manifested in being it is multiform; and conversely, the multiform, by involution, is substantially one. It anticipates the Spinozist "Alles ist Eins, und Eins ist Alles." Man having had an eternal existence in the ideality of the Divine Being, partakes of that Being. From the divine substance he comes forth, and into that substance he returns, a consummation apparently but little removed from the Nirvana (q.v.) of the Indian theosophy. Man, both in his origin and in his future destiny, is impersonal. As uniting in one the material and intellectual, he is a microcosmic representation of the universe; as the crowning effort of creation, he embodies in himself the future recapitulation of all things in God. Substantial union with the Deity is only possible in human nature; and it was made possible to all by the union of manhood and Godhead in Christ. Thereby man's spirit soars up to God through the energy of the will,  and the incarnation of the Word is perpetuated in the individual.

By means of his own free will man may be raised more and more above the trammels of the body, and be formed in God. As God is man by incarnation, so man through grace is divinely formed, and is one with God. God through love became man; man through love, and by virtue of the incarnation, becomes God. It is not once for all, but by an indefectible continuance in all and through all, the whole mass of humanity, that the mystery of the incarnation is perfected. These opinions were not held only by their author. The writings of Maximus, with Erigena's translation of Dionysius, circulated freely, and among the theologians of the West helped to raise scholastic thought from its dry dialectics, and to create a taste for spiritual contemplation. They even reached the secluded monks in their cells, and led them to speculate so boldly that they fell into the wildest extravagances. One of the most favorable examples of this mediaeval monastic tendency is to be found in St. Bernard, of Clairvaux, who, in his deep appreciation of things unseen, stands forth in strong contrast with the materialism of Abelard and Gilbert de la Poree, for he went so far as to identify his own thoughts with the mind of God. Full of monastic prepossessions, Bernard spurned the flesh, and sought to rise by abstraction into the immediate vision of heavenly things. He denounced reason and the dialectics of the schools. Two canons of St. Victoire, selected apparently for their kindred tone of mystic thought — Hugo de St. Victoire being of Saxon, Richard of Irish extraction — did not, however, like St. Bernard, oppose scholasticism, but rather threw a fervor into the theology of the schools, the cold reasoning of which was seen by them to chill down religious warmth.

The conception of Hugo on every other subject was "moulded by his theology, and that theology is throughout sacramental" (Maurice. Medieval Philosophy, 4:74). Mysticism, as applied to this school, means a deep appreciation of the things of faith, a realization by the spirit of the unseen world, and is very far from implying the unintelligible musings of the enthusiast, or any other "cold, formal generalization of a later period" (Maurice, Medisev. Phil. 4:41). Fuller, in his Church History, speaking of this period of mysticism, quaintly says: "The schoolmen principally employed themselves in knotty and thorny questions of divinity; indeed, as such who live in London and like populous places, having but little ground for their foundations to build houses on, may be said to enlarge the breadth of their houses in height, so the schoolmen of this age, lacking the latitude of general-learning and language, thought to enlarge their active minds by mounting up, so  improving their small bottom with towering speculations — thought some of things mystical that might not, more of things difficult that could not, most of things curious that need not be known to us." Indeed, the schoolman and the Mystic were at this time generally regarded as formidable antagonists.

Yet it is apparent now that the schoolman and the Mystic are not so constantly antagonistic as has been supposed, and are assuredly alike in one respect — for the buildings of the latter, with foundations both very small and very insufficient, rise into the very clouds. We wish that the architectural analogy could be carried further, and that a Theological and Scientific Building Act could forbid the erections of theories above a certain height without a proportionate solidity of foundation. At the head of the Mystics of this time stands Hugo. Yet it was not his but Walter's mysticism which was in direct antagonism with the scholastic system, his Contrat quatuor Labyrinthos Galliae being a running invective against the principles developed by the four principal Gallican schoolmen — Peter Abelard, Gilbert de la Poree, Peter Lombard, and Peter of Poitiers. Joachim a Floris opposed an apocalyptic mysticism to the dialectical theology of the school. In Bonaventura and Gerson the mystic and dialectic elements flowed on once more in harmonious action. In the 14th century the mystic tone given by the Hesychast monks of Mount Athos to the Greek Church was approved by three councils held on the subject at Constantinople A.D. 1341, 1347. and 1350. They drew their inspiration from the writings of Maximus, the annotator of the Celestial Hierarchy. In the controversy that arose in the Greek Church, Nicholas Cabasilas (archbishop of Thessalonica, A.D. 1354) stood forth as the Hesvchast champion, and his Seven Discourses of Life in Christ is one of the most effective works that mystical theology has produced. The mysticism of St. Hildegard in the 12th century, of the Swedish saint Brigitta and of Catharine de Sienna in the 14th, all form part of the same wave of thought. Paulicianism, the remote germ of the Waldensian and Albigensian sects, was rooted iu a dualistic mysticism; and the Quietists of the 17th century were still true to the Alombrado stock from which they sprang.

Asceticism not unfrequently issued from the mystical religious life, its highest instances being that of St. Francis of Assisi, the founder of the Franciscan Order. The Fratricelli of the 13th century were an offshoot from this stock. The Beguine establishments, originally asylums for the widows  and daughters of Crusaders, became convents of mystical devotees, with more or less of heretical taint. SEE BEGHARDS.

Mysticism, which had been training men in the West for a great religious revolution, sprang up and spread rapidly also in the East. No sooner had the doctrines of Islam been proclaimed by the Arabian prophet than a class of Mystics appeared who revolted against the letter of the Koran in the name of the spirit, and boldly urged their claims to a supernatural intercourse with the Deity. For several centuries Persia was the chief seat of a body of Mohammedan Mystics, who are known by the name of Sufis; and the writings of their poets during the 13th and 14th centuries are deservedly admired by every student of Oriental literature. These Eastern Mystics sought, and in some cases claimed, an immediate knowledge of God by the direct exercise of the intuitive faculty, which is a ray of Deity, and beholds Essence. Hence the indifference which they uniformly exhibited to the various forms of positive religion. Self-abandonment and self-annihilation formed the highest ambition of the Sufi. He was bound wholly to lose sight of his individuality; by mystical death he began to live. The most extravagant among these Persian Mystics claimed identity with God, and denied all distinction between good and evil. They held the sins of the Sufi to be dearer to God than the obedience of other men, and his impiety more acceptable than their faith. 'The Sufism of the East has continued unmodified in its character down to the present day, and is actually at this moment on the increase in Persia, notwithstanding the inveterate hatred which the other Mohammedans bear to its adherents.

In the West, Germany has been the special seat of mysticism before and since the Reformation period. In the fellowships and spiritual associations which existed in Germany and the Netherlands throughout the 13th century and part of the 14th, mysticism was the predominant element; chiefly, however, in the form of mystical pantheism. This, indeed, was the common basis of the doctrine espoused on the Rhine, in the 13th century, by the "Brotherhood of the Free Spirit." Their fundamental principle, that God is the Being of all beings, the only real existence, unavoidably led them to consider all things, without exception, as comprised in him, and even the meanest creature as participant of the divine nature and life. God is, however, chiefly present where there is mind, and consequently in man. In the human soul there is an uncreated and eternal principle, namely, the intellect, in virtue of which he resembles and is one with God. Such mystical doctrines are partially a revival of the tenets of the Amaricians and  of David of Dinanto, who elaborated the doctrines of the Beghards into a regular speculative system. The following brief epitome of his doctrines is given by Dr. Ullman in his Reformers before the Reformation: "God is the Being, that is, the solid, true, universal, and necessary Being. He alone exists, for he has the existence of all beings in himself; all out of him is semblance, and exists only in as far as it is in God, or is God.

The nature of God, exalted above every relation or mode (aveiro), and for that reason unutterable and nameless, is not, however, mere abstract being (according to the doctrine of Amalric), or dead substance; but it is spirit, the highest reason, thinking, knowing and making itself known. The property most peculiar to God is thinking, and it is by exerting it upon himself that he first becomes God; then the Godhead — the hidden darkness — the simple and silent basis of the Divine Being actually is God. God proceeds out of himself, and this is the eternal generation of the Son, and is necessarily founded in the divine essence. In the Son, or creative Word, however, God also gives birth to all things, and as his operation, being identical with his thinking, is without time, so creation takes place in an 'everlasting now.' God has no existence without the world, and the world, being his existence in another mode, is eternal with him. The creatures, although they be in a manner set out of God, are yet not separated from him; for otherwise God would be bounded by something external to himself. Much more, the distinction in God is one which is continually doing itself away. By the Son, who is one with God, 'all things are in God,' and that which is in God is God himself. In this manner it may be affirmed that 'all things are God as truly as God is all things.' In this sense also every created object, as being in God, is good. 'According to this the whole creation is a manifestation of the Deity; every creature bears upon it a "stamp of the divine nature," a reflection of the eternal Godhead; indeed, every creature is full of God. All that is divine, however, when extraneous to the Divine Being, necessarily strives to return to its source, seeks to lay aside its finitude, and from a state of division to re-enter into unity. Hence all created things have a deep and painful yearning after union with God in untroubled rest. It is only when God, after having, by the Son, passed out of himself into a different mode of existence, returns by love, which is the Holy Spirit, into himself once more, that the Divine Being is perfected in the Trinity, and he rests with himself and with all the creatures.'"

To this pantheistic mysticism was opposed a less noxious kind of mysticism, which reared itself on the basis of Christian theism. The chief  representative of this theistical mysticism is Ruysbroek, by whose efforts the mystical tendency in the Netherlands and Germany underwent a complete revolution. The system of this able and excellent writer, in so far as it affects life, is thus sketched by Ullman: "Man, having proceeded from God, is destined to return and become one with him :again. This oneness, however, is not to be understood as meaning that we become wholly identified with him, and lose our own being as creatures, for that is an impossibility. What it is to be understood as meaning is that we are conscious of being wholly in God, and at the same time also wholly in ourselves; that we are united with God, and yet at the same time remain different from him. Man ought to be conformed to God, and bear his likeness. But this he can only do in so far as it is practicable, and it is practicable only in so far as he does not cease to be himself and a creature. For God remains always God, and never becomes a creature; the creature is always a creature, and never loses its own being as such. Man, when giving himself up with perfect love to God, is in union with him, but he no sooner again acts than he feels his distinctness from God, and that he is another being. Thus he flows into God, and flows back again into himself. The former state of oneness with and the latter state of difference from him are both enjoined by God, and between the two subsists that continual annihilation in love which constitutes our felicity." Gerson, himself a Mystic, attempted to involve Ruysbroek in the same charge of pantheistical mysticism which attaches to Henry Eckhart. The accusation, however, is without foundation. The mysticism of Ruysbroek, which had the double advantage of being at once contemplative and practical, was thoroughly theistical in its character, and its influence was widely felt.

In the 14th century the pantheistic theory of J. Scotus Erigena was revived by Eckhart, provincial of the Dominican Order in Saxony — the "Doctor Ecstaticus" — a man of unquestioned purity of life and great earnestness of character. The boldest metaphysical speculations were united in his system with a severe asceticism. His was a period that particularly favored the development of mystical or spiritual theology. The distraction of party warfare in state matters, the hostile attitude of the emperor towards the court of Rome, and the increasing divergence of religious opinion, gave an opportunity that was not thrown away by this Mystic theologian. Without adopting any party in particular, the Mystic devotee could combine his higher spiritual aspirations with the most opposite political and religious theories, and gain a willing ear from all. The whole heart of the people was  open to him. Hence the success of Tauler as a preacher in the 14th century. He was termed "Doctor Illuminatus," as being the most enlightened preacher of his age. A living faith in the pure Word of God, he said, was better than mass attendance or bodily mortification; the sincerely pious man alone was free, the friend of God, over whom the pope had no spiritual power, for God had enfranchised and sanctified him to his free service; the spiritual and political powers were essentially distinct; neither, if the former was ever on ill terms with the civil governor, had it authority to lay its subjects under a ban. In Tauler the mystic principle was exhibited on its most practical side, and in many of his views he was the harbinger of that school of thought which brought about the Reformation of the 16th century, and which was represented by Wycliffe in England, Huss in Bohemia, Savonarola in Italy, and John Wessel in Holland, more ubiquitously throughout the continent. SEE FRIENDS OF GOD.

With Tauler must be associated the name of Henry Suso, his friend and ardent admirer, a pupil of Eckhart (A.D. 1300-1365). Mysticism with him was a matter of feeling rather than of speculation. Wisdom as personified by Solomon was his theme, identified at one time with Christ, at another with his Virgin Mother. To make himself worthy of the object of his adoration, he practiced severe austerities, and claimed to be frequently favored with divine visions. His was no connected system, but a tissue of rhapsodical applications of the mystical theology of the preceding period, which he invested with fantastic and visionary forms. He adopted the view which led the schools so closely to the verge of pantheism, namely, that all created nature is a mirror in which Deity is reflected. Creation was eternally in God as the universal exemplar. No name call sufficiently declare the Deity. As Basilides termed the divine Principle οὐκ ὤν, and as Hegel in modern times has said the same thing, so Suso declared that the Deity might with as great propriety be termed an eternal nothing as a self-existent entity. He is a circle whose centre is everywhere, whose circumference is nowhere. Imitation of Christ's sufferings is the true meaning of man's regeneration. Three principal steps lead on to unity with the Deity: purification, or expulsion of all mortal desire; illumination, which fills the soul with divine forms; and perfection, to which is accorded the fullest enjoyment of heavenly good. If Eckhart was the philosophic Mystic, and Tauler the more practical devotee, Suso was more poetical in his enthusiastic adoration of eternal Wisdom.

In all ages a yearning for more spiritual forms of religion has driven ardent spirits into mysticism. The period heralding the approach of the Reformation was by far the most fruitful for the propagation of mystic views on life. Greatest among the Mystics of those days was Thomas à Kempis (q.v.), who in his Hortulus Rosarum, Vallis Liliorum, De Tribus Tcbernaculis, and, above all, in his De Imnitatione Christi, gives sufficient indication of the mystic spirit. Molinos of Saragossa, a resident of Rome from A.D. 1669, published Guida Spirituale (A.D. 1675), of a similarly mystical cast. Father La Chaise, the confessor of Louis XIV, brought it under the notice of the pope as a production of a kindred spirit to the Beghards of the Netherlands or Spanish Alombrados, who laid the whole work of religion in silent prayer, to the neglect of external ritual. Sixty- eight heretical propositions were found in it, and the book was condemned by Innocent XI (A.D. 1677). Molinos, notwithstanding his confession of error, was confined in a Dominican cell under a tedious course of life-long penance. His followers were termed "Quietists," and as the "Pietism" of Germany was copied from them, they may be considered as a link of connection between Romanism and Protestantism. Pope Innocent, before the denunciation of pere La Chaise, had received much edification from the work of Molinos which he afterwards condemned. Fenelon also, archbishop of Cambray (A.D. 1694), was more consistent in his appreciation of the mystic principle, as shown in his Reflections and Meditations on the Inner Life of the Christian.

His rival, Bossuet, bishop of Meaux, complained of this metropolitan to the king, and the matter was referred to the court of Rome, where twenty-three propositions of doubtful character were declared to be erroneous. Fenelon submitted with humility to the papal decree; himself published the judicial bull, and proscribed his own writing. But there was nothing about him of the-Protestant Pietist; one must be either Deist or Romanist, was rather his theory. There was also an unsuspected strain of mysticism about Pascal, the scourge of Jesuitism; for after his death an iron belt, rough with nails, was found to encircle his body, and a folded parchment sewn within his dress-Pascal's "amulet" — on which was a figure of the cross and the following writing: "In the year of grace 1654, Monday, November 23d, feast of St. Clement, pope and martyr, and others of the martyrology; vigil of St. Chrysogonus, martyr, and others; from about half-past ten in the evening till about half- past twelve at night, fire; God of Abraham, God of Isaac, God of Jacob (Exo 3:6; Mat 22:32), not of wise men and philosophers. Certainty, certainty; feeling joy, peace. The God of Jesus Christ, 'My God  and your God' (Joh 20:17). Thy God shall be my God (Rth 1:16). Forgetfulness of the world and of all besides. He is found only in ways taught of the Gospel. Dignity of the human soul. Righteous Father, the world hath not known thee, but I have known thee (Joh 17:25). Joy, joy, joy-tears of joy. I have separated myself from him. 'Dereliquerunt me fontem aquae vivae' (Jer 2:13). O God, wilt thou forsake me? (Mat 27:46), May I not be separate eternally!' This is true life, that they may know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.' Jesus Christ! Jesus Christ! I have separated myself from him; I have fled from him renounced, sacrificed. May I never be separated from him. Safety is alone in the ways taught by the Gospel. Self-renunciation, total and sweet; total submission to Jesus Christ and my guide. Everlastingly in joy for one day of trial upon earth. 'Non obliviscas sermones tuos' (Psa 119:16). Amen." If this be mysticism, it may find its parallel in the conversion of St. Augustine (Conf. 7:11, 12). Both sought peace in philosophy — the father in Plato, the Jansenist in Descartes; if their respective masters could demonstrate the existence of Deity, they could not lead the soul to the Eternal; the revelation of the way, the truth, and the life was in either case attended with the same effects — tears, vision, light, joy, peace. They were Mystics, according to Montesquieu's definition, "Les devots qui out le coeur tendre."

The mediaeval mysticism, in its gradual progress from a mere poetical sentiment to a speculative system, and thence to a living, practical power, led men steadily forward towards the Reformation. In the view of scholasticism, Christianity was an objective phenomenon, but in the view of mysticism it was an inward life. The former pointed to the Church as the only possible means of salvation, but the latter pointed directly to God, and aimed at being one with him. The one concerned itself chiefly with a gorgeous hierarchy, outward forms, and necessarily efficacious sacraments; the other was mainly occupied with having Christ formed in the soul, the hope of glory. The Reformers therefore could not fail to sympathize far more deeply with the teachings of the Mystics than with those of the schoolmen. Though an exceptional class, the Mystics possessed, with all their extravagances, more of the truth of God than could be found within the wide domains of the Roman Church. But while Luther and his brother Reformers learned much from the Mystics, their theology went far beyond the doctrines of mysticism. During the 15th century, indeed, the Scripture element had gradually supplanted the mystical in the religion of the times.  The Bible began to displace the schoolmen at the universities. Both in Germany and the Netherlands several able and orthodox divines had arisen, by whom the Word of God was brought into greater prominence than it had been for centuries as the standard of their teaching. No sooner was the great Protestant principle announced by Luther that the Scriptures are the sufficient standard of Christian truth than traditionalism and mysticism alike fell before it. Oral tradition and individual intuition were both of them rejected as infallible guides in an inquiry after truth. But while such was the general fate of mysticism among the Reformed, it broke forth in the most extravagant forms among the Zwickau prophets and the various sects of Anabaptists who appeared in the Low Countries and different parts of Germany. Thus, as Mr. Vaughan has well said, "By the Mystic of the 14th century the way of the Reformation was in a great measure prepared; by the Mystic of the 16th century it was hindered and imperilled.” The wild fanaticism of the Anabaptists was alleged to be a practical refutation of the asserted right of every man to the exercise of private judgment; and though Luther, Melancthon, Zwingli, and Bullinger exposed the fallacy of such an objection, yet for a time the work of reform was undoubtedly retarded thereby.

The “German Theology" had a great effect on the inner religious life of Germany at the time of the Reformation, and gave to it a mystic tone. It is the title of a work that was first brought under public notice by Luther, and published by him (A.D. 1518) as "eyn edels Buchlein, von rechtem Verstand was Adam und Christus sey, und wie Adam zu uns sterben und Christus erstehen soll." Since that time it has frequently been translated and republished, and has been a great favorite in Lutheran Germany. All that is known of the author is that he was custos of the Deutsch Herren Haus at Frankfort, or rather across the Main at Sachsenhausen, and a member of the society of "God's Friends," Romanists of mystical principles, who disappeared from the scene at the close of the 14th century. SEE FRIENDS OF GOD.

The style of the book is quite similar to that of Tauler and Suso. The book inculcates the necessity of completely merging the will of man in the will of God, and of practicing the most complete self-denial and mortification of natural inclinations. It is self-will that stands as a wall of separation between God and man; it converted angels into devils, and is as the fire that never can be quenched; voluntary humiliation is its remedy. Of the high conceit and lax morals of the Brethren of the Free Spirit it speaks with much severity as the very spirit of Antichrist. Enlightenment, in  which mysticism has always professed to initiate its votaries, is not to be attained by talk or study; but by steady acts of self-devotion, and the practice of active virtue. Love, and no taint of self-seeking, must be the spring of all one's actions; and he can only hope to attain perfection who renounces as unworthy all wish for earthly reward. The same mind must be in him which was in Christ Jesus-self-devoting and self-sacrificing.

The tone of the book shows no symptom of disrespect for the Church; but its free application of Bible principles in a neoterizing spirit scarcely failed to prepare the way of the Reformation. In some respects it also exhibits the germ of the Reine Vernunft of Kant. The book was always a great favorite with Luther, who freely owned himself to be under the deepest obligations to it. "Next to the Bible and St. Augustine," he says, "from no book which I have met have I learned more of what God, Christ, man, and all things are." The sound theology which pervades the work, though clothed in a somewhat mystical garb, conveyed much light to the Reformer's mind. The fundamental thought which the book contains is thus described by Ullman: "If the creature recognise itself in the immutable Good, and as one therewith, and live and act in this knowledge, then it is itself good and perfect. But if, on the contrary, the creature revolt from that Good, it is then evil. All sin consists in apostatizing from the supreme and perfect Good, in making self an object, and in supposing that it is something, and that we derive from it any sort of benefit, such as existence, or life, or knowledge, or ability. This the devil did, and it was by this alone he fell.

His presuming that he, too, was something, and that something was his, his 'I' and his 'me' and his 'my' and his' mine,' were his.apostasy and fall. In the self-same ,way Adam also fell. Eating the apple was not the cause of his fall, but his arrogating to self his 'I' and 'me' and 'mine.' But for this, even if he had eaten seven apples, he would not have fallen. Because of it, however, he must have fallen although he had not tasted the one. So is it with every man, in whom the same thing is repeated a hundred times. But in what way may this apostasy and general fall be repaired?' The way is for man to come out of self (isolation as a creature) and enter into God. In order to do this two parties must concur, God and man. Man cannot do it without God, and God could not do it without man; and therefore it behooved God to take upon him human nature and to become man, in order that man might become God. This once took place in the most perfect way in Christ, and as every man should become by grace what Christ was by nature, it ought to be repeated in every man, and in myself among the rest; for were God to be humanized in all other men, and all  others to be deified in him, and were this not to take place in me, my fall would not be repaired. In that way Christ restores what was lost by Adam. By Adam came selfishness, and with it disobedience, all evil, and corruption. By Christ, in virtue of his pure and divine life transfusing itself into men, came the annihilation of selfishness, obedience and union with God, and therein every good thing, peace, heaven, and blessedness." The Deutsche Theologie, which thus unfolded Protestant truth so clearly before the Reformation, has since 1621 been inscribed in the Romish Index of prohibited works.

At the Reformation period, Paracelsus (Theophrastus Bombast of Hohenheim, born A.D. 1493, d. 1541) was among the first to show a decided leaning to mysticism, though medicine, not theology, was his peculiar faculty. He was by no means a partisan of Luther, although he was himself a zealous Reformer. His theological mysticism was mixed up with medicine, astronomy, astrology, alchemy, and natural history. From a similar medley Jacob Bohme, at a later date, extracted religious comfort. But the first of the Reformed party who gave to mysticism a definite shape was Valentine Weigel, minister of Ischopping, near Meissen, in Saxony; he died A.D. 1588. Mysticism has often made a close approach to pantheism, and so in his system he said that God had pity on himself in pitying man; for since the believer is by his act of faith raised above himself and abandons the soul to God, so God is conscious of his own being in man. Thus Spinoza declared that God is only self-conscious in the self- consciousness of man. Man is a microcosmal power, and in him the world is exhibited in miniature reflection. During his life Weigel had the worldly wisdom to keep his thoughts to himself, and subscribed the Formula Concordiae as a good Lutheran — really to avoid inconvenience, as stated in a posthumous writing, and not from inner conviction. In his Postils he complains earnestly of the sluggish spirit of the existing schools of theology; their bulky bodies of doctrine, their confession, their commonplaces and table-talk, as well as their far-famed Formula of Concord. All such beggarly elements of instruction he would sweep away, and go to the Word of God alone for light. Imputed righteousness was a doctrine, he said, that could only have been devised by Antichrist. Thus he also, though a professed Reformer, was in many points at direct antagonism with Luther and Melancthon.

The most unintelligible of Mystics, however, was Jacob Bohme (q.v.). Light, he declared, had been revealed to him that held him in a state of  ecstatic rest; and thoughts were inspired by the revelation that he seems never to have had the power of communicating to others. After a silence of fifteen years he wrote the Aurora (A.D. 1612), which was followed by other similar coruscations. His reveries show a strange mixture of the naturalism afterwards developed by Schelling and the wilder theosophy of the ancient Gnostics. Thus he affirmed God and nature to be essentially one; and this dualized principle, without which neither nature as a whole, nor any integral portion of it, can exist, is the Deity. As to be self- engendered is the essence of the Deity, so nature and the external world is the substance of that self-generation. In the fall of Lucifer, where a spirit of light should have been engendered, there issued forth a spirit of fire. It is the principle of life of all creatures, the very heart of their existence. All that is gross and hard, dark and cold, terrible and evil, has its origin in the fall of Lucifer, the Prince of this world. But intimately as his spirit interpenetrates the mass of existence, he is not wholly one with it. The spirit of life is there also, held captive, as it were, under the covenant of death, yet not extinguished. The confines of the rival kingdoms touch each other in man, and keep up a perpetual contest between Love and Rage. In the material world the Creator is born as a creature in the quickened life of the spirit; the stars are nothing else than powers of God; and all three persons of the Trinity are ever present in the universe. The Father is the occult foundation of all; the Son in the heart of the Father is the quickening spirit of life and love, of tenderness and beauty. The Spirit is universally present. From nature and its internal development Bohme professed to have gained his knowledge of philosophy and astrotheology. He was indebted to no human lore; his only book was the book of nature, ever open before his soul. It is true he had learned much from the Theurgists who preceded him, particularly Cornelius Agrippa and Paracelsus, but the grand source of the knowledge which he professed to communicate in his mystical writings was an inward illumination, which he claimed to have received from the Spirit of God, whereby he became minutely acquainted with the essences, properties, and uses of all the objects in nature. Schlegel has been able to trace in these ravings the afflatus of a poetical mind of high order, and he does not scruple to rank Bohme with the master-minds that have taken their theme from the unseen world of Dante, Milton, and Klopstock. Hallam can see nothing in them — nothing better than the incoherence of madness (Literature of the Middle Ages, III, 3:20). Bohme was followed in the same form of mysticism by the Rosicrucians and  Freemasons, and by secret societies. which so abounded in the 16th century.

Of a very different stamp was Arndt's mysticism. It means a thoroughly spiritual religion. His principal works are the four books of True Christianity, and his devotional collection, the Paradise of Christian Virtues. They maintain their high character, and are still used in many households throughout Germany. But they encountered a vehement opposition when they first appeared, more especially from Osiander the younger, who managed to extract from them eight several heresies; the main gravamen being that Arndt slights school learning by his advocacy of practical piety, and of such "popish" Mystics as Thomas a Kempis and Tauler. Moreover, by his doctrine of the illumination and indwelling of the Holy Spirit he trenches upon the Lutheran theory of justification by faith alone and the orthodox doctrine of grace. J. Gerhard's Meditationes Sacre (A.D. 1606), his Scholas Pietatis and Postils. are works of a similar tone of thought to Arndt's, and they met with similar reception at first; as Gerhard said, "If any writer upholds pious practical Christianity, and aims at something higher than mere theological learning, he is straightway branded as a Rosicrucian or Weigelian." J. Val. Andrea, grandson of Jacob Andrei, who took a prominent part in setting up the Lutheran Formula of Concord, was of the same school. In his younger years he accepted the Rosicrucian mystery (A.D. 1602), but more in jest than in earnest. His later writings (A.D. 1617-1619) are conceived in a spirit of mystical piety. His endeavor evidently was to expose and put down the religious and political follies of the age, and uphold what he deemed to be spiritual Christianity. But he wrote in the spirit of Lucian; and it is often difficult to see where irony ends and earnest principle begins. His more liberal acceptation of the Formula Concordice made him many enemies among the high orthodox Lutherans. The Pietist Spener said of him: "If I could raise any from the dead for the good of the Church, it should be Valentine Andrea." It was owing to Arndt's influence that the mocking, scoffing spirit which seemed natural to Andrea was replaced by something higher and worthier of a Christian man.

But if Protestantism has had its Mystics, Romanism has not been altogether wanting in these religious enthusiasts. In France, in the 16th century, appeared St. Francis de Sales, and in Spain, St. Theresa and St. John of the Cross; all of them making their mystical doctrines subservient to the interests of the Mother Church. "Nowhere," says Mr. Vaughan, "is the  duty of implicit self-surrender to the director or confessor more constantly inculcated than in the writings of Theresa and John of the Cross, and nowhere are the inadequacy and mischief of the principle more apparent. John warns the Mystic that his only safeguard against delusion lies in perpetual and unreserved appeal to his director. Theresa tells us that whenever our Lord commanded her in prayer to do anything, and her confessor ordered the opposite, the divine guide enjoined obedience to the human, and would influence the mind of the confessor afterwards, so that he was moved to counsel what he had before forbidden! Of course; for who knows what might come of it if enthusiasts were to have visions and revelations on their own account? The director must draw after him these fiery and dangerous natures, as the lion-leaders of an Indian pageantry conduct their charge, holding a chain and administering opiates. The question between the orthodox and the heterodox mysticism of the 14th century was really one of theological doctrine. The same question in the 16th and 17th was simply one of ecclesiastical interests." According to the mystical doctrine of St. Theresa, there are four degrees of prayer: (1) simple mental prayer; (2) the prayer of quiet, called also pure contemplation; (3) the prayer of union, called also perfect contemplation; (4) the prayer of rapture or ecstasy. The raptures and visions of this female saint of Romanism have gained for her a high name. But the mysticism of John of the Cross wore a different aspect. He delighted not in ecstatic prayer like Theresa, but in intense suffering. His earnest prayer was that not a day might pass in which he should not suffer something.

In the history of mysticism the 17th centutry was chiefly distinguished by the Quietist controversy. The most remarkable exhibition of Quietism is to be found in the writings ofMadame Guyon. Thus. when describing her experience, she observes, "The soul passing out of itself by dying to itself necessarily passes into its divine object. This is the law of its transition. When it passes out of self, which is limited, and therefore is not God, and consequently is evil, it necessarily passes into the unlimited and universal, which is God, and therefore is the true good. My own experience seemed to me to be a verification of this. My spirit, disenthralled from selfishness, became united with and lost in God, its Sovereign, who attracted it more and more to himself. And this was so much the case that I could seem to see and know God only, and not myself... It was thus that my soul was lost in God, who communicated to it his qualities, having drawn it out of all that it had of its own... O happy poverty, happy loss, happy nothing, which  gives no less than God himself in his own immensity — no more circumscribed to the limited manner of the creation, but always drawing it out of that to plunge it wholly into his Divine Essence.

Then the soul knows that all the states of self-pleasing visions, of intellectual illuminations, of ecstacies and raptures, of whatever value they might have been, are now rather obstacles than advancements, and that they are not of service in the state of experience which is far above them, because the state which has props or supports, which is the case with the merely illuminated and ecstatic state, rests in them to some degree, and is pained to lose them. But the soul cannot arrive at the state of which I am now speaking without the loss of all such supports and helps... The soul is then so submissive, and perhaps we may say so passive — that is to say, is so disposed equally to receive from the hand of God either good or evil — as is truly astonishing. It receives both the one and the other without any selfish emotions, letting them flow and be lost as they came." This quotation contains the substance of the doctrine which pervades the mystical writings of Madame Guyon. The whole may be summed up in two words, "disinterested love," which she regarded as the perfection of holiness in the heart of man.

A similar, if not wholly identical, doctrine was inculcated at the same period by Molinos in Italy, in a book entitled The Spiritual Guide. Quietist opinions were then evidently on the advance in the different countries of Europe, and among their supporters were some of the most illustrious men of the day, of whom it is sufficient to name Fenelon, archbishop of Cambray. But the high character for piety and worth of the leading Quietists made them all the more obnoxious to the Jesuits. Nor was the hostile spirit which was manifested towards the Quietists limited to the Jesuits alone; the celebrated Bossuet, also, was one of the most bitter persecutors of Madame Guyon, and succeeded in procuring the public condemnation of her writings. Fenelon was for a time conjoined with Bossuet in opposing Guyon, but all the while he was conscious that his own opinions did not differ from hers. At length, in 1697, he openly avowed his sympathy with the sentiments of the Mystics in a work which, under the name of the Maxims of the Saints, was devoted to an inquiry as to the teachings of the Church on the doctrines of pure love, of mystical union, and of perfection. The publication of this treatise gave rise to a lengthened and angry controversy. Bossuet sought to invoke the vengeance of the government upon his heretical brother, and he had even hoped to call down upon him the fulminations of the pope. In the first object he was successful; in the second he was, for a time at least, disappointed. A war of pamphlets and treatises  now raged at Paris, the chief comnbatants being Bossuet on the one side and Fenelon on the other. The Maxims were censured by the Sorbonne, and their author was persecuted by the king of France; but pope Innocent XII declined for a time to pronounce a sentence of condemnation upon Fenelon, of whom he had been accustomed to say that he had erred through an excess of love to God. At length, with the utmost reluctance, and in measured terms, he sent forth the much expected anathema, and Fenelon submitted to the decision of the Roman see. Madame Guyon, after a long life of persecution, thirty-seven years of which were spent in prison, died in 1717. Among the Quietists of the 17th century may be mentioned Madame Bourignon and her accomplished disciple, Peter Poiret; and among those of later times, the fascinating Mystic, Madame de Krtidener.

Vaughan, in his Work, Hours with the Mystics, institutes a comparison between the Mystics of France and Germany up to this time, and is led thus to comment on the characteristics of these two exponents of mysticism: "Speaking generally, it may be said that France exhibits the mysticism of sentiment, Germany the mysticism of thought. The French love to generalize and to classify. An arrangement which can be expressed by a word, a principle which can be crystallized into a sparkling maxim, they will applaud. But with them conventionalism reigns paramount — society is ever present to the mind of the individual — their sense of the ludicrous is exquisitely keen. The German loves abstractions for their own sake. To secure popularity for a visionary error in France, it must be lucid and elegant as the language — it must be at least an ingenious and intelligible falsehood; but in Germany the most grotesque inversions of thought and of expression will be found no hinderance to its acceptability, and the most hopeless obscurity may be pronounced its highest merit. In this respect German philosophy sometimes resembles Lycophron, who was so convinced that unintelligibility was grandeur as to swear he would hang himself if a man were found capable of understanding his play of Cassandra. Almost every later German Mystic has been a secluded student — almost every Mystic of modern France has been a brilliant conversationalist. The genius of mysticism rises in Germany in the clouds of the solitary pipe; in France it is a fashionable Ariel, who hovers in the drawing-room, and hangs to the pendants of the glittering chandelier. If Jacob Bohme had appeared in France, he must have counted disciples by units, where in Germany he reckoned them by hundreds. If Madame Guyon had been born in Germany, rigid Lutheranism might have given her some  annoyance; but her earnestness would have redeemed her enthusiasm from ridicule, and she would have lived and died the honored precursor of German pietism."

The modern mysticism of Germany is chiefly remarkable for its excessive irreligiousness, and its close alliance with a congress of metaphysical clouds, misnamed philosophy, which, by essaying to pass beyond the limits of the human faculties, turns day-dreams into logical systems, and resolves all truth and all religion into the discovery that there is no God, or that God is but a name for the universe. The infidelity which in England took the form of natural religion, and in France that of ribaldry and ridicule, assumed in Germany the garb of speculation and of sentimental feeling. To the speculations of Kant, of Fichte, and of Schelling, as well as to the claims of divine revelation, Friedrich Henry Jacobi, in his work on Divine Things, opposed that intuitive and immediate knowledge of divine things which he denominated faith, mental feeling, or reason, and which has acquired for his philosophy the name of mysticism. It is a revival of the reveries of Bohme, of the Gnostics, and of the Orientals. Passing through such modifications as it could receive from the learned piety of Schleiermacher, the critical acumen of De Wette, the poetry of Novalis, and the picturesque genius of Carlyle, we now find it exciting to something like vitality the negative theology of Unitarianism in America and in England. By the side of these speculative Mystics we find also in modern times the imaginative Mystics, whose system is less the invention of something new and false than the perversion of what is old and true. To this branch of mysticism belongs the mystical interpretation of the Scriptures, the originator of which, as we have seen, is supposed to have been Philo the Jew, and the character of which pervaded the writings of Hermes, Justin, Clemens of Alexandria, Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, Ambrosius, Jerome, Augustine, Gregory the Great, Bede, Maurus, and Hugo de St. Caro.

In England we see it espoused in the spiritualizing of Solomon's Temple by Bunyan, and Brown's parallels of O.T. facts with the history of the Jews, etc. Mr. William Law (author of the Serious Call, etc.), and the very able opponent of bishop Hoadly, degenerated in the latter part of his life into all the singularities of mysticism; and some suppose that his extravagant notions were one means of driving the celebrated Gibbon into a state of infidelity. "Mr. Law," says Vaughan, "supposed that the material was the region which originally belonged to the fallen angels. At length the light  and Spirit of God entered into the chaos, and turned the angels' ruined kingdom into a paradise on earth. God then created man, and placed him there. He was made in the image of the Triune God (whom, like the Hutchinsonians, he compares to 'fire, light, and spirit'), a living mirror of the divine nature, formed to enjoy communion with Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and to live on earth as the angels do in heaven. He was endowed with immortality, so that the elements of this outward world could not have any power of acting on his body; but by his fall he changed the light, life, and spirit of the world. He died, on the very day of his transgression, to all the influences and operations of the Spirit of God upon him, as we die to the influences of this world when the soul leaves the body; and all the influences. and operations of the elements of this life were open to, him, as they are in any animal, at his birth into this; world; he became an earthly creature, subject to the dominion of this outward world, and stood only in the highest rank of animals.

But the goodness of God would not leave man in this condition: redemption from it was immediately granted; and the bruiser of the serpent brought the life, light, and spirit of love once more into the human nature. All men, in consequence of the redemption of Christ, have in them the first spark, or seed. of the divine life, as a treasure hid. in the centre of our souls, to bring forth by degrees a. new birth of that life which was lost in paradise. Noson of Adam can be lost except by turning away from the Saviour within him. The only religion which can save us must be that which can raise the light, life, and Spirit of God in our souls. Nothing can enter the vegetable kingdom till it have vegetable life in it, or be a member of the animal kingdom till it have the animal life. Thus all nature joins with the Gospel in affirming that no man can enter into the kingdom of heaven till the heavenly life is born in him. Nothing can be our righteousness or recovery but the divine nature of Jesus Christ derived to our souls." But the eminent Swedish theologian, Emmanuel Swedenborg, figures more conspicuously than these, if we regard him merely as an expositor of the Scriptures. As he, however, ascribes his spiritual interpretations to a special source, he will elsewhere occupy a more distinct and appropriate place, and we now simply advert to him as believing and teaching that God had made him the vehicle of new revelations. We refer our readers to the articles NEW JERUSALEM CHURCH SEE NEW JERUSALEM CHURCH and SWEDENBORG SEE SWEDENBORG for details of his views and their progress.  We are not altogether strangers to mysticism even in our own day. Only a few years have elapsed since we were asked to believe in the supernatural revelations made to the followers of Edward Irving (q.v.); and the Spiritualists of North America profess to hold converse with the spiritual existences of another world. SEE SPIRITUALISM.

But, passing by these, we find a class of Mystics in the Intuitionists on both sides of the Atlantic, who substitute the subjective revelation of consciousness for the objective revelation of the written Word. As examples of practical mysticism we must here refer also to the history of the Beghards, the Flagellants, Muinzers, Anabaptists, and the famous Peasants' War in Germany, and the institution of the Jesuits.

Another fact is worthy of notice in connection with this subject. It is that mysticism has always been most flourishing in times of general religious formalism — a striking illustration of the tendency of any extreme to generate its opposite. The laws of Brahminism brought forth the mystic Buddhism; the Jewish Talmudism gave rise to the mystic Cabala (q.v.); the Spanish theology of the Inquisition found its counterpoise in the mysticism of the Alombrados; Jesuitism in quietism and Jansenism; the old Protestant scholastic orthodoxy in Protestant mysticism.

Enough has now been said to show plainly that the theology of the true Mystics exhibits two distinct phases: a side towards earth, on which the legend on the medal is obscure and without meaning; and an obverse side, bright with the light of heaven; union with the Eternal through sacramental grace is its impress of truth, and flowing from that grace a loving exercise of the great duties of Christian life. It is closely allied with Quietism. A very different kind, and yet an essential form of mysticism, is that avowed by Schlegel; one closely similar to the rhapsodical notions of Plotinus, when he says that whereas human consciousness, in which subject and object are insuperably blended together in idea, cannot form to itself a notion of the Absolute, which is unity, still an adequate idea of the Absolute may be gained by the contemplative or intuitive faculty, independently of thought or consciousness; it is a rapid illumination, a sudden rapture, too fleeting for analysis, for it eludes reflection and baffles consciousness. Reflection is, in fact, its death. In this mystical condition of the mind all distinction between subject and object vanishes. There is no longer the Deity on the one hand, the soul on the other. The soul identifies itself with the Deity. It is on this side that mysticism passes into pantheism.

See Danz, Universablworterbuch d. Theolog. Literatur, page 681; Malcom, Theologrical Index, page 317 sq.; Winer, Handbuch, 1:501 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 10:152 sq.; Bretschneider, Systematische Entwickelung, page 22; Tholuck, Susismus sen Theosophia Persarume pantheistica (Berlin, 1821); Berger, Disputatio de mysticismo (Harlem, 1819); Hofling, Mysticismius (Erlangen, 1832); Theremin, Ueber d. Wesen d. mystischen Theologie (Abendstunden, Berlin, 1833); Heinroth, Gesch. u. Kritik. d. Mysticismus aller bekannten Volker u. Zeiten (Leips. 1830, 8vo); Gbrres, Die christl. Mystik (Regensb. 1836); Helfferich, Die christl. Mystik (Hamb. 1842); Lisko, Die Heilslehre d. Theologie (Stuttg. 1857); Hamberger, Stimmen aus dem Heiligthum, etc. (Stuttg. 1857); Greith, Die Deutsche Mystik im Prediger-Orden (Freib. 1861, 8vo); Pfeiffer, Deutsche Mystiker im 14 Jahrhund. (Leips. 1845-57); Noack, Die christliche Mystik ins Mittelalter, u. in d. neueren Zeit (Konigsb. 1853, 8vo); Ranke, Hist. of the Reformation; Lord Herbert, Memoirs; Coleridge, Aids to Reflection; Parker, Discourse of Matters pertaining to Religion; Cockburn, The Delusions and Errors of Antoina Bourignon, etc.; Stowell, On the Work of the Spirit, page 258 sq.; Vaughan, Hours with the Mystics: a Contribution to the History of Religious Opinion (Lond. 1856, 2 volumes); Bergier, Dict. de Theologie, 6:287; Migne, Dict. de Mystique chretienne; Heckethorn, Hist. of Secret Societies of all Ages and Countries (Lond. 1874), part 4; De Stael's Germany, part 2, chapter 5; Meth. Qu. Rev. January 1853, pages 105, 161; January 1860; April 1860, page 277; January 1869, page 49; Bibl. Sacra, January 1851, page 51; January 1854, page 546; Lond. Rev. January 1857, art. 2; Eddinb. Rev. 74:102, 195; NewEnglcander, 5:348; Retrospective Rev. 1:288; Christian Qu. July, 1873, art. 7; Blcrkwood's Mag. 1854, 1:66 sq. (Myst. in China); Christian Exanmier, 37:308; Brownson's Rev. October 1863, page 428; Brit. and For. Ev. Rev. September 1854, page 572; Kitto, Journ. of Sac. Lit. 1854, page 546; Westminster Rev. October 1853; October 1870, page 219; Christian Remembrancer, January 1866, page 86; Joahrb. deutsch. Theol. 1867, 2:362; Zeitschr. hist. Theol. October 1850, page 231; January 1859, page 49; Brit. Qu. October 1874, art. 1. A complete account of the host of mystical writers to 1740 is given in Arnold's Kirchen-Historie (Schaffhausen, 1742). See also the Church histories of Alzog, Gieseler, Milman, Niedner, Kurtz, Hardwick (M. A. and Ref.), Mosheim, Waddington; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctr. (Index in volume 2); Neander, Christian Dogmas, pages 604, 630; Ullman, Ref. before the Ref. 2:44 sq., 185 sq.; Fisher, Hist. Ref. pages 65, 67 sq., 245; Stoughton, Eccl. Hist. of  England, 1:482; 2:262, 369-385; Hurst's Hagenbach, Ch. Hist. of the 18th and 19th Centuries (Index in volume 2); Morell, Hist. of Modern Philosophy, 2:332 sq., 356 sq.; Lect. on the Philos. Tendencies of the Age, lect. 3; Ueberweg, Hist. of Philos. 1:358, 400, 433, 435, 436,:467 sq.; 2:20, 23, 54, 115, 213. 222; Lewes, Hist. Philos. (see Index in volume 2).

## Myth[[@Headword:Myth]]

             a Greek term (μῦθος), which, however, is not to be found in the Sept. Even in the Apocrypha the word occurs but once (μῦθος ἄκαιρος, Eccles. 20:19, A.V. "an unseasonable tale"), and that in a general sense; while, in one other passage (Bar 3:23), μυθόλογοι, "authors of fables," has a somewhat doubtful meaning. In the N.T., however, the word occurs five times, and always in a severely disparaging sense, and in every instance is rendered “fables" in our version. Thus Timothy is warned against "Jbbles and endless genealogies, which minister questions rather than godly edifying" (1Ti 1:4); and itgainst "profane and old wives' fables" (βεβήλους καὶ γραωδεῖς μύθους, 4:7). These "fables" are opposed to "the truth," and Titus is forbidden to give heed Ι᾿ουδα• κοις μύθοις. Lastly, in 2Pe 1:16 they are characterized as σεσοφισμένοι i, "cunningly devised," and are contrasted with the sober testimony of eye- witnesses (comp. πεπλασμένοι μύθοι, Diod. Sic. 1:93). Just so in Greek μῦθοι are opposed to ἱστορία (comp. Auson. Prof. Carm. 21, 26, "Callentes mython plasmata et historiam").

It is obvious, therefore, that in the N.T. a myth is used in its latest sense to express a story invented as the vehicle for some ethical or theological doctrine, which, in fact, has been called in later times an ethopceia or philosopheme. Yet the condemnation is special and not general, and cannot point with dissatisfaction to myths, which, like those of Plato, are the splendidly imaginative embodiment of some subjective truth, and which claim no credence for themselves, but are only meant to be regarded as the vehicles of spiritual instruction (see archbishop Trench On the Parables, chapter 2, where he distinguishes between "myth," "fable," "parable," "allegory," etc.). That there is nothing in such "myths" to deserve reprobation, nay more, that they are a wise form of teaching, is clear from the direct quotation of mythical stories by Jude (2Pe 1:9; 2Pe 1:14), and from the use of strictly analogous modes of conveying truth (allegory, fable, parable, etc.) in other parts of the Bible, as well as in the writings of all the wisest of mankind. It must, then, have been the doctrines involved, and not the "mythical" delivery of them, which awoke the indignation of the apostles; and if, as Tertullian thought (Adv.  Valent. 3), and as is now generally believed, the "myths" alluded to were the Gnostic mythology of the "'Eons," of which the seeds may have been beginning to develop themselves when the pastoral epistles were written, we can easily understand how they would appear to bear the stamp of "philosophy and vain deceit." Theodoret, however, on Tit 1:14, refers the "Jewish fables" to the Mishna (τὴν ὑπ᾿ αὐτῶν καλουμένην δευτέρωσιν, Alford, ad loc.).

No satisfactory definition of the word "myth" has ever been given, partly because of the manifold varieties of myths, and partly because the word has been used in several distinct senses. In Homer it is equivalent to λόγος (II. 18:253), and Eustathius remarks that in later times it came to mean ψευδὴς λόγος (II. a, 29), to which definition Suidas adds that it was λόγος ψευδής, εἰκονίζων τὴν ἀλήθειαν. Plutarch, less accurately, confounds it with plausible fiction (λόγος ψευδὴς ἐοικὼς ἀληθινῷ), and in the Etynnologicum Magnunz it is made, in its technical sense, to mean a veiled or enigmatical narration (μῦθος σημαίνει δύο... τόν τε σκοτεινὸν λόγον. . . καὶ τὸν ἁπλῶς λόγον). Neither the etymology nor the history of the word help us much. It is derived from Iuvew, to initiate, or μύω, to shut, and archbishop Trench thinks that it must therefore have originally meant the word shut up in the mind, or muttered with the lips (Synon. of the N.T. [2d ser.] page 174), though he admits that there is no trace of this in actual use; and as, at first, μῦθος merely means "word," we may even derive it from an onomatopoeia of the simplest consonantal utterance (m). It is not until Pindar's time (01. 1:47; Nem. 7:34; 6:1) that it is used of that which is "mentally conceived, rather than historically true;" and in Attic prose it assumes its normal later sense of any legend or tradition of the prehistoric times. If, however, we analyze the modern use of the word, we shall find that these historical myths, or amplified legends of the remote past, generally mingled with the marvellous, do not properly represent our notion of myths any more than the wellunderstood philosophemes to which we previously alluded. We must learn, too, to distinguish between the myths and the rationalistic explanations thrust into them by the critical knowledge of a later age. If we would understand the true nature, for instance, of the Greek myths, we must discard from them the timidly rationalistic suggestions of Hecatseus, the severely common-sense views of Palcephatus, and the unsympathizingly sceptical rashness of Euemerus, no less than the  profound moral intentions which have so often been transferred to them by the, speculative genius of a Bacon or a Coleridge.

A myth proper, then, is neither a philosopheme nor a legend. It is best described as a spontaneous product of the youthful imagination of mankind — the natural form under which an infant race expresses its conceptions and convictions about supernatural relations and prehistoric events. It is neither fiction, history, nor philosophy; it is a spoken poetry, an uncritical and childlike history, a sincere and self-believing romance. It does not invent, but simply imagines and repeats; it may err, but it never lies. It is a narration, generally marvellous, which no one consciously or scientifically invents, and which every one unintentionally falsifies. "It is," says Mr. Grote, "the natural effusion of the unlettered, imaginative, and believing man." It belongs to an age in which the understanding was credulous and confiding, the imagination full of vigor and vivacity, and the passions earnest and intense. Its very essence consists in the projection of thoughts into the sphere of facts ("der Grund-Trieb des Mythen das Gedachte in ein Geschehenes umzusetzen" [Creuzer Symbolik, page 99]). It arises partly from the unconscious and gradual objectizing of the subjective, or confusing mental processes with external realities; and partly from investing the object with the feelings of the subject —that is, from imaginatively attributing to external nature those feelings and qualities which only exist in the percipient soul.

The myth, then, belongs to that period of human progress in which the mind regards "history as all a fairy tale." Before the increase of knowledge, the dawn of science, and the general dissemination of books, men's fancies respecting the past, and the dim conjectures of nascent philosophy, could only be preserved by these traditional semi-poetic tales; to borrow the fine expression of Tacitus, "Fingunt simul creduntque." So far from being startled by the marvellous and the incredible, they expected and looked for it; while discrepancies and contradictions were accepted side by side, because the critical faculty was wholly undeveloped. "The real and the ideal," says Mr. Grote, "were blended together in the primitive conception;... the myth passed unquestioned, from the fact of its currency, and from its harmony with existing sentiments and preconceptions" (Hist. of Greece, 1:610). To the intensity of a fresh imagination, and the necessary weakness of the youth of language, we can trace the origin of a vast number of myths. In those early days men looked at all things with the large, open eyes of childish wonderment. The majority of phenomena  which they saw and enjoyed were incapable of other than a metaphorical or poetical description; and even if language had been more developed it would have responded less accurately to their thoughts, because they seriously transferred their own feelings and emotions to the world around them, and made themselves the measure of all things. Thus the hunter regarded the moon and stars which "glanced rapidly along the clouded heaven" as a "beaming goddess with her nymphs;" and

"Sunbeams upon distant hills,

Gliding apace with shadows in their train,

Might, with small help from fancy,

be transferred Into fleet Oreads sporting visibly."

Wordsworth, Excursion, book 4.

Thus the manifold aspects of nature, imaginatively conceived and metaphorically described, furnished at once a large mythology; and when these elements were combined and arranged for the purpose of illustrating early scientific or theological conceptions, and were corrupted by numberless erroneous etymologies of words, whose true origin was forgotten, we have at once the materials for an extensive and sometimes inscrutable mythology. In the early stage of the myth, confined to the period when everything is personified, it is as difficult to distinguish between what was regarded as fancy and what was believed as fact as it is to this day in the rude and grotesque legends of Polynesians and North American Indians. But in a later time, when myths were preserved in writing and systematized into dogmas, the poetical imaginative faculties had often well-nigh evaporated, and that which had originally been meant as half a metaphor was prosaically hardened into a real and marvellous fact. Thus in many myths, as they were finally preserved, we may see the mere misconceptions of a metaphor, and the guesses of a most imperfect etymology, mingling in two distinct streams with the original simple poetic tale. Any one who considers the evanescent "tradition" of untutored polytheism as it is displayed among modern savages, may watch, even at the present day, the growth and swift diffusion of myths; but we must look into various histories of civilized people (and especially into that of Greece) to see such myths first erroneously systematized into definite narratives, to be deliberately believed — then partially and timidly rationalized — next contemptuously rejected — and finally restored to their true rank as the most interesting relics of a primitive society, and the earnest teachings of a yet unsophisticated religious philosophy.  This subject would require a volume to explain it adequately; and, indeed, it has occupied many important volumes. All that we have here attempted is to remove a groundless and injurious prejudice against the word. Whether or not there be any myths in the Bible, and especially in the earlier books, is a question which must be settled purely on its own merits. SEE MYTHICAL THEORY.

It is, however, undesirable that the mere word "myth" should be avoided by those who undoubtedly regard some of the Biblical narratives as containing mythical elements. Even men like Bunsen and Ewald bowed to popular prejudice in shunning the word; and of the English theologians, who rely so much on their authority, scarcely one (with the exception of Dr. Davidson) has ventured in this particular to desert their guidance. Yet the word "myth" is far more reverent and far less objectionable than "fable," which some would substitute for it; and it is, as Dr. Davidson has pointed out, far more honest than circumlocutions which mean the same thing (Introd. 1:146). It will be observed that we are here giving no opinion whatever as to the fact of the existence of scriptural myths, but merely pleading that those Biblical critics who understand the true nature of myths, and, rightly or wrongly, believe that here and there in the Hebrew records a mythic element may be traced, should not hesitate to express their conviction by the term which is most suitable and most likely to secure for the subject a clear and fair discussion.

The following are a very few of the more important books on the subject of myths: O. Muller, Prolegomena zu einer Wissenschaftlichen Mythologie (Getting. 1825 [transl. by J. Leitch, Lond. 1844]); Grimm, Deutsche Mythologie; Buttmann, Mythologos; Hermann, Ueber das Wesen und die Behandlung d. Mythologie; Lobeck, Aglaophamus; Creuzer, Symbolik und Mythologie der Alten Volker;. Nitzsch, Helden-Sage der Griechen; Bottiger, Kunst-Mythologie d. Griechen; Kavanagh, Myths traced to their primary Source through Language (1856). The subject has of late years received three important contributions-Mr. Grote's History of Greece, volume 1; Prof. Max Miiller's Essay on Greek Mythology (Oxford Essays, 1856); and Cox, Mythology of the Aryan Nations (Lond. 1873, 2 volumes, 8vo). SEE MYTHOLOGY.

## Mythical Theory[[@Headword:Mythical Theory]]

             an attempt to destroy the sacred character of Scripture by considering its contents as myths similar in their nature and origin to those of ancient mythology. It is the result of the theological systems of Kant, Hegel,  Semler, Eichhorn,Woolston, and has found its fullest development in Strauss's Life of Jesus, and his Old Faith and New. The only question we can consider here is whether the sayings of the O. and N.T. can or cannot reallv be considered as myths. In the first place, it is worthy of remark that the word μῦθος, derived from μύω, to close the eyes, has the same root as mystery and mystic, and points to the shadowy conceptions of the soul, the thoughts which find next an expression in words. Hence it represents not merely the expression, but also the narrative, especially such as finds its origin in the vague ancient times, and consequently fables and sayings undeserving of belief (1Ti 4:7, γραώδεις μύθους παραιτοῦ ; comp. 2Ti 4:4, where it is opposed to the ἀλήθεια ; Tit 1:14, Ι᾿ουδαϊκοὶ μῦθοι), and generally every tradition unworthy of being believed (1Ti 1:4; μῦθοι σεσοφισμένοι, 2Pe 1:16). The ancients called untrustworthy sayings μυθολόγημα, and the narration of them μυθολογία. But by the word myths was formerly, and until of late, understood not only the history of the gods, but also many other traditions which rest on but slight or sometimes no historical foundation.

Here we have, then, to establish the difference between myths and tradition. The latter is the verbal relation of a fact, at first very correct, but generally becoming obscured in the course of time by additions and embellishments added to it. In modern times the distinction has become still more marked; as myths are made to be fables resting on an idea only, and developed as if they were truth, though generally connected either with persons, places, or circumstances which have really existed, while by tradition is understood the transmission of real facts or events connected with an idea. Strauss, in his Liif of Jesust defines myths as "the historical garb (of the original Christian ideas) used in the aimless poetical tradition (of the early Church) which composes the whole of the Gospel." It is in the nature of myths to be often a sort of symbol of the thoughts from which they sprang. This connection between them is well established in Ullmann, Historisch oder Mythisch (Hamb. 1838, page 56 sq.). Both are realizations of an idea; in the symbol by signs, in the myth by words. "The symbol expresses the immediate and permanent connection between the supernatural and the physical. The myth can take its rise in historical elements which it assimilates, or simply in the thoughts; this establishes the distinction between historical and philosophical myths, between which extremes, of course, there are many intermediates." Both myths and tradition are, then, distinct from history, but form the vague mist out of which history steps forth. This leads to a distinction between the historical period of a people's  existence, or that when tradition commences to be certain, and the mythical period. Now to the Bible student and to every Christian arises the question, first clearly proposed by Herder, whether in the original history of mankind, and especially of the chosen people, the same rule holds good that the time of tradition was preceded by a mythical period. This proposition may probably be admitted in a modified form; but the expression myths must be rejected, as many erroneous views would otherwise become entangled with it, and because "we are used to hear it especially applied to the fantastic produsctions of the poets of heathen religions" (Ullmann. page 58). Yet it cannot be denied that the O.T. contains passages the sense of which is traditional and mythic, and that acute criticism is required to get at real historical events in their true order, not only in the apocryphal books, but even in those recognised as canonical. The necessity of such criticism, which in former times was altogether neglected as useless, has become evident after the attacks of freethinkers and deists, and especially since the rationalists have brought forth their theory of myths and traditions to attack the reality of miracles, "as these are never to find a place in history."

Dr. M'Clintock (in the preface to his translation of Neander's Life of Christ, N.Y. 1848, page 14 sq.) has thus sketched the origin and progress of the mythical process of criticism, as the natural outgrowth of the rationalistic form which infidelity assumed in Germany:

"The declared aim of the rationalists was to interpret the Bible on rational principles; that is to say, to find nothing in it beyondc the scope o.f human reason. Not supposing its writers to be impostors, nor denying the recoi d to be a legitimate source, in a certain sense. of religious instruction, they sought to fiee it from everything supernatural; deeming it to be, not a direct divine revelation, but a product of the human mind, aided, indeed, by Divilne Providence, but in no extraordinary or miraculous way. The Miracles, therefore, had to be explained away; and this was done in any mode that the ingenuity or philosophy of the expositor might suggest. Sometimes, for instance, they were no miracles at all, but simple natural facts, and all the old interpreters had misunnderstood the writers. Sometines, again, the writers of the sacred history misunderstood the facts, deeming them to be miraculons when they were not; e.g. when Christ 'healed the sick,' he merely prescribed for them, as a kind physician, with skill and success; when he 'raised the dead,' he only restored men from a swoon or trance; when he 'subdued the storm,' there was simply a happy  'coincidence,' making a strong impression upon the minds of the disciples; when he' fed the 'five thousand,' he only set an example of kindness and benevolence which the rich by-standers eagerly followed by opening their stores to feed the hungry multitude, etc. But even this elastic exegesis, when stretched to its utmost capacity, would not explain every case: some parts of the narratives were stubbornly unyielding, and new methods were demanded. For nen who had gone so far, it was easy to go fartherthe text itself was not spared: this passage was doubtful, that was corrupt, a third was spurious. In short, 'criticism,' as this desperate kind of interpretation was called, was at last able to make anything, and in a fair way to make nothing, out of the sacred records. But still the rationalist agreed with the orthodox supernaturalist in admitting that there was, at bottom, a basis of substantial truth in the records, and asserted that his efforts only tended to free the substantive verity from the envelolpments of fable or perversion with which tradition had invested it. The admission was a fatal one. The absurdities to which the theory led could not long remain undetected. It was soon shown, and shown effectually, that this vaunted criticism was no criticism at all; that the objections which it offered to the Gospel history were as old as Porphyry, or, at least, as the English Deists, and had been refuited again and again: that the errors of interpretation into which the older expositors had fallen might be avoided without touching the truthiand inspiration of the evangelists; and, in a word, that there could be no medium between open infidelity and the admission of a supernatural revelation. During the first quarter of the present century the conflict was waged with ardor on both sides, but with increasing energy on the side of truth; and every year weakened the forces of rationalism. Still, the theological mind of Germany was to a considerable extent ulnsettled: its Tholuck and Hengstenberg stood strong for orthodoxy; its Twesten and Nitzsch applied the clearest logic to systematic theology; its Marheineke and Daub philosophized religiously; its Bretschneider and Hase upheld reason as the judge of revelation; while not a few maintained the old rationalism, though with less and less of conviction, or at least of boldness.

"It was at this point that Strauss conceived the audacious idea of applying the mythical theory to the whole structure of the evangelical history. All Germany has been more or less infected with the mytho-mania since the new school of archaeologers have gone so deeply into the heathen mythology. 'A mythis onmis priscorum hominum cum historia tum philosophia procedit,' says Heyne; and Bauer asks, logically enough, 'if the  early history of every people is mythical, why not the Hebrew?' The mere application of this theory to the sacred records was by no means original with Strauss: he himself points out a number of instances in which Eichhorn, Gabler, Vater, etc., had made use of it. His claim is to have given a comlpleteness to the theory, or rather to its application, which former interpreters had not dreamed of; and, to tell the truth, he has made no halting work of it. That Jesus lived; that he taught in Judaea; that he gathered disciples, and so impressed them with his life and teaching that they believed him to be the Messiah — this is nearly the sumn of historical truth contained in the evangeiists, according to Strauss. Yet he ascribes no firaudulent designs to the writers; his problem is, therefore, to account for the form in which the narratives appear: and this is the place for his theory to work. A Messiah was expected; certain notions were attached to the Messianic character and office; and with these Christ was invested by his followers. 'Such and such a thing must happen to the Messiah; Jesus was the Messiah; therefore such and such a thing must have happened to him.' 'The expectation of a Messiah had filourished in Israel long before the time of Christ; and at the time of his appearance it had ripened into full bloom; not an indefinite longing, either, but an expectation defined by many prominent characteristics.

Moses had promised (Deu 18:15) "a prophet like unto himself," a passage applied, in Christ's time, to the Messiah (Act 3:22; Act 2:37). The Messiah was to spring of David's line, and ascend his throne as a second David (Mat 22:42; Luk 1:32); and therefore he was looked for, in Christ's time, to be born in the little town of Bethlehem (Joh 6:42; Mat 2:5). In the old legends the most wonderful acts and destinies had been attrihuted to the prophets: could less be expected of the Messiah? Must not his life be illustrated by the most splendid and significant incidents fromu the lives of the prophets ? Finally, the Messianic sara, as a whole, was expected to be a period of signs and wonders. The eyes of the blind were to be openeed; the deaf ears were to be unstopped: the lame were to leap, etc. (Isaiah 35 :etc.). These expressions, part of which, at least, were purely figurative, came to be literally understood (Mat 11:5; Luk 7:21 sq.); and thus, even before Christ's appearance, the ima'e of Messiah was continually filling out with new features. And thus many of the legends respecting, Jesus had not to be newly invented they existed readymade in the Messianic hopes of the people, derived chiefly from the Old Testament, and only needed to be transferred to Christ. and adapted to his character and teachings.'  "These extracts contain the substance of Strauss's theory; his book is little more than an application of it to the individual parts of the history of Christ as (riven in the evangelists. A few instances of his procedure will suffice. He finds the key to the miraculous conception in Mat 1:22 : 'All this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying,' etc. 'The birth of Jesus, it was said, must correspond to this passage; and what was to be, they concluded, really did occur, and so arose the myth.' The account of the star of the Magians, and of their visit from the East, arose from a similar application of Num 24:17; Psa 72:10; Isa 60:1-6, etc. The temiptation of Christ was suggested by the trials of Job; its separate features helped out by Exo 34:2 S; Lev 16:8; Lev 16:10; Deu 9:9, etc. The transfiguratioin finds a starting-point in Exo 34:29-35. So we might go through the book.

"The appearance of the work, as we have said, prodiced a wonderful sensation in Germany; greater, by far, than its merits would seem to have authorized. It was the heaviest blow that unbelief had ever struck against Christianity; and the question was, what should be done? The Prussian government was disposed to utter its ban againust the book; and manuy evangelical theologians deemed this the proper course to pursue in regaardd to it. But Dr. Neander deprecated such a procedure as calculated to give the work a spurious celebrity, and as wearing, at least, the aspect of a confession that it was unanswerable. He advised that it should be met, not by authority, but by argument, believing that the truth had nothing to fear in such a conflict. His counsel prevailed; and the event has shown that he was right. Replies to Straus poured forth in a torrent; the Gospel histories were subjected to a closer criticism than ever; and today the public mind of Germany is nearer to an orthodox and evangelical view of their contents than it has been for almost a century.

"Besides the general impulse given by Strauss to the study of the four Gospels, he has done theology another good service. His book has given a deadly blow to rationalism properly so called. Its paltry criticism and beggarly interpretations of Scriptuire are nowhere more effectually dissected than in his investigations of the different parts of the history and of the expositions that have been given of it. In a word, he has driven rationalism out of the field to make way for his myths; and Neander, Eberhard, and others have exploded the myths; so that nothing remains biut  a return to the simple, truthful interpretations which, in the main, are given by the evangelical commentators."

In his New Life of Jesus (authorized translation, Lond. 1865, 2 volumes, 8vo) Strauss thus defines his modified and later position (page 213): "I have, mainly in consequence of Baur's hints, allowed more room than before to the hypothesis of conscious and intentional fiction. This may properly be called myth as soon as it has gained belief and passed into the legend of a people or a religious sect; for its having done so invariably shows at the same time that it was formed by its author not merely upon notions of his own, but in connection with the consciousness of a majority." He therefore still maintains that "the myth, in its original form, is not the conscious and intentional invention of an individual, but a production of the common consciousness of a people or religious circle, which an individual does indeed first enunciate, but which meets belief for the very reason that such individual is but the organ of this universal conviction" (page 206); and he proceeds to explain how in this way arose the account of the birth of Jesus in Bethlehem, and the disappearance of his body from the tomb. Yet he adds, "But when we thus point out that an unconscious invention of such accounts was possible far beyond the limits within which they are generally considered admissible, we do not mean to say that conscious fiction had no share at all in the evangelical formation of myths. The narratives of the fourth Gospel especially are for the most part so methodically framed, so carried out into detail, that, if they are not. historical, they can apparently only be considered as conscious and intentional inventions" (page 208). Accordingly he discards the Gospel of John altogether as being purely fictitious. This is the suicidal act of the mythical theorists; for once brought to the alternative of receiving or rejecting the Gospel records as a simple question of veracity, their battery is unmasked, and the argument becomes one of bold infidelity. Paley has proved, long ago, that the N.-T. writers had no possible motive or opportunity for either self-deception or imposture

Certain critics before Strauss had attempted to apply the theory of historical mythus to the Gospel narrative. By historical mythus is meant the adornment of actual facts by the imagination. Strauss, however; went further than this, and adopted what he calls the principles of philosophical mythus, i.e., "the expression of an idea in the form of an imaginary biography." But the weak point in Strauss's system, at which it finally broke down, was that he did not assert the whole Gospel to be mythical; he  admitted certain statements in the N.-T. histories as facts. Here, then, his system was as great a failure as any other. The very aim of his method was to exclude everything capricious or hypothetical; the result of its application was to leave the field as much open to caprice and hypothesis as before. Nor does his eventual denial of the truthfulness of John's Gospel mend his system; it only introduces a fresh element of discrimination and consequent perplexity. Late researches go much deeper into the idea of the myth and its application, particularly in the work of Schelling, Ueb. d. Alythen d. altesten Welt (in Paulus, Memorabilien); Creuzer; F. Baur, of Tubingen, Symbolik u. Mythologie, oder die Naturreligion d. Alterthums (Stuttg. 1824-25, 8vo); Ottfried Miiller, of Gottingen, Prolegomena zu einer Wissenschaftlichen Mythologie (Gltting. 1825); A. Batke, D. bibl. Theol. d. A. Test. (Berl. 1835). In the O.T. they consider as mythical the history of creation and of the fall of Adam, the consequent punishment, the flood, the origin of the various nations, and the election of the Jewish people, as well as their covenant with Jehovah; the history of the patriarchs, the stay in Egypt of a family which grew into a nation (although, as shown by remaining monuments, this is based on a fact), their egress from Egypt, the giving of the law on Mount Sinai, the forty-years' journey through the wilderness, the account of the manner in which the Israelites came into possession of the Promised Land.

Then a great deal in the following books, as also in the later history of the people and of the kings, especially in the form as we find it in the Book of Chronicles, where all is made to promote the priestly interest; the greater part of the history of the prophets, and even passages in the latest history of the people, as the apocryphal books, contain myths concerning the Maccabees. All through, tradition is connected with the myths which form an important element in these narratives, and both are in the whole history of the Israelites connected, in true Oriental style, with the historical element. These views, but often still more sweeping and exaggerated, were at that time advanced cautiously, and used to explain many passages in Scripture with some show of reason; the more as. all line of demarcation being destroyed by the generalization of some assertions, everything came to be measured by the same standard. The absurdities of these views, and their impiety, called into existence anl opposite party which rejected the assertion of any myths being contained in the canonical Scriptures; and the views of the latter have gradually prevailed among the more candid and careful even of German critics. Traces, however, of this mythical theory in an obscure or subdued form are seen in Stanley's Lectures on the Hist. of the Jewish Church;  having evidently come over from Ewald's destructive and arbitrary method of treating Jewish history in his Israelit. Volk. A sounder and soberer criticism, however, has found means to restore the narratives of both the O. and the N.T. to their proper rank as genuine history. SEE RATIONALISM.

## Mythology[[@Headword:Mythology]]

             (from μῦθος, a tale, and λόγος, a word) is, according to Pococke (India in Greece, page 2, note), intended strictly as a term synonymous with "invention," having no historical basis. Yet by usage the word is confined to fictions made in the early periods of a people's existence, for the purpose of presenting their religious belief, and generally their oldest traditions, in an attractive form. The tendency to create myths in this way seems inherent in every people; certainly there is no people so sunk into the brute as to be without them. And, what is more noteworthy, the systems of mythology have by no means ceased to exist even in our own day. They have only taken different shapes, and have been more widely diffused. The name is changed, while the essence remains. In losing their character of celestial reference they have become more earthly and less splendid and imposing, but their vitality is as great as ever. We might almost say of the gods as some do of the relics of saints of the Romish Church, that the more they are divided the more they multiply. The mystery with which the popular fancy delights to envelop them serves instead of the immortal ambrosia which ministers to their heavenly life. "Nothing," says De Gubernatis, "clings to the earth more closely than a superstition. A scientific truth requires years and sometimes centuries before it can obtain general acceptance. The ancient myth gives us the germ of many existing traditions, and in the same manner the current popular legends often explain the enigma of the old celestial personifications" (Zoological Mythology, volume 1, Introd.).

Myths may be divided into several classes. The most important is the moral and theological. The latter of these two is of course the more important; for it is in the myth that the oldest theology of all nonChristian nations is embodied. "Mythology," says one, "is not occupied merely or mainly with strange fancies and marvellous fictions, invented for the sake of amusement, but contains the fundamental ideas belonging to the moral and religious nature of man as they have been embodied by the imaginative faculty of the most favored races. It is this dominance of the imagination,  so characteristic of the early stages of society, which gives to myth its peculiar dramatic expression, and stamps the popular creed of all nations with the character of a poetry of nature, of man, and of God." Hence. arises the great importance of mythological study for the religious student, now so universally recognised.

Mythology, or, more strictly speaking, religious mythology, may be taken in a wider or a narrower sense. In its wider signification it includes all that was believed or might be affirmed concerning the gods of any polytheistic system — not only theology, or the doctrine concerning their nature, attributes, and operations, but their interferences in the history of the world. From the very nature of the case, the myth-producing faculty exercises itself with exuberance only under the polytheistic form of religion; for there only does a sufficient number of celestial personages exist whose attributes and actions may be clothed in a historical dress. There is nothing, however, to prevent even a monotheistic people from exhibiting certain great ideas of their faith in a narrative form, so as by prosaic minds to be taken for literal historical facts. The first of these divisions answers to the doctrine concerning God found in the Scriptures; the other to the manifestation of God in the events of the world, and especially in Jewish history. Besides strictly theological myths, there are physical myths, that is, fictions representing the most striking appearances and changes of external nature in the form of poetical history; in which view the connection of legends about giants, chimeras, etc., with regions marked by peculiar volcanic phenomena, has often been observed. It is difficult indeed, in polytheistic religions, to draw any strict line between physical and theological myths; as the divinity of all the operations of nature is the first postulate of polytheism, and every physical phenomenon becomes the manifestation of a god. Again, though it may appear a contradiction, there are historical myths; that is, marvellous legends about persons who may with probability be supposed to have actually existed. So intermingled, indeed, is fact with fable in early timne that there must always be a kind of debatable land between plain theological myth and recognised historical fact. The land is occupied by what are called the heroic myths; that is, legends about heroes, concerning whom it may often be doubtful whether they are merely a sort of inferior and more human-like gods, or only men of more than ordinary powers whom the popular imagination has elevated into demigods. Schelling, in his philosophy of mythology, uses the word in a somewhat broad meaning. He says that "these (divine, or  mythological) personalities are at the same time thought of both in certain natural and in certain historical relations to one another. Kronus is called a son of Uranus; this is a natural — when he emasculates and dethrones his father, this is a historical, relation. As, however, natural relations in the wider sense are historical, this element is sufficiently indicated when we speak of it as the historical one" (Lect. 1, page 7). And he goes on to remark that by their very nature the gods of heathenism as mythological beings have a historical character. They enter into the world of events in that part of the system of heathen religions, or rather of some religions, which speaks of their birth and of their relations among themselves, aside from any manifestations to men or interferences in human affairs. But if we make a distinction between the doctrinal part of polytheism, or of any particular religion, as that of India or Greece, and the historical part from which and from its cultus the doctrinal part, or the religious faith, is ascertained, we shall not be far out of the way. For the doctrinal part we refer to the article POLYTHEISM SEE POLYTHEISM . For the sake of greater clearness, however, we shall, by way of preface, proceed to enumerate some of the principles which ought to be borne in mind when we treat of mythology. We mention

(1) that the divine power or life-giving energy in nature was divided up in heathenism into many separate powers, which were personified, and even became to the heathen mind persons, endowed with separate wills, desires, and intelligence.

(2) These divine powers, or gods, cast off their connection with the natural object out of which they grew, so that the connection in the end was no longer obvious to the heathen mind. In this way they entered into various relations to a nation, a tribe, or a class of men; they acquired special moral qualities or attributes of various kinds; and thus all the interests of society in all its subdivisions, all arts and employments, everything in the physical world and among men, was placed under their care.

(3) They were conceived of as having human passions and desires; they had distinctions of sex — originally because active causes, as the sun, were aptly conceived of as masculine, and passive, like the earth, as feminine; they had marriages among themselves, and as they assumed human or other shape at will, they could have connections with human beings also.

(4) As objects of nature originally, and as many in number, they all had limited powers, and, while they were immortal, had had a beginning of their existence. The theogony — Hesiod's, for instance — is a part of the cosmogony which in several religions of heathenism was devised — somewhat later than the rise of mythology — to explain the original condition of the world and the way the gods came into existence. As man comes into being by procreation, so in general the existence of the gods is in the same way accounted for. Matter itself is for the most part conceived of as eternal.

(5) When the mythological process was in full activity, not only did powers of nature become persons before the imagination and faith of the polytheist, but moral powers or causes also, abstract and general conceptions, feelings, and the like, were turned into personified agents, or even into persons. Thus among the Greeks, Themis, or justice, Nemesis, or retribution, the Moirai (shares, allotments, fates, Latin Parcae), became personified, and even assumed personal existence, together with a multitude of others. And so by the side of the gods, properly so called, a multitude of subordinate beings, who grew out of such personifications, were worshipped among the Greeks and Romans, and formed a portion of a very large class which may be called secondary divinities, consisting, among others, of representatives of the life of smaller objects in nature, such as wood, fountain, and other nymphs and spirits; or of daemons attendant on higher gods, and of heroes, or the spirits of deceased men, as also of demigods, or men with a divine father or mother, who played a part second to no other in classical mythology.

(6) The mythological age cannot, on account of our want of historical records, have any exact limits assigned to it. It began in the earliest infancy of nations. We see the mythological spirit in the Vedau, which point back to an age from 1500 to 2000 years anterior to the birth of Christ. We find the Greek mythology fully mature in the age when the Homeric poems were written, and a rude philosophy working up its materials in the Hesiodic poems. Centuries must have elapsed before Homer, during which men looked at nature and the world in this spirit. The poets collected the myths of various parts of Greece, and gave to them a general Grecian stamp, but they did not originally invent them, nor were the gods imported from Egypt, the affirmation of Herodotus to the contrary notwithstanding. The end of this mythologizing spirit is also indefinite. Some few historical events are intermingled with myths, but the connection was later than the  myth. To say that they ceased when history began is to say no more, properly speaking, than that for a time mythology and the historical spirit were in conflict, and that, as the result, mythology was looked on as the history of the past.

So far as the actions and interferences of the gods form a part of mythology, it was in no sense a product of imposture. No priests or poets, or persons sustaining both characters, invented it. The poet and his hearers had the same faith, and their imaginations were in the same mythological condition: they honestly believed in the general doctrines of the theology, and the general system of divine interference in the affairs of men, of which they introduced the particulars into their poetry. Otherwise they could have met with no responsive chord in the souls of the people; or, if unbelieving themselves, they would not have searched out and reproduced the myths all through the epic age and afterwards. It is folly to suppose that the men of the myth-making times, or of the epic times, played with religion, or looked with critical eyes on the fables of the poets; or, for a long time, were injured in their moral sensibilities by the imnmoralities and grossness of many portions of the stories which were recited to them by the rhapsodists. This, however, is to be observed:

(1) That the epic poets of the Homeric period, and of the cyclical school afterwards, must have felt free to transform and work over and add to the myths which they received or gathered as their stock in trade. This is no more than Christian believers, such as Milton or Klopstoek, have done, without the least suspicion that they were practicing a fraud, or irreverently tampering with sacred things.

(2) The logographs or mythographs — the collectors of mythology into one corpus, the translators into prose of the epic sagas — these persons did allow themselves to make alterations; they may have invented connections between myths, so as to make them fit into their framework and form one whole; they may to some extent have given an improved version of one or another of the fables, under the conscious or unconscious influence of a rationalizing spirit.

(3) The lyric poets in making use of the same materials went a little further. Pindar is offended by the immoral acts imputed to the gods, and thus we see that a higher moral standard is beginning to cause a conflict between religious myths and the moral sense. This is more evident afterwards, and was one of the causes of the scepticism of later Greece. We have on record  a remarkable story relating to Stesichorus, one of the earliest lyric poets. In the beginning of an ode he had indulged in invectives against Helen, and, as a retribution for his evil speaking, lost his eyesight. He then composed his Helena, in which his version of her story was that she never went to Troy, but her phantom, or eidolon, took her place; his eyesight was thereupon restored. This furnished to Euripides the argument of the drama of Helena. The nucleus of truth here is that the poet deserted the received fable for another which was thought to be new with him (Stesich. Frag. in Bergk, 29; Herm. Praef. in Eurip. Hel.; Bernhardy, Gesch. Griech. Lit. 2:473).

(4) The tragic poets indulged in still greater liberties. AEschylus and Sophocles, being religious believers, still respected the myths; while Euripides, an unbeliever, cared little for them except as materials for his verse.

(5) In a still later age they were mere materials for works of poetry and art; and that a poet interwove them inl his narrative is no proof that he received them as true. It must be observed, also, that in the mouth and recollection of the people myths could not remain exactly fixed. They changed from age to age. The spot where the events were first reputed to happen had afterwards many competitors. The actors, especially the minor actors, varied. The poets chose what suited them best, or what first presented itself. Hence it happens that a more antique form of a myth is sometimhes picked out of the fragments of some obscure writer, or of some modern author like Pausanias, who went about among the people, or had access to authorities now lost.

The main inquiry is, How did the myths arise, if neither priest nor poet, neither fraud nor conscious invention, was the source of the great mass of them? When we say that they arose by the power of the imagination looking at the world as being full of life, or by the mythologizing process, we say nothing. When we draw analogies from modern myths — as the story of Roland, or the Holy Grail, or the epic of Arthur and his Knights — or trace the marvellous alterations which the life of Alexander the Great underwent iul a series of poems and prose narratives, to be found in all the languages of Europe and in some of those of Asia, we still fall short of the explanation (comp. Grote, Hist. of Greece, 1, end). For in the first place there is in most of the modern myths a germ of fact, as, for instance, in the story of Roland; but the myths relating to the gods had no intrinsical, bit only physical, facts for their foundation. When we come to the myths of the  heroic times of Greece, there must have been historical events in some shape, perhaps very much distorted, out of which they grew. The machinery in the epic stories founded on these myths — in other words, the interventions of the gods — were conformed to a belief of an age when the material was first chosen for the songs of the rhapsodists; but the difficulty still remains how the religious element of the myths became united with the rest. It is easy enough to see that a story like that of Roland, or a tradition of a siege of Troy, possessing sources of interest for the national mind, should by and by grow in the multitude of its details, be worked over, be altered in the mouth of the people or by the poetsthis is what happens on a small scale every day; but it is hard to account for the turning of celestial phenomena into events of history. This does not happen now. The power to do it is lost. If, for instance, the passage of the sun through the signs of the Zodiac — a yearly occurrence — becomes, through some faith of the ancient mind and some power of the imagination, the series of labors of a demigod like Hercules, struggling against monsters on the earth, and doing his work in its particulars once for all, we must say that there is no analogy for this in the present state of the world. The world of physical nature and the world of history are separated now by fixed limits. How in the mvthological age did a fact of nature turn into a fact of history? That is the great difficulty which we encounter while speculating on mythology, and it meets us in all the fables concerning the gods of such a nation as Greece, India, or ancient Germany. Mythology must continue a mystery until this is explained.

In attempting a solution of a part of this problem, we must bear in mind the conception of the gods already spoken of, and the sway of the imagination looking out on the life of the world, and conceiving of it as directly originated by superhuman spiritual causes, and not as yet recognizing, to the degree that we do, the control of secondary, physical laws. Take a single instance, that of Apollo. We assume here that Apollo was at first a sun-god; this, although no traces of such an identification appear in the poets before AEschylus, and although it has been denied by some writers on mythology (as by Voss, Mythol. Briefe, 2:378 sq.), is nowr admitted by the later and best scholars, in whose hands the Greek religion has been cleared of many of its difficulties (as, e.g., Creuzer, Welcker, Preller. and others). And it was the sun-god with a personality aftel the fashion of men, although the sun, Helios, still retained a place — a subordinate place — in Greek worship, just as Demeter, the earth-goddess, entered into the events  of the world by the side of Guea, earth, whose action was nearly confined to the myths of the cosmogony. The sun was thought to produce pestilence through the excessive heats of summer and autumn.

Apollo therefore was conceived of as originating pestilential disease. The sun's rays are naturally thought of as darted forth from the body of the sun itself. Apollo now became an archer, the god of the silver-bow; and when at the beginning of the Iliad evil disease was sent through the army before Troy, it was because Apollo was angry at the treatment which his priest, Chryses, met with from Agamemnon. Here we have moral ideas, the god's protection of an injured suppliant, and relations which only a personal existence could assume. The god came down from Olympus — where we have a society of the upper gods under Zeus — he shot his arrow into the army, the mules and dogs first, then the men, were smitten and died. But this sun-god has human feelings and can be propitiated; he can turn away his darts and heal disease. Perhaps here, too, a physical phenomenon may explain the attribute, that as the sun generates pestilence when there is an undue amount of moisture and heat, so his tempered rays bring health. However this may be, the author of pestilence became the arrester of it; he is called Hekaergos, the driver off; and in the Doric dialect Apellon, the averter, which in common Greek became Apollon. As an averter, he is the curer of disease — Paeon or Paean, the healer. His connection with music and poetry is more accidental; and his relations to political and social life (which were so important that he became the leading divinity of Greece) must be explained on historical grounds. His name, Phoebus, the bright or pure, brings him again into connection with the sun and with purifying rites. He was a source of inspiration as well at Delphi as to others besides the priestess of the oracle — for instance, to the Sibyls. All this, however, does not reach the difficulty.

It is quite conceivable that mythological divinities should thus arise, as well as that events which are of common occurrence should be attributed to a special god. But go beyond such events, and you get into deeper water. Take the story of Niobe, for instance, and its explanation by two of the principal mythologers, Welcker (Gr. Gdtter. 3) and Preller (Gr. Mythol. 2:283). Omitting details, Niobe, daughter of Tantalus, the mother of many children, exalted herself against Leto (Latona) because she had given birth to two children only, Apollo and Artemis. Accordingly the angry god avenged his mother; the children of Niobe were shot down, and she wasted away in grief. She was turned into stone, and her stone image was shown on Mount Sipylus, not far from Magnesia, in Asia Minor. This is an Asiatic myth, naturalized in Greece  proper, and it signifies the decay of the products of the earth. Niobe is Rhea, the earth-mother, whose multitude of offspring, born in spring, are withered by the god of light in autumn; or, as Welcker explains it, the new or renewed nature (Niobe being from the root denoting new), losing her children by the solar heat, mourns for them like Rachel. What renders this fable verv remarkable is the stone on Mount Sipylus, which many travellers describe (comp. Hamilton, Asia Minor, 1:49, 50) as having the resemblance of an image. Now, whether these or other explanations deserve the preference, we have an annually recurring event turned into a historical and personal event that happened once for all. Here the difficulty comes up again, and is coming up continually. The myth of Cybele and Attis, that of Adonis or Thammuz, that of Osiris, in the same way probably arose out of annually recurring physical phenomena, and yet they Stood before the ancient mind as individual events that did not repeat themselves. In these myths dead gods represent the annual decay of life in nature. And so with much more certainty can we interpret the rape of Proserpine in a physical way. She is snatched by the underground king — Hades, or the invisible one — and carried to his abode within the earth to be his wife. Here the myth takes the form of a stealing of a bride, which can be traced in Greece, and even now is found in the practice of many tribes. In consequence of the protests and grief of Demeter, it was arranged that she should be on earth with her mother two thirds of the year, and one third below with her husband, Hades.

This threefold division clearly points to the division of the season in the early times of Greece into spring, summer, and winter (literally, ear, early time; theros, hot time; and cheima, either snow- time, from a root extant in Sanscrit, or pouring-time, rainy time, from Greek χέω). Thus the principle of vegetative life manifests itself in spring and summer only. This myth is the most important one that the Greeks had, as it lay at the foundation of the worship and mysteries at Eleusis. We have explained it in its main features to our satisfaction; but; supposing that we have been successful, the conversion of a recurring physical phenomenon into, a historical. event which appears in it we find hard to explain. We may say the gods became persons: their attributes, before physical, are now personal attributes; what they do must have a historical quality, must be like human actions; so that if anything physical was attributed to them before, it would be incongruous with their new personal, non-physical nature. But still this turning-point is dark to us, because we are other men than those of the mvthological period; we have no longer the mythological faculty in its full exercise — nay, it is all but dead. The anthropomorphic  tendency — which men cannot escape from in speaking of the God of the Scriptures whenever they are exalted in their feelings — aided the mythological process, as well as the desire to express an object of worship in human form. But this pertains rather to the article POLYTHEISM SEE POLYTHEISM , where it will be spoken of more at length.

Not all nations are equally mythological, and some which have historical myths to show are not rich at all in religious myths. The Aryan race had in most of its divisions, as among the Hindus, the Greeks, the Germans and Northmen, and the Slavonians, a great richness of conception and imagination in this respect; but to none was it given as to the Greeks to stamp the impress of beauty on their mythology, so that their art and poetry, although built on mythology, still charms the Christian world. The Romans were poor in the number of their religious myths, for which the reason may be that they were formal and conscientiously scrupulous in their worship rather than free and gay; or possibly their myths may have been driven into oblivion by early culture derived from Greece. The Shemitic nations and Egypt had also a poor mythology, copious as the pantheon of the last mentioned was. It is said that the myth of Isis, Osiris, and Typhon was their only one. Thus it must either have expelled others from circulation, or none ever existed. Probably there were other myths in remote times. The Persian religion was of Aryan origin, although in centring all interest on the lasting strife between Ormusd and Ahriman it seems to have somewhat chilled the mythmaking power.

Its pantheon of inferior gods or daemons was copious enough, but the grand moral idea swallowed up every other. Their myth-making faculty is exercised in their cosmogony and eschatology, but concerns itself little with special historical relations between man and the divinities. The primitive tribes of this continent were far from wanting in this power, although the forms of their myths are like the imaginings of children. All this shows that mankind are much the same in all races, that resemblances do not necessarily prove one or another race to have been the borrower, and that the religions of nature, man being what he is, have a necessary existence. Again, the myths of a religious character, in which the gods enter into human history, show a craving on the part of man for intercourse with the gods. It was no strange thing that myths should arise where there was no revelation, or where a primitive revelation had been lost; it was equally not strange that a real revelation should take the historical form.  There are certain myths which narrate the origin of the world and the births of the gods. These cosmogonical and theogonical narratives are found alike among the Indians of this continent, among the Greeks, the Syrians, in the Teutonic race, and elsewhere. These of course can be, in great part, nothing else than early human speculations put into a religious mythic shape. They are the rude, childish philosophy of early men, who try to solve the riddles presented to human reflection without knowledge of law and of the world. We believe we may affirm it to be a general truth that no natural religion conceives of a creation out of nothing, and to a great extent the gods had no eternal existence. There was, then, a necessity of a primitive firm or stuff out of which the life and thought of the'vorld was evolved. In the Greek speculation on the first origin of things, the rudest shape of matter was the first, and the progress was towards the more perfect, until their thought reached the present condition of things. In Hesiod's theogony there is a strange mixture of true personalities and allegorical ideas, but a connection of one with another, a birth or evolution, runs through all except the first. Chaos came to be (ἐγένετο); then the broad-breasted Earth, and Tartarus in the dark recess of spacious Earth, and Eros (most beautiful among the immortal gods).

From Chaos Erebus and Night were born (ἐγένοντο); from Night AEther and Day, the progeny of Night and Erebus. Earth first bare starry Uranus to cover her over on every side, with the Hills and the Pontus, without sexual love; then to Uranus she bore many children — the Titans, among whom was Kronus (Saturn), the Cyclops, and the hundred-handed ones. Uranus hid his children, as they were born, in a cavern below the earth, but Kronus mutilated him with the advice of Gaea, and reigned in his stead. From Kronus and Rhea a new class of gods were born, whom the god swallowed, lest any of them should seize his throne, which Uranus and Gaea forewarned him of as being his destiny. When, however, Zeus was born, he was privily conveyed away; and a stone wrapped up in an infant's clothing was swallowed in his stead by Kronus. These children, with the stone, Kronus was made to disgorge, and Zeus, overcoming his father and his Titans, took the throne. In this strange medley, where allegorical beings and such as never received divine honors are put among the gods, we find the Titans playing a great part, who can have had no veneration as gods in the earliest Greek religion. We find also three dynasties: Uranus and Gaea, Kronus and Rhea, and Zeus with Hera. Schelling, following an earlier writer, supposes this to be a tradition of three successive forms of worship, the first and second of which were dualistic. But there is no evidence  within the Greek records worth anything going to show that Uranus was ever an object of worship. It is probable that the word itself is connected with Varuna, a highly honored Aryan divinity of the Vedic times. The prevalence, however, of such a worship in Greece, or of a worship of Kronus (i.e., either of time personified, or of a divinity corresponding in part with the Roman Saturnus, and having also some Phoenician characteristics drawn from Moloch), prior to that of Zeus, cannot be made out. Nor is there any proof that the Greeks held to a dualism something like that of the Chinese. On the contrary, the Vedic gods, worshipped seven or eight centuries before Hesiod, show that in that early age a polytheism had already been evolved. As was said once before, the whole theogony shows a philosopher with his materials before him, using the cement of his own reflections to unite them together in one structure. We do not mean to say that one man did all this, but that it was not popular tradition. This was necessarily so, for the popular mind knew nothing of a cosmogony. It had no facts to work upon, as it had in the formation of the religions of nature as she appears in the present order of things. We might go on and speak of the cosmogonies of other nations, but the Greek systemthe clearest of all-will show, we think, that the part of mythology in which this is treated of is neither popular nor of the very earliest origin.

It is a very interesting inquiry whether any primeval traditions of mankind, facts pertaining to the general history of man and of the world, have mingled with the mythologies of heathenism. On the one hand. if there is a tradition of a great fact appearing with marked variations in different countries, and perhaps assuming a local character, the universality is a proof of common origin, notwithstanding the variations; and the presumption is against its being propagated from one part of the world to another, since all things else in mythology seem confined to a particular race or continent. On the other hand, if a myth contains an explanation of some interior conviction of human nature, as the sense of evil, or of a lapse of man from a better state, this may be explained on psychological grounds. To begin with the last kind of myths, the tradition of a former golden age can easily be accounted for on the principle that memory blots out what is evil in the past, and at its time hard to bear, so that the age of our fathers, our youth when we are old, the early history of a nation, are surrounded with a golden halo. As to traditions of a lapse, a departure from the idea of man, they are found in a number of mythologies, but they may all be the product of reflection. Let us take the Prometheus myth for a  sample, as it appears in Hesiod. Omitting some of the details, we find that Prometheus — surnamed from his forethought, as his brother Epimetheus was from thinking after he acted — tried to cheat Zeus in respect to the offering of a victim. In revenge, Zeus would not let men have fire.

Prometheus, however, who is really a fire-genius or daemon, stole it out of heaven, carrying it in a hollow stalk, and thus again provoked the wrath of the god. The latter bound Prometheus in chains to a rock, and tormented him by sending an eagle to devour his liver, which grew daily as fast as it was eaten, until Hercules killed the bird and set the victim free. As a punishment to mankind for receiving the fire, a woman was fashioned, endowed with various gifts by the gods, and sent to Epimetheus. She brought with her as a kind of outfit a jar or cask, such as was used in housekeeping. Epimetheus was not wise enough to adopt the advice of his brother to reject the gift. The woman opened the jar, which was full of pains and death-bringing diseases, unknown before, and in consequence of this act they were scattered abroad. Only Hope stayed within the jar's cover. To this we add from the Prometheus Bound of AEschylus the striking trait that a condition of the prisoner's deliverance was that some god should suffer in his place (Hesiod, Theog. 507-516; Op. 43-104; AEschylus, Prom. 1027). There is no objection against finding a tradition of a fall in this myth arising from the fact that a state of misery, and not one of sin, is contemplated. That is just the difference between heathenism and revelation, that the former, although conscious of evil, yet finds it hard to come up to the idea of sin. The resemblances between this fable and the third chapter of Genesis are plain enough. Prometheus, the fire-bringer, the introducer of the arts into the world, may stand for the tree of knowledge, and Pandora may stand for Eve. "Our woe" came by a woman in both narratives. But the differences are still greater. There is in the fable no temptation of man to evil; he is quite passive, and the craft of his benefactor is the cause of his calamity. Woman does not lead him into sin, but is contrived expressly for his suffering. And, what adds to the awkwardness of the myth in its present form, the race of man was made, and had offered religious homage to the gods, before Pandora spread maladies over the world. It was no progenitor who entailed evil on his posterity, but the god sent evil on a race already spread over the earth. We are disposed, therefore, to regard the story as a Greek invention, rather than as a distorted tradition of the primeval times. When the more recent form of the myth makes it the condition of the liberation of Prometheus that a god shall take his place of suffering, some have found in this  particular an adumbration of the Christian doctrine of vicarious suffering; but to admit this would be to admit that heathen myths make as near an approach to the highest truths of the Gospel as is made by the Old Testament itself.

There is, however, another class of myths that have to do with the great fact of the flood, which no local phenomena, happening here and there over the world, can account for, and which could not be originated by the reflecting or observing mind. Traditions of a flood are very numerous, and confined to no one or two races. According to a remark of Bunsen (in his Chriistianity and Mankind, 4:121), they are not to be met with in the myths of the Turanian or Hamitic.races; the tribes of Africa have retained but slender traces of a flood at the best; but in China, Hindostan, Persia, Greece, Babylon, in the Edda, and through the tribes of North and South America, they present themselves to us as a part of the mythologies. In many local traditions it is the land of the tribe which is visited with a deluge, but this is no objection against their common origin. In Greece there were fables of three deluges, one of which, Deucalion's, was in Thessaly, that of Ogyges in Bceotia or Attica, and one was localized in the island of Samothrace. Pindar's simple story makes mention of the water overwhelming the earth, of its being forced back by the wisdom of Zeus, and then of Deucalion and Pyrrha coming down from Mount Parnassus to their home at Locrian Opus, where they had a posterity of stones. The destruction of the men of the iron age, the building of an ark by Deucalion at the suggestion of Prometheus, the copious rains bringing on a flood, the death of all men but a few who fled to the highest mountains, the floating of the ark nine days and nights until it struck on Parnassus, are particulars given by mythographers and later poets. The renewal of the human race by Deucalion and Pyrrha throwing stones behind their backs is a play of words between λαός, people, and λᾶας, stone, as Max Muller and others remark.

This myth seems to have been known to Hesiod; and Deucalion is engrafted into the genealogies of the Hellenie race. It is possible that some story imported from foreign parts was its foundation. Across the Atlantic, in a widely different race, we find a tradition which repeats the story of the renewal of men in the time of Deucalion and Pyrrha. The Caribbean tribe of the Tamanakas, on the Orinoco, say that a man and a woman, the only persons saved in a deluge, threw the fruit of the Mauritia-palm over their heads, and thus created a new race (J.G. Miller, Amer. Urreliq. page 229, and Humboldt there cited). We have only room to refer to two other  traditions of a flood. One is that of India, which first appears in the Mahabharata, as an episode which Bopp has translated (Berlin, 1829). In this myth Manus, a rigidly ascetic prince, was on the bank of the Wirini, when a small fish called for his protection against larger ones, and was put by him into a dish. The fish outgrew the vessel, was then removed into a lake, then, again outgrowing its dwelling, into the Ganges, and from the Ganges into the ocean. As it entered the ocean it told Manus that a great deluge was at hand, that he must build a ship with sails, go into it with the seven wise men, and provide himself with all the seeds known to the Brahmins. The fish promised to appear with a horn, to which Manus should tie his vessel, and so pass over the waters in safety. Many years the fish towed the ship of Manus over the fulness of waters. At length he gave orders to bind the ship to the highest point of Himavan (the Himalayas), which is called, says the poet, "ship-fastening," Naubandhanam, until this day.

Then the fish said to Manus, "I am the lord of creatures, even Brahma; higher than me there is nothing." And he bade him renew the race of created things and the worlds, which by means of strict penance he was to accomplish. The deluge of Xisuthrus, which seems half borrowed from the narrative in the Scriptures, is reported by Berosus, who was born under Alexander the Great. Xisuthrus, king of Babylon, was warned by Saturn (Bel) that a flood would come upon the earth in which all men would perish, and was ordered to conceal his books in one of the cities called Heliopolis, and to build a vessel into which he could go with his relations and friends, with birds, beasts, and quadrupeds, together with all necessary food. When the flood was abating he repeated the experiment of Noah, sending out birds, which twice returned, but the third time went their way. He now broke a hole in the vessel, and disappeared, being translated among the gods, with his wife, his son, and the ark-builder. Fragments of that vessel, Berosus is made to say, are still to be seen on a mountain in Armenia. The same story was known to Nicolaus of Damascus, a friend of Herod the Great. Josephus (Ant. 1:3, 6), who mentions this, says that all who have recorded the history of barbarian nations have mentioned the deluge and the ark. The story which made the Almenian mountains the landing-place from the ark seems to have circulated in that country before it received Christianity (comp. Wiseman's Lect. page 290, Amer. ed. of 1837). To this Babylonian flood myth can now be added an Assyrian one, discovered by George Smith, the decipherer of cuneiform records, who published two or three years since the life of Assurbanipal, one of the last Assyrian kings, and a contemporary of Manasseh, from the clay tablets  recording his reign, and has since found new tablets made for the same king, on which the myth referred to is narrated. It is far more mythological than the Babylonian tradition, and seems to be of later origin, but does not materially differ from the earlier known account, while the name of the ark- builder, which is Sisit, is evidently identical with Xisuthrus. It is worthy of mention that M. Lenormant, in a memoir on this newlyfound Assyrian myth, with some plausibility, shows how the story passed from Assyria into India, and was not indigenous in the latter cotuntry. We might strengthen (our position by the aid of other similar myths, but for this we have no space. What but a tradition of a great fact can have led men all over the world to have a common story of a deluge inwoven in their mvthology, the very variations of which — and they are very great — point to a great antiquity of the story, as well as to its independent working up? We close the subject with some remarks of Prof. Welcker's (Griech. Gottern. 1:770) on the Greek myths relating to the flood. These, he says, were not inferences from observations of their own. “Only a great event, a covering of the earth with water over wide regions, was sufficient to make a deep impression on human memory, and to produce a story formed with such beautiful simplicity, and spread so widely among the original nations of Asia." SEE DELUGE.

Nothing remains, according to our plan, but to say a few words on the explanations of the mvths of heathendom, especially by the ancients. Great difficulties and uncertainties attend such explanations, because in very many cases the myths are not homogeneous, and because the minds that created them were in a condition unlike our own. To the Greeks especially this was a subject of deep interest, and a number of solutions were offered; most of which were unsuccessful, because the Greeks of a historic and philosophic age could not comprehend their own remote ancestors. The spirit to attempt such solutions began perhaps in scepticism, and especially in moral revolt from the low conceptions of the mythology. Xenophanes, the founder of the early Eleatic school, more than five hundred years before Christ, says, in an extant fragment of a poem, that "Homer and Hesiod ascribed everything to the gods that was shameful and blamable among men, as to steal, commit adultery, and deceive one another;" and, in another place, that "those who say the gods are born are equally impious with those who say that they die." He also inveighed against the anthropomorphisms of mythology, and rejected a plurality of gods (comp. Nagelsbach, Posthom. Theol. page 428). Such utterances so early could  not but meet with responses. The race was not ready to give up its faith in the only divinities known to it; some compromise was therefore necessary; and even the sceptics felt themselves bound to account for the series of events in the mythological times, and for the belief in the gods itself. One of the explanations was the historical. Thus Hecatueus of Miletus (about B.C. 520) taught that the myth of Cerberus owed its origin to a poisonous snake lying by the great cavern of Tennarum, in Southern Laconia, which was accounted an opening into the subterranean world. Herodorus of Heraclea turned Atlas into an astrologer and Prometheus into a Scythian king, who was troubled by a river gnawing away, so to speak, the fat of his land by its floods, but was freed from the plague by Hercules changing the course of the stream. The river was called the Aetus. or eagle river, whence the fable of the eagle consuming the liver of Prometheus (see Lobeck, Aglaoph. 2:987 sq.). So Herodotus mentions a version of the story of Io, which made her the daughter of the king of Argos, whereas modern students of mythology regard her as one of the forms of the moon- goddess. This method reminds us of the older rationalists — Paulus, for instance — who nibbled at the supernatural without daring to deny it, and are now deservedly almost forgotten. The gods themselves, however, were not as yet explained away.

A new form of the historical interpretation appearedi in the 3d century B.C., which is called, after the name: of its founder, Euemerus (Euhemerus, Evemerus), a Sicilian Greek of Messene, who enjoyed the acquaintance of Cassander (ob. 296 B.C.). This man published a book called Sacred Records, which claimed to give authentic accounts of Zeus and other gods, drawn from sacred titles and inscriptions found in the most ancient temples, and especially in one of Zeus Triphylius, on an Indian island called Panchaea. His theory was that the gods were deceased men deified: "Great personages in the confulsions of uncivilized life, being desirous of obtaining from the common mass of men greater admiration and respect, feigned that they had a certain extraordinary and divine power, on which account they were thought by the multitude to be gods." We have nearlv followed the words of Sextus Empiricus (9:7, page 394, ed. Bekker). Lactantius (Inst. 1, § 2) says that Euemerus stated that Zeus lived on Mount Olvmpus, andwas much resorted to for the settlement of disputes by those who had found out anything new and useful to society. The poet Ennius translated this book into: Latin, and, although Cicero speaks of it (De Nat. Deor, 1:42, 118) as entirely overthrowing religion, it  had great currency as a rational .account of the religious system. It was accepted by some of the Christian fathers, and a theory of polytheism somewhat like it was advocated by some of the scholars two centuries ago.. Eluemerus wasi without question a forger of records; but the theory found favor (1) because some of the old fables spoke of the birth and reign of Zeus in Crete, and even of his death and burial, and so also of the death of other gods; (2) because the interval between gods and men in Greek polytheism was not very wide, and was almost obliterated by the bestowal of divine honors on such men as Alexander the Great. Heathenism destroyed itself just by destroying all essential differences between the divine and the human. (3) Although the mall does not seem to have been an atheist, it was a convenient theory for getting rid of the popular gods, now offensive to philosophy and morality (comp. Hoeck, Creta, 3:326, 337).

The physical explanation was forced upon the minds of thinking men by noticing the veneration paid to heavenly bodies, the earth, and the elements, in almost all nations. This was obvious enough in the religions of Phoenicia and Egypt. The great mother, or Cybele, the leading divinity of Asia'Minor, was the earth-goddess, according to a generally received interpretation which Lucretius (2:601 sq.) gives at large. Etymology was used in the service of this theory. A Roman could hardly fail to perceive the connectio;n between Jupiter or Diespiter (Jovis or Diovis) and divum, the clear, broad heaven, or sky; or to notice that the phrases sub Jove and sub-Divo are identical in sense. The poet Ennius, in a line cited by Cicero, says, "Look on this bright space on high which all invoke as Jove." The pantheistic philosophy of the Stoics adopted this explanation of the objects of popular religion. Varro, who was a Stoic, thought that the authors of religion in the old time believed in a world-soul, and that the principal gods were symbolical of the principal portions of the world. Jupiter was heaven, and branched out into various manifestations, while the female principal was earth under many names. The Stoics supported their philosophy by etymologies as worthless. Saturnus, or Time, is so called because it is saturated (satur), so to speak, with years. He swallowed his children, which means that duration consumes the spaces of time, and is filled with times past, without being full.

Another method of explanation may be called the allegorical, which was generally a way of conveying moral or philosophical truth, without necessarily asserting in all cases that the old mythology meant just what the philosophers made it to mean. Philo deals with the history of the Old  Testament just in the same way. An instance may be found of this and other interpretations in Plutarch's essay on Isis and Osiris. Isis is the principle which receives ideas, Osiris is reason, Typhon unreason, and so on. The same method applied to the mysteries of Eleusis brought into them, as we suppose, the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. A playful specimen of this method is found in Plato's Gorgias, where he explains the perforated vessels of the Danaides to mean the souls of men whose desires are unbounded; administering supplies to the desires, yet never able to satisfy them. A ridiculous specimen of a physical interpretation is the explanation of the alternate appearance of Castor and Pollux above ground by the two celestial hemispheres, the one under, the other above, the earth (Sextns Empiricus, page 399, ed. Bekker).

The scientific study of mythology commenced with the ancient nations who produced it, specially with the acute. and speculative Greeks. The great mass of the Greek people, indeed — of whom we have a characteristic type in the traveller Pausanias — accepted their oldest legends, in the mass, as divine and human facts; but as early as the time of Euripides, or even before his day, in the case of the Sicilians Epicharmus and Empedocles, we find that philosophers and poets had begun to identify Jove with the upper sky, Apollo with the sun, Juno with the nether atmosphere, and so forth; that is, they interpreted their mythology as a theology and poetry of nature.

This, indeed, may be regarded as the prevalent view among the more reflective and philosophical heathens (who were not, like Xenophon, orthodox believers) from the age of Pericles, B.C. 450, to the establishment of Christianity. But there was an altogether opposite view, which arose at a later period under less genial circumstances, and exercised no small influence both on Greek and Roman writers. This view was first prominently put forth by the Messenian Euemerus in the time of the first Ptolemies, and consisted in the flat prosaic assertion that the gods, equally with the heroes, were originally men, and all the tales about them only human facts sublimed and elevated by the imagination of pious devotees. This view seemed to derive strong support from the known stories about the birth and death of the gods, especially of Jove in Crete; and the growing sceptical tendencies of the scientific school at Alexandria were of course favorable to the promulgation of such views. The work of Euemerns accordingly obtained a wide circulation and having been translated into Latin, went to nourish that crass form of religious scepticism which was one of the most notable symptoms of the decline of  Roman genius at the time of the emperors. Historians, like Diode's, gladly adopted an interpretation of the popular mythology which promised to swell their stores of trustworthy material; the myths accordingly were coolly emptied of the poetic soul which inspired them, and the early traditions of the heroic ages were set forth as plain history, with a grave sobriety equally opposed to sound criticism, natural piety, and good taste. In modern times, the Greek mythology has again formed the basis of much speculation on the character of myths and the general laws of mythical interpretation.

The first tendency of modern Christian scholars, following the track long before taken by the fathers, was to refer all Greek mythology to a corruption of Old-Testament doctrine and history. Of this system of interpreting myths we have examples in Vossius, in the learned and fanciful works of Bryant and Faber, and very recently, though with more pious and poetic feeling, in Gladstone. But the Germans, who have taken the lead here, as in other regions of combined research and speculation, have long ago given up this ground as untenable, and have introduced the rational method of interpreting every system of myths, in the first place, according to the peculiar laws traceable in its own genius and growth. Ground was broken in this department by Heyne, whose views have been tested, corrected, and enlarged by a great number of learned, ingenious, and philosophical writers among his own countrymen, specially by Buttmann, Voss, Creuzer, Muller, Welcker, Gerhard, and Preller.

The general tendency of the Germans is to start — as Wordsworth does in his Excursion, book 4 — from the position of a devout imaginative contemplation of nature, in which the myths originated, and to trace the working out of those ideas, in different places and at different times, with the most critical research and the most vivid reconstruction. If in this work they have given birth to a large mass of ingenious nonsense and brilliant guess-work, there has not been wanting among them abundance of sober judgment and sound sense to counteract such extravagances. It may be noticed, however, as characteristic of their over-speculative intellect, that they have a tendency to bring the sway of theological and physical symbols down into a region of what appears to be plain, historical fact; so that Achilles becomes a water-god, Peletus a mud-god, and the whole of the Iliad, according to Forchhammer, a poetical geology of Thessaly and the Troad! Going to the opposite from Euemerus, they have denied the existence even of deified heroes; all the heroes of Greek tradition, according to Uschold, are only degraded gods; and generally in German writers a preference of transcendental to simple and obvious explanations  of myths is noticeable. Creuzer, some of whose views had been anticipated by Blackwell, in Scotiand, is specially remarkable for the high ground of religious and philosophical conception on which he has placed the interpretation of myths; and he was also the first who directed attention to the Oriental element in Greek mythology — not, indeed, with sufficient discrimination in many cases, but to the great enrichment of mythological material, and the enlargement of philosophical survey. In the most recent times, by uniting the excursive method of Creuzer with the correction supplied by the more critical method of O. Muller and his successors, the science of comparative mythology has been launched into existence; and specially the comparison of the earliest Greek mythology with the sacred legends of the Hindlus has been ably advocated by Max Muller in the Oxford Essays (1856). In France, the views of Euemerus were propounded by Banier (1739); and generally the French scholars, such as Raoul Rochette and Petit Radel, show a distinct national tendency to recognize as much of the historical element as possible in mythology. By the British scholars mythology is a field that has been very scantily cultivated. Besides those already named, Bulfinch and Gould have done something in gathering material, but Payne Knight, Mackay, Grote in the first volumes of his history, Keightley, and Freeman are the only names of any note, and their works can in nowise compete in originality, extent of research, in discriminating criticism, or in largeness of view, with the productions of the German school. The best for common purposes is Keightley; the most original, Payne Knight. In this country some service has been rendered to this department of recent study by Profs. Hadley and Whitney, and by the Reverend James Freeman Clarke.

The charm which mythology threw over polytheism, its fascinations for the imaginative faculty, its connection with idolatry and with worship, its appeals to the senses, the vantage-ground which it had in a life-struggle with a severe holy monotheism in more ways than one — these topics will be duly considered in the article on POLYTHEISM SEE POLYTHEISM , to which we must refer the reader for a list of some of the best books on the heathen religions and mythologies likely to be of special interest to the theological student. SEE NORSE MYTHOLOGY. (T.D.W.)