

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY
REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL,
THEOLOGICAL and
ECCLESIASTICAL
LITERATURE

Metropolitan - Ministerium

by James Strong & John McClintock

To the Students of the Words, Works and Ways of God:

Welcome to the AGES Digital Library. We trust your experience with this and other volumes in the Library fulfills our motto and vision which is our commitment to you:

MAKING THE WORDS OF THE WISE
AVAILABLE TO ALL — INEXPENSIVELY.

AGES Software Rio, WI USA
Version 1.0 © 2000

Metropolitan

(**Μητροπολίτης**) is the name of an ecclesiastical dignitary an episcopal officer who, by virtue of his residence in the capital of a country or province, exercises not only the authority of a presiding officer in his own diocese, but exerts, in some sense, jurisdiction over the other bishops of the same country or province; and in this respect differs from the *archbishop* (q.v.), who simply enjoys some additional privileges of honors and respect not common to the plain bishop (comp. Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 1:270).

The office originated in the Roman countries, when the chief city of a province was called **μητρόπολις**. The date of its origin cannot be exactly fixed, but “the third century,” says Coleman (*Manual of Prelacy and Ritualism*, page 235), “may be regarded as the period in which it was chiefly consolidated and established.” Romanists hold that it can be traced, at least in germ, to the days of the apostles, and that mention is made of the office in the letters of Paul to Timothy and to Titus (comp. Pierre de Marca, *Concord.* lib. 6, Giorgi, *De Antiquo Ital. Metropol.*). Several of the Church fathers also mention the fact that the metropolitan office existed in apostolic days (e.g. Chrysostom, 15 *Hom. in V. Tim.*, and Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* 3, c. 4); but it is clear that “the *name* of metropolitan does not occur until the 4th century” (Coleman, *Anc. Christianity Exemplified*, page 143). The title was first publicly adopted by the Church at the Council of Nicaea, A.D. 325, and there seems good ground for the belief that, like all other episcopal offices, the metropolitan government “was not the production of a day, but the result of a gradual modification of the diocesan government, by a further concentration of episcopal power, and the extension of its influence over a wider range of territory” (Coleman, *Prel. and Rit.* page 242; comp. Schaff, *Ch. Hist.* 2:270).

The following maybe considered as the rights and privileges of the office. The metropolitan had precedence of all other bishops of his province, a decisive voice in their election, and the power of confirming and ordaining them. He summoned provincial councils, presided in them, and drew up the decrees. He had the oversight of the provincial bishops, and the ecclesiastical superintendence of the whole province. He had the privilege of determining all causes of special importance in provincial council, but in concurrence with the other bishops of the province. In extreme cases, appeal was made to him, when he had the power of controlling a provincial

bishop, without the assistance of other bishops. He could give and receive letters of communion, and publish and carry into effect laws enacted either by emperors or by councils relating to the Church. The bishops of a province elected and ordained their metropolitan. without the concurrence of the metropolitan of any other province.

The ninth canon of the Council of Antioch (341) thus defines the office of the metropolitan: “The bishops of each eparchy (province) should know that upon the bishop of the metropolis (the municipal capital) also devolves a care for the whole eparchy, because in the metropolis all, who have business, gather together from all quarters. Hence it has been found good that he should also have a precedence in honor, and that the other bishops should do nothing without him-according to the old and still binding canon of our fathers — except that which pertains to the supervision and jurisdiction of their parishes (i.e., dioceses in the modern terminology), and the provinces belonging to them; as in fact they ordain presbyters and deacons, and decide all judicial matters. “Otherwise they ought to do nothing without the bishop of the metropolis, and he nothing without the consent of the other bishops.” In the nineteenth canon, this council forbade a bishop being ordained without the presence of the metropolitan, and the presence or concurrence of the majority of the bishops of the province. The writers of the Latin Church use promiscuously the words archbishop and metropolitan, making either name denote a bishop, who, by virtue of his see, presides over or governs several other bishops. Thus in the newly-constituted hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church in England the archbishop of Westminster has the rank of *metropolitan*. In the Roman Catholic Church of Ireland, the archbishops of Armagh, Dublin, Cashel, and Tuam, all possess the same rank. In the Church of England, also, the real meaning of the term metropolitan seems to have been lost sight of, and the archbishops of Canterbury and York, in England, and in Ireland those of Armagh and Dublin, are called metropolitans. The Greeks, however, use the name only to denote him whose see is really a civil metropolis. See Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.* s.v.; Hook, *Church Dict.* s.v.; Walcott, *Sacred Archaeology*, s.v.; Siegel, *Handbuch d. christl.-kirchl. Alterthumer*, 3:264 sq.; Planck, *Gesch. d. christl.-kirchl. Gesellschaftsverfassung*, 1:572 sq.; Ziegler, *Versuch d. kirchl. Verfassungsformen*, page 61 sq.

Metropolitum

is the name of the archiepiscopal ordinariate and consistory, a sort of ecclesiastical supreme court, or second court of appeals, in the Church of Rome, installed by the metropolitans or archbishops. Occasionally it has the special power conferred which constitutes it also a third court of appeals, but, as a rule, this court hears all appeals in matters of discipline and matrimonial difficulties. As the duties of the archbishop are both to attend to the management of his own diocese and the dioceses of his subaltern bishops, the metropolitan council is divided into two boards or senates, one of which constitutes the court in cases of discipline and matrimonial differences of the archdiocese, the other hearing appeals from the ordinaries and consistories of the assistant bishops. But it is against the nature of archiepiscopal jurisdiction that the metropolitum can also take the appeals against the sentence of the archiepiscopal vicary and ordinary and decide upon those. An appeal *ab eadem ad eundem* is not admissible, for it cannot be thought of that the general vicary or the archiepiscopal ordinary represents the archbishop as common bishop in *propria dicecesi*, the metropolitum representing him as such, inasmuch as the archbishop is in his own archdiocese as *ordinarius*. The archbishop certainly cannot fill the offices of two dignitaries; the cognition or decision of appeals from sentences of archiepiscopal general vicaries and metropolitan courts should therefore be sent to other, hence to the metropolitan court of another archbishopric. Appeals from the decisions of the metropolitan courts in second instance are usually presented to the pope himself, securing acquittal at Rome by the Curia Romana, unless his holiness may please to order a *judices in partibus*, i.e., confer upon the metropolitum the power of acting as a court of appeal of the third instance. See Wetzler und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, s.v.

Mets, Laurent Re

a Flemish prelate, was born at Grammont about 1520. He studied theology at Louvain, became a curate at Deinse, almoner and canon of Saint-Gudula's church at Brussels, and shortly after the opening of the year 1562 he was appointed vicar to cardinal de Granvelle, archbishop of Malines, and installed ecclesiastical judge, or official, for the district of Brussels. In 1569, the University of Louvain constituted him the conservator of its privileges and vested rights, which were then hotly contested. Laurent de Mets did not long discharge the intricate functions of this last office, for in

November 1569, he was preferred to the bishopric of Bois-le-Duc. Mets founded a seminary, and published a Ritual for the use of his clergy. In November 1577, he was constrained to yield to the insurrection of the Calvinists. At first he took refuge in Cologne, and then in Namur, where, in 1578, Gregory XIII invested him with the episcopal see rendered vacant by the death of Anthony Havet. He died at Namur, 1580. He is the author of *Statuta Synodi Diocesanae Buscoducensis anno Domini MDLXXI* (Bois-le-Duc, 1571, 8vo): — *Manuale Pastorum diaecesis Sylvaeducensis*, (ibid. 1572, 4to). See Paquot, *Memoires pour servir l'histoire litteraire des Pays-Bas*, 12:319-27; Valere Andre, *Bibliotheca Belgica*; Guillaume Gazet, *Histoire ecclesiastique des Pays-Bas*; Foppens, *Bibliotheca Belgica*, page 810.

Metsiah

SEE PRISON REFORM.

Mettray, Reformatory of.

This noted institution for the reformation of juvenile delinquents is the parent of all institutions of this character, and deserves our notice therefor. The object of the Reformatory of Mettray and other like institutions, which have, especially of late, been fast multiplying, is the mild punishment and ultimate restoration to society of juvenile delinquents. The founder of the reformatory — whose labors, like those of the prison reformers of our day, deserve to be cherished forever — was M. Demetz, a French lawyer, a member of the Parisian bar, who, struck with the evils and hardships attending the committal to prison of young persons, and considering the training and habits of scarcely responsible criminals, condemned to languish hopelessly for a time, incapable of producing results other than their emerging worse than when they entered, resolved, in conjunction with the vicomte Bretigneres de Courteilles, to found a school which should have for its object the reformation of this class of offenders. In 1839, accordingly, the Reformatory, or, as it is called, the Colony of Mettray, was set on foot, about five miles from the city of Tours, in France. From that day to this, M. Demetz has, by his assiduous labors and self-devotedness, rendered to France and Europe one of the greatest benefits that could be conferred on society, proving that, by agricultural and other labors of industry, and well-considered rules of organization and discipline, the neglected and criminal may be trained to take their place honestly and

honorably in society; the relapses into crime being in the institution of Mettray only 3.81 per cent. *SEE PRISON REFORM.* (J.H.W.)

Metus

an aged and venerable Christian of Alexandria, who, in the persecution of that city A.D. 249, for refusing to blaspheme his Saviour, was first beaten with clubs, then pierced with sharp reeds, and finally stoned to death. Quinta and Apollonia, two Christian females, and many others whose names are not preserved, were fellow-sufferers. Fox, *Book of Martyrs*, page 26.

Metz

an important fortified city of the province of Lorraine, lately conquered by the Prussians in their contest with France, and situated on the Moselle, at its confluence with the Seille, holds an important position in Church history.

This place, known to the Romans by the name of *Divodorum*, was the chief town of a people called the *Mediomatrici*, whose name it took at a later date. In the 5th century the corrupted form *Mettis* first came into use, whence the modern *Metz*. It was destroyed by the Huns in 452. At the death of Clovis it became the capital of Austrasia, and later the capital of Lorraine. In 985 it became a free imperial town. It was finally secured to France by the peace of Westphalia in 1648, and was held by the French until ceded to the Germans in 1870. It has a population of over 50,000, somewhat diminished of late by the excursions of families unwilling to live under Prussian rule. Its streets are wide and clean, and it contains numerous spacious squares. The cathedral, a Gothic edifice, begun in 1014, and finished in 1546, is remarkable for its boldness, lightness, and elegance, and has a beautiful spire of open work, 373 feet in height. The church of Notre-Dame-de-la-Ronde is a noteworthy structure. Its choir was built in 1130. Metz contains also many other noble edifices and institutions, religious, civil, and military. Its industry is active, the chief employments being lacemaking, tanning, embroidering, and the manufacture of brushes, clothing for the army, flannels, pins, and canes; there are also brass and copper foundries.

Metz figures quite prominently in the history of religious persecutions during the 16th and 17th centuries. The Huguenot war, especially, affected

the peace of the Protestants of this place. The revocation of the Edict of Nantes was put in force at this place only five days after its publication. More than 4000 people left the place. (Comp. *La persecution de l'église de Metz*, d'écrite par le sieur Olry [2d ed], by O. Cuvier [Paris, 1860]).

Metz, Council Of

(*Concilium Metense*). Church councils were held at Metz as early as A.D. 590. At this time AEgidius, archbishop of Rheims, was deposed and banished for high-treason against king Childebert. Of far greater importance, however, was a council held here in A.D. 835, which revoked the excommunication of Louis le Dboinaire, who had been unjustly treated by Ebbo, archbishop of Rheims. Another council, in the year following, supplemented the action of 835 by crowning Louis, Ebbo himself receding from his former position. **SEE LOUIS LE DEBONNAIRE**. See also Landon, *Manual of Councils*, s.v.

Metz, Christian

SEE INSPIRED.

Metz, Joseph von

a German Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Ebenhofen, Bavaria, March 9, 1758. He was educated by Meinrad Meichelbeck, prior of the monastery at Reichenau, continued his education at the monastery at Benedictheuren, and graduated in 1779 at Augsburg. Afterwards he studied at the seminary at Pfaffenhausen; was ordained at Augsburg in 1785; became in the same year tutor of the children of the count of Stauffenberg, with whom he went to Strasburg, Mentz, and Wurzburg; was then installed as minister at Freighalden, and a few years after as chaplain at Eberstall. In 1801 he was nominated clerical counselor by Carl Theodor of Dalberg, bishop at Constance. In 1802 he got a position as minister to Risdissen, and in 1804 as deacon at Laupheim; in 1809 poor health forced him to resign both positions, but in 1810, being restored to health, he became clerical counsellor of the government of the bishopric of Constance; in 1812 general counsellor of the vicarage at Elwangen; resigned in 1817, and died January 4, 1819. His manifold duties as pastor prevented the composition of extended literary works. Besides several essays in journals, he published *Katechismus, oder Leitfaden zum Christ-katholischen*

Religionsunterricht (Const. 1812, 8vo). See Doring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands des 18ten u. 19ten Jahrhunderts*, 2, s.v.

Meucci, Vincenzo

a Florentine artist, born in 1694, was chiefly employed in works of perspective, which he executed at various places in Tuscany, and in the cupola of the royal chapel in S. Lorenzo. Several works of Meucci are dispersed through various churches in Florence, and in a chapel of the Wunziata, where he painted a lovely *Madonna*, which is allowed to be one of his best works. He died in 1776. See Lanzi's *History of Painting*, transl. by Roscoe (London, 1847, 3 volumes, 8vo), 1:253.

Meuillon, Raymond De

a French preacher and theologian, was born about 1235 in Dauphiny. After having declared to adhere to the rules of St. Dominic at the Convent of Sisteran, he was elected in 1264 general preacher of that order, and some time afterwards he was nominated definitor. In 1278 he was commissioned to go to England to suppress the too liberal discourses of some Dominicans, accused of irreverence to the memory of St. Thomas. After having accomplished the mission assigned to him, Raymond gave an account of his journey to the assembled chapels in Paris in May, 1279. The delinquents were condemned, and the priors authorized to punish vigorously whosoever should attempt new excesses. As a reward for his zeal, Raymond was nominated definitor for a second time. Some years after he was introduced to the secular Church in the capacity of a bishop. In 1289 Raymond was promoted archbishop of Embrun. He died June 29, 1294. Raymond de Meuillon's writings may be divided into two distinct categories, viz. his statutes and his dogmatical books. *L'Histoire Litteraire* analyzes them both. His dogmatical books have been translated into Greek. The only copy of this version, once kept in the Monastery of St. Germain-des-Pres at Paris, is now in the imperial library of St. Petersburg, with a great number of other manuscripts of his. See *Le Catalogue des MSS. Bibl. imper.* by M. Edouard de Muralt, and the valuable article of M.V. Le Clerc in *L'Histoire Litteraire*.

Meunim

(Nehum 752). *SEE MEHUNIM*.

Meur, Vincent

a noted French divine, the inspirer of French foreign missions, was born at Tonguedec, in the diocese of Frdzuier, France, in 1628. When yet a young man, he obtained the post of almoner to the court of Louis XIV. Tiring, however, of the idleness which frequently intervened in the discharge of his duties, he induced several other ecclesiastics, his friends and colleagues, to unite with him in founding an institution to prepare zealous apostles and effective preachers of the Word, and by this movement originated the French Board of Foreign Missions. In its incipiency, twelve persons assembled for consultation and deliberation in a small house in the Rue de la Harpe. Meur presided at this meeting. The Jesuits, comprehending the advantages which their society would derive from cooperative work with such auxiliaries, in 1652 affiliated with them. Meur, the moving spirit of these Roman Catholic missionaries, advised that work be inaugurated in South-eastern Asia, and, to obtain the approval of pope Alexander VII, in 1657 repaired to Rome. The pontiff warmly approved the project. Meur himself, however, instead of accompanying his associates, returned to Paris, and there engaged in theological discussions. He attacked Jansenius and his followers; in 1664 was appointed superior of the Seminary for Foreign Missions; assumed the priorate of St. Andre, in Brittany; and went on some religious missions to Dijon, Auxerre, and other cities of Burgundy, where he had friends. He had just returned from Brittany, to receive property bequeathed to him by his father and his brother, when he died, at Vieux-Chateaux-en-Brie, in 1668. See Richard et Giraud, *Biblioth. Sacrae*; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Meuschen, Johann Gerhard

a learned German Protestant theologian, was born at Osnabruck, in Westphalia, May 4, 1680, a son of the minister Johann Conrad Meuschen at the St. Catharinenkirche. He commenced his education at the gymnasium of his native town; in 1699 entered the University of Jena, where, in 1702, he secured the title of master of arts. In 1703, being about to take a position as professor at Copenhagen, but detained accidentally at Kiel, he was appointed professor. extraordinary of philosophy at the university of that place. He returned to Osnabriick in 1704, whither he was called by the St. Catharinenkirche as assistant to his father. In 1708 he was called to the Hague as pastor of the Lutheran congregation of that place, and here he labored until 1716, when he went to Hanau as chief court and

city minister, with the character of counsellor of the consistory; in 1720 he was appointed clerical superintendent of the district of Hanau-Lichtenberg. In 1723, after having refused several important offers made to him, he removed to Coburg as ecclesiastical counsellor, superintendent-general, and professor of theology, and died there December 15, 1743. Meuschen was a decided opponent of the papists, and especially of the Jesuits; and had to suffer considerably from their animosity towards him. One of his pamphlets against the machinations of Jesuitism, *Nugae venales Rullenses*, was even publicly destroyed by fire under the hands of the executioner. The larger part of his works are of an ascetic tendency. The most important of his productions are: *Postilla mythica*, and *Die neu eroffnete Bahn des wahren Christenthums: — Madonna et santa casa di Laretto, oder historische Beschreibung der lieben Frauen und des heiligen Hauses zu Loretto* (Jena, 1702, 8vo): — *Diss. academica de Cynisis philosophis* (Kilon. 1703, 4to): — *Diss. de praejudicio auctoritatis* (ibid. 1704, 4to): — *Diss. de antiquo et moderno ritu salutandi sternutantes* (ibid. 1704, 4to): — *Diss. de fabis Pythagoricis mysticis* (ibid. 1704, 4to): — *Anweisung zur Verleugnung der Welt und seiner selbst* (Osnabrück, 1706, 12mo): — *Das hohe Geheimniss der Geburt Christi in der Seele* (Amsterdam, 1709, 8vo): — *Die in der ersten Kirche, gebräuchliche apostolische Consecration des heil. Abendmahls, aus den Patribus und Kirchengeschichten erwiesen*.

Meuschen was a very superior student in the ancient and Oriental languages, and his contributions to exegetical theology are perhaps among the most valuable productions of his age and country. His best works in the field of Biblical literature are: *Diatribes de Nasi principe et direttore Synedrii Magni Hebraeorum* (Coburg, 1724, 4to): — *Novum Testamentum e Talmude illustratum* (Leip. 1736, 4to): — *Bibliotheca medici sacri, seu recensio scriptorum qui Scripturam Sacram ex medicina et philosophia naturali illustrant* (The Hague, 1712, 8vo). He also edited Eygas's *Chronicon Universale*, under the title *Herml. Eygantis Ord. minor. flores temporum s. chronicon universale ab anno Christi ad A.D. 1340 et adhuc ad a. 1513 continuatum a M. Eysenhardt; editum prazemisse glossario Latinitatis ferreae J.C.G. Meuschenii* (Lugd. Batav. 1743, 4to). See *Programma funebre in Meuschenium* (in the *Acta Historico Ecclesiastica* [Leipsic, volume 7]); Strieder, *Hessische gelehrten geschichte*, volume 9; Gotten, *Gelehrtes Europa*, volumes 2 and 3. (J.H.W.)

Meusel (Or Mosel), Wolfgang

(Latin *Musculus*), a German Protestant theologian and Hebraist, was born at Dieuze, Lorraine (lately in France, but now in Germany), in 1497. At the age of fifteen, through the good offices of the prior, he was entered as a novice in the monastery of the Benedictines near Lixheim. After a course of arduous studies he was ordained a priest, and then devoted himself to preaching. In 1518 the writings of Luther strongly inclined Meusel to embrace the doctrines of the Reformation. Though elected prior of the cloister with which he was connected, he declined that office in order to maintain his independence. About this time he began so openly to preach the dogmas of Protestantism that he became generally known as the "Lutheran monk." Soon afterwards he quitted the monastery and went to Strasburg, where, in 1527, he married a relative of his former superior in the priory. A series of misfortunes and vicissitudes involved Meusel in obscurity until 1529, when he was appointed vicar at the cathedral at Strasburg. It was then that he diligently applied himself to the pursuit of Hebrew under the tuition of Bucer and Capito. In 1531 the Augsburg Senate invited him to come and labor for the spiritual good of the city. His principles of liberality and toleration so pleased the Senate that they intrusted him with some important missions. In 1536 he was sent to the assembly at Wittemberg, where he executed the formulary of a union designed to bind together the churches of Germany, North and South, in the matter of the Eucharist. In 1540 the Augsburg Senate delegated him to the councils held at Worms by the Protestants and the Catholics, and afterwards to the conferences which took place at Ratisbon. In the following year he drew up the heads of the controversy between Melancthon and Eck. In 1544 he established at Donauwirth the principles of the Reformation, and distinguished himself as a preacher. In 1549 he was installed professor of theology at Bern. He died in that city about 1563. Meusel wrote, *Anti-Cochlaeus primus, aduersus J. Cochlei de sacerdotio ac sacrificio novae legis libellum* (Augsburg, 1644, 4to): — *Commentarii in D. Joannis Evangelium* (Basle, 1545, fol.): — *Commentarii in Matthaeum* (ibid. 1548, fol.): — *Dialogi IV de Quaestione: Liceat homini Christiano evangeliae doctrinae guaro papisticis superstitionibus ac falsis cultibus externa societate communicare?* (1549, 8vo): — *Commentarii in Psalmos* (ibid. 1553, fol.): — *In Decalogum Explanatio* (ibid. 1553): — *Commentarii in Genesis* (ibid. 1554, fol.): — *Commentarii in Epistolam ad Romanos* (ibid. 1555,

fol): — *Commentarii in Esaiam prophetam* (ibid. 1567, fol.): — *Commentari in Epistolas ad Corinthios, ad Galatos, ad Ephesios* (ibid. 1559, fol.): — *Loci communes Theologiae sacrae* (ibid. 1560, fol.): — *Commentarii in Epistolas ad Philippenses, Colossenses, Thessalonicenses et in primam ad Timotheum* (ibid. 1565, fol.). See *Synopsis festalium concionum, auctore Wolf. Musculo Dusano. Ejusdem vita, obitus, erudita carmina. Item clariss. virorum in ipsius obitu epicedia* (Basle, 1595, 12mo). See Haag, *Le France Protest.*; Melch. Adam, *Vitae Theologorum*; Bayle, *Hist. Dictionary*, s.v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Bio. Generale*, s.v.

Mexico

a federal republic of North America, and by far the most powerful representative of the Spanish American states.

I. General. — Mexico is situated between latitude 150 and 320 north, and longitude 970 and 117° west. The area is estimated by Behm and Wagner (*Bevolkerung der Erde*, Gotha, 1872) at 776,280 square miles; by other authorities somewhat differently. The population amounted in 1868, according to the calculations of the Mexican statistician, Cubas y Garcia, to 9,173,052. The country was, in 1518, conquered by Cortes for Spain, and from that time to 1821 constituted the vice-kingdom of New Spain. Up to 1843, when Texas separated from Mexico and declared itself independent, the area of Mexico was more than double what it is at present, embracing an area of about 1,500,000 square miles, but soon after the loss of Texas, the entire country north of the Rio Grande had, in consequence of the war of 1846 to 1848, to be ceded to the United States. In 1821 Mexico declared independence from Spain, and constituted itself a republic. The attempt of the Creole, Iturbide, to convert the country into an empire (1822), ended after about one year with his expulsion; and from that time Mexico, though continually torn by civil wars, remained a republic, with the single exception of the interval from 1864 to 1867 when Maximilian I was emperor of Mexico. The Mexican population embraces about 1,140,000 whites (40,000 Europeans, 300,000 Creoles, 800,000 Chapetones, or persons of mixed descent, who claim to be white), 1,500,000 to 2,000,000 Mestizoes of mixed descent, and about 16,000 negroes; all the others are Indians. Nearly all of these last are Christianized (*fideles*), only about 100,000 are still unbaptized (*Indios bravos*), and inhabit in small tribes the northern regions of the republic. All races have equal rights before the law; slavery was abolished on Sept. 16, 1829, under

president Guerrero. The general language of the country is Spanish; of the Indian dialects, about twenty have maintained themselves to the present day; those most extensively spoken are the Aztec, or Mexican, and the Otonutian. The population in 1883 was 10,447,974.

II. History of the Roman Catholic Church. — The conquest of the country was soon followed by its Christianization. The first missionaries (after 1522) belonged to the Franciscan order, and one of the first Franciscan monks, Peter of Ghent, reported that the missionaries of his order had, during the first six years of their labors, converted 200,000 Indians; and according to a report of the first bishop of Mexico, Zumaraga, in 1531, the number of the converts had risen to 1,000,000. Even the missionaries, however, complain that the conversion in many cases was little more than nominal, and many hid their idols under the cross in order to be able to worship them with impunity. The Franciscans were, in 1526 followed by the Dominicans, who gave to the country most of its bishops, by the Mercedarians (Order of Mercy), and (after 1553) by the Augustinians. When the Jesuits arrived in the country in 1572, the Christianization of the districts settled by the colonists was nearly complete; but the Jesuits established a number of prosperous missions in the territories of Northern Mexico which at that time did not belong to the Spanish dominions. About the year 1600 Mexico abounded in magnificent churches, convents, and charitable institutions. The cruel treatment of the Indians by many Spaniards often called forth the remonstrances of monks and bishops, who prevailed upon king Charles V of Spain to interfere in behalf of the Indians, and upon pope Paul III to declare authoritatively that the Indians were rational beings, and must be treated as such. At the same time the bishops took good care of their own interests, and the Church of Mexico was one of the wealthiest on the globe. In 1767 the Jesuits were expelled from the country, and about the same time the influence of the liberal and rationalistic tendencies which prevailed in South-western Europe invaded Mexico, and gradually undermined both the Spanish rule and the influence of the Catholic Church. Among the leaders of the war of independence were many liberals. After the establishment of the federative republic, the Church generally sided with the Centralists, or Escosesos (so called after the Scotch rite of Freemasonry), and thereby provoked the bitter hostility of the Federalists, or Yorkinos (so called after the York rite of the Freemasons), who confiscated very large amounts of Church property whenever they were in power. In consequence of the refusal of

the Spanish government to relinquish its historical rights in Mexican Church affairs, nearly all the episcopal sees became gradually vacant, until a convention with Rome for the reorganization of the Mexican Church was concluded and proclaimed, in 1831. as a law of the state. In 1851, under the presidency of Arista, a papal nuncio, Clementi, was appointed for Mexico, but the Chamber of Deputies did not recognise him, and even a portion of the clergy received him with distrust. In an allocution of December 15, 1856, the pope complained that in the previous year (1855) the ecclesiastical jurisdiction had been abolished, the property of the diocese of Puebla confiscated, and the bishop of that city exiled; that in 1856 the Church had been stripped of all her possessions, the bishop of Guadalajara exiled, the sale of the Church property ordered, and the monks prevailed upon to leave their convents; that liberty of worship, speech, and the press had been introduced, many priests fined, a number of convents destroyed, and others suppressed; and that in general the government of president Santa Anna had shown a bitter hostility to the Church. President Commonfort (elected in 1856) was regarded as a still worse enemy of the Church than Santa Anna. A good understanding between Church and State was for a short time re-established under president Zuloaga (1858); but after his speedy overthrow (1859) the conflict began anew. A papal allocution of September 30, 1861, deplored the new persecution of the Church in Mexico, when under the administration of president Juarez the possessions of the Church had been declared as national property, churches plundered, bishops expelled, clergymen, monks, and nuns exposed to many annoyances, and so forth. When Maximilian I was proclaimed emperor, the entire Church party supported him. Maximilian, before going to Mexico, implored at Rome the papal blessing, conferred many favors upon the Church. and received a new papal nuncio in Mexico; but the negotiations for a new concordat failed from reasons that have not yet been fully cleared up. After the re-establishment of the republican government under Juarez, the Church again complained of the liberal policy pursued by the government, and these complaints continued when Juarez was succeeded (1872) by president Lerdo de Tejada. The new president, as well as the majority of the Mexican Congress, adhered to the principles of religious toleration. In May, 1873, the Mexican Congress adopted a new law for the regulation of the affairs of the Roman Catholic Church, and the relation between Church and State, which contained the following provisions: Art. 1. Church and State are independent of each other. Congress can issue no laws which. establish or prohibit any religion.

Art. 2. Marriage is a civil contract, which is under the exclusive jurisdiction of the state authorities, and regulated by law. Art. 3. Religious societies can possess no real estate. Art. 4. All inhabitants of the republic are declared free from religious vows. The first article of this law was adopted unanimously, the remainder by overwhelming majorities, the minority in no case consisting of more than seventeen votes.

III. *Constitution and Statistics of the Roman Catholic Church.* — Soon after the conquest of the country by the Spaniards, the first bishopric was established in Mexico. About 1600 the vice-kingdom was divided into 7 dioceses: Mexico, Chiapa, Michoacan, Oajaca, Puebla, Guadalajara, and Yucatan, forming the ecclesiastical province of Mexico. Subsequently the number of dioceses rose to 11, and the number of parishes, in 1856, amounted to 1235. In 1863 pope Pius IX raised the dioceses of Michoacan and Guadalajara to archbishoprics, and erected 7 new dioceses. Accordingly the country is at present divided into 3 ecclesiastical provinces: *Mexico*, with the dioceses of Puebla, Chiapa, Oajaca, Yucatan, Vera Cruz, Chilapa, and Tulancingo; *Michoacan*, with the dioceses of San Luis Potosi, Queretaro, Leon, and Zamora; and *Guadalajara*, with the dioceses of Durango, Linares, Sonora, and Zacatecas. All the old dioceses have chapters. According to the decrees of the third Provincial Council of Mexico, each cathedral shall have 5 dignitaries (dean, archdeacon, cantor, theologus, thesaurarius), 10 canons, 6 prebendates, 6 half-prebendates, and 6 clerks, “with a good income.” The new dioceses have as yet no chapter. Besides the regular parishes, there are many missionary stations, part of which were supported by six collegios de propaganda fide. Most of the latter were, however, suppressed by a decree of president Santa Anna, and parishes erected in their place. Under the Spanish rule the bishops were appointed by the king. After the establishment of the republic, the president of Mexico claimed the same right, and appointed bishops for every see that became vacant. But the popes refused to recognise the rights claimed by the presidents, and to confirm the appointments. Thus in 1829 all the dioceses, with the exception of one, had become vacant. In 1830 the canon Valdez, as envoy of the Mexican republic, succeeded in concluding a convention with the pope, which regulated the election of Mexican bishops by providing that the chapter were to propose to the government three candidates, among whom the latter would designate one as the future bishop, who thereupon would receive the canonical institution from the pope. The emperor Maximilian again claimed all the rights and privileges

which the Spanish kings had possessed in Mexico, inclusive of the right of appointing the bishops. These, as well as other controverted points, were to be settled by a concordat, for the conclusion of which he was negotiating with the pope; but before an agreement had been arrived at, Maximilian lost his throne and life. The Mexican bishops formerly enjoyed all the rights conferred upon the bishops by the canon law as it prevailed in Spain; but the presidents of the Mexican republic refused to recognise many of these rights, and pope Pius IX, in an allocution of December 15, 1856, complained that president Commonfort had abolished the ecclesiastical jurisdiction altogether. The emperor Maximilian also failed to meet the expectations of Rome in this respect; for a note of the cardinal secretary of state to the Mexican ambassador in Rome, dated March 9, 1864, reclaimed from the imperial government "the full freedom of the bishops in the exercise of their pastoral office." The income of the bishops during the Spanish rule amounted to from 25,000 ducats to 100,000 ducats annually. The republic confiscated the entire property of the Church, and promised to give to the bishops a fixed income from the public revenue; but the bishops protested against this, and declared that they preferred to be supported by the voluntary gifts of the faithful. The number of priests is variously estimated at from 6000 to 10,000; they are partly educated in diocesan seminaries, partly in convents. Nearly all of them are of Indian descent; the native Spanish priests were in 1828 expelled from the country, in common with all the other Spaniards. The parish priests derived their income formerly from the very high fees which had to be paid for the ecclesiastical function. 'These fees were abolished by a decree of Santa Anna (August 17, 1833), and again by Maximilian (December 27, 1864), and it was provided that they should receive salaries from the state; but the bishops refused to accept this arrangement. Monks and nuns were very numerous in Mexico during the Spanish rule. In 1810 the Franciscans had 6 provinces, the Dominicans 3, the Augustinians 2, the Carmelites and Mercedarians 1 each. There were in all 1931 monks in 149 monasteries. The female orders in the same year had 57 convents with 1962 nuns. The property of the monasteries amounted to about 10,000,000 pesos, exclusive of the large amount of alms. The female orders had, in 1845, 50 convents, with real estate yielding a net annual income of 500,000 piastres; and had besides a capital of 4,500,000 piastres. The republic abolished the obligatory character of the monastic vows, and suppressed several convents; yet the number of convents did not begin to show any marked decrease until about 1860, when the Franciscans had 30 houses, the

Dominicans 25, the Augustinians 10, the Carmelites 10, the Jesuits 1, the Oratorians 3, the Benedictines 1, the Brothers of Charity 2, The female orders were all suppressed by a decree issued in 1863, except the Sisters of Charity. The public educational institutions are under the exclusive control of the state authorities. They embrace one university in the city of Mexico, founded in 1551, 2 lyceums in Potosi and Guanajuato, and colleges in most of the large cities. Elementary instruction has severely suffered from the constant civil wars; but, according to recent accounts (*Annual American Cyclopedia*, 1872), "in most of the states each municipality has primary schools for both sexes, the teachers being paid out of municipal funds. The Lancasterian Society of the city of Mexico furnishes examined teachers for the elementary branches of those schools, and by its untiring efforts for the advancement of the cause of education generally, is establishing a firm basis for the future welfare of the country." There is, however, also a large number of schools established by the Church, and under her exclusive control, and their number has of late considerably increased. Besides the religious societies found in all Catholic countries, Mexico has some peculiar confradias and hermandados, the members of which engage to pay monthly contributions for defraying the extraordinary pomp at the festivals of the patron saints of the churches. Some of these confraternities are very wealthy. One of these secular brotherhoods is called the "Brotherhood of the Coachmen of our Lord." It was founded in 1758, and the members engage to act as coachmen for the priests who carry the Eucharist to sick persons. The confiscation of the immense Church property was begun by the Spanish government soon after the expulsion of the Jesuits. During the War of Independence, the government of Mexico drew largely upon the possessions of the Church in order to get the money needed for carrying on the war. The value of the tithe, which in 1810 yielded about 2,000,000 pesos, had decreased in 1826 to about one half, and decreased still more when the Mexican Congress in 1833 abolished the cooperation of the secular arm in the collection of the tithe, leaving the payment of it wholly to the individual piety of the citizens. President Commonfort, in 1855, confiscated all the property of the Church of Puebla. Under president Juarez, in 1859, the entire possessions of the clergy were declared to be a national domain, and their sale ordered. The income from this property was estimated at about 20,000,000 pesos. The regency which was appointed after the French invasion did not dare to stop the progress of the sale, and was therefore excommunicated by the bishops. After the establishment of the empire, the clerical party demanded the restoration of all the property

that had belonged to the Church, and which was estimated at one third of the entire real estate of the republic. As a considerable portion of the sold property had already changed hands, the emperor found it impossible to concede the demand, and by decree of December 27, 1864, ordered the secularization of the Church property to be proceeded with.

Commissioners were subsequently sent to Rome, to come, if possible, to an understanding with the pope; but they were unsuccessful. Four provincial synods were held by the Mexican bishops — the first three in 1555, 1565, 1585; the fourth by archbishop Lorenzana (1766-1771).

IV. Protestant Missions. — The history of the Protestant missions in Mexico began in 1860, when the government proclaimed religious freedom. Until then, Protestant Christianity in any form had been prohibited. But previously to that year Miss Rankin had (in 1852) opened at Brownsville, in Texas, just opposite the Mexican town of Matamoras, a school for the children of the large Mexican population. She sent a considerable number, of Spanish Bibles, which were supplied by the American Bible Society, into Mexico, and in 1854 established a Protestant seminary for Mexican girls likewise at Brownsville. In 1856 the American Foreign and Christian Union took charge of the Mexican mission. After all obstructions to the establishment of Protestant worship had been removed in 1860, the Reverend Mr. Thompson, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, went (in November 1860) as agent of the American Bible Society into Mexico as far as Monterey. He was cordially received, the authorities giving him leave to plant Protestant missions and to circulate the Bible; but when the outbreak of the civil war in the United States interrupted the communication with New York, he had to suspend his labors, and to return to Texas. When the communication with New York had been re-established by the opening of a port on the Mexican side of the Rio Grande, the Reverend Hickey, a colporteur of the American Bible Society, who, being a Union man, had to flee the South, went to Matamoras, and accepted in 1863 an agency of the Bible Society for Mexico. He subsequently went to Monterey, collected a congregation, and after a little time administered baptism to a dozen Mexicans. When his duties compelled him to leave Monterey, he selected a suitable man from the converts to continue religious services. In 1865 Miss Rankin went to Monterey, where she erected a missionhouse, suited for chapel, school, and residence of the missionary. The building was completed in 1868, and several of the converts were sent out as colportors and Bible-readers. Two

of these men went to the state of Zacatecas, in company with two of the Bible Society's agents. Their labors resulted in the conversion of thirty persons, among whom were two highly educated men, who took up the work after the departure of the colportors, and carried it forward with great success. An evangelical paper, the *Antorcha Evangelical*, was published, which proved a very efficient aid to Protestant preaching. In 1871 the number of converts amounted to more than one hundred. In 1872 the mission of Zacatecas was transferred by the American and Foreign Christian Union to the Board of the Presbyterian Church, which in the same year also stationed missionaries at San Luis Potosi and in the city of Mexico. In 1873 there were in all from ten to fifteen little congregations connected with the missions of the Presbyterian boards. Two schools, one for each sex, had been formed in the capital, and two also at Cos, a small town of 4000 inhabitants in the state of Zacatecas. The mission at Monterey, at the beginning of 1873, numbered six regularly organized churches, the number of members in these ranging from twelve to sixty. As the American and foreign Christian Union in 1873 suspended operations in foreign lands, Miss Rankin offered the Monterey mission to the American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions, which, in September 1872, had sent from California the first missionaries into Mexico. During the decline and ruin of the empire of Maximilian, the foreign committee of the Board of Missions of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States sent out an agent to collect information in regard to the prospects of an effort for the establishment of a congregation. under the jurisdiction of the Protestant Episcopal Church. It was found that there was a widespread preparation for a reformation of the National Church, and that a large number of priests sympathized with the movement. Though the government of Maximilian strongly favored the Roman Catholic Church, the foundation of a Reformed Catholic Church, called "the Church of Jesus," was laid. After the re-establishment of the republic, the movement soon assumed large dimensions. The government sold to the Reformers some of the most beautiful churches in the capital. During the greater portion of this time the Reverend Dr. Riley, a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, who had been born and educated in one of the Spanish republics of South America, had been the constant adviser and friend of the Reformers. He had brought with him from New York to Mexico a printing-press, and used it for the dissemination of the principles of the Reformed Church. He had prepared a Liturgy in Spanish, conformed in all essential respects to that of the Protestant Episcopal Church. He had

purchased one church in the capital and one half of another, and presented them to a board of trustees, to be held in trust for the benefit of the movement. As the foreign committee of the Protestant Episcopal Church was restricted by its constitution to the support of missions of its own Church, and on that account could not comprise an independent Church like that of the Church of Jesus, the American Church Missionary Society in 1873 took the movement under its charge. The Methodist Episcopal Church established a mission in Mexico in 1872. In November of that year the Reverend Dr. William Butler was appointed superintendent of the mission. He accepted, and arrived in the city of Mexico in February 1873. He reported the statistics of the work of the Church at the close of its first quarter as; follows: four Mexican congregations — two in the city of Mexico, 75 persons; one in Pachuca, capital of the state of Hidalgo, 45 persons; one in Rio del Monte, five miles beyond, 10 persons; total, 130 souls; two English congregations — in the city of Mexico, 60 attendants, and Pachuca, 45; being an aggregate of 235 persons in six congregations; 12 scholars in day-schools, and 42, with 9 teachers and officers, in two Sunday-schools. The mission had two classmeetings, about 14 Mexicans and 16 English and Americans attending. A missionary property has been purchased in Puebla. The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, also resolved in 1872 to take up Mexico as a missionary field. Bishop Keener proceeded to Mexico and purchased a chapel for the mission, and in 1873 the first missionary was stationed there. The progress of these Protestant missionary labors produced a great excitement among the strict adherents of the Roman Catholic Church. In a number of places mobs insulted the Protestants, as well as the members of the Reformed Church of Jesus. At Chapulhuac three persons were killed and several wounded. The Methodist and Presbyterian missionaries in the city of Mexico, with the representatives of the British Bible Society, solicited through the United States minister, the Hon. Thomas H. Nelson, an interview with the president of Mexico, in order to seek from him an assurance of his disposition to protect Protestants in Mexico in: the enjoyment of their religious rights under the constitution. The interview took place on April 25, 1873, when president Lerdo de Tejada assured the missionaries that the opinion of all the enlightened classes of society favored religious toleration, and that he, the president, would answer for the conduct of all the authorities depending directly upon the federal government.

See Lorenzana, *Concilio (Mexic.) primero y segundo* (Mexico, 1769); Lorenzana, *Histor. de Nueva Espana escrito por su esclarecido conquistador H. Cortez, aumentada con otros documentos y notas* (Mexico, 1770); Prescott, *Hist. of the Conquest of Mexico*; Baluffi, *L'America un tempo Spagnuolu, riguardata sotto l'aspetto religioso dall' epoca del suo discuoprimento sino al 1843* (Ancona, 1844); Brasseur du Bourbourg, *Hist. des nations civilisees du Mexique* (Paris, 1858-60, 4 tom.); Muhlenpfordt, *Schilderung der Republic Mexico* (Hanover, 1844); Richthofen (Prussian ambassador in Mexico), *Die aussern u. innern polit. Zustinde der Republic Mexico* (Berlin, 1859); Neher, *Kirchl. Statistik*, 3:337, sq.; Kalkar, *Gesch. der rim-kathol. Mission* (Germ. transl. [Erlangen, 1867]). (A.J.S.)

Meyer, Hermanus, D.D.

a noted Dutch Reformed minister, was born in Bremen, Lower Saxony, July 27, 1733. He was educated at the Latin school and gymnasium of that Saxon city, and subsequently at the theological academy in Groningen, where in 1758 he became a candidate for the ministry. Having received a call to the Dutch Church of Kingston, New York, he was ordained March 31, 1763, and sailed from London for New York, where he arrived in October of that year, and immediately assumed the duties of his pastoral charge. He found the Church sadly divided on the old quarrel of the Coetus and Conference parties as to ordination in this country or in Holland. He sympathized with the former, which was the liberal side, in favor of a ministry trained in America; but his efforts to keep the peace were vain. His pungent, practical preaching also made him many foes among the formal and worldly people. Thus, after preaching on regeneration, one of his Church officers said to him, "Flesh and blood cannot endure such preaching." "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God," was his quick reply. The ecclesiastical difficulties alluded to above culminated in his suspension from the active duties of the ministry by an exparte and illegal body of Conference ministers in 1766. For nearly seven years afterwards, although this discipline was declared illegal, he remained in Kingston, preaching to his adherents in private houses. In 1772 he removed to New Jersey, as pastor of the united churches of Pimpton and Totowa (now Paterson). Brighter days had dawned. He was a member of the convention of 1771, which reunited the long-sundered churches. The General Synod elected him to two professorships in their theological institution-Hebrew (1784) and lector in divinity (1786), both of which he

held during life; and in 1789 he was made a doctor of divinity by Queen's College. He died October 27, 1791, lamented as "one of the pillars of the Church." Dr. Meyer was a truly learned divine. In Latin, Greek, and Hebrew he was a critical scholar, and had made considerable attainment in the Syriac. He had long meditated a new translation of the Old Testament, but the ecclesiastical troubles of his life prevented its completion. He left "the, beginning of that work in a full translation of the Psalms of David, in Latin interlineations between the text, with copious commentaries and emendations in the finest German writing upon a broad margin." His person was small, his features fine and benevolent, his voice and manner in the pulpit good, and his delivery very animated. In theological sentiment he was thoroughly evangelical. His faithful preaching made him pre-eminent among the godly ministers of his day. Amiable and kind-hearted, punctual and exact, faithful as a pastor, and humble in his private and official walk, his severe trials chastened and exalted his sterling piety, and his last days were crowned with honor. His death was pre-eminently peaceful and happy. See *Magazine of Ref. Dutch Church*, 2:300; Sprague, *Annals*, volume 9; Corwin's *Manual of Ref. Church*, s.v. (W.J.R.T.)

Meyer, Johann Friederich von

an eminent German theologian and jurist, was born at Frankfort-on-the-Main, September 12, 1772. In 1789 he entered the University of Gittingen, where he applied himself with great zeal to jurisprudence, not however neglecting his favorite study, Greek. In 1790 he published his *Commentatio de diis ac deabus Graecorum et Romanorum* δαδούχοις *cum vi tabulis aereis*, which attracted great attention. In 1793 he went to Leipsic, where he turned his attention mainly to the study of philosophy. After holding various official positions, which he successively lost in consequence of the French invasion, he was, in 1807, appointed counsellor to the municipal court of Frankfort; became member of the senate in 1816; judge in 1821, and finally, in 1837, president of the criminal court and of the court of appeals. At the same time he was a member of the diet, and thrice, in 1825, 1839, and 1843, filled the office of burgomaster. He died January 27, 1849. In the early part of his life Meyer inclined to rationalism — this still appears in his poem of *Tobias*, in seven cantos, published in 1800; but he was subsequently converted, and thenceforth became very active as a theologian. In 1806 and 1807 he translated Cicero's works on the nature of the gods, divination, and fate; in 1813, Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* (2d ed. 1823). In 1812 he published his *Bibeldeutungen*, in which he found full

play for his acquirements in philology, jurisprudence, etc. He next turned his attention to a new translation of the Bible, as he wished to correct the philological errors contained in Luther's translation. It assumed the form of a revision of Luther's translation, with annotations, and was published in 1819 (2d ed. without the notes, 1823; latest ed. Frankf. 1855). The value of this work was recognised by the University of Erlangen, and he was honored with the doctorate in divinity, and in 1816 was made president of the Bible Society of Frankfort. On emerging from rationalism, Meyer took a leaning towards mysticism, in the better sense of the word. This is apparent in such works as his *Blatter fur höhere Wahrheit* (Frankf. 1820-32); *Wahrnehmungen einer Seherin* (Frankf. 1827). Aside from the above-named works, he wrote, *Der Rosenkranz, die Fama u. d. Confession* (Frankf. 1828): — *Kritische Kranze* (Berl. 1830): — *Das Buch Jezira, hebraisch v. deutsch* (Leips. 1830): — *Inbegriff d. christlichen Glaubenslehre* (Kempt. 1832): — *Hesperiden*, (Kempt. 1836): — *Prosodisches Hilfsbuch* (1836): — *Zur Aegyptol.* (1840). See Doring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschl.* s.v. (J.H.W.)

Meyer, Johann Hermann

a German Protestant theologian, was born at Hamburg October 6, 1737, and was educated at the University of Helmstadt. He was appointed minister at Hamburg in 1766, in 1778 at Rendsburg. He was elected deacon in 1771 by the parishioners of the Nicolai Kirche at Kiel. and made, in 1778, archdeacon, and in 1786 pastor of that church. He died August 26, 1795. Meyer was very much beloved for his strict sense of honesty, morality friendship, and love. He was very devoted to his vocation as minister, and found but little time for the publication of books. The following dissertations are the most important works he gave to the public: *Hamburgische Abschiedsrede-und Rendsburgische Antrittspredigt.* (Hamburg, 1768, 4to); *Gedenkverse mit dem Inhalt Predigten vom J. 1774* (Kiel, 1774, 8vo); *Der Verlust der Gnade, in einer Wahlpredigt* (Hamburg, 1775, 8vo); *Das Andenken voriger Zeiten* (Kiel, 1776, 8vo).

Meyer, John

a noted Dutch theologian and Hebraist, was born about the middle of the 17th century. He flourished as professor of theology at the University of Haderwyk, and died in 1725. His works are of great value to the exegete. Those most worthy of notice are his *Uxor Christiana, sive de conjugio*

inter duos, deque incestu et divortii, dissertationes tres (Amst. 1688, 4to); *Tractatus de temporibus et fasti diebus Hebraeorum* (Amst. 1724); and his edition of *Seder Olam*, a Hebrew chronicle of great esteem among the Jews, usually attributed to rabbi Jose ben-Chilpeta.

Meyer, John H.

son of Dr. Herman Meyer (q.v.), another distinguished minister of the Reformed Church, was born at Pequet, N.J., October 19, 1774; graduated at Columbia College in 1795; studied theology under Dr. Livingston, and was licensed to preach in 1798; settled as pastor of the Dutch churches at New Paltz and New Hurley, N.Y., from 1799 to 1803, and at Schenectady from 1803 to 1806. He was an accomplished scholar, and preached with great elegance and ease in the Dutch and English languages. He was remarkable for unction and popularity as a preacher.

Meyerbeer, Giacomo

a very noted German composer of music, was born in Berlin September 5, 1794, and was of Jewish descent. At the age of nine years he was regarded as a masterly pianist in a city full of cultivated musicians, and at ten he commenced his career as a composer, producing many songs and pieces for the piano-forte, which excited the wonder and admiration of his friends by their spirit and originality. At fifteen he was placed under the tuition of abbe Vogler, who had established a celebrated school of composition in the city of Darmstadt. Here, under the abbe's instruction, young Meyerbeer composed a quantity of classic and elaborate sacred music in the severest scholastic style of his master, all of which, however, is lost to the world, as the composer, when his ideas became more matured, did not care to preserve it. One of these compositions, however, brought him into notoriety: it was an oratorio bearing the title *God and Nature*, and was performed in the presence of the grand-duke of Darmstadt, gaining for its author the distinction of being appointed composer to the court. When Meyerbeer was eighteen, his first dramatic piece, *Jephthah's Daughter*, was performed at Munich. Though intended for the stage, it was more of an oratorio than an opera; but on account of its severe style, and the evident inattention to the minor attractions of melody, it was not received in a flattering manner by the Bavarian public. After a series of professional disappointments, his first success was achieved at Padua in 1818, in the performance of *Romilde Costanza*, which, together with *Semiramide*,

produced at Turin in 1819, and *Emnna di Resburgo*, at Venice in 1820, firmly established the composer's reputation. In 1831 he gave to the public *Robert the Devil*. His subsequent works are operatic. He died May 2, 1864. See L. de Lomenie, *M. Meyerbeer, par un Homme de Rien* (1849); De Bury, *Meyerbeer et son temps* (1865); Mentel, *Meyerbeer, s. Leben u. Werke* (1868).

Meyere, Lievin De

a Belgian Jesuit, was born at Gand in 1655. In 1700 he became a member of the Society of Jesus. He subsequently taught philology, philosophy, and theology, and was made rector of a college at Louvain. He bitterly opposed the tenets of the Jansenists. His numerous writings, nearly all poetical, are replete with animadversions against them. Meyere died at Louvain in 1730. The following work, said to have been written by Theod. Eleutherius, was edited by Meyere: *Historia Controversiarum de divinae gratiae auxiliis sub pontif. Sixto V, Clemente VIII, et Paulo V*, lib. 6 (Antwerp, 1705, fol.). See Moreri, *Grand Dict. Hist.* s.v.; Goethals, *Lectures relatives a l'hist. des sciences et des lettres en Belgique*, volume 1.

Meyfart (Or Mayfart), Johann Mattheus

a Lutheran theologian of considerable note, son of a Protestant divine, was born at Jena in 1590. He received an excellent philological and philosophical education at Gotha, and afterwards entered the University of Wittenberg, where he devoted himself to the study of logic, physics, ethics, and the classics. In 1611, having secured the degree of A.M., he began the study of theology. In 1616 Meyfart was called to a professorship at the newly-founded University of Coburg. He published his first theological essays in 1617. In 1624 he was created doctor of theology by the University of Jena. In the same year he began the preparation of large dogmatic work entitled *De theologia, de philosophiae sobrio usu, de S.S., et de symbolis*; but he never completed this work. In 1627, however, he went before the public with quite large and valuable works: *Anti-Becanus sive manualis controversiarum theol., a Becano collecti, confutatino* (L'eipsic, 1627, 2 volumes); *Nodu. Gordius Sophistarum solutus, i.e. de ratione solvend argumenta sophistica*, etc., libri 4 (Coburg, 1627, 8vo) Meyfart is one of the most remarkable characters of the 17th century, and can justly be called the forerunner of Spener (q.v.). With an intense longing

for the highest ideals, which undoubtedly had been fostered by his classical studies, he united a true, living faith in Christ and desired to leave this earth to be with his Saviour. At the same time he was quick to perceive the many errors and the moral decay of the Church, and, with an earnestness seldom surpassed, he raised his voice against the manifold sins and imperfections of the Church of his day and country. In 1626 he issued his *Tuba novissima*, i.e., of the four last things, viz. death, judgment, eternal life, and condemnation. These were originally four sermons preached by him at Coburg; but they created such an impression that he had not only to publish them in book form, but was also urged to publish more sermons and admonitions on these and similar subjects. Thus he published six more volumes on *The Heavenly Jerusalem*, *Eternal Damnation*, and the *Final Judgment*. Some of these books passed through five and more editions. Henke, in just appreciation of his merits, calls Meyfart “a German Dante, full of poetry and knowledge.” During his later life Meyfart published several books and essays which were written in the spirit of the Reformation. One of his essays contains an earnest address to the clergy how to live and how to pray; another is directed against the vice of nepotism and simony; and in another, *De concilianda pace inter ecclesias per Germaniam evangelicas*, he enumerates seventeen characteristic reasons why theologians are so ill adapted to peace, e.g. *insufficiencia mtorum et eruditionis, metus odii et invidiae, intuitus humanae auctoritatis*, etc. After the capture of Erfurt by Gustavus Adolphus, Meyfart was called as professor of theology to the newly-reorganized Lutheran University of Erfurt, and in 1635 he was elected rector of the university, and senior of the theological department. He died January 26, 1642.

Mez’ahab

(Heb. *Mey-Zahab*’, *bhz;ym* water of gold, i.e., of a golden luster; Sept. *Μαίζωαβ*, but omits in Chronicles; Vulg. *Mezaab*), the father of Matred and maternal grandfather of Mehetabel, which last was wife of Hadar, or Hadad, the last mentioned of the early Edomitish kings (¹⁰³⁹Genesis 36:39; ¹⁰⁴⁰1 Chronicles 1:50), B.C. considerably ante 1619. “His name has given rise to much speculation. Jarchi renders it, ‘What is gold?’ and explains it, ‘He was a rich man, and gold was not valued in his eyes at all.’ Abarbanel says he was ‘rich and great, so that on this account he was called Mezahab, for the gold was in his house as water.’ ‘Haggaon’ (writes Aben-Ezra)

‘said he was a refiner of gold, but others said that it pointed to those who made gold from brass.’ The Jerusalem Targum of course could not resist the temptation of punning upon the name, and combined the explanations given by Jarchi and Haggæon. The latter part of ⁽¹³³⁾Genesis 36:39 is thus rendered: ‘The name of his wife is Mehetabel, daughter of Matred, the daughter of a refiner of gold, who was wearied with labor (*adr fñi matreda*) all the days of his life; after he had eaten and was filled he turned and said, What is gold? and what is silver?’ A somewhat similar paraphrase is given in the Targum of the Pseudo-Jonathan, except that it is there referred to Matred, and not to Mezahab. The Arabic version translates the name ‘water of gold,’ which must have been from the Hebrew, while in the Targum of Onkelos it is rendered ‘refiner of gold,’ as in the *Quæstiones Hebraicæ in Paralip.*, attributed to Jerome, and the traditions given above; which seems to indicate that originally there was something in the Hebrew text. now wanting, which gave rise to this rendering, and of which the present reading, *ymemey*, is an abbreviation.”

Mezuzah

Picture for Mezuzah

(*hzwm*) or Mezuzoth (*tzwm*) the sing. and plur. forms of a “door-post,” the place on which the Mosaic law is interpreted by the Jews as enjoining the Israelites to write passages of Scripture (⁽¹³⁴⁾Deuteronomy 6:9; 11:20). In the following account we especially treat of the Rabbinical regulations.

1. Signification of the Word, and Design of the Injunction. — The word *hzwm* (from *zwz*, to push about, to move) denotes either that which is most prominent, hence *the post of a door*, or that on which the door moves, or on which the hinges turn — hence a *door-post*. This is the sense in which it occurs in the Hebrew Scriptures. From the fact, however, that on it were written passages of the law, the term *Mezuzah* came afterwards synecdochically to denote the writing itself, or the passages of Scripture affixed to the door-post, and this is the sense in which the word is used in the Chaldee paraphrases, and in the Jewish writings generally. As books were exceedingly rare and expensive in ancient times, and could only be possessed by very few, the practice obtained among the nations of antiquity, and still prevails in the East, of writing, engraving, or painting such sacred mottoes or sage maxims over the doors of dwellings as the parents were especially anxious to record or to impart to their children.

Thus the ancient Egyptians had brief hieroglyphical legends over their doorways (Wilkinson, *Manners and Customs of Ancient Egypt*, 2:102; Wathen, page 101); the Greeks and Romans had inscriptions over their doors (Virgil, *Georg.* 3:26 sq.). Other nations had their laws written upon their gates (Huetius, *Demonstratio Evangelica*, page 58); and the Moslems to the present day, “never set up a gate, cover a fountain, build a bridge, or erect a house, without writing on it choice sentences from the Koran, or from their best poets” (Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, page 98). Now Moses in this instance, as in many other cases, availed himself of a prevalent custom, in order to keep the divine precepts ever before the eyes of the people, and to enable them to instruct their children in the law of God. Hence Maimonides beautifully remarks: “The commandment about *the Mezuzah* is binding on every one. For whenever an Israelite comes into the house, or goes out, he, seeing on it the name of the Holy One, blessed be he, will thereby be reminded of his love; and when he awakens from his sleep, and from his thoughts about the vanities of time, he will thereby be led to remember that there is nothing which endures forever and throughout all eternity except the knowledge of the everlasting Rock, and he will reflect and walk in the paths of righteousness” (*Jad Hachezaka, Ililchoth Tephillin*, 6:13).

2. The Manner in which this Injunction has been and still is observed. — That the Jews of old literally observed this injunction is not only evident from the above-mentioned prevailing custom of antiquity, but also from Josephus, who distinctly says that the Jews “inscribe the greatest blessings of God upon their doors” (*Ant.* 4:8, 13); from the Chaldee paraphrase of Onkelos, who translates ^{<RB>}Deuteronomy 6:9; 11:20, “And thou shalt write them upon scrolls, and affix them on the door-posts of thy houses and thy gates;” from the Jerusalem Targum, Jonathan ben-Uziel, Jerusalem Talmud (*Pesach*, 1:1), Babylonian Talmud (*Erubin*, 96 b; *Aboda Sara*, 11 a), etc. These authorities, moreover, show that the Hebrews, at least after the Babylonian captivity, and at the time of Christ, wrote the passages containing this injunction on a piece of parchment, and affixed it to the door-posts; and that this *Mezuzah*, as it is called, is substantially the same as the Jews now have it, which is made in the following manner: On the inside of a piece of square parchment, prepared by a Jew especially for this purpose, are written ^{<RB>}Deuteronomy 6:4-9, and 11:13-21, while on the outside are written the divine name *ydç the Almighty*, on the place where the first passage ends, and the words *zskwmb wzwk wzwk, Kuzu Bemuksaz*

Kuzu, to the left at the bottom. Thus written, the schedule is then rolled up in such a manner that the divine name *ydc* is outside, and is put into a reed, or hollow cylinder made of lead, brass, or silver, varying in costliness according to the circumstances of the people. In this tube there is a little hole, just large enough to show the divine name, which is protected by a piece of glass, forming, as it were, a little window, through which *ydc* is seen. Such a *Mezuzah* must be affixed to the right-hand doorpost of every door in the house by a nail at each end. The fixing of it is accompanied by the following prayer: "Behold I prepare my hands to perform the commandment which my Creator has given me about *the Mezuzah*. In the name of the one, holy, most blessed God and his Shechinah, who is concealed, mysterious, and incorporated in the name of all Israel. Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, king of the universe, who hast sanctified us by thy commandments. and hast enjoined us to affix the *Mezuzah*." Like the Greeks and Romans, who attached amulets to the jambs of the doors, and ascribed to them magic power, the Jews from a very early period believed that *the Mezuzah* guarded the house against the entrance of diseases and evil spirits, as may be seen from the remarks in the Talmud (*Jerusalem Pesach*, 1:1; and *Babylonian Aboda Sara*, 11 a; *Menachoth*, 33 b), and the Chaldee paraphrase of the Song of Solomon (8:3), which is, "I have affixed *the Mezuzah* to the right side of my door, in the third part thereof, towards the inside,. so that the evil spirits may have no power to hurt me." Hence the divine name *ydc* is made to denote *the Guardian of the dwellings of Israel*, the *c* standing for *rmwç*, the *d* for *tryd*, and the *y* for *l arçy*, according to the exegetical rule called *^wqywfwn* (= *notaricum*, from *notarius*, a short-hand writer, one who writes with abbreviations), which regards every letter of a word as an initial or abbreviation of a word; while the words *wzwk zskwmb wzwk*, supposed to be the name of the guardian angel, or of God himself, are made to stand for *wnyhl a hwhy hwby*, *Jehovah our God is Jehovah*, by another exegetical rule, which exchanges each letter of a word with its immediate predecessor in the alphabet; e.g. the *k* in *wzwk* is exchanged for *y*, the *w* for *h*, the *z* for *w*, and the *w* for *h*, .thus yielding *hwby*. Every pious Jew, as often as he passes *the Mezuzah*, in leaving the house or in entering it touches the divine name with the finger of his right hand, puts it to his mouth, and kisses it, saying in Hebrew, "The Lord shall preserve thy going out and thy coming in, from this time forth, and for evermore" (³⁰⁸Psalm 121:8); and when leaving on a business

expedition, he says, after touching it, **j yl xaw ! a wzwk zskwmb wzwk mčb**, “in thy name, *Kuzu Bemuksaz Kuzu* (= God), I go out and shall prosper.”

III. Literature. — Maimonides, *Jad Ha-Chezaka Hilchoth Tephillin U-Mezuzah Ve-Sepheh Torah*, 5, 6; *Jork Dea*, § 285-295; the Jewish ritual entitled *Derek Ha-Chajim*, containing a summary of all the laws connected with the Jewish observances (Vienna, 1859), page 31 sq.; Buxtorf, *Synag. Jud.* pages 482-487; Leo Modena, *Rites and Customs*, part 1, chapter 2:§ 3; Allen's *Modern Judaism*, page 327-329. **SEE DOOR-POST.**

Mezzofanti, Joseph Caspar

a Roman Catholic prelate, celebrated as the greatest linguist the world has ever seen, was born at Bologna September 17, 1774. His father, Francis Mezzofanti, was a carpenter; and he himself, being destined for the same humble career, was placed at one of the free schools of the Oratory in his native city. Father Respighi; a priest of that congregation, observed the remarkable talents of the boy, and saved him for literature. He was removed to a higher school — one of the so-called “*Scuole Pie*” of Bologna — and eventually to the archiepiscopal seminary, where, after completing the usual course of letters, philosophy, divinity, and canon law in the university, he was admitted to priest's orders in September 1797. Of the details of his progress in the study of languages during these early years no accurate record is preserved; but it is known that, like most eminent linguists, he was gifted, even in childhood, with a very wonderful memory, and that, partly under the various professors in the university, partly by the aid of foreign residents in the city, partly by his own unassisted studies, he had acquired, before the completion of his university career, the Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Arabic, Spanish, French, German, and Swedish languages. In 1797, at the early age of twenty-two, he was appointed professor of Arabic in the university; but on the annexation of Bologna, as one of the papal legations, to the newly-established Cisalpine republic, he, refusing to take the oaths of the new constitution, was set aside from the professorship. After the conclusion of the concordat between Pius VII and the first consul, the ancient constitution of the university was restored. In 1803 Mezzofanti was named to the higher professorship of Oriental languages, and in the same year became assistant librarian of the public library of the city. In 1808 the professorship was discontinued, and Mezzofanti was reduced to great distress. He made a scanty living by

private tuition; but, nothing daunted, steadily followed in private what had become his engrossing pursuit — the study of languages. A letter of his, dated in 1804, to the celebrated Orientalist, John Bernard de Rossi, whose personal acquaintance he subsequently formed during a short visit to Modena in 1805, enclosed a composition in twelve languages, which he submitted to the judgment of his correspondent; and by 1812 Mezzofanti's reputation as a linguist was thoroughly established. The well-known Pietro Giordani, in several of his letters to his friends, calls him "the divine Mezzofanti," and declares that his skill in living and dead languages entitles him to be regarded as "a man of all ages and all nations." The war of which Northern Italy was so long the theatre afforded Mezzofanti many opportunities of extending his stock of languages. In the hospital of Bologna, to which he was attached as volunteer chaplain, were to be met — among the invalids of the Austrian, Russian, and French armies — Germans, Hungarians, Bohemians, Wallachians, Servians, Russians, Poles, and Croats. Partly in the desire to offer these sufferers the consolations of religion, partly from his love of the study itself. Mezzofanti labored assiduously to turn these and all similar opportunities to account; and several instances are recorded in which, without the assistance of a grammar or dictionary, he contrived to establish a mode of communication with a stranger who was utterly ignorant of every language except his own, and eventually to master that language sufficiently for all the purposes of conversation. He has left an account of his mode of study during these years, which is not a little curious and interesting. "The hotel-keepers," he says, "were in the habit of notifying me of the arrival of all strangers at Bologna; and I never hesitated, when anything was to be learned thereby, to call upon them, to interrogate them, to make notes of their communications, and to take lessons in the pronunciation of their several languages. There were a few learned Jesuits too, and several Spaniards, Portuguese, and Mexicans residing in Bologna, from whom I received valuable assistance, both in their own and in the learned languages. I made it a rule to learn every strange grammar, and to apply myself to every new dictionary that came within my reach. I was constantly filling my head with new words. Whenever a stranger, whether of high or low degree, passed through Bologna, I tried to turn the visit to account, either for the purpose of perfecting my pronunciation, or of learning the familiar words and turns of expression. Nor did all this cost me so much trouble; for, in addition to an excellent memory, God had gifted me with remarkable flexibility of the organs of speech." In the year 1812 Mezzofanti was appointed assistant

librarian of the university; in 1814 he was reinstated in his professorship; and in 1815 he became chief librarian. From this period, especially after the restoration of peace, his reputation rapidly extended. Every visitor of Bologna related fresh marvels regarding his prodigious attainments. Tourists from every nation, whether of Europe or of the East, united in representing him as perfect, each one in his own language. Lord Byron, about 1820, pronounced him “a walking polyglot, a monster of languages, and a Briareus of parts of speech.” M. Molbech, a Danish traveller of the year 1820, reports the number of his languages at “more than thirty,” and testifies to his speaking Danish “with almost entire correctness.” French, German, Spanish, Polish, Russian, Greek, and Turkish travellers concur in the same report, not only with regard to their own, but also to many other languages. During all these years — except a short visit to Pisa, Leghorn, Florence, and Rome — he had resided altogether at Bologna, though invited, with many flattering offers, to transfer his residence to Paris, to Vienna, to Florence, and to Rome. At length, having gone to Rome as a member of the deputation sent by the Bolognese to offer their submission to pope Gregory XVI, after the revolution in 1831, he was induced by the pontiff to settle permanently in Rome, and to accept a prebend in the Church of St. Mary Major, which was soon after exchanged for a canonry in St. Peter’s, and, on the promotion of the celebrated Angelo Mai, then keeper of the Vatican Library, to the secretaryship of the Propaganda, Mezzofanti was appointed to succeed him in the important charge of the Vatican. He held this office till 1838, in which year, conjointly with Mai, he was elevated to the cardinalate. His residence in a great center of languages, such as Rome, and especially the facilities of intercourse with the various races represented in the College of the Propaganda, gave a new impulse to Mezzofanti’s linguistic studies. The reports of his visitors at Rome are still more marvellous than those of the Bolognese period. An eminent German scholar, Herr Gorres, who had much intercourse with him in the year 1841, writes thus: “He is familiar with all the European languages; and by this I mean not only the ancient classical tongues and the modern ones of the first class — such as the Greek and Latin, or the Italian, French, German, Spanish, Portuguese, and English — his knowledge extends: also to the languages of the second class, viz., the Dutch, Danish, and Swedish; to the whole Slavonic family — Russian, Polish, Bohemian, or Czechish; to the Servian, the Hungarian, the Turkish;, and even those of the third and fourth classes — the Irish, the Welsh, the Wallachian, the Albanian, the Bulgarian, and the Illyrian. The Romani of

the Alps and the Lettish are not unknown to him; nay, he has made himself acquainted with Lappish. He is master of the languages which fall within the Indo-Germanic family — the Sanscrit and Persian, the Kurdish, the Georgian, the Armenian; he is familiar with all the members of the Shemitic family — the Hebrew, the Arabic, the Syriac, the Samaritan, the Chaldee, the Sabaic — nay, even with the Chinese, which he not only reads, but speaks. Among the Hamitic languages, he knows Coptic, Ethiopic, Abyssinian, Amharic, and Angolese.” What is especially notable in this marvellous gift possessed by Mezzofanti is that his knowledge of each among this vast variety of languages was almost as perfect as though his attention had been devoted to such language exclusively. The reports of all the great students of language concur in describing him as speaking even their own tongues always with the precision and, in most cases, with the fluency of a native. His pronunciation, his idiom, his vocabulary, were alike unexceptionable. Even the familiar words of everyday life, and the delicate turns of conversational language, were at his command; and in each language he was master of the leading dialects, and of the provincial peculiarities of idiom, of pronunciation, or of expression. In French, he was equally at home in the pure Parisian of the Falubourg St. Germain or in the Provincial of Toulouse. He could accommodate himself in German to the rude jargon of the Black Forest or to the classic vocabulary of Hanover; and he often amused his English visitors with specimens of the provincialisms of Yorkshire, Lancashire, or Somersetshire. With the literature of those various countries, too, he was well acquainted. He loved to talk with his visitors of the great authors in their respective languages; and his remarks are described as invariably sound and judicious, and exhibiting careful and various reading, often extending to departments with which it would never be supposed that a foreigner could be familiar. A Dutch traveller, for instance, Dr. Wap, was surprised to find him acquainted with his own national poets, Vondel and Cato.; a Dane, with the philological works of Rask; a Swede, with the poetry of Ochsentsjerna. To a Sicilian he would repeat whole pages of the poetry of Meli; and an English gentleman was astounded to hear him discuss and criticise Hudibras, of all English writers the least attractive, as well as the least intelligible to a foreigner. He was in the habit, too, of amusing himself by metrical compositions in the various languages which he cultivated, and often wrote for his visitors a couplet or two in their native language, as a little memento of their interview. Dr. Wap, the Dutch traveller just referred to, speaks in high praise of some extempore lines in Dutch by which

Mezzofanti replied to a sonnet which Dr. Wap had addressed to him; and the well-known Orientalist, Dr. Tholuck; having asked Mezzofanti for some memorial of his visit, received from him a Persian couplet, after the manner of Hafiz, which he composed (although not without some delay) during Dr. Tholuck's visit. After his removal to Rome, although he had already passed his fiftieth year, he added largely to his stock of languages. His most notable acquisition during this period was Chinese, which he acquired (partly at the Chinese college in Naples, partly among the Chinese students of the Propaganda) in such perfection as to be able not only to write and converse freely in it, but even to preach to the young Chinese ecclesiastics. During the same period he acquired the Abyssinian, the Californian, some of the North American Indian languages, and even the "impossible" Basque. It was in Rome, and especially in the Propaganda, that he displayed in its greatest perfection his singular power of instantaneously passing in conversation from one language to another, without the slightest mixture or confusion, whether of words or of pronunciation.

Mezzofanti, by virtue of his position as cardinal, was member of many ecclesiastical congregations in Rome, but he never held any office of state. He died on the 15th of March, 1849, and was buried in the Church of St. Onofrio, beside the grave of Torquato Tasso. His personal character was gentle, humble, modest, humane, and he was a sincere and devout man.

It is difficult to determine with accuracy the number of languages known by Mezzofanti, and still more so to ascertain how many of these he spoke, and with what degree of fluency in each. During his lifetime, as we have seen, report varied considerably at different times; nor was he himself believed to have made any very precise statement on the subject. To a Russian traveller, who visited him before the year 1846, and who begged of him a list of all the languages and dialects in which he was able to express himself, he sent a paper in his own hand containing the name of God in fifty-six languages. The author of a memoir which appeared soon after the cardinal's death in a Roman journal, the *Civita Catolica* (now known to be by father Bresciani, a Roman Jesuit), states that in the year 1846 Mezzofanti himself informed him that he was able to express himself in seventy-eight languages. Marvellous as these statements may appear, they seem fully borne out by inquiries (with a view to the preparation of a biography) which have been made since the death of the cardinal. Reports have been received from a vast number of individuals, natives of different

countries, whose collective testimony, founded on their own personal knowledge of Mezzofanti, places beyond all question the fact of his having spoken fluently considerably more than fifty different languages. There are others among the languages ascribed to him, regarding which it is difficult to institute any direct inquiry; but, judging from analogy, and relying on the well-known modesty and truthfulness of Mezzofanti, we need not hesitate to accept his own statement as reported by F. Bresciani; the more so as among his papers now in the possession of his family is a list, drawn up from memoranda contained therein, of no less than a hundred and twenty languages with which he possessed some acquaintance, unaccompanied, however, by any note specifying those among the number which he spoke, or the degree of his knowledge of each. His English biographer, Russell, comes to the following results, which are, in brief (for details see that work):

1. Languages frequently tested, and spoken by the cardinal with rare excellence—thirty.
2. Stated to have been spoken fluently, but hardly sufficiently tested—nine.
3. Spoken rarely and less perfectly — eleven.
4. Spoken imperfectly; a few sentences and conversational form — eight.
5. Studied from books, but not known to have been spoken — fourteen.
6. Dialects spoken, or their peculiarities understood thirty-nine dialects of ten languages, many of which might justly be described as different languages.

This list adds up one hundred and eleven, exceeding by all comparison everything related in history. Jonadab Almanor and Sir William Jones are not claimed to have gone beyond twenty-eight; while Mithridates and Pico of Mirandola have been made famous by twenty-two.

In general learning Mezzofanti's attainments were highly respectable. He was a well-informed theologian and canonist, and an impressive though not eloquent preacher. M. Libri, the historian of mathematical science in Italy, found him well acquainted with algebra, and reports an interesting

conversation which he had with him on the Bija Gannita (the algebra of the Hindus), as well as on the general subject of Indian history and antiquities. Other writers describe him as entering freely into the history as well as the literature of their several countries. But as an author he is almost unknown. He occasionally read papers at various literary and scientific societies in Bologna and Rome; but his only known publication is a short memoir of his friend and brother professor, father Emanuel da Ponte, which was printed at Bologna in 1820; and he leaves no monument for posterity beyond the tradition that he was incomparably the greatest linguist the world has ever seen. See G. Stolz, *Biographia del Cardinal Giuseppe Mezzofanti*, in the *Journal de Rome* of February 5, 1850; A. Manavit, *Esquisse historique sur le Cardinal Mezzofanti* (Paris, 1854, 8vo); Russell, *Life of the Cardinal Mezzofanti*, etc. (Lond. 1857, 8vo); *L'Ami de la Religion* (1849); *Revue Catholique de Louvain*, September 1853; *Engl. Cyclop. s.v.*; *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1849, page 407; *English Review*, January 1855; *Princeton Review*, 1858, page 645 sq.; *Catholic World*, March, 1870, page 857.

Miako

one of the largest cities of Japan, was, until the recent abolishment of the ecclesiastical emperor, the seat of the *mikado*, or spiritual prince. The city, containing nearly one million of inhabitants, is situated in the south-west of the island of Nipon, in the midst of an extensive plain, and about thirty miles from Osaca. Miako is also noted as the great stronghold of *Sintuism* (q.v.) — the ancient religion of Japan — of temple-worship, priests, monks, ceremonies, and ritualism. Some of the temples are of great size and splendor. Don Rodrigo de Vivero, the Spanish governor of Manilla, who visited Miako in 1608, was told that it then contained 5000 temples. He describes one in which was, an immense bronze image of Buddha. the construction of which was begun by the tycoon in 1602. He says, "I ordered one of my people to measure the thumb of the right hand; but, although he was a person of the ordinary size, he could not quite encircle it with both arms, But the size of the statue is not its only merit: the feet, hands, mouth, eyes, forehead, and other features are as perfect and as expressive as the most accomplished painter could make a portrait. When I first visited this temple it was unfinished; more than 10,000 men were daily employed upon it. The devil could not suggest to the emperor a surer expedient to get rid of his immense wealth." This colossus was injured by an earthquake in 1662, after which it was melted down and a substitute

prepared of wood gilded. Kampfer, who was at Miako in 1691, describes the temple which contained this image as enclosed by a high wall of freestone, some of the blocks of which were twelve feet square. "A stone staircase of eight steps led up to the gateway, on either side of which stood a gigantic image twenty-four feet high, with the face of a lion, but otherwise well proportioned, black, and almost naked, and placed on a pedestal six feet high. Within the gateway were sixteen stone pillars on each side for lamps, and on the inside of the enclosing wall was a spacious gallery covered with a roof supported by two rows of pillars eighteen feet high and twelve feet distant from each other. Opposite the gateway, in the middle of the court, stood the temple, much the loftiest structure which Kampfer had seen in Japan, with a double roof supported by ninety-four immense wooden pillars, nine feet in diameter. The floor of the temple was paved with square flags of marble. There was nothing inside but the great image of Buddha sitting on a *terete*, or lotus flower, supported by another flower of which the leaves were turned upwards, the two being raised about twelve feet from the floor. The idol was gilded all over, had long ears, curled hair, and a crown on the head which appeared through the window over the first roof of the temple. The shoulders were so broad as to reach from one pillar to another, a distance of thirty feet. In front of this temple is an edifice containing a bell, which is described in the Japanese guide-books as seventeen feet two and a half inches high, and weighing 1,700,000. Japanese catties, equal to 2,066,000 English pounds, a weight five times greater than that of the famous bell at Moscow. Kampfer, however, who had seen the great bell at Moscow, describes this Japanese bell as inferior in size to that, and as being rough, ill cast, and ill shaped. It was sounded by striking it on the outside with a large wooden mallet. Another temple, dedicated to Quanwon, was very long in proportion to its breadth. In the centre was a gigantic image of Quanwon, with thirty-six arms. Sixteen black images larger than life stood round it, and on each side two rows of gilt idols, with twenty arms each. On either side of the temple, running from end to end, were ten platforms rising like steps one behind the other, on each of which stood fifty images of Quanwon as large as life — 1000 in all. each on its separate pedestal, so arranged as to stand in rows of five, one behind the other, and all visible at the same time, each with its twenty hands. On the heads and hands of all these are placed smaller idols, to the number of forty or more. The whole number of images is stated by the Japanese to be 33,000" (*New American Cyclopaedia*, volume 11, s.v.). Miako is also the head-quarters of literature, science, and

art. The imperial palace, on the northern side of the city, is, together with its ward, a town of itself. *SEE JAPAN; SEE MIKADO.*

Mi'amin

(Heb. *Miyamin'*, מִיָּמִין contracted form of the name *Miniamin*), the name of three persons after the exile.

1. (Sept. *Μείαμειν* v.r. *Μείαμίν*, Vulg. *Maiman*, Auth. Vers. "Mijamin.") The head of the sixth division of the sacerdotal order as distributed by David (^{<1310>}1 Chronicles 24:9). B.C. 1014.
2. (Sept. *Μεαμείν* v.r. *Μιαιμίν*, Vulg. *viamin.*) One of the chief priests who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (^{<16215>}Nehemiah 12:5). B.C. 536. He must have attained a great age if identical with the priest who subscribed the religious covenant with Nehemiah (^{<16007>}Nehemiah 10:7, where the name is Anglicized "Mijamin"). B.C. cir. 410. He is probably the same person called *MINIAMIN* in ^{<16217>}Nehemiah 12:17, but his son's name appears there to have accidentally escaped from the text. *SEE MOADIAH.*
3. (Sept. *Μεαμίν* v.r. *Μεαμίμ*, Vulg. *Miamin.*) One of the Israelites, a "son" (i.e., inhabitant) of Parosh, who divorced his Gentile wife after the captivity (^{<15125>}Ezra 10:25). B.C. 459.

Miautse

the hill-tribes of China, are generally supposed to be the *aborigines* of that country. From the dawn of Chinese history, we find the people of the plains contending against those of the high lands, and to the present day the hardy mountaineers have maintained their independence. The Miautse consist of forty-one tribes, occupying large portions of Kwang-se, Kweichow, Yun-nan, Sze-chuen, and adjacent provinces. Some of them own Chinese sway; other tribes are absolutely independent. They are smaller in size and stature, and have shorter necks, and their features are somewhat more angular, than the Chinese. Their dialects are various, and wholly different from the Chinese; their affinity is most likely with the *Laos* and other tribes between Burmah, Siam, and China. Dr. Macgowan, a well-known ethnologist, describes them as skillful in manufacturing. He holds to an identity of the Miautse of Western China and the hill-tribes of Burmah. *SEE KARENS.* The degree of civilization they have attained to is much

below .that of the Chinese. Both sexes wear their hair braided in a tuft on the top of the head, but never shaven and twisted as the Chinese; they dress in loose garments of cotton and linen; ear-rings are in universal use among them. They live in huts constructed upon the branches of trees, and in mud hovels. Their agriculture is rude, and their garments are usually obtained by barter from other people. Their religious observances are of the same peculiar nature as those of the other Asiatic tribes uninfluenced by Christian civilization. Their marriage and funeral usages are particularly striking. In one tribe it is the custom for the father of the new-born child, as soon as the mother has become strong enough to leave her couch, to get into bed himself, and there receive the congratulations of his acquaintances as he exhibits his offspring. See *Chinese Repository*, 1:29; 14:105 sq.; Williams, *The Middle Kingdom*, I, 37, 147 sq.

Mib'har

(Heb. *Mibchar'*, רַי בְּחַרְ *choice*, as in ^{<207>}Isaiah 22:7, etc.; Sept. Μαβάρ v.r. Μεβράλ), a Hagarene (“son of Haggeri”), one of David’s famous warriors (^{<118>}1 Chronicles 11:38); apparently the same called in the parallel passage (^{<123>}2 Samuel 23:36) BANI the Gadite. B.C. 1046. *SEE DAVID*. “It is easy to see, if the latter be the true reading, how *ydāhiynē* Bani *hag-gadi*, could be corrupted into *yrāhā`B*, *ben-hag-geri*; and *ydgh* is actually the reading of three of Kennicott’s MSS. in 1 Chronicles, as well as of the Syriac and Arabic versions, and the Targum of R. Joseph. But that ‘Mibhar’ is a corruption of *hbχma* (or *abxm*, ace. to some MSS.), *mitstsobah*, ‘of Zobah,’ as Kennicott (*Dissert.* p. 215) and Cappellus (*Crit. Sacr.* i.c. 5) conclude, is not so clear, though not absolutely impossible. It would seem from the Sept. of 2 Samuel, where instead of Zobah we find *πολυδυνάμεως*, that both readings originally co-existed, and were read by the Sept. *abχhirj bjhæ* *mibchar hats-tsaba*, ‘choice of the host.’ If this were the case, the verse in .1 Chronicles would stand thus: ‘Igal the brother of Nathan, flower of the host; Bani the Gadite.’”

Mib'sam

(Heb. *Mibsam'*, מִבְּשָׁם *fragrance*), the name of two men.

1. (Sept. *Μασσάμ*. v.r. in Chronicles *Μαβσάν*.) The fourth named of the twelve sons of Ishmael, and head of an Arabian tribe bearing his name (^{<153>}Genesis 15:13; .^{<129>}1 Chronicles 1:29). B.C. post 2061. “The

signification of his name has led some to propose an identification of the tribe sprung from him with some one of the Abrahamic tribes settled in Arabia aromatifera, and a connection with the *balsam* of Arabia is suggested (Bunsel, *Bibelwerk*; Kalisch, *Genesis*, page 483). The situation of Mekkeh is well adapted for his settlements, surrounded as it is by traces of other Ishmaelitish tribes; nevertheless the identification seems fanciful and farfetched.” *SEE ARABIA*.

2. Sept. **Μαβασαν** v.r. **Μαβασάμ.**) The son of Shallurm and father of Michma, apparently the grandson of Shaul, a son of Simeon (^{<1305>}1 Chronicles 4:25). B.C. ante 1658.

Mib'zar

(Heb. *Mibtsar'*, **ῥχβῖνα** *fortress*, as often; Sept. in Chronicles **Μαβσάρ** v.r. **Βαβσάρ**, in Genesis **Μαζάρ**). The ninth named of the petty Edomitish chieftains descended from Esau contemporary with the Horite kings (^{<1352>}Genesis 36:42; ^{<1315>}1 Chronicles 1:53). B.C. long post 1905. “These phylarchs are said to be enumerated ‘according to their settlements in the land of their possession;’ and Knobel (*Genesis*), understanding Mibzar as the name of a place, has attempted to identify it with the rocky fastness of Petra, ‘the strong city’ (**ῥχβῖνα** *æir mibstar*, ^{<1381>}Psalms 108:11; comp. ^{<1381>}Psalms 60:11). ‘the cliff,’ the chasms of which were the chief stronghold of the Edomites (^{<1416>}Jeremiah 49:16; ^{<1310>}Obadiah 1:3).” *SEE EDOM*.

Mi'cah

(Heb. *Mikah'*, **ḥkymān** ^{<1770>}Judges 17:1, 4, the prolonged form *Mika'yehu*, **ḥykymān** used], a contracted form of the name *Micaiah*; Sept. **Μιχά**, but **Μιχαία** in 2 Chronicles [18:14, where the name is for that of “Micaiah,” and is so rendered in the Auth. Vers.] 34:20; and **Μιχαίας** in ^{<1388>}Jeremiah 26:18; ^{<1310>}Micah 1:1), the name of several men. *SEE MICAIAH*; *SEE MICAH*; *SEE MICHAIAH*.

1. An Ephraimite, apparently contemporary with the elders who outlived Joshua. B.C. cir. 1590-1580. He secretly appropriated 1100 shekels of silver which his mother had saved; but being alarmed at her imprecations on the author of her loss, he confessed the matter to her, and restored the money. She then forgave him, and returned him the silver, to be applied to the use for which it had been accumulated. Two hundred' shekels of the

amount were given to the founder, as the cost or material of two teraphim, the one molten and the other graven; and the rest of the money served to cover the other expenses of the semi-idolatrous establishment formed in the house of Micah, of which a wandering Levite, named Jonathan, became the priest, at a yearly stipend (Judges 17). Subsequently the Danite army, on their journey to settle northward in Laish, took away both the establishment and the priest, which they afterwards maintained in their new settlement (Judges 17). *SEE DAN; SEE JONATHAN.*

The establishments of this kind, of which there are other instances — as that of Gideon at Ophrah — were, although most mistakenly, formed in honor of Jehovah, whom they thus sought to serve by means of a local worship, in imitation of that at Shiloh (see Kitto's *Daily Bible Illustra.* ad loc.). This was in direct contravention of the law, which allowed but one place of sacrifice and ceremonial service; and was something of the same kind, although different in extent and degree, as the service of the golden calves, which Jeroboam set up, and his successors maintained, in Dan and Bethel. The previous existence of Micah's establishment in the former city no doubt pointed it out to Jeroboam as a suitable place for one of his golden calves. — Kitto. *SEE JEROBOAM.* The preservation of the story here would seem to be owing to Micah's accidental connection with the colony of Danites who left the original seat of their tribe to conquer and found a new Dan at Laish—a most happy accident, for it has been the means of furnishing us with a picture of the “interior” of a private Israelitish family of the rural districts, which in many respects stands quite alone in the sacred records, and has probably no parallel in any literature of equal age. But apart from this the narrative has several points of special interest to students of Biblical history in the information which it affords as to the condition of the nation, of the members of which Micah was probably an average specimen.

(1.) We see how completely some of the most solemn and characteristic enactments of the law had become a dead letter. Micah was evidently a devout believer in Jehovah. While the Danites in their communications use the general term *Elohim*, “God” (“ask counsel of God,” ^{<0718>}Judges 18:5; “God hath given it into your hands,” verse 10), with Micah and his household the case is quite different. His one anxiety is to enjoy the favor of Jehovah (^{<0717>}Judges 17:13); the formula of blessing used by his mother and his priest invokes the same awful name (^{<0717>}Judges 17:2; 18:6); and yet so completely ignorant is he of the law of Jehovah that the mode which he

adopts of honoring him is to make a molten and a graven image, teraphim or images of domestic gods, and to set up an unauthorized priesthood, first in his own family (^{<0776>}Judges 17:5), and then in the person of a Levite not of the priestly line (verse 12) — thus disobeying in the most flagrant manner the second of the Ten Commandments, and the provisions for the priesthood-laws both of which lay in a peculiar manner at the root of the religious existence of the nation. Gideon (^{<0787>}Judges 8:27) had established an ephod; but here was a whole chapel of idols, “a house of gods” (^{<0776>}Judges 17:5), and all dedicated to Jehovah.

(2.) The story also throws a light on the condition of the Levites. They were indeed “divided in Jacob and scattered in Israel” in a more literal sense than that prediction is usually taken to contain. Here we have a Levite belonging to Bethlehem-judah, a town not allotted to the Levites, and with which they had, as far as we know, no connection; next wandering forth, with the world before him, to take up his abode wherever he could find a residence; then undertaking, without hesitation, and for a mere pittance, the charge of Micah’s idol-chapel; and, lastly, carrying off the property of his master and benefactor, and becoming the first priest to another system of false worship, one, too, in which Jehovah had no part, and which ultimately bore an important share in the disruption of the two kingdoms. It does not seem at all clear that the words “molten image” and “graven image” accurately express the original words *Pesel* and *Massekah*. **SEE IDOL**. As the Hebrew text now stands, the “graven image” only was carried off to Laish, and the “molten” one remained behind with Micah (^{<0780>}Judges 18:20, 30; comp. 18). True the Sept. adds the molten image in verse 20, but in verse 30 it agrees with the Hebrew text.

(3.) But the transaction becomes still more remarkable when we consider that this was no obscure or ordinary Levite. He belonged to the chief family in the tribe; nay, we may say to the chief family of the nation, for, though not himself a priest, he was closely allied to the priestly house, and was the grandson of no less a person than the great Moses himself. For the “Manasseh” in 18:30 is nothing less than an alteration of “Moses,” to shield that venerable name from the discredit which such a descendant would cast upon it. **SEE MANASSEH**, 3. In this fact we possibly have the explanation of the much-debated passage, ^{<0783>}Judges 18:3: “They knew the voice of the young man the Levite.” The grandson of the Lawgiver was not unlikely to be personally known to the Danites; when they heard his voice (whether in casual speech or in loud devotion we are not told) they

recognized it, and their inquiries as to who brought him hither, what he did there, and what he had there, were in this case the eager questions of old acquaintances long separated.

(4.) The narrative gives us a most vivid idea of the terrible anarchy in which the country was placed when “there was no king in Israel, and every man did what was right in his own eyes,” and shows how urgently necessary a central authority had become. A body of six hundred men completely armed, besides the train of their families and cattle, traverses the length and breadth of the land, not on any mission for the ruler or the nation, as on later occasions (^{<0102>}2 Samuel 2:12, etc.; 20:7, 14), but simply for their private ends. Entirely disregarding the rights of private property, they burst in wherever they please along their route, and, plundering the valuables and carrying off persons, reply to all remonstrances by taunts and threats. The Turkish rule, to which the same district has now the misfortune to be subjected, can hardly be worse.

At the same time it is startling to our Western minds — accustomed to associate the blessings of order with religion — to observe how religious were these lawless freebooters: “Do ye know that in these houses there is an ephod, and teraphim, and a graven image, and a molten image? Now therefore -consider what ye have to do” (^{<0184>}Judges 18:14). “Hold thy peace and go with us, and be to us a father and a priest” (verse 19). —

(5.) As to the date of these interesting events, the narrative gives us no direct information beyond the fact that it was before the beginning of the monarchy; but we may at least infer that it was also before the time of Samson, because in this narrative (^{<0172>}Judges 17:12) we meet with the origin of the name of Mahaneh-dan, a place which already bore that name in Samson’s childhood (^{<0135>}Judges 13:25, where it is translated in the Auth. Vers. “the camp of Dan”). That the Danites had opponents to their establishment in their proper territory before the Philistines entered the field is evident from ^{<0103>}Judges 1:34. Josephus entirely omits the story of Micah, but he places the narrative of the Levite and his concubine, and the destruction of Gibeah (chapters 19:20, 21) — a document generally recognised as part of the same (see Bertheau, *Kommentar*, page 192) with the story of Micah, and that document by a different hand from the previous portions of the book at the very beginning of his account of the period of the judges, before Deborah or even Ehud (*Ant.* 5:2, 8-12). This is supported by the mention of Phinehas, the grandson of Aaron, in ^{<0118>}Judges

20:28. An argument against the date being before the time of Deborah is drawn by Bertheau (page 197) from the fact that at that time the north of Palestine was in the possession of the Canaanites — “Jabin, king of Canaan, who reigned in Hazor,” in the immediate neighborhood of Laish. The records of the southern Dan are too scanty to permit our fixing the date from the statement that the Danites had not yet entered on their all of men that is to say, the allotment specified in ^{<0694>}Joshua 19:40-48. But that statement strengthens the conclusion arrived at from other passages, that these lists in Joshua contain the towns *allotted*, but not therefore necessarily *possessed* by the various tribes. “Divide the land first, in confidence, and then possess it afterwards,” seems to be the principle implied in such passages as ^{<0617>}Joshua 13:7 (comp. 1); 19:49, 51 (Sept. “So they went to take possession of the land”).

The date of the insertion of the record may perhaps be more nearly arrived at. That, on the one hand, it was after the beginning of the monarchy is evident from the references to the ante-monarchical times (^{<0780>}Judges 18:1; 19:1; 21:25); and, on the other hand, we may perhaps infer from the name of Bethlehem being given as “Bethlehem-judah,” that it was before the fame of David had conferred on it a notoriety which would render any such affix unnecessary. The reference to the establishment of the house of God in Shiloh (^{<0783>}Judges 18:31) seems also to point to the early part of Saul’s reign, before the incursions of the Philistines had made it necessary to remove the tabernacle and ephod to: Nob, in the vicinity of Gibeah, Saul’s head-quarters. Some, like Le Clerc, argue for a later date, from the phrase, “until the day of the captivity of the land,” in ^{<0783>}Judges 18:30, as if it necessarily referred to the Assyrian invasion. The reading is doubtful. Studer and Hitzig take the 30th verse as a later interpolation; Kimchi, Havernick, Hengstenberg, and Bleek refer the phrase to the captivity of the ark in the time of Eli, but on no good ground, unless the reading /rah; be changed, as some prefer, into [^]w^oah; Stahelin and Ewald, regarding the verse as a later addition, place the composition about the period of Asa or Jehoshaphat; Stahelin insisting, too, that the diction does not belong to the purer period of the language. Verse 30; indeed, does not quite agree with 31, which seems to limit the duration of the Danite idolatry to the period of the station of the-ark at Shiloh; and the phrase, “until the day of the captivity,” as Keil remarks (*Commentary*, ad loc.), may refer to some unknown invasion on the part of the neighboring Syrians. Besides, it can scarcely be supposed that this idolatrous cultus, so directly and openly

opposed to the spirit and letter of the Mosaic law, would have been allowed to stand in the zealous days of Samuel and David. See Stanley's *Lectures on the Jewish Church*, pages 296, 297. **SEE JUDGES, BOOK OF.**

2. The son of Mephibosheth, or Meribbaal (son of Jonathan and grandson of king Saul), and the father of several sons (^{<1834>}1 Chronicles 8:34,35; 9:40,41). B.C. post 1037. In ^{<1892>}2 Samuel 9:2, he is called MICHA.

3. The first in rank of the priests of the Kohathite family of Uzziel, under the sacerdotal arrangement by David (^{<1320>}1 Chronicles 23:20). B.C. 1014. He had a son named Shamir, and a brother Isshiah (^{<1324>}1 Chronicles 24:24, 25; Auth. Vers. "Michah").

4. The son of Shimei and father of Reaia, of the descendants of Reuben (^{<1385>}1 Chronicles 5:5). B.C. ante 782.

5. A prophet, apparently of the kingdom of Judah, and contemporary with Isaiah (^{<3006>}Micah 1:1). B.C. cir. 750. He is styled "the Morasthite," as being a native of Moresheth of Gath (1:14, 15), so called to distinguish it from another town of the same name in the tribe of Judah (^{<1654>}Joshua 15:44; ^{<1449>}2 Chronicles 14:9, 10). Micah is thus likewise distinguished from a former prophet of the same name; called also Micaiah, mentioned in ^{<1228>}1 Kings 22:8. The above place of Micah's birth "Jerome and Eusebius call Morasthi, and identify 'with a small village called Eleutheropolis, to the east, where formerly the prophet's tomb was shown, but which in the days of Jerome had been succeeded by a church (*Epit. Paulle*, c. 6). As little is known of the circumstances of Micah's life as of many of the other prophets. Pseudo Epiphanius (*Opp.* 2:245) makes him, contrary to all probability, of the tribe of Ephraim; and besides confounding him with Micaiah the son of Imlah, who lived more than a century before, he betrays additional ignorance in describing Ahab as king of Judah. For rebuking this monarch's son and successor Jehoram for his impieties, Micah, according to the same authority, was thrown from a precipice, and buried at Morathi in his own country, hard by the cemetery of Enakim' (**Ἐνακείμ**, a place which apparently exists only in the Sept. of ^{<3006>}Micah 1:10), where his sepulchre was still to be seen. The *Chronicon Paschale* (page 148 c) tells the same tale. Another ecclesiastical tradition relates that the remains of Habakkuk and Micah were revealed in a vision to Zebennus, bishop of Eleutheropolis, in the reign of Theodosius the Great, near a place called Berathsatia, which is apparently a corruption of Morasthi (Sozomen. *H.E.*

7:29; Nicephorus, *H.E.* 12:48). The prophet's tomb was called by the inhabitants *Nephsamemana*, which Sozomen renders *μνήμαπιστόν.*"

Micah, Book Of,

the sixth of the minor prophets in the usual arrangement, but the third in the Sept. (after Hosea and Amos). In the following account of it we treat in special detail those points that have created controversies in modern times.

I. The Name. — This, which the prophet bears in common with the other persons above and below, is found with considerable variation in the Heb. and A.V. The full form is *Whykymæ* *Mikaya'hu*, "who is like Jehovah," which is found in ^{<4132>}2 Chronicles 13:2; 17:7. This is abbreviated to *Whykymæ* *Mikayehu*, in ^{<0770>}Judges 17:1, 4; still further to *Whykmæ* *Mika'yehu* (^{<2661>}Jeremiah 36:11), *hykymæ* *Mikayah'* (^{<1221>}1 Kings 22:13); and finally to, *hkymæ* *Mikah'*, or *akymæ* *Mika'* (^{<1092>}2 Samuel 9:12).

II. Date. — The period during which Micah exercised the prophetic office is stated, in the superscription to his prophecies, to have extended over the reigns of Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah, giving thus a maximum limit of 59 years (B.C. 756-697), from the accession of Jotham to the death of Hezekiah, and a minimum limit of 16 years (B.C. 742-726), from the death of Jotham to the accession of Hezekiah. In either case he would be contemporary with Hosea and Amos during part of their ministry in Israel, and with Isaiah in Judah. According to rabbinical tradition, he transmitted to the prophets Joel, Nahum, and Habakkuk, and to Seraiah the priest the mysteries of the Kabbala, which he had received from Isaiah (R. David Ganz. *Tsemach David*), and by Syncellus (*Chronogr.* page 199 c) he is enumerated in the reign of Jotham as contemporary with Hosea, Joel, Isaiah, and Oded. The date of the book itself may be fixed at about B.C. 725. His prediction with impunity of the desolation of Jerusalem (^{<3312>}Micah 3:12) is expressly alluded to in Jeremiah (^{<2468>}Jeremiah 26:18, where the text has *hykymæ* *Micaiah*), as having been uttered during the reign of Hezekiah. The allusions to idolatry (^{<3373>}Micah 7:13) and to Babylon (^{<3340>}Micah 4:10) have induced Berthold (*Einleitung*, § 411) to refer the prophecy of Micah to the time of the captivity; but De Wette truly observes that this supposition is unnecessary, as idolatry existed under Hezekiah (2 Kings 23), and Babylon equally belonged to the kingdom of Assyria. Hartmann's attempt to regard the passage respecting Babylon as

an interpolation (see *Micha neu ubersetzt*), De Wette regards as even still more venturesome; nor had this writer the slightest authority for supposing that some only of the prophecies are Micah's, and that the work was compiled during the exile. The time assigned to the prophecies by the only direct evidence which we possess agrees so well with their contents that it may fairly be accepted as correct.

Why any discrepancy should be perceived between the statement in Jeremiah, that "Micah the Morasthite prophesied in the days of Hezekiah king of Judah," and the title of his book, which tells us that the word of the Lord came to him "in the days of Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah," it is difficult to imagine. The former does not limit the period of Micah's prophecy, and at most applies only to the passage to which direct allusion is made. A confusion appears to have existed in the minds of those who see in the prophecy in its present form a connected whole, between the actual delivery of the several portions of it, and their collection and transcription into one book. In the case of Jeremiah, we know that he dictated to Baruch the prophecies which he had delivered in the interval between the 13th year of Josiah and the 4th of Jehoiakim, and that when thus committed to writing they were read before the people on the fast day (^{<281D>}Jeremiah 36:2, 4, 6). There is reason to believe that a similar process took place with the prophecies of Amos. It is, therefore, conceivable, to say the least, that certain portions of Micah's prophecy may have been uttered in the reigns of Jotham and Ahaz, and for the probability of this there is strong internal evidence, while they were collected as a whole in the reign of Hezekiah and committed to writing. Caspari (*Micha*, page 78) suggests that the book thus written may have been read in the presence of the king and the whole people on, some great fast or festival day, and that this circumstance may have been in the minds of the elders of the land in the time of Jehoiakim, when they appealed to the impunity which Micah enjoyed under Hezekiah. Knobel (*Prophetismus*, 2:§,20) imagines that the prophecies which remain belong to the time of Hezekiah, and that those delivered under Jotham and Ahaz have perished. It is evident from ^{<300D>}Micah 1:6 that the section of the prophecy in which that verse occurs must have been delivered before the destruction of Samaria by Shalmaneser, which took place in the 6th year of Hezekiah (cir. B.C. 722), and connecting the "high-places" mentioned in ^{<300D>}Micah 1:5 with those which existed in Judah in the reigns of Ahaz (^{<1264>}2 Kings 16:4; ^{<1264>}2 Chronicles 28:4, 25) and Jotham (^{<1255>}2 Kings 15:35), we may be justified in assigning chap. 1 to the time of one of these monarchs,

probably the latter; although, if chap. ii be considered as part of the section to which chapter 1 belongs, the utter corruption and demoralization of the people there depicted agree better with what history tells us of the times of Ahaz. Caspari maintains that of the two parallel passages, ^{<300>}Micah 4:1-5, ^{<200>}Isaiah 2:2-5, the former is the original, and the latter belongs to the times of Uzziah and Jotham, and this view is maintained by Hengstenberg (*Christology*, 1:480), and accepted by Pusey (*Minor Prophets*, page 289). But the evidence on the point is not at all conclusive: ^{<300>}Micah 4:1-4 may possibly, as Ewald and others have suggested, be a portion of an older prophecy current at the time, which was adopted by both Micah and Isaiah (^{<200>}Isaiah 2:2-4). The denunciation of the horses and chariots of Judah (5:10) is appropriate to the state of the country under Jotham, after the long and prosperous reign of Uzziah, by whom the military strength of the people had been greatly developed (^{<400>}2 Chronicles 26:11-15; 27:4-6). Compare ^{<200>}Isaiah 2:7, which belongs to the same period. Again, the forms in which idolatry manifested itself in the reign of Ahaz correspond with those which are threatened with destruction in ^{<300>}Micah 5:12-14; and the allusions in 6:16 to the “statutes of Omri,” and the “works of the house of Ahab,” seem directly pointed at the king, of whom it is expressly said that “he walked in the way of the kings of Israel” (^{<200>}2 Kings 16:3). It is impossible in dealing with internal evidence to assert positively that the inferences deduced from it are correct; but in the present instance they at least establish a probability that, in placing the period of Micah’s prophetic activity between the times of Jotham and Hezekiah, the superscription is correct. In the first years of Hezekiah’s reign the idolatry which prevailed in the time of Ahaz was not eradicated, and in assigning the date of Micah’s prophecy to this period there is no anachronism in the allusions to idolatrous practices. Maurer contends that chap. 1 was written not long before the taking of Samaria; but the third and following chapters he places in the interval between the destruction of Samaria and the time that Jerusalem was menaced by the army of Sennacherib in the 14th year of Hezekiah. The passages, however, which he quotes in support of his conclusion: (^{<300>}Micah 3:12; 4:9, etc.; ^{<300>}Micah 5:5, etc.; ^{<300>}Micah 6:9, etc.; ^{<300>}Micah 7:4, 12, etc.) do not appear to be more suitable to that period than to the first years of Hezekiah, while the context, in many cases, requires a still earlier date. In the arrangement adopted by Wells (pref. to Micah, § 4-6), chapter 1 was delivered in the contemporary reigns of Jotham king of Judah and of Pekah king of Israel; ^{<300>}Micah 2:1-4:8 in

those of Ahaz, Pekah, and Hosea; 3:12 being assigned to the last year of Ahaz, and the remainder of the book to the reign of Hezekiah.

It is remarkable that the prophecies commence with the last words recorded of the prophet's namesake, Micaiah the son of Imlah, "Hearken, O people, every one of you" (^{<1228>}1 Kings 22:28). From this, Bleek (*Einleitung*, page 539) concludes that the author of the history, like the ecclesiastical historians, confounded Micah the Morasthite with Micaiah; while Hengstenberg (*Christology*, 1:409, Eng. tr.) infers that the coincidence was intentional on the part of the later prophet, and that "by this very circumstance he gives intimation of what may be expected from him, and shows that his activity is to be considered as a continuation of that of his predecessor, who was so jealous for God, and that he had more in common with him than the mere name." Either conclusion rests on the extremely slight foundation of the occurrence of a formula which was at once the most simple and most natural commencement of a prophetic discourse.

III. Contents. — But, at whatever time the several prophecies were first delivered, they appear in their present form as an organic whole, marked by a certain regularity of development. Three sections, omitting the superscription, are introduced by the same phrase, **W[m]yæHear ye,**" and represent three natural divisions of the prophecy — 1-2, 3-5, 6-7 — each commencing with rebukes and threatenings, and closing with a promise.

1. The first section opens with a magnificent description of the coming of Jehovah to judgment for the sins and idolatries of Israel and Judah (^{<3000>}Micah 1:2-4), and the sentence pronounced upon Samaria (verses 5-9) by the Judge himself. The prophet, whose sympathies are strong with Judah, and especially with the lowlands which gave him birth, sees the danger that threatens his country, and traces in imagination the devastating march of the Assyrian conquerors from Samaria onward to Jerusalem and the south (^{<3000>}Micah 1:8-16). The impending punishment suggests its cause, and the prophet denounces a woe upon the people generally for the corruption and violence which were rife among them, and upon the false prophets who led them astray by pandering to their appetites and luxury (^{<3000>}Micah 2:1-11). The sentence of captivity is passed upon them (verse 10), but is followed instantly by a promise of restoration and triumphant return (^{<3012>}Micah 2:12, 13).

2. The second section is addressed especially to the princes and heads of the people; their avarice and rapacity are rebuked in strong terms; and as they have been deaf to the cry of the suppliants for justice, they too “shall cry unto Jehovah, but he will not hear them” (^{<300>}Micah 3:1-4). The false prophets who had deceived others should themselves be deceived; “the sun shall go down over the prophets, and the day shall be dark over them” (^{<300>}Micah 3:6). For this perversion of justice and right, and the covetousness of the heads of the people who judged for reward, of the priests who taught for hire, and of the prophets who divined for money, Zion should “be ploughed as a field,” and the mountain of the temple become like the uncultivated woodland heights (^{<300>}Micah 3:9-12). But the threatening is again succeeded by a promise of restoration, and in the glories of the Messianic kingdom the prophet loses sight of the desolation which should befall his country. Instead of the temple mountain covered with the wild growth of the forest, he sees the mountain of the house of Jehovah established on the top of the mountains, and nations flowing like rivers unto it. The reign of peace is inaugurated by the recall from captivity, and Jehovah sits as king in Zion, having destroyed the nations who had rejoiced in her overthrow. The predictions at the close of this section form the climax of the book, and Ewald arranges them in four strophes, consisting of seven or eight verses each (^{<300>}Micah 4:1-8; 4:9-5:2; 5:3-9; 5:10-15), with the exception of the last, which is shorter, and in which the prophet reverts to the point whence he started: all objects of politic and idolatrous confidence must be removed before the grand consummation.

3. In the last section (6, 7) Jehovah, by a bold poetical figure, is represented as holding a controversy with his people, pleading with them in justification of his conduct towards them and the reasonableness of his requirements. The dialogue form in which chapter 6 is cast renders the picture very dramatic and striking. In ^{<300>}Micah 6:3-5 Jehovah speaks; the inquiry of the people follows in verse 6, indicating their entire ignorance of what was required of them; their inquiry is met by the almost impatient rejoinder, “Will Jehovah be pleased with thousands of rams, with myriads of torrents of oil?” The still greater sacrifice suggested by the people, “Shall I give my first-born for my transgressions?” calls forth the definition of their true duty, “to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with their God.” How far they had fallen short of this requirement is shown in what follows (verses 9-12), and judgment is pronounced upon them

(verses 13-16). The prophet acknowledges and bewails the justice of the sentence (^{<300>}Micah 7:1-6), the people in repentance patiently look to God, confident that their prayer will be heard (verses 7-10), and are reassured by the promise of deliverance announced as following their punishment (verses 11-13) by the prophet, who in his turn presents his petition to Jehovah for the restoration of his people (verses 14, 15). The whole concludes with a triumphal song of joy at the great deliverance, like that from Egypt, which Jehovah will achieve, and a full acknowledgment of his mercy and faithfulness to his promises (verses 16-20). The last verse is reproduced in the song of Zacharias (^{<407>}Luke 1:72; 73).

The predictions uttered by Micah relate to the invasions of Shalmaneser (^{<300>}Micah 1:6-8; ^{<274>}2 Kings 17:4, 6) and Sennacherib (1:9-16; ^{<283>}2 Kings 18:13), the destruction of Jerusalem (^{<382>}Micah 3:12; 7:13), the captivity in Babylon (^{<340>}Micah 4:10), the return (^{<301>}Micah 4:1-8; 7:11), the establishment of a theocratic kingdom in Jerusalem (^{<348>}Micah 4:8), and the Ruler who should spring from Bethlehem (^{<382>}Micah 5:2). The destruction of Assyria and Babylon is supposed to be referred to in ^{<385>}Micah 5:5, 6; 7:8, 10. According to many, ^{<343>}Micah 4:13 refers to the heroic deeds of the Maccabees, and their victories over the Syrians or Syro-Macedonians, called Assyrians in Micah 5, as well as in ^{<301>}Zechariah 10:11.

There is no prophecy in Micah so interesting to the Christian as that in which the native place of the Messiah is announced (^{<382>}Micah 5:2), which is cited by the evangelist (^{<406>}Matthew 2:6) with slight verbal variations, but substantially the same import (see Kuinil, *Comment. ad loc. Mat.*). In Micah emphasis is laid on the actual smallness of Bethlehem to enjoy such an honor; in Matthew the prominent idea is the honor itself, and its ideal grandeur — the converse side of the statement. Pocock cuts the knot by adopting rabbi Tanchum's odd opinion that the term **ry[æ]** means both little and great, the prophet selecting the one sense and the evangelist the other. It is evident that the Jews in the time of Jesus interpreted this passage of the birthplace of the Messiah (^{<406>}Matthew 2:5; ^{<474>}John 7:41, 42). The Targum gives the reference formally to the Messiah. The later rabbinical writers, however, such as Kimchi, Aben-Ezra, Abrabanel, etc., have maintained that it had only an indirect reference to the birthplace of the Messiah, who was to be a descendant of David, a Bethlehemite, but not of necessity himself born in Bethlehem. Others, however, as David Ganz (*B. Zemach David*), expressly mention Bethlehem as the birthplace of the Messiah. The interpretation which considered this prophecy as intimating

only that the Messiah was to be a descendant of David, was that current among the Jews in the time of Theodoret, Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Euthymius Zigabenus, from whom we learn that it was maintained to have been fulfilled in Zerubbabel, the leader of the Jews on their return from Babylon, of which, and not of Bethlehem, he was a native. (See Sozomen, 7:729; Carpzov, *Introd.* 3:374 sq.; Jerome, *Ep. ad Eustach.* 1:704.) This interpretation was held among Christians by the celebrated Theodore of Mopsuestia (as we learn from his condemnation by the council at Rome under pope Vigilius), and afterwards by Grotius (*Comment.*), who, however, regarded Zerubbabel as a type of Christ, and considered Christ's birthplace at Bethlehem as an outward representation of his descent from the family of David. Many of the moderns have been attached to this interpretation of the prophecy, referring it to the general idea of the Messiah rather than to Zerubbabel, while some among them have, after the example of some Jews, ventured to assert that the account of the birth of Christ at Bethlehem was not to be depended on. Some have asserted, after Jerome (*Comm. in Micah*), that the citation in ⁴¹¹⁶Matthew 2:6 is that of the Sanhedrim only, not of the evangelist (Hengstenberg's *Christology*). Jahn (*Append. Hermeneut.*) observes that it is evident that the Jews in the time of Christ expected the Messiah's birth to take place at Bethlehem; and although he admits that the prophecy may be understood tropically in the sense applied to it by Grotius, he contends that the context will not admit of its applicability either to Hezekiah or any other monarch than the Messiah; nor is it possible to apply the prophecy fully and literally to any but him who was not only of the house and lineage of David, but was actually born at Bethlehem, according to the direct testimony of both Matthew's and Luke's gospels. The plain meaning is that the Messiah, as David's son, should be born in David's town (Hofmann, *Weiss. u. Erf.* page 249). Tertullian also presses the argument that the Messiah has come, for Bethlehem was deserted — "Neminem de genere Israel in civitate Bethlehem remansisse" (*Adv. Judeos*, volume 13; *Opera*, 2:734, ed. Oehler). To give the vague sense of Davidic extraction, and yet to deny that the words point out the place of birth, was thus a necessary but feeble Jewish subterfuge. Ronan admits the usual interpretation of the prophecy, though he affirms that Jesus was really not of the family of David, and was born at Nazareth (*Vie de Jesus*, chapter 2). (See generally, Eichhorn, *Einleit.* 4:369 sq.; Bertheau, *Einl.* 4:1633 sq.; Knobel, *Prophet.* 3:199 sq.)

SEE MESSIAH.

IV. The *genuineness* of the book has not been called in question. Only Ewald, in his *Jahrb.* 11:29, is disposed to maintain that the two concluding chapters are the work of a different author. His objections, however, have no force against the universal opinion. The language of Micah is quoted in ^{<3015>}Matthew 2:5, 6, and his prophecies are alluded to in ^{<3005>}Matthew 10:35, 36; ^{<4132>}Mark 13:12; ^{<2123>}Luke 12:53; ^{<4072>}John 7:42.

V. The *style* of Micah is rich, full, and musical — as nervous, vehement, and bold, in many sections, as Hosea, and as abrupt, too, in transitions from menace to mercy. He presents, at the same time, no little resemblance to Isaiah in grandeur of thought, in richness and variety of imagery, and in roundness and cadence of parallelism. The similarity of their subjects may account for many resemblances in language with the latter prophet, which were almost unavoidable (comp. ^{<3300>}Micah 1:2 with ^{<2302>}Isaiah 1:2; ^{<3302>}Micah 2:2 with ^{<2308>}Isaiah 5:8; ^{<3306>}Micah 2:6, 11 with ^{<2300>}Isaiah 30:10; ^{<3302>}Micah 2:12 with ^{<2300>}Isaiah 10:20-22; ^{<3300>}Micah 1:6-8 with ^{<2301>}Isaiah 1:11-17). The diction of Micah is vigorous and forcible, sometimes obscure from the abruptness of its transitions, but varied and rich in figures derived from the pastoral (^{<3300>}Micah 1:8; 2:12; 5:4, 5, 7, 8; 7:14) and rural life of the lowland country (^{<3300>}Micah 1:6; 3:12; 4:3, 12, 13; 6:15), whose vines, and olives, and figtrees were celebrated (^{<3377>}1 Chronicles 27:27, 28), and supply the prophet with so many striking allusions (^{<3300>}Micah 1:6; 4:3, 4; 6:15; 7:1, 4) as to suggest that, like Amos, he may have been either a herdsman or a vine-dresser who had heard the howling of the jackals (^{<3300>}Micah 1:8; A. Vers. “dragons”) as he watched his flocks or his vines by night, and had seen the lions slaughtering the sheep (^{<3308>}Micah 5:8). The sudden changes are frequently hidden from the English reader, because our version interprets as well as translates; the simple connective *and* being often rendered by some logical term, as “therefore” (^{<3300>}Micah 1:6), “then” (^{<3307>}Micah 3:7), “but” (^{<3300>}Micah 4:1), “notwithstanding” (^{<3373>}Micah 7:13), etc. Concise and pointed questions are put suddenly; persons are changed rapidly; the people are spoken of, and then in a moment spoken to; the nation is addressed now as a unit, and now edged appeals are directed to individuals. The language is quite pure and classical-intercourse with northern countries had not yet debased it. An under-tone of deep earnestness pervades the book; everywhere are discerned the workings of an intensely honorable and patriotic soul. Micah is successful in the use of the dialogue, and his prophecies are penetrated by the purest spirit of morality and piety (see especially 6:6-8; and 7:1-10).

One peculiarity which Micah has in common with Isaiah is the frequent use of paronomasia; in ^{<3300>}Micah 1:10-15 there is a succession of instances of this figure in the plays upon words suggested by the various places enumerated (comp. also ^{<3304>}Micah 2:4), which it is impossible to transfer to English, though Ewald has attempted to render them into German (*Propheten des A. B.* 1:329, 330). In these verses there is also vivid grouping, as place after place is challenged along the line of the conqueror's march. Each town is seen to carry its doom in its very name. That doom is told in many ways either to them or of them; either in the prophet's name or as a divine burden; either as an event about to come or as a judgment which will certainly overtake them. Perhaps in ^{<3308>}Micah 7:18 there is an allusion to the meaning of the prophet's own name. The divine name which appears with greatest frequency is, as is usual with the prophets, Jehovah; but we also meet with Adonai and Adonai Jehovah (^{<3300>}Micah 1:2), also "the Lord of the whole earth" (^{<3313>}Micah 2:13), and "Jehovah of hosts" (^{<3304>}Micah 4:4). Elohim is used distinctively of the divine as opposed to the human in ^{<3307>}Micah 3:7. Allusions to the past history of the people are found in many places. There are also several expressions which are found in the Mosaic writings, though it might be rash to say that Micah takes them directly from the Pentateuch. Nor would we endorse all the instances in which, as Caspari affirms, later prophets, as Jeremiah and Ezekiel, Habakkuk and Zephaniah, have adopted the language of Micah (*Micha*, page 449, etc.). The poetic vigor of the opening scene, and of the dramatic dialogue sustained throughout the last two chapters, has already been noticed.

VI. Commentaries. — The following are the especial exegetical helps on the whole book alone, to a few of the most important of which we prefix an asterisk: Ephrem Syrus, *Explanatio* (in *Opp.* 5:272); Theophylact, *Commentarius* (in *Opp.* volume 4); Luther, *Commentarius* (ed. Theodore, Vitemb. 1542, 8vo; also in his *Works*, both Germ. and Lat.); Brentz, *Commentaria* (in *Opp.* volume 4); Gerlach, *Commentarius* (Aug. Vind. 1524, 8vo); Bibliander, *Commentarius* (Tigur. 1534, 8vo); Phrygio, *Commentarius* (Argent. 1538, 8vo); Gilby, *Commentary* (Lond. 1551, 1591, 8vo); Chytraeus, *Explicatio* [includ. Nehemiah] (Vitemb. 1565, 8vo); Draconis, *Explicatio* [includ. Joel and Zechariah] (Vitemb. 1565, 8vo); Graxar, *Comnzentarius* (Salmant. 1570, 8vo); Selnecker, *Anmersckungen* (Leips. 1578, 4to); Bang, *Fontium trias* [includ. Jonah and Ruth] (Hafn. 1631, 8vo); Graver, *Expositio* (Jen. 1619, 1664, 4to);

*Pocock, *Commentary* (Oxf. 1677, fol.; also in *Works*); Van Toll, *Vitleyginge* (Utrecht, 1709; 4to); Schnurrer, *Animadversiones* (Tibing. 1783, 4to); Buer, *Aninadversiones* [on chapter 1, 2] (Altorf, 1790,4to); Grosschopff *Uebersetzung* (Jena, 1798, 8vo); *Justi, *Erlauterung* (Leips. 1799, 8vo); *Hartmann, *Erlauterung* (Lemgo, 1800,8vo); Wolf, [hr/hfj](#) [hj njna](#) Dessau, 1805, 8vo); Gliemann, *Illustratio* (Hall. 1842, 4to); *Caspari, *Micha der Morasthiter* (Marb. 1852, 8vo); Roorda, *Commentarius* (Leyd. 1869, 8vo). **SEE PROPHETS, MINOR.**

6. The father of Abdon (^{<480>}2 Chronicles 34:20); elsewhere called MICHAIAH, the father of Achbor (^{<2212>}2 Kings 22:12).

7. A Levite of the descendants of Asaph (^{<1395>}1 Chronicles 9:15); elsewhere properly called MICHA(^{<6117>}Nehemiah 11:17, 22).

Micaiah

the prevailing form of the name of several persons (one a Levite, ^{<4432>}2 Chronicles 13:2), written with considerable diversity in the original and in the ancient translations, as well as the Auth. Vers. (properly, for Heb. *Mikayah*’, [hykyma](#) *who is like Jehovah?* ^{<2212>}2 Kings 22:12; Sept. [Μιχαίας](#), Vulg. *Micha*, Auth. Vers. “Michaiah,” ^{<1625>}Nehemiah 12:35, [Μιχαία](#), *Michaja*, “Michaiah;” ^{<624>}Nehemiah 12:41, [Μιχαίας](#), *Michaea*, “Michaiah;” ^{<238>}Jeremiah 26:18, [Μιχαίας](#), *Michaeas*, “Micah;” paragogically, Heb. *Mikah’yehu*, [Whykymæ](#) ^{<771>}Judges 17:1, 4, [Μιχά](#), *Michas*, “Micah;” ^{<1218>}1 Kings 22:8, 9, 13,14,15, 24, 25, 26, 28, [Μιχαίας](#), *Micheas*, “Micaiah;” ^{<487>}2 Chronicles 18:7, 8,12,13, 23,24,25,27, [Μιχαίας](#), *Michaeas*, “Micaiah;” ^{<2651>}Jeremiah 36:11, 13, [Μιχαίας](#), *Michaeas*, “Michaiah;” fully, Heb. *Mikaya’hut* ^{<4432>}2 Chronicles 13:2, [Μααχά](#), *Michaja*, “Michaiah “ ^{<4470>}2 Chronicles 17:7, [Μιχαίας](#), *Micheas*, “Michaiah;” contracted, Heb. *Mikah*’, [hkymæ](#) ^{<771>}Judges 17:5, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 18:2, 3, 4, 13, 15, 18, 22, 23, 26, 27, 31, [Μιχά](#), *Michas*, “Micah;” ^{<1385>}1 Chronicles 5:5, and 8:34,35, and 9:40,41, and 23:20, [Μιχά](#), *Michas*, “Micah;” ^{<1320>}1 Chronicles 24:24, 25, [Μιχά](#), *Micha*, “Micah;” ^{<484>}2 Chronicles 18:14, [Μιχαίας](#), *Michaeas*, “Micaiah;” ^{<4840>}2 Chronicles 34:20, [Μιχαία](#), *Micha*, “Micah;” ^{<2411>}Jeremiah 26:11 [Μιχαίας](#) v.r. [Μιχέας](#) and [Μηχαίας](#), *Michtas*, “Micah” ^{<3100>}Micah 1:1, [Μιχαίας](#), *Michaeas*, “Micah;” by Chaldaism, *Mika*’, [akymæ](#) ^{<1092>}2 Samuel 9:12, and ^{<1601>}Nehemiah 10:11, and 11:17, [Μιχά](#), [Μιχά](#), “Micha;” ^{<1395>}1 Chronicles 9:15, [Μιχά](#), *Micha*,

“Micah;” ^{<112>}Nehemiah 11:22, **Μιχά**, *Michas*, “Micha”). The only person invariably thus called was the son of Imla, and a prophet of Samaria (^{<123>}1 Kings 22:13; 2 Chronicles 18). B.C. 895. The following abstract of the narrative concerning him is sufficiently copious on certain disputed points. Three years after the great battle with Benhadad, king of Syria, in which the extraordinary number of 100,000 Syrian soldiers is said to have been slain, without reckoning the 27,000 who, it is asserted, were killed by the falling of the wall at Aphek, Ahab proposed to Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, that they should jointly go up to battle against Ramoth-Gilead: which Benhadad was, apparently, bound by treaty to restore to Ahab. Jehoshaphat, whose son Jehoram had married Athaliah, Ahab’s daughter, assented in cordial words to the proposal; but suggested that they should first “inquire at the word of Jehovah.” Accordingly, Ahab assembled 400 prophets, while, in an open space at the gate of the city of Samaria, he and Jehoshaphat sat in royal robes to meet and consult them. “That these were, however, no true prophets of Jehovah, is evident from their being afterwards emphatically designated Ahab’s prophets, in contradistinction to the Lord’s (verses 22, 23). It is evident also from the suspicion created in the mind of Jehoshaphat respecting their character by their manner and appearance; for, after they had all spoken, and as having yet to learn the real purpose of heaven, Jehoshaphat asked whether there was not yet a prophet of Jehovah. In consequence of this request Micaiah was mentioned by Ahab, but with the notification that he hated him, ‘for he doth not prophesy good concerning me, but evil’ (verse 8); which, in the circumstances, cannot be regarded otherwise than as a further proof of the essential difference between the actual position of this man and the others who assumed the name of prophets of the Lord.” The prophets unanimously gave a favorable response; and among them, Zedekiah, the son of Chenaanah, made horns of iron as a symbol, and announced, from Jehovah, that with those horns Ahab would push the Syrians till he consumed them. For some reason which is unexplained, and can now only be conjectured, Jehoshaphat was dissatisfied with the answer, and asked if there was no other prophet of Jehovah at Samaria? Ahab replied that there was yet one, Micaiah, the son of Imla; but, in words which obviously call to mind a passage in the *Iliad* (1:106), he added, “I hate him, for he does not prophesy good concerning me, but evil.” Micaiah was, nevertheless, sent. for; and after an attempt had in vain been made to tamper with him, he first expressed an ironical concurrence with the 400 prophets, and then openly foretold the defeat of Ahab’s army and the death of Ahab himself.

In opposition to the other prophets, he said that he had seen Jehovah sitting on his throne, and all the host of heaven standing by him, on his right hand and on his left: that Jehovah said, Who shall persuade Ahab to go up and fall at Ramoth-Gilead; that a spirit (the Heb. has the art. *the spirit*, as if some special emissary of evil) came forth and said that he would do so; and on being asked, Wherewith? he answered, that he would go forth and be a lying spirit in the mouth of all the prophets. Irritated by the account of this vision, Zedekiah struck Micaiah on the cheek, and Ahab ordered Micaiah to be taken to prison, and fed on bread and water, till his return to Samaria. Ahab then went up with his army to Ramoth-Gilead; and in the battle which ensued, Benhadad, who could not have failed to become acquainted with Micaiah's prophecy, uttered so publicly, which had even led to an act of public personal violence on the part of Zedekiah, gave special orders to direct the attack against Ahab, individually. Ahab, on the other hand, requested Jehoshaphat to wear his royal robes, which we know that the king of Judah had brought with him to Samaria (^{<1220>}1 Kings 22:10); and then he put himself into disguise for the battle; hoping thus, probably, to baffle the designs of Benhadad and the prediction of Micaiah; but he was, nevertheless, struck and mortally wounded in the combat by a random arrow. We hear nothing further of the prophet. Josephus dwells emphatically on the death of Ahab. as showing the utility of prophecy, and the impossibility of escaping destiny, even when it is revealed beforehand (*Ant.* 8:15, 6). He says that it steals on human souls, flattering them with cheerful hopes, till it leads them round to the point whence it will gain the mastery over them. This was a theme familiar to the Greeks in many tragic tales, and Josephus uses words in unison with their ideas. (See Euripides, *Hippolyt.* 1256, and compare Herodot. 7:17; 8:77; 1:91). From his interest in the story, Josephus relates several details not contained in the Bible, some of which are probable, while others are very unlikely; but for none of which does he give any authority. Thus. he says, Micaiah was already in prison when sent for to prophesy before Ahab and Jehoshaphat, and that it was Micaiah who had predicted death by a lion to the son of a prophet, under the circumstances mentioned in ^{<1225>}1 Kings 20:35, 36; and had rebuked Ahab after his brilliant victory over the Syrians for not putting Benhadad to death. There is no doubt that these facts would be not only consistent with the narrative in the Bible, but would throw additional light upon it; for the rebuke of Ahab in his hour of triumph, on account of his forbearance, was calculated to excite in him the intensest feeling of displeasure and mortification; and it would at once explain Ahab's hatred

of Micaiah, if Micaiah was the prophet by whom the rebuke was given. Nor is it unlikely that Ahab, in his resentment, might have caused Micaiah to be thrown into prison, just as the princes of Judah, about 300 years later, maltreated Jeremiah in the same way (^{<2475>}Jeremiah 37:15). But some other statements of Josephus 'cannot so readily be regarded as probable. Thus he relates that, when Ahab disguised himself, he gave his own royal robes to be worn by Jehoshaphat in the battle of Ramoth-Gilead, an act which would have been so unreasonable and cowardly in Ahab, and would have shown such singular complaisance in Jehoshaphat, that, although supported by the translation in the Septuagint, it cannot be received as true. The fact that some of the Syrian captains mistook Jehoshaphat for Ahab is fully explained by Jehoshaphat's being the only person in the army of Israel who wore royal robes. Again, Josephus informs us that Zedekiah alleged, as a reason for disregarding Micaiah's prediction, that it was directly at variance with the prophecy of Elijah, that dogs should lick the blood of Ahab, where dogs had licked the blood of Naboth, in the city of Samaria: inasmuch as Ramoth-Gilead, where, according to Micaiah, Ahab was to meet his doom, was distant from Samaria a journey of three days. It is unlikely, however, that Zedekiah would have founded an argument on Elijah's insulting prophecy, even to the meekest of kings who might have been the subject of it; but that, in order to prove himself in the right as against Micaiah, he should have ventured on such an allusion to a person of Ahab's character, is absolutely incredible. *SEE AHAB.*

It only remains to add, that the history of Micaiah offers several points of interest, among which the two following may be specified:

1. Micaiah's vision presents what may be regarded as transitional ideas of one origin of evil actions. In Exodus, Jehovah himself is represented as directly hardening Pharaoh's heart (^{<1008>}Exodus 7:3, 13; 14:4, 17; 10:20, 27). In the Book of Job, the name of Satan is mentioned; but he is admitted without rebuke, among the sons of God, into the presence of Jehovah (^{<1306>}Job 1:6-12). After the captivity, the idea of Satan, as an independent principle of evil, in direct opposition to goodness, becomes fully established (^{<1320>}1 Chronicles 21:1; and compare Wisd. 2:24). *SEE SATAN.* Now the ideas presented in the vision of Micaiah are different from each of these three, and occupy a place of their own. They do not go so far as the Book of Job much less so far as the ideas current after the captivity; but they go farther than Exodus.. See Ewald, *Poet. Bücher*, 3:65.

2. The history of Micaiah is an exemplification in practice of contradictory predictions being made by different prophets. Other striking instances occur in the time of Jeremiah (^{<2443>}Jeremiah 14:13,14; 28:15,16; 23:16, 25, 2-6). The only rule bearing on the judgment to be formed under such circumstances seems to have been a negative one, which would be mainly useful after the event. It is laid down in ^{<6182>}Deuteronomy 18:21, 22, where the question is asked, how the children of Israel *were to know* the word which Jehovah had not spoken? The solution is, that “if *the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which Jehovah has not spoken.*” *SEE PROPHET.*

Mice

SEE MOUSE.

Mi'cha

(for the Heb., etc., *see MICAIAH*), the name of three men.

- 1.** Ason of Mephibosheth (^{<3092>}2 Samuel 9:12); elsewhere (^{<3384>}1 Chronicles 8:34, 35) called MICAH *SEE MICAH* (q.v.).
- 2.** The son of Zabdi and father of Mattaniah, a Levite of the family of Asaph (^{<6117>}Nehemiah 11:17, 22); probably the same that-joined in the sacred covenant after the captivity (^{<6101>}Nehemiah 10:11). B.C. cir. 410. In ^{<3395>}1 Chronicles 9:15 his name is incorrectly Anglicized “Micah.” He must not be confounded with the Michaiah of ^{<6125>}Nehemiah 12:35.
- 3.** “A Simeonite, father of Ozias, one of the three governors of the city of Bethulia in the time of Judith (Judith 6:15). His name is remarkable as being connected with one of the few specific allusions to the ten tribes after the captivity.”

Mich'eeas

(Vulg. *id.*), an erroneous form (2 Esdr. 1:39) of the name of the prophet MICAH.

Mi'chael

(Heb. *Mikael*, **ἰακυμα** *who is like God?* Sept. and N.T. **Μιχαήλ**), the name of an archangel and of several men.

1. The title given in the angelology of the Jews adopted during the exile, to one of the chief angels, who, in ^{<27063>}Daniel 10:13-21; 12:1, is described as having special charge of the Israelites as a nation, and in Jude 9 as disputing with Satan about the body of Moses, in which dispute, instead of bringing against the archenemy any railing accusation, he only said, "The Lord rebuke thee, O Satan!" Again, in ^{<6217>}Revelation 12:7-9, Michael and his angels are represented as warring with Satan and his angels in the upper regions, from which the latter are cast down upon the earth. "This representation served not only to give that vividness to man's faith in God's supernatural agents, which was so much needed at a time of captivity, during the abeyance of his local manifestations and regular agencies, but also to mark the finite and ministerial nature of the angels, lest they should be worshipped in themselves. Accordingly, as Gabriel represents the ministration of the angels towards man, so Michael is the type and leader of their strife, in God's name and his strength, against the power of Satan. In the O.T. therefore he is the guardian of the Jewish people in their antagonism to godless power and heathenism. In the N.T. (see ^{<6217>}Revelation 12:7) he fights in heaven against the dragon that old serpent called the Devil and Satan, which deceiveth *the whole world*: and so takes part in that struggle which is the work of the Church on earth. The nature and method of his war against Satan are not explained, because the knowledge would be unnecessary and perhaps impossible to us: the fact itself is revealed rarely, and with that mysterious vagueness which hangs over all angelic ministrations, but yet with plainness and certainty." On the authority of the first of these texts the Jews have named Michael not only one of the "seven" archangels, but the chief of them (comp. the Targum on Cant. 8:9); and on the authority of all three the Christian Church has been disposed to concur in this impression (see J.D. Habermel, *Selecta de Mich. ejusque apparitionibus, gestis et cultu*, Helmst. 1758). The Jews regard the archangels as being such, not simply as a class by themselves, but as respectively the chiefs of the several classes into which they suppose the angels to be divided; and of these classes Michael is the head of the first, and therefore chief of all the archangels (*Sepher Othioth*, fol. 16). "The rabbinical traditions constantly oppose him to Sammael, the accuser and enemy of Israel, as disputing for the *soul of Moses*: as bringing the ram the substitute for Isaac, which Sammael sought to keep back, etc.: they give him the title of the 'great high-priest in heaven,' as well as that of the 'great prince and conqueror;' and finally lay it down that 'wherever Michael is said to have appeared, there the glory of the Shechinah is

intended.’ It is clear that the sounder among them, in making such use of the name, intended to personify the divine power, and typify the Messiah (see Schottgen, *Hor. Hebr.* 1:1079, 1119; 2:8,15, ed. Dresd. 1742).” Hengstenberg maintains at length (both in his *Christology* and his *Commentary on the Apocalypse*) that Michael is no other than the Lord Jesus Christ himself; but this is hardly in accordance with the mention of the other archangel, Gabriel, nor with the other theophanies of the O.T., in which the Logos appears only as the Angel [of] Jehovah, or the Angel of the Covenant. The passages in Daniel and Revelations must be taken as symbolical, and in that view offer little difficulty. In the former, one of the guardian angels of the Jews (probably Gabriel, ^{<302>}Daniel 9:21) exhibits himself as a protector, and as struggling with the prince of Persia for the liberation of the Jewish exiles. In the discharge of this duty, Michael, the chief guardian of the same people, comes to help him. The first angel promises to return (from his visit to Daniel) to renew the contest, and indicates his success by declaring that “the prince of Greece will come,” i.e., to overthrow the Persian empire. Here also Michael, in particular, is designated as the prince of the Jews. So in ^{<300>}Zechariah 1:8, 14, the guardian angel of the Jews exhibits his solicitude for them and his care over them. The same thing is again exhibited in ^{<300>}Zechariah 3:1, 2, where the angel of the Lord rebukes Satan on account of his malignant intentions towards the high-priest Joshua. So again in ^{<621>}Revelation 12:7, 9, Michael and his angels are represented as waging war with Satan and his angels. This passage stands connected with verse 5 of the context, which represents the Man-Child (Jesus) as caught up to the throne of God. The war waged would seem to have arisen from the efforts of Satan to annoy the ascending Saviour. Such appears to be the symbolic representation (see Stuart’s *Comment.* ad loc.). The allusion in Jude 9 is more difficult to understand, unless, with Vitranga, Lardner, Macknight, and others, we regard it also as symbolical; in which case the dispute referred to is that indicated in ^{<300>}Zechariah 3:1; and “the body of Moses” as a symbolical phrase for the Mosaical law and institutions, *see JUDE*, in accordance with the usual mode of speaking among Christians, who called the Church “the body of Christ” (^{<501>}Colossians 1:18, 24; ^{<515>}Romans 12:5). A comparison of Jude 9 with ^{<300>}Zechariah 1:8-14 gives much force and probability to this conjecture (see F.U. Wolter, *De Michaeli cuns diabolo litigante* [Rinteln, 1727-9]). According to others, “the body of Moses” here means his proper and literal body, which the Lord secretly buried (^{<634>}Deuteronomy 34:5, 6), and which Satan wished to present to the Jews

as an object of idolatry (comp. ^{<12804>}2 Kings 18:4). “The allusion seems to be to a Jewish legend attached to ^{<16346>}Deuteronomy 34:6. The Targum of Jonathan attributes the burial of Moses to the hands of the angels of God, and particularly of the archangel. Michael, as the guardian of Israel. Later traditions (see OEcumen. *in Jud.* cap. 1) set forth how Satan disputed the burial, claiming for himself the dead body because of the blood of the Egyptian (^{<11113>}Exodus 2:13) which was on Moses’s hands” (see Quistorp, *Num Michaelis de corpore Mosis disceptatio fabula sit?* [Gryph. 1770]).

Picture for Michael 1

Michael as a Saint in the Church of Rome. — This archangel is canonized in the Roman calendar, and his festival, called Michaelmas (q.v.), is ‘celebrated on the 29th of September., The legends preserved by Roman Catholics relate that Michael appeared to the Virgin Mary to announce to her the time of her death, and that he received her soul and bore it to Jesus. And again, that during the 6th century, when a fearful pestilence was raging in Rome, St. Gregory advised that a procession should be made, which should pass through the streets singing the service which since then has been called the Great Litanies. This was done for three days, and on the last day, when they came opposite to the tomb of Hadrian, Gregory beheld the archangel Michael hovering over the city; and he alighted on the top of the mausoleum and sheathed his sword, which was dripping with blood. Then the plague was stayed, and the tomb of Hadrian has been called the Castle of Sant’ Angelo from that day, and a chapel was there consecrated, the name of which was Ecclesia Sancti Angeli usque ad Ccelos. Michael is also said to have appeared to command the building of two churches (see Mrs. Clement, *Legendary and Mytholog. Art*, page 229). The first was on the eastern coast of Italy, and was called the church of Monte Galgano, which became a resort for numerous pilgrims. Again, in the reign of Childebert II, Michael appeared to Aubert, bishop of Avranches, and commanded that a church should be built on the summit of a rock in the Gulf of Avranches, in Normandy; and Mont-Saint-Michel became one of the most celebrated places of pilgrimage, as it is one of the most picturesque in scenery. From this time Michael was greatly venerated in the Church of Rome, especially in France. He was selected as patron saint of the country and of the order which Louis instituted in his honor.

Representations of the Archangel as a Saint. — “Michael is always represented as young and beautiful.

Picture for Michael 2

As patron of the Church Militant, he is ‘the winged saint,’ with no attribute save the shield and lance. As conqueror of Satan, he stands in armor, with his foot upon the Evil One, who is half human or like a dragon in shape. The angel is about to chain him, or to transfix him with the lance. But the treatment of this subject is varied in many ways, all, however, easily recognized. As lord of souls, St. Michael is unarmed; he holds a balance, and in each scale a little naked figure representing the souls; the *beato* usually joins the hands as in thankfulness, while the rejected one expresses horror in look and attitude. Frequently a daemon is seizing the falling scale with a Plutonic hook, or with his talons. In these pictures the saint is rarely without wings. When introduced in pictures of the Madonna and Child he presents the balance to Christ, who seems to welcome the happy soul. Whether with or without the balance, he is always the lord of souls in pictures of the death, assumption, or glorification of the Virgin Mary, for tradition teaches that he received her spirit, and cared for it until it was reunited to her body and ascended to her Son. The old English coin called an angel was so named because it bore the image of this archangel.”

On the subject generally, see Surenhusius, *Bibl. Katall.* page 701; Fabricius, *Pseudepigr.* 1:839 sq.; Wetstein, 1:649; 2:735; Hartmann, *Verbind.* p. 83; Eisenmenger, *Judenth.* 1:806 sq.; Thilo, *Apocryph.* 1:691; Trigland, *Dissert. theol.* page 198 sq.; Laurmann. *Collectan. in ep. Jud.* page 71 sq.; Seeland, in the *Brem. u. Verdensch. Biblioth.* 3:89 sq.; Braunl, *De Michale* (Altorf, 1726); — Hurenus, *De Michaele* (Vitemb. 1593), **SEE ANGEL; SEE MOSES.**

2. The father of Sethur, which latter was the Asherite commissioner to explore the land of Canaan (^{<1313>}Numbers 13:13). B.C. ante 1657.
3. One of the four sons of Izrahiah, the great-grandson of Issachar (^{<1318>}1 Chronicles 7:3). B.C. prob. post 1618. Possibly the same with No. 8.
4. One of the “sons” of Beriah, a son of Elpaal, of the tribe of Benjamin (^{<1316>}1 Chronicles 8:16). B.C. post 1612.
5. Achief Gadite resident in Bashan (^{<1313>}1 Chronicles 5:13), B.C. apparently post 1093. He was perhaps identical with the son of Jehishai and father of Gilead, some of the posterity of whose descendant Abihail are

mentioned as dwelling in the same region (^{<1364>}1 Chronicles 5:14). B.C. long ante 782.

6. One of the Manassite chiliarchs who joined David when he returned to Ziklag (^{<1320>}1 Chronicles 12:20). B.C. 1053.

7. The son of Baaseiah and father of Shimea, among the ancestors of the Levite Asaph (^{<1360>}1 Chronicles 6:40). B.i. considerably ante 1014.

8. The “father” of Omri, which latter was the phylarch of the tribe of Issachar under David and Solomon (^{<1378>}1 Chronicles 27:18). B.C. ante 1014.

9. One of the sons of king Jehoshaphat, whom he portioned before the settlement of the succession upon Jehoram, but whom the latter, nevertheless, out of jealousy, caused to be slain upon his own accession (^{<1202>}2 Chronicles 21:2). B.C. 887.

10. A “son” (prob. descendant) of Shephatiah, whose son Zebadiah returned with eighty males from Babylon (^{<1308>}Ezra 8:8). B.C. ante 459.

Michael, St., and all Angels, Feast of

This festival of the Latin and Greek churches, commemorating the ministry of the holy angels to the heirs of salvation, originated in some provincial festivals which were introduced between the 3d and 5th centuries, and which were then combined into one common celebration on the 29th of September by pope Felix III in 480 (Mansi, 14:73). Its observance was not enjoined upon the Greek Church before the 12th century (Guericke, *Kirchen-Gesch.* page 194 sq.). The Collect is taken from the Missal: “Deus, qui miro ordine angelorum ministeria hominumque dispensas; concede propitius ut a quibus tibi ministrantibus in coelo Semper assistitur, ab his in terra vita nostra muniatur. Per dominum” (*Missal Sar.* “In festo sancti Michaelis Archangeli,” fol. 206). See Procter, *Hist. Book of Common Prayer*, page 301.

Michael Alexandrinus

a noted patriarch of Alexandria, flourished near the middle of the 9th century. He was very active in behalf of a union of the Eastern and Western churches, and wrote, about A.D. 869, *De Unitate Ecclesii*

(printed in Labbe's *Concil.* volume 8, and in Hardouin, *Concil.* volume 5)
See Cave, *Hist. Lit.* ad an. 869; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graca*, 11:188.

Michael Anchilus

another distinguished Eastern ecclesiastic, patriarch of Constantinople from 1167 to 1185, was a decided opponent to the attempt at union of the Eastern and Western churches. He was also noted as an eminent disciple of Aristotelian philosophy. His extant works are five synodal decrees, published in Greek and Latin in the *Jus Gr. Rom.* (3:227), and a dialogue with the emperor Manuel Comnenus concerning the claims of the Roman pontiff. Of the latter work only some extracts have been published by Leo Allatius.

Michael Angelo Buonar(r)ot(t)I

an Italian artist, who, in an age when Christian art had reached its zenith, stood unrivalled as a painter, sculptor, poet, and architect, was born March 6, 1474, at the Castle of Caprese in Tuscany. He was of noble origin, having descended on his mother's side from the ancient family of Canossa, in Tuscany, while the Buonarotti had long been associated with places of trust in the Florentine republic. Michael Angelo was very early afforded the advantages of association with first-class artists, and this gave rise to the saying that "he sucked in sculpture with his milk." About 1488 he was admitted as a student into the seminary which was established by Lorenzo the Magnificent for the study of ancient art in connection with the collections of statuary in the Medicean Gardens, and there he attracted the notice of Lorenzo by his artistic skill, and was invited by that generous Florentine prince to take up his residence at the palace of the Medici. As an inmate of the palace, he enjoyed the society of eminent literary men, one of whom, Angelo Poliziano (Politian), became his intimate friend. Among his earliest works was a marble bas-relief, the subject of which was *The Battle of Hercules with the Centaurs*. This work, which was approved by his own mature judgment, is preserved in Florence. Lorenzo's death in 1492, and the temporary reverses which befell the Medici family in consequence of the incapacity of Lorenzo's successor, Pietro, led Michael Angelo to quit Florence for Bologna. There, however, he remained only about a year, and gladly enough turned his face towards Florence again. Michael now found a patron in the person of Pietro Soderini, the gonfaloniere (chief ruler) of Florence. About 1497 he produced an admirable marble group called a

“Pieth,” representing “The Virgin weeping over the Dead Body of her Son.” “In none of his works,” says Ernest Breton, “has he displayed more perfect knowledge of design and anatomy, or more profound truth of expression” (*Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.). This *Mater Dolorosa* now adorns a chapel in the Church of St. Peter at Rome. After this he executed a gigantic marble statue of the psalmist David, which stands in front of the Palazzo Vecchio, in Florence. He received 400 ducats for this work, on which he spent about eighteen months, and which he finished in 1504. Next in order of time, and, according to some of his contemporaries, first in merit, ranks his great cartoon for the ducal palace at Florence, which, together with the pendant executed by Leonardo da Vinci, has long since perished. This work, which represented a scene in the wars with Pisa, when a number of young Florentines, while bathing in the Arno, are surprised by an attack of the Pisans, showed so marvellous a knowledge of the anatomical development of the human figure, and such extraordinary facility in the powers of execution, that it became a study for artists of every land, creating actually a new era in art. “Such was the excellence of this work,” says Vasari, “that some thought it absolute perfection.”

Another production which belongs to this period, and which is of special interest to the student of Christian art, is an oil-painting of the *Holy Family* (about 1504). Shortly after his accession to the pontificate, Julius II called Michael Angelo to Rome, and commissioned him to make the pope’s monument, which was to be erected within St. Peter’s. Although this work was never completed on the colossal scale on which it had been designed, and was ultimately erected in the Church of St. Pietro ad Vincolo, it is a magnificent composition, and is memorable for having given occasion to the reconstruction of St. Peter’s on its present sublime plan, in order the better to adapt it to the colossal dimensions of the proposed monument. In 1506 Michael Angelo, incensed by the indifference of the pontiff towards him, quitted Rome; but after a short time the repeated and urgent entreaties of Julius led him to return, and at the pope’s request he now painted with his own hand the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel, and, although unwillingly, he began in 1508, and completed within less than two years his colossal task, which proved one of the most marvelous of his works. The subjects of these cartoons are taken from the book of Genesis, but between these and the representations of the persons of the Savior’s genealogy are colossal figures of prophets and sibyls.

Julius II died in 1513, and was succeeded by Leo X, who, together with successive popes, is censured for illiberal conduct towards Michael Angelo. Leo ordered him to build the façade of the Church of San Lorenzo, at Florence, and compelled him, against his will, to spend several years in procuring marble for that purpose. "It is a mortifying reflection," says Duppa, "that the talents of this great man should have been buried and his time consumed, during the whole reign of Leo X, in little else than in raising stone out of a quarry and making a road to convey it to the sea" (*Life of M. Angelo*). Under the patronage of Clement VII (1523), Michael Angelo devoted himself to the library and sacristy of San Lorenzo, at Florence, and in 1528 or 1529 he spent his time at Florence in the erection of fortifications to resist the attempts of the expelled Medici to recover possession. He also fought in the defence of that city against the papal troops. On the surrender of Florence he returned to Rome, and after the accession of pope Paul III, in 1534, was permitted to resume the monument of Julius II, which he completed on a smaller scale than he had first designed. It consists of seven statues, one of which represents Moses, and was placed in the Church of San Pietro ad Vincolo. This statue of Moses is called one of his masterpieces. Another great production of this period is his great picture of *the Last Judgment*, painted for the altar of the Sistine Chapel. This colossal fresco, nearly 70 feet in height, which was completed in 1541, after some eight years of close confinement, was regarded by contemporary critics as having surpassed all his other works for the unparalleled powers of invention and the consummate knowledge of the human figure which it displayed. On a comparison with Raphael it loses, however, much of its value, for, as has been truly said, "one will seek in vain for that celestial light and divine inspiration which appears in the Transfiguration." After its completion, Michael Angelo devoted himself to the perfecting of St. Peter's, which by the touch of his genius was converted from a mere Saracenic hall into the most superb model of a Christian church. He refused all remuneration for this labor, which he regarded as a service to the glory of God. He never married; and upon his death in 1563, at Rome, his remains were removed to Florence, and laid within the Church of Santa Croce. His piety, benevolence, and liberality made him generally beloved; and in the history of art no name shines with a more unsullied lustre than that of Michael Angelo. "He was the bright luminary," says Sir Joshua Reynolds, "from whom painting has borrowed a new lustre, under whose hands it assumed a new appearance and became another and superior art, and from whom all his contemporaries and

successors have derived whatever they have possessed of the dignified and majestic" (*Discourses on Painting*, volume 2). Always a student, always dissatisfied with what he had done, many of his works were left unfinished; but his fragments have educated eminent men. In disposition he was proud and passionate, but highminded; not greedy of gold, but princely in his generosity. His mind was full of great conceptions, for which he was ready to sacrifice and forego physical comforts. Of his merits as an artist, it is enough to say that Raphael thanked God that he was born in the time of Michael Angelo Buonarrotti. Comparing him with Raphael, Quatremere de Quincy marks Michael Angelo as "the greatest of draughtsmen." "In painting," says Duppa, "the great work on which Michael Angelo's fame depends, and, taking it for all in all, the greatest work of his whole life, is the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel... His sibyls and prophets exhibit with variety and energy the colossal powers of his mind... In his great works, his superior abilities are shown in the sublimity of his conceptions, and the power and facility with which they are executed." See Condivi, *Vita di Michael Angelo Buonarrotti* (Rome, 1553; new ed. Pisa, 1823); Vignali, *Vita di Michael Angelo* (1753); Richard Duppa, *Life of Michael Angelo* (London, 1806); Hauchecorne, *Vie de Michel-Ange*; Quatremere de Quincy, *Vie de Michel Ange* (1835); J.S. Harford *Life of Michael Angelo* (1856-7, 2 volumes, 8vo); Hermann Grimm, *Michael Angelo's Leben*, and English version of the same (London, 1865, 2 volumes,); Vasari, *Lives of Painters and Sculptors*; Lanzi, *Storia della Pittura*; Winckelmann, *Neues Maler-Lexikon*, s.v.; Nagler, *Künstler-Lexikon*, s.v.; Marie Henri Bavlé, *Histoire de la Peinture en Italie*, Pater, *Studies in the History of the Renaissance* (Lond. and N.Y., Macmillan & Co., 1873, 8vo), chapter 5, contains an interesting essay on the poetry of *Michael Angelo*.

Michael Apostolius

an eminent Greek scholar, who contributed largely to the revival of learning in Italy, flourished in the 15th century. He was an intimate friend of Gemistus Pletho, and an adherent of the Platonic philosophy, two circumstances which, together with his own merits, caused him to be well received by cardinal Bessarion in Italy, where he settled about 1440. Later in life Michael retired to Candia, where he got a livelihood by teaching children and copying manuscripts. There he died, some time after 1457, for in that year he wrote a panegyric on the emperor Frederick III. His principal works are, a defence of Plato against Theodore Gaza, extant in MS. in the Vienna library: — *Menexenus*, a dialogue on the Holy Trinity,

investigating whether the Mohammedans and Jews are right in believing a Mono-Deus; or the Christians, in believing a Deus Trinus; extant in MS., *ibid.* — *Oratio consultoria ad Socerum sibi irascendum cum, ad secundas transiret nuptias*, extant in the Bodleian: *Appellatio ad Constantinum Palaeologum ultimum Imperatorum: Oratio ad Ioannem Argyropulum: — Epistolae XLV*; these letters are extremely important for the history of the writer's time, as Lambecius asserts, who perused all or most of them, and it is to be regretted that none of them are printed. The first is addressed to Gemistus, the others to Manuel Chrysolaras, Chalcocondylas, Argyropulus, Bessarion, and other celebrated men of the time. They are extant in MS. in the Bodleian; some of them are also to be found in the Vatican and at Munich: — *Oratio Panegyrica ad Fredericum III*, written about or perhaps in 1457; it was published in Greek and Latin by Freherus in the second volume of his *Rerum German. Script.*: — *Oratio Funebris in Laudem Bessarionis*, does credit to the heart of Michael for it seems that the cardinal had not behaved very generously towards the poor scholar. Still it is very questionable whether our Michael is the author of it; Bessarion died in 1472, and as Michael, previously to leaving Constantinople, in or before 1440, had enjoyed, during many years, the friendship of Gemistus, whose name became conspicuous in the very beginning of the 15th century, and who was a very old man in 1441, he must have attained a very great age if he survived *Bessarion*: — *Disceptatio adversus eos qui Occidentales Orientalibus superiores se contendebant*, extant in MS. in the Bodleian: — *De Figuris Grammaticis*, which Leo Allatius esteemed so highly that he intended to publish it, but was unfortunately prevented: — *An Etymological Dictionary*; doubtful whether still extant; a work of great importance: — **Ἴωνία**, *Violets*, a pleasing title given to a collection of sentences of celebrated persons. Arsenims. of Malvasia, made an extract of it (**Ἀποφθέγματα** Rome, 8vo), which he dedicated to pope Leo X, who reigned from 1513 to 1522: — **Συναγωγή Παροιμιῶν**, containing 2027 Greek proverbs, a very remarkable little work, which soon attracted the notice of the lovers of Greek literature; it was dedicated by the author to Casparus Uxama, or Osmi, a Spanish prelate, whom Michael met at Rome. Editions: the Greek text by Hervagius (Basle, 1558, 8vo); the text, with a Latin version and valuable notes, by P. Pantinus and A. Scholl, (Leyd. 1619, 4to); also cum Clavi Homerica, by George Perkins. See Cave, *Hist. Lit.* ad an. 1440; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* 11:189; Smith, *Dict. Greek and Rom. Biog. and Mythol.* s.v.

Michael Balsamon

a noted Eastern ecclesiastic flourished in the latter half of the 15th century. He is supposed to have been a native of Constantinople, where he always lived. He was one of the Greek deputies sent in 1438 to the Council of Florence, discovered the secret intrigues of the Latins, and prognosticated the ultimate fate of the union of the two churches, to which he subscribed reluctantly. He wrote and addressed to the emperor Joannes Palaeologus *Anaphora Cleri Constantinopolitani*, of which Leo Allatius gives a few fragments in his work *De Consensu utriusque Ecclesiae*. See Cave, *Hist. Lit.* ad an. 1440; Fabricius, *Bibl. Græca*, 10:373, note.

Michael Bradacius

the first Moravian bishop, flourished originally as a Hussite priest at Zamberg, in the eastern part of Bohemia, about the middle of the 15th century. In 1467, when the Moravian Brethren (q.v.) separated from the National Church, and instituted a ministry of their own, Michael, who had in the mean time joined the Moravian Brethren, was sent, together with two other priests, to a Waldensian colony on the frontiers of Bohemia and Austria, in order to secure the episcopacy. These Waldenses were on friendly terms with the Calixtines, and openly fraternized with them at the mass. John Rokyzan, the Calixtine leader, who had ambitious projects with regard to the archiepiscopal chair at Prague, which had long been vacant, hoped to win the support of the Waldenses. Hence, when their ministry had become extinct, he induced bishop Philibert, who had come to Prague as a delegate of the Council of Basle, to ordain two members of the Waldensian colony, Frederick Nemez and John Wlach, as priests, on the 14th of September, 1433. In the summer of the following year (1434) — when the Taborites had been defeated by the Calixtines; when the utmost confusion prevailed throughout Bohemia in Church and State; when an open feud was raging between the council and the pope; when, however, the former did everything in its power to conciliate the Bohemians — these two Waldensian priests were consecrated bishops at Basle by bishops of the Roman Catholic Church. This act was meant as an example and encouragement for the Bohemians, that they might be the more ready to accept the compactata of the council. Nemez and Wlach consecrated other bishops, of whom two were living in 1467, the name of the senior being Stephen. He and his associate consecrated Michael Bradacius and his two companions, who thus became the first bishops of the Bohemian Brethren.

A Church council was organized, of which Michael Bradacius was constituted the president. After a time he resigned the presidency in favor of Matthias of Kunwalde (q.v.), but remained in the council. He died at Reichenau in 1501. Zezschwitz in his article *Lukas v. Prag*, in Herzog's *Real-Encykl.* volume 20 calls in question the authenticity of the above narrative, but fails to make good his doubts. He is misled by preconceived notions against the Moravian episcopacy, as his article plainly shows. The transfer of the Waldensian episcopate to the Brethren is established by a number of documents, whose dates range from 1476 to 1600, in the "Lissa Folios," at Herrnhut, *see MORAVIAN BRETHERN, THE ANCIENT*; by the official report (1478) of Wenzel Koranda, the administrator of the Utraquist Consistory at Prague (Palacky's *Geschichte v. Bohmen*, 1:191, 192); and by the earliest histories of Blahoslav, Lasitius, Regenvolscius, and Comenius; while the origin of the Waldensian episcopacy is set forth in the official answers with which the Brethren met the attacks of the learned Jesuit, Wenzel Sturm, in the reign of Maximilian I. These answers were written by the assistant bishop Jaffet, and are preserved in the archives at Herrnhut. The validity of the episcopate of the Brethren was not doubted either by the Roman Catholic or by the National Church, and the fact that they had secretly secured it from the Waldenses brought about a severe persecution immediately after the truth became known (1468). Compare Benham's *Origin and Episcopate of the Boh. Breth.* (Lond. 1867); Schweinitz's *Moravian Episcopate* (Bethlehem, 1865); Palacky's *Geschichte v. Bohmen*, 7:492; Gindely's *Geschichte d. B.B.* 1:37; Czerwenka's *Persekutionsbuchlein* (Gutersloh, 1869), c. 20, n. 31; Croger's *Gesch. d. Alten Bruderkirae* (Gnadan, 1865), volume 1. (E. de S.)

Michael Cerularius

a noted Eastern ecclesiastic, flourished as patriarch of Constantinople near the middle of the 11th century. He gained great notoriety mainly by his violent attacks upon the Latin Church. He caused so much scandal that pope Leo IX sent cardinals Humbert and Frederick, with Peter, archbishop of Amalfi, to Constantinople in order to persuade Cerularius to a more moderate conduct. Their efforts were not only unsuccessful, but they were treated with such abuse that Humbert excommunicated the virulent patriarch. Cerularius in his turn excommunicated the three legates, and he caused the name of pope Leo IX to be erased from the diptychs. In 1057 he prevailed upon the emperor Michael Stratoticus to yield to his

successful rival, Isaac Comnenus, whose interest he took care of for some time. Differences however, soon broke out between them; and when he was once quarrelling with Isaac about the respective authority of the Church and the State, he impudently cried out, "I have given you the crown, and I know how to take it from you again." Banishment was his due reward, and Isaac was about to remove him from his see when death removed him from the earth (1058). Cerularius wrote: *Decisio Synodica de Nuptiis in Septino Gradu*: — *De Matrimonio prohibito* (the former printed, Greek and Latin, in the third book, and fragments of the latter in the fourth book of Leunclavius, *Jus Graeco-Roman.*): — *Epistole II ad Petrum Antiochenum* (Greek and Latin, in the second vol. of Cotelerius, *Eccles. Graec. Monument.*): — *De Sacerdotis Uxore Adulterio polluta* (in Cotelerius, *Patres Apostol.*): — **Σημείωμα**, s. *Edictum Synodale adversus Latinos de Pittacia, seu De Excommunicatione a Latinis Legatis in ipsum ab ipso in Legatos vibrata, anno 1054, die septimo Junii factum* (Graece et Latine, in Leo Allatius, *De Libr. Eccles. Graecis*): — *Homilia* (ed. Graece et Latine, by Montfaucon, under the title *Epistola Synodi Nicaeanae ad Sanctam Alexandricam Ecclesiam* [Paris, 1715, fol.]). There are, farther, extant in MS. fragments of several letters, as *Contra Rebelles Abbates, Contra Armenios. De Homicidio facto in Ecclesia, De Episcoporum Judiciis*, etc. See Cave, *Hist Lit.* ad an. 1043; Fabricius, *Bibl. Graec.* 11:195, 196.

Michael Glycas

a noted ecclesiastical historian of the Greek Church of the 12th century (some place him as late as the 15th), was a native of Sicily, and flourished about A.D. 1120. His most important production, the *Annales Quadripartiti*, is a work not only historical, but also philosophical and theological. Part I describes the creation of the world in six days; Part II extends from the creation to the birth of Christ; Part III to Constantine the Great; and Part IV to the death of Alexius Comnenus, A.D. 1118. It was published in Gr. and Lat., with notes, by Labbe (Paris, 1660, fol.). Glycas also wrote *Disputationculae II*, and likewise many epistles, of which fragments are preserved.

Michael Monachus

a theologian of the Church of the East, flourished as presbyter at Constantinople probably towards the close of the 9th century. He is noted

as the author of *Encomium Ignatii Patriarchae* (who died in 877), edited, Greek and Latin, in a very mutilated form, by Raderus in his *Acta Concilii* (Ingolstadt, 1604, 4to), also in the eighth volume of the *Concilia*: — *Encomium in Angelicorum — Ordinum Ductores, Michaellem et Gabrielem*: — *Encomium in glorisum Christi Apostolum Philippum*: — Perhaps *Vita et Miracula S'ti Nicolai*: — *Vita Theodori Studite*, of which Baronius gives some fragments in his *Annales* ad an. 795 and 826. The complete text, with a Latin translation, was published by Jacobus de la Baune in the fifth volume of *Opera Sirmondi* (Paris, 1696, fol.). The life of Theodore Studita, as well as one or two of the other productions, was perhaps written by another Michael Monachus, a contemporary and survivor of Studita, who died as early as 826. The author of this life was a very incompetent writer. Cave, *Hist. Lit.*; ad an. 876; Fabricius, *Biblioth. Graec.* 9:505.

Michael Psellus, Jr.

a noted Greek philosopher and teacher, flourished at Constantinople from 1026 to 1105, as teacher of theology and philosophy. He is noted as the writer of *Διδασκαλία παντοδαπή* in Fabricius, *Biblioth. Graeca* (volume 10): — *Περὶ δυνάμεων τῆς ψυχῆς*, edited by Tarin (Par. 1618 sq.): — a Paraphrase of Aristotle's *Περὶ ἑρμηνεαίς* (Ven. 1503): — Synopsis of Aristotle's *Organon*, edited by Ehlinger (Augsb. 1597): — Commentary on Aristotle's *Natural Philosophy*, in Lat. by Camotius (Ven. 1554): — *Περὶ τῶν πέντε φωνῶν* of Porphyrius (Basle, 1542): — *Περὶ ἐνεργείας δαιμόνων*,. edited by Gaulinenus (Paris, 1615). See Leo Allatius, *De Psellis eorumque scriptis* (Rome, 1634); Ueberweg, *Hist. Philos.* 1:404; Enfield, *Hist. Philos.* page 474.

Michael Scotus

a learned author of the 13th century, was born at Durham, England; or, as some assert, at Balweary, Scotland. He attended lectures at Oxford, and afterwards at Paris, and devoted himself to the study of mathematics and Oriental languages. Emperor Frederick II, who reigned at that time in Germany, was the most prominent protector of art and sciences, and Michael went to his court, studying medicine and chemistry. After a stay of several years in Germany, he returned to England, where he became a great favorite of king Edward II. He died in 1291, at a very advanced age. Michael Scotus was celebrated on account of his knowledge in secret arts

and magic (comp. Dante, *Inferno*, 20:115-118). It is said that his books on magic were buried with him. He was also actively engaged in the translation of Aristotle, which was made by command of emperor Frederick II, and was afterwards printed at Venice in 1496: *Aristotelis opera Latine versa, partime Graeco, partime Arabico, per vios lectos et in utriusque linguae prolatione peritos, jussu imperatoris Fridirici II.* He probably translated the natural philosophy of Aristotle from the Arabic version of Avicenna. Michael is the author of *De secretis naturae, sive de procreatione hominis et physiognomia*, and of the *Quaestio curiosa de natura solis et lunae,*” i.e., of gold and silver. He has also been considered the author of *Mensa philosophica seu enchiridion, in quo de quaestionibus mensalibus et variis ac jucundis hominum congressibus agitur*, which has been printed several times. This latter work, however, has been attributed, by some at least, to Theobald Anguilbertus, a learned Irishman, who lived about the year 1500 as doctor of medicine and philosophy at Paris. See Tennemann, *Manual list. Philos.* page 223; Wetzer u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, s.v.

Michael VIII

surnamed PALAEOLOGUS (ὁ Παλαιολόγος), emperor of Nicaea, and afterwards of Constantinople, from A.D. 1260 to 1282, the restorer of the Greek empire, and the laborer for the “unity of the Church,” was born of noble parentage in 1234. At an early age he rose to eminence, which he owed more to his uncommon talents than to his illustrious birth. He was in great favor with the emperor Theodore (II) Lascaris. This sovereign died in August 1259, leaving a son, John III, who was only nine years old, and over whom he had placed the patriarch Arsenius, and the magnus domesticus Muzalon, as guardians. Michael, the friend of the soldiers, was determined to secure for himself the place of Muzalon, who was despatched by the imperial guard, and Michael Palaeologus, whom Theodore shortly before his decease had appointed magnus dux, was chosen as guardian instead, and soon afterwards received or gave himself the title and power of despot. Next he made himself master of the imperial treasury, bribed or gained the Varangian guard and the clergy, and secured his proclamation as emperor at Magnesia. Michael and the boy John were crowned together at Nicaea, on the 1st of January, 1260. While the event was hailed with satisfaction at home, it failed to secure friends abroad. The Latins, especially, were dissatisfied; assumed a haughty tone towards Michael, and demanded the cession of those parts of Thrace and

Macedonia which belonged to Nicaea, as a condition of acknowledging him as emperor. But Michael treated the Latin ambassadors with ridicule, and, in answer, took prompt measures for driving the Latins out of Constantinople; and, before the end of the year 1260, Baldwin II was shut up within his capital. Michael, however, was not strong enough to reduce the city, and was obliged to convert the siege into a blockade; until one day, one Curtrizacus, the commander of a body of volunteer auxiliaries, was informed of the existence of a subterranean passage leading from a place outside the walls into the cellar of a house within them, and which seemed not to be generally known. Upon the strength of this information, a plan was formed for the surprise of the garrison by means of the passage, and, after concerting measures with the commander-in-chief, he ventured with fifty men through the passage into the city. His plan succeeded completely. No sooner was he within than he took possession of the nearest gate, disarmed the post, opened it, and the main body of the Greeks rushed in. The stratagem was executed in the dead of night. The inhabitants, roused from their slumber, soon learned the cause of the noise, and kept quiet within their houses, or joined their daring countrymen. The Latins, dispersed in various quarters, were seized with a panic, and fled in all directions, while the emperor Baldwin had scarcely time to leave his palace and escape on board of a Venetian galley, which carried him immediately to Italy. On the morning of the 25th of July, 1261, Constantinople was in the undisputed possession of the Greeks, after it had borne the yoke of the Latins during fifty-seven years, three months, and thirteen days.

Michael, informed of the success of his arms, lost no time in repairing to Constantinople; and on the 14th of August held his triumphal entrance, saluted by the people with demonstrations of the sincerest joy. Constantinople, however, was no more what it had been. During the reign of the Latins plunder, rapine, and devastation had spoiled it of its former splendor; trade had deserted its harbor, and thousands of opulent families had abandoned the palaces or mansions of their forefathers in order to avoid contact with the hated foreigners. To restore, repeople, and readorn Constantinople was now Michael's principal task; and, in order to accomplish his purpose the better, he confirmed the extensive privileges which the Venetian, the Genoese, and the Pisan merchants had received from the Latin emperors. Although the Nicaean emperors considered themselves the legitimate successors of Constantine the Great, the

possession of Constantinople was an event of such magnitude as to suggest to Michael the idea of a new coronation, which was accordingly solemnized in the cathedral of St. Sophia. But Michael was crowned alone, without John — an evil omen for the friends of the young emperor, whose fears were but too soon realized, for on Christmas-day of the same year, 1261, John was deprived of sight and sent into exile to a distant fortress. This hateful crime caused a general indignation among the people, and might have proved the ruin of Michael had he been a man of a less energetic turn of mind. The patriarch Arsenius, coguardian to John, was irreconcilable; he fearlessly pronounced excommunication upon the imperial criminal, and years of trouble and commotion elapsed before Michael was readmitted into the communion of the faithful by the second successor of Arsenius, the patriarch Joseph.

The loss of Constantinople pope Urban IV regarded as robbing him of the hope of effecting a union between the Latin and the Greek churches, and he therefore urged the European princes to undertake a crusade against the Greek schismatics; but Michael avoided the danger by promising the pope to do his utmost in order to effect himself a mediation between the belligerents, and, as both the parties were tired of bloodshed, peace was soon restored (1263). In 1265 Arsenius was deposed, because he would not revoke the excommunication he had pronounced against the emperor; whereupon the prelate's adherents, the Arsenites, caused a schism which lasted till 1312. *SEE ARSENIUS*. In this skilful manner he also avoided troubles which threatened him in 1269, when Charles, king of Sicily, took up arms on pretence of restoring the fugitive Baldwin to the throne, and forthwith marching upon Constantinople, placed the capital in jeopardy. Michael, afraid that these hostilities were only the forerunners of a general crusade of all the Latin princes against him, made prompt proposals for a union of the Greek Church with that of Rome. The learned Veccus, accompanied by several of the most distinguished among the Greek clergy, were sent to the council which was called to assemble at Lyons in 1274; and there the union was effected by the Greeks giving way in the much disputed doctrine of the procession of the Holy Ghost, and submitting to the supremacy of the pope. *SEE LYONS, II*. The union, however, was desired only by a minority of the Greeks, and the orthodox majority accordingly did their utmost to prevent the measure from being carried out. Michael, in his turn, supported his policy with force. The patriarch Joseph was deposed, and Veccus appointed in his stead; cruel punishment was

inflicted upon all those who opposed the union; and Greece was shaken by a religious commotion which forms a remarkable event in the ecclesiastical history of the East. As space forbids us to dwell here longer upon these important transactions, we can only remark that the union was never effectually carried out, and was entirely abandoned upon the death of Michael. *SEE FILIOQUE; SEE GREEK CHURCH.*

The manifest duplicity and the cruelty with which the emperor behaved finally made him odious to his own subjects and contemptible to his Latin friends, and the latter part of his reign was an uninterrupted series of domestic troubles and foreign wars. His dearly-bought friendship with the Latin, and especially the Italian powers, was brought to a very speedy end. Upon the decease of the ex-emperor Baldwin, his son Philip assumed the imperial title, and formed an alliance between pope Martin IV, Charles of Anjou, king of Sicily, and the Venetians, with a view of reconquering Constantinople and dividing the Greek empire. But the invaders failed, and Michael, not satisfied with the glory of his arms and the material benefit he derived from his victory, resolved to take terrible revenge: he paid twenty thousand ounces of gold towards equipping a Catalan fleet, with which king Peter of Aragon was to attack Sicily; and the "Sicilian Vespers," in which eight thousand Frenchmen were massacred, and in consequence of which Sicily was wrested from Charles of Anjou and united with Aragon, were in some degree the work of Michael's fury. In the autumn of 1282 he fell ill, and died December 11, 1282, leaving the renown of a successful but treacherous tyrant. See Niceph. Gregor. lib. 4-5; Acropol. c. 76, etc.; Phranz. lib. 1; Pachymeres, *Histaria Rerum a Michaele Palkeologa gestarum* (1666); Neale, *Hist. of the East. Ch. 2:311 sq.*; Hase, *Ch. Hist.* pages 269, 354 sq.; Schrockh, *Kirchengeschichte*, 28:315 sq.; Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* 3:232, 413; Ffoulkes, *Divisions in Christendom*, volume 1; Neander, *Ch. Hist.* 8:264; Hardwick, *Ch. Hist. of the Middle Ages*, pages 279-282; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, volume 4; Smith, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Biogr.* s.v.

Michaelensi, Jean

a Swiss theologian of the 12th century, the date of whose birth and death are unknown, figured as a bishop of Lausanne in 1166. We know so little of his life that we cannot say whether this same Michaelensi was the one that assisted at the Council of Troyes in 1128, and who was commissioned to draw up a body of rules for the Temple order. These rules have often

been reprinted, but appeared for the first time in the *Chronique de Citeaux*, by Aubert Lemire. They have also been attributed to Saint Bernard, but without foundation. See, for the scanty information accessible, Fleury, *Hist. Eccles.* liv. 67, n. 55; Mabillon, *Op. S. Bernarde*, 1:571; *Hist. Litter. de la France*, 11:66; Ruchat, *Abrgey de l'Histoire Eccles. du pays de Vaud.* page 75.

Michaelis is the name of a German family distinguished in the Protestant theological world. The following are the most eminent members of this family:

1. CHRISTIAN BENEDIKT was born at Elrich, in Hohnstein, January 26, 1680. He was educated at Halle, and in 1713 was made a professor extraordinary of philosophy, and in 1731 ordinary professor of theology at his alma mater. In 1738 he was transferred to the departments of Greek and Oriental literature. He died February 22, 1764. He was not a very prolific writer, but his few productions display unusual talent and ripe scholarship. He was a thorough master of the Biblical languages, particularly the Hebrew. His principal works are,

(1.) *On Hebrew Grammar and Philology: — Dissertatio, qua solcecismus casuum ab Ebraismo S. Codicis depellitur* (Halle, 1729): — *Dissert. qua solcecismus generis a Syntaxi S. Codicis Ebraici depellitur* (Halle, 1739): a treatise against the etymological hypothesis, defended by Hermann Hardt and others, that Hebrew and the cognate tongues were derived from Greek (Halle, 1726): — a treatise on the Hebrew points, in which he took the side of Capellus (Halle, 1739): — a dissertation on *Scripture Paronomasia* (Halle, 1737): — a disputation on *Hebrew Ellipses* (Halle, 1724).

(2.) *On Biblical Exegesis: De Herba Borith* (Halle, 1728): — *De Idumaea et ejus Antiq. Historia* (Halle, 1733): — *Philologemata Medica* (in which he discusses certain points of the *ars medica* of the Bible): — *Observationes philologiae de nominibus propriis Ebrceis*, a work which was a worthy predecessor of Simon's *Onomasticon V.T.*: — *Dissertatio philologica de antiquitatibus inconomice patriarchalis* (reprinted in Ugolino, *Thesaur.* 24:323). In the year 1749 he published *Tractatus criticus de variis lectionibus N.T. caute colligendis et dijudicandis*, an elaborate treatise on the various readings of the Greek Testament, exhibiting proofs of an accurate critical judgment. It gives some account of the MSS. known in his day, both Greek and Latin; of the ancient versions, and of the patristic quotations. We must not omit to mention his

cooperation with his uncle, *Johann Heinrich Michaelis* (q.v.), in the valuable commentary on the *Hagiographa*. Our author contributed the annotations on the Proverbs, Lamentations, and Dafiël. He was also associated with J.H. Michaelis in a commentary on the first two of the greater prophets. Simultaneously with the work of the latter on Isaiah, noticed above, appeared C.B. Michaelis's treatise, *De Jeremia et de Vaticinio ejus* (Halle, 1712). In the year 1736 he published a short work, *De vaticinio Amosiprophetæ*. See Kitto, *Cyclop. Bibl. Lit.* s.v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopædie*, s.v.

2. JOHANN DAVID, one of the ablest of Germany's theologians, and son of the preceding, was born at Halle February 27, 1717. After receiving instruction for some time from private tutors, Michaelis spent four years in the Orphan School at Halle, where his attention was particularly directed to languages and philosophy. In 1733 he began to attend the lectures at the university, and it was here that he obtained from the chancellor Ludwig's lectures on German history the foundation of that knowledge of general law and of the constitution of society which was afterwards displayed in his *Mosaisches Recht*. (See below.) In 1740 he visited England, where he made the acquaintance of several eminent scholars both in London and in Oxford. During part of his residence in England he preached in the German chapel at St. James's Palace. On his return to Germany, he devoted himself to the study of history, Oriental languages, and Biblical criticism. Upon the death of the chancellor Ludwig, Michaelis was commissioned to arrange and catalogue his immense library. The catalogue was published in 1745, and is considered a model for such works. Michaelis published his first book in 1739. It was a *Dissertatio de Punctuorum Hebr. Antiquitate*, and was quite ultra-orthodox, written in the Buxtorfian manner. But later he appears to have joined the school of Schultens, if we may judge by the Hebrew Grammar he published in 1745. The pietistic air of Halle finally led him to accept the proffered position at Gottingen, and he removed to that place in 1746, and there he spent the rest of his life, although he was invited by Frederick the Great in 1763 to return to Prussia. To the University of Gottingen Michaelis rendered the most important services as professor of theology 'and Oriental literature from 1745 to 1791; as secretary and director of the Royal Society of Sciences, from 1751 to 1770, when he left it on account of some differences with the members; as editor of the journal entitled *Gelehrte Anzeigen*, from 1753 to 1770; and as librarian and director of the philological seminary, which would have been

abandoned after the death of Gesner in 1761 if Michaelis had not consented to direct it gratuitously.

In order to throw new light upon Biblical science, Michaelis planned the expedition to Arabia and India which was conducted by Carsten Niebuhr. The first project of this enterprise was submitted in the year 1756 to baron Von Bernstorff, then minister of Frederick V, king of Denmark. The course of the travellers was directed mainly by Michaelis, who drew up a series of questions for their guidance. These questions discuss the most interesting points of Biblical science — sacred geography, Oriental habits and customs, natural productions mentioned in the Bible, and diseases which still affect men in the East as they did of old. “The perspicuity, and precision, and learning with which our author proposes the questions, and the information in answer, to them obtained by Niebuhr and Forskal (as embodied in the *Voyage en Arabie* and *Description de l’Arabie* of the former, and in the *Descriptiones Animalium*, etc., of the latter), strikingly illustrate the sagacity of Michaelis; and the literary results of the expedition, though short of the exaggerated expectations of the time, have, in the shape of five quarto volumes, been permanently beneficial to Biblical science. In 1775 Michaelis was made a knight of the Polar Star by the king of Sweden; in 1786 he was appointed an Aulic counsellor of Hanover, and in 1789 he was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society of London. He was also a member of the Academy of Inscriptions, Paris. He died August 22, 1791.

The works of Michaelis are very numerous; the following are some of the most important. In Oriental literature, grammars of Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, and Arabic, and treatises on various subjects connected with these languages: *Orientalische und Exegetische Bibliothek* (a valuable periodical commenced by Michaelis in 1771, and of which he conducted 24 vols.): — *Supplementa in Lexica Hebraica* (6 parts in 2 volumes, 4to — useful, not more for the language illustrated, than for the information afforded on Biblical geography, archaeology, and natural history. In philosophy: an essay *On the Influence of Opinions on Language, and of Language on Opinions*, which obtained a prize from the Prussian Academy of Sciences in 1759; a treatise on *moral philosophy*, and other works. In history, geography, and chronology: *Spicilegium Geographiae Hebraeorum exterarum post Bochartum* (Gotting. 1769, 1780); other treatises on geography and chronology; several separate dissertations on the laws and antiquities of the Jews, the substance (f most of which is embodied in his

Mosaisches Recht, in 6 volumes, 1770-75; a second edition of the first 5 volumes of this work was published in the years 1775-80. This work, which is considered the masterpiece of Michaelis, was translated into English by Dr. Alexander Smith, under the title of *Commentaries on the Laws of Moses* (1814, 4 volumes, 8vo). "The great object of Michaelis in this work is to investigate and illustrate the philosophy of the Mosaic laws, to show their wonderful adaptation in every respect to the very peculiar circumstances in which the people to whom they were given had been placed by Providence; and, while he takes every opportunity of establishing the claims of Moses to the character of an ambassador from heaven, to inculcate upon human legislators the important lesson of studying those particulars: respecting the nature and political situation, the ideas and prejudices, the manners and customs of their countrymen, by attention to which alone they can ever hope to make them virtuous, prosperous, and happy" (Dr. Smith's Preface, page 17). In Biblical criticism, Michaelis's *Introduction to the New Testament* is well known in England by the translation of the late bishop Marsh; he also published part of an *Introduction to the Old Testament; a Translation of the Bible, with Notes, for the Unlearned*; a monograph on the three chief Messianic psalms (viz. 10:40, 110), in which he ably defended their prophetic character (comp. cardinal Wiseman, *Lectures*, page 378); a commentary on the *Book of Maccabees* (1778); on *Ecclesiastes* (1762). He also wrote an able vindication of the sacred narrative on *the Burial and Resurrection of Christ according to the Four Evangelists* (Halle, 1783; English transl. 1827); and published learned notes on an edition of bishop Lowth's *Sacra Poesis Hebrceorum* (reprinted in the Oxford edition. with further annotations by E.F.C. Rosenmuller, 1821).

Johann David Michaelis has been in many respects more influential as a Biblical writer than any other of the numerous savants whom Germany has produced within the last 150 years. He exhibited an indomitable energy in the prosecution of his studies, and, hurried forward by an inquiring spirit, he could not fail to produce valuable writings. Unfortunately, however, he was inconsistent as a writer. Anxious to adhere to the established system of Lutheranism, he displayed outwardly great respect for the Christian religion, while he was really too light-minded, as he himself acknowledges, to adopt their tone of pious feeling. It is true, however, that his early pietistic training nevertheless sustained in him a certain conviction of the truth of Christianity. He endeavored constantly, by new and singularly

ingenious theories, to remove objections to Christianity; and, much to the surprise of his younger contemporaries, whose rationalistic views were ripening apace, he held to the last many parts of the older system, which they had either modified or thrown aside. The melancholy consequences, however, of this merely natural persuasion are abundantly manifest. Destitute of that conviction which alone can give a comprehensive insight into the real character of revelation, and the harmonious relation of its several parts, he had no guide to enable him to perceive what might be safely admitted without detriment to the system itself; he consequently, according to the usual custom of persons taking only a partial view of subjects, frequently opposed the objection, instead of the principle on which the objection was founded; endeavored to remove it by theories in conformity with mere human systems, and strengthened it equally by his concessions and by his own inadequate and arbitrary defences.. Possessed of no settled principles, every minute difficulty, presented itself with intrinsic force and perplexity to his mind; his belief was a reed ready to be shaken by every fresh breeze; all that he had previously gained seemed again staked on the issue of each petty skirmish; and, in the very descriptive comparison of Lessing, he was like the timid soldier who loses his life before an outpost, without once seeing the country of which he would gain possession. The theological opinions of this celebrated man are never to be trusted; and, indeed, the serious student cannot but be disgusted with the levity which too frequently appears in his writings, and the gross obscenity which frequently defiles them. After all drawbacks, however, the discriminating and careful student will seldom consult Michaelis without benefiting by his erudition and clearness of illustration; and often will he find objections on Scripture refuted with much force and felicitous originality. Dr. Tholuck describes Michaelis as one of the chief pioneers of neology, though not because he indulged in bold neological assumptions, but because he was devoid of religious life, retaining only the external form of orthodoxy, but abandoning its essence and spirit (comp. Tholuck, *Vermischte Schriften*, 2:130). See *Lebensbeschreibung von ihm selbst abgefasst* (Leipsic and Rinteln, 1793); C.G. Heyne, *Elogium J.D. Michaelis* (1791); Kitto, *Cyclop. Bibl. Lit.* s.v.; *English Cyclop.* s.v.; Doring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, volume 2, s.v.; Hagenbach, *Ch. Hist. of the 18th and 19th Centuries*, 1:157 sq.; Kahnis, *Hist. of German Protestantism*, page 120.

3. JOHANN FRIEDRICH, another writer of this family, a pupil of Danzius, is the author of a philological dissertation on the derivation and meaning of the sacred name $\mu\eta\eta\alpha$, (reprinted in Ugolino, *Thesaur.* 24:105-138). With this treatise it is worth while to compare J.D. Michaelis's remarks, *Supplement. ad Lex. Hebraic.* pages 85-87; and Gesenius, *Thesaur.* pages 95-99.

4. JOHANN GEORG, who flourished as divinity professor at Halie, was born at Zerbst May 22, 1690; was educated at the University of Franeker; in 1715 entered the ministry; in 1717 accepted a position in the gymnasium at Frankfort-on-the-Oder; and in 1730 was promoted to a professorship in the university then at that place. In 1735 he was called to Halle, and died there July 16, 1758. He is the author of several learned works; one, on the famous Catechetical School of Alexandria, was first published in 1739; another work is entitled *De progressu et incremento doctrines salutaris inde a protevangelio usque ad Noachum* (1752); he is, however, better known for his *Observationes Sacrae*, a volume of great and varied erudition, comprising certain disputations which he had held at the University of Frankfort. This volume was published at Utrecht in 1738; we add the titles of such as claim mention in this work: *De incisura propter mortuos*: — *De Elisaeo, a proprio puerorum Bethlehensium justo Dei judicio vindicato*: — *De cane, symbolo prophetae*: — *De Spiritu Sancto, sub externo linguarum ignearum symbolo Apostolis communicato*: — *De crustulis quotidianis pontificis maximi*: — *De Sacerdote, ex ministerio sufftus non divite*. In Ugolino, *Thesaur.* 11:727-748, there occurs a valuable dissertation, *De Thuribulo Adyti*, in which our author fully considers the high-priest's sacrificial duties on the great day of atonement, and takes occasion to illustrate, in an interesting manner, the priesthood of Christ in some of its features as indicated in the Epistle to the Hebrews (9:7-15). See Doring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, 2:516 sq.; Kitto, *Cyclop. Bibl. Lit.* s.v. (J.H.W.)

5. JOHANN HEINRICH, upon the whole, the most accurately learned of all the accomplished members of his family, was born at Klettenberg, in Hohnstein, July 26, 1668. He studied Oriental literature for some years at Frankfort-on-the-Oder, where he had the celebrated Ludolf for his instructor in Ethiopic. He next studied for a time at Leipsic, and then removed to Halle, the head-quarters of Spener's influence, and became librarian to the university, later professor of the Oriental languages, and eventually of divinity. Halle was at that time the most renowned of the

German universities; its professors were eminent men, and its schools crowded with sager students, and J. Heinrich Michaelis was the soul of the place. In connection with A.H. Franke, he instituted the *Collegium Orientale Theologicum*, a seminary for instruction in the Biblical languages. Fifty years before Kennicott's publication, J.H. Michaelis, after some thirty years' conscientious labor, led the way in Old-Testament textual criticism by issuing from the press a carefully-edited Hebrew Bible (Halle, 1720, 2 volumes, 4to). Kennicott, who was impetuous in judgment, spoke slightly of this work, as if the author, from favor of the Masoretic text, had improperly used his manuscripts (see Kennicott's *Annual Account of Hebrew Collections*, page 146). He afterwards modified his opinion in the following statement, which we extract, as giving a good description of Michaelis's labors: "This edition was the first which contained any various readings collected from Hebrew MSS. by a Christian editor. The text is taken from Jablonski's edition, with some few emendations... There were collated for this Bible most of the best printed editions, and also five Hebrew MSS. belonging to the library at Erfurt; two of which contain the verses in Joshua excluded by the Masora. The propriety of selecting various readings from Hebrew MSS. and ancient versions is set forth in the preface" (*Hist. of Hebr. Text. Dissert.* 2:487, Teller's ed. page 465). Three quarto volumes of exegesis, in the shape of a commentary on the *Hagiographa*, entitled *Annotationes Philologico-Exegeticae in Hagiographis* (Halle, 1720), accompanied the critical text. This is a work of still acknowledged value. J.H. Michaelis was the general editor of the whole work; but he received assistance from his nephew, and from Rambach in portions of it. The annotations on the Psalms, Job, Canticles, Ezra, and the Chronicles were contributed by him (on the critical merit of our author, see Wiseman, *Connection between Science*, etc. 2d ed. page 349). Other works of his, worthy of mention here, are, a dissertation, *De Paradiso*: — a tract, *De peculiaribus Hebraeorum loquendi modis* (Halle, 1702): — *De Iesaia propheta ejusque vaticinio* (Halle, 1710): — and on the N.T., *De textu N.T. Graeco* (Halle, 1707: — *Introductio in Jacobi epistolam* (Halle, 1722, 4to). Johann Heinrich Michaelis died in 1738. See Doring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, volume 2, s.v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie*, 9:522 sq.

Michaelis, Sebastien

a French Dominican, was born in 1543, at Saint-Zacharie, Provence. He introduced reforms into many houses of his order, for which, with the

consent of the court of Rome, he raised a particular congregation. Michaelis was the first vicar-general of this body, and, after having refused in 1579 the bishopric of Frejus, became prior of the new convent of the Friar Preachers at Paris in 1613. He may be regarded as the restorer of the Order of St. Dominicin France, a work with which in our days Lacordaire's name has figured prominently. Besides some religious works, he wrote *L'Histoire veritable de ce qui s'est passe sous l'exorcisme de trois filles possedees au pays de Flandre, avec un Traite des Sorciers et des Magiciens* (Paris, 1623, 2 volumes, 8vo); and edited Le Fevre, *Calendrier historique et chronologique de l'Eglise de Paris*. See Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Michaelius, Jonas

a Reformed (Dutch) minister, the *first* minister of the Reformed Church in America, was born in 1577; was educated at Leyden University; settled in Holland in 1612-16, in St. Salvador in 1624-25, in Guinea in 1626-27, and then migrated to this country, and arrived at Manhattan (now New York) in 1628. He organized a consistory, administered the sacraments, and performed all the functions of a minister of the Gospel. In 1633 he was succeeded by the Rev. Everardus Bogardus, who was accompanied by Adam Roelandsen, the first schoolmaster. After a few years of service he returned to Holland, and "the Classis of Amsterdam wished to send him back to New York in 1637, but he did not return. At his first communion here he had fifty communicants. He paints a sad picture of the low condition of the natives, and proposes to let the parents go and try to educate the children. His letter breathes a spirit of deep piety, and of submission to the divine will in all his bereavements." His wife died in 1628, only seven weeks after their arrival in this country, leaving him with three small children. This letter, and other particulars respecting this pioneer of the Dutch churches in this country, are found in *Colonial Hist. of New York*, 2:759-770. See also Corwin's *Manual Ref. Church*, page 164. (W.J.R.T.)

Michaelmas

a day which, according to the Church of Rome, was set apart to express her thankfulness to God for the many benefits she had received by the ministry of holy angels; and called Michaelmas because St. Michael is alluded to in Scripture as an angel of great power and dignity, and as

presiding and watching over the Church of God with particular vigilance and application, and as triumphant over the devil. It originated in some provincial festivities which were introduced between the 3d and 9th centuries, and which were then combined into one common celebration on the 29th of September, the day on which St. Michael's Church on Mount Garganus was dedicated, as mentioned in the Saxon Chronicle in 1011, and in Ethelred's laws in 1014. There is a tradition that this feast was instituted by Alexander, bishop of Alexandria. It was generally observed in the 8th century; in the 12th century by the Council of Mayence, and indeed by the whole Greek Church, in accordance with an injunction of the emperor Manuel Comnenus. The apparition of St. Michael, "the prince seraphim, leader of the angelic hosts, prefect of Paradise, and conductor of souls to the place of repose," to whom cemetery chapels and churches on hills were in consequence dedicated, was observed on the 8th of May. In the 10th century there was a curious superstition that on every Monday morning St. Michael held high mass in the churches.

The Greek and other Eastern churches, the Church of England, as well as several other evangelical churches, continue to observe the Feast of St. Michael, according to Wheatly, in order "that the people may know what benefits Christians receive by the ministry of angels" (*On the Common Prayer*, page 190).

The Romish Church, besides observing St. Michaelmas, also celebrates three appearances of St. Michael, which have happened (we are told) in these later years. The first is the appearance of this archangel at Colossus, in Phrygia; but at what time the Romanists do not know themselves. They observe September 6 as the day. The second is that of Mount Garganus, in the kingdom of Naples, about the end of the 5th century. May 8 is set apart as the day to commemorate the event. The third is his reputed appearance to Aubert, bishop of Avranches, upon a rock called the *Tomb*, where now stands the abbey of St. Michael. This was about 706. October 16 is observed in memory of this event. See Broughton, *Biblioth. Hist. Sacra*, 2:93; Procter, *On the Book of Common Prayer*, page 301; Wheatly, *On the Common Prayer*, page 253; Butler, *Lives of Fathers, Martyrs, and Saints*, 2:94; 3:177; Michaelis, *Denkwürdigkeiten a.d. christl. Archdol.* 3:28 sq.

Mi'chah

(Heb. as in MICAIAH), a son of Uzziel and a Kohathite priest (^{<1324>}1 Chronicles 24:24,25); elsewhere (^{<1323>}1 Chronicles 23:20) more correctly Anglicized MICAH *SEE MICAH* (q.v.).

Michai'ah

(for the Heb., etc., *see MICAIAH*), the name of several men and one woman.

1. The queen-mother of king Abijah (^{<1413>}2 Chronicles 13:2); elsewhere (^{<1412>}2 Chronicles 11:20) called MAACHAH *SEE MAACHAH* (q.v.).
2. One of the national chieftains to whom Jehoshaphat gave orders to instruct the people of the various cities of Judah in the sacred law (^{<1477>}2 Chronicles 17:7). B.C. 910.
3. The father of Achbor, which latter was one of the courtiers (perhaps a Levite) sent by Josiah to inquire of the prophetess Huldah concerning the newly-discovered copy of the Pentateuch (^{<1222>}2 Kings 22:12). B.C. ante 623. In the parallel passage (^{<1484>}2 Chronicles 34:20) he is called MICAH, and his father's name is written Abdon.
4. The son of Gemariah and grandson of Shaphan; after having heard Baruch read the terrible predictions of Jeremiah in his father's hall, he went, apparently with good intentions, to report to the king's officers what he had heard (^{<2451>}Jeremiah 36:11-13). B.C. 605. "Michaiah was the third in descent of a princely family, whose names are recorded in connection with important religious transactions. His grandfather Shaphan was the scribe, or secretary, of king Josiah, to whom Hilkiah the high-priest first delivered the book of the law which he said he had found in the House of Jehoivah — Shaphan first perusing the book himself, and then reading it aloud to the youthful-king (^{<1220>}2 Kings 22:10). It was from his father Gemariah's chamber in the Temple that Baruch read the prophecies of Jeremiah in the ears of all the people. Moreover, Gemariah was one of the three who made intercession to king Zedekiah, although in vain. that he would not burn the roll containing Jeremiah's prophecies." *SEE JEREMIAH*.
5. The son of Zaccur and father of Mattaniah, Levites ("priests' sons") of the line of Asaph (^{<1625>}Nehemiah 12:35). B.C. considerably ante 446.

6. One of the priests who celebrated with trumpets the completion of the walls of Jerusalem after the exile (^{<6124>}Nehemiah 12:41). B.C. 446.

M'chal

(Heb. *Mikal'*, *l kymæivulet*, as in ^{<1072>}2 Samuel 17:20; Sept. *Μεχόλ* v.r. *Μελχόλ*; Josephus, *Μιγάλα*, *Ant.* 6:11, 4), the younger of king Saul's two daughters (^{<0144>}1 Samuel 14:49), doubtless by his wife Ahinoam (^{<0145>}1 Samuel 14:50). In the following statement of the Biblical history, we chiefly dwell upon those points that relate to his successor. *SEE DAVID*.

The king had proposed to bestow on David his eldest daughter Merab; but before the marriage could be arranged an unexpected turn was given to the matter by the behavior of Michal, who fell violently in love with the young hero. The marriage with her elder sister was at once put aside. Saul eagerly caught at the opportunity which the change offered him of exposing his rival to the risk of death. The price fixed on Michal's hand was no less than the slaughter of a hundred Philistines. For these the usual "dowry" by which, according to the custom of the East, from the time of Jacob down to the present day, the father is paid for his daughter, was relinquished. David by a brilliant feat doubled the tale of victims, and Michal became his wife (^{<0821>}1 Samuel 18:20-28). What her age was we do not know — her husband cannot have been more than twenty. B.C. cir. 1063.

It was not long before the strength of her affection was put to the proof. They seem to have been living at Gibeah, then the head-quarters of the king and the army. After one of Saul's attacks of frenzy, in which David had barely escaped being transfixed by the king's great spear, Michal learned that the house was watched by the myrmidons of Saul, and that it was intended on the next morning to attack her husband as he left his door (^{<0911>}1 Samuel 19:11). That the intention was real was evident from the behavior of the king's soldiers, who paraded around and around the town, and "returning" to the house "in the evening," with loud cries, more like the yells of the savage dogs of the East than the utterances of human beings, "belched out" curses and lies against the young warrior who had so lately shamed them all (^{<1513>}Psalms 59:3, 6, 7, 12). Michal seems to have known too well the vacillating and ferocious disposition of her father when in these demoniacal moods. The attack was ordered for the morning; but before the morning arrives the king will probably have changed his mind and hastened his stroke. So, like a true soldier's wife, she meets stratagem

by stratagem. She first provided for David's safety by lowering him out of the window; to gain time for him to reach the residence of Samuel, she next dressed up the bed as if still occupied by him; one of her teraphim; or household gods, was laid in the bed; its head enveloped, like that of a sleeper, in the usual net (so Ewald, *Gesch.* 3:101, renders *rybke* rather perhaps a *quilt* or mattress, A.V. "pillow" [q.v.] of goat's hair for protection from gnats, the rest of the figure covered with the wide *begeg* or plaid. It happened as she had feared; Saul could not delay his vengeance till David appeared out of doors, but sent his people into the house. The reply of Michal is that her husband is ill and cannot be disturbed. At last Saul will be balked no longer: his messengers force their way into the inmost apartment, and there discover the deception which has been played off upon them with such success. Saul's rage may be imagined: his fury was such that Michal was obliged to fabricate a story of David's having attempted to kill her (^{<01912>}1 Samuel 19:12-17). B.C. cir. 1062.

This was the last time she saw her husband for many years; and when the rupture between Saul and David had become open and incurable, Michal was married to another man, Phalti, or Phaltiel, of Gallim (^{<0254>}1 Samuel 25:44; ^{<01815>}2 Samuel 3:15), a village apparently not far from Gibeah. Her father probably did not believe her story concerning David's escape; but he had taken advantage of it by canceling her former marriage. David, however, as the divorce had been without his consent, felt that the law (^{<0204>}Deuteronomy 24:4) against a husband taking back a divorced wife could not apply in this case; he therefore formally reclaimed her of Ishbosheth, who employed no less a personage than Abner to take her from Phaltiel, and conduct her with all honor to David. It was under cover of this mission that Abner sounded the elders of Israel respecting their acceptance of David for king, and conferred with David himself on the same subject at Hebron (^{<01812>}2 Samuel 3:12-21). As this demand was not made by David until Abner had contrived to intimate his design, it has been supposed by some that it was managed between them solely to afford Abner an ostensible errand in going to Hebron; but it is more pleasant to suppose that, although the matter happened to be so timed as to give a color to this suspicion, the demand really arose from David's revived affection for his first wife and earliest love. After the death of her father and brothers at Glib, Michal and her new husband appear to have betaken themselves, with the rest of the family of Saul, to the eastern side of the Jordan. If the old Jewish tradition inserted by the Targum in 2 Samuel 21

may be followed, she was occupied in bringing up the sons of her sister Merab and Adriel of Meholah. At any rate, it is on the road leading up from the Jordan valley to the Mount of Olives that we first encounter her with her husband — Michal under the joint escort of David's messengers and Abner's twenty men, *en route* to David at Hebron, the submissive Phaltiel behind, bewailing the wife thus torn from him. It was at least fourteen years since David and she had parted at Gibeah, since she had watched him disappear down the cord into the darkness, and had perilled her own life for his against the rage of her insane father. That David's love for his absent wife had undergone no change in the interval seems certain from the eagerness with which he reclaims her as soon as the opportunity is afforded him. Important as it was to him to make an alliance with Ishbosheth and the great tribe of Benjamin, and much as he respected Abner, he will not listen for a moment to any overtures till his wife is restored. Every circumstance is fresh in his memory. "I will not see thy face except thou first bring Saul's daughter... my wife Michal whom I espoused to me for a hundred foreskins of the Philistines" ([1083](#) 2 Samuel 3:13, 14). The meeting took place at Hebron. B.C. cir. 1047. How Michal comported herself in the altered circumstances of David's household, how she received or was received by Abigail and Ahinoam we are not told; but it is plain from the subsequent occurrences that something had happened to alter the relations of herself and David. They were no longer what they had been to each other. The alienation was probably mutual. On her side must have been the recollection of the long contests which had taken place in the interval between her father and David; the strong anti-Saulite and anti-Benjamite feeling prevalent in the camp at Hebron, where every word she heard must have contained some distasteful allusion, and where at every turn she must have encountered men like Abiathar the priest or Ismaiah the Gibeonite ([1310](#) 1 Chronicles 12:4; comp. [1210](#) 2 Samuel 21:2), who had lost the whole or the greater part of their relatives in some sudden burst of her father's fury. Add to this the connection between her husband and the Philistines who had killed her father and brothers; and, more than all perhaps, the inevitable difference between the boy-husband of her recollections and the matured and occupied warrior who now received her. The whole must have come upon her as a strong contrast to the affectionate husband whose tears had followed her along the road over Olivet, and to the home over which we cannot doubt she ruled supreme. On the side of David it is natural to put her advanced years, in a climate where women are old at thirty, and probably a petulant and jealous temper

inherited from her father, one outburst of which certainly produced the rupture between them which closes our knowledge of Michal.

It was the day of David's greatest triumph, when he brought the Ark of Jehovah from its temporary restingplace to its home in the newly-acquired city. It was a triumph in every respect peculiarly his own. The procession consisted of priests, Levites, the captains of the host, the elders of the nation; and conspicuous in front, "in the midst of the damsels playing on the timbrels" (comp. ^{<OR25>}Psalm 68:25), was the king dancing and leaping. Michal watched this procession approach from the window of her apartments in the royal harem; the motions of her husband, clothed only in a thin linen ephod (^{<3157>}1 Chronicles 15:27), shocked her as undignified and indecent — "she despised him in her heart." B.C. cir. 1043. It would have been well if her contempt had rested there; but it was not in her nature to conceal it, and when, after the exertions of the long day were over — the last burnt-offering and the last peace-offering offered, the last portion distributed to the crowd of worshippers — the king entered his house to bless his family, he was received by his wife, not with the congratulations which he had a right to expect, and which would have been so grateful to him, but with a bitter taunt, which showed how incapable she was of appreciating either her husband's temper or the service in which he had been engaged. David's retort was a tremendous one, conveyed in words which once spoken could never be recalled. It gathered up all the differences between them which made sympathy no longer possible, and we do not need the assurance of the sacred writer, that "Michal had no child unto the day of her death," to feel quite certain that all intercourse between her and David must have ceased from that date. Josephus (*Ant.* 7:4, 3) intimates that she returned to Phaltiel, but of this there is no mention in the records of the Bible; and it would be difficult to reconcile such a thing with the known ideas of the Jews as to women who had once shared the king's bed. *SEE ABISHAG; SEE ADONIJAH.* The fanciful Jewish tradition, preserved in the Targum on ^{<OR25>}Ruth 3:3, states that Phaltiel had from the first acted in accordance with the idea alluded to in the text. He is placed in the same rank with Joseph, and is commemorated as "Phaltiel, son of Laish, the pious (*adysjæ*) *Assidaean*, the word used for the Puritans of the New Testament times), who placed a sword between himself and Michal, Saul's daughter, lest he should go in unto her." It was thus, perhaps, as Abarbanel remarks, ordered by Providence that the race of Saul and David

should not be mixed, and that no one deriving any apparent right from Saul should succeed to the throne.

Her name appears but once again (~~10208~~ 2 Samuel 21:8), as the bringer-up, or more accurately the mother, of five of the grandchildren of Saul who were sacrificed to Jehovah by the Gibeonites on the hill of Gibeah. But it is probably more correct to substitute Merab for Michal in this place (see Hitzig, *Begr. der Krit.* page 145 sq.; Flieschmann, *De filiis Michal*, Altorf, 1716). **SEE ADRIEL.**

Michel, Augustin

a German Roman Catholic theologian, was born in 1661, at Unterstorff, Bavaria, and was educated at the University of Dillingen. He studied both theology and law, and secured the doctorate in divinity and also in law. After finishing his studies, he returned as teacher to the convent-school of his native place, where he, had prepared for the university. He was afterwards appointed ecclesiastical counsellor by the prince elector of Cologne, the prince bishop of Freising, and the prince abbot of Kempten. He died in 1751. Some of his most important works, besides many dissertations and contributions to periodicals, are, *Expositiones in Psalmos, in Cantica, Cenciones dominicales*, etc. (never published): — *Theologia canonico-moralis* (1707, fol.): — *De juro et justitia, juridicae et theologiae tractata contra L.B. 'de Schmid* (Rome, 1699, 8vo): — *Discussio theologica de contritione et attritione* (ibid. 1710, 4to): — *Confutatio infamis libri cui Litalis Expostulatio contra damnationem Quesnellii*, etc. (Landeshuti, 1719, 4to).

Michel, Francois

a French visionary, was born at Salon, in Provence, in 1661. To this name is attached the memory of an extraordinary adventure, which, towards the close of the summer of 1699, created a great sensation in France. Michel practiced at Salon the trade of a farrier. When thirty-eight years of age, the father of a family, and well known in his vicinity, he claimed to have the following vision: "One evening, in the field, returning home, he saw at the foot of a tree, and surrounded by a great light, a beautiful fair woman, clothed in white, with a mantle arranged in court-fashion, who, calling Michel by his name, told him that she was the late queen, Marie Therese, who had been married to the king. After having confided to him some things of great importance, she ordered him, under pain of death, to go and

reveal them to the king, adding that if at first he could not obtain an audience with the king, he should demand to see a minister of state, but that he should reserve certain secrets for the king alone. This apparition was renewed three times. Yielding finally to these injunctions, the farrier repaired to Aix, to the intendant of Provence, who, surprised at the good sense and firmness of this man, gave him letters to the ministers, and paid his way. This marvellous story spread in all directions. Michel had scarcely arrived at Marseilles, when he sought M. de Brissac, major of the body-guard, and, without permitting himself to be disheartened, insisted on having access to the king. Louis XIV, informed of the singular obstinacy of Michel, finally consented to receive the farrier, and had with him two interviews; but to this day the conversation between the king and his subject remains a mystery. To his friends the king pronounced Michel a man of great good sense. Michel returned to his province, furnished with a sum of money, and provided for during the remainder of his life." This singular case was much commented upon. While some admitted the reality of a providential mission, others saw in it only a tissue of bold trickery, of which Michel, in his simplicity, was the first dupe. We are told to place all this story to the account of a Madame Arnoul, a romantic and intriguing woman, widow of the intendant of marine at Marseilles, and who preserved a secret and intimate friendship for a long time with Madame de Maintenon. Michel, fatigued with the curiosity of which he was the object, retired to Landon,- a village near Aix, where he died, December 10, 1726. Saint-Simon, *Memoires*, 11:16 sq. (edit. Cheruel); Proyard, *Vie du Dauphin pere de Louis XVI*. See Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Michel, Georg Adam

a German theologian, was born September 23, 1708, at Walpheim; was educated at the school of his native place, and studied theology at the University of Jena. Afterwards he assisted his father in his ecclesiastical functions for seven years, was then appointed inspector of the orphan asylum at Oettingen, with the title Counsellor of the Consistory; and died March 21, 1780. Michel combined with a great knowledge in theology a thorough acquaintance with history. He contributed largely to the *Oettingische Bibliothek* (Oettingen, 1758, 8vo), and to the *Oettingische politische kirchliche und gelehrten Geschichte* (ibid. 1772/79, 3 volumes, 8vo).

Michel, Jean

a French ecclesiastic, was born at Beauvais about the close of the 14th century. He was at first counsellor to Louis II, king of Sicily; then canon of Rouin, of Aix, and of Angiers. He was appointed bishop of Angiers by the state, February 28, 1439; archdeacon Guillaume d'Estouteville, of the same diocese, however, obtained edicts from the pope for the bishopric. Fortified with these bulls, he presented himself to the chapter, and demanded the deposition of Michel; but, instead, the supplicant himself was removed. Guillaume persisted notwithstanding, and seated himself as bishop of Angiers in the Council of Florence, while Jean Michel was seated with the same title in the Council of Basle. Stormy dissensions ensued, which the pope Eugenius endeavored to terminate by appointing Guillaume successively bishop of Digne and cardinal. But a man of so great an origin, and so powerful in his alliances, was not to be satisfied with these transactions. His intrigues continued to involve the bishopric in constant agitation. The plebeian Jean Michel had, however, resolute partisans. Few prelates have left in the Church of Angiers such honorable memories. The kings of France have several times demanded, though in vain, his canonization by the Church of Rome. Michel died September 11, 1447. See *Gallia Christiana*, volume 14, col. 580; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Michele, Parrasic

a Venetian painter, flourished about 1590. He was a pupil of Paul Veronese. He executed several works for the churches, especially a *Pieta*, in a chapel of the church of San Giuseppe, into which he introduced a portrait of himself. See Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts* (N.Y. 1865, 2 volumes, 8vo).

Michelians

SEE HAHN, MICHEL; SEE KORNTAL, SOCIETY OF.

Michelini, Gio. Battista

a painter of religious subjects, who flourished about 1650, was a native of Foligno. He was a pupil of Guido Reni, and wrought in the churches of the Romagna. Lanzi says there are several of his works at Gubbio, and mentions particularly a *Dead Christ*. But little is known of him. See Lanzi's

Hist. of Painting, transl. by Roscoe (Lond. 1847, 3 volumes, 8vo), 1:460; Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts* (N.Y. 1865, 2 volumes, 8vo).

Michelozzi (Or Michelozzo)

a celebrated Florentine sculptor and architect, was born in 1396. He was a pupil of Donatello, and the greater part of the sepulchral monument erected for pope Giovanni Coscia, in the church of San Giovanni at Florence, by Donatello, is in reality the work of Michelozzi. In the same church is a beautiful statue of *Faith*, which was executed by Michelozzi as a companion to the two statues of *Hope* and *Charity* by his master. Over the sacristy and the rooms of the superintendents, which are opposite to San Giovanni, Michelozzi executed a full relief of *San Giovanni*, which was afterwards removed, and is now in the Florentine Gallery, in the corridor of bronzes. As an architect, Michelozzi had deservedly a high reputation. He built, among many other fine buildings, the library of the monastery of San Giorgio Maggiore, a house of the Black Monks of Santa Giustina. In 1437 he commenced the construction of the convent of San Marco, which was finished, at a cost of 36,000 ducats, in 1452. Michelozzi also constructed for Cosmo de' Medici the noviciate of Santa Croce, which, for beauty of form and decoration, will compare favorably with any work of this master. The convent of the Barefooted Monks of St. Francis, the church and convent of the monks of San Girolamo, and many other works of purely secular character, are by this distinguished man. He died in 1470, and was buried in his own tomb, in the church of Sali Marco, in Florence. See Vasari, *Lives of the Painters*, transl. by Mrs. Foster (Lond. 1850, 5 volumes, 8vo), 1:494; Quatremere de Quincy, *Vies des Architectes illustres*.

Michl, Anton

a German Roman Catholic theologian, was born in 1753 at Ebersberg, Bavaria; was educated at Freysing, and ordained in 1776. He afterwards studied law and ecclesiastical history, and was in 1799 appointed professor of ecclesiastical law and history at Landshut. He was a faithful adherent of the government party, at that time, as in our own day, decidedly anti-Romanistic in feeling and tendency, and Michl thereby made many friends even among the Protestants, who looked upon him as a friend of liberty and of light. He died at Landshut in 1813. Besides several dissertations, he published *Kirchenrecht fur Katholiken. und Protestanten, mit Hinsicht auf*

den Code Napoleon und die bayerischen Landesgesetze (Munchen, 1809); and *Kirchengeschichte* (ibid. 1807-11, 2 volumes, 8vo). See C.A. Baaders, *Lexikon verstorbener bayer. Schriftsteller* (Augsburg and Leipsic, 1824); Wetzter u. Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, s.v.

Mich'mas

(Heb. *Mlikmas'*, ^{<1673>}smkḵḵas something hidden; ^{<1927>}Ezra 2:27, Sept. Μαχμάς v.r. Χαμμός; ^{<1673>}Nehemiah 7:31, Μαχεμάς), or MICHMASH (Heb. *Mikmash'*, ^{<1673>}vmkḵḵaš. ^{<1613>}Nehemiah 11:31, Sept. Μαχαμάς, in pause ^{<1673>}vmkḵḵaš ^{<1673>}1 Samuel 13:2, 5, 11, 16, 23; 14:5, 31; ^{<2308>}Isaiah 10:28; Sept. Μαχμάς, and so in 1 Macc. 9:13; Josephus, Μαχμά [*Ant.* 13:1, 6]), a town of Benjamin (^{<1927>}Ezra 2:27; ^{<1613>}Nehemiah 11:31; comp. 7:31), east of Bethel or Beth-aven (^{<1673>}1 Samuel 13:5), and south from Migron, on the road to Jerusalem (^{<2308>}Isaiah 10:28). “If the name be, as some scholars assert (First, *Handwb.* page 600b, 732b), compounded from that of Chemosh, the Moabitish deity, it is not improbably a relic of some incursion or invasion of the Moabites, just as Chephar-haammonai, in this very neighborhood, is of the Ammonites. But though in the heart of Benjamin, it is not named in the list of the towns of that. tribe (comp. Joshua 17).” The words of ^{<1673>}1 Samuel 13:2; 14:4; and ^{<2308>}Isaiah 10:29, show that at Michmas was a pass where the progress, of a military body might be impeded or opposed, since it was held by the Philistines while Saul and the Israelites were at Gibeah; it was also on the line of march of an invading army from the north, and the Assyrians are represented as depositing their baggage there on their way to Jerusalem, just before reaching Gibeah (^{<2308>}Isaiah 10:28). It was perhaps for this reason that Jonathan Maccabseus fixed his abode at Michmas (1 Macc. 9:73); and it is from the chivalrous exploit of another hero of the same name, the son of Saul, that the place is chiefly celebrated (1 Samuel 13, 14:4-16). “Saul was occupying the range of heights above mentioned, one end of his line resting on Bethel, the other at Michmas (^{<1673>}1 Samuel 13:2). In Geba, close to him, but separated by the wide and intricate valley, the Philistines had a garrison with a chief officer. The taking of the garrison or the killing of the officer by Saul’s son Jonathan was the first move. The next was for the Philistines to swarm up from their, sea-side plain in such numbers that no alternative was left for Saul but to retire down the wady to Gilgal, near Jericho, that from that ancient sanctuary he might collect and reassure the Israelites. Michmas was then occupied by the Philistines, and was their

furthest post to the east. But it was destined to witness their sudden overthrow. While he was in Geba, and his father in Michmas, Jonathan must have crossed the intervening valley too often not to know it thoroughly; and the intricate paths which render it impossible for a stranger to find his way through the mounds and hummocks that crowd the bottom of the ravine — with these he was so familiar — the passages here, the sharp rocks there—as to be able to traverse them even in the dark. It was just as the day dawned (Joseph. *Ant.* 6:6, 2) that the watchers in the garrison at Michmas descried the two Hebrews clambering up the steps beneath. We learn from the details furnished by Josephus, who must have had an opportunity of examining the spot when he passed it with Titus on their way to the siege of Jerusalem (see *War*, 5:2, 1), that the part of Michmas in which the Philistines had established themselves consisted of three summits, surrounded by a line of rocks like a natural entrenchment, and ending in a long and sharp precipice, believed to be impregnable. Finding himself observed from above, and taking the invitation as an omen in his favor, Jonathan turned from the course which he was at first pursuing, and crept up in the direction of the point reputed impregnable. It was there, according to Josephus, that he and his armor-bearer made their entrance to the camp (Josephus, *Ant.* 6:6, 2)” (Smith). **SEE GIBEAH; SEE JONATHAN.** It was inhabited, after the return from Babylon (^{<4613>}Nehemiah 11:31), by 122 returned colonists (^{<4502>}Ezra 2:27; ^{<4613>}Nehemiah 7:31). Eusebius describes Michmas as a large village nine Roman miles from Jerusalem, on the road to Ramah (*Onomast.* s.v. **Μαχμά**). Travellers have usually identified it with *Bir* or *el-Bireh* (see Maundrell, March 25; and the details in Quaresmius, *Elucidato*, 2:786, 787); but Dr. Robinson (*Researches*, 2:117) recognizes it in a place still bearing the name of *Mukhmas*, at a distance and position which correspond well with these intimations. It is small, and almost desolate, but bears marks of having once been a place of strength and importance. There are many foundations of hewn stones, and some columns lie among them. The steep and precipitous *Wady es-Suweinit*, a valley into which the two ravines on the low ridge between which the village is situated run, is probably the “passage of Michmash” mentioned in Scripture (^{<49133>}1 Samuel 13:23; ^{<23109>}Isaiah 10:29). “In it,” says Dr. Robinson, “just at the left of where we crossed, are two hills of a conical, or rather spherical form, having steep rocky sides, with small wadys running up between each so as almost to isolate them. One of them is on the side towards Jeba (Gibeal), and the other towards Mukhmas. These would seem to be the two rocks mentioned in connection

with Jonathan's adventure (^{<0406>}1 Samuel 14:4, 5). *SEE BOZEZ; SEE SENEH*. They are not, indeed, so sharp as the language of Scripture would seem to imply; but they are the only rocks of the kind in this vicinity. The northern one is connected towards the west with an eminence still more distinctly isolated" (*Bib. Researches*, 2:116; comp. new ed. 3:289; see Thenius, in the *Sachs. exeget. Stud.* 2:147 sq.). "Immediately facing Mukhmas, on the opposite side of the ravine, is the modern representative of Geba; and behind this again are Ramah and Gibeah—all memorable names in the long struggle which has immortalized Michmas. Bethel is about four miles to the north of Michmas, and the interval is filled up by the heights of Burka, Deir Diwan, Tell el-Hajar, etc., which appear to have constituted the Mount Bethel of the narrative (13:2)." In the Talmud (*Menachoth*, 8:1; comp. Schwarz, *Palest.* page 131) the soil of Michmas is celebrated for its fertility (Reland, *Palaest.* page 897). "There is a good deal of cultivation in and among groves of old olives in the broad, shallow wady which slopes down to the north and east of the village; but Mukhmas itself is a very poor place, and the country close to it has truly a most forbidding aspect. Huge gray rocks raise up their bald crowns, completely hiding every patch of soil, and the gray huts of the village, and the gray ruins that encompass them, can hardly be distinguished from the rocks themselves. There are considerable remains of massive foundations, columns, cisterns, etc., testifying to former prosperity greater than that of either Anathoth or Geba" (Porter, *Handbk.* pages 215, 216).

Mich'mash

(^{<0932>}1 Samuel 13:2-23; 14:5, 31; ^{<6131>}Nehemiah 11:31; ^{<2008>}Isaiah 10:28).
SEE MICHMAS.

Mich'methah

(Heb. *Mikmethath'*, **ttmkīnāp** perh. *hiding-place*; Sept. **Μαχθῶθ**, Vulg. *Machmethath*), a town on the northern border of Ephraim (and the southern of Manasseh), situated eastward of Shechem and southward from Asher, in the direction of Tappuah (^{<0670>}Joshua 17:7), also not very far west of Jordan, but beyond Taanath-Shiloh (^{<0646>}Joshua 16:6; where part of the verse appears to have become transposed from its proper location at the beginning of verse 8; see Keil's *Comment.* ad loc.). These notices appear to fix it not far from Wady Bidan, north-east of Salem. *SEE TRIBE*. This position corresponds to the location assigned to the associated places by

Eusebius (Schwarz, *Palest.* page 147); and M. de Saulcy found a little village in this vicinity, called *el-Makhna*, which he thinks may be a vestige of the Biblical locality (*Narrative*, 1:93); but Dr. Robinson, who passed through this region during his last visit, speaks only of “several villages” visible in this vicinity (*Researches*, new ed. 3:298), and applies the name *el-Makhna* to a large fertile valley south of Nablus (*ibid.* page 132, etc.); which, however, according to Van de Velde’s *Map*, runs into Wady Bidan.

Mich’ri

(Heb. *Mikrai’*, *yrkmas* *salable*; Sept. *Μοχορέ* v.r. *Μαχίρ*), the father of Uzzi and grandfather of Elah, which last was one of the principal Benjamites resident in Jerusalem after the exile (^{<1308>}1 Chronicles 9:8). B.C. considerably ante 440.

Mich’tam

(Heb. *miktam’*, *μTKḡa* prob. for *bTKḡa* *written*; Sept. *σθηλογραφία*, Vulg. *tituli inscriptio*), a term found in the titles of several psalms (16, 56, 57, 58, 60), and signifying a *writing*, i.e., a *poem* or song (see Gesenius, *Thesaur.* p. 724), like *bTKḡa* *niktab’*, “writing,” in ^{<2380>}Isaiah 38:9). Others (as Luther, after Aben-Ezra, Kimchi, and others) unaptly translate it *golden*, i.e., precious, distinguished, as if from *μTK*, gold. Still others (as Hezel, Ewald) refer to an Arabic root meaning to *conceal*, as if written from retirement, or in a plaintive strain; and some (after the rabbins) make it a compound of *μtwjĒm*; i.q. *humble and perfect*, referring to David.
SEE PSALMS.

Micislaus

duke of Poland in the 10th century, is noted in ecclesiastical history as the promulgator of Christianity among the Poles, A.D. 965. His own conversion was brought about by his wife, Dambrowka, daughter of a Bohemian prince. John XIII was at that time the Roman pontiff, and he despatched AEgidius, bishop of Tusculum, to the aid of the duke and his wife. **SEE POLAND.**

Micqueau, Jean-Louis

a French Protestant theologian, was born at Rheims about 1530. He took part in the Reformation; established a school at Orleans in 1557, and taught

the humanities in the college of the same city. Allied by friendship with Gentien Hervet, a canon of Rheims and native of Orleans, the difference in their religions brought on a polemical correspondence., He died near the close of the 16th century. Micqueau wrote, *Lycampaei castris obsidio et excidium* (1554): — *De constituenda apud Aurelios juventutis disciplina Oratio* (1558): — *Aureliae urbis memorabilis ab Anglis obsidio, anno 1428, et Joannae Virginis Lotharingae res gestae* (1560): — *Response au discours de Gentien Hervet, sus ce que les pilleurs, voleurs et branleurs de l'eglises disent qu'ils ne veulent qu'aux prieres* (1564): — *Deuxieme Response de Jean-Louis Micqueau, maistre d'ecole a Orleans, aux folies reveries, execrables blasphemes, erreurs et mensonges de G. Hervet* (1564). See *Revue historique et litteraire de la Champagne*, No. 11, 15 (November, 1854), page 74; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Micraelius, Johann

a German Lutheran professor, was born at Cosslin, in Pomerania, September 1, 1597. He began his studies at the college of his own town, and in 1614 removed to Stettin, where he studied theology under professor Aamer. In 1616 he maintained a dispute, "*De Dea uno et trino,*" which secured him much reputation. A year after he disputed at the University of Konigsberg, "*De veritate transcendentali.*" He received in 1621 the degree of master of philosophy at the University of Greifswald, after having maintained a thesis, "*De meteoris.*" He finished his studies at Leipsic. He was made professor of rhetoric in the royal college at Stettin in 1624, rector of the Senate School in 1627, and rector of the royal college and professor of theology in 1649. He had a famous dispute with John Bergius, first preacher at the court of the elector of Brandenburg, upon the differences between the Lutherans and Calvinists. On a visit to Sweden, in 1653, he had the honor to pay his respects to queen Christina, who received him with very marked attention. She defrayed the charges of his doctor's degree. He died December 3, 1658. Micrelius' wrote, *Lexicon Philologicum*: — *Lexicon Philosophicum*: — *Syntagma Historiae Mundi*: *Syntagma Historiae Ecclesiasticae*: — *Ethnophronius contra Gentiles de Principiis Religionis Christianae*: — he afterwards added a continuation, *Contra Judeas Depravationes*: — *Tabellae Historicae, ad Millen. et Rerumpublic. Tempora dijudicanda Necessarice*: — *Tractatus de copia Rerum et Verborum, cum Praxi continua Praeceptorum Rhetor*: — *Archerologia, Arithmetica, usus Globorum et Tabular. Geographicar.*: — *Orthodoxia Lutherana contra Bergium*; and numerous theses,

disputations, orations, etc. See *Allgemeines Historisches Lexikon* (Leips. 1731, 5 volumes, fol.), 3:560 sq.; Witte, *Memor. theol.* page 282 sq.; Bayle, *Hist. Dict.* s.v. (J.H.W.)

Micronesia

(from Greek μικρός, *small*, and νῆσος, *island*, signifying a region of small islands or islets) is a term of recent application, and is applied to a portion of the Central Archipelago, Pacific Ocean, including the Kingsmill group. Micronesia proper extends from the westernmost island of the Sandwich group to near Japan and the Philippines, and reaches south of the equator, including the Ladrone Islands, the Carolinas, and the Pellew Islands. The Kingsmill group lies on both sides of the equator, and consists of fifteen principal islands, all coral, and densely covered with cocoa-nut groves.

Customs. — The population of these islands amounts to about 50,000 souls. They are governed by independent chiefs or kings, and mostly lead a life of indolence. They are divided into three classes — chiefs, landholders, and slaves. They live in small communities, regarding the eldest of their number as a kind of patriarch. Polygamy is common. They are hospitable, and ready to share the last morsel with the needy. In each town is a “stranger’s house,” where travelers find a temporary home. The cocoa-nut, which everywhere abounds, supplies the few wants of the natives with little labor. Their chief employment is the manufacture of coconut oil. Almost everything which the natives eat, drink, wear, live in, or use in any way, is obtained from the cocoa-nut tree.

Religion. — There exists hardly any well-developed form of worship or religion. They have no idols and no priests. A loose system of spirit worship, or, better said, of veneration for the spirits of the dead, used to prevail among these people, but is gradually dying out. When a Micronesian dies, the body is placed upon mats, in the center of the house, and rubbed with coconut oil till the flesh is gone; then the bones are placed in a loft or thrown into the sea. A stone is placed near the house as a resting-place for the spirit, and offerings are made to it twice a year. There are but few traditions, and the people cannot be said to be very superstitious.

Missions. — Prosperous missions have been established in these groups by agents of the American Board of Foreign Missions; several of the workers have been selected from among their converts in Honolulu. As the result of

the mission to Micronesia, during the nineteen years since its commencement, it would appear that a wonderful change has been produced in the social and moral condition of the once wild and savage inhabitants. A number of the natives have been converted to Christianity, and, according to the last report, 668 converts are united in Church fellowship. See *The Missionary World* (N.Y. 1873, 12mo), page 457 and 1123; Grundemann, *Miss. Atlas*, s.v.; Newcomb, *Cyclop. of Missions*, page 539 sq. *SEE SANDWICH ISLANDS*.

Micronius, Martin

a very distinguished Dutch divine, was born about 1523 at Ghent, of a noble Dutch family. We know little of Micronius's early years. He was at first a physician, and is said to be the author of several medical books and essays. In 1550, when the Protestant Church was bitterly persecuted by the Spaniards, Micronius, with many others of his countrymen, fled to England, and there proved himself a very efficient helpmate to John a Lasko (q.v.) in the establishment and organization of the foreign Protestant congregation in London. He translated John Lasko's system of Church order and liturgical formulars into Dutch, and introduced them into the congregation of Dutch refugees in London. The death of the king wrought an entire change in the prospects of the exiles, and on the accession of queen Mary they prepared to leave for other parts. Micronius accompanied them to Denmark and East Friesland, and finally became pastor at Norden. He died towards the close of the 16th century. In his disputations and writings Micronius opposed Simon Menno (q.v.) and David George; and when Westphal (q.v.), a Lutheran divine, had called his fellow-pilgrims "martyrs of the devil," on account of Lasko's views of the sacraments, Micronius sought to convince, or at least silence him, but failed. In Norden he edited his larger and smaller Catechism, 1592: *De cleyne catechismus of kinderbere der Duitschen Ghemeynte van London, etc., weekenu hier ende daer verstrogt is. Ghemaect door Martin Micron. Ghedruckt bey Gellium Itematium anno 1555*. These catechisms were consulted in the composition of the Heidelberg Catechism (q.v.). Micronius also wrote an apology of the foreign Protestant congregation, defending them against the accusation of high-treason, which had furnished a pretext for their expulsion from England. See Kocher, *Katech. Gesch. der reform. Kirche*; Bartel's *Johannes a Lasko*.

Mid-day

(μυαηχ; *double light*,. ^{<1182>}1 Kings 18:29, i.e., noon, as elsewhere rendered; μ/Υhi tyxjñi *half of, the day*, ^{<168>}Nehemiah 8:3; ήμέρα μέση, *middle day*, ^{<483>}Acts 26:13). *SEE DAY*.

Mid' din

(Heb. *Middin'*, ὕδαρ distaznce; Sept. Μαδδίν v.r. Μαδών), a town in the desert of Judah, mentioned between Beth-arabah and Secacah (^{<165>}Joshua 15:61); and probably situated not far from the Dead Sea, about opposite its middle, or possibly at the ruins near a well marked on Van de Velde's *Map as Khan Mardeh*, near the north end of the Dead Sea. "By Van de Velde (*Memoir*, page 256, and *Map*) mention is made of a valley on the south-western side of the Dead Sea, below Masada, called *Urn el-Bedun*, which may contain a trace of the ancient name."

Middle Ages

The barbarism of this period may be said to have begun about A.D. 510, when the barbarians had made an eruption into the West very prejudicial to the interests of literature. Learning was preserved in the bishops' schools and monasteries: the works of ancient authors were kept in the libraries of the monasteries, but the libraries of monks and churchmen were composed chiefly of ecclesiastical and ascetic works. Greek literature was generally neglected, Latin but poorly cultivated; rhetoric was turned into bombast, the liberal arts comprised within a few rules, and the study of philosophy abandoned and decried. This barbarism almost *extinguished the light* (hence the name "*Dark Ages*") and life of Christianity, as the influence of the Church in the course of its previous corruption had already suppressed ancient literature. See Riddle's *Eccl. Chronicles*; Eden, *Theol. Dict.*; Farrar, *Eccles. Dict.*

Middle Wall

(μεσότοιχον), spoken of the *chel* or sacred fence ("partition") between the Court of the Gentiles and the interior sanctum of the Temple (^{<424>}Ephesians 2:14). *SEE TEMPLE*.

Middlekauff, Solomon

a German Reformed minister, was born near Hagerstown, Maryland, in 1818; was educated at Marshall College, Mercersburg, Pennsylvania, (class of 1839); studied theology in the theological seminary of the German Reformed Church located in the same place; was ordained in 1842, and became pastor of the Lincolnton charge in North Carolina. He died at the mineral springs, Catawba County, N.C., May 21, 1845. His ministry was brief but blessed. Energetic, mild and peaceful in spirit, well educated and zealous, his influence was widely felt, and his memory is faithfully cherished.

Middleton, Conyers

a celebrated divine and scholar of the Church of England, was born December 27, 1683, at Richmond, in Yorkshire. His father, the Reverend William Middleton, rector of Hinderwell, gave him a liberal education. At the age of seventeen he was sent to Trinity College, Cambridge, of which college he was two years afterwards chosen a scholar. He took his degree of B.A. in 1702, and was shortly after ordained deacon. In 1706 he was elected a fellow of Trinity' College; and in 1708 joined with other fellows of his college in a petition to the bishop of Ely, as the visitor of the college, against Bentley (q.v.), the master. Middleton, who was then a young man, did not take a prominent part in this proceeding; but the feelings of hostility to the master originated by these disputes sank deep into his mind, and made him subsequently the most determined and dangerous of Bentley's enemies. Soon after this petition, he withdrew himself from Bentley's jurisdiction by marrying a lady of ample fortune. He subsequently resided for a short time in the Isle of Ely, on a small living in the gift of his wife, but the unhealthiness of the situation induced him to return to Cambridge at the end of a year. In October, 1717, when George I visited the University of Cambridge, Middleton, with several others, was created doctor of divinity by mandate; but Bentley, who was regius professor of divinity, refused to confer the degree unless a fee of four guineas was given to him in addition to the so-called "broadpiece," which had by ancient custom been allowed as a present on this occasion. This demand was resisted by Middleton, who, however, at last consented to pay it under protest. An appeal to court proved unfavorable to Bentley, but still he kept the money. Middleton thereupon sued Bentley for it in the vice-chancellor's court; and Bentley, refusing to pay the money or to

acknowledge the jurisdiction of the court, was deprived of his degrees. Bentley petitioned the king for relief from that sentence, and, as he was a firm supporter of the Whig ministry then in power, it was feared that a commission might be issued by the crown to inquire into the state of the university. Middleton, to justify himself and his friends, published *A full and impartial Account of all the late Proceedings in the University of Cambridge against Dr. Bentley*; which, says Dr. Monk, “was the first published specimen of a style which, for elegance, purity, and ease, yields to none in the whole compass of the English language. The acrimonious and resentful feeling which prompted every line, is in some measure disguised by the pleasing language, the harmony of the periods, and the vein of scholarship which enliven the whole tract” (Monk, *Life of Bentley*, page 388). A few months afterwards Middleton published *A Second Part of the full and impartial Account of all the late Proceedings*, and also *A true Account of the present State of Trinity College, in Cambridge, under the oppressive Government of their Master, R. Bentley, late D.D.* These books seem to have been written in order to destroy the suspicion which many then had, viz. that the proceedings of the university against Dr. Bentley did not flow so much from any real demerit in the man, as from a certain spirit of opposition to the court, the great promoter of whose interest he was thought to be. Middleton, in one of his pamphlets, had very imprudently declared “that the fellows of Trinity College had not been able to find any proper court in England which would receive their complaints;” and Bentley, perceiving that his adversary had been guilty of an expression which might be considered as a libel upon the administration of justice in the whole kingdom, brought an action against him, in which the jury returned a verdict of guilty. The court, however, was unwilling to pronounce sentence, and the matter was eventually settled by Middleton’s begging pardon of Bentley, and consenting to pay all the expenses of the action.

But Middleton had not done with Bentley yet. The latter, in 1720, published proposals for a new edition of the Greek Testament, with a specimen of the intended work. The former, in 1721, published *Remarks, Paragraph by Paragraph, upon the Proposals lately published by R. Bentley for a new Edition of the Greek Testament.*

Although Middleton professed, in the commencement of the pamphlet, that “his remarks were not drawn from him by personal spleen or envy to the author of the *Proposals*, but by a serious conviction that he had neither

talents nor materials proper for the work he had undertaken. and that religion was much more likely to receive detriment than service from it," the whole tenor and style of the pamphlet showed that it was the result of the most virulent personal animosity. He followed up his attack on Bentley by *Some further Remarks*; and it must be conceded that these two books against Bentley are written with great acuteness and learning, and, though Bentley affected to despise them, they destroyed the credit of his *Proposals* so effectually that his intended publication of the New Testament came to nothing.

Upon the great enlargement of the public library at Cambridge, a new office of principal librarian was established, to which Middleton was elected, notwithstanding a violent opposition. He afterwards travelled through France and Italy, and spent some months in Rome in 1724. After his return, Middleton published his celebrated *Letter from Rome* (1729), in which he attempted to show that "the religion of the present Romans was derived from that of their heathen ancestors;" and that, in particular, the rites, ceremonies, dress of the priests, etc., in the Roman Catholic Church, were taken from the pagan religion. This work was received with great favor by the learned, and went through four editions in the author's lifetime. The free manner, however, in which he attacked the miracles of the Roman Catholic Church gave offence to many Anglican divines, and they charged Middleton with entertaining as little respect for the miracles of the apostles as for those of the Roman Catholic saints.

Hitherto Dr. Middleton stood well with mankind; for notwithstanding the offence he had given to some bigots by certain passages in the above-mentioned pamphlet, yet the reasonable part of Christians were well pleased with his writings, believing that he had done great service to Protestantism by his expose of the absurdities of popery. He was, in fact, a general favorite with the public, when, by the publication of a new work, *Christianity as old as Creation* (1731), he not only gave great offence to the clergy, but also ruined all his hopes for preferment. This letter, which was first published anonymously, was soon known to be written by Middleton. Pearce (q.v.), bishop of Rochester, replied to it, treating the author as an infidel; and so strong was the feeling against Middleton that he was in danger of losing his degree and office of librarian. Promising, however, to publish a satisfactory vindication of his course, the authorities withheld their intended degradation, and in 1732 Middleton gave to the world *Sonu Remarks on Dr. Pearce's second Reply*; wherein the author's

sentiments, as to all the principal points in dispute, are fully, clearly, and satisfactorily explained. In this manifesto, Middleton strongly asserted his belief in Christianity, and disavowed any intention to cast doubt upon its evidences; and thereby saved himself from degradation, but not from strong suspicion of hypocrisy — a charge which has ever since attached to his name. Middleton regarded Christianity in scarcely any other light than as a republication of the law of nature, and endeavored to reduce, as far as possible, everything supernatural in the Bible to mere natural phenomena. He expressly maintained that there were contradictions in the four evangelists which could not be reconciled (*Reflections on the Variations found in the Four Evangelists*); he accused Matthew “of wilfully suppressing or negligently omitting three successive descents from father to son in the first chapter of his Gospel” (see volume 2:24); he asserted that the apostles were sometimes mistaken in their applications of prophecies relating to Christ (2:59); he considered “the story of the fall of man as a fable or allegory” (2:131), and, with respect to the prophecy given at the fall, he did not hesitate to declare (3:183) “that men who inquire into things will meet with many absurdities which reason must wink at, and many incredibilities which faith must digest, before they can admit the authority of this prophecy upon the evidence, of this historical narration.” Such being the opinions of Middleton, it cannot excite surprise, notwithstanding his assertions to the contrary, that he should have been looked upon as a disbeliever in the fundamental doctrines of Christianity.

While these discussions were going on, Middleton was appointed to the professorship of natural history, which appointment he resigned in 1734. In the following year he published *A Dissertation concerning the Origin of Printing in England*, showing that it was first introduced and practiced by an Englishman, William Caxton, at Westminster, and not, as commonly supposed, by a foreign printer at Oxford. In 1741 he published by subscription his most celebrated work, *The History of the Life of M. Tullius Cicero* (Lond. 2 volumes, 4to). There were three thousand subscribers to this work, and the profits arising from its sale were so considerable as to enable Middleton to purchase a small estate at Hildersham, six miles from Cambridge, where he chiefly resided during the remainder of his life. Two years afterwards Middleton published a translation of Cicero’s letters to Brutus, and of Brutus’s to Cicero, with the Latin text, and a prefatory dissertation, in which he defended the authenticity of the Epistles. In 1745 he published *Germana quaedam*

Antiquitatis eruditae Monumenta, etc., in which he gave an account of the various specimens of ancient art which he had collected during his residence at Rome. Two years afterwards he published his *Treatise on the Roman Senate*, in which he maintained that all vacancies in the senate were filled up by the people. But the work which has a peculiar interest for us he published shortly after, under the title *An Introductory Discourse to a larger Work, designed hereafter to be published, concerning the Miraculous Powers which are supposed to have subsisted in the Christian Church from the earliest Ages, through several successive Centuries; by which it is shown that we have no sufficient Reason to believe, upon the Authority of the primitive Fathers, that any such Powers were continued to the Church after the Days of the Apostles* (1748). The *Introductory Discourse* to the work, and the *Free Inquiry* itself, elicited numerous controversial tracts. Middleton was attacked by Stebbing and Chapman, the former of whom endeavored chiefly to show that Middleton's scheme was inseparably connected with the fall of Christianity, while the latter labored to support the authority of the fathers. These attacks Middleton repelled by *Some Remarks on Two Pamphlets (by Drs. Stebbing and Chapman) published against the Introduction*. "The discourse," remarks Mr. Orme (*Bibl. Bib.* s.v.), referring to the whole controversy, "is worthy of attention, for, though the combatants on both sides carried matters too far, considerable information may be collected from them — on the character and testimony of the fathers, the nature of miracles, and on other points closely connected with the Christian revelation." The controversy began to grow very hot. Besides Stebbing and Chapman, Parker, Brook. Johnson, Dodwell, Church, and others attacked him, while he was defended by Yates, Jenkins, Toll, etc. A full list of the principal publications on the subject are enumerated by Kippis in a note to the 6th part of Doddridge's *Course of Lectures* (see. also Orme's *Bibl. Bib.*; Strong's *Cat. of Engl. Theol.* 1830, No. 9441 sq.; Lord Brougham, *Men of Letters of the Times of George III*, page 384). It was declared by Middleton's opponents that the tendency of his inquiry was to destroy the evidence of miraculous interpositions; but Middleton explicitly disavowed such intentions, and should have the benefit of the doubt. This much, however, must be admitted, that he seems never to have been so much pleased as when, by broaching some startling point of disputation, he succeeded in horrifying the minds of his orthodox brethren. Accordingly, before the theological world had recovered from the surprise and indignation into which they had been thrown by the *Free Inquiry*, its

fearless author put forth upon the world an attack upon bishop Sherlock, entitled *An Examination of the Lord Bishop of London's Discourses concerning the Use and Intent of Prophecy; with some cursory Anismadversions on his late Appendix, or additional Dissertation. containing a further Inquiry into the Mosaic Account of the Fall* (1750). In this work he attempted to refute Sherlock's (q.v.) theory of a chain of prophecy running through the different portions of the Old Testament. He was refuted by Dr. Rutherford, divinity professor at Cambridge; but Middleton, whose end seems to have been answered, which was to abuse the bishop a little, pursued the argument no further. The obstinate controversialist died with the armor on his back and the lance in his hands. He was meditating a general answer to all the objections made against the *Free Inquiry*; but, being seized with illness, and imagining he might not be able to go through it, he singled out Church and Dodwell, as the two most considerable of his adversaries. and employed himself in preparing a particular answer to them. This, however, he did not live to finish, but died July 28, 1750, at Hildersham, in Cambridgeshire. A little before his death, he thought it prudent to accept a small living from Sir John Frederick. A few months after his death was published his *Vindication of the Free Inquiry into the Miraculous Powers, etc., from the Objections of Dr. Dodwell and Dr. Church*. The piece is unfinished, but very able as far as it goes. In 1752 all the before-mentioned works, except *The Life of Cicero*, were collected and printed in four volumes, 4to, under the title of *Miscellaneous Works*; among which were inserted the following pieces, never before published, viz., *A Preface to an intended Answer to all the Objections made against the Free Inquiry*; — *Some cursory Reflections on the Dispute, or Dissension, which happened at Antioch, between the Apostles Peter and Paul*; — *Reflections on the Variations, or, Inconsistencies, which are found among the Four Evangelists in their different Accounts of the same Facts*; — *An Essay on the Gift of Tongues, tending to explain the proper Notion and Nature of it, as it is described and delivered to us in the sacred Scriptures, and as it appears also to have been understood by the learned both of ancient and modern times*; *Some short Remarks on a Story told by the Ancients concerning St. John the Evangelist and Cerinthus the Heretic; and on the Use which is made of it by the Moderns, to enforce the Duty of shunning Heretics*; — *An Essay on the allegorical and literal Interpretation of the Creation and Fall of Man*; — *De Latinarum literarum pronunciatione dissertatio*; — *Some Letters of Dr. Middleton to his Friends*. A second edition of these *Miscellaneous*

Works was published in five volumes, 8vo, in 1755. "Dr. Middleton," says Parr, in his preface *Bellendenus*, "was a man of no common attainments: his learning was elegant and profound, his judgment was acute and polished, his taste was fine and correct; his style was so pure and harmonious, so vigorously flowing without being inflated, that, Addison alone excepted, he seems to me without a rival." See Leckey, *Hist. of Rationalism* (see Index in volume 2); Jortin, *Eccles. Remarks*, 1:298; Disraeli, *Miscell. of Literature, Quarrels of Authors*, page 313; Nichols, *Lit. Anec.* page 414 sq.; Knox, *Essays*, 2:56; *N. Amer. Review*, 35:440; Chancellor Kent, *Course of Engl. Reading*; Macaulay, *Crit. and Hist. Essays*, 2:132; Orme, *Bibl. Bib.* s.v.; *Biogr. Brit.* s.v.; Chalmers's *Biogr. Dict.* s.v.; *General Biogr. Dict.* s.v.; *English Cyclop.* s.v.; Hook, *Eccles. Biogr.* s.v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibl.* 1:2057; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, 2:1273 sq.; *Blackwood's Magazine*, 14:257; 15:461; 28:440 sq.; 32:607; Bickersteth, *Christ. Student*, page 298.

Middleton, Erasmus

a noted English divine, was born about 1740. He received his education at St. Edmund's Hall, Oxford, but was expelled from that university, together with five other youths, on account of his sympathy with the Methodists. This circumstance gave rise to MacGowan's satire of *The Shaver*. Middleton then entered King's College, Cambridge, and, after his graduation, became pastor of an Episcopal congregation at Dalkeith, Scotland, and curate successively to Romaine and Cadogan, and at St. Margaret's, Westminster. He was presented to the rectory of Turvey, Bedfordshire, in 1764, and was thus a predecessor of Leigh Richmond (q.v.). He died April 25. 1805. Dr. Middleton was a man of warm piety, and of a Catholic spirit. He is the well-known author of *Biographia Evangelica, or an historical Account of the Lives and Deaths of the most eminent evangelical Authors or Preachers, both British and Foreign, in the several Denominations of Protestants* (1779, 4 volumes, 8vo). This great biographical work is a collection of invaluable materials, and must immortalize his memory, while doing immense good. Of his other works we mention: *Archbishop Leighton's whole Works, with Life* (1805, 4 volumes): — *Versions and Initiations of the Psalms of David* (1806): — *Luther's Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, with his Life* (1807). See Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, 2:1275; Cooper, *Biog. Dict. of Eminent Persons*, page 865.

Middleton, Thomas Fanshawe, D.D.

the first English bishop of Calcutta, largely identified with the Anglican Church missionary work in India, only son of the Reverend T. Middleton, rector of Kedleston, Derbyshire, was born at that village January 26, 1769. His early training he received under his father. In 1779 he was admitted into Christ's Hospital, London, and thence proceeded to Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, where he took his degree of B.A., with honors, in January, 1792. Shortly after he received ordination, and entered upon the curacy of Gainsborough, in Lincolnshire. Here he edited a periodical work entitled the *Country Spectator*, which continued to appear for about seven months, Middleton sustaining the paper mainly by his own compositions. This connection brought him to the notice of Dr. John Pretyman, archdeacon of Lincoln, who in 1794 appointed him tutor to his two sons. Middleton in consequence removed first to Lincoln, and afterwards to Norwich, where he became curate of St. Peter's Mancroft in 1799, having previously (in 1795) been presented by Dr. Pretyman to the rectory of Tansor, in Northamptonshire. In 1802 he was presented with the rectory of Bytham, in Lincolnshire. About this time he wrote his chief work, *The Doctrine of the Greek Article applied to the Criticism and Illustration of the New Testament*, which he published in 1808, with a dedication to Dr. Pretyman. The object of this work — is first, to establish the rules which govern the use of the article, and then to apply these rules to the interpretation of various passages in the New Testament, many of which are of such a nature that they furnish arguments for or against the divinity of Christ, according to the different views which are taken of the force of the article. Owing to this circumstance, the doctrine of the Greek article has become the subject of warm discussion among theologians; and some Unitarian divines have strongly opposed the views of Middleton. His chief rules have, however, been received as sound by the great majority of Biblical critics. (A second and improved edition was published by Prof. Scholefield in 1828; and a third by the Reverend Hugh James Rose in 1833. An abstract of the work is prefixed to Valpy's edition of the Greek Testament.) In the same year in which he published this work he took his degree of D.D. at Cambridge, and removed to his living at Tansor, where he discharged his duties in such a manner as to gain the affection and esteem of his people. In 1809 he was appointed by bishop Pretyman to a stall in the cathedral of Lincoln, and in 1812 to the archdeaconry of Huntingdon. In 1811 he resigned his two livings for the vicarage of St. Pancras, Middlesex, and the

rectory of Rottenham, in Hertfordshire. He fixed his residence at St. Pancras, and made the acquaintance of several dignitaries of the Church and other distinguished individuals. He was in sympathy with the object of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and was earnest and untiring in advancing its interests, as well as those of other societies in connection with the Church. The knowledge thus acquired of their plans, resources, and activities greatly aided him in his subsequent career in India, and the discernment and good judgment which he brought to their meetings contributed materially to their efficiency. About this time the Anglican Church established a bishopric in India, constituting Calcutta as the episcopal residence. For this distinguished position Dr. Middleton was selected; and he was accordingly consecrated the first colonial bishop ever set apart by the Anglican Church by the archbishop of Canterbury, May 8, 1814. A short time prior to his departure for Calcutta, bishop Middleton was made a fellow of the Royal Society. He arrived in Calcutta November 28, 1814 a little more than a year from the time of the death of Henry Martyn, that valued worker in this field. During the voyage Middleton had diligently employed himself in increasing his qualifications for his office, especially by the study of Hebrew and Persian. As bishop of Calcutta he made every effort to promote the interests of Christianity, and to aid the cause of education. He made three visitations of his immense diocese, in two of which he directed his particular attention to the state of the Syrian Christians in the neighborhood of Cochin, on the coast of Malabar. By his efforts the Bishop's College at Calcutta was established for the education of clergymen and missionaries for the British possessions in Asia; and he laid the first stone of its buildings December 15, 1820. He instituted a consistory court at Calcutta, and would have done the same at Madras but for the opinion of the advocate-general of Madras that he regarded such a measure as illegal. These extended labors and extraordinary exertions, embarrassed by daily annoyances from the civil authorities in their application of regulations applicable only to the home clergy, could not result otherwise than in depressing him and diminishing his vigor, especially in India's unhealthy climate, and greatly hastened the end of his days. He died July 8, 1822, abidlutely worn out by toil and fatigue. His successor in the work was the sainted Reginald Heber (q.v.). Bishop Middleton was large and dignified in form, animated in manner, and generous and kind in disposition. As a preacher he was very impressive, his voice clear and pleasing, his style simple and manly, generally argumentative, and strongly imbued with the doctrines of the Church of England. In accordance with

his last desires, bishop Middleton's papers were destroyed, and we have, therefore, none of his greater works excepting the one he had published in his earlier years on "the Greek Article," the periodical publication mentioned above, and some sermons, charges, and tracts, which have been collected into a volume, to which a memoir of bishop Middleton is prefixed, by H.K. Bonney, D.D., archdeacon of Bedford (London, 1824). See Charles Webb Le Bas, *Life of the Right Rev. Thomas Fanshawe Middleton* (London, 1831, 2 volumes, 8vo); Miss Yonge, *Pioneers and Founders*, chapter 7; *Monthly Review*, 1810 (May); Kaye, *Christianity in India*. (J.H.W.)

Middoth

SEE TALMUD.

Midgard's Serpent

or the *World-Serpent* (*Jormungand*), is, in the mythology of the Norsemen, the great serpent which surrounds the world. As the offspring of Loki (q.v.), the principle of evil, the other gods feared the new-born, and determined to get early possession of, it and Fenrir, another of Loki's offspring, and, when secured, Midgard's Serpent was cast into the ocean, where it grew till it encircled the world, biting its own tail. At the end of the world, the world-serpent will fight among the enemies of the gods and be slain by Thor, who, however, will die immediately afterwards from the effect of its venom. The myth of the world-serpent is supposed to signify the deep or main ocean, which, excited by Loki (subterranean fire or earthquake), is thrown upon the land, thus proving scarcely less fatal to the works of man than the direct action of volcanic fire, represented under the form of Fenrir. For further particulars, see Thorpe's *Northern Mythology*, 1:80 sq., 161 sq.; Mallet's *Northern Antiquities*, volume 2, Fables 16:25, 26, 27; Keyser's *Religion of the Northmen*; Petersen's *Nordisk Mythologi*.

Mid'ian

(Heb. *Midyan'*, *ydina* *strife*, as in ^{<2018>}Proverbs 18:18; 19:13; Sept. *Μαδιάν* v.r. *Μαδιάμ*; N.T: *Μαδίαμ*, ^{<4079>}Acts 7:29, where the Auth.Vers. has "Madian;" the Heb. often stands collectively for the "Midianites" also, as it is frequently rendered in all the versions), the fourth son of Abraham by Keturah, and the progenitor of the Midianites (^{<0312>}Genesis 35:2; ^{<1012>}1 Chronicles 1:32). B.C. post 2024. His five sons are

enumerated in ^{<02504>}Genesis 25:4; ^{<13133>}1 Chronicles 1:33. Of his personal history nothing further is known. *SEE MIDIANITE*.

Mid'ianite

(Heb. *Midyani'*, ^{<04112>}*myḡelīnā* Numbers 10:29, used collectively, and so rendered "Midianites," which is the usual translation for *Midian* itself; Sept. *Μαδιανίτης*; but the plur. ^{<04112>}*myḡelīnā* also occurs, ^{<03728>}Genesis 37:28, and the fem. ^{<02515>}*tyḡelīnā* Numbers 25:15; *SEE MADIAN*), a tribe of people descended from Abraham's son Midian (q.v.), a branch of the Arabians dwelling principally in the desert north of the peninsula of Arabia. Southwards they extended along the eastern shore of the Gulf of Aileh; and northwards they stretched along the eastern frontier of Palestine; while the oases in the peninsula of Sinai seem to have afforded them pasturegrounds, and caused it to be included in the "land of Midian." The notion that there were two peoples called Midian, founded on the supposed shortness of the interval for any considerable multiplication from Abraham to Moses, and on the mention of Moses's Cushite wife, seems to be untenable. Even conceding the former objection, which is unnecessary, one tribe has often become merged into another and older one, and only the name of the latter retained. See Burton, *Goldmines of Midian and Ruined Midianitish Cities* (Lond. 1878, 8vo).

I. History. — Midian, though not the oldest, was the most celebrated son of Keturah. What Judah became among the tribes of Israel. Midian became among the tribes of Arabia. It is true we find the other branches of the Keturites spoken of a few times in sacred history, and mentioned in such a way as to prove that as tribes they never lost their individuality; yet the Midianites were the dominant people, and Midian is the great name which always comes out prominently before the historian. Not only so, but the Midianites appear to have been for a lengthened period the virtual rulers of Arabia, combining into a grand confederacy, and then guiding or controlling, as circumstances required, all the Arabian branches of the Hebrew race. This fact comes out incidentally in many parts of Scripture; and we require to keep it carefully in view in order to understand the sacred narrative.

1. Midian had five sons, who, doubtless, in accordance with Arab custom, became heads of distinct tribes (^{<02504>}Genesis 25:4; comp. ^{<02103>}Numbers 31:8). We are told that while "Abraham gave all that he had to Isaac," that

is, made him his heir — head of his house and patrimony — “to the sons of the concubines Abraham gave gifts, and sent them away from Isaac his son while he yet lived, eastward, to the land in the east” (verses 5, 6). This is the first indication of the country occupied by the Midianites and other descendants of Keturah. The expression is not very definite. Abraham’s principal place of residence was Southern Palestine — Mamre and Beersheba. The “country of the east” appears to have included the whole region on the east side of the Arabah or great valley which reaches from the fountains of the Jordan to the AElanitic Gulf. All Arabia, in fact, and even Mesopotamia were included in the “country of the East” (⁰¹²⁰¹Genesis 29:1; ⁰¹²⁰⁷Numbers 23:7, etc.). *SEE BENE-KEDEM*. Another incidental notice in ⁰¹³⁵⁵Genesis 36:35 points more clearly to the exact territory of Midian. Hadad, one of the early kings of Edom, is said to have “smitten Midian in the field of Moab.” We may conclude from this that the Midianites were at that time settled on the eastern borders of Moab and Edom. They were, like all Arabians, a nomad or semi-nomad people; having some settlements around fountains and in fertile valleys, but forced to wander in their tents from place to place to secure sufficient pasture for their flocks. The Midianites were an enterprising people. They were not satisfied with the dull routine of pastoral and agricultural life. From the first they appear to have engaged in commercial pursuits. Some districts of Arabia, Eastern Palestine, and Lebanon, yielded valuable spices and perfumes which were in great demand in Egypt, not merely for the luxuries of the living, but for the embalming of the dead. In this profitable trade the Midianites engaged. It was to one of their caravans passing through Palestine from Gilead to Egypt that Joseph was sold by his brethren (⁰¹³⁷⁵Genesis 37:25 sq.). Slaves at that time found as ready a market in Egypt as they do now. It will be observed that the traders are called by the historian both *Ishmaelites* and *Midianites*, the two names being used as synonymous. The reason probably is that these were the dominant tribes in Arabia, and carried on the trade jointly; hence they were known among strangers by both names. It would seem, however, that the merchants in this caravan were true Midianites. though they may have been accompanied by Ishmaelites (verses 28, 36; but comp. 25, 27). In verse 36 the Hebrew is מִדְיָנִים, the *Medanites*, which is the regular plural of *Medan* (⁰¹³⁷⁵dm), the third son of Keturah (⁰¹²³¹Genesis 25:2); while in verse 28 the word is מִדְיָנִים, the regular plural of ⁰¹³⁷⁵dm. There can be little doubt that the Midianites are referred to in both passages, as represented in the Septuagint, Vulgate, Targums, and other ancient versions. *SEE MEDAN*.

By a similar latitude of expression, the Midianites sometimes appear to be reckoned among the Ishmaelites (^{<OR12>}Judges 7:12; 8:22, 24); elsewhere they are distinguished from them (^{<OR2>}Genesis 25:2,4,12,16). This probably arose from their being nomadic in their habits, so that bands of them often moved from place to place. But the difficulty may be avoided by supposing that the terms “Midianite” and “Ishmaelite” are used as a synonyme of travelling merchant, such as they became in later times. *SEE* *ISHMAELITE*.

2. The next notice of Midian is in connection with the eventful history of Moses — “Moses fled from the face of Pharaoh, and dwelt in the land of *Midian*” (^{<OR15>}Exodus 2:15). Reuel or Jethro, the priest of Midian, became his master and father-in-law. Moses kept his flock. The subsequent incidents of this strange narrative show clearly the region then inhabited by Jethro, and called “the land of Msidian.” It was the peninsula of Sinai, and it was while watching his flock there on the side of Horeb that Moses saw the glory of the Lord in the burning bush, and received the commission to return to Egypt for the deliverance of Israel (^{<OR16>}Exodus 3:1 sq.). It would appear, from a comparison of the several incidental notices of Jethro given in the Pentateuch, that the peninsula of Sinai was not his settled place of abode. When Israel was encamped at Horeb, Jethro brought thither Moses’s wife and his two sons; and, after a brief stay, we are told that “he went his way into his own land” (^{<OR18>}Exodus 18:1-3, 27; comp. ^{<OR19>}Numbers 10:29, 30). The Midianites were nomads roaming over a very wide region, but, like most Arab tribes, having one permanent nucleus. This nucleus was specially their home: it was the “land of their kindred;” yet they also claimed the whole region in which they pastured their flocks as their own. The nucleus of the Midianites was somewhere on the eastern border of Edom, but their pasture grounds probably extended as far as Gilead and Bashan on the north, while on the south they embraced an extensive territory along both shores of the Atlantic Gulf. Hence Horeb was said to be in the land of Midian (^{<OR15>}Exodus 2:15 with 3:1), while the chief seat of Jethro’s tribe was on the east of Edom. The Midianites were thus accustomed to lead their flocks and herds over the whole of that region which the Israelites afterwards traversed the choice pastures, the fountains, and the wells in the desert were all known to them. This fact throws light on Moses’s urgent request to his father-in-law, “Leave us not, I pray thee: forasmuch as thou knowest how we are to encamp in the wilderness, and thou mayest be to us instead of eyes” (^{<OR21>}Numbers 10:31).

It should, however, be remembered that the name of Midian (and hence the “land of Midian”) was perhaps often applied, as that of the most powerful of the northern Arab tribes, to the northern Arabs generally, i.e., those of Abrahamic descent (comp. ^{<0E7B>}Genesis 37:28, but see respecting this passage above; and ^{<0E3B>}Judges 8:24); just as BENE-KEDEM embraced all those peoples, and, with a wider signification, other Eastern tribes. If this reading of the name be correct, “Midian” would correspond very nearly with our modern word “Arab;” limiting, however, the modern word to the Arabs of the northern and Egyptian deserts: all the Ishmaelitish tribes of those deserts would thus be Midianites, as we call them Arabs, the desert being their “land.” At least it cannot be doubted that the descendants of Hagar and Keturah intermarried; and thus the Midianites are apparently called Ishmaelites in ^{<0E3B>}Judges 8:24, being connected, both by blood and national customs, with the father of the Arabs. The wandering habits of nomadic tribes must also preclude our arguing from the fact of Moses’s leading his father’s flock to Horeb, that Sinai was necessarily more than a station of Midian: those tribes annually traverse a great extent of country in search of pasturage, and have their established summer and winter pastures. The Midianites were mostly (not always) dwellers in tents, not towns; and Sinai has not sufficient pasture to support more than a small, or a moving people. But it must be remembered that perhaps (or we may say *probably*) the peninsula of Sinai has considerably changed in its physical character since the time of Moses; even the adjacent isthmus has been thought, since that period, to have risen many feet, so that “the tongue of the Egyptian Sea” has “dried up;” and this supposition would much diminish the difficulty of accounting for the means of subsistence found by the Israelites in their wanderings in the wilderness, when not miraculously supplied. Apart from this consideration, we know that the Egyptians afterwards worked mines at Sarabet el-Khddim, and a small mining population may have found sufficient sustenance, at least in some seasons of the year, in the few watered valleys, and wherever ground could be reclaimed: rock-inscriptions (though of later date) testify to the number of at least passers-by; and the remains of villages of a mining population have recently been discovered. Whatever may have been the position of Midian in the Sinaitic peninsula, if we may believe the Arabian historians and geographers, backed as their testimony is by the Greek geographers (see below), the city of Midian was situate on the opposite or Arabian shore of the Arabian Gulf; and thence northwards, and spreading east and west, we have the true country of the wandering Midianites. *SEE SINAI.*

3. The next occurrence of the name of this people in the sacred history marks their northern settlements on the border of the Promised Land, “on this side Jordan [by] Jericho,” in the plains of Moab (⁽⁻⁰²¹⁾Numbers 22:1-4). The Midianites were a wise and a wily people. So long as the Israelites only traversed their outlying pasturegrounds on the west of the Arabah, they were content to cultivate their friendship; but when, in the latter part of their journey, having passed round the southern end of Edom, they entered the proper territory of Midian, the Midianites tried every plan and used every effort to work their destruction. They consulted with their neighbors, the chiefs of Moab, and resolved to bring the prophet Balaam to curse the powerful strangers (⁽⁻⁰³⁴⁾Numbers 33:4-7). Balaam came, and the Lord turned the intended curse into a blessing. The prophet, however, adopted a more effectual mode of injuring the Israelites than by the agency of enchantments. He persuaded the women of Midian and Moab to work upon the passions of the Israelites, and entice them to the licentious festivals of their idols, and thus bring upon them the curse of heaven (⁽⁻⁰³¹⁶⁾Numbers 31:16). This infamous scheme proved only too successful (ch. 25), and, had it not been checked by the almost complete annihilation of the Midianites, it would have brought destruction upon the whole host of Israel (⁽⁻⁰²⁵⁷⁾Numbers 25:17; 31:2). The vengeance then executed upon Midian was terrible. Their cities and castles were burned; the entire males that fell into the hands of the conquerors were put to death, including the five kings of Midian — Evi, Rekem, Zur, Hur, and Reba, together with Balaam and with them all the married females; and the young women and children were reduced to slavery. It has been affirmed that these acts of vengeance are so cruel, so barbarous in their character, that they could never have been prompted by a God of love, and that, therefore, the narrative cannot be considered as of divine authority. Those who bring such an accusation against the Scriptures must surely overlook the leading circumstances of the case—they must forget that the God of love is also the God *of justice*. The whole Midianitish nation, male and female, had deliberately combined and conspired, by wile and stratagem, to wean the Israelites from their allegiance to the God of heaven, and not only so, but wantonly to allure them to the commission of the most foul and degrading crimes. Was it inconsistent with justice for the moral Governor of the universe to punish such guilt? Could any punishment less sweeping have freed the earth from crime so deep-rooted and so dangerous? The influence of the Midianites on the Israelites was clearly most evil, and directly tended to lead them from the injunctions of Moses. Much of the dangerous

character of their influence may probably be ascribed to the common descent from Abraham. While the Canaanitish tribes were abhorred, Midian might claim consanguinity, and more readily seduce Israel from its allegiance.

The details of this war given by Moses afford us some little insight into the nature of the country of Midian, and the occupations of the people. The Midianite: were not pure nomads; they had cities and goodly castles (^{<0610>}Numbers 31:10). Their principal wealth consisted, however, in flocks and herds, for the Israelites capture(675,000 sheep, 72,000 beeves, and 61,000 asses. It is singular that camels are not mentioned; but it is probable that, as the Israelites were all footmen, the camel escaped to the desert. Recent investigations have shown that the whole desert east of Edom and Moab is thickly studded with the ruins of ancient cities and castles (Wallin, in *Journal of R.G.S.* 24:115 sq.; Porter *Damascus*, 2:188; Wetstein, *Reisebericht iiber Hauran* etc.; Graham, in *Journal of R.G. S for 1859*). These were doubtless the habitations of the Midianites. The whole region around their cities, extending from the mountains of Hauran to the AElanitic Gulf, though no dreary and desolate, is not barren. In spring and early summer it is covered with vegetation, and it has many rich valleys, a few patches of which are still here and there cultivated by the Arab tribes. Everywhere there are evidences of partial cultivation in former days, and there are also traces of a comparatively dense population (see Porter, *Hand-book*, pages 501, 508, 523, etc.).

Some time previous to the exodus it appears that the Midianites had allied themselves closely to the Moabites. Sihon, king of the Amorites, made war upon Moab and Ammon, conquered a large part of their territory, and retained possession of it (^{<07113>}Judges 11:13-23). At the same time he made Midian, the ally of Moab, tributary; and hence the five princes of Midian are called by Joshua *vassals* (^{<0632>}Keil on ^{<0632>}Joshua 13:21) or “dukes” of Sihon. The defeat of Sihon by the Israelites secured the freedom of the Midianites; and then they, fearing lest they should in like manner be subdued by Moses, conspired to destroy Israel, and thus brought destruction upon themselves. The government of Midian was doubtless similar to that of all the nations of Arabia-patriarchal. The nation was divided into a number of tribes, each of which was independent, and led by its own *sheik* or chief. In time of common danger or of war, the sheiks of the various tribes formed a council, but always acknowledged the presidency of the head of one leading family, who was (and still is) styled

the “prince” (*emir*) of the nation. Five of the sheiks of Midian are mentioned in Judges as subjects of Sihon. In ^{QEBIB}Numbers 31:8 they are called “kings” (μykl m); while in 22:4 Moab is said to have consulted with the “elders” (μynqz) of Midian. The great Arab tribes have two classes of chiefs: one class is composed of the rulers of the leading divisions of the tribe, the other of the rulers of subdivisions. The former are hereditary, the latter are simply influential or warlike men who, by their talents, have gathered around them a number of families. It would seem to be the former class—the hereditary rulers of Midian—who are called “kings;” while the others, the influential leaders or senators of the tribe, are termed “elders.” In the transaction with Balaam, the elders of Midian went with those of Moab, “with the rewards of divination in their hand” (22:7); but in the remarkable words of Balaam; the Midianites are not mentioned. This might be explained by the supposition that Midian was a wandering tribe, whose pasture-lands reached wherever, in the Arabian desert and frontier of Palestine, pasture was to be found, and who would not feel, in the same degree, as Moab, Amalek, or the other more settled and agricultural inhabitants of the land allotted to the tribes of Israel, the arrival of the latter. But the spoil taken in the war that soon followed, and more especially the mention of the dwellings of Midian, render this suggestion very doubtful, and point rather to a considerable pastoral settlement of Midian in the trans-Jordanic country. “Such settlements of Arabs have, however, been very common. In this case the Midianites were evidently *tributary* to the Amorites, being “dukes of Sihon, dwelling in the country” (/rah;yboꝝ): this inferior position; explains their omission from Balaam’s prophecy. The rank of the Midianitish woman Cozbi, that of a daughter of Zur, who was “head over a people, of a chief house in Midian,” throws a strange light over the obscure page of that people’s history. The vices of the Canaanites, idolatry and licentiousness, had infected the descendants of Abraham, doubtless connected by successive intermarriages with those tribes; and the prostitution of this chief’s daughter, caught as it was from the customs of the Canaanites, is evidence of the ethnological type of the latter tribes. Some African nations have a similar custom: they offer their unmarried daughters to show hospitality to their guests.

4. There is no further mention of the Midianites in history for two hundred and fifty years. During that period the nation had completely recovered its ancient influence and power, probably by the arrival of fresh colonists from the desert tracts over which their tribes wandered; and they again turned

their arms against their old enemies, the Israelites. For seven years they oppressed them so grievously that the people were forced to flee from the open country, and to seek an asylum in mountain fastnesses, in caves, and in fortified cities (^{<0001>}Judges 6:1, 2). Midian was now at the head of a great confederacy, comprising the Amalekites and the leading tribes of Arabia, called by the sacred historian *Beni Kedem* ("children of the East," verse 3). In early spring the confederates assembled their vast flocks and herds, descended through the defiles of Gilead, crossed the Jordan, and overran the rich plains of Central Palestine, plundering and destroying all before them — "sheep, oxen, asses," property, the young corn, and the luxuriant pastures: "For they came up with their cattle, and their tents, and they came as grasshoppers for multitude; for both they and their camels were without number; and they entered into the land to destroy it" (verse 5). In their distress the Israelites cried unto the Lord, and he sent a deliverer in the person of Gideon (verses 8-13). The invaders were concentrated on Esdraelon-their flocks covering the whole of that splendid plain, and their encampment lying along the base of "the hill of Moreh," now called Little Hermon (verses 33; 7:1,12). Gideon assembled his band of warriors 'at the well of Harod, or fountain of Jezreel, situated at the foot of Gilboa, and famed in after-days as the scene of Saul's defeat and death (^{<0001>}Judges 7:1). *SEE HAROD*. The romantic incidents in this memorable campaign have been treated of elsewhere, *see GIDEON*, but the Midianitish side of the story is pregnant with interest. The scene over that fertile plain, dotted with the enemies of Israel, "the Midianites, and the Amalekites, and all the Bene-Kedem, [who] lay along (מַיִל מִן הַפֶּלֶל, i.e., pitched their tents) in the valley like locusts for multitude, and their camels were without number, as the sand by the sea-side for multitude" (^{<0001>}Judges 7:12), has been picturesquely painted by Prof. Stanley (*Sinai and Palestine*, page 333).

The descent of Gideon and his servant into the camp, and the conversation of the Midianitish watch, forms a vivid picture of Arab life. It does more:: it proves that as Gideon, or Phurah, his servant, or both, understood the language of Midian, the Shemitic languages-differed much less in the 14th century B.C. than they did in after-times, *see ARABIA*; and we besides obtain a remarkable proof of the consanguinity of the Midianites, and learn that, though the name was probably applied to all or most of the northern Abrahamitic Arabs, it was not applied to the Canaanites, who certainly did not then speak a Shemitic language that Gideon could understand. The stratagem of Gideon-receives an illustration from modern Oriental life.

Until lately, the police in Cairo were accustomed to go their rounds with a lighted torch thrust into a pitcher, and the pitcher was suddenly withdrawn when light was required (Lane's *Mod. Eg.* 5th edit. page 120) — a custom affording an exact parallel to the ancient expedient adopted by Gideon. The consequent panic of the great multitude in the valley, if it have no parallels in modern European history, is consistent with Oriental character. Of all peoples, the nations of the East are most liable to sudden and violent emotions; and a panic in one of their heterogeneous, undisciplined, and excitable hosts has always proved disastrous. In the case of Gideon, however, the result of his attack was directed by God, the divine hand being especially shown in the small number of Israel, 300 men, against 135,000 of the enemy. At the sight of the 300 torches, suddenly blazing round about the camp, in the beginning of the middle-watch (which the Midianites had newly set), with the confused din of the trumpets, “for the three companies blew the trumpets, and brake the pitchers, and held the lamps in their left hands, and the trumpets in their right hands to blow [withal], and they cried, [The sword] of the Lord and of Gideon” (7:20), “all the host ran, and cried, and fled” (verse 21). The panic-stricken multitude knew not enemy from friend, for “the Lord set every man’s sword against his fellow even throughout all the host” (verse 22). The rout was complete, the first places made for being Beth-shittah (“the house of the acacia”) in Zererath, and the “border” (**hpc**) of Abel-meholah, “the meadow of the dance,” both being probably down the Jordan valley, unto Tabbath, shaping their flight to the ford of Beth-barah, where probably they had crossed the river as invaders. The flight of so great a host, encumbered with slow-moving camels, baggage, and cattle, was calamitous.. All the men of Israel, out of Naphtali, and Asher, and Manasseh, joined in the pursuit; and Gideon roused the men of Mount Ephraim to “take before” the Midianites “the waters unto Beth-barah and Jordan” (verses 23, 24). Thus cut off; two princes, Oreb and Zeeb (the “raven,” or, more correctly “crow,” and the “wolf”), fell into the hands of Ephraim, and Oreb they slew at the rock Oreb, and Zeeb they slew at the wine-press of Zeeb (^{<00025>}Judges 7:25; comp. ^{<23026>}Isaiah 10:26, where the “slaughter of Midian at the rock Oreb” is referred to). It is added, in the same verse, that they pursued Midian, and brought the heads of the princes to Gideon “on the other side Jordan.” This anticipates the account of his crossing Jordan (^{<0004>}Judges 8:4), but such transpositions are frequent, and the Hebrew may be read “On this side Jordan.” But though we have seen that many joined in a desultory pursuit of the rabble of the Midianites, only

the 300 men who had blown the trumpets in the valley of Jezreel crossed Jordan with Gideon, “faint yet pursuing” (^{<OR84>}Judges 8:4). With this force it remained for the liberator to attack the enemy on his own ground, for Midian had dwelt on the other side Jordan since the days of Moses. Fifteen thousand men, under the “kings” of Midian, Zebah and Zalmunna, were at Karkor, the sole remains of 135,000, “for there fell a hundred and twenty thousand men that drew sword” (^{<OR80>}Judges 8:10). The assurance of God’s help encouraged the weary three hundred, and they ascended from the plain (or *ghdr*) to the higher country by a ravine or torrentbed in the hills, “by the way of them that dwelt in tents [that is, the pastoral or wandering people as distinguished from towns-people], on the east of Nobah and Jogbehah, and smote the host, for the host was secure” (^{<OR81>}Judges 8:11) secure in that wild country, on their own ground, and away from the frequent haunts of man. A sharp pursuit seems to have followed this fresh victory, ending in the capture of the kings and the final discomfiture of the Midianites. The overthrow of Midian in its encampment, when it was “secure,” by the exhausted companies of Gideon (they were “faint,” and had been refused bread both at Succoth and at Penuel, 8:5-9), set the seal to God’s manifest hand in the deliverance of his people from the oppression of Midian. Zebah and Zalmunna were slain, and with them the name itself of Midian almost disappears from’ sacred history. That people never afterwards took up arms against Israel, though they may have been allied with the nameless hordes who, under the common designation of “the people of the East,” Bene-Kedem, harassed the eastern border of Palestine.

To this victory there are subsequent allusions in the sacred writings (^{<OR30>}Psalms 83:10, 12; ^{<OR94>}Isaiah 9:4; 10:6); but the Midianites do not again appear in sacred or profane history. The name, indeed, occurs after the exile in Judith 2:16, but it seems to be there confounded with the Arabians. Josephus, however, asserts (*Ant.* 4:7,1) that Petra, the capital of Arabia (i.e., Idumea), was called by the natives Arceme, from the Midianitish king Rekem slain by Moses (^{<OR8>}Numbers 31:8). Eusebius and Jerome also mention a city *lladian*, so named after the son of Abraham by Keturah, situated beyond Arabia (Idumsea) to the south, by the Red Sea, from which the district was called; and another city of the same name near the Arnon and Areopolis, the ruins of which only existed in their days (*Onomast.* s.v.; comp. Jerome, *Comment. ad Jes.* 60, and *Ezech.* 25). These were doubtless traditionary recollections of the different branches of

the Midianitish stock, showing their prevalence throughout Idumsea and the Sinaitic peninsula as a migratory tribe.

II. Geographical Identification. — From all the above notices, we may gather with considerable certainty that there were at least two main branches of the Midianites. It seems to have been that portion of the tribe dwelling about the eastern arm of the Red Sea, among whom Moses found refuge when he fled from Egypt, and whose priest or sheik was Jethro, who became the father-in-law of the future lawgiver (^{<HIE>}Exodus 3:1; ^{<HIE>}Numbers 10:29). *SEE KENITE*. These in like manner are usually reckoned along with the Ethiopians of Cushite origin. It is certain that some Cushite tribes did settle in and on the outskirts of Arabia, which was therefore called Gush, in common with other districts occupied by Cushite tribes; and, under this view, it is observable that the wife of Moses is called a Cushite (^{<HIE>}Numbers 12:1), and that, in ^{<HIE>}Habakkuk 3:7, the Midianites are named with the Cushites; for these are undoubtedly the Midianites who trembled for fear when they heard that the Israelites, had passed through the Red Sea. We do not again meet with these Midianites in the Jewish history, but they appear to have remained for a long time settled in the same quarter, where indeed is the seat of the only Midianites known to Oriental authors. The Arabian geographers of the middle age (Edrisi, *Clim.* 3:5, page 3; Ibn el-Wardi, and Abulfeda, *Arab. descr.* page 77; comp. Seetzen, 20:311) speak of the ruins of an ancient town called *Jiadian*, on the eastern side of the Red Sea, where was still to be seen the well at which Moses watered the flocks of Shoaib or Jethro. This was doubtless the same as *Modiana*, a town in the same district, mentioned by Ptolemy (*Geog.* 5:19); and Niebuhr conjectures that the site is now occupied by Moilah, a small town or village on the Red Sea, on the Haj road from Egypt (*Descript. Arab.* page 377); but, as Rosenmuller remarks (*Bibl. Geog.* 3:224), this place is too far south to be identified with the Midian of Jethro. The Madian of Abulfeda is doubtless that mentioned by Josephus (*Ant.* 12:11, 1) as *Madiene* (Μαδσηνή), situated at the Red Sea, ‘properly identified by Reland (*Paleest.* pages 98, 100) with the modern *Miidyan*, situated about half-way down the eastern coast of the AElanitic Gulf (Forster’s *Geogr. of Arabia*, 2:116, and Index, s.v.). To the same effect are the notices of the city Madian in Eusebius and Jerome above.

Another branch of the Midianites occupied the country east and south-east of the Moabites, who were seated on the east of the Dead Sea; or rather, perhaps, we should say that, as they appear to have been a seminomad

people, they pastured their flocks in the unsettled country beyond the Moabites, with whom, as a kindred, although more settled tribe, they seem to have been on the most friendly terms, and on whose borders were situated those “cities and goodly castles which they possessed” (^{Q310}Numbers 31:10). It is to these Midianites that we must refer the brief statements of a collision with Hadad, one of the early Edomitish kings (^{Q35}Genesis 36:35). These Midianites, like the other tribes and nations who had a common origin with them, were highly hostile to the Israelites.

Midian is named authentically only in the Bible. It has no history elsewhere. The names of places and tribes occasionally throw a feeble light on its past dwellings; but the stories of Arabian writers, borrowed, in the case of the northern Arabs, too frequently from late and untrustworthy Jewish writers, cannot be seriously treated. For trustworthy facts we must rest on the Biblical narrative. The city of “Medyen [say the Arabs] is the city of the people of Shu’eib, and is opposite Tabuk, on the shore of Bahr el-Kulzum [the Red Sea]: between these is six days’ journey. It [Medyen] is larger than Tabuk; and in it is the well from which Moses watered the flock of Shu’eib” (*Mardsid*, s.v.). El-Makrfzi (in his *Khitat*) enters into considerable detail respecting this city and people. The substance of his account, which is full of incredible fables, is as follows: Medyen are the people of Shu’eib, and are the offspring of Medyan [Midian], son of Abraham, and their mother was Kanturan, the daughter of Yuktan [Joktan] the Canaanite: she bare him eight children, from whom descended peoples. He here quotes the passage above cited from the *Marasid* almost verbatim, and adds that the Arabs dispute whether the name be foreign or Arabic, and whether Medyen spoke Arabic, so called. Some say that they had a number of kings, who were respectively named Abjad, Hawez, Hutti, Kelemen, Saafas, and Karashet. This absurd enumeration forms a sentence common in Arabic grammars, which gives the order of the Hebrew and ancient Arabic alphabets, and the numerical order of the letters. It is only curious as possibly containing some vague reference to the *language* of Midian, and it is therefore inserted here. These kings are said to have ruled at Mekkeh, Western Nejd, the Yemen, Medyen, and Egypt, etc., contemporaneously. That Midian penetrated into the Yemen is, it must be observed, extremely improbable, notwithstanding the hints of Arab authors to the contrary: Yakut, in the *Moajam* (cited in the *Journal of the Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesellschaft*), saying that a southern Arabian dialect is of Midian; and El-Mes’udl (*ap.* Schultens, page 158) inserting a Midianitish king

among the rulers of the Yemen; the latter being, however, more possible than the former, as an accidental and individual, not a national occurrence. The story of Shu'eib is found in the Kuran. He was sent as a prophet to warn the people of Midian, and being rejected by them, they were destroyed by a storm from heaven (Sale's *Kurdn*, 7 and 11). He is generally supposed to be the same as Jethro, the father-in-law of Moses; but some, as Sale informs us, deny this; and one of these says that "he was first called Buyun, and afterwards Shu'eib; that he was a comely person, but spare and lean, and of few words." The whole Arab story of Medyen and Shu'eib, even if it contain any truth, is encumbered by a mass of late rabbinical myths. El-Makrizi tells us that in the land of Midian were many cities, of which the people had disappeared, and the cities themselves had fallen to ruin; that when he wrote (in the year 825 of the Hegira) forty cities remained, the names of some being known, and of others lost. Of the former, he says there were, between the Hijaz and Palestine and Egypt, sixteen cities; and ten of these in the direction of Palestine. They were El-Khalasah, El-Sanitah. El-Medereh, El-Minyeh, El-Aawaj, El-Khuwevrak, ElBirein, El-May-eyn, El-Seba, and El-Mu'allak. The most important of these cities were El-Khalasah and El-Sanitah; the stones of many of them had been removed to El-Ghazzah (Gaza) to build with them. This list, however, must be taken with caution.

III. Condition and Customs. — Much of this has already been incidentally mentioned. The whole account of the doings of the Midianites with Israel — and it is only thus that they find a place in the sacred writings plainly marks them as characteristically Arab. We have already stated our opinion that they had intermarried with Ishmael's descendants, and become nationally one people, so that they are apparently called Ishmaelites; and that, conversely, it is most probable their power and numbers, with such intermarriages, had caused the name of Midian to be applied to the northern Abrahamic Arabs generally. They are described as true Arabs — now Bedawin, or "people of the desert;" anon pastoral or settled Arabs — the "flock" of Jethro; the cattle and flocks of Midian, in the later days of Moses; their camels without number, as the sand of the sea-side for multitude when they oppressed Israel in the days of the Judges — all agree with such a description. Like Arabs, who are predominantly a nomadic people, they seem to have partially settled in the land of Moab, under the rule of Sihon the Amorite, and to have adapted themselves readily to the "cities" (μῦραι) and forts (A.V. "goodly castles," τῦραι) which they did

not build, but occupied, retaining even then their flocks and herds (^(-0E10)Numbers 31:9,10), but not their camels, which are not common among settled Arabs, because they are not required, and are never, in that state, healthy. Israel seems to have devastated that settlement, and when next Midian appears in history it is as a desert horde, pouring into Palestine with innumerable camels; and, when routed and broken by Gideon, fleeing “by the way of them that dwelt in tents” to the east of Jordan. The character of Midian we think is thus unmistakably marked. The only glimpse of their habits is found in the vigorous picture of the camp in the valley of Jezreel, when the men talked together in the camp, and one told how he had dreamed that “a cake of barleybread tumbled into the host of Midian, and came into a tent, and smote it that it fell, and overturned it, that the tent lay along” (⁽⁻⁰⁰⁷¹³⁾Judges 7:13).

The spoil taken in both the war of Moses and that of Gideon is remarkable. On the former occasion, the spoil of 675,000 sheep, 72,000 beeves, and 61,000 asses, seems to confirm the other indications of the then pastoral character of the Midianites; the omission of any mention of camels has already been explained. But the gold, silver, brass, iron, tin, and lead (^(-0E12)Numbers 31:22), the jewels of gold, chains, and bracelets, rings, earrings, and tablets” (verse 50) — the offering to the Lord being 16,750 shekels (verse 52) — taken by Moses, is especially noteworthy; and it is confirmed by the booty taken by Gideon; for when he slew Zebah and Zalmunna he “took away the ornaments that [were] on their camels’ necks” (⁽⁻⁰⁰⁸²⁾Judges 8:21), and (verses 24-26) he asked of every man the ear-rings of his prey, “for they had golden ear-rings, because they [were] Ishmaelites.” “And the weight of the golden ear-rings that he requested was a thousand and seven hundred [shekels] of gold; besides ornaments and collars, and purple raiment that [was] on the kings of Midian, and besides the chains that [were] about their camels’ necks.” (The rendering of the A.V. is sufficiently accurate for our purpose here, and any examination into the form or character of these ornaments, tempting though it is, belongs more properly to other articles.) We have here a wealthy Arab nation, living by plunder, delighting in finery (especially their women, for we may here read “nose-ring”), and, where forays were impossible, carrying on the traffic southwards into Arabia, the land of gold-if not naturally, by trade-and across to Chaldsea, or into the rich plains of Egypt. *SEE ARABIA.*

Midlent Sunday

(or Mothering Sunday), imperfectly explained in the *Antiquitates Vulgares*; is founded on the Roman Hilaria (q.v.), or feast in honor of Cybele, the mother of the gods, who, the legend tells us, was converted by Christianity into the mother Church, whence, in the second step, the *Antiquitates Vulgares* deduces the origin of Midleat. See Broughton, *Bibl. Historico-Sacra*, 1:194; Fosbrook, *British Monachism*, page 61.

Midnight

(I ~~ya~~ night, ~~νύξ~~, in connection with ~~t/xj ;yxjæ~~ or ~~Ἔωτ~~; μέσος, middle; ~~μεσονύκτιον~~ simply. **SEE NIGHT**.)

Midraish

(Heb. ~~vrđm~~) is a word applied to the oldest Jewish exposition of the Scriptures—a peculiar, somewhat wild mode of interpretation, which appeals more to the feelings than to the reason.

I. Title and its Signification, etc. — The term ~~çrdm~~, which is strangely rendered in the text of the A.V. by *story* (~~14132~~ 2 Chronicles 13:22; 24:27), is derived from the root ~~çrd~~, to search into, to examine, to -investigate, to explain, and primarily denotes *the study, the exposition of Holy Scripture*, in the abstract and general sense. Thus it is said, “Not the study of it (~~çrdmh~~), but the doing of the law is the chief thing” (*Aboth*, 1:17). The study or exposition of Holy Writ (~~çrdm~~) was effected in earlier times through public discourses, delivered on Sabbaths, festivals, and days of assembly, by the priests, Levites, elders of Israel, and prophets. During the period of the second Temple, when the canonical books and the written discourses ‘of the older prophets became unintelligible to the mass of the’ people, who spoke Hebraized Aramaic, these public expositions became more formal, and were delivered on a large scale by the lawyers, or Scribes (~~μyρps~~), as they are called in the N.T., the directors of schools (~~nrbr~~), graduated rabbins (~~twbr~~, only with suff. ~~wytwbr~~), or learned men in general and members of societies (~~μyrbh~~).

II. Design and Classification. — The design of the Midrash or exposition varied according to circumstances. Sometimes the lecturer (~~çrd çrdw~~)

confined himself to giving a running paraphrase ($\hat{m}grwtm$) into the vulgar Aramaic, or the other dialects of the country, of the lessons from the Law and Prophets which were read in Hebrew, *see HAPHTARAH*, thus gradually giving rise to the Chaldee, Syriac, and Greek versions, so that these Targumim may be regarded as being the result, or forming part of the Midrash. The chief design of the Midrash, however, was to propound the Scriptures either *logically* or *homiletically*. Hence obtained that twofold mode of expression called *the legal* or *Halachic exegesis*, and the *homiletic* or *Hagadic exegesis*, and their respective literatures.

1. The Legal or Halachic Exegesis. — The object of this branch of exposition is to ascertain, by analogy, combination, or otherwise, the meaning of the law respecting exceptional cases about which there is no direct enactment in the Mosaic code, as it was the only rule of practice in the political and religious government of the Jews under all vicissitudes of the commonwealth, and as the motto of the expositors and administrators of it was “ Turn it (i.e. the inspired code) over and over again, for everything is in it, and will be discovered therein” (*Aboth*, 5:22). The laws thus obtained, either by deduction from the text or introduction into it, are called *Halachoth* ($twkl\ h$, sing. $hkl\ h$, from $l\ h$, *to go*), *the rule by which to go, the binding precept, the authoritative law*, being equivalent to the Hebrew word $\mu y f p \zeta m$ (comp. Chaldee Paraphrase on ^{<1219>}Exodus 21:9), and this mode of exposition, which is chiefly confined to the Pentateuch as the legal part of the O.T., is termed *Halachic exegesis*. These Halachoth ($twkl\ h$), some, of which are coeval with the enactments in the Pentateuch itself (^{<6711>}Deuteronomy 17:11), while some are the labors of the Great Synagogue or the Sopherim = Scribes — beginning with Ezra, and terminating with Simon the Just — were for centuries transmitted orally, and hence are also called *Shematha* ($at[m\zeta]$), i.e., that which was heard, or that which was received by members of the chain of tradition. Those prohibitory laws or fences ($gys\ rdg$, later $hrzg$) which the Sopherim were obliged to make on their own account in consequence of the new wants of the times, without being indicated in the Pentateuch, and which are called Sopheric precepts ($\mu y r p w s\ yrbd$), and in the N.T. *Tradition of the Elders* ($\pi \alpha \rho \acute{\alpha} \delta \omicron \sigma \iota \varsigma\ \tau \acute{\omega} \nu\ \pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta \upsilon \tau \acute{\epsilon} \rho \omega \nu$, ^{<1012>}Matthew 15:2; ^{<1013>}Mark 7:3), are distinguished from the traditional laws which are deduced from the Bible. The latter are designated *Deductions from the Laig* ($rq[atyrwad]$), and are of equal authority with the Biblical

precepts. The few learned men who during the period of the Sopherim (B.C. 450-300) wrote down some of these laws, or indicated them by certain signs ($\mu\upsilon\eta\mu\varsigma$) or hints ($\mu\upsilon\zeta\mu\rho$) in their scrolls of the Pentateuch, only did so to assist their memory, and the documents are called *Secret Scrolls* ($\mu\upsilon\rho\tau\varsigma\ \tau\omega\lambda\ \gamma\mu$). These marginal glosses in the MSS. of the Law became the basis of the *Masorah* (q.v.). Gradually, however, these Halachoth were fully written down, and are embodied in the following works.

(1.) It was not till the period of the *Tanaim* (an honorable appellation given to those doctors who transmitted the oral law), B.C. 220-A.D. 220, that the fixing, collecting, and final redaction of the *Halachah* — this mass of juridico-political and religious practice, or doctrine of human and divine law (*humani et divini juris*) — took place. The first attempt at a compilation' and rubrication of it was made by Hillel I (B.C. 75-A.D. 8), who classified and arranged the diverse laws under six *sedarim* ($\mu\upsilon\rho\delta\varsigma$) or orders. In this he was followed by Akiba (A.D. 20-120), and Simon III b.-Gamaliel II, who was the president of the Sanhedrim A.D. 140-163, and whose son R. Jehudah I the Holy, called Rabbi $\kappa\alpha\tau\ \epsilon\acute{\xi}\sigma\chi\eta\nu$ (died A.D. cir. 193), completed the final redaction of the code called *Mishna* (q.v.).

(2.) The *Mishna*, however, like the Pentateuch, soon became the subject of discussion or study, as many of its expositions and enactments are not only couched in obscure language, but are derived from antagonistic sources. Hence, like the divine code of the law, which it both supplements and expounds, the *Mishna* itself was expounded during the period of the *Amoraim*, or *expositors*; an appellation given to the public expositors of the oral law ($\tau\omega\kappa\lambda\ \eta$), recorded by the *Tanaim*, A.D. 220-540, both in Jerusalem and Babylon. The result of these expositions is the two *Talmuds*, or more properly *Gemaras*, viz. the Jerusalem and the Babylon. **SEE TALMUD.**

(3.) Prior in point of age to the compilation of the *Mishna* is the commentary on Exodus, called *Mechilta*, which is composed of nine Tractates ($\tau\omega\tau\kappa\upsilon\varsigma\mu$), subdivided into sections ($\tau\omega\upsilon\zeta\rho\rho$), and treating on select sections of Exodus in the following order: The first tract treats on $\langle\text{P121}\rangle$ Exodus 12:1-13:6, in eighteen sections; the *second* is on $\langle\text{P137}\rangle$ Exodus 13:7-14:31, in six sections; the *third* is on $\langle\text{P150}\rangle$ Exodus 15:1-21, in ten sections; the *fourth* is on $\langle\text{P152}\rangle$ Exodus 15:22-17:7, in seven sections; the *fifth*

is on ^{<1278>}Exodus 17:8-18:27, in four sections; the *sixth* is on ^{<1291>}Exodus 19:1-20:22, in eleven sections; the *seventh* is on ^{<1291>}Exodus 21:1-22:22, in eight sections; the *eighth* is on ^{<1223>}Exodus 22:23-23:19, in two sections; and the *ninth* tract is on ^{<1291>}Exodus 29:12-17; 35:1-3, in two sections. The first compilation of the *Mechilta* was most probably made under the influence of R. Ishmael b.-Elisa, A.D. cir. 90, *see* **ISHMAEL SEE ELISA**, which accounts for the many maxims contained in it, and not to be found elsewhere. It was re-edited afterwards, and greatly altered (comp. Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 434 sq.). It was printed at Constantinople in 1515; then again at Venice in 1545; then, with a commentary and revised text by M. Frankfurter (Amst.), in 1712; but the best edition is that by Landau (Vilna), in 1844. A Latin translation of it by Ugolino is given in his *Thesaurusus Antiquitatum Sacrum*, volume 14 (Venice, 1752).

(4.) Commentary on Leviticus, called *Siphraa*, *Sifra* (**arps**), *the Book*; also *Siphra D'be Rab* (**ybd arps br**), *Siphra of the school of Rab*, because *Rab*=*Abba* Areka, the first of *the Amosraim*, and founder of the celebrated school at Sora, of which he was president twenty-eight years (A.D. 219-247), is its author; and by some it is denominated *Borsaita shel Torath Cohanim* (**μynhk trwt l ç atyrb**), *because the book of Leviticus* which it expounds is called by the Jews *the Code of the Priests* (**μynhk trwt**, *Jebamoth*, 72 b; Rashi, *on Levit.* 9:23). The *Siphra* is divided into treatises (**μyrwbyd**), which are subdivided into sections (**twçrp**), and these again into chapters (**μyqrp**). The first edition of it appeared, together with the *Mechilta* and *Siphri*, at Constantinople in 1515; then at Venice in 1545; and, with a very extensive commentary by Ibn Chajim, at Venice in 1609-11; with the commentary *Ha-Tora Veba-Mitzva*, by M.L. Malbim, at Bucharest in 1860. The best edition, however, is that by Schlossberg, with the commentary of Abraham b.-David, and the *Massoreth Ha-Talmud* of Weiss (Vienna, 1862). A Latin translation of it by Ugolino is given in his *Thesaurusus 'Antiquitatum Sacrumn* (Venice, 1752), volume 14.

(5.) Commentary on Numbers and Deuteronomy, called *Siphrae* or *Siphri* (**yrps**), *the Books*, also *Siphre D'be Rab* (**br ybd yrps**), because *Rab*, the author of the preceding work, is also the author of this commentary, and *Vishallechu* (**wj l çyw**), because it begins with Numbers v, 2, where this word occurs. The commentary on Numbers is divided into one hundred

and sixty-one chapters, and that on Deuteronomy into three hundred and fifty-seven. The Siphre first appeared with the Mechilta and Siphra at Constantinople in 1515; at Venice in 1545. The best edition of it is in two volumes, with the extensive commentary by Lichtstein (volume 1, Dyrhenfort, 1810; volume 2, Radvill, 1819). A Latin translation of it by Ugolino is given in his *Thesaurus Antiquitatum Sacrum* (Venice, 1753), volume 15.

2. The Homiletic or Hagadic Exegesis. — The design of this branch of the Midrash or exposition is to edify the people of Israel in their most holy faith, to encourage them to obedience, to commend to them the paths of virtue and morality, to stimulate them to all good works, and to comfort them in tribulation by setting before them the marvellous dealings of Providence with the children of man, the illustrious examples of the holy patriarchs, and the signal punishment of evil-doers from by-gone history — investing each character, and every event, with the halo or contumely, the poetry or the legend, which the fertile genius of the Hebrew nation and the creative power of tradition had called into existence in the course of-time. This branch of exposition extends over the whole Hebrew Scriptures, while the *Halachic* interpretation, as we have seen, is chiefly confined to the Pentateuch, which is the civil and legal portion of the Bible. It is also called *Hagadah* (**hdgh**; Chaldee **hdga**, from **dgn**, *to say*), *said, reported, on it*, without its having any binding authority, in contradistinction to the *Halachah*, which is authoritative law. When it is stated that this department of Biblical exegesis is interspersed with homiletics, the beautiful maxims and ethical sayings of illustrious men, attractive mystical expositions about angels and demons, paradise and hell, Messiah and the Prince of Darkness; poetical allegories, symbolical interpretations of all the feasts and fasts, charming parables, witty epithalamiums, touching funeral orations, amazing legends, biographical and characteristic sketches of Biblical persons and national heroes; popular narratives, and historical notices of men, women, and events of by-gone days; philosophical disquisitions, satirical assaults on the heathen and their rites, able defences of Judaism, etc., etc., it will be readily understood why the Jewish nation gradually transferred to this storehouse” of Biblical and national lore the name *Midrash the exposition*, **κατ' ἐξοχήν**. This branch of public and popular exposition, in which the public at large naturally felt far more interest than in the dry disquisitions about legal enactments, being thus called by them *The Midrash*, the collection of works which contain this

sacred and national lore obtained the name *Midrashim* (μϣϛrdm), *Commentaries*, in the sense of Caesar's *Commentaries*. Hence the term *Midrashic* or *Hagadic* exegesis, so commonly used in Jewish writings, by which is meant an interpretation effected in the spirit of those national and traditional views. The following are the principal *Midrashim*, or commentaries, in the more restricted sense of the word, which contain the ancient Hagadic expositions. (It must here be remarked that as this branch of the Midrash embraces the whole cycle of ethics, metaphysics, history, theosophy, etc., as well as Biblical exposition, it has been divided into-1, *General Hagadah* or *Hagadah Midrash*, in its wider sense, treating almost exclusively on morals, history, etc.; and, 2, into *Special Hagadah* or *Hagadah Midrash*, -in its narrower, and *Midrash* in its narrowed sense, occupying itself almost entirely with Biblical exposition, and making the elements of the general Hagada subservient to its purpose. It would be foreign to the design of this article were we to discuss anything more than the Midrash in its narrowest sense.)

(1.) *Midra-sh Rabbith* (twbr ϣrdm), or simply *Rabbith* (twbr), which is ascribed to Oshaja b.-Nachmani (fl. A.D. 278), and derives its name from the fact that this collection begins with a *Hagadah* of Oshaja *Rabba*, contains ten *Midrashim*, which bears the respective names of —

1. *Bereshith Rabba* (abr tyϣarb), abbreviated from *Bereshith d'Rabbi Oshaja Rabba* (tyϣarb abr ay[ϣwa ybd), on Genesis, divided into a hundred sections (twϣrp).
2. *Shemoth Rabbah* (twmϣ hby), on Exodus, in fifty-two sections.
3. *Va-jikra Rabbah* (hbr arqyw), on Leviticus, in thirty-seven sections.
4. *Ba-midbar Rabbah* (hbr rbdmb), on Numbers, in twenty-three sections.
5. *Debarim Rabbah* (hbr μyrbd), on Deuteronomy, in eleven sections.
6. *Shir Ha-Shirimm Rabbah* (hbr μyryϣh ryϣ), also called *Agadath Chasith* (tyzj tdga), because the text begins with the word *Chasith*, on the Song of Songs.

7. *Midrash Ruth Rabbah* (**hbr twr çrdm**), on Ruth.
8. *Midrash Eichah Rabbathi* (**ytbr hkya**), on Lamentations.
9. *Midrash Coheleth* (**tl hq çrdm**), on Ecclesiastes.
10. *Midrash Megillath Esther* (**tl ygm çrdm rtsa**), also called *Hagadath Megillah* (**hl gm tdgh**), on Esther.

This *entire* collection, which was first published at Venice in 1545, has been reprinted many times since (best edition by Schrentzel, with the different commentaries, Stettin, 1863, 2 volumes). Excerpts of the Midrash on Ruth, Esther, and Lamentations have been published in Latin by Schnell (Altdorf, 1650). The age of the compilation of the separate Midrashim constituting this collection is critically and elaborately discussed by Zunz, *Die Gottesdienstlichen Vortrage der Juden*, pages 174-184, 263 sq...

(2.) *Pesikta* (**atqysp**), compiled by Cahana or Kahana ben-Tachlifa, who was born about A.D. 330, and died in 411. This Midrash, which comprises a complete cycle of lectures on the Pericopes of the feasts and fasts, *see HAPHTARAH*, and which was lost for several centuries, has been restored by an anonymous writer about the year A.D. 846, and edited under the name *Pesita Rabbathi* (**ytbr atqysp**), intermixing it, however, with portions from the *Midrash Jelammedenu*. In this new form the *Pesikta* was first published by Isaac ben-Chajim Ha-Cohen (Prague, 1655). An excellent edition, entitled **çwrpw twdgh µ[ytbr atqysp**, with divisions into paragraphs, an emended text, extensive references, and a critical commentary and indices by Seeb (Wolf) ben-Israel Isser, was published in Breslau in 1831. The nature and date of this Midrash are discussed in a most masterly manner by Zunz, *Die Gottesdienstlichen Vortraige*, pages 185-226, 239-251: Rapaport, *Erech Millin*, page 171.

(3.) *Midrash Tanchuma* (**amwj nt çrdm**), i.e., the Midrash compiled by Tanchuma ben-Abba (flourished cir. A.D. 440), also called *Midrash Jelammedenu* (**çrdm wndml y**), from the fact that eighty-two sections begin with the formula **wndml y**, *it will teach us*. This Midrash extends over the whole Pentateuch, and consists of 140 sections. It contains extracts from the Mechilta, Siphre, Va-Ikra Rabba, Pesikta, and Boraitha de Rabbi Eliezer. and was first published after a redaction of the first Geonim period, when a great deal of it was lost, altered, and interpolated by Joseph ben-

Shoshan. (Constantinople, 1520; also Venice, 1545; Mantua, 1563; Salonica, 1578; with corrections after two MSS. and additions, Verona, 1595; and at different other places); the best edition is that with the twofold commentary by Chan. Sandel ben-Joseph (Vilna, 1833). For a thorough analysis of this Midrash we must refer to Zunz, *Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge*, pages 226-238.

(4.) Pirke Rabbi Eliezer (rz[yl a ybr yqrp), also called *Boraitha* or *Agada de Rabbi Eliezer* (wa adga rz[yl a ybrd atyrb), because Eliezer ben-Hyrcanus (flourished cir. A.D. 70) is its reputed author. This Midrash, which discusses the principal events recorded in the Pentateuch, consists of fifty-four sections, treating respectively on the following important subjects: the life of R. Eliezer (sections 1 and 2); the creation (6); new moon (7); intercalary year (8); the fifth day's creation (9); the flight of Jonah, and his abode in the fish (10); the sixth day's creation (11); Adam, paradise, and the creation of the plants (12); the fall (13); the curse (14); paradise and hell (15); Isaac and Rebecca (16); the offices to be performed to bridal pairs and mourners (17); the creation (18); the ten things created on the eve of the sixth creation day (19); the expulsion from paradise (20); Adam, Eve, Cain, and Abel (21); the degeneracy of Cain's descendants and the flood (22); the ark and its occupants (23); the descendants of Noah, the tower of Babel (24); Sodom, Lot, and his wife (25); the ten temptations of Abraham (26); his rescuing Lot (27); God's covenant with Abraham (28); his circumcision (29); the sending away of Hagar and Ishmael, the condition of the Jews in the days of Messiah (30); Abraham about to sacrifice Isaac (31); Isaac bestowing the blessing on Jacob (32); the resurrection (33); future state (34); Jacob's dream (35); his sojourn with Laban (36); his wrestling with the angel (37); the selling of Joseph (38); Jacob's sojourn in Egypt (39); God's manifestation in the bush (40); the giving of the law (41); the exodus (42); the power of repentance (43); the conflict of Moses with Amalek (44); the golden calf (45); the tables of stone and the atonement (46); the exploit of Phineas (47); the birth of Moses and the redemption from Egypt (48); Samuel, Saul, Agag, Haman, Mordecai, Titus, Nebuchadnezzar, Ahasuerus, Vashti, and Esther (49, 50); the new creation (51); the seven wonders of the world (52); the punishment of calumny, Absalom and David (53); and the leprosy of Miriam (54). This Midrash, which is chiefly written in pure and easy Hebrew, was first published at Constantinople in 1514, and has since been reprinted numerous times; but the best edition is with the critical

commentary called *the Great Edifice* (l wdgh tyb), emended text and references to Talmud and Midrashim by Broda (Vilna, 1838; a more convenient edition of it, Lemberg, 1858). A Latin translation by Vorst was published under the title *Capitula R. Eliezeris continentia imprimis succinctam historiae sacrae recensioens, etc., cum vett. Rabb. Commentariis* (Leyden, 1644). The composition and age of this Midrash are discussed by Zunz, *Die Gottesdienstlichen Vortrage*, pages 271-278.

(5.) Midrash on Samuel, called (l awmç çrdm atbr) *Midrash Shemuel [Rabbatha]*, divided into thirty-two sections (twçrp), twenty-four of which are devoted to 1 Samuel and eight to 2 Samuel. It is chiefly made up of excerpts from older works, and the compiler is supposed to have lived about the beginning of the 11th century. Rashi is the first who quotes this Midrash (*Comment. on Chronicles 10:13*). It was first published at Constantinople in 1517, and has since been frequently reprinted with the Midrash described below. The best editions of it are the one with the twofold commentary Ez Joseph and Anaph Joseph, references to the parallel passages in the Talmud and Midrashim, etc., by Schrentzel (Stettin, 1860); and the other published together with the Midrash on Proverbs and the commentary of Isaac Cohen (Lemberg, 1861).

(6.) Midrash on the Psalms, called (µyl t çrdm atbr) *Midrash Tillim [Rabbatha]*, *Hagadath Tillim* (µyl t tdgh), or *Shochar Tob* (bwf rj ç), after the words with which it commences. With the exceptions of seven psalms — viz. 42, 96, 97, 98, 115, 123, and 131 — this Midrash extends over the whole Psalter. As it contains extracts from the Babylonian Talmud, the Pesikta, Boraita of R. Eliezer, Tanchuma, and Pesikta Rabbathi, it must have been compiled about the end of the 10th century, most probably in Italy. It was first published at Constantinople in 1512. The portion on Psalm 119, which extends to the first verses of the letter q, is called *Midrash Alpha Betha* (atyb apl a çrdm), from the fact that this is an alphabetic psalm; it has been published separately (Salonica, 1515). The Midrash on the Psalms has frequently been published together with the Midrash on Samuel, under the title *Midrash Shochar Tob* (rj wç bwf), which properly belongs only to that on the Psalms.

(7.) Midrash on Proverbs, called (yl çm çrdm atbr) *Midrash Mishle [Rabbatha]*, consists of a compilation of those maxims and expositions

from former works which are best calculated to illustrate and explain the import of the book of Proverbs. The compiler, who lived about the middle of the 11th century, omits all the references to the original sources, discards the form of lectures, and assumes that of a commentary. The first edition of this Midrash appeared at Constantinople in 1512-17, with the commentary Sera Abraham (Vilna, 1834), and the commentary of Isaac Cohen (Stettin, 1861).

(8.) *Midrash Jalkut* (fwql y çrdm), or *Jalkut Shimoni* (ynw[mç fwql y), i.e., *the collection or compilation of Simeon*, who flourished in the 11th century. This Midrash, which extends over the whole Hebrew Scriptures, is described in the article CARA *SEE CARA* in this *Cyclopaedia*.

III. *Method and Plan of the Midrash.* — In discussing its method and plan; it must be borne in mind that the Midrash first developed itself in public lectures and homilies; that the ancient fragments of these discourses became afterwards literary commodities, serving frequently as the groundwork of literary productions; and that the Midrashic writers or compilers mixed up other matters and pieces of their own composition with the remnants of expository lectures. The ancient relics, however, are easily discernible by their dialect, diction, etc., and by the authority to whom they are ascribed. That there was a method in them has been shown by the erudite and indefatigable Jellinek, than whom there is no greater authority on the subject. He points out the following plan as gathered from the ancient fragments:

1. The lecturer first set forth the theme of his discourse in a passage of Scripture enunciating the particular truth which he wished to unfold, and then illustrated it by a parable, and enforced it by a saying which was popular in the mouth of the people. This rule is given in the Midrash itself (comp. ^whl wkw ^hl çy hxy l m µhl çyw l çm µhl çyw arqm, *Midrash on the Song of Solomon*, 1a).

2. The attention of the audience was roused and the discourse was enlivened by the lecturer using a foreign word instead of a well-known expression, or by employing a Greek, Latin, Aramaic, or Persian term in addition to the Hebrew (comp. *Aruch*, s.v. yqdwda). This accounts for the striking fact that so many foreign words occur in the Midrash to express things for which the Hebrew has expressions, and that both Hebrew and foreign words, *expressing the same idea*, stand side by side (comp.

װפּיְיָ לװפּיְיָ מֶלֶךְ לְרַדְיָ מִן מִדְרַשׁ רַבֵּה עַל גֵּנְזִי;
 װפּוּנְיָ טַבּ װײַסַּׁ םַּבּ, *Midrash on the Song of Solomon*, 1a).

3. The lecturer increased the beauty of his discourse by trying to discover analogies between numbers and persons related to each other — *e.g.* between David and Solomon. Comp. *Midrash on the Song of Songs*, *ibid.*
4. The lecture was also rendered more attractive by being interspersed with plays upon words, which were not intended to explain or corroborate a statement, but were simply meant to create a pleasant feeling in the audience. Hence, to judge of the frequent plays upon words by the rules of hermeneutics is to misunderstand the esthetics of the Hagadah.
5. It was considered as ornamenting the discourse, and pleasing to the audience, when single words were reduced to their numerical value in order to put a certain point of the lecture in a clearer light. Thus, *e.g.*, the lecturer speaking of Eliezer, Abraham's faithful servant, and being desirous to show that he alone was worth a host of servants, remarked that Eliezer (רז[ל] א, 1+30+10+70+7+200=318) is exactly as much as the three hundred and eighteen young men mentioned in ~~וי~~Genesis 14:14. Comp. *Midrash Rabboth* on Genesis, chapter 42. When it is remembered that the Hebrew letters were commonly used as numbers, it will be easily understood how the audience would be rejoiced to see a word converted so dexterously into figures.
6. To relieve the discourse of its monotony, the lecturer resolved a long word into several little words, or formed new words by taking away a letter or two from the preceding and following words in the same sentence.

“If the Midrash is read with the guidance of these nesthetical canons,” continues Dr. Jellinek, “we shall find in it less arbitrariness and more order. We shall, moreover, understand its method and plan, and often be put in a position to distinguish the original discourse from the literary element of a later date, as well as from interpolations. For the confirmation of our aesthetical canons, let the reader compare and analyze chapters 2, 3, and 5 of *Midrash Rabboth* on Genesis” (*Ben Chanamja*, 4:383 sq.).

IV. *Halachic and Hagadic Rules of Interpretation.* — The preceding exposition of the method and plan of the Midrash has prepared us to enter upon the Halachic and Hagadic rules of interpretation which were collected and systematized by Elieser ben-Jose the Galilaeen (ל' ל' ג' ה')

yswy), one of the principal interpreters of the Pentateuch in the 2d century of the Christian era. According to this celebrated doctor, whose sayings are so, frequently recorded in the Talmud and the Siphri, there are thirty-two rules (**twdm** **µytçw** **µyçl ç**) whereby the Bible is to be interpreted, which are as follows:

1. *By the superfluous use of the three particles **ta** **µg**, and **āa**, the Scriptures indicate in a threefold manner, that something more is included in the text than the apparent declaration would seem to imply. Thus, e.g., when it is said, ^{<0201>}Genesis 21:1, “And the Lord visited (**ta hrç**) Sarah; the superfluous **ta**, which sometimes denotes *with*, is used to indicate that *with* Sarah the Lord also visited other barren women. The second, **µg**, is used superfluously in the passage “take also your herds, and *also* (**µg**) your flocks” (^{<0222>}Exodus 12:32), to indicate that Pharaoh also gave the Israelites sheep and oxen, in order to corroborate the declaration made in ^{<0205>}Exodus 10:25; while the superfluous **āa**, ^{<0214>}2 Kings 2:14, “He also (**āa**) had smitten the waters,” indicates that more wonders were shown to Elisha at the Jordan than to Elijah, as it is declared in ^{<0209>}2 Kings 2:9. This rule is called **ywbyr**, *inclusion*, more being meant than said.*

2. *By the superfluous use of the three particles **b** **qr**, and **ˆm**, the Scriptures point out something which is to be excluded. Thus, e.g., **b** in ^{<0073>}Genesis 7:23, “And Noah only (**b**) remained,” shows that even Noah was near death, thus indicating exclusion. The superfluous **qr** in “Only (**qr**) the fear of God is not in this place” (^{<0201>}Genesis 20:11), shows that the inhabitants were not altogether godless; while **ˆm** in ^{<0213>}Exodus 18:13, “And the people stood by Moses from (**ˆm**) the morning unto the evening,” indicates that it did not last all day, but only six hours (*Sabbath*, 10a). This rule is called **fw[ym]**, *diminution, exclusion*.*

3. *If words denoting inclusion follow each other, several things are included. Thus in ^{<0176>}1 Samuel 17:36, “Thy servant slew also (**ta µg**) the lion, also (**µg**) the bear,” three superfluous expressions follow each other, to show that he slew three other animals besides the two expressly mentioned in the text. This rule is called **ywbyr ywbyr rj a**, *inclusion after inclusion*.*

4. *If words denoting exclusion follow each other, several things are excluded.* Thus in ^{<0412B>}Numbers 12:2, “Hath the Lord indeed only spoken to Moses? hath he not also spoken to us?” the superfluous expressions **qr** and **h** which follow each other denote that the Lord spoke to Aaron and Miriam before he spoke to Moses, thus not only without the lawgiver *being present* to it, but *before* God spoke to him, and not only did he speak to Aaron, but also to Miriam, so that there is here a twofold exclusion. If two or more inclusive words follow each other, and do not admit of being explained as indicative of inclusion, they denote *exclusion*. Thus, *e.g.*, if the first word include the whole, while the second only includes a part, the first inclusion is modified and diminished by the second. If, on the contrary, two or more exclusive words follow each other, and do not admit of being explained as indicative of exclusion, they denote *inclusion*. Thus, *e.g.*, if the first exclude four, while the second only excludes two, two only remain included, so that the second exclusive expression serves to include or increase. This rule is called **rj a fw[ym fw[ym**, *exclusion after exclusion*, and the two exceptions are respectively denominated **rj a ywbyy ^ya f[ml al a ywbyr**, *inclusion after inclusion effecting diminution*, and **twbrl al a fw[ym rj a fw[ym ^ya**, *exclusion after exclusion effecting increase* (comp. *Pessachimn*, 23a; *Joma*, 43a; *Megilla*, 23b; *Kiddushin*, 21b; *Baba-Kama*, 45b; *Sanhedrin*, 15a; with *Menachoth*, 34a).

5. *Expressed inference from the minor to the major*, called **çrwpm rmwj w l q**. An example of this rule is to be found in ^{<2117>}Jeremiah 12:5, “If thou hast run with the footmen, and they have wearied thee, [inference] then how canst thou contend with horses?”

6. *Implied inference from the minor to the major*, called **pwts rmwj w l q**. This is found in ^{<1913A>}Psalms 15:4: “He sweareth to his own hurt, and changeth not,” hence how much less if he swear to his advantage (comp. *Maccoth*, 24a).

7. *Inference from analogy or parallels*, called **hrzg hwç**. Thus it is said of Samuel, that “there shall no razor come upon his head” (^{<0011>}1 Samuel 1:11), and the same language is used with respect to Samson — “No razor shall come on his head” (^{<0715>}Judges 13:5); whereupon is based the

deduction from analogy, that just as Samson was a Nazarite, so also Samuel (*Nasir*, 66a).

8. Building of the father (*ba ḥnb*) is the property of any subject which is made the starting-point, and to constitute a rule (*ba, a father*) for all similar subjects. Thus, *e.g.*; in ^{<1884>}Exodus 3:4, it is stated, “God called unto him out of the midst of the bush, and said, Moses, Moses;” hence it concludes that whenever God spoke to Moses, he addressed him in the same manner. *SEE HILLEL* and *SEE ISMAEL BEN-ELISA*.

9. Brachylogy (*hrgq ḥd*). The Scriptures sometimes express themselves briefly, and words must be supplied. Thus, *e.g.* *dwd l ktw*, where it ought to be *dwd ḥpn l ktw*, and *David’s soul was consumed*, *ḥpn* being omitted; again, ^{<1375>}1 Chronicles 17:5, where *hwhaw ḥkḥmmw l hwa l a l hwam* ought to be *l htm hyhaw ḥkḥml ḥkḥmmw l hwa l a l hwam*, “And I went from tent to tent, and from tabernacle to tabernacle,” the words *l htm* and *ḥkḥml* being omitted.

10. Repetition (*ywnḥ awḥḥ rbd*). The Scriptures repeat a thing in order to indicate thereby something special. Thus it is said in ^{<2006>}Jeremiah 7:4, “Trust ye not in lying words, saying, The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord;” the last phrase is repeated three times, to indicate that though his people Israel celebrate feasts in the temple three times in the year, the Lord will not regard it because they do not amend their ways.

11. The separation and order of the verses (*rwdḥ ql j nḥ*) are designed to convey some explanation. Thus verses 18 and 19 of 2 Chronicles 30 ought to be differently placed (comp. *Rashi*, ad loc.).

12. A subject often explains itself while it imparts information on other subjects (*axmnw dml l abḥ rbd dml*). Thus, “Its cry, it shall arise like that of a serpent” (^{<2462>}Jeremiah 46:22), indicates that the serpent must have raised a tremendous cry after the curse which the Lord pronounced against it, since we are nowhere else told that there was any occasion on which it cried; and that Egypt raises an equally loud cry — thus serving to give information upon another subject, and at the same time explaining itself (comp. *Sofa*, 9b).

13. *A general statement is made first, and is followed by a single remark, which is simply to particularize the general.* This rule is called **wnyaw** **hç[m wyrj aç | l b ^wçar | ç wfrp al a**, and is illustrated by ^{<0027>}Genesis 1:27, where the creation of man is recorded in general terms “Male and female created he them;” while ^{<0027>}Genesis 2:7, which describes the creation of Adam, and ^{<0021>}Genesis 2:21, which speaks of the creation of Eve, are simply the particulars of ^{<0027>}Genesis 1:27, and not another record or contradiction.

14. *A great and incomprehensible thing is represented by something small to render it intelligible.* This rule is called **rdk ^zwah [ykçhl ^fqb hl tñç | wdq rbd t[mwç ayhç**, and is illustrated by ^{<6312>}Deuteronomy 32:2 “My doctrine shall drop as the rain;” where the great doctrines of revelation are compared with the less significant rain, in order to make them comprehensible to man; and by ^{<3038>}Amos 3:8 — “When the lion roareth, who doth not fear? the Lord speaketh,” etc.; where the lion is compared with the Deity, to give man an intelligible idea of the power of God.

15. *When two Scriptures seem to contradict each other, a third Scripture will reconcile them* **µybwtk yñç yçyl çh bwtkh abyç d[hz ta ta µyçyj kmh µyhynyb [yækyw**. Thus it is said in ^{<1049>}2 Samuel 24:9, “There were in Israel eight hundred thousand valiant men,” in contradiction to ^{<1326>}1 Chronicles 21:5, where “a thousand thousand and a hundred thousand men that drew sword” — three hundred: thousand more are said to have been among all Israel. The apparent contradiction is reconciled by 27:1, where it is said, “The children of Israel after their number; to wit, the chief fathers and captains of thousands and hundreds, and their officers who served the king in all matters of the courses, who came in and went out, was, month by month, through all the months of the year, twenty-four thousand in each course.” From this it is evident that the number of these servants for twelve months amounted to two hundred and eighty-eight thousand, and as the chief fathers of Israel consisted of twelve thousand, we obtain the three hundred thousand who were noted in the registers of the king, and therefore are not mentioned in ^{<1049>}2 Samuel 24:9. Thus the two apparently contradictory Scriptures are reconciled by a third Scripture. It deserves to be noticed that this ancient interpretation is now generally followed, and that it is espoused by Dr. Davidson, *Sacred Hermeneutics* (Edinb. 1843), page 546, etc.

16. *An expression used for the first time is explained by the passage in which it occurs* (w^mw^qm^b d^j w^ym r^bd). Thus, e.g., Hanuah is the first who in her prayer addresses God as “Lord of Hosts; whence it is concluded that the superfluous expression *hosts* indicates that she must have argued to this effect — “Lord of the universe, thou hast erected two worlds (t^wa^bx); if I belong to the nether world I ought to be fruitful, and if to the upper I ought to live forever.” Hence the expression is designed for this passage (*Berachoth*, 31b).,

17. *A circumstance is not fully described in the passage in which it first occurs, but is explained elsewhere* (r^j a μ^wq^mb ç^rp^tm^w w^mw^qm^b ç^rp^tm wⁿy^aç r^bd). Thus it is stated in ^{<0018>}Genesis 2:8, where the garden of Eden is first mentioned, that there were in it all manner of fruit; but it is not to be gathered from this passage that there was anything else in the garden; while from ^{<4813>}Ezekiel 28:13, where this passage is further explained, it is evident that there were also precious stones in Paradise.

18. *A thing is named in part, but comprises the whole* (l^kb g^hwⁿ a^wh^w t^xq^mb r^maⁿç r^bd). Thus in ^{<0231>}Exodus 22:30 it is forbidden to eat flesh “torn of beasts in the field;” and in ^{<1218>}Leviticus 22:8, it is said, “That which is torn he shall not eat,” here also forbidding that which is torn in the city. The use of the expression *field* in the first passage is owing to the fact that beasts are far more frequently torn in it than in the city; and the Scriptures mention the common and not the uncommon occurrences. Hence in the expression *field* everything is comprised — city, country, forest, mountain, valley, etc.

19. *The respective predicates of two subjects in the same passages may refer to both alike* (h^zb r^maⁿç r^bd w^ry^bj l^k h^hw). Thus, “Light is sown for the righteous, and gladness for the upright in heart” (^{<3971>}Psalm 97:11), does not imply that the former is without gladness and the latter without light, but what is predicated of one also belongs to the other (comp. *Taanith*, 15a).

20. *The predicate of a subject may not refer to it at all, but to the one next to it* (wⁿy^aw h^zb r^maⁿç r^bd w^ry^bj l^k ^^yn[a^wh^w w^l ^^yn[). Thus there mark, “This to Judah” (^{<4813>}Deuteronomy 33:7), does not refer to Judah, since it is said further on, “And he said, Hear, Lord, the voice of Judah,” but to Simeon, whom Moses hereby blesses after Reuben.

21. *When a subject is compared with two things, it is to receive the best attributes of both* (ytçl çqwhç rbd ^hytçbç hpyh j k wl ^twn htaw twdm). Thus, “The righteous shall flourish like the palm-tree; he shall grow up like a cedar in Lebanon” (^{<1922>}Psalm 92:12) the comparison is with the best qualities of both (comp. *Taanith*, 25a).

22. *The first clause explains by its parallelism the second, to which it refers* (wyL[j ywm wryj ç rbd). Thus, “A gift in secret pacifieth anger,” in the first hemistich signifying the anger of God, shows that “and a reward in the bosom strong wrath” (^{<2114>}Proverbs 21:14), in the second hemistich, refers to the strong wrath of God (comp. *Baba Bathra*, 9b).

23. *The second clause in parallelism explains the first hemistich, to which it refers* (j ykwm awhç rbd wrybj). Thus, “The voice of the Lord shaketh the wilderness; the Lord shaketh the wilderness of Kadesh” (^{<1918>}Psalm 29:8). Here Kadesh, though comprised in the expression wilderness of the first clause, is used in the second clause to heighten the strength of the first hemistich, by showing that the wilderness must have been shaken exceedingly, since Kadesh, the great wilderness, was shaken (comp. ^{<1616>}Deuteronomy 1:16).

24. *A subject included in a general description is excepted from it to convey a special lesson* (hyhç rbd axy wmx[l [dml l l l kh ^m axyw l l kb). Thus, “Joshua, the son of Nun, sent out of Shittim two men to spy secretly, saying, Go, view the land, and Jericho” (^{<1111>}Joshua 2:1). Here Jericho is superfluous; since it is comprised in the general term *land*, but it is especially mentioned to indicate that Jericho by itself was equal in power and strength to the whole country. Hence that which is excepted teaches something special about itself.

25. *A subject included in a general description is excepted from it to teach something special about another subject* (l [dml l l l kh ^m axyw l l kb hyhç rbd wrybj). Thus the command, “Ye shall take no redemption-price for the life of a murderer who is guilty of death” (^{<1651>}Numbers 35:31), is entirely superfluous, since it is included in the declaration already made “As he hath done, so shall it be done to him” (^{<1249>}Leviticus 24:19). It is, however, mentioned especially to be a guide for other punishments, since it is concluded from it that it is only for murderers that no redemption-price is to be taken, but that satisfaction may be taken

in case of one knocking out his neighbor's tooth or eye (comp. *Kethuboth*, 37b, 38a).

26. Parable (I צמ). Thus, “The trees went forth on a time to anoint a king over them, and they said unto the olive-tree, Reign thou over us” (⁴⁰⁰⁸Judges 9:8), where it is the Israelites and not the trees who said to Othniel, son of Kenaz, Deborah and Gideon reign over us. So also the remark, “And they shall spread the cloth before the elders of the city” (⁴²²⁷Deuteronomy 22:17), is parabolic, meaning that they should make their testimony as clear as the cloth (comp. *Kethuboth*, 46a).

27. The preceding often explains what follows (ִּנְמ הִדְגְּבִּי [מִּמֵּן יְצַרְוֹדֶּה). Thus, “And the Lord said unto Jehu, Because thou hast done well, executing that which is right in mine eyes... thy children of the fourth generation shall sit on the throne of Israel” (²¹⁰⁰2 Kings 10:30), is to be explained by what precede, Because Jehu destroyed four generations of the house of Ahab-viz. Omri, Ahab, Joram, and his sons, as is stated (comp. verse 13) — therefore shall four generations of his house remain on the throne.

28. Antithetic sentences often explain each other by their parallelism (הִדְגְּבִּי רִגְנִי יְצַרְוֹדֶּה יְנִמ). Thus in ²³⁰⁶Isaiah 30:16, “But ye said, No; for we will flee upon horses; therefore shall ye flee, and ride upon rapid runners; therefore shall your pursuers run;” the words wherewith they have sinned are put in parallelism with the words of punishment, couched in the same language and in similar expressions.

29. Explanations are obtained by reducing the letters of a word to their numerical value (יְצַרְוֹדֶּה יְנִמ הִדְגְּבִּי אַיִר־פִּמֵּג), and substituting for it another word or phrase of the same value, or by transposing the letters (תְּוַיְתְּוֵא אִילֵּי־יָדֵּי). For an instance of the first we must refer to the reduction of רַז[יֵלֵּ אֵלֵּי־יָדֵּי to 318, given in the preceding section. The second part of this rule is illustrated by examples which show that several modes of transposing the letters were resorted to. Thus צֶּצֶּ, *Sheshach*, is explained by לֵּבֵּב, *Babel* (²²³³Jeremiah 25:26; 51:41), and יִמֶּקֶּ בֵּלֵּי by יְדִּדְּקֶּ (ibid. 51:1), by taking the letters of the alphabet in their inverse order; א, the first letter, is expressed by ת, the last letter of the alphabet; ב, the second letter, by צ, the last but one; ג by ר; ד by ק; ה by ח, and so on. This principle of

commutation is called *Atbash* (çb ta), from the first two specimen pairs of letters which indicate the interchange. Or the commutation is effected by bending the alphabet exactly in the middle, and putting one-half over the other, and the interchange is a for l, b for m, g for n. This mode is termed *Albam* (µ b l a), from the first two specimen pairs of letters which indicate the interchange (comp. *Nedarim*, 32a; *Sanhedrin*, 22a).

30. *An explanation is to be obtained by either dividing a word into several words, or into syllables, and transposing these syllables, or into letters, and taking each letter as an initial or abbreviation of a word.* This rule is termed *hdghb ^wqyrfwn ^yçrwdç ^ynm*, and is illustrated by the word *µhrba* being divided into *ba µywg ^wmh*, the father of many nations; by *l mrk* being divided into *l m* and *rk*, and the latter transposed into *r*, viz. soft and grindable; and by every letter of *txrmn* (^{<ARB>}1 Kings 2:8) being taken as standing for a word, viz.: *n āawn*, adulterer; *m ybawm*, Moabite; *r j xwr*, murderer; *x rrwX*, apostate; and *t hb[wt*, abhorred (comp. *Sabbath*, 105a).

31. *Words and sentences are sometimes transposed* (^yn[b rj wam awhç µdqwm). Thus ^{<ARB>}1 Samuel 3:3, “And ere the lamp of God went out, and Samuel was lying in the temple of the Lord,” the words *hwhy l kyhb*, in the temple of the Lord, which are placed later in the sentence, evidently belong to *hbky*, went out, since no one was allowed to sit down in the Temple except the kings of the house of David, much less to lie down. So also in Psalm 34 where verse 18 must be taken up to verse 16 (comp. *Kiddushin*, 78 b; *Baba Kama*, 106).

32. *Whole sentences are sometimes transposed* (µdqwm twçrpb awhç rj wam). Thus, e.g. the record, “And he said unto him, Take me a heifer of three years old,” etc. (^{<ARB>}Genesis 15:9, etc.), ought properly to precede ch. 14, inasmuch as it is anterior in point of time. This reversed order is owing to the fact that the Scriptures for some reason put certain events which occurred earlier in time after later occurrences (comp. *Berachoth*, 7b, with *Pessachim*, 6 b).

Besides these thirty-two rules, the following laws of interpretations must be mentioned:

i. Deduction from Juxtaposition. — When two laws immediately follow each other, it is inferred that they are similar in consequences. Thus it is said in ^{<0228>}Exodus 22:18, 19, “Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live. Whosoever lieth with a beast shall surely be put to death;” whence it is inferred that these two enactments are placed close to each other to indicate the manner of death a witch is to suffer, which the Scriptures nowhere define. Now, as he who cohabits with an animal is, according to *the Halachah* based upon Leviticus 20 to be stoned to death, hence it is concluded that a witch is to die in the same manner.

ii. All repetitions of words, as well as the construction of the finite verb with the infinite, *e.g.* **bçh wnfyb[t fb[h byçt**, have a peculiar signification, and must be explained. Some, however, maintain that the Bible, being written in human language, employs these repetitions (**µda ynb ^wçl k hrwt hrbyd**) in accordance with the *usus loquendi* (*Mishna Baba Mezia*, 2:9; 12:3; *Gemara*, *ibid.* 31; *Jerusalem Nedarin*, 1:1; *Kethuboth*, 77b; *Berachoth*, 31b).

iii. Letters are to be taken from one word andjoined to another, orformed into new words. Thus, *e.g.* **mttnw wraçl wtlj n ta**, “Then ye shall give his inheritance unto his kinsman” (^{<0271>}Numbers 27:11), is explained by **wl raç tlj n ta µttnw**, “And ye shall give the inheritance of his wife to him,” *i.e.*, the husband, by taking away the **w** from **wtlj n** and the **l** from **wraçl**, thus obtaining the word **wl**; and it is deduced therefrom that a man inherits the property of his (**raç**) wife (comp. *Baba Bathra*, 3:6; *Menachoth*, 74a). This rule is called **^yçrwdw ^ypyswmw ^y[rwwg**.

iv. A word is to be explained both with the preceding and following words. Thus, **al µrba tça yrçw rgh hmçw tyrxm hj pç hl w wl hdl y**, “And Sarai, Abraham’s wife, bare him no children; and she had a handmaid, an Egyptian, whose name was Hagar” (^{<016>}Genesis 16:1), is explained, “And Sarai, Abraham’s wife, bare no children to him and to herself” (**hl w wl**); and then again, *to him* (*i.e.*, Abraham) *and to her* (*i.e.*, Sarai) *there was a handmaid* (**hkpc hl w wl**). This rule is called **wyrj al w yynpl çrdn arqm**, and is not admitted by some (comp. *Sabbath*, 32 b; *Menachoth*, 19a).

v. *The letters of a word are sometimes transposed.* Thus **wnl m** [, “our labor” (^(כִּלְבֵּי)Deuteronomy 25:7), is made to mean *our children*, **wnml** [, by transposing the **m** and the **l** .

vi. *Letters resembling each other in sound or appearance, or belonging to the same organ of speech, are interchanged.* Thus **tl hq hçrwm hçm wnl hwx hrwt bq**[y, “Moses commanded us the law, an inheritance of the congregation of Jacob” (^(כִּלְבֵּי)Deuteronomy 33:4), is explained, “The law which Moses has given us, is the BETROTHED or WIFE (**hcrām**) of the congregation of Jacob,” by changing the **w** in **hçrwm** for **a**, and **v** for **c** .

The alteration produced by rules 5 and 6 and which are in the Talmudic and post-Talmudic period generally introduced by the remark **k al a k yrqt l a**, *Read not so and so, but so and so*, must not be taken for emendations of the text of *various readings*, but are simply another mode of obtaining an additional meaning of the text. It was argued that as the literal and limited sense of the Bible, read in the stereotyped order, could not yield sufficiently the divine and inexhaustible mind couched in those letters, every transposition, commutation, etc., ought to be resorted to in order to obtain as much as possible of the infinite idea; especially as every such effort yielded that sense and meaning thoroughly in harmony with what might justly be expected from Holy Scripture. It was therefore regarded as probable that the Bible designed to indicate it in addition to what the regular order and reading of the words conveyed. It must also be remembered that some of these rules, especially those which involved an alteration of the text and a departure from the literal meaning, were not used in *Halachic exegesis*, and that *the Hagadic exegesis* employs many more than those we have specified. In fact, anything and everything is resorted to which can make the text speak comfort and consolation in every time of need, or connect the legends about Scriptural characters with the Biblical record. The puerility and extravagance of many of the rules are obvious, while others are of acknowledged value. *SEE CABALA*.

V. Importance of the Halachic and Blagadic Exegesis. — When it is borne in mind that the annotators and punctuators of the Hebrew text, and the translators of the ancient versions, were Jews impregnated with the theological opinions of the nation, and prosecuted their Biblical labors in harmony with these opinions, and the above-named exegetical rules, the

importance of the Halachic and Hagadic exegesis to the criticism of the Hebrew text, and to a right understanding of the Greek, Chaldee, Syriac, and other versions, as well as of the quotations of the O.T. in the N.T., can hardly be overrated. If it be true and few will question the fact that every successive English version, either preceding or following the Reformation, reflects the peculiar notions about theology, Church government, and politics of each period and of every dominant party; and that even the most literal translation of modern days is, in a certain sense, a commentary of the translator; we ought to regard it as natural that the Jews, without intending to deceive, or wilfully to alter the text, should by the process of the *Midrash* introduce or indicate, in their Biblical labors, the various opinions to which shifting circumstances gave rise. Let a few specimens from the Hebrew text, and the ancient versions, suffice to illustrate the Midrashic process, and its paramount importance to Biblical criticism.

1. *The Hebrew Text and the Masorah.* — The influence of the Halachic and Hagadic exegesis on the formation of the Hebrew text and the Masorah is far greater than has hitherto been imagined, though the limits of this article only admit of a few examples. Thus, *e.g.*, the question put by Isaiah to Hezekiah, “The shadow has gone forward (Ĕl h) ten degrees; shall it go back ten degrees?” (²³¹⁹2 Kings 20:9) as the Hebrew text has it, is not only grammatically incorrect, inasmuch as the repetition of the *ten degrees* a second time requires the article, but is at variance with the king’s reply given in verse 10, from which it is evident that the prophet asked him whether the shadow should *go forwards OR backwards* ten degrees, that Hezekiah chose the latter because it was more difficult and wonderful, and that the original reading was Ĕl ~~h~~ instead of Ĕl h; and, indeed, this reading is still preserved by the Chaldee, the Syriac, the Vulgate, etc.; is followed by Luther and the Zurich version, whence it found its way into Coverdale, the Bishop’s Bible, and has finally got into the A.V. The mystery about the origin of the present textual reading is solved when we bear in mind the Hagadic explanation of the parallel passage in ²³¹⁸Isaiah 38:8. Now, tradition based upon this passage tells us that the shadow or the sun had gone ten degrees forwards at the death of Ahaz, and the day was thus shortened to two hours (hyh tw[ç ytç zj a wb tmç µwyh wtwa, *Sanhedrin*, 96a), in order that his burial might be hasty and without royal honors, and that now these ten degrees went backwards. Hence the present reading, which was effected by the trifling alteration of l yh into

I h, i.e., “the shadow,” the prophet is made to say to the king, “Has once gone forward ten degrees” (i.e., at the death of Ahaz); “shall it now go backward ten degrees?” Thus the Midrashic exposition of ^{<2308>}Isaiah 38:8, it may be supposed, gave rise to the textual reading of ^{<2319>}2 Kings 20:9. For the influence of the Halachic and Hagadic exegesis on the Masorah and the various readings, we must refer to Krochmal, *More Neboche Ha-Jeman* (Lemberg, 1851), page 169 sq. *SEE KERI AND KETHIB; SEE NETHINIM.*

2. The Greek Versions. — That the Septuagint is pervaded by the Halachic and Hagadic exegesis may almost be seen on every page of this version. A few examples must suffice. Thus, *e.g.*, the Septuagint rendering of **hyj** by **ζωογονούντων**, in ^{<6147>}Leviticus 11:47, is only to be explained when it is borne in mind that, according to the Halachah, the prohibition respecting **hprf** (^{<0223>}Exodus 22:30, etc.) does not simply refer to animals torn by wild beasts, but to every animal which is sickly and maimed, though belonging to the clean animals allowed to be eaten in Leviticus 11; and that one of the sure tests whether an animal is healthy, and hence eatable, is when it *bears young ones*; barrenness is an infallible sign of its sickly condition (comp. *Chulin*, 24 with 58; Salomon ben-Adereth, *Respons.* 108; *Torath Cohanim*, 124) hence the Septuagint rendering, “Between those which bear young ones and [for this reason] may be eaten, and those which bear young ones and may not be eaten,” because they belong to the animals proscribed. Again, the rendering of ^{<0632>}Joshua 13:22, **μ[I b taw brj b wgrh**, by **καὶ τὸν Βαλαάμ... ἀπέκτειναν... ἐν ῥοπῆ**, which has caused such perplexity to commentators and given rise to diverse emendations (*e.g.* **προνομή**, Oxf.; **ἐν ῥομφαία ἐν τροπῆ**, Ald. and Complut.), is at once explicable when reference is made to the Hagadah, which is quoted in Jonathan ben-Uzziel’s Chaldee Paraphrase of ^{<0636>}Numbers 31:6, and is as follows: “Balaam flew into the air by his magic arts, and Phinehas threw him down;” so that **ἐν ῥοπῆ** means *in the fall* (comp. also Rashi on ^{<0636>}Numbers 31:6).

Symmachus, too, cannot be understood in many of his translations without reference to the Halachic and Hagadic exegesis. Thus the apparently strange rendering of **wma bl j b ydg l vbt al** by **οὐ σκευάσεις ἔριφον διὰ γάλακτος μητρὸς αὐτοῦ** (^{<0239>}Exodus 23:19) becomes intelligible when it is remembered that the Halachah not only prohibits the cooking, but the mixing and eating of animal meat and milk in any form

(comp. *Mechilta*, ad loc.; *Cholin*, 115). Hence the rendering of **l vbt** by **σκευάσεις**. The rendering of **hvm l awyw** by **ῥρκισε δὲ Μωϋσήν** (^{<0121>}Exodus 1:21), which has been thought very extraordinary and inexplicable, becomes perfectly plain when the Hagadah on this passage is consulted, which tells us that Jethro demanded of Moses to swear that he would devote to idolatry his first-begotten son by Zipporah, and that Moses consented to it; and remarks further, *Then said Jethro, Swear, and Moses swore to him, as it is written, hvm l awyw*. Now **hl a** denotes *to swear*, as in ^{<0121>}1 Samuel 14:24, and ^{<0123>}2 Kings 5:23 (comp. *Mechilta*, sec. Jethro, beginning quoted in *Jalkut*, ad loc.; *Nedarim*, 65a).

These few specimens must suffice, for, greatly important as the subject is, the limits of this article prevent us from giving illustrations of the influence which the Halachic and Hagadic exegesis exercised upon the other Greek versions, as well as upon the Chaldee paraphrases, the Syriac version, the Vulgate, the Arabic, and the expositions of the early fathers.

VI. Literature. — Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden* (Berlin, 1832), page 35 sq.; Hirschfeld, *Halachische Exegese* (Berlin, 1840); by the same author, *Die hagadische Exegese* (Berlin, 1847); Sachs, *Die religiöse Poesie der Juden in Spanien* (Berlin, 1845), page 141 sq.; Rapaport, *Erech Millin* (Prague, 1852), art. Agada, page 6 sq.; Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta* (Leipsic, 1841), page 179 sq.; by the same author, *Ueber den Einfluss der palastinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik* (Leipsic, 1851); and *Programm zur Eröffnung des jüdisch-theologischen Seminars zu Breslau* (Breslau, 1854); Luzzatto, *Oheb. Ger.* (Vienna, 1831); Pinner, *Vorstudien zum Talmud* (Berlin, 1831); Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzung der Bibel* (Breslau, 1857); Steinschneider, *Jewish Literature* (London, 1857), page 5 sq.; Deutsch, in *Lond. Quarterly Review*, April 1867 sq., art. on Talmud; Ginsburg, *Historical and Critical Commentary on Ecclesiastes* (London, 1861), page 30 sq., 455 sq.; and the literature there referred to.

Midwife

(**tdLym**] part. in Piel of **dl y**; “to bring forth;” Sept. *Gala*, Vulg. *obstetrix*; ^{<0157>}Genesis 35:17; 38:28). It must be remarked that **twq**; ^{<0119>}Exodus 1:19, “lively,” is also in rabbinical Hebrew “midwives,” an explanation which appears to have been had in view by the Vulg., which interprets *chayoth* by

“ipsae obstetricandi habent scientiam.” It is also rendered “living creatures,” implying that the Hebrew women were, like animals, quick in parturition. Gesenius renders “vividie, robustae” (*Thes.* page 468). In any case the general sense of the passage ^{<0019>}Exodus 1:19 is the same, viz. that the Hebrew women stood in little or no need of the midwives’ assistance. Parturition in the East is usually easy. **SEE WOMAN.** The office of a midwife is thus, in many Eastern countries, in little use, but is performed, when necessary, by relatives (Chardin, *Voy.* 7:23; Harmer, *Obs.* 4:425). **SEE CHILD.** It may be for this reason that the number of persons employed for this purpose among the Hebrews was so small, as the passage ^{<0019>}Exodus 1:19 seems to show; unless, as Knobel and others suggest, the two named were the principal persons of their class. In the description of the transaction mentioned in Exodus 1, one expression, “Upon the stools,” receives remarkable illustration from ancient as well as modern usage. On the walls of the palace of Luxor, in Upper Egypt, there is a grand painting, which is faithfully copied in Lepsius’s *Denkzaler*, representing the birth of the eldest son of Thothmes IV, and very possibly the “first-born” of the Pharaoh who was drowned in the Red Sea. Queen Mautmes is represented as receiving a message through the god Thoth, that she is to give birth to a child. The mother is placed *upon a stool*, while two midwives chafe her hands, and the babe is held up by a third (Sharpe’s *History of Egypt*, 1:65). Gesenius doubts the existence of any custom such as the direct meaning of the passage implies, and suggests a wooden or stone trough for washing the new-born child. But the modern Egyptian practice, as described by Mr. Lane, exactly answers to that indicated in the book of Exodus. “Two or three days before the expected time of delivery, the *Layeh* (midwife) conveys to the house the *kursi elwiladeh*, a chair of a peculiar form, upon which the patient is to be seated during the birth” (Lane, *Mod. Egypt.* 3:142). **SEE STOOL.** The moral question arising from the conduct of the midwives does not fall within the scope of the present article. The reader, however, may refer to St. Augustine, *Contr. mendacium*, 15:32, and *Quaest. in Hept.* 2:1; also Com. a Lap. *Com. on Ex.* 1. When it is said, “God dealt well with the midwives, and built them houses,” we are probably to understand that their families were blessed either in point of numbers or of substance. Other explanations of inferior value have been offered by Kimchi, Calvin, and others (Calmet, *Com. on Ex.* 1; Patrick; Corn. a Lap.; Knobel; Schleusner, *L.V.T. oirctia*; Gesenius, *Thesaur.* page 193; *Crit. Sacr.*). It is worth while to notice only to refute on its own ground the Jewish tradition which identified Siphrah and Puah

with Jochebed and Miriam, and interpreted the “houses” built for them as the so-called royal and sacerdotal families of Caleb and Moses (Josephus, *Ant.* 3:2, 4; Corn. a Lap. and *Crit. Sacr.* 1.c.; Schottgen, *Hor. Hebr.* 2:450; *De Mess.* c. 4). **SEE BIRTH.**

Mieg, Johann Casimir

a German theologian and philologist, was born at Heidelberg October 6, 1712. His father was a professor of theology and minister at the Heiligengeistkirche of that place. He entered the university of his native place when fourteen years of age; continued his studies at Zurich, Basle, and Berne; returned to Heidelberg in 1732, and finished his education at Marburg and Halle. He was appointed a professor of philosophy at Herborn in 1733, and in 1743 professor of divinity and philology at Lingen. This position he resigned in 1757, and returned to Herborn as professor of theology and preacher. He died September 28, 1764. Some of his most celebrated works are, *Diss. τωβδj μydb[*, *hoc est Constitutiones servorum tam in genere, quam in Hebraeorum specie* (Herbornae Nassoviarum, 1734, 4to): — *rb[ydb[tykl j*, *hoc est: Constitutio res servi Hebraei e Scriptura et Rabbiorum monumentis collectae nec non cum ceterarum gentium consuetudinibus huic inde collate* (ibid. 1735, 8vo): — *Commentatio theologico-practica, de virtute in praecordiis objecto εὐαρεσίας divinae ad Psa. 2* (Lemgoviae, 1749, 8vo).

Mieg, Ludwig Christian

a German Reformed theologian, was born August 20, 1668, at Heidelberg, and received his education at his native place and at Basle, where he defended his dissertation “De regulis communicationis motus.” In 1689, during the French war, when Heidelberg was destroyed, he was vicar of the French congregation at Manheim. Later he made a voyage through the Netherlands, and returned in 1691 to Heidelberg, and was appointed professor of Greek, and minister of the Reformed congregation at Rinteln. In 1694 he was made professor of ecclesiastical history at Marburg, and in 1697 professor of theology. He returned in 1706 to Heidelberg as ecclesiastical counsellor, professor of divinity, and first minister of the church of the Holy Ghost; resigned his place in 1730, and died January 19, 1740. His most noted works are, *Diss. de regulis communicationis motus* (Basle, 1685, 4to): — *Theses historico-practicos ex historia et vita Abrahami desumptae* (Marburg, 1696, 4to): — *Diss. historica, qua A.*

Pagii sententia de occasione Apologiarum a veteris ecclesiae doctoribus conscriptarum examinatur (ibid. 1696, 4to): — *Diss. theologica de terrore Dei* (ibid. 1699, 4to): — *Disquisitio theologica de perspicuitate et universalitate institutionis naturalis. ad Psa. 19:4, 5* (ibid. 1699, 4to): — *Diss. theologico-philologica I et II de cura pauperum apud Hebraeos* (ibid. 1700, 4to): — *Theses theologicae de traditionibus* (ibid. 1700, 4to): — *Diss. de propheta promisso*, ^{CRISIS}*Deuteronomy 18:15, contral D. Hugueminum* (ibid. 1704, 4to): — *Oratio de providentia divina circa nascentem Univers. Heidelberg. cum elencho Professor. Heidelberg.* (ibid. 1770, 4to). See Doring, *Gelehrte Theol. Deutschlands*, s.v.

Miel, Jan

a distinguished Flemish painter, was born in a small village near Antwerp in 1599. Lanzi says he was a pupil of Vandyck. He resided some time at Rome, where he studied under Andrea Sacchi, to whom he gave such proofs of genius that he was employed to assist him in his works at the Palazzo Barberini. Miel, whose disposition led him to the grotesque, introduced something ludicrous into the work, which was deemed unworthy the dignity of the subject, and he was dismissed. He then visited Lombardy to study the works of Correggio, and also passed some time in Parma and Bologna. On his return to Rome he was employed by pope Alexander VII to paint a picture of *Moses striking the Rock* for the gallery of Monte Cavallo. He also painted a *Baptism of St. Cyrillio* for the church of S. Martino de' Monti, and the *Annunciation*, and some frescos of the life of St. Lamberti, in S. Maria dell' Anima. Subsequently he was invited to Turin by Charles Emanuel, duke of Savoy, who appointed him court painter, and in whose service he was retained the residue of his life. After his engagement by the duke he painted no more religious works. He was elected a member of the Academy of St. Luke in 1648, and thereafter devoted himself almost entirely to hunting scenes and battle pieces. He died at Turin in 1664. Many of Miel's best works are in the Imperial Gallery at Vienna. See Lanzi, *History of Painting*, transl. by Roscoe (Lond. 1847, 3 volumes, 8vo), 3:307; Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of the fine Arts* (N.Y. 1865, 2 volumes, 8vo).

Mielk, Johann Bertram

a German theologian, was born at Kiel March 24, 1736, where he was also educated. In 1758 the dignity of master of arts was conferred upon him as

a reward for the defense of his dissertation “*De divisione in infinitum.*” In 1768 he was appointed deacon at Neustadt, in Holstein: in 1771, second minister at the Fleckenkirche at Preetz, and in 1784 chief minister at Oldenslohe, where he died June 14, 1801. He was very much renowned as editor of *Beitrage zur Beforderung der hauslichen Andacht it Predigten* (1777-83). He deserves also much credit for his translation of Millot’s *Universal History*.

Mieris, Frans, Jr.

a Dutch artist and writer of note, deserves a place here as the author of a work on *History and Ecclesiastical Antiquities of the Seven United Provinces* (1726). He was born at Leyden in 1689, and died in 1763.

Mies, Jacob Von

SEE JACOB.

Migdal-Edar

(“tower of the flock”), a place on the route of Jacob (⁽¹⁰⁵²⁾Genesis 35:21), probably about two miles south of Jerusalem, near the Bethlehem road, where the cluster of ruins called *Kirbet Um-Moghdala* is now situated (Tobler, *Dritte Wanderung*, page 81). SEE EDAR.

Mig’ dal-el

(Heb. *Migdal’-El*, ⁽¹⁰⁵²⁾ *El Digha*, tower of God; Sept. *Μαγδαλιήλ* v.r. *Μαγδαλιηώραμ* or *Μεγαλααρίμ*), a fortified city of the tribe of Naphtali (⁽¹⁰⁵⁸⁾Joshua 19:38), “named between Iron and Horem, possibly deriving its name from some ancient tower the tower, of El, or God.” By Eusebius (*Onomasticon*, *Μαγδιήλ*) it is spoken of as a large village lying between Dora (Tantura) and Ptolemais (Akka), at nine miles from the former, that is, just about *Athlit*, the ancient ‘Castellum peregrinorum.’ No doubt the Castellum was anciently a *migdol* or tower; but it is impossible to locate a town of Naphtali below Carmel, and at least twenty-five miles from the boundaries of the tribe. It may, however, have been the *Magdalum* named by Herodotus (2:159) as the site of Pharaoh Necho’s victory over Josiah (see Rawlinson’s *Herod.* 2:246, note). But this was not the only Migdol along this coast. If the modern Hurah is Horem and Yarun Iron, there is a possibility in finding Migdal-el in *Mujeidel*, at no great distance from them, namely, on the left bank of the Wady Kerkerah, eight miles due east of the

Ras en-Nakurah, six miles west of Hurah and eight of Yarun (see Van de Velde's *Map*, 1858)." The enumeration of the towns in the above passage of Joshua, however, favors the connection of this name with the preceding as one, i.e., Migdal- el-Horem, as in the Sept. In any case the present Migdal is probably the MAGDALA *SEE MAGDALA* (q.v.) of the New Test. (^{<4153>}Matthew 15:39), which lay within the limits of Naphtali (q.v.).

Mig'dal-gad

(Heb. *Migdal'-Gad*, ^{<4154>}דגל גַּד *Dijlā-gad* tower of fortune; Sept. Μαγδαλγδά), a town in the plain of Judah, mentioned between Hadashah 'and Dilean (^{<4155>}Joshua 15:37); probably the *el-Mejdel* a short distance northeast of Ascalon (Schwarz, *Palest.* page 103; Van de Velde, *Memoir*, page 334). It is a prosperous village, encircled by luxuriant orchards and olive groves, and fields unsurpassed in fertility. Among the houses are many traces of antiquity-large hewn stones and broken columns. Some three miles south-east of Mejdol is the village of Jenin, which may perhaps be the Zenan noted by Joshua. in the group with Migdal-gad; and ten miles distant in the same direction are the ruins of Lachish and Eglon (Porter, *Hand-book*, page 261, 272).

Migdal-Sannah

a large village located by Jerome (*Onomast.* s.v. Senna, "Magdal-senna, quod interpretatur Turris Senna;" but perhaps he has merely misread Eusebius, ^{<4156>}μεγάλη Σεννά) at seven (Euseb. eight) Roman miles north of Jericho, on the border of Judea. Dr. Robinson (*Bib. Res.* 3:295) inclines to identify it with the *Mejdol* in the central mountains of Palestine, near the edge of the Ghor, at the upper end of the Wady Fasail, and not far from Daumeh, the ancient Edumia (Van de Velde, *Syr. and Pal.* 2:307).

Mig'dol

(Heb. *Migdol'*, ^{<4157>}מִגְדוֹל *Migdol* tower; Sept. ^{<4158>}Μάγδωλον or ^{<4159>}Μαγδωλόν), a town in Lower Egypt (^{<4160>}Jeremiah 44:1; 46:14), the northern limit of the country (opposite Syene, ^{<4161>}Ezekiel 29:10; 30:6). It is apparently the *Magdolum* of the *Antonine Itinerary* (p. 171), situated twelve Roman miles from Pelusium; and, as it is doubtless also the place mentioned (^{<4162>}Exodus 14:2; ^{<4163>}Numbers 33:7) in the description of the passage of the Red Sea by the Israelites (see Gesenius, *Thesaur.* page 268; Ewald, *Isr. Gesch.* 2:55), a difficulty has been experienced from the statements of those texts that this

occurred “between Migdol and the sea,” and “before Migdol,” arising from the much greater distance of this locality from Pelusium, which the explanation of Hengstenberg (*Mos. u. Aeg.* page 58 sq.), that these expressions simply refer to the general region within which the Israelites were hemmed, scarcely meets. It is therefore better to regard the distance given in the *Itinerary* as somewhat vague, so that Migdol may have been situated sufficiently near to be said to be opposite the scene of the miracle. **SEE EXODE.** The name has been traced in the Coptic *Meshtol*, which signifies *many hills* (Champollion, *L’Egypte sous les Pharaons*, 2:79), and has been referred (see Niebuhr, *Descr. Arabice*, page 409) to the *Meshtul* of Arabian geographers, in the province of Sharkje, in Lower Egypt, on the island Myeephor (Rosenmuller, *Alterth.* 3:260); but it is better (with Forster, *Ep. ad Michael.* page 29) to consider it as alluding to a mountainous situation (suitable for a watch-tower on the frontier), and we may then (with Tischendorf, *De Israel. per mare rubrum transitu*, page 25 sq.; Kutscheit, *Lepsius u. der Sinai*, page 6 sq.; and other earlier travellers) identify it with *Jebel Ataka* (see Olin’s *Travels in the East*, 1:350). The only objection to this identification that remains, worthy of consideration, is that, according to some travellers, a gentle slope, some two or three miles wide, intervenes between this range of hills and the sea-shore, containing many camel-paths, and offering an easy escape for the Israelites hemmed in by the Egyptians that came down upon them, through Wady Tuwarik (Aiton’s *Lands of the Messiah*, page 120); but it is doubtful whether so extensive a shore existed here anciently (see *ib.* page 106), and even if this margin were not at that time covered by the waves, it may easily have been preoccupied by a detachment of the Egyptian troops sent round by way of the isthmus to cut off the retreat of the Israelites. Herodotus (2:159) doubtless alludes to this place under the name of *Magdolum*, which he describes as a frontier town towards Palestine, where Josiah was slain by Necho; evidently confounding it with Megiddo. **SEE RED SEA, PASSAGE OF.**

Miget, St.

a prelate of the French Church, was born about the beginning of the 7th century. His life was written in the 10th century by an anonymous hagiographer, and published by the Bollandists, June 6. Another chronicler of the same century, Adson, in his *Legende de Saint Waldebert, abbe de Luxueil*, says that St. Miget presided at the obsequies of this abbot, who was his dearest friend. St. Miget is spoken of as a reformer within the

Church. It appears that he introduced great changes in the liturgy of his diocese, and instituted first in the church of Besanon five archdeacons, to whom he gave important privileges. He died about the year 670. His name is found in the *Martyrologe Galliean* of the date of August 7. — Dunod de Charnage, *Hist. de l'Eglise de Besanon*; J.-Jacques -lifflet, *Vesuntio*, part 2; *Vie des Saints de Franche Comte* by the professors of the college of St. Francis Xavier, 1:236. See Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Miglionico, Andrea

a Neapolitan painter, was a pupil of Luca Giordano. According to Dominici, he acquired considerable reputation, and executed many works for the churches at Naples, among which the *Descent of the Holy Ghost*, in the church of S. S. Nunziata, is highly commended. He died about 1710. — Lanzi's *History of Painting*, transl. by Roscoe (Lond. 1847, 3 volumes, 8vo), 2:59; Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts* (N.Y. 1865, 2 volumes, 8vo).

Mignard, Pierre (1)

(called *the Roman*), an eminent French painter, was born at Troyes in 1610. After receiving some instruction at home, his father placed him in the school of Jean Boucher at Bruges; subsequently under Vouet. In 1636 he went to Rome, to study after Raphael and Michael Angelo; there he remained twenty-two years, painting a number of fine Madonnas, and the portraits of popes Urban VIII and Alexander VII. One of the finest frescos in France, the cupola of the Val de Grace, was executed by Mignard. He also adorned the great hall at St. Cloud with mythological subjects. He died in 1695, after having received many distinctions and honors. — Lanzi's *History of Painting* (Lond. 1847, 3 volumes, 8vo), 1:476.

Mignard, Pierre (2)

a French architect, and nephew of the preceding, was born at Avignon in 1640. After a series of extensive journeys throughout France and Italy, during which he devoted himself to the study of architecture, he settled in Paris. He built the Abbey de Montmajour, near Aries, which gained him great reputation; and he was intrusted with many important works. Among these may be mentioned the facade of the church of St. Nicholas and the Porte St. Martin. Subsequently the Abbey de Montmajour was destroyed by fire, but was rebuilt precisely according to the designs of Mignard. He

was one of the six architects who, in 1671, founded the French Academy of Architecture, of which he was appointed professor. He died in 1725. See Spooner, *Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts* (N.Y. 1865, 2 volumes, 8vo), 2:564.

Mig'ron

(Heb. *Migron'*, מִיגְרוֹן *precipice*; Sept. in 1 Samuel **Μαγδών**, in Isaiah **Μαγδών** v.r. **Μαγγελδῶ**, apparently reading **d** for **r**; Vulg. *Magron*), a town of Benjamin, which, from the historical indications, must have been between Ai and Michmas, on the route of the invading Assyrian army southward (²³⁰⁸Isaiah 10:28). From Michmas a narrow valley extends northward out of and at right angles with that which has been identified as the passage of Michmas (q.v.). The town of Migron seems to have been upon and to have commanded the pass through this valley, somewhere between the modern Deir Diwan and Mukhmus (Robinson's *Researches*, 2:149). Saul was stationed at the further side of Gibeah (? Geba), "under a pomegranate tree which is by Migron" (^{494D}1 Samuel 14:2), when Jonathan performed his great exploit at Michmas; and this is to be explained (see Rosenmuller, *Alterth.* II, 2:170 sq.; Bachiene, II, 2:145) on the supposition that Migron was on the border (perhaps extending considerably north-west of Michmas) of the district to which Gibeah gave its name. Migron, therefore, was in all probability situated on, or close to, the ravine now called Wady Suweinit. It was a commanding position (Josephus, *Ant.* 6:6, 2. where it is said to be "a high hill"), for Saul was able to see from it the commotion which followed the attack of Jonathan on the Philistine camp. The ravine is not quite half a mile in breadth from brow to brow. According to Schwarz (*Palest.* page 130), there are extant some ruins about half a mile south of the site of Bethel, which the Arabs still call Burj (fort) *Magrun*; but no map exhibits here more than a ruined church, and the position is too far north. Keil thinks the Migron of 1 Samuel was a different place from that of Isaiah (*Comment. on Samuel* ad loc.), but this is an unnecessary supposition. The only locality that seems to combine the scriptural requirements is the eminence just north-west of Mukhmus, which separates Wady Suweinit from its branch running up directly north to Deir Diwan; and some ancient town appears to be indicated by the sepulchres in the latter valley.

Mihill, Norris

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Sheffield, C.W., about 1823. He was converted at eighteen, while resident at Wilmington, N.Y.; but continued in his trade until 1861, when he was placed in charge of West Peru Circuit, which he served with marked ability for two years. At the end of this time he joined the Troy Conference on trial, and was sent to Beekmantown, where he was serving for the third year with great efficiency at the time of his death, October 3, 1868. Mihill was earnestly devoted to the interests of his Master, and was beloved by his associates and parishioners. See *Minutes of Conference*, 1869, page 117.

Mih-Teih, Or Me-Teih

an eminent Chinese philosopher, who flourished about 400 B.C., says Dr. Legge “was an original thinker, and exercised a bolder judgment on things than Confucius. or any of his followers He taught that all the evils in society arise from the want of mutual universal love. For example, a prince loves only his own state, and does not love the neigh boring state. Therefore he makes war against it.” “If princes,” he asked, “regarded other states as their own, who would begin a war? If every one regarded his neighbor’s person as his own, who would be found to rob? If universal love prevailed, all enmities, usurpations, and miseries would disappear. Princes, loving one another, would have no battle-fields; the chiefs of families, loving one another, would attempt no usurpation; men, loving one another, would commit no robberies.” See Dr. Legge, *Chinese Classics*, volume 2, chapter 3; Thomas, *Dict. of Biog. and Mythol.* s v.

Mij’amin

(a, ^{<1349>}1 Chronicles 24:9; b, ^{<1610>}Nehemiah 10:7). *SEE MIAMIN.*

Mikkelsen, Hans

a noted Danish Biblical student, author of the first Danish version of the New Testament, was originally mayor of Malmoe, in Scaiaa, and subsequently secretary to Christian II of Denmark. When the king was, in 1523, obliged to flee from his dominions and take refuge in Holland, Mikkelsen accompanied him, and it was while there that, at the suggestion of his sovereign, he set himself to the work of translating the New Testament. Driven by the bigoted jealousy of the papal party in the

Netherlands from his place beside the king, he retired to Harderwick, in Guelderland, where he died about the year 1532. His translation, which was published in 1524 (small 4to), professes to be made from the Latin, but this applies only to the four Gospels, in translating which he seems to have followed the version of Erasmus; for the other books he has closely followed the German version of Luther. See Henderson, *Dissertation on Hans Mikkelsen's Translation* (Copenhagen, 1813); W.L. Alexander, in Kitto, *Cyclop. Bibl. Lit.* s.v.

Mik'loth

(Heb. *Mikloth'*, ת/י קלחא prob. i.q. ת/י קלחא *staves*, as in ^{<10137>}Genesis 30:37, etc.; Sept. Μακαλώθ, Μακελώθ, and Μακελλώθ, the name of two men.

1. The principal officer of, the second contingent of troops under Dodo, during the reign of David and Solomon (^{<13704>}1 Chronicles 27:4). B.C. 1014.
2. A descendant of Benjamin resident at Jerusalem, and father of Shimeah or Shimean; of the family of king Saul, but in what degree of relationship is not clear (^{<1382>}1 Chronicles 8:32; 9:37, 38). B.C. perhaps cir. 536.

Miknei'ah

(Heb. *Mikneya'hu*, חמניקיהא *possessions of Jehovah*; Sept. Μακενία or Μακενίας), a Levitical door-keeper of the Temple and harper in the time of David (^{<13518>}1 Chronicles 15:18, 21). B.C. 1014.

Mikron

SEE MICRONIUS.

Mikvaoth

SEE TALMUD.

Mil'alai

(Heb. *Milalay'*, מלילאי *eloquent*; Sept. omits; Vulg. *Malalai*), one of the Levitical musicians who made the circuit of the newly-completed walls of Jerusalem after the exile (^{<16126>}Nehemiah 12:36). B.C. 446.

Milan

one of the large cities of Italy, capital of Lombardy, situated on the River Olona, contains a population of 295,543. It is a very ancient city, and is noted in ecclesiastical history as the seat of several important Church councils. Milan (Lat. *Mediolanum*) was originally a town or village of the Insubrian Gauls. It was conquered by the Romans 222 B.C., received the Latin franchise about 89 B.C., and the full Roman franchise 49 B.C. Under the Romans it became a conspicuous centre of wealth and civic influence; its inhabitants were noted for their refined manners and literary taste and the public buildings for their beauty and elegance. In the beginning of the 4th century it was selected as the residence of the imperial court by Maximian. Milan was sacked by the Huns (under Attila) in 452; by the Goths (under the brother of Vitiges) in 539; and passed to the Longobards and Franks previous to its subjection by the German Empire. After 961, it was long governed by dukes in the name of the emperors. The feuds of the Guelphs and Ghibellines distracted Milan, like all the other Italian cities. Supreme power became eventually vested in the Ghibelline Visconti, by whom the ascendancy of Milan was extended over the whole of Lombardy. From 1545 to 1714, Milan submitted to the successive predominance of France and Austria. Under Bonaparte, it was declared the capital of the Cisalpine republic, of the Italian republic, and, finally, of the kingdom of Italy. In 1815, Milan was restored to Austria, and continued the capital of the Austro-Italian kingdom until the annexation of Lombardy to Piedmont, in 1859, by the peace of Villafranca.

Milan, Archbishopric Of.

We have no trustworthy information as to its early history. There is a vague tradition that Barnabas (q.v.), the colaborer of the apostle Paul, established the Christian Church at Milan, and was the first bishop. This account lacks support, and scarcely deserves notice. But though of no historical value, the legend is significant in regard to the position which the archbishopric of Milan held in the controversies between the Oriental and Occidental churches. It has been aptly remarked by Reuchlin that, "just as Barnabas was the connecting link between Paul and the other apostles, so the Church of Milan attempted to reconcile the Greek and Roman opinions." The first bishop of Milan, of whom we have any historical knowledge, is Auxentius (q.v.), A.D. 355-374. He was the leader of the Arians in the Western churches. When the orthodox bishops, at a

provincial synod held at Rome in 369, condemned Arianism, they did not dare to pronounce the anathema against Auxentius, because they knew him to be protected by the emperor Valentinian I. Although they were at last prevailed upon by Athanasius to pronounce against Auxentius in their synodal epistle to the Illyrians, Auxentius maintained himself in his see until his death. But the divisions thus created in the Church by the Arian heresy (q.v.) rendered the election of a successor to Auxentius no easy matter. The contest was carried on between Catholics and Arians with such violence that Ambrose, who was the consular prefect of Liguria and AEmilia, was obliged to proceed himself to the church to exhort the people to order. At the close of his speech the whole assembly, Catholics and Arians, with one voice demanded him for their bishop, and he was constrained to accept the proffered honor. Ambrose devoted himself to his work with great zeal, and soon acquired great influence both with the people and the emperor Valentinian. He opposed the Arians from the very beginning of his episcopacy, and in 382 presided at an episcopal synod at Aquileia, at which the Arian bishops Palladius and Secundianus were deposed. Ambrose died at Milan, April 4, 397. All succeeding archbishops and bishops were in like manner elected by the people, the Church of Milan not being subject to the Roman bishop until the days of Gregory the Great (q.v.). After the overthrow of the Gothic kingdom, the archbishops of Milan, owing to the religious differences and the feeling of enmity which existed between the people and their conquerors, the Lombards (q.v.), resided at Geneva. But when, in 653, Aribert, the son of duke Garduald, was chosen king of the Lombards, matters changed. “Rex Heribertus,” says Dollinger, “pius et catholicus. Arianorum abolevit haeresem et Christianam fidem fecit crescere.” The Lombards now became enthusiastic churchmen, and the archbishop returned to Milan. But although the archbishop of Milan was henceforth considered the first bishop of the kingdom, crowning the kings with the so called *iron crown*, and obtaining increasing power, he nevertheless remained subject to the king, and the inferior clergy to the subordinate judges — in short, the Church was subject to the State. After the downfall of the Longobard kingdom, the archbishops of Milan at first lost much of their power; but during the fights and quarrels of the 9th, 10th, and 11th centuries, they not only regained their former influence, but became even more independent than ever before. Owing to the then prevailing German policy, large feudal estates were bestowed upon the bishops of Milan, and, during the reign of the Ottos (q.v.), the archbishops

of Milan were considered the most influential allies of the German emperors.

Eriberto di Argago, who filled the archiepiscopal chair of Milan from 1019 to 1045. was one of the most powerful princes, and though unsuccessful in the revolt which he organized in 1034 against emperor Conrad the Salic, his influence was scarcely diminished after his return from the expulsion to which his rebellion had subjected him. At the time of his death, Milan 'was passing through one of its accustomed civil dissensions, and the election of Eriberto's successor caused great excitement. Erlembaldo, the popular chief (*dominus populi*), called the citizens together to nominate candidates, and induced them to select four. These four were sent to the emperor Henry III (*q.v.*), for him to make the appointment; but the faction of the nobles despatched a rival in the person of Guido di Valate, who had recommended himself to the emperor by his zealous services, and who was given the coveted dignity, to the great disgust of the popular nominees. Their expostulations were unavailing with the emperor, and both parties returned Guido to assume an office harassed by the opposition of the people on whom he had been forced, and the disappointed candidates to brood over the wrongs they had experienced. We shall presently see how thoroughly these men avenged themselves on Guido, with whom the independence of the Milanese archbishopric came to an end.

It is historically evident, then, that Milan was at one time completely independent of the papacy. Rome was not even thought of in creating the archbishop, whose spiritual and temporal power were granted by the imperial investiture. But when, soon after, the German popes had rescued the pontificate from the contempt into which it had fallen, its domination over Milan became a necessary step in its progress to universal supremacy.

Marriage, at that time, was a universal privilege of the Milanese clergy. Pope Leo IX (*q.v.*) and his successors attacked the Milanese on this account, and, in a council held at Rheims by Leo IX in 1049, many laws were enacted against clerical matrimony. Archbishop Guido defended the position of the Milanese clergy, not only by Scripture texts, but also by a decision which he affirmed was rendered by St. Ambrose, to whom the question of the permissibility of sacerdotal marriage had been referred by the pope and bishops. The popes by their emissaries excited great tumults in Milan, inflaming the popular passion against, what they called, the irregularities of the clergy. Guido in vain endeavored to repress the

agitation thus produced, and argued in favor of the married clergy. Armed resistance was offered to the papal faction, the result of which was incessant fights and increasing bloodshed. Nicholas II (q.v.), who then occupied the papal chair, sent Hildebrand and Anselm on a mission to Milan, with instructions to allay the passions which led to such deplorable civil strifes. The milder Anselm might perhaps have succeeded in this errand of reconciliation, but the unbending Hildebrand refused to listen to aught but unconditional subjection to Rome. The quarrel, therefore, waxed fiercer and deadlier (see Arnulf, *Gest. Archiep. Mediolan.* lib. 3, c. 9; Landulf, *Sen.* lib. 3, c. 9).

In 1059 another papal legation was sent, with full authority to force the recalcitrant archbishop and clergy to submission. An assembly was held, where the legates asserted the papal pre-eminence by taking the place of honor, to the general indignation of the Milanese, who did not relish the degradation of their archbishop before the representatives of a foreign prelate. The authority of Rome, which at first was stoutly denied by the archbishop, was finally acknowledged, the archbishop and the clergy signing a paper in which they expressed their contrition in the most humiliating terms (see Damiani, *Opusc.* 42, c. 1).

The pride of the Milanese, however, was deeply wounded by such a subjection to Rome, unknown for many generations, and ill endured by men who gloried in the ancient dignity of the Ambrosian Church. When, therefore, in 1061, after Nicholas's death, their townsman, Anselm, was elevated from the episcopate of Lucca to that of the holy see, under the name of Alexander II, the Milanese Church attempted to regain its former independence. A council of German and Lombard bishops convened at Basle, and unanimously elected as pontiff Cadalus, bishop of Parma, under the title of Honorius II. By the assistance of the German emperors, the Lombard bishops, with Guido, the archbishop of Milan, at their head, assembled a considerable army in 1062, with which they conducted their new pope to Rome, while the popular party in Milan and Northern Italy assumed a formidable aspect in its alliance to the Lombard bishops. At this juncture Alexander II was rescued from probable defeat by the occurrence of a most unexpected event — the German bishops, under the influence of Hanno, archbishop of Cologne, sided with Alexander, and in 1064 the Synod of Mantua pronounced the deposition of Honorius. The archbishop of Milan, being unable to support the pretensions of the rival pope without German aid, of which there was no prospect, yielded, and was

excommunicated by the pope in 1066. Guido, however, disregarding this excommunication, resolved to officiate in the solemn services of Pentecost (June 4, 1066), and, braving all opposition, appeared at the altar. Excited to fury at this unexpected contumacy, the papal party attacked him in the church; his followers rallied in his defence, but, after a stubborn fight, were forced to leave him in the hands of his enemies, by whom he was nearly beaten to death. Some few months later archbishop Guido succeeded in reorganizing his party, and the war was for several years carried on with varying fortune. At last, in 1069, Hildebrand proposed that both the Milanese clergy and laity should take an oath that in future their archbishops should apply to the pope, and not to the emperor, for confirmation. Guido sought to anticipate this movement, and, old and wearied with the endless strife and contention, resigned his archbishopric to the subdeacon Gotefrido, who had long been his principal adviser. The latter procured his confirmation from Henry IV (q.v.), but the Milanese, defrauded of their electoral privileges, refused to acknowledge him. The papal party, taking advantage of this popular feeling, excited a tumult, and Gotefrido was glad to escape at night from the rebellious city.

Meanwhile Azzo, the papal aspirant, fared no better than his rival. The people rushed in to his inaugural banquet, unearthed him from the corner where he had hidden himself, dragged him by the heels in the street, and, placing him in a pulpit, forced him to swear that he would make no further pretensions to the see, and Azzo quitted the city, content to have saved his life.

The city remained thus without an archbishop, and in 1074 Hildebrand, who in April, 1073, had succeeded to Alexander, launched an interdict against Milan. The Milanese were disposed to disregard the interdict, and applied to Henry IV, requesting the appointment of another archbishop. To this the emperor responded by nominating Tedaldo, who was duly consecrated. Tedaldo was the leader of the disaffected bishops, who at the Synod of Pavia, in 1076, excommunicated pope Gregory himself; and though, after the interview at Canossa in 1077, the Milanese, disgusted with Henry's voluntary humiliation before that papal power which they had learned to despise, abandoned the imperial party for a time, yet Tedaldo kept his seat until his death in 1085, notwithstanding the repeated excommunications launched against him by Gregory (see Arnulf, lib. 4; 5, c. 2, 5, 9; Landulf, *Sen.* lib. 3, c. 29; 4:2; Muratori, *Annales*, ann. 1085). With his death the independence of the Milan archbishopric ceased.

At present the clergy of Milan seem to be inclined to follow the lead of the Old Catholic party. Their programme, which contains the following reforms: election of the priests by the parish, the use of the vernacular at all Church-services, reform of Mariolatry and adoration of saints, marriage of the priests, etc., shows a healthy reaction against papal abuses. E. Serra Gropelli may be pointed out as the leader of the Milanese reform party.

See Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, 4:297 sq.; Riddle, *Hist. of the Papacy*, 2:119 sq.; Dupin, *Eccles. Hist.* 9, chapter 8; Mosheim, *Church Hist.* 3:11, part 2; Lea, *Hist. of Sacerdotal Celibacy*, chapter 13; Schrockh, *Kirchengesch.* 22:523 sq.; Bohringer, *Kirche Christi*, 1:90; 3:92 sq.; Milman, *Hist. of Lat. Christianity*, 3:240 sq.; Reichel, *Roman See in the Middle Ages*, pages 189, 191 sq.; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 5:318 sq.; Herzog, *Real Encyklop.* 20:72 sq.

Milan, Council Of.

There is no historical proof extant to warrant the assertion that any Church councils or synods were held at Milan before 355 A.D. We have no reliable information concerning the synod which is said to have been held at Milan in 344 (see Hardouin, *Acta Conciliorum et Epistolae decretales ac Constitutiones*, etc. [Paris, 1715], 1:627 sq.), and very little is known of the synod of 346 (or 347). In that year a council of Western bishops was summoned at Milan, when the so-called *Long Creed* (*μακρόστιχος*, to be found in Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* 2:18), which had been drawn up by the Arian Council of Antioch (A.D. 345), was rejected. The council also required the deputies who brought it to sign a condemnation of Arianism. Of course they left the council in wrath (see J. Dominic, *Mansi Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, etc. [Florent. 1759], 2:1370). After the death of Constance (A.D. 350), and the victory over Magnentius (A.D. 353), Constantius endeavored to establish Arianism by force in the West. In the synods of Arles (A.D. 354) and of Milan (A.D. 358), he compelled the assembled bishops to sign the condemnation of Athanasius, though most of them were, it is thought, orthodox. Constantius was now sole master of the Roman world, and by bribes, by threats, and by force, the condemnation of Athanasius was extorted from the assembled bishops. Even Liberius (q.v.), the successor of Julius I, rejected Athanasius, from fear of Constantius, but soon afterwards threw off his timidity, and refused to subscribe to his condemnation (see Mansi, 3:233 sq.; Hefele, 1:631).

The next council was held A.D. 390, St. Ambrose presiding. It is commonly supposed that in this council the sentence of the Gallic bishops against Ithacius Ursacius (who had caused the death of the Priscillianists by their fiery zeal against their errors) was confirmed by the bishops of Italy. Baronius (as well as the collection of councils) states that this same council condemned Jovinian, the author of a new heresy, which decried the merit of virginity. St. Jerome reduces his doctrine to the four following heads:

1. That virgins, widows, and married women, being baptized, have the same degree of merit, if there be no difference between them in other respects.
2. That they who have been regenerated in baptism cannot be overcome by the devil.
3. That there is no difference in point of merit, between those who abstain from meat and those who partake of it with thanksgiving.
4. That all those who have kept their baptismal state shall have the same glory in heaven.

From these principles other errors were deduced, viz. that there is no difference of degree in sin; that fasting is not requisite; that there will be no distinction of merits in heaven. The fathers of the council condemned the opinions of Jovinian- and his followers, and they were driven out of the city. See Mansi, 1.c. 690; Gieseler, 1:333.; Hefele, 2:48.

Another council was held at Milan in 451, convoked by Eusebius, bishop of Milan, at the request of St. Leo the Great. All the suffragans of Milan were present, in all twenty bishops, among whom were Crispinus of Pavia, Maximus of Turin, Abundius of Como, Optatianus of Brescia. The letter of the pope to Eusebius was read; the legates then made a report of what was passing in the East, and especially of the miseries existing from the acts of the Latrocinium at Ephesus; afterwards the celebrated letter of St. Leo to Flavianus was read, and the council unanimously declared that it contained the true doctrine of the Catholic Church upon the subject of the *Incarnation* (q.v.), and that it was built upon the teachings of the prophets, evangelists, and apostles. At the same time they decreed that all who should oppose this doctrine should be anathematized. Finally, a synodal letter was addressed to the pope filled with expressions of esteem and respect (Mansi, 2:78 sq.; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, 2:374 sq.). In A.D. 679 pope Agatho summoned a council at Milan to condemn anew the

heresy of *Monothelism* (q.v.) (Mansi, 11:174; Hefele, 3:228). The provincial synods of A.D. 842, 860, 880, and 1009 have no bearing upon the general history of the Church, but those interested in these are referred to Mansi, 14:790; 15:590; 17:535, and 19:310; Hefele, 4:99, 217, 770. September 12, 1287, a synod was held by Otto, the archbishop, assisted by eight of his suffragans, and the deputies of all the chapters of the province. Ten canons were published, in which they ordered the observation of the papal constitutions, and the laws of the emperor Frederick II against heretics. Abbots and abbesses, monks and nuns, were ordered to observe the rule of St. Benedict or that of St. Augustine, and monks were forbidden to enter nunneries. The power of building churches and oratories was declared to be solely in the hands of the bishop (Mansi, 24:868 sq.; Hefele, 6:225; Muratori, *Rev. Ital.* volume 4). From 1565 to 1582 six provincial councils were held at Milan. For information concerning their enactments, see *Concil.* 15:242, 337, 365 sq., 408, 556, 706; Jo. Harduini *Acta*, 10:633, 1140; Christ. Wilhelm Franz Walch, *Entwurf einer vollstandigen Historie der Kirchenversammlungen* (Leipsic, 1759).

Milanese Liturgy

The Liturgy of Milan, commonly attributed to Ambrose, is substantially the same as that of Rome until the time of Gregory the Great, and appears to have been derived from the same origin. "In the time of Gregory, the Church of Milan did not adopt the chief alteration made by him. From that time, if not previously, the Liturgy of Milan began to be considered a peculiar rite; and as the Romans gave their sacramentaries the names of Gelasius and Gregory, so the Milanese gave theirs the name of Ambrose; who, in fact, may have composed some parts of it. After the time of Gregory, the Milan Liturgy doubtless received several additions. The earliest ecclesiastical writer who has been cited as speaking of the Ambrosian rite is. Walofred Strabo, who died A.D. 849" (Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, page 417). *SEE LITURGY.*

Milani, Aureliano

nephew of the following, was born at Bologna, Italy, in 1675. He painted in the style of Caracci, and, next to Carlo Cignani, no one did more to maintain the dignity and credit of the Bolognese school. Lanzi says he was not so excellent in his coloring. His principal works in Bologna are the *Resurrection*, in the church of La Purita; the *Stoning of St. Stephen*, in St.

Mascarella; and *St. Jerome*, in Sta. Maria della Vita. He afterwards went to Rome, where his finest work is the *Beheading of St. John the Baptist*, in the church of the Bergamaschi. He died in 1749. See Lanzi, *History of Painting*, transl. by Roscoe (London, 1847, 3 volumes, 8vo), 3:152.

Milani, Giulio Cesare

a Bolognese painter, who was born in 1621, executed many works for the churches in Bologna and the adjacent cities. His finest productions are the *Marriage of the Virgin*, in the church of St. Giuseppe; *St. Antonio di Padova*, in St. Maria del Costello; and a *Holy Family*, at the Lervi. According to Lanzi, “he was the most eminent of Torre’s disciples, and was rather admired in the churches of Bologna, and extolled in many adjacent states.” He died in 1678. See Lanzi, *History of Painting*, transl. by Roscoe (Lond. 1847, 3 volumes, 8vo), 3:107; Spooner, *Biog. History of the Fine Arts* (N.Y. 1865, 2 volumes, 8vo).

Milbourne, Luke

an English divine, was born at Wroxhali, Warwickshire. He was educated at Pembroke Hall, Cambridge; after which he became rector of St. Ethelburga; London, and lecturer of Shoreditch in 1704. He died April 13, 1720. He published thirty-one single sermons between 1692 and 1720; several theological treatises, poems, etc.; and the following work, by which he is best known: *Notes on Dryden’s Virgil* (Lond. 1698). Among Milbourne’s theological works, we regard as the most important his *Legacy to the Church of England* (new ed. 1726, 2 vols. 8vo), in which he vindicates her orders from the objections of Papists and Dissenters. This work. it is stated, was undertaken by the special command of archbishop Sancroft and Dr. Lloyd, bishop of Norwich. See Cooper, *Biograph. Dict.* page 806; Ellis, *Hist. of Shoreditch*; Malone’s *Dryden*, 2:214; 4:633, 645; Johnson, *Lives of the Poets*, ed. Cunningham, 1:371 sq.; Allibone, *Dict. of Authors*, 2:1277.

Mil’cah

(Heb. *Milkah*’, חַמְלָה *ḥamla* advice; Sept. Μελλά), the name of two women.

1. The daughter of Haran, and sister of Lot and Iscah (or Sarah); she married Nahor (⁽⁻⁰¹¹²⁾Genesis 12:29), by whom she had eight sons (⁽⁻⁰²¹²⁾Genesis 20:20, 23), one of whom was Bethuel, the father of Rebekah

(^{<0245>}Genesis 24:15, 24, 47). She was thus Abraham's sister-in-law, and the grandmother of Isaac's wife. B.C. cir. 2047.

2. The fourth named of the five daughters of Zelophehad, of the tribe of Manasseh (^{<0833>}Numbers 26:33), who became heiresses for the want of brothers (^{<0270>}Numbers 27:1), and, having married members of the same tribe (^{<0361>}Numbers 36:11), were assigned portions in Gilead (^{<0673>}Joshua 17:3). B.C. 1619-1612.

Mil'com

(Heb. *Milkom'*, **מלכֹמ** *their king*, ^{<1116>}1 Kings 11:5; Sept. **Μελχόμ** and **Μελχόμ**, Vulg. *Moloch*; ^{<0233>}2 Kings 23:13, **Μολόχ**, *Melchom*; also MALCHAM, Heb. *Malkam'*, **מלכי חני** *id.*, ^{<2401>}Jeremiah 49:1, 3, Sept. **Μελχόλ**, Vulg. *Melchom*, "their king;" but this last is the proper rendering in ^{<3000>}Amos 1:15; ^{<3006>}Zephaniah 1:5, in which latter passage the Auth. Vers. has "Malcham"), the principal deity of the Ammonites (^{<2401>}Jeremiah 49:1, 3), for whose worship Solomon erected altars on the Mount of Olives, hence called the Hill of Offence (^{<0233>}2 Kings 23:13). Milcom is usually regarded as the same as *Molech* or *Moloch*, although the latter was worshipped in a different place and manner, namely, by the offering of children in the flames of the valley of Hinnom (see Keil, *Comment.* ad loc. Kings; Movers, *Phon.* page 324 sq.; Ewald, *Isr. Gesch.* 3:100). **SEE MOLOCH.**

Mildew

(^{<0700>}*qrye* *yerakon'*, *greenness*, i.e., pallor, as the "paleness" by affright, ^{<2806>}Jeremiah 30:6) is properly a species of fungus or parasitic plant generated by moisture, and corrosive of the surface to which it adheres. In Scripture it is applied to grain, and refers to the pale green or yellowish color indicative of fading or withering of plants (^{<1632>}Deuteronomy 28:22; ^{<1087>}1 Kings 8:37; ^{<4168>}2 Chronicles 6:28; ^{<3049>}Amos 4:9; ^{<3717>}Haggai 2:17; in all which passages it is connected with "blasting"). The Arabic applies the word *yerakon* to human beings as well as to corn, and thus describes the disease called in Europe yellow jaundice. Forskal was informed in Arabia by a Jew that it was the general opinion there that it is a mild breeze, dangerous to the corn, by which the ears are turned yellow. **SEE LEPROSY.**

Mile

(μίλιον, the Greek form of the Latin *milliarium*, from *mille*, a *thousand*, ^{<1854>}Matthew 5:41), a Roman measure of 1000 geometrical paces (*passus*) of five feet each, and therefore equal to 5000 Roman feet (see Smith's *Dict. of Greek and Roman Antiq.* s.v. *Milliare*). Taking the Roman foot at 11.6496 English inches, the Roman mile would be 1618 English yards, or 142 yards less than the English statute mile (see *Penny Cyclopaedia*, s.v.). By another calculation, in which the foot is taken at 11.62 inches, the mile would be little more than 1614 yards. The number of Roman miles in a degree of a large circle of the earth is little more than 75 (see Ukert, *Geogr. d. Griech.* I, 2:75). The most common Latin term for the mile is *mille passuum*, or only the initials M.P.; sometimes the word *passuum* is omitted. The Roman mile contained eight Greek stadia (Pliny, 2:21). Hence it is usual with the earlier writers on Biblical geography to translate the Greek "stade" into the English "furlong" in stating the measurements of Eusebius and Jerome, who, like the early itineraries, always reckon by Roman miles. **SEE FURLONG**. The Talmudists also employed this measure (which they call *lyma*, ¹⁸⁵⁴Ortho, *Lex. Rabb.* page 421), but estimate it at 7½ stadia (*Baba Mezia*, 33:1), as also the Roman historians frequently reckon it, without geographical or mathematical accuracy (Forbiger, *Handbuch d. alt. Geogr.* 1:555). Mile-stones were set up along the roads constructed by the Romans in Palestine (Reland, *Palaest.* page 401 sq.), and to this day they may be seen, here and there, in that country (Robinson, *Bib. Res.* 2:161, note; 2:306). The mile of the Jews is said to have been of two kinds, long or short, dependent on the length of the pace, which varied in different parts, the long pace being double the length of the short one (Carpzov, *Apparat.* page 679). **SEE METROLOGY**.

Miles, Henry G.

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Amsterdam, N.Y., about the year 1811. He was educated in Hudson, Ohio, studied theology in the Union Theological Seminary, New York; was licensed by the New York Third Presbytery, and ordained by the Rochester Presbytery in 1851. He received and accepted a call to the Church at Dover, Ohio, and subsequently preached at Hublinsbury, Pa., and Parma Centre and Woodhull, N.Y., where he died, July 21, 1860. Mr. Miles had to struggle with many difficulties, but in all his duties he was conscientious and zealous. As a

preacher he was clear and practical. See *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1862, page 189. (J.L.S.)

Mile'tum

(~~500~~2 Timothy 4:20). *SEE MILETUS*.

Mile'tus

Picture for Miletus 1

(*Μίλητος*, from the name of a fabled son of Apollo, who is said to have founded the city, Apollod. 3:1, 2), a city and seaport of Ionia, in Asia Minor, about thirty-six miles south of Ephesus (Cramer's *Asia Minor*, 2:385 sq.). The apostle Paul touched at this port on his voyage from Greece to Syria, and delivered to the elders of Ephesus, who had come to meet him there, a remarkable and affecting address (~~400~~Acts 20:15-38). "In the context we have the geographical relations of the latter city brought out distinctly, as if it were Luke's purpose to state them. In the first place, it lay on the coast to the south of Ephesus. Next, it was a day's sail from Trogyllium (verse 15). Moreover, to those who are sailing from the north, it is in the direct line for Cos. We should also notice that it was near enough to Ephesus by land communication for the message to be sent and the presbyters to come within a very narrow space of time. All these details correspond with the geographical facts of the case. As to the last point, Ephesus was by land only about twenty or thirty miles distant from Miletus. There is a further and more minute topographical coincidence, which may be seen in the phrase, 'They accompanied him to the ship,' implying as it does that the vessel lay at some distance from the town. The site of Miletus has now receded tell miles from the coast, and even in the apostle's time it must have lost its strictly maritime position (Hackett, *Comm. on the Acts*, 2d ed. page 344; comp. ~~400~~Acts 21:5). In each case we have a low, flat shore, as a marked and definite feature of the scene." Miletus was a place of considerable note, and the ancient capital of Ionia and Caria (Herod. i, 142; Pliny, 5:31). It was the birthplace of several men of renown — Thales, Timotheus, Anaximander, Anaximenes, Democritus (Pomp. Mela, 1:17; Diog. Laertius, *Vit. Philosoph.* pages 15, 88, 89, 650). Ptolemy (*Geogr.* 5:2, 9) places Miletus in Caria by the sea, and it is stated to have had four havens, one of which was capable of holding a fleet. (See J.E. Rambach, *De Mileto ejusque coloniis* [Hal. 1790]; Soldan, *Rer. Miles. Comment.* [Darmst. 1829]; Schroeder, *Comment. de rebus Miles.* [Strals.

1827].) “In early times it was the most flourishing city of the Ionian Greeks. The ships which sailed from it were celebrated for their distant voyages. Miletus suffered in the progress of the Lydian kingdom and became tributary to Croesus. In the natural order of events, it was absorbed in the Persian empire; and, revolting, it was stormed and sacked. After a brief period of spirited independence, it received a blow from which it never recovered, in the siege conducted by Alexander when on his Eastern campaign. But still it held, even through the Roman period, the rank of a second-rate trading town, and Strabo mentions its four harbors. At this time it was politically in the province of Asia, though Caria was the old ethnological name of the district in which it was situated. Its preeminence on this coast had now long been yielded up to Ephesus. These changes can be vividly traced by comparing the whole series of coins of the two places. In the case of Miletus, those of the autonomous period are numerous and beautiful, those of the imperial period very scanty. Still Miletus was for some time an episcopal city of Western Asia. Its final decay was doubtless promoted by the silting up of the Meander.” It was noted for a famous temple of Apollo, the oracle of which is known to have been consulted so late as the 4th century (Apollodorus, *De Orig. Deor.* 3:130). There was, however, a Christian church in the place; and in the 5th, 7th, and 8th centuries we read of bishops of Miletus, who were present at several councils (Magdeburg, *Hist. Eccles.* 2:1-2; 4:86; 5:3; 7:254; 8:4). The city fell to decay after its conquest by the Saracens, and is now in ruins, not far from the spot where the Meander falls into the sea. (See Büsching, *Erdbeschr.* XI; 1:100; Tzschucke, *ad Mel.* III, 1:481.) The exact site, however, is somewhat a matter of uncertainty (Rosenmüller, *Bibl. Geogr.* I, 2:187), owing to the altered character of the coast in modern times; but it appears to be in part covered by the remains now called *Palatia*, i.e. the palace (Leake, *Asia Minor*, page 240). It lies in a triangular plot of ground, bounded by two branches of the river Menderes — the ancient Meander. These unite a little to the north of the ruins, and the stream thus formed disembogues through marshy ground into the sea about two miles distant. The harbor is filled up by the alluvial soil brought down by the river, which has already created a delta of no insignificant dimensions. The ruins of the ancient Miletus are even at the present time striking and picturesque, especially those of the theatre, one of the largest in Asia Minor. Seen from the south-west, it makes still a splendid object; to the south is a mosque, and farther still, in the same direction, a line of ruined arches, once forming an aqueduct. The fragments of a church

remain, in which the current tradition of the place asserts that St. John preached the Gospel; but it is unquestionably of a date far later than that of the evangelist. In the plain, between the theatre and the aqueduct, are a few pillars, indicating the site of a temple, probably dedicated to Diana. See Texier, *Asie Mineure*, page 316 sq.

Picture for Miletus 2

Some take the Miletus where Paul left Trophimus sick (~~2~~ Timothy 4:20; Auth. Vers. "Miletum") to have been in Crete, and therefore different from the above; but there seems to be no need for this conclusion. "This passage presents a very serious difficulty to the theory that there was only one Roman imprisonment. When Paul visited the place on the occasion just described, Trophimus was indeed with him (~~4~~ Acts 20:4); but he certainly did not 'leave him sick at Miletus,' for at the conclusion of the voyage we find him with the apostle at Jerusalem (~~4~~ Acts 21:29). Nor is it possible that he could have been so left on the voyage from Caesarea to Rome, for in the first place there is no reason to believe that Trophimus was with the apostle then at all; and in the second place the ship was never to the north of Cnidus (~~4~~ Acts 27:7). But on the hypothesis that Paul was liberated from Rome and revisited the neighborhood of Ephesus, all becomes easy, and consistent with the other notices of his movements in the pastoral epistles. (See Conybeare and Howson, *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, chapter 27; Birks, *Horae Apostolicae*.) See further in Schmidt, *Res Milesianae* (Gott. 1855); Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Geogr.* s.v.; Conybeare and Howson, *St. Paul*, 2:214 sq.; Tschihatscheff, *L'Asie Mineure* (Par. 1853), 1:252 sq.; Rawlinson, *Herod.* 1:218 sq.

Picture for Miletus 3

Mileum

a city of Numidia, in the northern part of Africa, is celebrated in Church history as a place where, at the beginning of the 5th century, two synods were held. The first of them, which is of little importance, convened Aug. 27, 402. Aurelius of Carthage presided. The canons of Hippo and Carthage were confirmed, and five canons of discipline published, which are contained in the African Code (comp. *Codex Canon. Eccl. Afric.* pages 85-90). It was decided that the younger bishops should give place to those of older standing, excepting the primates of Numidia and Mauritania, who always took precedence of all other primates of whatever standing (*Conc.*

2:1323). The second synod, which was held towards the autumn of A.D. 416, is known as the *Concilium Milevitanum*. This was a provincial council of Numidia, and was attended by sixty-one bishops of the province. It was chiefly owing to Augustine's (q.v.) influence, and to the happy issue of the synod at Diospolis (q.v.), that the African bishops assembled in a synodical meeting. Having learned the proceedings of the Council of Carthage of the same year, they wrote a synodal letter to pope Innocent I (q.v.), in which, after enlarging upon the enormity of the Pelagian heresy, which denied the necessity of *prayer in adults* and of baptism for children, and after showing how worthy it was of the notice and censure of the Church, they entreated him, since the salvation of Pelagius (q.v.) and Ccelestius (q.v.) could not be secured, that he would at least provide for that of others by condemning their heresies. They did not ask the excommunication of Pelagius and Celestius, as has sometimes been stated, but that they should be commanded to renounce their heresies, and that only the heresies themselves should be condemned. "Hoc gestum," they concluded, "Domino frater, sanctae caritati tuae intimandum ducimus, ut statutis nostrae mediocritatis etiam apostolicae sedis adhibeatur auctoritas." Among the names attached to this letter are those of Silvanus, primate of the province of Numidia, Alypius, St. Augustine, Severus of Mileum, Fortunatus of Citha, and Possidius. Another and more confidential letter was addressed to Innocent by five North African bishops, of whom Augustine was one (see Mansi, 4:321 sq.). Pelagius also sent him a letter and a confession of faith, which, however, were not received in due time. Innocent understood both the controversy and the interests of the Roman see. In his reply, which is to be found in *August. Epist.* page 182, he commended the Africans for having addressed themselves to the Church of St. Peter, before which it was seemly that all the affairs of Christendom should be brought. He praised the zeal and pastoral care of the African bishops, briefly established the true doctrine of grace, and condemned Pelagius and Coelestius, with their followers, declaring them to be separated from the Catholic Church. "Non solum enim," he says, "qui faciunt sed etiam qui consentiunt facientibus, digni sunt morto; quia non multum interesse arbitror inter committentis animum et consentientis favorem." He refrained, however, from giving judgment respecting the Synod of Diospolis. He also replied to the letters which Augustine and the four bishops — Aurelius, Alypins, Evodius, and Possidius — had addressed to him. These letters of Innocent were written in a council held at Rome upon the subject in January, 417, and are to be found in Mansi

(3:1071 sq.). See Schillstraten, *Antiq. Eccles. Afric. Diss.* volume 3; Norris, *Hist. Pelag.* 1:10; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, 2:100; Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* 1:330 sq.; Schaff, *Church Hist.* 3:797; Milman, *Hist. of Christianity*, pages 389, 414 sq.

Milicz Von Kremsier (Kromesize), John

was one of the most eminent precursors of the Bohemian Reformation. Of his early years little is known. The fact that in his mature years he first engaged in the study of the German language, would indicate that his education must have been acquired elsewhere than in a German university; possibly in Italy or at Paris, or in his own country, Moravia. Commencing his public career as a priest about the year 1350, he soon attracted the notice of the emperor Charles IV, who was also king of Bohemia, and became his secretary. At the same time, as canon of the cathedral at Prague, and archdeacon, he occupied a conspicuous ecclesiastical position. Resigning, however, all his prospects of promotion, notwithstanding the entreaties of the bishop, he chose a lot of poverty and hardship, that he might more fully imitate the example of Christ. For six months he preached to the people at Bishop-teinitz; but fearing lest his position there was too tempting, in a worldly point of view, he returned to Prague, first officiating in the church of St. Nicholas, in the Kleine Seito, and afterwards in that of St. AEgidius, in the old city. At first his hearers were few. Perhaps his Moravian dialect was not attractive. His reproof of sin, and his earnest words, however, soon attracted notice. Multitudes thronged to hear him. He preached daily, and often three, and sometimes five sermons. To be more extensively useful, he applied himself to the study of German, that he might address himself to the Germans of Prague. The evils and corruptions of the times doubtless led him to select his themes of discourse largely from the Apocalypse, and the prophets of the Old Testament, and ere long the coming of Antichrist became the burden of his pulpit discourses. He fixed the date of his coming at A.D. 1365-67, nor did he fear to expose the iniquities which, to his view, seemed to herald it. Priests, bishops, and magistrates, and even the emperor himself, were not spared. It is to the credit of his reputation for sincerity that, notwithstanding the hostility which he provoked in some quarters, he was sustained and befriended by the highest powers in Church and State.

In 1367, on the report that the pope was about to return from Avignon to Rome, Milicz resolved to visit and confer with him. The pope's arrival was

delayed; and Milicz, obedient to what he regarded as the voice of the Spirit within him, nailed upon the doors of St. Peter's the sentence which had so long occupied his thoughts — "The Antichrist has come." He zealously warned the people and the clergy to withdraw themselves from iniquity. The inquisitor, encouraged by reports of Milicz's course in Bohemia, ordered his arrest and imprisonment. From his prison he was summoned to preach to an assembly of the clergy, but his full release did not take place till the pope's arrival in Rome in 1368. In free conference with the pope and some of the cardinals who befriended him, he moderated, if he did not modify his views. On his return to Prague, where he succeeded Conrad Waldhauser in the Tein Church, his enthusiastic zeal assumed a new phase. He devoted himself earnestly to the reform of the vicious and abandoned. Scores of prostitutes were recalled to repentance and virtue. The quarters they had occupied, heretofore the scandal of the city, were transformed. Achapel to St. Mary Magdalene was erected there, and buildings were provided for the residence and support of the hundreds, if not thousands, that were recovered to the paths of virtue. Milicz's course made him many enemies. Of the clergy, some were jealous of him, and others hated him for his rebukes. Charges were drawn up against him, and forwarded to the pope at Avignon. It is quite significant that these articles, twelve in number, are almost silent as to any doctrinal errors. The pope, however, was prejudiced against Milicz, and summoned him to his court, to answer in person. Milicz, promptly responded to the summons. He met a kindly reception, and succeeded in vindicating his innocence. But his career was drawing to a close. He was taken sick at Avignon, and died June 29, 1374. At Prague his decease gave occasion for public and general lamentation.

Of the Christian character and devotion of Milicz, Matthias of Janow speaks in terms that might seem extravagant if the actual results of Milicz's labors did not go so far to justify them. Notwithstanding the envy which was felt towards him by some of the clergy, and the hostility which he provoked by his sharp rebuke of prevailing iniquity, he does not seem to have laid himself open to the charge of departing seriously from the accepted doctrines and usages of the Church. Indeed, his zeal took more of a practical than a speculative direction, and in this respect only can he be considered as a precursor who prepared the way for Huss.

Of Milicz's writings, some are still extant in manuscript, and some have been preserved by his friend and admirer, Matthias von Janow (q.v.). His Latin works were, *Libellus de Antichristo*; *Gratia Dei*, or sermons on the

occasion of Church festivals throughout the year; and *Sermones Quadrigesimales*. Of his Bohemian works, consisting of sermons and postils, one only has been printed, and, though it found a place in the Prohibitory Index, not a copy of it is now known to exist.

A somewhat detailed account of Milicz is given by Neander in his *History of the Church* (volume 5). To the other sources of information — besides Balbinus (*Miscell.* 1, lib. 4:34) and the writings of Matthias of Janow — to which Neander had access, must be added P. Jordan's *Die Vorlauffer des Hussitentums in Bohmen*, which presents a concise sketch of Conrad of Waldhausen, Milicz, and Matthias of Janow. This sketch, really drawn up by F. Palacky, the historian of Bohemia, was published at first in Germany, with the name of P. Jordan affixed, since at the time it was doubtful whether the laws of the press in Austria would permit its publication in any of its states. It was republished, however, in 1868, under the name of its real author, F. Palacky; and doubtless furnishes the most trustworthy account extant of the subject of this article. See also Gillett, *Life of Huss* (see Index in volume 2); Hardwick, *Ch. Hist.* pages 397, 399; Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* 3:184 sq.; Riddle, *Hist. of the Papacy*, 2:363; Czerwonka, *Gesch. der evagel. Kirche in Bohmnen* (Bibf. 1869), volume 1. (E.H.G.)

Militant, Church

a term applied to the *whole congregation* of faithful men on earth (in distinction from the Church *triumphant* in heaven), as engaged "to fight manfully" under Christ's banner against sin, the world, and the devil; and to continue his faithful *soldiers* (milites) and servants unto their life's end.

Military Orders

is a term applied to three celebrated fraternities which sprang up in the period of the *Crusades* (q.v.). They were religious associations which arose from a mixture of the religious enthusiasm and the chivalrous love of arms which almost equally formed the characteristics of mediaeval society. The first origin of such associations may be traced to the necessities of the Christian residents of the Holy Land, in which the monks, whose first duty had been to serve the pilgrims in the hospital at Jerusalem, were compelled, by the necessity of self-defense, to assume the character of soldiers as well as of monks. These were termed *Knights of St. John*. **SEE HOSPITALLERS**. The second, the order of the *Templars* (q.v.), and the third, the *Teutonic Knights*, were the outgrowth of the days of the

Crusades. *SEE KNIGHTHOOD*. These military orders professed to unite religious vows with the duties and discipline of a warrior. The chief objects they claimed to have in view were to defend and support Christianity, by force of arms, against the Mohammedans; to keep the public roads of Palestine from being infested with robbers; and to assist the poor, and minister to the sick, among those who were prompted by the spirit of the times to visit, as pilgrims, the various places reputed to be scenes of our Lord's earthly career.

The inferior orders of Alcantara and Calatrava, in Spain, having for their immediate object the defence of their country against the Moors, as well as those of Avis, in Portugal, claimed to have been instituted for like reasons as those above mentioned. They followed the Cistercian rule, and all three differed from the Templars and the Knights of St. John in being permitted by their institute to marry once. The same privilege was enjoyed in the Savoyard order of Knights of St. Maurice and the Flemish order of St. Hubert. On the contrary, the Teutonic Knights, who had their origin in the Crusades, *see TEUTONIC KNIGHTS*, were bound by an absolute vow of chastity.

With the varying conditions of society, these religious associations have at various times been abolished or fallen into disuse; but most of them still subsist in the form of orders of knighthood, and, in some of them, attempts have recently been made to revive, with certain modifications, the monastic character which they originally possessed. See Lea, *Hist. of Sacerdotal Celibacy*, chapter 22; Giustiniani, *Ordini Militari*, s.v.

Militz

SEE MILICZ.

Milk

is designated by two Hebrew words of distinct signification.

1. bl j (*chalab'*, *fat*, i.e., rich; Gr. γάλα) denotes new or *sweet* milk. This, in its fresh state, appears to have been used very largely among the Hebrews, as is customary among people who have many cattle; and yet make but sparing use of their flesh for food (see ~~182124~~ Job 21:24; ~~17049~~ Judges 4:19). It is not a mere adjunct in cookery, or restricted to the use of the young, although it is naturally the characteristic food of childhood, both

from its simple and nutritive qualities (^{<4112>}1 Peter 2:2), and particularly as contrasted with meat (^{<4412>}1 Corinthians 3:2; ^{<3812>}Hebrews 5:12); but beyond this it is regarded as substantial food adapted alike to all ages and classes. Hence it is enumerated among “the principal things for the whole use of a man’s life” (Ecclus. 39:26). It frequently occurs in connection with honey, as a delicacy (^{<1118>}Exodus 3:8; 13:5; ^{<4115>}Joshua 5:6; ^{<2415>}Jeremiah 11:5; comp. Dio Chrvs. 35:p. 434; Strabo, 15, page 715). In reading of milk in Scripture, the milk of cows naturally presents itself to the mind of the European reader; but in Western Asia, and especially among the pastoral and semi-pastoral people, not only cows, but goats, sheep, and camels are made to give their milk for the sustenance of man. That this was also the case among the Hebrews maybe clearly inferred even from the slight intimations which the Scriptures afford. Thus we read of “butter of kine, and milk of sheep” (^{<1524>}Deuteronomy 32:14); and in ^{<3127>}Proverbs 27:27, the emphatic intimation, “Thou shalt have goats’ milk for food,” seems to imply that this was considered the best for use in the simple state (comp. Pliny, 28:33; see Russell’s *Aleppo*, 2:12; Sonnini, *Trav.* 1:329 sq.; Bochart, *Hiero.* 1:717 sq.). “Thirty milk camels” were among the cattle which Jacob presented to his brother Esau (^{<1325>}Genesis 32:15), implying the use of camels’ milk.

The most striking scriptural allusion to milk is that which forbids a kid to be seethed in its mother’s milk, and its importance is attested by its being thrice repeated (^{<1239>}Exodus 23:19; 34:26; ^{<1521>}Deuteronomy 14:21). The following are the most remarkable views respecting it:

- (1.) That it prohibits the eating of the foetus of the goat as a delicacy: but there is not the least evidence that the Jews were ever attached to this disgusting luxury.
- (2.) That it prevents the kid being killed till it is eight days old, when, it is said, it might subsist without the milk of its mother.
- (3.) This ground is admitted by those who deduce a further reason from the fact that a kid was not, until the eighth day, fit for sacrifice. But there appears no good reason why a kid should be described as “in its mother’s milk,” in those days, more than in any other days of the period during which it is suckled.
- (4.) Others, therefore, maintain that the eating of a sucking kid is altogether and absolutely prohibited. But a goat suckles its kid for three

months, and it is not likely that the Jews were so long forbidden the use of it for food. No food is forbidden but as unclean, and a kid ceased to be unclean on the eighth day, when it was fit for sacrifice; and what was fit for sacrifice could not be unfit for food.

(5.) That the prohibition was meant to prevent the dam and kid from being slain at the same time. But this is forbidden with reference to the goat and other animals in express terms, and there seems to be no reason why it should be repeated in this remarkable form with reference to the goat only.

(6.) Others understand it literally, as a precept designed to encourage humane feelings. But, as Michaelis asks, how came the Israelites to hit upon the strange whim of boiling a kid in milk, and just in the milk of its own mother?

(7.) Still, understanding the text literally, it is possible that this was not a common act of cookery, but an idolatrous or magical rite. Maimonides, in his *More Nebochim*, urges this opinion, and adduces the fact that in two of the above passages the practice is spoken of in immediate connection with the three great annual feasts (⁴⁰²³¹⁷Exodus 23:17, 19; 34:23, 26), although he admits that he “had not yet been able to find it in the Zabian books.” This opinion is confirmed by an extract which Cudworth (*Discourses concerning the True Notion of the Lord’s Supper*, page 30) gives from an ancient Karaite commentary on the Pentateuch; it has been supported by Spencer (*De Legibus Hebr.* 2:9, § 2), and has been advocated by Le Clerc, Dathe, and other able writers; it is also corroborated by the addition in the Samaritan copy, and in some degree by the Targum.

(8.) Michaelis, however, advances a quite new opinion of his own. He takes it for granted that **l vB**; rendered “seethe,” may signify to roast as well as to boil, which is hardly disputable; that the kid’s mother is not here limited to the real mother, but applies to any goat that has kidded; that **bl j**; here denotes not *milk*, but *butter*; and that the precept is not restricted to kids, but extends not only to lambs (which is generally granted), but to all other not forbidden animals. Having erected these props, Michaelis builds upon them the conjecture that the motive of the precept was to endear to the Israelites the land of Canaan, which abounded in *oil*, and to make them forget their Egyptian *butter*. Moses, therefore, to prevent their having any longing desire to return to that country, enjoins them to use oil in cooking their victuals, as well as in seasoning their

sacrifices (*Mosaisches Recht*, part 4, page 210). This is ingenious, but it is open to objection. The postulates cannot readily be granted, and, if granted, the conclusion deduced from them is scarcely just, seeing that, as Geddes remarks, “there was no need nor temptation for the Israelites to return to Egypt on account of its butter, when they possessed a country that flowed with milk and honey” (*Critical Remarks*, page 257). *SEE KID*.

In its figurative use, milk occurs sometimes simply as the sign of abundance (^{<04912>}Genesis 49:12; ^{<25304>}Ezekiel 25:4; ^{<21818>}Joel 3:18, etc.); but more frequently in combination with honey “milk and honey” being a phrase which occurs about twenty times in Scripture. Thus a rich and fertile soil is described as a “land flowing with milk and honey;” which, although usually said of Palestine, is also applied to other fruitful countries, as Egypt (^{<04613>}Numbers 16:13). This figure is by no means peculiar to the Hebrews, but is frequently met with in classical writers. A beautiful example occurs in Euripides (*Bacch.* 142). Hence its use to denote the food of children. Milk is also constantly employed as a symbol of the elementary parts or rudiments of doctrine (^{<41812>}1 Corinthians 3:2; ^{<38512>}Hebrews 5:12, 13); and, from its purity and simplicity, it is also made to symbolize the unadulterated Word of God (^{<41812>}1 Peter 2:2; comp. ^{<28501>}Isaiah 55:1).

The term rendered “milk out” in ^{<28511>}Isaiah 66:11, is /x̄m; matsats’, which occurs only in that passage, and apparently signifies to suck or draw out something sweet with relish, as milk from the breast; it is put as a symbol of abundant satisfaction.

2. hamj , chemah’, from hmj ; to coagulate), is always translated “butter” in the Authorized Version. It seems to mean both butter and curdled milk, but most generally the latter; and the context will, in most cases, suggest the distinction, which has been neglected by our translators. It was this curdled milk, highly esteemed as a refreshment in the East (where it is called *lebben*, see Russell’s *Aleppo*, 1:150; Burckhardt, *Trav.* 2:697, 727; Robinson, 2:405; 3:574), that Abraham set before the angels (^{<01818>}Genesis 18:8); and it was the same that Jael gave to Sisera, instead of the water which he asked (^{<01825>}Judges 5:25), as Josephus particularly notes (γάλα διαφθορὸς ἥδη, *Ant.* 5:5, 4); it was produced from one of the goat-skin bottles which are still used for the purpose by the Bedouins (^{<01819>}Judges 4:19; comp. Burckhardt’s *Notes*, 1:45). As it would keep for a considerable time, it was particularly adapted to the use of travellers (^{<01723>}2

Samuel 17:29). In this state milk acquires a slightly inebriating power, if kept long enough. ^{<2372>}Isaiah 7:22 is the only text in which the word is coupled with “honey,” and there it is a sign of scarcity, not of plenty, as when honey is coupled with fresh milk. It means that there being no fruit or grain, the remnant would have to live on milk and honey; and, perhaps, that milk itself would be so scarce that it would be needful to use it with economy, and hence to curdle it, as fresh milk cannot be preserved for chary use. Although, however, this word properly denotes curdled milk, it seems also to be sometimes used for milk in general (^{<6314>}Deuteronomy 32:14; ^{<3015>}Job 20:15; ^{<2375>}Isaiah 7:15). *SEE BUTTER; SEE CHEESE.*

Lebben is still extensively used in the East: at certain seasons of the year the poor almost live upon it, while the upper classes eat it with salad or meat (Russell, 1:118). It is still offered in hospitality to the passing stranger (Robinson, *Bib. Res.* 1:571; 2:70, 211) — so freely, indeed, that in some parts of Arabia it would be regarded as a scandal if money were received in return (Burckhardt’s *Arabia*, 1:120; 2:106). The method now pursued in its preparation is to boil the milk over a slow fire, adding to it a small piece of old *lebben* or some other acid in order to make it coagulate (Russell, *Aleppo*, 1:118, 370; Burckhardt, *Arabia*, 1:60). See Foo).

Milk And Honey

used at Baptism. — The practice of tasting milk and honey at baptism appears to have been founded upon the promises made to the Israelites (^{<1188>}Exodus 3:8,17; 33:3). They were probably regarded as appropriate emblems at the administration of that sacrament by which we are introduced into that new land “flowing with milk and honey,” the spiritual kingdom of God under the Gospel. The tasting of milk may be supposed to refer especially to the words of St. Peter, “As new-born babes, desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby” (^{<1112>}1 Peter 2:2); a passage which was applied to baptism. As milk denoted the spiritual nourishment afforded by God’s Word, so honey denoted its pleasantness or agreeableness to the mind and heart of a renewed person (^{<9911>}Psalms 19:11; 119:103; ^{<6109>}Revelation 10:9,10). And the use of honey at baptism may have served to remind believers of the superiority of the Christian dispensation over the Jewish, since under the latter there was a law against the use of honey at sacrifices, on account of its liability to corrupt. *SEE HONEY.* The emblems of milk and honey were in use as early as the third and fourth centuries. Salmasius and some others suppose that they were

given to the communicant instead of the Eucharist. This, however, is a mistake, for the Eucharist was administered at the same time (Salmasius, ap. *Suicer. Thesaur.* part 2, page 236). Tertullian says it was a sign of new birth, and that the communicants became as children adopted into God's family — "Inde suscepti lacti et mellis concordiam praegustamus" (Tertull. *De cor. Mil.* c. 3). St. Jerome says this was done in allusion to those passages of the apostle, "I have fed you with milk, and not with strong meat;" and to St. Peter's saying above; for milk denotes the innocency of children (*Comment. in Es.* LV, 1). Clemens Alexandrinus also takes notice of this custom, saying, "As soon as we are born, we are nourished with milk, which is the nutriment of the Lord; and when we are born again, we are honored with the hope of rest by the promise of Jerusalem which is above, where it is said to rain milk and honey: for by these material things we are assured of that sacred food" (Clem. Alexandr. 1:6, 103). We learn further, from the third Council of Carthage, that the milk and honey had a peculiar consecration distinct from that of the Eucharist (*Cod. Eccles. Afric.* can. 37, ap. Justellun) — "Nothing else should be offered in the sacraments of the body and blood of the Lord but what the Lord commanded, that is, bread and wine mingled with water. But the first-fruits, and honey and milk, which are offered on one most solemn day for the mystery of infants, though they be offered at the altar, shall have their own peculiar benediction, that they may be distinguished from the sacrament of the body and blood of the Lord." Here we see that milk and honey were only to be offered on one solemn day, that is, on the great Sabbath, or Saturday before Easter, which was the most solemn time of baptism; and only for the mystery of infants, that is, persons newly baptized, who were commonly called infants, in a mystical sense, from their new birth, in the African Church. In the time of the Council of Trullo the offering of milk and honey at the altar was forbidden (comp. *Conc. Trull.* can. 57). See Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, page 520; Ayer, *Treasury of Bible Knowledge*, page 591; Coleman, *Ancient Christianity*, page 402; Bingham, *Antiquities of the Latin Church*, 1:500 sq.; 2:755 sq.; Eadie, *Eccles. Dict.*; Augusti, *Christl. Archceology*, 2:446 sq.

Mill

Picture for Mill 1

(**myja** **erecha**'yim, the two millstones, from **hj r**; to bruise, ^{<2116>}Exodus 11:5; "mills," ^{<9408>}Numbers 10:8; "millstones," ^{<2570>}Isaiah 47:2; ^{<2510>}Jeremiah

25:10; “nether” millstone, ^{<5216>}Deuteronomy 24:6; **μύλων**, ^{<1221>}Matthew 24:21. Each millstone was called **j l P**, *pe’lach*, a *slice* or piece, as of fruit, in ^{<2118>}Song of Solomon 4:3; ^{<8012>}1 Samuel 30:12; always “piece” of a millstone, ^{<0053>}Judges 9:53; ^{<10121>}2 Samuel 11:21; ^{<38124>}Job 41:24; Gr. **μύλος**, ^{<1816>}Matthew 18:6; ^{<2172>}Luke 17:2; ^{<6821>}Revelation 18:21, 22). The mill (properly **hnhfi** *tachanah*, a “grinding,” ^{<2124>}Ecclesiastes 12:4; **~j f** *techon*, “to grind,” ^{<5133>}Lamentations 5:13; Gr. **μύλη**) for grinding grain had not wholly superseded the mortar for pounding it in the time of Moses (^{<0118>}Numbers 11:8). **SEE MORTAR**. But fine meal—that is, meal ground or pounded fine — is mentioned so early as the time of Abraham (^{<1816>}Genesis 18:6): hence mills and mortars must have been previously known. **SEE GRITS**. The mill common among the Hebrews differed little from that which is in use to this day throughout Western Asia and Northern Africa. It consisted of two circular stones, two feet in diameter and half a foot thick. The lower is called the “nether millstone” (^{<3816>}Job 41:16 [24]), and the upper the “rider” (^{<0053>}Judges 9:53; ^{<10121>}2 Samuel 11:21). The former was usually fixed to the floor, and had a slight elevation in the center, or, in other words, was slightly convex in the upper surface. The upper stone had a concavity in its under surface fitting to, or receiving, the convexity of the lower stone. There was a hole in the top, through which the grain was introduced by handfuls at a time. The upper stone had an upright stick fixed in it as a handle, which which it was made to turn upon the lower stone, and by this action the grain was ground, and came out at the edges. As there were neither public mills nor bakers, except the king’s (^{<0412>}Genesis 40:2; ^{<2074>}Hosea 7:4-8), each family possessed a mill; and, as it was in daily use, it was made an infringement of the law for a person to take another’s mill or millstone in pledge (^{<5216>}Deuteronomy 24:6). **SEE MILLSTONE**. On the second day, in warm climates, bread becomes dry and insipid; hence the necessity of baking every day, and hence also the daily grinding at the mills early in the morning. **SEE BREAD**. It is worked by women, sometimes singly and sometimes two together, who are usually seated on the bare ground (^{<2371>}Isaiah 47:1, 2) facing each other; both have hold of the handle by which the upper is turned round on the ‘nether’ millstone. The one whose right hand is disengaged throws in the grain as occasion requires through the hole in the upper stone. It is not correct to say that one pushes it half round, and then the other seizes the handle.

Picture for Mill 2

This would be slow work, and would give a spasmodic motion to the stone. Both retain their hold, and pull *to*, or *push from*, as men do with the whip or cross-cut saw. The proverb of our Savior (^{<1244>}Matthew 24:41) is true to life, for *women* only grind. I cannot recall an instance in which men were at the mill” (Thomson, *Land and Book*, 2:295). The labor is very hard, and the task of grinding is in consequence performed only by the lowest servants (^{<1215>}Exodus 11:5; comp. Plaut. *Merc.* 2:3) and captives (^{<0762>}Judges 16:21; ^{<1811>}Job 31:10; ^{<2370>}Isaiah 47:1, 2; ^{<2153>}Lamentations 5:13; comp. Homer, *Od.* 7:103; Suetonius, *Tib.* c. 51). Grinding is reckoned in the Mishna (*Shabbath*, 7:2) among the chief household duties, to be performed by the wife unless she brought with her one servant (*Cethuboth*, 5:5); in which case she was relieved from grinding, baking, and washing, but was still obliged to suckle her child, make her husband’s bed, and work in wool. Among the Fellahs of the Hauran, one of the chief articles of furniture described by Burckhardt (*Syria*, page 292) is the “*hand-mill*, which is used in summer when there is no water in the wadies to drive the mills.” The operation occasions considerable noise, and its simultaneous performance in a great number of houses or tents forms one of the sounds as indicative of an active population in the East as the sound of wheel-carriages in the West. Hence the sound of the mill is the indication of peaceful household life, and the absence of it is a sign of desolation and abandonment: “When the sound of the mill is low” (^{<2113>}Ecclesiastes 12:4). No more affecting picture of utter desolation could be imagined than that conveyed in the threat denounced against Judah by the mouth of the prophet ^{<2510>}Jeremiah 25:10: “I will take from them the voice of mirth, and the voice of gladness, the voice of the bridegroom and the voice of the bride, *the sound of the millstones*, and the light of the candle” (comp. ^{<6182>}Revelation 18:22). The song of the women grinding is supposed by some to be alluded to in the above passage of Ecclesiastes, and it was evidently so understood by the Sept.; but Dr. Robinson says (1:485), “We heard no song as an accompaniment to the work,” and Dr. Hackett (*Bibl. Illust.* page 49) describes it rather as shrieking than singing. It is alluded to in Homer (*Od.* 20:105-119); and Athenaeus (14, page 619a) refers to a peculiar chant which was sung by women winnowing corn, and mentioned by Aristophanes in the *Thesmophoriazusae*.

Picture for Mill 3

The hand-mills of the ancient Egyptians appear to have been of the same character as those of their descendants, and like them were worked by women (Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg.* 2:118, etc.). “They had also a large mill on a very similar principle, but the stones were of far greater power and dimensions; and this could only have been turned by cattle or asses, like those of the ancient Romans and of the modern Cairenes.” It was the millstone of a mill of this kind, driven by an ass, which is alluded to in ^{<0816>}Matthew 18:6 (μύλος ὄνικός), to distinguish it, says Lightfoot (*Hor. Hebr.* ad loc.), from those small mills which were used to grind spices for the wound of circumcision, or for the delights of the Sabbath, and to which both Kimchi and Jarchi find a reference in ^{<2510>}Jeremiah 25:10. Of a married man with slender means it is said in the Talmud (*Kiddushin*, page 29b), “With a millstone on his neck he studies the law,” and the expression is still proverbial (Tendlau, *Sprichwörter*, page 181). The ordinary mill of the Romans, however, was essentially like the conical hand-mill of the East, as specimens preserved among the ruins of bake-houses in Pompeii show (see Smith’s *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Antiq.* s.v. Mola).

It was the movable upper millstone of the hand-mill with which the woman of Thebez broke Abimelech’s skull (^{<0853>}Judges 9:53). It is now generally made, according to Dr. Thomson, of a porous lava brought from the Hauran, both stones being of the same material; but, says the same traveller, “I have seen the *nether* made of a compact sandstone, and quite thick, while the *upper* was of this lava, probably because from its lightness it is the more easily driven round with the hand” (*Land and Book*, 2:296). The porous lava to which he refers is probably the same as the black tufa mentioned by Burckhardt (*Syria*, page 57), the blocks of which are brought from the Lejah, and are fashioned into millstones by the inhabitants of Ezra, a village in the Hauran. “They vary in price according to their size, from fifteen to sixty piastres, and are preferred to all others on account of the hardness of the stone.”

One passage (Lamentations 5:13) is deserving of notice, which Hoheisel (*De Molis Manual. Vet.* in Ugolini, volume 29) explains in a manner which gives it a point that is lost in our Auth. Vers. It may be rendered, “The choice (men) bore the mill (װֶפֶף] *techen*), and the youths stumbled beneath the wood;” the wood being the woodwork or shaft of the mill, which the captives were compelled to carry. There are, moreover, allusions

to other apparatus connected with the operation of grinding — the sieve, or bolter (**hpn**; *naphah*’, ^{<308>}Isaiah 30:28; or **hrbKJ** *kgbarah*’, ^{<309>}Amos 9:9), and the hopper, though the latter is only found in the Mishna (*Zabim*, 4:3), and was a late invention. We also find in the Mishna (*Demai*, 3:4) that mention is made of a miller (**ׁj װב**, *tochen*), indicating that grinding grain was recognised as a distinct occupation. Wind-mills and water-mills are of more recent date.

Mill, David, D.D.

a noted German Orientalist. was born at Königsberg, Prussia, April 13, 1692. Called to Holland, he accepted a professorship in the University of Utrecht. He died May 22, 1755. His ablest work is, *Dissertationes Selectae Varia S. Litt. et Antiquitatis Orientalis Capita exponentes et illustrantes, curis secundis* (Lugd. Bat. 1743).

Mill, James

an eminent British metaphysician and political economist, was born of humble parentage in the neighborhood of Montrose, Scotland, April 6, 1773. After having received a thorough education in the house of Sir John Stuart, M.P., he was sent to the University of Edinburgh, where he was educated for the Church. He entered into holy orders in 1798, but, instead of devoting himself to his sacred calling, he went to London in 1800; became editor of the *Literary Journal*, and wrote for various periodicals, including the *Eclectic* and the *Edinburgh Review*. In 1806 he commenced a *History of British India*, which he completed and published in 1818. The impression produced by this masterly history on the Indian authorities was such that in 1819 Mill was appointed assistant-examiner of Indian correspondence. He continued in this office till 1832, when he was appointed head of the examiner’s office, where he had the control of all the departments of Indian administration. Shortly after his appointment to the India House, he contributed the articles on *Government, Education, Jurisprudence, Law of Nations, Liberty of the Press, Colonies, and Prison Discipline* to the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. These essays were reprinted in a separate form and became widely known. The powers of analysis, of clear statement, and thorough application of principles exhibited in these articles had probably never before been brought to bear on this class of subjects. In 1821 1822 he published his *Elements of Political Economy*, a

work prepared primarily with a view to the education of his eldest son, John Stuart Mill (q.v.).

In 1829 Mr. Mill came before the public with his *Analysis of the Phenomena of the Human Mind*, a work on which he bestowed more of the labor of thought than on any other of his productions, and on a subject of special interest to the theologian and the philosopher. In this work Mill has attempted to resolve all the powers of the human mind into a very small number of simple elements. From an examination of a number of the more complicated cases of consciousness, he arrives at the conclusion that they all resolve themselves into three simple elements — sensations, ideas, and the train of ideas. He thus explains what he means by the terms *sensations* and *ideas*: “We have two classes of feeling: one, that which exists when the object of sense is present; another, that which exists after the object of sense has ceased to be present. The one class of feelings I call sensations, the other class of feelings I call ideas” (1:41). He begins with the simpler phenomena, and thence proceeds to the exposition of the more complex ones. “The feelings,” he says, “which we have through the external senses are the most simple, at least the most familiar, of the mental phenomena. Hence the propriety of commencing with this class of our feelings” (*Analysis*, 1:1). Accordingly he begins with sensation, under which head he ranges the feelings which we have by the five senses — smell, taste, hearing, touch, and sight; the muscular sensations, and the sensations in the alimentary canal. He next treats of ideas, or, as he calls them, the images of sensation. He then comments on ideas put together or associated in trains, and of the order of their association and the causes of that order. He then treats of consciousness and conception, which philosophers, he says, have erroneously created into what they called powers of the mind; whereas, he says, consciousness is merely a name applied to sensations, and to ideas whether simple or complex — to all the feelings of our sentient nature: and conception a name applied only to ideas, and to ideas only in a state of combination. “Imagination,” he says, “is the name of a train of ideas. I am said to have an imagination when I have a train of ideas. There is a great diversity of trains. Not only has the same individual an endless variety of trains, but a different character belongs to the whole series of trains which pass through the minds of different individuals or classes of individuals. The different pursuits in which the several classes of men are engaged render particular trains of ideas more common to them than other trains. One man is a merchant, and

trains respecting the goods in which he buys and those in which he sells are habitual in his mind. Another man is a lawyer, and ideas of clients and fees, and judges and witnesses, and legal instruments and points of contestation, and the practice of his court, are habitually passing in his mind. Ideas of another kind occupy the mind of the physician; of another kind still the mind of the warrior. The statesman is occupied with a train different from that of any of the classes that have been mentioned, and one statesman with a very different train from another, according as his mind is running upon expedients Which may serve the purpose of the day, or arrangement which may secure the happiness of the population from generation to generation. A peculiar character belongs to the train which habitually occupies the mind of the mathematician. The mind of the metaphysician is also occupied by a train distinguished from that of other classes. And there is one man yet to be mentioned, the poet, the peculiarity of whose trains has been a subject of particular observation. To such a degree, indeed, have the trains of the poet been singled out for distinction, that the word imagination, in a more restricted sense, is appropriated to them. We do not call the trains of the lawyer, or the trains of the merchant, imagination. We do not speak of them as imagining, when they are revolving each the ideas which belong to his peculiar occupation; it is only to the poet that the epithet of imagination is applied. His train, or trahis analogous to his are those which receive the name of imagination” (1:179).

In some parts of his philosophy Mill has, we think, been led into error, by carrying his notion of association, as an explanation of these phenomena, too far. Thus, in the chapter on classification, after very ably showing how long men had been led away by mere jargon from the real nature and object of classification, he says: “Man first becomes acquainted with individuals. He first names individuals. But individuals are innumerable, and he cannot have innumerable names. He must make one name serve for many individuals.” Then, after alluding to the case of “synchronous sensations so concentered by constant conjunction as to appear, though numerous, only one, of which the ideas of sensible objects — a rose, a plough, a house, a ship — are examples,” he thus proceeds: “It is easy to see wherein the present case agrees with and wherein it differs from those familiar cases. The word man, we shall say is first applied to an individual; it is first associated with the idea of that individual, and acquires the power of calling up the idea of him; it is next applied to another individual, and acquires the power of calling up the idea of him; so of another, and

another, till it has become associated with an indefinite number, and has acquired the power of calling up an indefinite number of those ideas indifferently. What happens? It does call up an indefinite number of the ideas of individuals as often as it occurs; and calling them up in close connection, it forms them into a species of complex idea" (1:204). From this simple basis he builds up with remarkable dexterity a comprehensive system, all the errors or defects of which lie at the very threshold. His conclusions are inevitable, if his premises, his representation of the facts of consciousness, be accepted. Sensation, ideation, association, and naming are the elementary processes in his analysis, by which he accounts for all the complex phenomena of the mind — for abstraction, memory, judgment, ratiocination, belief, and the power of motives. He devotes the latter half of the second volume of his *Analysis* to the phenomena in which the sensations and ideas are to be considered as not merely existing, but also as exciting to action. He treats of pleasurable and painful sensations, and of the causes of the pleasurable and painful sensations; then of ideas of the pleasurable and painful sensations, and of the causes of them. He treats of wealth, power, and dignity, and their contraries; of our fellow-creatures, and of the objects called sublime and beautiful, and their contraries, contemplated as causes of our pleasures and pains. Chapter 22 is devoted to the subject of motives, and chapter 24 to that of the will; chapter 25 (the last) to intention. Mr. Mill's exposition of all these phenomena is mainly grounded on the law of association, by which he means simply the fact that the order of occurrence among our ideas is the order of occurrence among our former sensations, of which those ideas are the copies.

The last publication of Mill was a fragment containing a severe criticism on James Macintosh's dissertation on the progress of ethical philosophy. Mill, who had always exercised a particular championship for the doctrines of Thomas Hobbes (q.v.), was not at all pleased with the unceremonious manner in which his favorite was handled by Sir James. If Hobbes and Mill are right, then many great names are liable to the charge of error. Mill took a leading part in the founding of University College, London, and gave a powerful intellectual stimulus to a number of young men, some of whom (including his own son, and Grote, the Greek historian) have risen to eminence. Hedien at Kensington June 23, 1836. See *Engl. Cyclop.* s.v.; *Amer. Cyclop.* 11:501 sq.; Chambers, *Cyclop.* s.v.; Lewis, *Biog. Hist. of Philosophers*, 2:507; *Westminst. Rev.* 13:265; *Blackwood's Magazine*, 46:671; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, 2:1279 sq.

Mill, John, D.D.

a very learned English divine and Biblical critic, was born at Shapp, Westmoreland, in 1645. In 1661 he became a servitor in Queen's College, Oxford, where he secured the master of arts in 1669. He was afterwards elected a fellow, and became eminent as a tutor. Having entered into orders, he was greatly admired for his pulpit eloquence. In 1676 he became chaplain to the bishop of Oxford. In 1680 he received from his college the living of Bletchington, in Oxfordshire, and in the year following received the degree of D.D., and became chaplain in ordinary to Charles II. In 1685 he was elected principal of St. Edmund's Hall, Oxford, and in 1704 was appointed prebendary of Canterbury. He died in 1708. He is famous for having devoted the labor of thirty years to the preparation of a new edition of the Greek Testament, finishing it only fourteen days before his death. It appeared under the title of *Ἡ Καινὴ Διαθήκη, Novum Testamentum Graecum, cum Lectionibus Variantibus MSS. Exemplarium, Versionum, Editionum, SS. Patrum et Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum, et in easdem notis; Studio et labore Joannis Millii, S.T.P. Oxonii, e Theatro Sheldoniano* (1707, fol.). The various readings are reckoned at about 30,000, the text being that of Robert Stephens's edition of 1550. The collection of such a mass of various readings, instead of supplying arms for infidelity, as some seem to have feared, has served to place the uncorrupted integrity of the Scriptures in a stronger light than ever. Dr. Whitby (q.v.) attacked the work in his *Examen variantum lectionum Joh. Millii* (1710), but Dr. Bentley (q.v.), under the signature of Phileleutheros Lipsiensis, ably vindicated the labors of Mill; and Michaelis, Marsh, Harewood, and critical scholars generally, attest the great value of his edition. It has been aptly remarked that "the infancy of criticism ends with the edition of Gregory, and the age of manhood commences with that of Mill." Mill's edition ranks next to that of Wetstein in importance and utility, its prolegomena being beyond price. See Marsh, *Divinity Lectures*, 7:9, 10, 13; Wood, *Athen. Oxon.*; Jones, *Christ. Biography*, s.v.; *Brit. and For. Rev.* 1871, February, art. 8; *Lond. Qu. Rev.* July 1871; *Blackwood's Mag.* 28:443; Chambers, *Cyclop.* s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, 2:1279 sq.; Home, *Bibl. Bib.* (1839), page 16; Orme, *Bibl. Bib.* s.v. **SEE CRITICISM.**

Mill, John Stuart

the British philosopher whose writings have done much to shape the thinking of this generation, was the son of James Mill (q.v.), and was born

in London May 20, 1806. His intellectual training was conducted by his learned father, who, holding that all men are born with equal faculties, and that character is the result solely of association and circumstance, preferred, it would seem, the sole control of the boy in order to test upon him the theories he had espoused and preached. At an age when children are usually weaned, John Stuart began the study of Greek, followed shortly after by arithmetic, with Latin at eight, and logic in his twelfth year, and before he had completed his fourteenth year, as he tells us himself, he had gone over the whole range of ancient literature and philosophy, as well as the most noted of modern historians, civil and ecclesiastical, besides having himself composed volumes of history. Such an education, conducted by a person of his father's ability, could not fail of remarkable results. By it he also gained lasting, habits of application, and a wonderful power of sustained and accurate thinking; and by the constant use of his pen he early became master of a style whose point and lucidity are unrivalled among logical and metaphysical writers. But with these advantages there came also a most serious drawback. The training intentionally left one side of his nature untouched. It ignored all culture of the imagination, the emotions, or the sympathies. Of the tender associations, the sweet charities that cluster about the thought of home, this young philosopher knew nothing. He cannot bring himself to say that he loved his father, and of his mother he makes no mention whatever. Nor was the solitude of his early life broken by the cheerful intercourse of school. Indeed, he was carefully kept apart from all his contemporaries lest he should be corrupted by their prejudices or their example, insomuch that he was not himself aware that his own education and acquirements were not those of any other boy of his age. As this education, especially with respect to religion, has an important bearing on the life and work of this so justly celebrated man, we quote here at length from his *Autobiography*:

“I was brought up from the first without any religious belief, in the ordinary acceptance of the term. My father, educated in the creed of Scotch Presbyterianism, had by his own studies and reflections been early led to reject not only the belief in revelation, but also the foundations of what is commonly called Natural Religion... Finding no halting-place in deism, he remained in a state of perplexity until, doubtless after many struggles, he yielded to the conviction that *concerning the origin of things nothing whatever can be known*. This is the only correct statement of his opinion, for dogmatic

atheism he looked upon as absurd; as most of those whom the world has considered atheists have always done. These particulars are important, because they show that my father's rejection of all that is called religious belief was not, as many might suppose, primarily a matter of logic and evidence: the grounds of it were moral still more than intellectual. He found it impossible to believe that a world so full of evil was the work of an Author combining infinite power with perfect wisdom and righteousness . . .

His aversion to religion, in the sense usually attached to the term, was of the same kind with that of Lucretius he regarded it with the feelings due not to a mere mental decision, but to a great moral evil. He looked upon it as the greatest enemy of morality: first, by setting up fictitious excellences, belief in creeds, devotional feelings, and ceremonies, not connected with the good of the human race-and causing them to be accepted as substitutes for genuine virtues; but, above all, by radically vitiating the standard of morals, making it consist in doing the will of a being on whom it lavishes all the phrases on adulation, but whom in sober truth it depicts as eminently hateful. I have a hundred times heard him say that all ages and nations have represented their gods as wicked in a constantly increasing progression; that mankind have gone on adding trait after trait till they reached the most perfect conception of wickedness which the human mind cant devise, and have called this God, and prostrated themselves before it. This *ne plus ultra* of wickedness he considered to be embodied in what is commonly presented to mankind as the creed of Christianity. Think (he used to say) of a being who would make a hell who would create the human race with the infallible fore knowledge, and therefore with the intention, that the great majority of them were to be consigned to horrible and everlasting torment!"

It does not seem to have occurred to James Mill to inquire whether what was presented as the creed of Christianity by the Kirk and its divines really was the only lesson to be learned from the religion of the Gospel and the idea of God. But, holding this entirely negative belief, essentially and directly, as was well said by Browne before the Christian Evidence Society, because he did not admit the freedom of the will, he based the education of his son upon it. Hence we are not astonished when a little after the passage quoted above we find John Stuart Mill writing:

“It would have been wholly inconsistent with my father’s ideas of duty to allow me to acquire impressions contrary to his convictions and feelings respecting religion; and he impressed upon me from the first that the manner in which the world came into existence was a subject on which nothing was known; that the question, ‘Who made me?’ cannot be answered, because we have no experience or authentic information from which to answer it; and that any answer only throws the difficulty a step further back, since the question immediately presents itself, ‘Who made God?’”

That is to say, because he could not solve the problem of the origin of evil, he took refuge in a cheerless nescience, and denied the possibility of knowing anything relative to the origin or the destiny of mankind, denied the authority of conscience, and substituted the principle of utility for any intuitive standard of right and wrong. In his own life this dismal philosophy had already borne its bitter fruit, and his son writes that

“He deemed very few pleasures worth the price paid for them; he thought human life a poor thing after the freshness of youth and of unsatisfied curiosity had gone by. He would sometimes say that if life were made what it might be by good government and good education, it would be worth having; but he never spoke with any enthusiasm even of that possibility. He used to say he had never known a happy old man, except those who were able to live over again .in the pleasures of the young.”

At first young Mill accepted without hesitation the leading ideas of his father, and of the circle of his father’s friends, among whom were chief the philosopher Bentham (q.v.) and the political economist Ricardo. They had many projects on foot for the improvement of mankind, and the youthful and inexperienced Mill entered into their plans with the zeal becoming his age and wisdom; indeed, he believed he had a call “to be a reformer of mankind,” and felt as if all his earthly happiness hung upon this design. His studies were directed to this end, and he began when only sixteen to employ his pen in the work. The enthusiasm lasted until his twentieth year. He was in the midst of eager discussion, he had already made himself a reputation in the new *Westminster Review*, and was hard at work upon his edition of *Judicial Evidence*, when he stopped to ask himself this question, “Suppose that all your objects in life were realized, that all the changes in institutions and opinions which you are looking forward to could be

completely effected at this very instant, would this be a great joy and happiness to you?" He got the inevitable answer, "No." In an hour the light faded out of all his visions. His labor had lost its motive and its charm. He had nothing, he thought, to live for; and he sank into a dull and dreary melancholy. He had heretofore made happiness the end of existence, and the test of all right action; but he now found it impossible, in his own experience, to realize that end or apply that test, because he was forced to confess that no action, however apparently successful, was competent to bring him happiness. His philosophy of life had broken down under him. It was evidently necessary to reconstruct it; and as the six months' melancholy wore away he elaborated his new theory. He still considered happiness the end of life, but "thought this end only to be attained by not making it the direct end. Ask yourself whether you are happy, and you cease to be so, The only chance is to treat, not happiness, but some end external to it, as the purpose of life." These utilitarian doctrines became the life of his theory of morals, and the principles in his expansion of the Benthamite formulas. They are, it must be confessed, "the least earthy forms of this earthy philosophy," and yet how very far from the Christian doctrine of duty and of right is any such theory of morals as this! Still, had he but followed the free and uncontrollable bent of his philosophical growth from this point in his life, or had he fallen into hands other than those which subsequently enchained him, we think that he might have arrived at far higher and more sound results in moral and metaphysical science than he ever attained to. For it may be here remarked that one of the distinctive peculiarities of Mill was what, for want of a simpler term, must be called his *receptivity*. Seldom has so powerful a thinker been so subject to the unconscious influence of others; but in him sympathy was more powerful than individuality — he had more of the feminine principle that receives than the masculine power which imparts an impression. Hence through life, whenever his sympathies and affections were excited, his opinions followed.

In 1820 John was first suffered to pass beyond the narrow limit of his father's study, and he was sent for a year to France, where he studied some of the sciences and the higher mathematics. On his return he continued his philosophical studies, and in the winter of 1822-23 had the pleasure of starting a "Utilitarian Society," where he enjoyed discussions upon some of the heaviest metaphysical topics that occupied the British mind. and he himself tells us that he always dated from them his own "real inauguration

as an original and independent thinker.” He also obtained valuable instructions from the “Co-operative Society,” composed of the disciples of Owen, the Communist, with ‘whom Mill and a few other political economists, sworn enemies of Communism, had discussions in order to “settle” the question whether the Owenites had any right to exist. The result was the formation of a “Speculative Society,” composed of a body of young men who became almost as famous as Mill — Macaulay, Thirlwall, Wilberforce, and the Bulwers, among others, were of that circle. In May 1823, his father procured for him employment in the East India Company, which he himself was serving, and John was thus afforded the necessary competency for the continuation of his literary labors, besides enjoying that training in accurate and perspicuous writing for which he afterwards became noted. There can be no doubt that his work in the India House was of great value to him. It considerably enlarged his knowledge of social and political subjects, and in a more direct and *human* way than by the study of books. He was led to study mind in the concrete. His despatches had to pass the scrutiny of the directors; then they were to be read and acted on by men living on the other side of the world — both of which facts led him to choose not only the strongest arguments, but the strongest way of putting them. Mr. W.T. Thornton, his colleague, thus describes the vast amount of his work in that relation:

“In 1828 he was promoted to be assistant examiner, and in 1856 he succeeded to the post of chief examiner, after which his duty consisted rather in supervising what his assistants had written than in writing himself; but for the three-and-twenty years preceding he had had immediate charge of the political department, and had written almost every ‘political’ despatch of any importance that conveyed the instructions of the merchant princes of Leadenhall Street to their pro-consuls in Asia. Of the quality of these documents it is sufficient to say that they were John Mill’s; but in respect to their quantity, it may be worth mentioning that a descriptive catalogue of them completely fills a small quarto volume of between 300 and 400 pages, in their author’s handwriting, which now lies before me; also that the share of the Court of Directors in the correspondence between themselves and the Indian government used to average annually about ten huge vellum-bound volumes, foolscap size, and five or six inches thick, and that of these volumes, two a year, for more than twenty years

running, were exclusively of Mill's composition: this, too, at times when he was engaged upon such voluntary work in addition as his *Logic and Political Economy*" (*Memorial*, page 31).

Mill remained with the East India Company until its extinction in 1858. In 1865 he was elected to Parliament, and acted with the advanced liberals, but lost his seat in 1868. In 1867 he was chosen rector of St. Andrew's University, Edinburgh. In 1869 his wife, whom he adored, died, and in order to be ever near her grave he removed to Avignon, France, and there spent the remainder of his life. He died May 9, 1873.

While yet a youth we have seen Mill a writer of various essays. They were of such a bold and thoughtful character as to secure him even then a prominent place in the *Edinburgh* and *Westminster Reviews*, and from 1834 to 1840 he was editor in chief of the latter. In 1827 he was intrusted with the editorship of Bentham's *Rationale of Judicial Evidence*. But his great production he brought out when he was thirty-eight years old, and at once secured by the *System of Logic, Ratiocinative and Inductive* (Lond. 1843, 2 volumes, 8vo; republished, N.Y., Harpers, 1864, from the 8th ed.), a worldwide reputation. It is a perfect exhibit of his philosophy, notwithstanding his claim that he seeks simply to discover and expound the proper method of investigating truth, without pledging himself to any system of speculative philosophy. "There are so many points of a speculative nature touched upon, all in the spirit of the *Analysis*, that he must necessarily be regarded as a partisan of the modern Lockian school of metaphysics" (Morell, page 252). Mill has developed in his *Logic* the deductive principle and its application to logic as a science, and thus has lent special value to his work. The last hundred pages are taken up with what the author calls "the logic of the moral sciences." Here, as he tells us, he makes "an attempt to contribute towards the solution of a question which the decay of old opinions, and the agitation which disturbs European society to its inmost depths, render as important in the present day to the practical interests of human life as it must at all times be to the completeness of our speculative knowledge, viz. whether moral and social phenomena are really exceptions to the general certainty and uniformity of the course of nature, and how far the methods by which so many of the laws of the physical world have been numbered among truths irrevocably acquired and universally assented to can be made instrumental to the formation of a similar body of received doctrine in moral and political science." The *Logic*, together with an *Examination of Sir William*

Hamilton's Philosophy (1865), and his editorial corrections and comments on his father's *Analysis of the Human Mind*, constitute John Stuart Mill's philosophical works. From these it is apparent that, as Dr. Porter says (in Ueberweg's *Hist. of Philos.* 2:427-429),

“The physiological foundation on which he builds is the system of James Mill, modified by that of Dr. Thomas Brown. He carefully insists, however, that he neither accepts nor inculcates any system of metaphysics. But the system of metaphysics which he usually applies is substantially that of Hobbes, Hume, and Comte. He does not rigidly adhere, however, either to the psychology or to the philosophy which characterizes or controls his conclusions. He differs from his father in holding the act of belief to be something more than an inseparable association of one object with another (compare James Mill's *Analysis*, 2d edition, chapter 11 note); that causation is a term which it is indispensable we should use in our analysis of the conceptions of matter and mind; and that certain axioms are the necessary foundations of mathematical and physical sciences, but are themselves the products of induction (comp. *Logic*, passim). After a long and laborious analysis, he reaches the conclusion that matter must be defined as ‘a permanent possibility of sensation,’ and that ‘mind is resolved into a series of feelings, with a background of possibilities of feeling.’ He concedes that in adhering to this definition ‘we are reduced to the alternative of believing that the mind, or *ego*, is something different from any series of feelings or possibilities of them, or else of accepting the paradox that something which, *ex hypothesi*, is but a series of feelings can be aware of itself as am series.’ In respect to the belief in the real existence of the external world, he concedes that it cannot be proved philosophically, and can only be justified by the consideration that ‘the world of possible sensations, succeeding one another according to laws, is as much in other beings as it is in me; it has therefore an existence outside me; it is an external world’ (comp. *Exam. of Sir W. Hamilton's Philosophy*, chapter 11:12, 13).” Mill's posthumous publications — *Three Essays on Religion; Nature; The Utility of Religion* (Lond. and N.Y. 1874, 8vo) — teach more clearly, however, than the preceding works that he believed very positively in matter and very hesitatingly in spirit; very strongly in man and very feebly in God; very earnestly in human government and social organization, and not at all in divine providence. Indeed, “the perfectibility of man through an enlightened self-interest — by means of popular government and universal education, especially in the elements of political economy and

the Malthusian doctrines of population — was the chief article of his philosophical creed” (Dr. Porter, in *Internat. Rev.* N.Y. 1874, May-June, part 6). For further particulars, we refer our readers to Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, 2:1280; see also *Edinb. Rev.* July 1866, art. 4; January 1874, art. 4; January 1875, art. 1; *Brit. Qu. Rev.* July 1868, art. 1; January 1874, art. 9; *New-Englander*, October 1874, art. 1; *Westminster Rev.* January 1875, art. 1; *Christian Qu.* April 1874, art. 1; Masson, *Recent Brit. Philos.* (N.Y. 1866, 12mo), especially pages 245-335; Porter, *Human Intellect* (see Index) *John Stuart Mill, his Life and Works* (1873), twelve sketches by J.R. Fox Bourne, W.T. Thornton, Herbert Spencer, and others (reprinted in *Popular Science Monthly*, July 1873, art. 12; and the *Autobiography* (Lond. and N.Y. 1873, 8vo).

Mill, William Hodge, D.D.

an eminent English divine, was born at Cambridge in 1791. He was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, and was ordained deacon in 1817, and priest in 1820. Immediately after his ordination he was appointed principal of Bishop’s College, Calcutta, which position he held till 1838, when he was obliged to return to England in consequence of impaired health. In the year following he was appointed domestic and examining chaplain to archbishop Howley, and in 1840 was elected Christian advocate in the University of Cambridge. In 1843 he was presented to the living of Brasted, Kent, and in 1848 was chosen regius professor of Hebrew at Cambridge, and canon of Ely. His profound learning in mathematics, languages, and other branches of intellectual research, gained him a deservedly high reputation at home and abroad. His great work, *Christii Sangita, or the Sacred History of Jesus*, in Sanskrit, rendered him famous as a thorough Oriental philologist. He died December 25, 1853. Dr. Mill was a prolific author, and of his numerous works we mention only the most important: *Observations on the attempted Application of Pantheistic Principles to the Theory and Historic Criticism of the Gospel* (Camb. 1840-44; 5 div. 8vo; 2d ed. 1855, 8vo): — *Prelectio theologica* (1843): — *On the Temptation of Christ* (1844): — *On the Nature of Christianity* (1848): — *Lectures on the Catechism*, ed. by the Reverend B. Webb (1856). See Cooper, *Biog. Dict.* page 866; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, 2:1281.

Milledoler, Philip, D.D.

a noted American divine, was born at Rhinebeck, N.Y., September 22, 1775. His parents were Swiss Germans, who emigrated to America from the canton of Berne about the middle of the last century. Philip was converted in very early youth; was educated at Columbia College; and at nineteen years of age was licensed to preach the Gospel, and became pastor of the German Reformed Church in Nassau Street, New York, succeeding the Reverend Dr. Gross, his pastor and theological professor. He preached there in both German and English from 1795 to 1800. His reputation for unction and eloquence drew large audiences; he became generally known, and in 1800 was called to the Third Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia. He accepted the offer, and, removing to the city of brotherly love, labored there for five years with great success, large additions being made to the communion of the Church. In 1805 he accepted a unanimous call as first pastor of the Rutgers Street Presbyterian Church, New York, and remained there until 1813, when he transferred his relation to the Reformed Church, and became one of the pastors of the Collegiate Church of that city. In 1825 he was elected professor of didactic and polemic theology by the General Synod of the Reformed Church, to succeed the venerable Dr. John H. Livingston. At the same time he was appointed president of Rutgers College, and professor of moral philosophy. These offices he accepted and held until 1841, when he resigned, and retired to private life at New Brunswick. He died, full of years, labors, and honors, September 22, 1852. His wife died the next day, and both were buried in the same grave, with a common funeral service. Dr. Milledoler's professional career was marked by diligent and faithful services, by great dignity of character and kind demeanor towards his students, and by a saintly piety which shone through all his life. His gentleness of heart perhaps diminished his ability as a disciplinarian, and unfitted him to cope successfully with the difficulties of his double office. His forte was in the pulpit. His whole ministry in New York was remarkable for the constant divine blessing that followed his labors. In prayer he seemed almost like a man inspired. His use of scriptural language at the throne of grace was most wonderful, and it was woven together with a skill and power that were only to be accounted for by the influence of the Holy Spirit upon his suppliant soul. This fervor and unction in prayer characterized him till the very close of life. His preaching partook of much of the same elevated and tender spirit. His sermons were clear, earnest, solemn, and impressive. His

sentences were short, often highly rhetorical in structure and always pregnant with Gospel truth. As a pastor and in the sick-room, he was not surpassed. But in nothing did he so soar heavenward, and seem so full of divine power, as in public prayer. A number of powerful revivals of religion occurred under his ministry. Dr. Milledoler declined several pressing offers of high positions in the Church. In 1823, with Dr. Gardner Spring, he visited, as commissioner of the General Assembly, the missions among the Tuscarora, Seneca, and Cattaraugus Indians. In the great benevolent movements of his time he was an earnest actor. He was moderator of the Presbyterian General Assembly in 1808, and president of the General Synod of the Reformed Church in 1823, and was one of the members of the convention that formed the American Bible Society in 1816. He helped to organize and was the first president of the Society for Evangelizing the Jews, and an active original member and corresponding secretary of the United Foreign Missionary Society formed in 1817. He published a number of sermons, public addresses, and other pamphlets. 'In his old age Dr. Milledoler was most venerable in appearance; elegant in manners, and saintlike in spirit. His snow-white hair, and almost ruddy complexion, and scrupulous neatness in dress, his unfailing courtesy and radiant goodness, stamped him not merely as a Christian gentleman of the old school, but as one who lived for two worlds, blessing this one and waiting for the glory of the next. See Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, volume 9; Corwin's *Manual of the Ref. Church*, s.v. (W.J.R.T.)

Millenarians (or Chiliasts)

a name given to those who believe that the saints will reign on earth with Christ a thousand years. *SEE MILLENNIUM.*

Millenary Petition

is the name of the paper which was presented to king James VI of Scotland (James I of England), as he passed through England on his way to London, by the Puritans. It contained a petition signed by nearly a thousand ministers, and hence the name *Millenarian*. It prayed for such changes or alterations in ceremonial as the Puritans had generally contended for. An answer to it was published by the University of Oxford, and the divines of Cambridge thanked their Oxonian brethren. The conference at Hampton Court, however, was the result of the famous petition. See Fisher, *Hist. of*

the Reformation, page 434; Neale, *Hist. of the Puritans* (Harper's edition), 1:228; Fuller, *Church History*, book 10, page 21. **SEE PURITANS.**

Millennium.

This term signifies a period of a thousand years, and in its religious use is applied to the prophetic era mentioned in ^{<611>}Revelation 20:1-7. The Millenarians or Chiliasts, in ancient and modern times, are characterized by their tenet respecting the second advent of Jesus, which they believe will be accompanied by the resurrection of the martyrs and saints, who will reign with him on earth, in a state of blessedness and rest, for a thousand years, when the resurrection of the wicked will occur, together with the final judgment and its eternal awards. They have differed somewhat among themselves concerning the character of this millennial kingdom, some viewing it as more and some as less spiritual in its nature, employments, and joys. They have also differed in other minor particulars; but in the main opinion relative to the advent, the first resurrection, and the temporal reign of Christ, the various classes of Millenarians are agreed. This doctrine is generally attributed to a Jewish origin. Josephus (*Ant.* 18:1, 3) says of the Pharisees that they hold to the confinement of the souls of the wicked in an everlasting prison, but that the righteous "have power to revive and live again." In a second passage (*War*, 2:8, 14) he describes the Pharisaic doctrine in a similar manner, for it is not probable that, in this last place, he intends to ascribe to the Pharisees a doctrine of transmigration. In the Book of Daniel (^{<2711>}Daniel 12:2) it is declared that both the righteous and wicked will be raised from the grave, although it is no certain whether the sacred writer at the moment has in mind the whole human race or only Israel. The New Testament teaches us that both the righteous and the wicked will be raised from the dead (^{<4133>}John 5:28, 29; ^{<4245>}Acts 24:15; ^{<611>}Revelation 20:11-15). The passages on this topic in the writings of Paul pertain chiefly to the consequences of redemption, and hence relate to the resurrection of believers. The idea of a resurrection of the saints, and of their participation in a temporal, millennial reign of Christ, was early adopted, especially by Jewish Christians. In the Epistle of Barnabas (cir. 100) we find the rest of the seventh day (^{<0012>}Genesis 2:2, 3) symbolically interpreted, with the aid of ^{<3904>}Psalms 90:4, and made to prefigure a rest of Christ and his saints, to continue for a thousand years (chapter 15). The millennial theory was embraced in a sensuous form by Cerinthus (Eusebius, *Hist. Ecl.* 3:28; 7:25). It is found in apocryphal books by Jews and Jewish Christians in the first age of the Gospel — in the Book of Enoch, in the

Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, and in the Sibylline Books. It penetrated into the Gentile branch of the Church, and spread extensively. Papias, who is supposed to have been a contemporary of John the Apostle, is mentioned by Irenaeus and Eusebius as an adherent of this doctrine. The colossal grapes which Papias supposed that the millennial days would provide suggest the idea which he entertained of this happy period. It is true that the Chiliastic doctrine wears a Judaic stamp, and arose, in some degree, from Judaic influences; but, as Dorner has observed, there is one marked distinction between the millenarian views of Christians and all Jewish theories of the Messianic kingdom. Christian millenarians unanimously considered the earthly kingdom as limited in its duration, and as introductory to a spiritual and eternal state of being. The triumph of the Gospel through the agency of a present Redeemer was to be attended with the renovation of the earth, and to be succeeded by the everlasting, heavenly blessedness of the righteous, the proper sequel of the last judgment. Tracing down the history of the doctrine, we find that Justin Martyr (cir. 150) received it. In the dialogue with Trypho (c. 80), he says that he himself and many others "hold that Jerusalem will be built again as a residence for Christ, with the patriarchs and saints. He says that there are "many of a pure and devout Christian mind who are not of the same opinion;" but he adds, "I, and all other Christians whose belief is in every respect correct, know that there will be both a resurrection of the flesh and a thousand years in Jerusalem, which will then be rebuilt, adorned, and enlarged, as the prophets Ezekiel, Isaiah, and others declare." Justin quotes in support of his opinion ^{<2617>}Isaiah 65:17 sq.; ^{<000>}Genesis 2:2, in connection with ^{<0910>}Psalms 90:3; ^{<6610>}Revelation 20:4-6, and other passages. Irenaeus is likewise a millenarian. He speaks (*Adv. Haer.* V, 33:2) of "the times of the kingdom," when the "righteous shall bear rule upon their rising from the dead; when also the creation, having been renovated and set free, shall fructify with an abundance of all kinds of food, from the dew of heaven and from the fertility of the earth." Here follows the citation from Papias in regard to the colossal fruit of the vine. Tertullian advocated the same doctrine. Notwithstanding the extensive spreading of the millenarian tenet, it would be a rash inference to assume that it was universal, or accepted as the creed of the Church. On this point Neander has good observations (*Ch. Hist.*, Torrey's transl., 1:651). The first decided opponent of whom we have a knowledge was Caius, the Roman presbyter, about the year 200. The crass form in which Chiliasm entered into the heresy of Montanism contributed materially to the strengthening of the antagonism to millenarian

views. The Alexandrian school opposed them with energy, particularly Origen, with whose peculiar opinions it was inconsistent. Nepos, an Egyptian bishop, about the middle of the 3d century wrote, in defence of the doctrine, a work entitled *A Confutation of the Alegorists*, by which name were designated such as explained allegorically the passages on which the opinion of a millennium rested. This work, which acquired much reputation, was refuted with equal zeal and candor by Dionysius of Alexandria. It was still common, however, in the time of Jerome, who himself was one of its opponents. But gradually the tenet which had so widely prevailed became obnoxious and proscribed. One great reason of this remarkable change of sentiment is to be found in the altered condition and prospects of the Church. Christians at first yearned for the reappearance of the Lord. Moreover, it was impossible for them to raise their faith and hopes so high as to expect the conquest of the Roman empire by the moral power of the cross, independently of the personal and supernatural interposition of Christ. But as the Gospel made progress, the possibility and probability of a peaceful victory of the Christian cause over all its adversaries, by the might of truth and of the Spirit, gained a lodgment in the convictions of good men. It is believed that Origen (b. 180, d. 254) is the first of the ancient ecclesiastical writers to affirm the practicableness of such a triumph of the Gospel through its own inherent efficacy. The Judaic and Judaizing associations of the millenarian opinion were not without a strong influence in rendering it suspected and unpopular. Augustine's treatment of the subject marks an epoch. He says (*De Civitate Dei*, 20:7) that he had once held to a millenarian Sabbath; nor does he consider the doctrine objectionable, provided the joys of the righteous are figured as spiritual. But, proceeding to discuss the subject, he advocates the proposition that the earthly kingdom of Christ is the Church, which was even then in the millennial era, and on the road to a glorious ascendancy over all its enemies. It would seem that this modified interpretation of prophecy, sustained as it was by the authority of the principal Latin father, gave color to the mediaeval speculations on this subject. As the year of our Lord 1000 approached, it was a natural corollary that the judgment and the end of the world would then occur. Hence there was a widespread excitement throughout Western Europe, from the apprehension that the "dies irse" was at hand. There were not wanting in the Middle Ages "apocalyptic parties" — enthusiasts, whether individuals or in bands — who looked for the miraculous advent of Jesus as the indispensable means of purifying and extending the Church.

At the Reformation, the traditional method of interpreting the Book of Revelation was abandoned. The papacy was extensively regarded as Antichrist, and Luther and other leading Reformers frequently supposed themselves authorized by the signs of the times to expect the speedy coming of the Lord. A fanatical form of millenarianism was espoused by the Anabaptists of Germany, who took possession of the city of Meunster, and set up the reign of the saints.

The millenarian doctrine, in its essential characteristics, has had adherents among some of the sober-minded theologians of the Lutheran Church in later times. Of these, one of the most distinguished is John Albert Bengel, the author of the *Gnomon*, who defended his opinion in his commentary on the Apocalypse, published in 1740. He was followed by other divines of repute; and the doctrine has not been without prominent supporters among the Lutherans down to the present time. One of the latest of their number who has discussed this question is the Reverend A. Koch (*Das tausendjahrige Reich*, Basle, 1872). This writer endeavors, in particular, to refute the arguments adduced against the doctrine of a millennium by the German commentators Hengstenberg, Keil, and Kliefoth.

In all the other various orthodox Protestant bodies there are many who believe in the personal advent of Christ for the purpose of establishing a millennial king. dom. Now, as in former ages, the literal restoration of the Jews to Palestine, and their conversion to Christianity, is frequently a part of this creed. The coming of Christ in visible glory is to be signaled, it is held, by this among other wonderful events. The Chiliastic tenet forms one of the distinguishing features of the "Catholic Apostolic Church," or the religious denomination commonly known as Irvingites. (*SEE CATHOLIC APOSTOLIC CHURCH*, and *SEE IRVING, EDWARD*, in this Cyclopedia.) Christ is to come and gather his elect together; the Jews are to be brought back to their ancient land; the Gospel is to be extended by their instrumentality, and by the new agencies connected with the personal presence of the Lord, over the earth. Then is to follow the judgment and the end of the world. Such are the main points of the millenarian view, as cherished by the followers of Mr. Irving.

In the course of the history of the Church many sects have arisen by whom the speedy coming of Christ to set up a visible empire has been proclaimed. One of these is the class designated as "Millerites" (q.v.), the disciples of William Miller (q.v.). He was born in Pittsfield, Mass., in 1781, and died in

1849. With slender resources of learning, he began, about the year 1833, to preach on the subject of the second advent, which he declared, on the ground of his interpretation of the prophecies, to be near at hand. The Millerites at length went so far as to fix a certain day in the year 1843 when the Lord was to appear in the clouds of heaven. Some gave up their ordinary occupations, and prepared robes in which to ascend and meet Christ. Subsequently the members of this sect — if sect it is to be called — ceased to define the precise time of the miraculous advent, but continued to wait for it as near. *SEE ADVENTISTS*. The Millerites, in common with many other Chiliasts, have supposed themselves to be furnished by the prophecies with the means of calculating with mathematical accuracy the time of the Saviour's glorious advent.

When we leave the history of the doctrine, and look at the exegetical arguments of the several parties, it becomes plain that they are guided by diverse principles of interpretation. With respect to certain passages, millenarians adopt a second sense, or a figurative, tropical interpretation. This is the character of their view of the sabbatical rest, as predicted in ~~<1012>~~Genesis 2:2, 3, and ~~<1004>~~Psalm 90:4. On the contrary, to the passages in Isaiah and other prophets which describe Jerusalem as the centre and resort of worshippers of all nations, promise Canaan as an everlasting possession to the Jews, and depict their splendid restoration to power and plenty, they give a literal interpretation. The same course is pursued by them with regard to Revelation 20 and with regard to all that is said of the first and the second resurrection. They attach often a literal sense to the declaration of Jesus (~~<1153>~~Matthew 26:29; ~~<1125>~~Mark 14:25) in which he speaks of drinking new wine in his Father's kingdom. They consider their general view to be favored by ~~<1144>~~Luke 14:14 ("the resurrection of the just"); ~~<1215>~~Luke 20:35 ("they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection of the dead"); by ~~<1113>~~John 6:39, 44 (which speaks of the resurrection of believers, without any mention of others). The promise of Christ that the disciples at "the regeneration" — or the restitution of all things, and the deliverance of all things from corruption — shall sit on thrones, judging the tribes of Israel (~~<1103>~~Matthew 19:28), is confidently referred to as proving the millenarian hypothesis. So the statements of John and Paul with respect to Antichrist, and the sins and perils to immediately precede the advent — corroborated, as they suppose, by the Savior's own predictions in Matthew 24 and 25, and the parallel passages are brought forward in defence of their position.

The opponents of the millenarians rely principally upon the passages in which the resurrection of the good and evil is spoken of as if it were simultaneous, or without any considerable interval of time interposed. They appeal also to the passages in the Gospels and Epistles in which the general judgment is connected immediately with the second advent. Their conception of the prospects and destiny of the kingdom of Christ are derived from passages like the parables of the leaven, of the mustard-seed, and of the husbandman. That it was expedient for Christ to go away from his disciples in order that his visible presence might give way to his invisible presence and influence everywhere, and to the dispensation of the Spirit, is considered an argument against the general philosophy on which the millenarian tenet rests. It is thought to be more consonant with the genius of Christianity, as contrasted with the Jewish economy, to look for a triumph of the Gospel in the earth by moral forces and by the agency of the Holy Spirit within the souls of men, than to expect the stupendous miracle of Christ's reappearance as a Ruler on this globe, for the spiritual subjugation of unbelievers and enemies. Hence those who reject Chiliasm give a figurative rendering to the prophetic passages in the Apocalypse which are the most plausible argument for that theory. The tendency of the millenarian theory to chill the hopes, and thus repress the missionary activity of Christians, by exhibiting the world as in a process of deterioration, and by representing the efforts of Christians to convert mankind as fruitless, until the coming of Christ, constitutes not the least serious objection to such opinions.

There is in England at the present time an energetic propaganda of millenarian notions, called the "Prophecy Investigation Society," which consists of fifty members, some of them prominent Churchmen, and which has published a series of volumes on prophetic subjects, adding largely to apocalyptic literature. There are also numerous journals published in England to support these views. The most important is the *Quarterly Journal of Prophecy*, edited by Dr. Bonar, of the Free Church of Scotland, which has been established fourteen years, and has a large circulation. The *Rainbow* is a monthly periodical; the *Christian Observer*, the monthly journal of the evangelicals, often displays millenarian tendencies. There are, besides, numerous weeklies of small circulation, the chief being the *Revivalist*, originally established to promote revivals in personal religion, but now devoted to the spread of millenarian views. Nor is the interest in this subject confined to Dissenters in England or Scotland; a certain class

of minds in the Established Church seem to be just as strongly contaminated. For many successive years, during Lent, courses of lectures have been delivered in St. George's Church, Bloomsbury, on the subject of the second advent, by clergymen of the Church of England. The course for the year 1849 was printed, under the title of *The Priest upon his Throne*, being lectures by twelve clergymen of the Church of England, with a Preface by the Reverend James Haldane Stewart, M.A., rector of Limpsfield (Lond. 1849). This is, next to Dr. Brown's *Second Coming of our Lord*, the ablest book against the millenarian doctrine. One of the latest productions in English is *The End of all Things, or the Coming of Christ*, by an anonymous author, a clergyman of the Church of England. It is an argument against millenarianism, and is interesting for its sketch of the rise of the doctrine with the well-meaning but weak-minded Papias, and its progress through all the sects and shades of belief, until "more than half of the evangelical clergy of the Church of England are at this moment millenarians."

Among the most important writings on the millennium are Corrodi, *Krit. Gesch. d. Chiliasmus* (Frankfort, 1871); Dorner, *Gesch. d. Person Christi*, vol. i; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* art. Chiliasmus. See also the exegetical criticism in Rothe's *Dognzatic*, part 2, section 2. Most of the recent treatises on doctrinal theology — for example, that of Gass, *Dogmengeschichte*, 2:477 sq.; and the able work by Dr. Hodge — contain discussions of this subject. Among the special writers on the subject may be consulted, on the millenarian side, Mede, Abbadie, Beverley, Burnet, Hartley, Price, Frere, Irving, Birks, Bickersteth, Brooks, the duke of Manchester, Begg, Burgh, Greswell, Gilfillan, Bonar, Elliot, Homes, Burchell, Wood, Tyso, Molyneux, etc.; and on the other side, bishop Hall, R. Baxter, Gipps, Dr. David Brown. Waldegrave, Fairbairn, Urwick, Bush, and many others. Floerke (evangelical pastor in Libz), *Die Lehre von tausendjahrigen Reiche. Ein theologischer Versuch.* (Marburg, 1859, 8vo); Volck, *Der Chiliasmus seiner neuesten Bekämpfung gegenüber, eine historisch-exegetische Studie* (Dorpat, 1869, 8vo); Carson, *The Personal Reign of Christ during the Millennium proved to be impossible* (1873, 12mo); *Second Adventism in the Light of Jewish History*, by the Reverend T.M. Hopkins, edited by Joseph R. Boyd, D.D. (N.Y. 1873, 12mo). The following periodicals may be consulted to advantage: *Church of England Rev.* 1854, October page 443; *Lond. Rev.* No. 10, art. 9; *Meth. Qu. Rev.* 1845; January art. 5 and 7; 1850, July, page 485; 1851, April,

page 325; 1868, October page 615; Kitto, *Journal of Sacred Literature*, 1854, July, page 505; October page 19 sq.; 1856, January page 467; *Amer. Presb. Rev.* 1861, April, page 403; 1864, April, page 177 sq.; July, page 411; 1865, April, page 195; *Princet. Rev.* 1867, January page 160; *Evangel. Qu. Rev.* 1861, January, art. 2; 1868, July, p. 337; *Theological Medium* (Cumberland Presb. Church), 1873, April, art. 9; *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1873, January art. 4; *Qu. Rev. Evang. Luth. Church*, 1873, Jan. art. 2. (G.P.F.)

Miller, Armistead

a Presbyterian missionary of African parentage, was born in North Carolina about 1830. as a slave, but was liberated and went to Africa when a boy; was educated in the Alexander High School, Liberia, and afterwards returned to America, and received a theological training in the Ashmun Institute, Oxford, Pa. In 1859 he was licensed and ordained by New Castle Presbytery, and soon afterwards went to Africa, and became pastor of Mount Coffee Church, Liberia, where he died, January 15, 1865. — Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1866, page 131.

Miller, Charles W.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Wayne County, Ind., in 1820. He entered the ministry in 1840, and, continued faithful in the prosecution and studies of the work. When failing health obliged him to seek the climate of the Rocky Mountains, he went to Colorado as a laborer for the Church of which he was a member, and acceptedly applied himself to his task. He died in Colorado City, Colorado, April 8, 1872, universally deplored, and long to be remembered for his great activity. Three thousand persons are said to have been converted under his preaching. See F.H. Sutherland, in the *Central Christian Advocate* (M.E. Ch., South), May 1, 1872.

Miller, David

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at New Hartford, Connecticut, November 24, 1792. He entered the ministry in 1816 as a member of the New York Conference. For several years he was chaplain at the State Prison at Wethersfield. In 1855 he was appointed presiding elder of the Hartford District. He died at Bristol, Connecticut, December 26, 1855. David Miller was a man of good judgment and a practical mind,

which aided him in his own affairs and also in giving counsel to others. As a preacher, he was plain and earnest, relying upon the truth which he endeavored always to proclaim in the spirit of one determined not to know anything among men save Jesus Christ and him crucified.

Miller, George, D.D.

an Irish divine, distinguished for his eminence in theology, history, and literature, was born at Dublin October 22, 1764. He was educated at Trinity College in his native city, and, after receiving holy orders, soon rose to prominence. In 1801 he was appointed vicar-general of Armagh, and lecturer of modern history at his alma mater. His lectures attracted universal attention, and were published in 1816, under the title of *Lectures on the Philosophy of Modern History from the Fall of the Roman Empire to the French Revolution* (Dublin, 1816, 8 volumes; 1852, 4 volumes, 8vo). This work of Dr. Miller "possesses unity of subject, harmony of proportion, and connection of parts; theory constituting one of the best of modern histories in English, and affording a systematic view of the progress of civilization" (*For. Qu. Rev.*). "Dr. Miller assumes, as the basis of his system, that all the events of this world have an intrinsic connection, which gives them the coherence and the unity of a moral drama. A single event or period, taken by itself, is a grain of dust in this mighty balance" (*Edinb. Rev.* 1:287 sq.). "Dr. Miller," says a prominent critic in the *Dublin University Magazine* (13:572), "advances and establishes his great principle, that God reigneth in the affairs of men, and that the end of the divine government is man's improvement." In the winter of 1817 Dr. Miller was induced to apply for the head-mastership of the Royal School of Armagh, which was immediately conferred upon him. In conjunction with many able champions of Protestantism, he made a noble stand against the fatal policy of English statesmen, by which Roman Catholic were admitted to political power. While Dr. Miller, in 1793, had hailed with pleasure the commencement of political concessions to the Romish Church, and had even lent a helping hand to these reforms, he now, with deeper philosophy and wider statesmanship, opposed the growing political power of the Romanists. His *Letter to Mr. Plunkett: on the Policy of the Roman Catholic Question* (Lond. 1826) is a fair index to his opinions. In the same year he showed himself the champion of the true faith by attacking the modern Arian opinions in his *Observations on the Doctrines of Christianity and on the Athanasian Creed*; and when the Pusey (q.v.) discussions were at their height, he published *A Letter to Dr. Pusey in*

reference to his *Letter to the Lord Bishop of Oxford* (1840, 8vo). A *Second Letter to Dr. Pusey* was published in the winter of 1841, and it suffices to say that Dr. Miller was thereafter considered one of the most formidable opponents of Puseyism. In his position as head-master of the Royal School of Armagh he showed himself uncompromising in his defence of Scriptural education in Ireland. Dr. Miller, being firmly persuaded that “most of our relations to our fellowmen, for which education is to prepare us, grow out of our relations to God,” advocated Scriptural education as the only true system. Christian influence must pervade the whole educational institution, he asserted, and all our knowledge must be derived from the holy Scriptures. His *Case of the Church Education Society of Ireland argued in Reply to Dr. Elrington* (Lond. 1847), and his *Supplement to the Case of the Church Education Society* (Dublin, 1847), are most important statements of what true education ought to accomplish. Blessed with a mind peculiarly cheerful, contented and happy in his disposition, devout in his religion, truly philosophic in his learning, Dr. Miller was beloved and esteemed by all who came into official or private connection with him. He died October 6, 1848. See *Memoir of Dr. Miller* in Bohn’s edition of *Miller’s History*, 4:5 sq.; *Dublin University Mag.* 17:674 sq.; *Edinburgh Review*, 1:287 sq.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, 2:1282.

Miller, George Benjamin, D.D.

an eminent divine of the Lutheran Church, was born of Moravian parentage at Emmons, Lehigh County, Pennsylvania, June 10, 1795. His father, the Reverend George G. Miller, connected with the classical and theological school at Nazareth, and descended from a long line of Moravian clergymen, furnished him with special facilities for intellectual and moral culture. He entered Nazareth Hall as a pupil when only eight years of age, and there he continued his studies for eight years. He then left for Philadelphia, and commenced his career as a teacher in a private school. Subsequently he turned his attention to mercantile pursuits, but he soon discovered that the work was not adapted to his natural tastes and inclinations. In less than a year he resumed his former employment, and became associated with the Reverend Dr. Hazelius as an instructor in an academy at New Germantown, N.J., and at the same time continued his theological studies, which had been commenced at Nazareth. In the autumn of 1818 he entered upon the work of the ministry at Canajoharie, N.Y., having been previously licensed to preach by the New York Ministerium,

then under the presidency of the Reverend Dr. Quitman. In connection with his pastoral labors he established a classical school, and gave regular instruction. In this position he faithfully labored till 1827, when he accepted a professorship in Hartwick Seminary, N.Y., and again became the colleague of Dr. Hazelius, whom he succeeded as principal of the institution in 1830. With the exception of five years spent in the work of teaching and preaching elsewhere, he continued connected with this seminary, either as principal or professor of theology, until his death, devoting all his energies to the preparation of young men for college or of candidates for the holy ministry. His name will always be as closely identified with the history of the institution as that of its benevolent founder. He died with the harness on, April 5, 1869. Dr. Miller was married to Delia B. Snyder in 1816, and in 1866 commemorated his "golden wedding" with a large number of relatives and friends, who had gathered from different parts of the country to present their congratulations and good wishes, the whole family, twenty-three in number, on the evening preceding the wedding festivities, uniting in the celebration of the Lord's Supper, and the reverend patriarch, surrounded by three generations, administering the sacred ordinance. Dr. Miller was a man of quick, acute, and discriminating intellect. He was distinguished for his accurate and ripe scholarship. As a man of learning, he had few superiors in the country. He had a perfect command of his own vernacular, and spoke and wrote German and French with wonderful facility. He was familiar with the exact sciences, his acquaintance with history was very extensive, and his knowledge of the ancient classics critical and complete. He was also a Profound Hebraist, and thoroughly versed in the Scriptures, so that he never found it necessary to use a concordance, but could turn with almost unerring intuition to the required passage of the sacred page. Dr. Miller was noted as a man of original thought and independent research. As a writer, he was universally commended as clear, accurate, and instructive. The productions of his pen show his power of analysis, of generalization, and great condensation in the method of statement. His extensive erudition and enlarged experience were only surpassed by the loveliness of his Christian character; and his earnest, simple-hearted, active piety made a deep impression upon all who came within the range of his influence. His elevated type of Christian excellence, his high culture, his unpretending, modest character, his life unsullied by a single stain, attracted towards him by the strongest sympathies all men. He was a bright and shining light in the Church, and his name will ever be cherished with the most affectionate

interest. All his acquisitions were made subordinate to that which most deeply interested his active mind — the study of divine truth. All his treasures were laid at the Master's feet, and devoted entirely to his service. When, in 1836, he received the distinction of D.D. from Union College, he meekly submitted, remarking to a friend that the letters would serve as a good Scriptural motto, *Deo Duce*. The Lutheran Church owes to him as much as to any other laborer in this country. The only works published by Dr. Miller are a volume of *Sermons on some of the Fundamental Principles of the Gospel*, and a text-book on German Grammar, which never reached an extensive circulation. For a more detailed account, see *Evangel. Qu. Rev.* 1870, January page 25 sq.; *Memorial Volume of Hartwick Seminary*. (M.L.S.)

Miller, George W.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born near Westminster, Md., in 1826. He was converted at sixteen; entered the ministry of the United Brethren Church in his twenty-fifth year, and travelled for seven consecutive years. He then joined the ministry of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in which he labored until his death, at Pioneer, Ohio, August 10, 1872. He was an earnest and successful minister, a faithful and beloved pastor.

Miller, Hugh

one of the most noted characters among the English-speaking nations of our century, the champion of the Free Church of Scotland, and the defender of revelation from "scientists," falsely so called, was born of very humble parentage at Cromarty, in Scotland, October 10, 1805. He received his first education at the parish school, where he was distinguished for his fondness for poetry and poetical composition. At that early age he was an extensive reader, and placed under contribution the libraries of the parish. In this way he laid the foundation of an extended knowledge of literature, which availed him in after-life. But the most important part of his education consisted in the natural history instruction he received from an uncle who had acquired a taste for the observation of natural phenomena. His poverty proved an obstacle to a collegiate education, and he was obliged to learn a trade in order to secure a livelihood. He determined fortunately, as his later history proved, to become a stone-mason. This occupation unexpectedly fostered the taste he had acquired for the study of natural history; and

while hewing blocks of stone in the quarry, he was diligently studying the traces they exhibited of their past history. It was in this way that he prepared himself to become the historian of the old red sandstone, among the rocks of which he principally worked. "It was the necessity which made me a quarrier that taught me to be a geologist," he himself wrote in after-life. He labored as a quarryman and stone-mason for about fifteen years, constantly improving himself in his leisure hours by reading and study. The publication of a volume of poems which he wrote during that time attracted the attention of some persons, who, by procuring him a situation in a bank of his native village, enabled him to devote more time to his studies. He now commenced contributing to several newspapers. The Church of Scotland was at that time a prey to internal dissensions, which ultimately led to a division. The Independents, who wished to throw off the yoke of the higher clergy, received great support from the people; Miller rendered them great service when the contest came to a close by the decision of the House of Lords in the Auchterarder case, in 1839, by his pamphlet, entitled *A Letter from One of the Scottish People to the Right Honorable Lord Brougham and Vaux on the Opinions expressed by his Lordship in the Auchterarder Case*. This remarkable letter drew towards him the attention of the evangelical party, and he was selected as the most competent person to conduct the newly-started *Witness* newspaper, the principal metropolitan organ of the Free Church. This paper owed its success to his able contributions — political, ecclesiastical, and geological. His articles on geology he contributed to the first congress of the British Association, held at Glasgow in 1840. They were highly praised by Charles Lyell, Murchison, Buckland, and Agassiz, and the name of Miller was by them associated with the wonderful fossil, the *Pterichthys Milleri*, which he had discovered in the red sandstone, and which had previously been thought to contain scarcely any fossils. Miller published these articles in book form, under the title *The Old Red Sandstone, or New Walks in an Old Field* (Edinburgh, 1841, 8vo; often reprinted, both in England and America). In 1847 appeared his *First Impressions of England and its People* (3d ed. 1853, 8vo), the result of a tour made during the previous year. Some parts of this book, especially the account of the pilgrimages to Stratford-on-Avon, and the Leasowes, and Olney, and other places, memorable for their literary associations, are among the very finest pieces of descriptive English. A magic style characterized all his works, whether those of a more popular kind or his scientific treatises, such as the *Footprints of the Creator* (1849), a work suggested by the *Vestiges of*

Creation, and subversive of the fallacies of that superficial and plausible book. "There was nothing in Miller's works," says the *Edinburgh Review* for July, 1858, "which so much surprised the reader as their mere literary merit. Where could this Cromarty mason have acquired his style?" Not one of the authors of our day has approached Hugh Miller as a master of English composition, for the equal of which we must go back to the times of Addison, Hume, and Goldsmith. During the later part of his life he suffered severely from disease of the brain, and he finally shot himself while in a fit of somnambulism, December 24, 1856. His death caused a most painful excitement. Few men have occupied a higher position in the estimation of his countrymen. He was a noble example of what self-education can do for a man; and, whether regarded as the fearless and independent writer, or the man of literature and science, his character must claim the respect and admiration of posterity. The personal appearance of Mr. Miller, or "Old Red," as he was familiarly named by his scientific friends, is thus described by one who had the good fortune to see him: "A head of great massiveness, magnified by an abundant profusion of sub-Celtic hair, was set on a body of muscular compactness, but which in later years felt the undermining influence of a life of unusual physical and mental toil. Generally wrapped in a bulky plaid, and with a garb ready for any work, he had the appearance of a shepherd from the Rossshire hills rather than an author and a man of science. In conversation or in lecturing the man of original genius and cultivated mind at once shone out, and his abundant information and philosophical acuteness were only less remarkable than his amiable disposition, his generous spirit, and his consistent, humble piety" (*Literary Gazette*). His other works are, *The Geology of the Bass* (1848, 8vo): — *On certain Peculiarities of Structure in some ancient Ganoids* (fishes) (1850): — *On the Fossil Flora of Scotland* (1855): — *My School and Schoolmasters*, a very interesting autobiography, in which he relates his early history, and his struggles in pursuit of science (1855): — *The Testimony of the Rocks* (Lond. 1858), in which he discusses the Biblical bearings of geology, published after his death. "Hugh Miller," says the writer in the *Edinburgh Review* whom we have already had occasion to quote, "must undoubtedly be regarded as one of the most remarkable men whom Scotland has produced... The interest of his narrative, the purity of his style, his inexhaustible faculty of happy and ingenious illustration, his high imaginative power, and that light of genius which it is so difficult to define yet so impossible to mistake, all promise to secure for the author of the *Old Red Sandstone* the lasting admiration of

his countrymen." The different scientific works of Hugh Miller mark an important epoch in the progress of the study of geology. He was one of the first to popularize the subject. "Besides adding much to our knowledge, and placing things previously known in a clear and pleasing light, Mr. Miller's performance will be very acceptable also to geologists both of the old and young school" (*Lond. Athen.* 1842, page 523). "But what is in a great degree peculiar to our author is the successful combination of Christian doctrines with pure scientific truth" (Agassiz, Introd. to Amer. ed. of *Footprints of the Creator*). See *Labor and Triumph: the Life and Times of Hugh Miller*, by Thomas N. Brown, D.D. (Glasgow and N.Y. 1858, 12mo); *Lond. Gentleman's Magazine*, 1857, part 1, page 244 sq.; *Lond. Athen.* 1856, page 1609; *Edinb. Rev.* July, 1858, art. Hugh Miller (reprinted in the *Living Age*, August 21, 1858); *North Brit. Rev.* August 1854; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; — *Men of the Time*, s.v.; *Engl. Cyclop.* s.v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generate*, 35:524; *New-Englander*, 8:237; *North Amer. Rev.* 73:448; *Eclectic Rev.* 4th series, 27:685; 15:690; *Brit. Qu. Rev.* 1871, July, page 40; *Meth. Qu. Rev.* 1859, October page 513; *Westminster Rev.* 1871, April, page 269.

Miller, Jacob (1), D.D.

was born December 11, 1788, at Goshenhoppen, Pennsylvania, and was reared under religious influences in accordance with the views and practices of the Lutheran Church. He was engaged in the prosecution of his literary and theological studies for five years, under the direction of the Reverend Dr. Geissenhainen, and completed them under the instruction of Drs. Helmuth and Schmidt, who at that time had charge of a private seminary in Philadelphia for the education of candidates for the ministry. His first field of labor was the Goshenhoppen District, among the people in whose midst he had lived all his life. Here he labored twentyone years, "not only with acceptance," says the record, "but with profit." In 1829 he removed to Reading, Pennsylvania, where he continued to labor till his death, just twenty-one years. He died May 16, 1850. Dr. Miller was a man of marked ability. His natural endowments were of a superior order, and they had been brought under the influence of careful culture. He wielded an immense influence. In whatever position he was placed his power was felt. In 1838 he was honored with the doctorate of divinity by the University of Pennsylvania, but he never recognised or used the degree. (M.L.S.)

Miller, Jacob (2)

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, a native of Germany, came to this country when but seventeen years of age (1832); was converted while a resident of Quincy, Illinois, and connected with the German Lutheran Church. Himself the product of a revival, he labored earnestly for the renewing of God's love in the hearts of his lukewarm Lutheran brethren, but the minister of the Church with which he was connected opposed him, and Miller was finally obliged to leave that body. With thirty others, like-minded, he joined the Methodist Episcopal Church. In 1848 he was admitted into the Illinois Conference, and labored with great success until, by reason of failing health, he was obliged to ask for a superannuated relation. In 1860 he was again placed on the active list, and sent to Alton, Illinois, where he labored successfully. In 1866 he was sent to Petersburg Circuit, Illinois; thence to Bushnell, where he died, March 7, 1871. See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1871, page 188.

Miller, James

a Presbyterian minister. was born near New Milns, Ayrshire, Scotland, February 4, 1803. He was educated at Glasgow College, Scotland; studied divinity in the theological seminary at Glasgow, and was licensed by Kilmarnock Presbytery of the United Secession Church. Soon after he came to the United States; was ordained in 1841 by the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church of Ohio as pastor over the Church in Perrysburg and Scotch Ridge, Wood County, Ohio; subsequently removed to Iowa, preaching as opportunity offered, and died January 26, 1867. Mr. Miller was a successful and useful minister, and did much to advance the cause of truth. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1868, page 274.

Miller, Johann Peter

a German Protestant theologian, was born at Leipheim April 26, 1725; was educated at the university at Helmstadt; in 1747 went to Gottingen, and in 1750 became rector of the Latin school at Helmstadt. In 1756 he accepted a similar position at the Lutheran Gymnasium at Halle, but returned in 1766 to Gottingen, as professor of theology, and there died, May 29, 1789. Miller wrote and published a continuation of Mosheim's *Sittenlehre*. His productions of value are, *Das Reich der Natur und Sitten* (Halle, 1757-1762): — *Diss. in locum ad Roman. S. 28* (Helmstadt, 1747): — *Diss. locus antologicus de Eodem et Diverso* (Gotting. 1748, 4to): — *Diss. de*

notabili et maximo versionis Italae ad verba Christi ~~AMB~~ *Matthew 20:28 additamento* (ibid. 1749,4to); — *J.L. Mosheimii Commentationes et orationes varii generis* (Hamburg, 1751, 8vo): — *Vollstandiger Auszug aus allen neuen Theilen der Mosheimischen Sittenlehre der heiligen Schrift* (Halle, 1765, 8vo; 2d auflage, ibid. 1777, 8vo): — *Die Hoffnung besserer Zeiten für Schulen* (ibid. 1765, 4to): — *Progr. quo probatur, cum theopneustea Apostolorum nec omniscientiam quasi aliquam, nec anamartesium fuisse conjunctam* (Gotting. 1789, 4to).

Miller, John E.

a minister of the Reformed (Dutch) Church, was born at Albany in 1792; graduated at Union College in 1812; was licensed in 1817; served the Church as missionary in the South and West in 1817 and 1818; was pastor at Chester, N.J., Presbyterian Church from 1818 to 1823; and then of the Reformed Church, Tompkinsville, Staten Island, until he died, in 1847, in the midst of a powerful revival of religion in his Church. Miller was also chaplain in the Marine Hospital and at the Seaman's Retreat. In this place he exhibited the highest degree of moral courage and religious faith and zeal in times of appalling pestilence, and among sufferers of all kinds. Contagious diseases had no fears for him. He was a simple-hearted, bold, tender, and faithful preacher of the Gospel; a guileless, outspoken, honest soul; a hater of strife; and a brave, calm, earnest, uncompromising lover and defender of the faith once delivered to the saints. His memoir is to be found in a goodly volume, called *An Old Disciple and his Descendants*, by Reverend F.M. Kip, D.D., which contains brief biographies of his patriarchal father (Christian Miller, Esq., of Albany) and several of his family, who were noted for unusual gifts of mind, character, and piety. Among these was a grandson, Isaac Livingston Kip Miller, a youth of unusually brilliant and powerful intellect, and of great promise, who died in 1846, while studying for the ministry. He was the elder brother of Dr. W.A. Miller (q.v.). (W.J.R.T.)

Miller, John Peter

a talented but eccentric American minister, was born in the Palatinate, Germany, about the year 1715; was thoroughly educated in his native land; came to this country in 1730; was licensed and ordained by the Philadelphia Synod of the Presbyterian Church; and in 1731 became pastor of the German Reformed Church in Tulpehocken, Berks County,

Pennsylvania, where he labored successfully for about four years. In 1735 he fell in with an enthusiast by the name of Beissel, by whom he was immersed, and so became identified with the Seventh-day Baptists. Flying from the society of the world, he entered upon a solitary or monastic life at the base of a mountain, near a "limpid spring." He afterwards, urged by the force of his trials, entered the cloister of the Seventh-day Baptists at Ephrata, Pennsylvania. "Here, under the name of Jabez, he lived a quiet life as a Protestant monk, using a board for his bed at night, and devoting himself by day to what he imagined to be the service of God in severe self-castigation." See Harbaugh, *Fathers of the Ref. Church*, 1:301-311. (D.Y.H.)

Miller, John Wesley

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born at Charleston, South Carolina, October 27, 1829. He enjoyed a collegiate education, and entered the ministry in 1850; was, as licentiate, deacon, and elder, on circuits, stations, missions, and in the Southern army as chaplain of hospitals, always a faithful, devoted servant of Christ. He died in the village of Darlington, South Carolina, June 29, 1866. See *Minutes of the M. E. Church, South*, 1866.

Miller, Lovis Pilketon

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Union County, Pennsylvania, January 8, 1809. He joined the Church in his sixteenth year. He was soon after impressed by a strong conviction that it was his duty to preach the Gospel to others. He worked in his father's fields by moonlight, that he might procure religious books to qualify himself for this station in life. In 1828 he entered the academy at Milton, Pennsylvania, and in 1830 he was admitted into the Ohio Conference. He was successively stationed at Athens, Norwich, Georgetown, Madisonville, South Charleston, Wilmington, Franklin, White Oak, Madisonville, Amelia, Williamsburg, Lockland, West White Oak, Amelia, Milford, New Carlisle, Raysville, Batavia, Madisonville, Miami, Jamestown, and Moscow. In 1864 he entered the army as chaplain, and served until peace was restored. He died in 1872. Mr. Miller was a man of great humility and piety, and his ministry was a glorious success.

Miller, Nathan W.

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Washington, Me., December 24, 1831; was converted and united with the Church in June 1842. In 1853 he was licensed as a local preacher, and in 1859 was employed by the presiding elder of the Rockland District to preach at Benton and vicinity, where he labored successfully. He entered the itinerancy in 1862 as a member of the East Maine Conference, and was appointed to North Searsport; in 1864 and 1865, to Bear Hill, Charleston, and Garland; in 1866, to Garland; in 1867, to Abbott and Greenville; in 1868, to Danforth, Weston, and Topsfield. In 1869 he was granted a superannuated relation; and in June following he moved to Benton, where he could be near his family friends. Here he assisted in the public service as long as his strength would permit. He died February 22, 1870. "Brother Miller, as a Christian minister, had clear perceptions; a high sense of honor, combined with a deep sense of obligation; as a citizen, he was kind and obliging; as a friend, true, trusty, and confiding; as a companion and father, affectionate, kind, and faithful." See *Minutes of Annual Conferences*, 1870.

Miller, Samuel (1), D.D., LL.D.

an eminent Presbyterian divine, whose name is cherished as that of one who materially assisted in laying the foundations of the Presbyterian Church in this country, was born October 31, 1769, at Dover, Delaware. He received his early literary training under the direction of his father, the Reverend John Miller, a native of Boston, who early settled as a Presbyterian pastor in Delaware. Samuel was educated at the University of Pennsylvania (class of 1789), and graduated with the highest honor in his class; commenced the study of theology under his father, and finished his theological course under the Reverend Dr. Nesbit, at Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pennsylvania; in 1791 was licensed to preach, and in 1793 was installed as colleague pastor with Drs. McKnight and Rodgers over the First Presbyterian Church in New York City, and, after the dissolution, was pastor of the Wall Street Church until 1813. He was instrumental in the establishment of Princeton Seminary, and subsequently was appointed to the chair of ecclesiastical history and Church government, which he held for more than thirty-six years. He died January 7, 1850. Dr. Miller was an extensive author, and published, *Sermon on Psa. 2:11* (February 1799): — *A Pastoral Discourse* (1800): — *A Brief Retrospect of the 18th Century*

(1803, 2 volumes, 8vo): — *Letters on the Constitution and Order of the Christian Ministry* (1807, 12mo): — *Discourse designed to Commemorate the Discovery of New York* (1809): — *Memoir of Rev. John Rogers, D.D.* (1813, 8vo): — *Letters on Unitarianism* (1821, 8vo): — *On the Eternal Sonship of Christ* (1823): — *Lectures at the Seminary* (1827): — *Letters on Clerical Manners and Habits* (1827, 12mo): — *Lectures at the Seminary* (1830): — *Essay on the Utility and Importance of Creeds and Confessions*: — *On the Office of Ruling Elder* (1831, 12mo): — *On Baptism*: — *Letters on the Observance of the Monthly Concert in Prayer*: — *Memoir of the Rev. Charles Nesbit, D.D.* (1840): — *The Primitive and Apostolical Order of the Church of Christ vindicated* (1840, 12mo): — *Letters from a Father to his Son in College* (1843): — *Thoughts on Public Prayer* (1848): — *On Christian Education of Children*. Dr. Miller also contributed a *Life of Jonathan Edwards* to Sparks's "American Biography." Dr. Miller possessed admirable natural qualities that constituted the foundation of his eminently attractive character. His countenance, full of generosity and manliness, was indicative of great purity and nobility of character; his manners were uncommonly dignified and polished; his conversation brilliant and attractive. He was pre-eminently a man of system and method. His intellect was naturally clear, comprehensive, and symmetrical. As a minister, he was singularly adapted to profit theological students — his preaching clear, direct, and full of evangelical truth. As a professor, he was eminently qualified; his lectures were luminous exhibitions of his subject, full of well-digested thought, and arranged with graceful naturalness. As an author, he was at home in almost every field, whether literary or theological. His taste was beyond criticism, insomuch that, in reading his works, one rarely meets with an expression that admits of being essentially improved. His style is marked by an elegant simplicity—generally easy and flowing, but occasionally rising to the more artificial, condensed, and elevated strain. See *Life of Samuel Miller, D.D., LL.D.*, by Samuel Miller (1869); *The Biblical Rep. and Princeton Rev.* January 1870, page 33; *Amer. Presb. Rev.* July 1869, page 619; *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1863, page 52; *N. Amer. Rev.* 28:505-531; *Sketches of the Lit. of the United States*; *London Athen.* 1835, page 716; Dr. J.W. Francis's *Old New York* (2d. ed. 1858), page 57; *Life of Archibald Alexander, D.D.*, by his son, page 380.

Miller, Samuel (2)

a minister of the German Reformed Church, was born in Union County, Pennsylvania, March 23, 1815. He was licensed in 1842, and ordained the following year. He first labored in Dauphin, and then in Butler County, Pennsylvania. In 1852 he removed to Chambersburg, Pennsylvania, where he stood in connection with the publication office of the Reformed Church as associate editor of the *Messenger* and *Kirchenzeitung*. After laboring in this capacity about six years, he returned to the pastoral work, residing for several years in Lebanon, and afterwards in Pottsville, Pennsylvania. His health failing, he removed to Philadelphia, where he died, October 11, 1873. Mr. Miller was a man of decided talent, genial spirit, and indomitable energy, patience, and perseverance. He is the author of a work of some merit, entitled *Mercersburg and Modern Theology compared*, and of quite a number of articles in the *Mercersburg Review*. See *Ref. Church Messenger*. November 5, 1873. (D.Y.H.)

Miller, Samuel J.

an American divine of some note, figured first as missionary to Africa, and later as agent of the Colonization Society. He died in 1818. He was the editor of the celebrated *Report of the Presbyterian Church: The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania vs. Ashbel Green and Others* (Phila. 8vo; new ed. 1855. 8vo, page 596).

Miller, Thomas

one of the pioneer preachers of American Methodism, largely identified with the spread of Methodist doctrine in Maryland, was born about the year 1770, of Irish parentage, and was reared in the Presbyterian Church. About 1800 he joined the Methodist Episcopal Church, and soon became an official member; in 1808 he was licensed to exhort and preach. His itinerant life commenced in 1809, under the elder Dr. Chandler, and continued till 1848, nearly forty years. In his early ministry he was healthy and strong, and never spared his strength; in fact, his health and strength served him well through all his ministerial course. He was stationed for twelve years at different times in Philadelphia, and held other important charges. His early education was limited, but constant reading and close application, added to great natural abilities, made him an able minister of the New Testament. He was known by the title of "Old Father Miller" far and wide, and he was loved and honored by all who knew him, both in and

out of the Church. He was a good friend to the young, and took great interest in the Sabbath-school. He took many a young man by the hand, and helped him into the ministry. He died in 1848.

Miller, Tobias Ham

a Universalist minister and journalist, was born about 1802. In early life he was settled in Maine as an orthodox clergyman, but later he became a firm Universalist. He was the original "Uncle Toby" of the *Boston Carpet Bag*; was on the *Chronicle* (Portsmouth) eighteen years, and the *Portsmouth Journal* twenty years. He died in Portsmouth, New Elampshire, March 30, 1870.

Miller, William

the founder of the *Millerites* (q.v.), was born at Pittsfield, Massachusetts, in 1781. He enjoyed but slender educational advantages. During the war of 1812 he served as a volunteer with the rank of captain. About 1833, while a resident of Low Hampton, N.Y., he began his career as an apostle of the new doctrine, which taught that the world was coming to an end in 1843. The main argument on which his belief rested was that relative to the termination of the 2300 days in ~~2084~~Daniel 8:14, which he regarded as years. Then considering the seventy weeks in ~~2084~~Daniel 9:24, as the key to the date of the 2300 days of the preceding chapter, and dating the periods B.C. 457, when Artaxerxes, king of Persia, sent up Ezra from his captivity, to restore the Jewish polity at Jerusalem (Ezra 7), and ending the seventy weeks, as commentators generally do, in A.D. 33, with the crucifixion of Christ, he found the remainder of the 2300 days, which was 1810, would end in 1843. For ten years he held forth to this purport, and succeeded in gathering a large number of followers, which is said to have reached fifty thousand, who awaited, with credulous expectation, the appointed day. The result, however, turning out contrary to the teaching of their apostle, the Adventists, as they are sometimes termed, gradually forsook Miller. He died at Low Hampton, Washington County, N.Y., December 20, 1849. His followers esteemed him as a man of more than ordinary mental power, as a cool, sagacious, and honest reasoner, a humble and devoted Christian, a kind and affectionate friend, and a man of great moral and social worth.

SEE MILLERITES.

Miller, William A., D.D.

a minister of the Reformed (Dutch) Church; was born at Albany, N.Y., in 1824; graduated at Union College in 1842, and at the theological seminary of the Reformed Church at New Brunswick in 1845. He was a grandson of the "Old Disciple," and nephew of Reverend John E. Miller, whom we notice above, and inherited the robust intellect, strong character, and religious peculiarities of his remarkable family. After a brief settlement as pastor of the Reformed Church of Glenham, N.Y. (1846-49). he became professor of languages, and subsequently principal of the Albany Academy, a celebrated classical and mathematical school (1849-56). From 1856 to 1859 he was the useful pastor of the Reformed Church of Rhinebeck when his health failed from pulmonary disease, of which he died in 1863. Dr. Miller was a highly-gifted man, a thoroughly accurate and critical scholar, an enthusiastic and competent instructor, a logical, practical, and profitable preacher, and a man who always devoted himself completely to his professional duties. He dealt much in careful expository preaching, for which his turn of mind, classical culture, and love of the truth admirably fitted him. Had his life been spared, he would doubtless have risen to higher positions in the Church which he so greatly adorned by his scholarship and services. He was "chosen in the furnace of affliction," and his graces were beautifully developed by the protracted trials of bereavement, disease, and suffering, and especially by being obliged to desist from all labor for Christ, just when he felt most anxious and best qualified for it. His Christian experiences during his last years and in death were delightful and impressive exhibitions of the triumphs of grace. (W.J.R.T.)

Millerites, Or Adventists

as they are sometimes called, are those millenarians, *SEE MILLENNIUM* who adhere to the doctrines as expounded by William Miller (q.v.). When in 1833 he first began to proclaim millennial doctrines, the earnestness of his manner, his evident familiarity with the Scriptures and with history, and the bold confidence with which he proclaimed his views, made so deep and wide an impression that he everywhere left in his wake large numbers examining the evidences for themselves. Among his most ardent followers was Joshua V. Himes, a minister of the Christian connection, who, having become a believer, commenced, in 1840, without subscribers or funds, the publication of a semi-monthly journal entitled *Signs of, the Times and*

Exposition of Prophecy; and, meeting with success, two years later issued a weekly, under the title of the *Advent Herald*, which largely aided in disseminating the doctrines of the Adventists, who now comprise many thousands, in the United States, British America, and Great Britain. This journal (still published in Boston, Massachusetts), together with the labors of Mr. Miller, who gave his time, his energies, and his property to the extension of his views, and the efforts of numerous proselytes that everywhere rose up, soon established great numbers in a belief in the general correctness of Mr. Miller's interpretation of the prophecies, and the personal appearing of the Lord was eagerly looked for by some 50,000 followers. Though disappointed at the time set, and frequently from time to time since, there are still many adherents to Miller's views. Their aggregate number is quite respectable, and their efforts for the dissemination of their convictions generous and unfaltering.. While as a body they make little or no pretension to influence, as individuals they are necessarily close Bible students; are liberal, according to their means, to the poor and for the support of the Gospel; and noticeable in the main for the modesty and uprightness of their walk, and their careful conformity to virtue and to law. As a body they accept the great leading doctrines of the evangelical Church, and are distinguished only for their peculiar belief in the personal coming of Christ, and his bodily reign with his saints on the earth. They have no creed nor form of discipline other than the Word of God, which they regard as a sufficient rule of faith and duty. They hold conferences, composed of lay and clergy, as often as it is deemed necessary for the discussion of such subjects and measures as the interests of the cause may demand; but these are purely voluntary and advisory, and claim to exercise no authority over the conscience of any.

In round numbers the Millerites are supposed to comprise in this country from fifteen to twenty thousand, scattered over all the states of the Union, in which estimate those in the different churches, who are numerous, are not included.

General Doctrines of Belief. They cannot see, if, according to ⁽²⁰⁷⁴⁾Isaiah 7:14, Christ was foretold to be born of a virgin, and it came to pass ⁽⁴⁰¹⁸⁾Matthew 1:18-25); if, as foretold ⁽³⁰⁸²⁾Micah 5:2), Christ was literally born in Bethlehem ⁽⁴⁰¹⁸⁾Matthew 2:1); if, as foretold ⁽²⁰²⁶⁾Daniel 9:26), Messiah came at the expiration of seven weeks and sixty-two weeks. ⁽⁴⁰¹⁵⁾Mark 1:15), and if after the sixty-two weeks Messiah was literally cut off; if, as foretold ⁽²³⁰⁸⁾Isaiah 53:8, 9), he was cut off out of the land of the

living for the transgression of his people, and made his grave with the wicked and with the rich in his death; if (^{<39|60>}Psalm 16:10) Christ's soul was not left in hell, nor did his flesh see corruption; if (^{<38|01>}Psalm 110:1) Christ did sit on the right hand of God, and is to sit there till his enemies be made his footstool-if all these predictions have literally come to pass, and they think they have, then they cannot see ground for doubting that the same rule will be observed in the fulfilment of all other predictions relating to Christ.

2. Prophecy (^{<02|28>}Genesis 22:18) foretells Christ as the seed of Abraham, in whom all the families of the earth shall be blessed. It also promises to the seed of Abraham all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession, in connection with Abraham himself (^{<01|78>}Genesis 17:8); hence the land is called Emanuel's land (^{<23|88>}Isaiah 8:8). But, when Christ was on earth, he had not where to lay his head. Therefore he must return personally to inherit it.

3. Christ is the predicted Son of David. who is to sit forever on David's throne; he is the Son of David according to the flesh (^{<39|21>}Psalm 132:11). But, while on earth, he never sat on David's throne. He went to Jerusalem, as foretold, on an ass's colt; claimed his rights, and was proclaimed king by the children, but rejected by the rulers (Matthew 21). Hence he must return to enjoy his kingdom and reign over the house of Jacob forever (^{<01|3>}Luke 1:32,33).

4. Christ has the promise of the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession (^{<39|08>}Psalm 2:8), but he never yet had it. Therefore he must come back to earth to possess it.

5. Prophecy (^{<20|73>}Daniel 7:13,14) points out the coming of Christ to receive his kingdom and dominion over all nations, to be in the "clouds of heaven." But he has never yet come thus. He must, therefore, fulfil the prediction in futurity, at his second advent. He cannot have universal dominion till he does.

6. Christ rose from the dead in the identical body in which he was crucified and buried, and was so identified (^{<39|24>}John 20:24-31). Those who thus identified his person; of flesh and bones, saw him go from earth up into heaven, and a cloud received him out of their sight. They were told by divine messengers that this same Jesus, whom they saw go into heaven, "shall so come back again in like manner" (^{<40|2>}Acts 1:2-11). .

7. That the second advent will be pre-millennial. First, because the millennial reign is placed after the first resurrection (~~(660)~~ Revelation 20:1-6), which cannot be till the second advent of Christ. Those who have part in the first resurrection are saints, and will live forever. The second death has no power on them. But they that are Christ's are to be raised at his coming; and that is the order of the resurrection to follow Christ's resurrection (~~(485)~~ 1 Corinthians 15:23). Christ's coming, and the resurrection of the just, must therefore precede the millennial reign.] Second, because the millennial period follows the casting the beast and the false prophet into the lake of fire, and the shutting up of the devil in the bottomless pit (~~(660)~~ Revelation 19:20, and 20:1-3). Third, because thus, before the millennium, all the great anti-Christian powers are to be put down. The man of sin, however, the son of perdition, is only to be destroyed by the brightness of Christ's coming (~~(308)~~ 2 Thessalonians 2:8). The coming of Christ, for his destruction, must therefore be pre-millennial.

8. That there will be two resurrections, a thousand years apart, viz. the "first resurrection," "the resurrection of life," "the resurrection of the just;" and the "resurrection of the rest of the dead," the "resurrection of damnation," the "resurrection of the unjust."

9. That the general view that the millennium will be a thousand years of peace, and be introduced by the conversion of the world to Christ, and consist in his universal spiritual reign; and the millenarian view that though Christ will come and reign personally on earth during the millennium, yet that that period will be one of probation, in which the heathen who had never heard of Christ, and the Jews who have been cut off during the Christian dispensation, will have the Gospel preached to them and be converted, are both unscriptural and not to be received, -because both the general and specific teachings of the Bible are against it. Thus the dream of Nebuchadnezzar (Daniel 2) foretells four universal empires which are to fill up the period from then till the everlasting kingdom of God comes and destroys them, and fills the whole earth. But there can be no everlasting kingdom without immortality, which cannot be till the resurrection at the second advent of Christ. The seventh chapter of Daniel presents, in vision, the same four empires, with the divisions and successions of the fourth empire, which only end (verses 13,14) when the Son of Man comes in the clouds of heaven to receive his everlasting dominion, which is also universal. Till the judgment. the little blasphemous horn wears out the saints, and prevails against them. So, also, in the twenty-fourth of

Matthew, the course of events from the time of Christ to his second coming and the end of the world is given. There were to be wars, famines, pestilences, persecutions of the saints, false prophets, false Christs, abominations, great tribulations, mournings by all the tribes of the earth, the preaching of his Gospel to all the world for a witness to all nations, and *then* the end should come, and they see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. There is no peace in the prediction till he comes. Therefore he will come personally to judge the world and reign, and not spiritually to convert and save the world. The tares and wheat, too (the righteous and wicked), are to grow together till the end of the world or age, and then they are to be cast off and punished, and the other glorified in the kingdom of God (~~403A~~ Matthew 13:24-43). For these and many other reasons, they cannot believe in the conversion of the world before the second advent of the Saviour.

10. That the thousand years will be one of judgment rather than probation. For they read in the second Psalm that when the heathen are given to Christ for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession, that he is to break or rule them (~~403B~~ Revelation 12:5, and 2:27) with a rod of iron, and dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel, which they consider to be anything else besides conversion. They also read in Psalm 149 that all the saints will "bind their kings with chains, and their nobles with fetters of iron, and execute upon them the judgments written." From Isaiah 60 and Zechariah 14 they likewise learn that the worship and service of the heathen will be compulsory service.

11. That final and eternal retribution will be awarded to all nations when the Son of Man comes in his glory (Matthew 25 and Luke 13).

12. That the promises made to Israel of a yet future and final gathering to the land of Canaan will be literally accomplished, and Israel forever dwell there in peace. But that this cannot be fulfilled before the resurrection of the just, when the believing remnant of Israel, of every generation, including Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, will be raised from the dead, and restored to their own land. This Ezekiel 37 declares will be the way the whole house of Israel will be restored: "I will open your graves, and bring you up out of your graves, and bring you into your ownland." The resurrection, according to Paul is "the hope of Israel." But if the resurrected and glorified Israel are to have the land and dwell there forever, the Jews in flesh and blood, as a nation, cannot have it forever. All the

promises, however, of a future return, promise an everlasting possession of the land. But mortal Jews cannot possess it forever — glorified and immortal ones can. Therefore they are the heirs of promise.

13. That the coming of the Lord is at the door for the following reasons, viz.: First, the four great empires are to be succeeded by the kingdom of God; and it is very manifest that the last — the Roman government — has passed its predicted divisions, and must soon end. Second, the waning of the Ottoman or Mohammedan power is another index pointing to the speedy coming of the kingdom of Christ. Third, the universal movements and agitations, the famines, pestilences, and earthquakes, the wars and rumors of wars, together with the signs in the sun, moon, and stars, etc., are conclusive evidence of his speedy approach. Fourth, the Gospel, which was to be preached in all the world, for a witness to all nations, is now completing its work.

14. That the advent doctrine, embracing, as it does, the resurrection of the body, the personal and visible appearance and reign of Christ on earth, the restitution of the heavens and earth to their paradisaical state, as the eternal inheritance of the saints, etc., is the only view which will explain and harmonize the Word of God.

The intelligent reader will perceive, however, that most of the above arguments are merely precarious inferences from passages of Scripture whose meaning is greatly disputed. *SEE MILLENNIUM.* (J.H.W.)

Milles, Jeremiah, D.D.

a celebrated English divine and antiquary, was born in 1714, and received his preparatory education at Eton. He studied at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and took the degree of M.A. in 1735, and that of D.D. in 1747. His uncle, Dr. Thomas Milles, bishop of Waterford and Lismore, collated him to a prebend in the cathedral of Waterford, and presented him to a living near that city. In 1762 Dr. Milles was nominated to the deanery of Exeter, and in 1767 he was chosen president of the Society of Antiquaries. He died February 13, 1784. In the "Archaeologia" are several communications by him, particularly one entitled *Observations on the Wardrobe Account of the Year 1483*, wherein are contained the deliveries made for the coronation of king Richard III; and another (*Archaeol.* 4:331 sq.) in which he denies the genuineness of the Apamsean medal. In connection with Pococke (q.v.), he edited *Inscriptiones Antiuce* (1752).

He also published some of his sermons. Dr. Milles is, however, best known in the literary world by his edition in defence of the antiquity of the “Poems of Rowley.” See Chambers, *Cyclopaedia*, s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, 2:1288.

Millet

Picture for Millet 1

(*Ἰ Dodo'chan*, so called from the dark-green or *smoky* color of the leaf; Sept. κέγγρος, *Vulg. nzilium*) occurs in Scripture only in ³⁰⁰Ezekiel 4:9, where the prophet is directed to take unto him wheat, and barley, and beans, and lentiles, and *millet*, and fitches, and to put them into one vessel, and to make bread thereof for himself. All the grains enumerated in this verse continue to form the chief articles of diet in the East at the present day, as they appear to have done in ancient times. The Hebrew word *dochan* is identical with the Arabic *dukhun*, which is applied in the present day by the Arabs to a small grain cultivated from the middle of Europe to the most southern part of India. This is the common millet, *Panicum miliaceum* of botanists, which is sometimes cultivated in England on account of the seeds being used for feeding birds and poultry. But the grain is usually imported from the Mediterranean. In India it is cultivated in the cold weather, that is, in the same season with wheat and barley, and is an article of diet with the inhabitants. The culms are erect, from two to four feet high, the whole plant being very hairy; leaves large, with long sheaths, which involve most part of the culm; panicle oblong, much branched, bending down with the weight of the grain: glumes cuspidate; corol three-valved, adventitious valve emarginate; seed oval and smooth, colored longitudinally with five streaks. The name, *miliaceua*, is said to have been applied to this plant from its producing such a quantity of grain, as if one stalk bore a thousand seeds. Tournefort says (*Voyage*, 2:95) that in the isle of Samos the inhabitants, in preparing their bread, knead together one half wheat and the other half barley and millet mixed together. It is also an article of diet both in Persia and India. Forskal applies the name *dukhun* to another corn-grass, which he first found in a garden at Rosetta, cultivated on account of its seed being given as food to birds. Afterwards he found it commonly cultivated in Arabia. It grows to a great size, being about five cubits in height, with seeds of the size of rice. To it he has given the name of *Holcus dochna*, but the plant is as yet unknown to botanists. The Biblical “millet” is confounded by many writers with the broom-corn

varieties, which belong to the genus *Sorghum*, a species of which is the modern Egyptian *durra*. It is possible that the Heb. *dochan* includes the common species, *Sorghum vuggare*. There is, however, little doubt that the true *dukhun* of Arab authors is the above-described *Panicum miliaceum*. This is so universally cultivated in the East as one of their smaller corn-grasses that it is most likely to be the kind chiefly alluded to in the passage of Ezekiel. Two cultivated species of *Panicum* are named as occurring in Palestine, viz. *P. miliaceum* and *P. italicum* (Strand's *Flor. Palest.* Nos. 35, 37). The genera *Sorghum* and *Panicum* belong to the natural order *Gramineae*, perhaps the most important order in the vegetable kingdom. See Celsii *Hierobot.* 1:453 sq.; Oedmann, *Verm. Sanml.* 5:92 sq.; Niebuhr, *Arabia*, page 295; *Trav.* 1:158; Forskal, *Flora AEGypt.* page 174; Wellsted, *Tray.* 1:295; Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* page 333; *Penny Cyclopaedia*, s.v. *Panicum*.

Picture for Millet 2

Millet, Simon-Germain

a French Benedictine, was born at Venisy, near Sens, in 1575. He died near Paris, June 28, 1647. But little is known of his life's history. The following are his works: *Les Dialogues de Saint-Gregoire* (translated into French; Paris, 1624, 1644, 8vo): — *Le Tresor sacre, ou inventaire des saintes reliques etau tres precieux joyaux de l'eglise et du tresor de Saint-Denys* (Paris, 1638, 12mo): — *Vindicata Ecclesiae Gallicanae de suo Areopagita Dionysio Gloria* (Paris, 1638, 8vo): — *Ad Dissertationem nuper evulgatam de Duobus Dionysiis Reponsio*, against the canon of Launoy (Paris, 1642, 8vo). — *Hist. Litter. de la Congregation de Saint-Maur*, page 28. See Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Genesis* s.v.

Milletiere

SEE LAMILETIERE.

Milligan, James, D.D.

a Presbyterian divine. was born in Dalmellington, Ayrshire, Scotland, August 7, 1785. At the age of fourteen he united with the Established Church of Scotland. His early education was obtained while out upon the moor watching the sheep, reciting two or three times a week to a teacher in a neighboring village. In 1801, dissatisfied with the government of

Scotland, he emigrated to America, and came to Westmoreland County, Pennsylvania. After engaging in mercantile life for some months, he entered Jefferson College, Pennsylvania. His funds becoming exhausted, he was obliged to leave, and went to Greensburg, Pennsylvania; instituted an academy, taught eighteen months, realized a sum sufficient to complete his collegiate course, and graduated with honors. He next accepted a call as teacher of languages in the Philadelphia University. While there he pursued his theological studies in the Reformed Presbyterian Seminary. He was licensed by the Northern Presbytery in 1811, and in 1812 was ordained pastor of Coldenham Congregation, Orange County, N.Y.; in 1818 he accepted a call to the Scotch Covenanter Congregation at Ryegate, Caledonia County, Vermont; thence he went to New Alexandria, Pennsylvania, in 1839; and in 1848 to Eden, Illinois, — where he continued to preach until 1855. He died about the year 1861. Dr. Milligan was a warm friend of the Scotch Covenanters. He was instrumental in inaugurating the first temperance reform movement in the State of Vermont; and was first also to introduce the scriptural office of deacon in the American Reformed Presbyterian Church. His publications are, *A Narrative of the Secession Controversy in Vermont: — Sermon on Free Agency: — Sermon on the Prospects of a True Christian in a Sinful World: — A Defence of Infant Baptism* See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1863, page 388.

Millington, William, D.D.

an eminent Anglican divine of the Reformatory period, And one of the most learned men of his day, was a native of Pocklington, Yorkshire. He was ordained priest March 8, 1420. He took his doctor's degree at Cambridge, and is said to have been a member of Clare Hall, in that university; but however that may be, certain it is that in 1443 he was appointed the provost of King's College. This important position, however, he voluntarily resigned in 1446, on a point of conscience. The oft-repeated statement that he was deprived of the provostship for unduly favoring natives of Yorkshire is without foundation. It is said that on leaving King's he retired to Clare Hall. He died in May 1466, and was buried in St. Edward's Church, Cambridge. An interesting memoir of Dr. Millington, by George Williams, B.D., was communicated to the Cambridge Antiquarian Society in 1858.

Million

(**hbbr**] *rebabah*’, ^{<0206}Genesis 21:60), *ten thousand*, as elsewhere rendered.

Mil’lo

(Heb. always with the art. *ham millo*’, **a/LM***æthe fulness*; Sept. [Alex.] in 1 Kings 9 only **ἡ Μελλιο**; Vulg. *Mello*), properly a mound or rampart, as being filled in with stones and earth; hence a fortress or castle; applied to two structures or fortifications:

(a) According to Gesenius (*Thes. Heb.* page 789), a part of the citadel of Jerusalem, probably the rampart or intrenchment; or, as Winer thinks (*Worterb.* s.v.), the tower afterwards called Hippicus (^{<1089}2 Samuel 5:9; ^{<1095}1 Kings 9:15, 24; 11:27; ^{<13108}1 Chronicles 11:8; ^{<4316}2 Chronicles 32:5). In the last of these texts, where David is said to have restored or fortified the Millo “of” (not “in”) the city of David, the Sept. has **τὸ ἀνάλημμα τῆς πόλεως**, “the *fortification* of the city of David;” in the other passages it has simply **ἄκρα**, the *mound* or tower. The Targum merely Chaldaizes the Heb. term (**aty] ḥiatyl ḥ] vallum**) “Both name and thing seem to have been already in existence when the city was taken from the Jebusites by David. His first occupation, after getting possession, was to build around about, from the Millo and to the house’ (A.V. ‘inward.’ ^{<1089}2 Samuel 5:9); or, as the parallel passage has it, ‘he built the city round about, and from the Millo round about’ (^{<13108}1 Chronicles 11:8). Its repair or restoration was one of the great works for which Solomon raised his ‘levy’ (^{<1095}1 Kings 9:15, 24; 11:27); and it formed a prominent part of the fortifications by which Hezekiah prepared for the approach of the Assyrians (^{<4316}2 Chronicles 32:5).” The same place is probably meant by the “house of Millo,” where Joash was killed (^{<1221}2 Kings 12:21). Others are of the opinion that Millo was the name of a valley in Jerusalem, which separated ancient Jebus from the city of David, but which was afterwards filled up by David and Solomon (Barclay, *City of the Great King*, page 113). Schwarz (*Pcrlest.* page 241) holds that it was on the eastern declivity towards the spring of Siloam (reading Shiloah for Silla). The most natural impression from the notices is that it was some region or space adjacent to Mount Zion, perhaps that portion of the Tyropoeon enclosed by the first wall, the bridge, and the Temple. (See Lightfoot, *Works*, 2:189; — Hamelsveld, *Bibl. Geogr.* 2:46 sq.; Ewald, *Jsr. Gesch.* 3:70; Strong’s

Harm. and Expos. of the Gospels, Append. 2, page 24; Schulz, *Jerusalem*, page 80.) *SEE JERUSALEM*.

(b) The fortress or citadel of Shechem, all the occupants or garrison of which joined in proclaiming Abimelech their king (~~1006~~Judges 9:6, 20). *SEE BETH-MILLO*; *SEE SILLA*.

Mills, Abraham, LL.D.

a prominent American author, was born in Dutchess County, N.Y., in 1796. After having received a thorough academic education, he opened a classical school in New York City. He had not been long engaged in this school when he was appointed professor of mathematics and philosophy in the Baptist Literary and Theological Institute, then established in New York. Three years after, when the institute was transferred to Hamilton, N.Y., Mills severed his connection, and flourished as a highly-esteemed teacher of and lecturer on rhetoric and belles-lettres. He died July 8, 1867. Mills issued text-books on the topics on which he gave instruction. The honorary degree of LL.D. was conferred on him by Madison University. He deserves a place here on account of his *Compendium of the History of the Ancient Hebrews* (1856). See Drake, *Dict. of Amer. Biogr.* s.v.; Appleton's *Annual Cyclop.* 1867, page 511.

Mills, Henry, D.D.

a Presbyterian divine, was born at Morristown, N.J., March 12, 1786; pursued his preparatory studies in his native town; graduated at Princeton College in 1802; for a considerable time taught in the academy at Morristown, and also at Elizabethtown, N.J.; was tutor for two years at Princeton College; studied theology with the Reverend Dr. James Richards; was licensed by the Presbytery of New Jersey, and in 1816 was ordained pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Woodbridge, N.J. In 1821 he was called to the professorship of Biblical criticism in the theological seminary at Auburn, N.Y., where he continued to perform his duties with eminent ability until 1854, when he resigned, and was made professor emeritus. He died June 10, 1867. Dr. Mills was a man of marked characteristics — impressive in personal appearance, instructive in conversation, sharp in intellect. As a preacher, his style was simple, chaste, and direct. As a scholar, he was most eminent — thoroughly versed in Hebrew and master of the German language. He published in 1845 *Horae Germaniae*, a

Version of German Hymns. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1868, page 218.

Mills, Nathaniel B.

an early and eminent minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church. He was born in Newcastle County, Delaware, February 23, 1766; was converted in 1783; entered the Baltimore Conference in 1787; in 1790 was stationed at Hartford, Connecticut; in 1804 at Baltimore; filled various important circuits, etc., until 1835, when he became superannuated.' He died in Carroll County, Maryland, February 20, 1845. He preached with great zeal and success for nearly sixty years. — *Minutes of Conferences*, 3:594; Stevens, *Memorials of Methodism*.

Mills, Samuel

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Northampton County, N.C., in 1780; was converted in 1800; entered the itinerancy in 1804; was stationed at Columbia in 1806, at Charleston in 1809, at Milledgeville in 1810, and at Camden in 1811, where he died, June 8, 1811. He was a plain, earnest preacher, possessed of good abilities, and “a witness of sanctification, which he frequently pressed on his hearers.” See *Minutes of Conferences*, 1:206.

Mills, Samuel John (1)

a Congregational minister, was born May 16, 1743, in Kent, Conn. He graduated at Yale College in 1764, and was ordained June 29, 1769, in Torrington, Conn., where he resided until his death, May 11, 1833. He published a few occasional sermons, and two sermons on the religious sentiments of Christ, in a volume entitled *Sermons Collected* (1797). See Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, 1:672.

Mills, Samuel John (2)

popularly called the “Father of Foreign Mission Work in Christian America,” an efficient minister of the Congregational Church, was the son of the minister of Torrington, Conn., and was born April 21, 1783. He was educated at Williams College (class of 1809). He next entered the theological seminary, having decided to preach the Gospel, and while at school in Andover his mind was deeply impressed with the importance of foreign missions, and he endeavored to awaken a similar feeling in the

hearts of his fellow-students. He united with Judson, Newell, Nott, and Hall in a resolution to undertake a foreign mission. In 1812 and 1813 he and J.F. Schermerhorn made a missionary tour in the Western States. He was ordained, with other missionaries, at Newburyport, June 21, 1815. He ascertained in March, 1815, that not a Bible could be found for sale or to be given away in New Orleans; he thereupon distributed many Bibles in French and English, and visited the sick soldiers. Finding that seventy or eighty thousand families at the South and West were destitute of a Bible, he suggested at the close of his report the formation of a national society like the British. His efforts contributed to the establishment of the *American Bible Society*, May 8, 1816. The plan of the *United Foreign Mission Society*, which, however, accomplished but little, originated with him while residing with Dr. Griffin at Newark, N.J., as did also the African school, which existed a few years at Parsippany, near Newark. He attended the first meeting of the Colonization Society, January 1, 1817, which was established by his and Dr. Finley's exertions, and Mills was at that time appointed, together with Dr. Burgess, to visit England, and explore the coast of Africa for the society. He sailed in November 1817, and in a wonderful manner escaped shipwreck on the coast of France. He sailed from England for Africa February 2, 1818, and arrived on the coast March 12. After a laborious inspection of more than two months, he embarked on his return in the brig *Success*, May 22, 1818. A severe cold, which he took early in June, was succeeded by a fever, and he died at sea, June 16, 1818. He was buried in the depths of the ocean. See Spring, *Memoirs of John Samuel Mills* (N.Y. 1820, 8vo); Sprague, *Annals Amer. Pulpit*, 2:566; *Cyclop. Missions*, page 263 sq.; Anderson, *Hist. Missions of A. B. For. M. in India* (1874).

Mills, Thornton A., D.D.

a Presbyterian divine, was born in Paris, Kentucky, September 1810. He early enjoyed excellent educational advantages; graduated at Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, in 1830; studied theology for a short time in Lane Theological Seminary. and afterwards privately, and was licensed in 1833. He labored for some time in Frankfort, Kentucky, and in 1836 was installed pastor of the Third Presbyterian Church, Cincinnati. In 1848 he purchased *The Watchman of the Valley*, and continued to edit that paper, first under the name of *Central Watchman*, and later of *Central Christian Herald*, until January, 1853, when it was bought by the synods of Ohio, Indiana, Cincinnati, and Wabash. During 1853 he was secretary and

general agent for the Church Erection Committee; in 1854 accepted a call to the Second Church, in Indianapolis; in 1856 was chosen as general secretary of the Permanent Committee of the General Assembly on Education for the Ministry, to which work he devoted the remainder of his life. He died June 21, 1867. Dr. Mills was a man of firm grasp of mind, clear and positive views of truth, and indomitable energy and perseverance. See Wilson, *Presb. Hist. Almanac*, 1868, page 220; *Meth. Qu. Rev.* January 1872, page 27. (J.L.S.)

Mills, William

an early minister of the Methodist Church, was born in Monmouth County, N.J., August 26, 1747; entered the United States army in 1776; suffered various vicissitudes during the war until he was carried a prisoner to Europe, whence he returned after the war; was converted through Methodist instrumentality in 1792; entered the itinerancy at Philadelphia in 1799, and died at Long Branch, N.J., December 5, 1813. He was a most amiable and excellent man, and a very successful preacher. Several extensive revivals resulted from his labors. See *Minutes of Conferences*, 1:239.

Mills, William Robert

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Alexandria, Virginia, July 5, 1816. He enjoyed the advantages of a liberal academical training, and was for some time a student at William and Mary College. At an early age he was converted, and shortly after became fully persuaded of a divine call to the ministry; was licensed to preach, and was admitted into the Baltimore Conference in the spring of 1840. He labored successively on Berwick Circuit; in 1841 on Huntington Circuit; 1842, Northumberland; 1843, Lycoming; 1844, Lock Haven; 1845-46, Penn's Valley; 1847, Northumberland; 1848-49, Warrior's Mark; 1850-51, Huntingdon; 1852-53, Lewistown Circuit; 1854-55, Newport; 1856, Mercersburg; 1857-58, Liberty, Maryland; 1859-60, East Baltimore Station; 1861-62, North Baltimore *Station; 1863-65, Altoona; 1866-67, Lewisburg; 1868, Carlisle; 1869, York. In the last-named place he died, December 18, 1869. Mills was a faithful pastor and an eloquent preacher. His sermons evinced deep research, were argumentative, and logically arranged, and enlivened with illustrative incidents. See *Minutes of Conferences*, 1870, page 54.

Millstone

(**bkʀ**, *re'keb*, usually a *chariot*, hence the “upper millstone” or *rider*, ^{<5246>}Deuteronomy 24:6; more fully. **bkʀ,j l k**, ^{<0705>}Judges 9:53; ^{<1012>}2 Samuel 11:21; in ^{<18424>}Job 41:24 there is no Hebrew word corresponding; in ^{<3470>}Isaiah 47:2; ^{<2510>}Jeremiah 25:10, **μϋλᾱ** elsewhere rendered “mill;” Gr. **μῶλος**). *SEE MILL*.

Milman, Henry Hart, D.D.

one of the leaders of the Broad Church party in the Anglican communion of our day, an ecclesiastic of distinction also, both as a historian and a poet, was the youngest son of Sir Francis Milman, physician to George III, and was born in London February 10, 1791. He was educated at Eton, and afterwards at Brasenose College, Oxford, where he took the degrees of B.A. and M.A., and of which he was elected a fellow. He wrote several poems, and secured much distinction by his efforts. In 1817 he took holy orders, and was appointed vicar of St. Mary's, Reading. In 1820 Mr. Milman published *The Fall of Jerusalem*, a dramatic poem, founded on Josephus's narrative of the siege of the sacred city. This, in some respects his most beautiful poetical production, established his reputation. In 1821 he was elected professor of poetry in the University of Oxford. He now published three other dramatic poems: *The Martyr of Antioch*, *Belshazzar*, and *Anne Boleyn*. In 1827 he published his sermons, delivered as the Bampton Lecture, and entitled *The Character and Conduct of the Apostles considered as the Evidence of Christianity* (8vo), and in 1829, without his name, *The History of the Jews* (Lond. and N.Y. 3 volumes, 18mo). This work was written in so liberal a spirit that orthodox ecclesiastics could hardly fail to be offended. Its weak point was a want of adequate learning, especially in the department of Biblical criticism. A new edition, greatly improved, and more critical, yet still far from being very accurate, or built on solid foundations, prefaced by an interesting introduction, was published in 1863 (Lond. and N.Y. 3 volumes, 12mo). In this new form the work has had a large circulation both among Jews and Gentiles. It is to this day the only worthy record of the “chosen people of God” in the English tongue. In 1840 he came again before the public as a historian; this time with a *History of Christianity from the Birth of Christ to the Abolition of Paganism in the Roman Empire* (Lond. 3 volumes, 8vo; N.Y., Harpers, 1 volume, 8vo). In this work he professes to view Christianity as a historian,

in its moral, social, and political influences, referring to its doctrines no further than is necessary for explaining the general effect of the system. It is a far better effort than his previous work, and marks the advance of an accomplished and liberal-minded student. His scholarly attainments received the acknowledgment of the Church by various appointments. In 1849, after having been honored successively with the rectory of St. Margaret's, Westminster, and the canonship of Westminster, he was promoted to the deanery of St. Paul's. This position he held until his death, September 24, 1868.

The works already mentioned will secure for dean Milman an honorable place in the literary history of England, but they are by no means his ablest productions. His greatest work, and one of the most valuable productions in the English language, is his *History of Latin Christianity, including that of the Popes to the Pontificate of Nicholas V* (Lond. and N.Y. 1854, 8 volumes, 8vo); a continuation of the author's *History of Christianity*, and yet in itself a complete work. To give it that completeness, dean Milman has gone over the history of Christianity in Rome during the first four centuries. It brings the history down to the close of the pontificate of Nicholas V, that is, to 1455. It is a work of great learning, liberality, and chastened eloquence; it displays a broad grasp of human nature in its religious workings; something of the philosopher, and still-more of the poet, is seen in the strong and vivid spirit of sympathy with which he deals with men of the most different opinions. The work has secured for its author a position in the first rank of English historians. "No such work," says the *Qu. Rev.* of London, "has appeared in English ecclesiastical literature—none which combines such breadth of view with such depth of research, such high literary and artistic eminence with such patient and elaborate investigation." Perhaps we should add the estimate of one of our own historical writers, than whom no greater or more competent critic could be heard; we refer to William H. Prescott (*Philip II*, 2:500, n. 69), who says of it: "One of the most remarkable works of the present age, in which the author reviews, with curious erudition and in a profoundly philosophical spirit, the various changes that have taken place in the Roman hierarchy; and, while he fully exposes the manifold errors and corruptions of the system, he shows throughout that enlightened charity which is the most precious of Christian graces, as, unhappily, the rarest." Dean Milman also earned the gratitude of the Christian world by an edition of Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, which presented the

great historian with more ample illustration than he had before received, and set at rest many exceptions taken by Gibbon against Christianity. The notes were further elucidated and verified by Dr. W. Smith, and Gibbon's works are now sought for only in this amended form. Other works of Milman are a *Life of Keats*, and *Hebrew Prophecy*, a sermon, published in 1865. He also edited an illustrated review of Horace, with a Life of the poet; translations from the Agamemnon of Eschylus, Bacchanals of Euripides, etc. He was a frequent contributor to the [London] *Quarterly Review*. A collected edition of his "Poetical Works," including *Fazio*, a tragedy, which has frequently been on the stage, was published in 1840, and, besides the works above mentioned and his smaller poems, contains the *Noala and Damayanti*, translated from the Sanscrit. Since his death *Annals of St. Paul's Cathedral* (1868), and *Savonarola, Erasmus, and other Essays* (1870), have been published.

Dean Milman was also an important contributor to English hymnology. Some of his productions are familiar to every English-speaking Christian; in the Anglican Church he is a particular favorite, and as the author of "When our heads are bowed with woe," "Bound upon the accursed tree," "Ride on, ride on in majesty," and the more subjective composition, "Brother, thou art gone before us" (from the *Martyr of Antioch*), has established a household name, and has secured popular love. As he occupied for years the pulpit of one of the largest and most influential of English churches, we append the following portrayal of dean Milman from the *Saturday Rev.* (October 1868): "He was no speaker; he had not the very least of platform tricks; with a superb scorn, he disdained the arts which win fame at public meetings; and in a certain sense he was not a good preacher. He was too refined, too much habituated to limitations, too sensitive, and too careful, to be able to fling out those broad statements which must be hazarded by the popular preacher. But in a certain sort of preaching he was first-rate. His eulogium on the duke of Wellington — we doubt whether it is published — struck us, as we were fortunate enough to hear it, as equal to the best of the French models of pulpit eloquence." See Vapereau, *Dict. des Contemporains*, s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; *English Cyclop.* s.v.; *Men of the Times*, s.v. 1, Hagenbach, *Hist. Doctrines*, 2:423 sq.; Schaff, *Christ in Song*, pages 206-209; *Lecky, Hist. of European Morals from Augustus to Charlemagne* (Preface) (1869); *Edinb. Rev.* January 1858; January 1864; and January 1869; *Lond. Qu. Rev.* April 1816; July 1818; May 1820, and April 1869;

Blackwood's Mag. March and July 1822; December 1868; *North Brit. Rev.* Nov. 1854; March, 1869; *Fraser's Mag.* October 1854; *Christian Remembrancer*, 1854, October page 266; Kitto, *Journ. of Sac. Lit.* 1854, October; *Westminst. Rev.* 1870, October page 219; *Princeton Rev.* 1842, page 238; *Pen Pictures of popular English Preachers* (Lond. 1852), pages 175-178.

Milne, Colin

a Scottish divine, noted for his attainments in natural science, was born at Aberdeen, Scotland, about 1744. He was educated at Marischal College under the supervision of his uncle, Dr. Campbell, who was both principal and divinity professor at the college. After completing his studies there, Milne entered the University of Edinburgh. He joined the Church of England, and by the aid of the duke of Northumberland obtained the rectory of North Chapel, in Sussex. His pulpit eloquence soon made him widely known, and he received the appointment of preacher to the London Hospital, and also the lectureship of Deptford, a position which he held for many years. He died in 1815. His sermon preached at the anniversary meeting of the Roval Humane Society was published in 1779 (8vo). A volume of his sermons was published in 1780 (8vo). His other publications were in a line foreign to our work.

Milner, Isaac (1), D.D.

an Anglican divine of note, eminent for his piety as well as for his great attainments in divinity and the sciences, was born of humble parentage near Leeds, Yorkshire, in 1751. As a boy of six he entered the grammar school of his native place, but the straitened circumstances of his family obliged the removal of Isaac, and he was transferred from the schoolroom to the factory. Though apprenticed to a weaver, he continued to devote his leisure hours to study, and gradually acquired sound learning. His brother, the noted Joseph Milner (q.v.), who had enjoyed many educational advantages, was in 1767 appointed head-master of the grammar school at Hull. By him Isaac was relieved of his obligation at the factory, and afforded opportunity to continue his studies in the position of assistant to Joseph. In 1770 Isaac was admitted a student at Queen's College, Cambridge, and there received his degree in 1774, and was appointed tutor. He received among his pupils Mr. Pitt and Mr. Wilberforce, with whom he travelled abroad, and became the honored instrument in the

conversion of the latter. **SEE WILBERFORCE**. In 1775 Isaac Mihber was elected fellow of Queen's College. In 1783, returning to the university, he was chosen professor of natural philosophy, and master of his college in 1788, when he proceeded doctor in divinity. In 1791 he was appointed to the deanery of Carlisle. He was elected vice-chancellor of the university in 1792, and six years afterwards became Lucasian professor of mathematics. He died at the house of Wilberforce, at Kensington Gore, April 1, 1820. Dean Milner wrote, besides several papers in the *Philosophical Transactions*, and the continuation of his brother's *Church History*, the following works: *Animadversions on Dr. Haweis's Impartial History of the Church of Christ* (1800, 8vo): — *Strictures on some of the Publications of the Rev. Herbert Marsh, intended as a Reply to some of his Objections against the Bible Society* (1813, 8vo): — *Essays on Human Liberty; Sermons* (2 volumes, 8vo); besides works of a mathematical kind. "Dean Milner was possessed of very extensive and accurate learning, which he always had at his command. He had great talents for conversation, and a dignified simplicity of manner. His religious and political principles agreed pretty closely with his brother's." See *Meth. Qu. Rev.* 1840 (July), page 407; Jones, *Christ. Biog.* s.v.; *English Cyclop.* s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Mary Milne, *Life of Isaac Milner* (1842).

Milner, Isaac (2)

a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Yorkshire, England, April 2, 1818. His parents were of the old English Wesleyan stock, and young Milner was educated with great piety and care. In his seventeenth year he was converted, and, believing: himself called of God to preach the Gospel, he hesitatingly prepared to enter the ministry. While human reasoning held him back, divine love impelled him forward. He began his elementary studies alone and after the midnight hour, and in this way gained his education. Being of a studious habit, he soon acquired a storehouse of knowledge, and was numbered among the promising youths of the ministry. Seized with a desire to visit America, he came to New Orleans in 1848. Many and severe trials awaited him in his new home. He was taken sick of typhoid fever, and for three months he lay hovering between life and death. After his recovery he was for a time a member of the Memphis Conference. He afterwards joined the Tennessee Conference, and remained a member of it till his death, which occurred near Columbia, Tennessee, June 16, 1872. Isaac Milner was one of the most popular

Methodist preachers. He knew no failure; if he ever did, his audience knew nothing about it. In every department he proved himself to be a man of great ability and usefulness. His mind was naturally vigorous and receptive; his memory tenacious; his well-balanced mind, like a rich, productive field, yielded a wealth of thought, independent of the production of other men. His fancy was vigorous, his figures original and bold always pleasing often overwhelming. Milner served his Church in various ways, but in every department he proved himself not only a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, but a workman of great ability, usefulness, and popularity. See *Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the M.E. Church, South, 1872*, page 715 sq.

Milner, John (1),

an English nonjuring divine of note, was born near Halifax in 1627 or 1628. He was educated at Christ's College, Cambridge, and after his graduation took orders. He was, however, obliged to live retired till the Restoration, when he obtained the curacy of Beeston, and in 1673 was appointed vicar of Leeds. In 1681 he was chosen prebendary of Ripon; but, on refusing the oaths at the Revolution, he quitted his preferments and went to St. John's College, Cambridge, where he died, February 16, 1702. Dr. Milner was a prolific writer, and published several controversial theological tracts and critical dissertations upon various portions of the Scriptures. Of his numerous works we mention the following: *Church History of Palestine from the Birth of Christ to Diocletian* (1688, 4to): — *Conjectanea in* ²⁰⁰⁰ *Isaiah 9:1*: — *De Nethinin sive Nethinceis*: — *Defence of Archbishop Usher against Drs. Cary and Vossius*: — *Account of Mr. Locke's Religion*: — *Animadversions on Le Clerc's Reflections upon our Saviour and his Apostles*. See Watson, *Halifax*; Thoresby, *Vicaria Leodensis*, page 114 sq.; Wilford, *Memorials*; Cooper, *Biog. Dict.* Page 869; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, 2:1293.

Milner, John (2), D.D.

more properly named MILLER, an eminent Romish theologian and antiquary, was born in London, October 14, 1752. He was educated at the schools of Sedgley Park and Edgbaston, and then went to study theology at Douai. Having taken orders, he was in 1779 attached to Winchester Chapel. Although a zealous Roman Catholic, he refused to join in the efforts made by his Church in England in 1788 and in 1791 to obtain from

Parliament the repeal of the ancient laws against Roman Catholics. In after-times he was engaged in numerous controversies, both with Protestant theologians and with members of the Roman Catholic committee, who accused him of too great vivacity in his discussions. He declared against the right of the king of vetoing the appointment of bishops, and, together with the Irish Roman Catholic clergy, obstinately refused to yield the point to the solicitations of his own party. In 1814 he even took a journey to Rome, to consult with the pope on this point. The esteem in which he was held in the midst of these difficulties is evinced by the appointment he received in 1803 as apostolic vicar of the midland district, under the title of bishop of Castabala *in partibus*. Dr. Milner settled at Wolverhampton, where he died, April 19, 1826. He was quite distinguished as an archaeologist, belonged to the Antiquarian Society, and contributed many learned papers to the *Archæologia*. He wrote *The History, Civil and Ecclesiastical, and Survey of the Antiquities of Winchester* (1798, 2 volumes, 4to; 2d ed., corrected and enlarged, 1809, 2 volumes, 4to): — *The End of Religious Controversy, addressed to Dr. Burgess, Bishop of St. David's, in answer to his Protestant Catechism* (1818; 2d ed., revised, 1819, 8vo; transl. into French under the title *Excellence de la Religion Catholique*, Paris, 1823, 2 volumes, 8vo): — *A Vindication of the End of Religious Controversy from the Exceptions of Bishop Burgess and the Rev. R. Grier* (Lond. 1822, 8vo): — *Letters to a Prebendary, being an Answer to Reflections on Popery by the Rev. John Sturges, LL.D.* (Winchester, 1800, 4to): — *A short Description of the Hospital of St. Cross, near Winchester* (21st ed. Winchester; no date): — *An Historical and Critical Inquiry into the Existence and Character of St. George, Patron of England* (1795, 8vo): — *A Treatise on the Ecclesiastical History of England during the Middle Ages* (1811, royal 8vo): — *Letter to the Author of a Book called A candid and impartial Sketch of the Government of Pope Clement XIV* (Lond. 1785, 8vo): — *Divine Right of the Episcopacy* (1791, 8vo): — *The Case of Conscience solved, or the Catholic Claims proved to be compatible with the Coronation Oath* (1802, 8vo): — *Inquiry into certain Opinions concerning the Catholic Inhabitants and the Antiquities of Ireland* (1808, 8vo). Of all the advocates of the papal Church, no one has displayed more learning and acuteness than Milner, though not unmixed with partisan gall and misrepresentation. See *Lond. Qu. Rev.* 1810 (May), 1811 (October); *Rose, New Biog. Dict.* s.v.; *Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog.* 2:2771; *Hoefler, Nouv.*

Biog. Generale, 35:554; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.; Dr. Husenbeth, *Life of Dr. Milner* (Dublin, 1862, 8vo).

Milner, Joseph

an eminent Anglican divine and ecclesiastical historian, the elder brother of Isaac, was born near Leeds, Yorkshire, January 2, 1744. He was sent to the grammar school at Leeds, where, by his industry and talents, among which a memory of most extraordinary power was conspicuous, he gained the warm regard of his master. Milner's father had always been in very narrow circumstances; his death only made the task greater; but, by the assistance of some gentlemen in Leeds, whose children Milner had lately engaged in teaching, and by the offer of the office of chapel-clerk at Catharine Hall, Cambridge, he was enabled to enter that hall at the age of eighteen. In the year 1766 he took his degree of B.A., and gained the chancellor's second gold medal for classical knowledge. He was made assistant in the school, and afterwards the curate of the Reverend Mr. Atkinson, of Thorp Arch, near Tadcaster. While in this place he undertook the completion of an epic poem, entitled *Davideis*, which he had commenced at Cambridge. It was submitted to Dr. (afterwards bishop) Hurd, who highly complimented the author on the talent it displayed, but advised him to defer its publication. On entering into deacon's orders, Mihier was elected head-master of the grammar school, and afternoon lecturer of the principal church of Hull. In this position he succeeded beyond the most ardent expectations of his dearest friends, especially in the capacity of an instructor, and the school. increased under his care. About the year 1770 Joseph Milner embraced the sentiments of the evangelical party in the Church of England. This change in his religious views brought upon him neglect, and in some cases open opposition from many among the upper classes who had once been his admirers and friends; but his church was soon crowded with others, chiefly from the lower orders of the people, in whose sentiments and manners his preaching produced a striking change; and at length he not only recovered the esteem of his fellow-townsmen, but lived to see his own religious sentiments become so popular in the town that many of the pulpits of the churches were filled by his friends and pupils, and he himself was chosen vicar of Hull by the mayor and corporation. Mr. Milner had been appointed vicar of North Ferriby, near Hull; subsequently he had been appointed to the vicarship of the Holy Trinity, Cambridge. His election as vicar of Hull occurred only a few weeks before his death, which took place on the 15th of November, 1797.

A monument, executed by Bacon. was erected to his memory in the high church of Hull by several of his friends and former pupils. The excellences of Mr. Milner's personal character were of the highest order. He was deeply pious, upright in all his conduct, singularly open and sincere, and kind, cheerful, and amusing in social life. In his political principles he was strongly attached to the established order of things in Church and State.

His principal works are *Gibbon's Account of Christianity considered* (1781, 8vo), in which he not only exposes the sophistry of that infidel theologian, but gives the true character of the religion which he had attempted to undermine: — *Some Passages in the Life of Wm. Howard* (1785, 8vo): — *Essays on the Influence of the Holy Spirit* (1789, 12mo): — *Practical Sermons* (1801, 2 volumes, 8vo; 2d edit. revised, corrected, and enlarged by Reverend Isaac Milner, D.D., dean of Carlisle, 1801-23, 3 volumes, 8vo): — *The Way of Salvation, or the Christian Doctrine of Justification explained* (Lond. 1814, 24mo); and, lastly, a *History of the Church of Christ* — a work by which Dr. Joseph Milner is principally known. He lived to complete only four volumes; but the task was taken up by his brother Isaac, who completed it by the addition of another volume, in which he was largely aided by the MS. left at his command. The work extends from the rise of Christianity to the Reformation. The first edition appeared in 5 volumes, 8vo, 1794 to 1812, and a second edition in 1810. The latest edition was published at London in 1847, 8vo. It was also translated into French (1836-8, 3 volumes, 12mo) and German (1804). At it omits nearly all discussion of ecclesiastical controversies, as well as of rites, ceremonies, and forms of Church government in fact, whatever did not agree with the writer's own opinions — Milner's work cannot be well termed a Church history, but its value as a contribution to ecclesiastical history is very considerable; only it should be read with much caution, and constant reference to Dr. Maitland's *Strictures on Milner's Church History*, and his *Notes on Milner's History*, etc. Dr. Milner's historical work certainly surpasses most other Church histories previously produced in the use made of the writings of the fathers, though the reverence which the author professes for those venerable men has led him to trust them too much. Most modern critics speak only in derogatory terms of this work. and an English writer of recent times thus comments upon it: "The principles on which the *History of the Church of Christ* is written are of the narrowest kind; the scholarship is poor, the literary merit still poorer, and the critical insight poorest of all. It deserves mention only for the

estimation in which it was formerly held.” The author of the *Natural History of Enthusiasm*, in commenting upon the characteristic defects of Mosheim and Milner as historians of Christianity, observes that “Mosheim gives us the mere husk of history, and Milner nothing but some separated particles of pure farina.” A collection of Dr. Joseph Milner’s works was published by his brother Isaac (Lond. 1810, 8 volumes, 8vo). See Isaac Milner, *Life of Joseph Milner*, prefixed to his “Sermons;” Perry, *Ecclesiastical History* (see Index in volume 4); *Bibliotheca Sacra*, January 1850, page 65; *North Brit. Rev.* November 1858, page 186; Bickersteth, *Christian Student*, page 320; *English Cyclop.* s.v.; Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliog.* 2:2771; Hook, *Eccles. Biog.* s.v.; Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, s.v.

Milnor, James, D.D.

a distinguished divine of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born at Philadelphia June 20, 1773. He studied for a while at the University of Pennsylvania, but about 1789 turned his attention to jurisprudence. His first settlement as a legal practitioner was at Norristown, but about 1797 he returned to Philadelphia, where he married. Until then he had lived, as he had been educated a Quaker; but as he had not been trained to any great strictness in the customs of the Friends, and as his wife belonged to an Episcopal family, it cost him little sacrifice to change his denomination. In consequence of his marriage, he had, moreover, been in due form “read out of meeting.” In 1805 Mr. Milnor was elected a member of the select council of Philadelphia for two years. In 1807 he was elected for three years to the same body; and in 1808 was raised to the presidency of the council for one year. In 1810 he was elected to the Congress of the United States, as a member of the House of Representatives, from the city and county of Philadelphia: his term there closed March 4, 1813. He was for a long time a man of the world, though in the better sense of that expression; but about the year 1800 he began to turn his attention to religion. At first he inclined to Universalism, but finally, in 1812, became a communicant in the Episcopal Church. Soon after the expiration of his term in Congress he removed to Norristown, where, while preparing himself to enter the ministry, he acted as lay-reader in St. John’s Church by permission of bishop White. He was ordained deacon in St. James’s Church, Philadelphia, August 14, 1814, and was admitted to the order of Presbyters in the same place August 27, 1815. On October 21 following he was unanimously elected by the vestry a minister of the United Churches in

Philadelphia. He finally received a call from St. George's Church, in New York, which he accepted after much hesitation, and was installed by bishop Hobart September 30, 1816. He was made D.D. by the University of Pennsylvania in 1819. In 1830 he was sent to the British and Foreign Bible Society as a delegate of the American Bible Society, and of various other religious and benevolent institutions. On his return he resumed his charge at St. George's, and continued there until his death, April 8, 1844. Dr. Milnor was distinguished for his dignity and wisdom, and especially for his benevolence and piety. He ardently labored for the advancement of the kingdom of Christ, and his life is full of incident and instruction, "alike attractive to the ardent youth, the man of business, the humble Christian, and the mature theologian." Dr. Milnor published an *Oration on Masonry* (Phila. 1811): a *Thanksgiving Sermon* (New York, 1817): *A Sermon on the Death of his Excellency De Witt Clinton* (New York, 1828): — *Two Sermons in: the National Preacher* (1836): — *A Charitable Judgment of the Opinions and Conduct of Others* (New York, 1845). See the Rev. John S. Stone, D.D. *Memoir of the Rev. James Milnor, D.D.* (New York, 1848, 12mo); *Prot. Epis. Qu. Rev. and Ch. Register*, April 1855, page 311; *N.Y. Ch. Rev.* 2:31; *New-Englander*, 7:122 sq.; *Princeton Rev.* 21:236; Sprague, *Annals of the Amer. Pulpit*, 5:562; *Meth. Qu. Rev.* July 1849, page 407; Drake, *Dict. of Amer. Biog.* s.v.

Milo Of Rheims

a noted character in the ecclesiastical history of the 8th century, flourished as archbishop of Rheims and Treves. In his early life he was decidedly irreligious; dedicated himself to a soldier's profession, and gained much notoriety as one of Charles Martel's warriors. When the Carlovingian was involved in a quarrel with St. Rigobert. the archbishop of Rheims, he ended the dispute by deposing Rigobert, and bestowed the primatical see upon Milo, who soon after succeeded in obtaining possession also of the equally important archiepiscopate of Treves. He is described as being a clerk in tonsure, but in every other respect an irreligious laic; yet when pope Boniface interfered and sought his removal, the holy father, with all the aid of his royal patrons, was unable to oust Milo from his inappropriate dignities; and in 752, ten years after the beginning of his reforms, we find pope Zachary, in response to an appeal for advice, counselling to leave Milo to the divine vengeance (*Epist.* 142). Nothing more is known of Milo's personal history. See Lea, *Hist. of Sacerdotal Celibacy*, page 132.

Milon (1)

a French monastic, was born about the beginning of the 9th century. In his youth he submitted to the monastic rules of the abbey of Saint Amand. Some critics have reckoned him among the abbots of that house, but this is an erroneous opinion. Milon was superintendent of the schools attached to Saint Amand, when Charles the Bald confided to him the education of his two sons, Pepin and Drogon. He died June 20, 872. A great number of the poems of Milon have been preserved. His *Vie de Saint Amand*, in heroic verse, is preserved in the collection of Bollandus of February 5th. It is to be regretted that we cannot find in this collection a supplement in prose to the *Vie de Saint Amand* by the monk Baudemond. Henschenius pretends, it is true, that this supplement is not the work of Milon; but the manuscripts, the epitaph of Milon, and the authority of Mabillon condemn the assertion of Henschenius. This supplement can be found in Surius of February 6th. Mabillon and Bollandus have, besides, published two sermons of Milon on Saint Amand, which are also found in the works of Philip, abbot of Bonne-Esperance. To the writings already mentioned we may add a *Homelie sur Saint Principe*, edited by Surius; a little poem, *Sur le Printemps et l'Hiver*, published by Casimir Oudin, in his *Supplémentun de Scriptoribus ecclesiasticis a Bellarmino omissis*; an epitaph on the princes Drogon and Pepin, in the collection of Bollandus, June 16th, ascribed to Milon by Mabillon; two pieces in hexameter verse, *Sur la Croix*, which are still unedited; also a poem, *Sur la Sobrieté*, published by Martene, *Anecd.* 1:44. See Trithemius, *De Script. eccles.* c. 283; Mabillon, *Annal.* 1:427; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, 5:409; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Milon (2)

a French prelate, was born about the beginning of the 11th century. He joined the Benedictine order in the monastery of Saint-Aubin, at Angers. Milon was sent to Rome by his abbot to pope Urban II, and was by him presented with the cardinal's hat, and made bishop of Palestine. He was finally ordered to return to France, and preach against simony. Milon assisted in 1095 at the Council of Clermont. After the death of Urban II, Milon was appointed by Pascal II papal legate. Milon died about the year 1112. Marbode wrote a eulogy upon him, which Mabillon has published in the fifth volume of his *Annales*. Martene has published, in his *Voyage Litteraire*, 2:244, some verses of a certain Milon which are believed to be

written by the chief bishop of Palestine. See *Hist. Litt. de la France*, 10:20; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Milon (3)

a French prelate, was born in the latter part of the 11th century. In his youth he lived in strict seclusion, but later embraced the rules of the canons of Prdmontre; in 1121 was made abbot of the monastery of Domp martin; and finally, in 1131, was elected and confirmed bishop of Terouanne. The first act of his episcopate appears to have been the consecration of Simon, abbot of Saint-Bertin. Milon was a strict disciplinarian. In 1148 he assisted in the Council of Rheims, at the trial of Gilbert de la Porree. In 1150 he was engaged in a debate with Thierry, count of Flanders. In 1157, delegated by the sovereign pontiff, he adjusted a dispute which arose between the bishop of Amiens and the abbot of Corbie. Baronius has praised the religious character and wisdom of Milon; others have greatly extolled his humility. Claude la Saussaye has given him a place in his martyrology; and Luc, abbot of Saint-Corneille, has dedicated to him his *Commentaires sur le Cantique des Cantiques*. Thus Milon, who lived in an age fruitful in illustrious prelates, was one of the glories of his province. No one has to this day made a rigorous distinction between his authentic writings and the more numerous works which appear to have been improperly attributed to him. He died July 16, 1158. See *Gallia Christ.* 10, col. 1347, 1546; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, 13:286; Hoefler, *Nouv. Biog.*

Milon (4)

a French prelate, was born in England, of French descent, about the latter part of the 11th century. Milon, bishop of Terouanne, having died in 1158, Milon was appointed his successor, having formerly been archdeacon of that church. A letter written to pope Alexander III, in favor of Thomas a Becket, has been attributed to him. A friend of John of Salisbury, bishop of Chartres has addressed two of his epistles to him. He died at Terouanne, September 14, 1169.. See *Gallia Christ.* 10, col. 1548; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, 13:287; Hoefler, *Vouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Milon (5)

a French ecclesiastic, was born about the beginning of the 12th century. He was sent by Innocent III to preach a crusade against the Albigenses. Subsequently he led the crusaders, marched under the walls of Beziers, and

besieged and burned that place, after having slaughtered the inhabitants. Milon is mentioned for the last time as being present at the council held at Avignon, September 6, 1209. In the collection of the letters of Innocent III published by Baluze are two letters from his legate. They also attribute to this fanatic a prayer to the Virgin, which has been inserted by P. Benoit in his *Histoire des Albigeois*, 1:279. See *Hist. Litt. de la France*, 17:26; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, s.v.

Milon, Johann Nicolaus

a German theologian, was born at Hamburg November 2, 1738; was educated at the Johanneum, and later at the gymnasium of his native city. In 1760 he entered the University of Göttingen, where he studied ancient languages and Church history. He returned in 1764 to Hamburg, and was appointed in 1765 professor of philosophy at Kiel; in 1769 he was appointed minister at Luneburg, and in 1770 at Wandsbeck, where he died, June 10, 1795. Some of his important works are, *Diss. de scribarum erroribus in textu Hebraico V.T. impresso* (Kilouii, 1764, 4to): — *Observationes criticae in aliquot Veteris Foederis loca* (ibid. 1765, 4to): — *Kritische Anmerkungen ber einige Stellen des Alten Testaments* (Kiel, 1768, 8vo): — *Etwas uber 1 Mos. xlix, 10 und ^{415B}Matthew 5:31, 32* (Hamburg, 1788, 8vo).

Miltiades

an early ecclesiastical writer, noted for his able defence of the orthodox Church against the Montanists, is supposed to have flourished towards the close of the 2d century. Eusebius and Jerome mention his writings, but there is now no trace of these supposed valuable productions. He is said to have lived under Marcus Aurelius (161-180), and under his son and successor Commodus (180-192). Miltiades was an able polemic, and waged war successfully, not only against the Montanists, but also combated Judaism and heathenism in its various phases. See Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* 5:17.

Miltiades

also called *Melchides* or *Melciades*, a bishop of Rome, was born about the middle of the 3d century. He early occupied as a priest a very conspicuous place by his arduous efforts to protect the rights and interests of the Roman Church against the many wrongs enacted by pope

Maxentius, and was, besides, prominent in the protection of Christians during the persecutions. He succeeded Eusebius on the pontifical throne in 310, and, in 313, was ordered by the emperor Constantine the Great, who was opposed to the Donatists, to bring the Donatist difficulties to a close. In council with twenty Gallican and Italian bishops, he reinstated Csecilian as bishop of Carthage. For his zeal and exertion in trying to bring back the Donatists into the union of the Church he was slandered, but Augustine (*Epiist.* 162) speaks of him as “vir optimus, filius Christianae pacis et pater Christianoa plebis.” The Manichaeans also, who worked secretly at Rome, found in him a watchful guardian against their doctrines. He was the first pope to live in a royal palace, which was presented to him by the emperor Constantine the Great with other rich endowments. Miltiades issued two well-known edicts the one interdicting fasting on Sundays and Thursdays, because the heathens celebrated these days “quasi sacrum jejunium;” and he also enacted, “Ut oblationes consecrate per ecclesias ex consecratu episcopi dirigerentur, quod declaratur fermentum.” The true meaning of the latter edict has often been a matter of dispute. Miltiades died in 314: it is erroneously reported of him that he died a martyr. St. Bernard, who, described the life of this pope, makes no mention of the manner of his death. His remains were interred in the Calixtine Chapel, but by pope Paul I they were removed “in capite” to the Church of St. Sylvester. See Bower, *Hist. of the Popes* (see Index in volume 7); D’Artaud, *Life and Times of the Roman Pontiffs* (N.Y. 1865, 2 volumes, roy. 8vo), 1:67; Herzog, *Real-Encyklope.* 9:300; Wetzer.u.Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, volume 6, s.v.

Miltitz, Karl Von

a Roman ecclesiastic, celebrated as the papal chamberlain and legate to the Reformers, was the son of a Saxon nobleman, and was born about 1490. He flourished first as canon at Mayence, Treves, and Missonia. In 1515 he removed to Rome and became papal notary. In 1518, when cardinal Cajetan had so signally failed in bringing “little brother Martin” to submission, Leo X became aware of the greatness of the schism likely to occur in the German Church. The strife against the Latin system had assumed gigantic proportions. Around Luther were now gathered the great, and the strong, and the learned of the Teutonic race. Frederick, the electoral prince of Saxony, was Luther’s staunch friend and protector, and Leo X, knowing the influence and power of this prince, felt loth to incur his ill-will by harsh measures against Luther. Miltitz was therefore despatched to the electoral court with a valuable present — the

consecrated golden rose. This was to give the electoral prince assurance of the good intentions of pope Leo towards Saxony, and of his special friendship for Frederick; at the same time he was instructed to conciliate Luther, and, if possible, to make an end of the whole Lutheran controversy. In December, 1518, Miltitz arrived in Saxony, but, being careful to find out first how matters stood, he did not take the consecrated rose with him on his first call. This was a mistake on Miltitz's part, for, when the rose afterwards arrived, the prince acted very coolly, and, instead of accepting the present in person, commissioned three of his noblemen to receive the pope's gift, and Luther aptly remarked that "its odor had been lost on the long journey" (see *Luther's Briefe*, edited by De Wette, 1:108, 109). Miltitz's special instructions were to *conciliate* Luther, and we must acknowledge that he acted with much policy and skill. He carefully abstained from visiting cardinal Cajetan, who, by his imperious and arrogant treatment of Luther, had lost all influence with the electoral prince. When among friends, or even while staying in public houses, he did not hesitate to denounce the indulgence traffic, and assured his hearers that the — shameful trade was carried on without the pope's consent. It was therefore perfectly natural that the electoral prince and Luther should have put confidence in Miltitz, and that his mission of conciliation seemed in a fair way to succeed (comp. however, Fisher, *Ref.* page 97, note 2). On January 3, 1519, Miltitz had a conference with Luther at Altenburg. The papal legate received the Reformer kindly, embraced and kissed him, and then addressed him as follows: "Dear brother Maftin, how much I have been mistaken! I always imagined you an old doctor, sitting behind the stove, and full of whims and chimerical notions. But now I see that you are in the very height of manly strength. Not with five thousand armed men would I dare to take you to Rome. All my investigations have shown me that, wherever one person is for the pope, three are against him and for you." He then in the kindest manner remonstrated against Luther's violence, showing him how much harm the Church had to suffer in consequence. He failed, however, to procure any recantation, and succeeded simply in obtaining from Luther an expression of submissiveness. Silence was imposed on him, as well as on his opponents, and it was agreed to transfer the whole matter to the judgment of the archbishop of Treves. In consequence of this agreement, Luther wrote to the pope a letter full of courtesy and humility, and went even so far as to declare publicly "that separation from a Church for which St. Paul and St. Peter, and one hundred thousand martyrs, had shed their blood, was not

permissible, and that on no account must we resist her teachings and commands” (see Walch, 15:812). This attitude of the great Reformer has often been stigmatized by the Romanists as an act of hypocrisy and simulation (see Wetzer u. Weite, *Kirchen-Lex.* 7:148 Pallavicini, *Gesch. d. Conc. v. Trient*); but Luther’s design, it must be borne in mind, was not to array himself against the Church, but to vindicate her against what he believed to be an abuse of her sacred name. Luther’s movements were so completely churchly that even archbishop Manning (*Unity of the Church*, page 328 sq.) is obliged to acknowledge it. At this critical moment (February 1519) Dr. Eck, one of Luther’s most prominent opponents, who in 1518 had challenged Carlstadt to a public disputation, published an outline of his *Theses*, which clearly proved to Luther that the main object of his attack was not Carlstadt, but himself. Luther considered this a breach of the agreement which he had concluded with Miltitz, and, as his adversaries did not hold themselves bound thereby, he, of course, felt relieved from his promise, and he so declared to the elector Frederick on the 13th of March. Luther’s position at these disputations widened the breach with Rome, **SEE LUTHER**; and the reformatory writings, *To the Christian Nobles of the German Nation, of the Bettering of the Christian State* (August 1520), and *Of the Babylonish Captivity of the Church* (October 1520), tended to fix the fact that reconciliation with the Church of Rome was no longer possible. Yet Miltitz would not despair of it. October 12, 1520, he had another conference with Luther at Lichtenberg, and then and there Luther expressed himself willing once more to test the question. It was too late, however, for in September 1520. Eck had appeared in Germany with the papal bull, condemning as heresies forty-one propositions extracted from Luther’s writings, and summoning him, on pain of excommunication, to retract his errors within sixty days. This ended Miltitz’s mission as far as Luther was concerned. But as Miltitz’s instructions extended not only against Luther, but also against Tetzel, whose behavior in the traffic in indulgences had been marked with peculiar impudence and indecency, he now repaired to Leipsic (December 1519), sent for Tetzel, and subjected him to a most searching examination, which is given in a letter written by Miltitz to Pfeffinger (see Lescher, *Reformationsacten*, 3:20 [Leipsic, 1729]): “I know enough of Tetzel’s scandalous and lying life and actions. I convicted him of his crimes by well-attested testimony. I showed him the receipts of Fugger’s commissioners, which proved beyond doubt that he received one hundred and thirty florins per month for his trouble, besides all expenses paid; a carriage with three

horses, and ten florins per month extra for his servant. Thus did Tetzal, who, moreover, has two illegitimate children in the employ of the Church. No one can estimate how much he may have stolen. I shall report all these things to Rome, and expect a papal judgment." Tetzal, in consequence of his fear and anxiety, was taken dangerously sick, and died soon after. All efforts of reconciliation having failed, Miltitz returned to Rome, but, after a short stay; he returned to Germany, and died there in 1529 — some say while on his homeward journey. See Seidemann, *Carl v. Miltitz* (Dresden, 1844, 8vo); id. *Die Leipziger Disputation im Jahre 1519* (Dresden, 1843, 8vo); *Luther's Briefe* (edited by De Wette), 1:108, 109, and 115; Ranke, *Hist. of the Reformation*, 1:386 sq.; Hagenbach, *Kirchengesch.* 3:83 sq.; Krauth, *Conservat. Reformation*; Fisher, *Hist. of the Reformation*, page 97; Waddington, *Hist. of the Reformation*, volume 1, chapter 3; Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.* volume 4; Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie*, 8:326, 577; 3:629; 15:579.

Milton, John

Picture for Milton

among the brightest glories of the rich and varied literature of England, one of the four master-singers of the English Helicon, has taken rank with Homer and Virgil and Dante. Dryden's eulogy was well-merited, though too epigrammatic. In splendor of conception and in majesty of language, he is without a peer. Gray recognizes in him no inferiority to Shakespeare. John Wilson, a graceful poet himself and an appreciative critic, concludes that England had produced but one perfect poem, and that that poem Milton's *Paradise Lost*. Poetry, however, was not the exclusive occupation of Milton's life. He was also a laborious and prolific writer of prose, and was long-engaged in religious polemics and political controversy His wreath of immortality was woven of poetic flowers but his distinction in his own day was more largely due to his writings as a publicist and theological disputant Milton is even more remarkable in the phases and circumstances of his life than in the brilliancy of his genius. His mature years coincided with that turbulent period when civil dudgeon first grew high, and passed into the turmoil and strife which constitute at once the shame and the glory of English history. The evening glories of the Elizabethan age lingered along the horizon at the commencement of his career; the serener but fainter radiance of the aera of queen Anne was prognosticated before his death. In the wide interval, one name of eminent renown in literature

stretches its single and unbroken line of light across the darkened heavens. That name is the name of John Milton. His birth was amid the glories that had ennobled the reign of the maiden queen; he gathered strength for the stern and shifting duties of life throughout the reign of James; he illustrated the early rule of Charles I by strains that seemed echoes from the fairy land behind he dignified the times of civil warfare and theological contention by prose compositions which occasionally united the grand cathedral harmonies of Hooker with the yet unanticipated magnificence of Burke. In poverty and depression, and blindness and age, he sought consolation from his music on that sacred harp, whose melting and piercing melodies no hand could ever awaken but his own. In character, and in the vicissitudes of his career, he was the true representative of the struggle which fills the seventeenth century. He bridges over the vast abyss between Shakespeare and Dryden, and marks the changing phases of the revolution in Church and State. Hence the consideration of his works can scarcely be severed from the notice of his life, which divides itself into four sharply-defined and well-contrasted periods.

I. *Period 1608-1629.* — Infancy, and education till he attains his majority, from the fifth year of James I to the fifth year of Charles I.

II. *Period 1629-1639.* — Completion of education at the university, in retirement and by foreign travel. From his majority to his return from the Continent.

III. *Period 1639-1660.* — Participation in the turmoil of the times. Active and public life.

IV. *Period 1660-1674.* — Milton's age, and blindness and seclusion. Production of his great poems.

Milton's Life and Works.

I. *Period 1608-1629.* — John Milton, the illustrious son of obscure but reputable parents, was born at the sign of "the Spread Eagle," in Bread Street, in the parish of All-hallows, London, on the 9th of December, 1608. His father, of the same name, was a scrivener, who had been disinherited by his Roman Catholic parents for adopting the Protestant faith. His exertions in pursuit of a livelihood had secured comfort, if not wealth, and had not repressed his tastes for literature and art. Thus may be explained the conjunction of Puritan principles, of romantic fancies, of chivalrous

sentiments, of literary and artistic sensibilities, so strangely, and not always congruously, exhibited in the poetry of his son.

That son received the tenderest care and the most sedulous instruction from his hopeful and appreciative sire. He was of frail constitution, and was, in consequence, educated at first at home. From his instructor — the eminent scholar and zealous Puritan, Thomas Young — he imbibed his taste for poetry, as he gratefully acknowledged. At the age of thirteen he was sent to St. Paul's School, London, and after two years was transferred to Christ Church, Cambridge, where he remained, with some interruptions, over eight years. He carried with him to college great proficiency in the classic tongues, and had added to them an acquaintance with Hebrew, French, and Italian, and some skill in music and fencing. These liberal pursuits he continued to prosecute at the university with unusual diligence and with admirable results. Indications of his progress are supplied by his Latin and English poems, by notices in his polemical writings, and by his college exercises, which Mr. Masson has reclaimed from oblivion. From these sources we learn that he was exceedingly handsome, though of slight frame and moderate stature, and was skilled in all manly exercises. He is said to have been called "the lady of his college," not less for the purity of his character than for his delicate beauty.

Along with his extensive acquirements, Milton bore with him to Cambridge the germs of all his future tastes, the beginnings of all his future accomplishments. In his boyhood he had been "smit with the love of sacred song." Aubrey states that he was a poet at ten years of age. The love of the Muse grew strong with his growth. His devotion to his native tongue was early displayed. He soon aspired to the production of a poem which "future ages would not willingly let die." He was already consecrating himself to his high vocation, and disciplining his young genius with patient diligence. In this calm and industrious tenor of life, Milton ripened to his majority.

II. *Period 1629-1639.* — On the 8th of December, 1629, Milton was twenty-one years of age. On the Christmasday ensuing he produced that magnificent choral song, *The Ode on the Nativity*. Admirable and exquisite as it is in itself, it is amazing as the composition of a young man who had just assumed the *toga virilis*, and was in the midst of his college career. Its remarkable merit may be best appreciated by comparing it with the nearly contemporaneous poems of George Herbert, Ben Jonson, and Vaughan on the same subject. The ode is equally remarkable for its startling indication

at so early a period of the characteristics of his grandest works. The lyric movement of thought and expression, the intricate melody and skill of the metre, the strength and propriety of the epithets, the concentration and point of the language, the harmonies of sound, the dexterous accumulation of suggested names, the solemnity and reverential awe of the whole utterance, are anticipations of his final glories. Grand as is this choral hymn, Milton felt that his powers of song were not sufficiently matured to sustain the yet vague splendor of his conceptions. The *Ode on the Passion* — the companion-piece to the *Ode on the Nativity* — was never completed. “This subject the author finding to be above the years he had when he wrote it, and nothing satisfied with what was begun, left it unfinished.” These two odes are the first outlines of the *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained*. The self-censure, patience, diligence, and humility of Milton are as notable as his lordly tone and conscious power. Three years later, just before leaving Cambridge, he laments that “my late spring no bud nor blossom shew’th;” but adds,

***“It shall be still in strictest measure even
To that same lot, however mean or high
To which Time leads me, and the will of Heaven.”***

Milton was designed for the Church, and had been trained in all secular and theological learning for that holy office. The depression of the Puritans under the stern domination of Laud closed the prospect to the young candidate. He waited long and patiently, in doubt and hope; but in 1632 withdrew from Cambridge, having taken both his degrees. He left the university with credit and honor, and retired to the grateful seclusion of his father’s villa at Horton — not far from Eton and Windsor. Here he remained for five years, spending the sunny summer-time of his life in multifarious study. He plunged into the mysteries of Hebrew lore, familiarized himself with the best lessons of history and carefully perused the whole series of the Greek and Latin authors, from Homer to Ducas and Phranza.

It was during the earlier half of his residence at Horton that Milton produced his *L’Allegro* and *II Penseroso*, and his two masques, the *Arcades* and *Comus*. These poems were not composed for the noisy public, but as relaxations from study, which embodied the shifting lights and shadows of his life at Horton. They are photographs of the scenery that surrounded his retreat, lighted up by the bright glow of his changing moods. They reveal also the character and ingredients of the ambrosia on

which his mind had feasted from boyhood, and betray the flowers from which the honey was distilled. The subjects, the contrasts, the metre, and many of the thoughts, phrases, and rhymes, are imitated from the poetical “Abstract of Melancholy” prefixed by Burton to his quaint *Anatomy of Melancholy*. Other obligations are due to the exquisite “Song on Melancholy” in Beaumont and Fletcher’s *Nice Valar*. The same royal seizure, which ennobles what it appropriates, and which is declared by Longinus to be no theft, signalizes all of Milton’s compositions. It is his manner. It is his genius. He claims the spoils of learning as his own. He made the triumphs of others the stepping-stones of his fame. To the year 1634 we probably owe the *Arcades*; to it we certainly owe the more splendid *Comus*. Both were written under circumstances which are curiously illustrative of the social, political, and theological condition of the times, and of the great controversy in respect to dramatic performances. The *Arcades* is a much slenderer performance than the *Comus*, but possesses the same general characteristics: purity, grace, fancy, melody, learning, and gorgeous expression. The *Comus* is an almost perfect gem. It is as distinctly unique in its charms as Shakespeare’s *Midsummer Night’s Dream*. Its authorship was not avowed. It was published by Henry Lawes, in 1637, to escape the constant importunities for copies of the manuscript. In this year the plague raged with great violence, and many notable deaths occurred. On the 3d of April Milton’s mother died; on the 6th of August Ben Jonson expired; on the 10th Edward King, of Christ Church, was lost at sea on his way to Ireland.

The death of Mrs. Milton broke up the family retreat at Horton, and Milton made preparations for foreign travel. He was meditating a great poem — an epic on the Round Table, or on the story of the Trojan Brutus. “Do you ask what I am meditating?” says he, in a letter to Deodati. “By the help of Heaven, an immortality of fame! But what am I doing? I am letting my wings grow, and preparing to fly, but my Pegasus has not yet feathers enough to soar aloft in the fields of air.”

One more poem — the last song of his young and fresh life—preceded his going abroad. The admirers of “Rare Ben” honored his memory by a volume of *epicedia*, or funeral eulogies, entitled *Jonson Virbius*. The scholars of Cambridge proposed a similar tribute to the ghost of Edward King. To this collection Milton contributed that finest of elegies, the *Lycidas*. It is the echo of the pastoral music of the ancient Greeks, and

recalls the plaintive strains of Bion, while adopting the metrical forms of the Italian *canzoni*.

Not long after this Milton set out on his Continental tour. Northern Europe was closed against him by the Thirty-Years' War, which was ravaging the whole of Germany. France was writhing beneath the tyranny of Richelieu, who was consolidating the monarchy at home, and strangling the supremacy of the House of Austria abroad. Milton crossed over to Paris, where he formed the acquaintance of Grotius; proceeded to Lyons, and, descending the Rhone, reached Marseilles. Thence he followed the *littorale* to Nice. From Nice he went to Genoa, and to Florence, in which city, the centre of Italian culture, he was welcomed with the highest distinction, and was elected a member of the Florentine academies. While at Florence he visited "the starry Galileo," now seventy-five years of age, at his pleasant villa of Arcetri, in the neighborhood. Continuing his journey he *reached Rome*, spending two months there "in viewing the antiquities," and listening to Leonora Baroni, the Jenny Lind of those days — who seems to have touched his heart, and to whom he addressed three Latin epigrams. He next proceeded to Naples, where he was hospitably entertained by Manso, marquis di Villa, the friend of Tasso. Everywhere he was received with honor, admiration, and the interchange of complimentary verses.

Milton had proposed to extend his travels to Sicily and Greece, but was not permitted to anticipate lord Byron in a poetic pilgrimage to the land of Helicon and Parnassus, and of the Vale of Tempe. He was recalled from Naples by the political agitations at home, and the dull murmurs of approaching civil war. On his homeward journey he was met by intelligence of the death of his friend, Charles Deodati, whereupon he wrote the *Epitaphium Damonii* — the Latin counterpart of the *Lycidas*. From this it is evident that he was still revolving an epic on the *Brut d'Angleterre* or the *Morte d'Arthur*. But he deserted the fountains of Hippocrene, and for twenty-one years devoted himself to polemics, politics, and prose.

III. *Period 1649-1660. — Milton as a Polemic, Theologian, Politician, and Prose-write.* — On his return to England, Milton undertook the education of his two nephews, John and Edward Phillips, He was induced to receive other boys also, and accordingly took a large house in Aldersgate Street, and opened a school. Out of his academical employments sprung his *Tractate on Education*, his *Accidence commenced*

Grammar, and his posthumous work *On Christian Doctrine*, which lay unknown till 1825. (It was edited by the present incumbent of the episcopal chair of Winchester [bishop Sumer]; a translation has also been published.) The first expounded his views on education, which resembled those of Roger Ascham and of John Lyly. The second was a practical exemplification of his method for the use of his school. The third was an expansion and systematization of the religious instructions given by him to his pupils. It has a much higher significance. It presents Milton's peculiar and utterly heterodox theology which is thoroughly Arian, and in a great measure materialistic. It was the theological preparation for the *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained*, and is their best commentary. Indeed, it is impossible to understand the esoteric meaning of those great poems, to estimate their spirit, or to appreciate many of their details, without the continuous illustration afforded by this long-lost treatise in prose. "His active imagination and impetuous spirit," it has been well said, "mingle too strongly with his theology, and in several particulars corrupt it; but though, like Locke, he sometimes mistakes the sense of Scripture, no man had a higher opinion of its supreme authority, or held more firmly its most vital truths. His name cannot be classed with modern Unitarians."

In 1641 Milton reappeared as a writer before the public with his first prose work, *Of Reformation in England*, "to prove that the Church of England still stood in need of reformation." He continued the subject in four other works, replying to bishop Hall and archbishop Usher in a short essay, *Of Prelatical Episcopacy*, and in a more elaborate response, entitled *The Reason of Church Government urged against Prelaty*. It is in this latter work that Milton commences the remarkable series of autobiographical sketches whence so much of our information in regard to his tastes, studies, habits, sentiments, principles, and occupations is gathered. Bishop Hall and archbishop Usher had aroused other assailants. Chief among such attacks in that pamphleteering day was a pamphlet designated *Smnecymnuus*, from the initials of its five authors — Stephen Marshal, Edmund Calamy, Thomas Young, Matthew Newcomen, and William Spurston. To this attack bishop Hall replied in a *Defence of the Remonstrance*. Milton, who had assailed the original Remonstrance, and was the grateful pupil of Thomas Young, now brought out *Animadversions on the Remonstrants' Defence*. A rejoinder from bishop Hall's son followed, to which Milton responded in 1642 by his celebrated *Apology for Smectymnuus*. These productions thus all hang together. Their

object and interdependence are pointed out in the author's *Second Defence for the People of England*. In 1643, during the brief superiority of the Cavaliers, Milton, now in his thirty-fifth year, hastily married Mary Powell, a gay, thoughtless, pretty girl of seventeen "the daughter of Richard Powell, Esq., of Forrest Hill, near Shotover, Oxfordshire, an active royalist." The match was a singular and ill-assorted union. It was unhappy. It could scarcely have been otherwise. The fair malignant, in her young beauty, could not endure the gloomy yoke of her sedate Puritan husband. After the honeymoon was over, she visited her father, and remained all summer, heedless of the entreaties, remonstrances, and commands of her grim lord. He turned to his books, and to the examination of nice points of theological ethics. He studied the nature and obligations of marriage, and soon arrived at the foregone conclusion to divorce his recalcitrant bride. The result of his eager inquiries was *The Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce, restored to the Good of both Sexes* — published anonymously in 1644. Another fruit of his studies and experiences was his undisguised contempt for women. Before concluding his inquiries, he proceeded to the practice of his theory by paying his addresses to another fascinating young lady. Mrs. Milton, after a year's absence, sought a reconciliation entreated forgiveness on her knees, was pardoned, and returned to her repellent, home. She died in 1653, leaving three daughters, the only children of the poet, who grew up without culture or companionship. The husband, who took back the wife, did not put away his scandalous doctrine, which was earnestly denounced. He enforced it in three other works: *The Judgment of Martin Bucer concerning Divorce; Tetrachordon*; a consideration of his four chief texts of Scripture on the subject; and *Colasterion*, a bitter castigation of an illiterate and anonymous opponent. The *Colasterion* is Milton's solitary attempt at humor — and very questionable humor it is, except as ill-humor. In the same year with *The Doctrine of Divorce* appeared the *Tractate on Education*, addressed to "Master Samuel Hartlib," and the noble *Areopagitica, or Speech for the Liberty of unlicensed Printing*. The *Areopagitica* is the finest of Milton's prose compositions in subject, treatment, spirit, and expression. It is the earliest of the grand English arguments for the liberty of the press. Written with the forms of Greek oratory, and in imitation of the orations of Isocrates, its stiff, stately, and sonorous periods roll on with involved Hellenistic phrase, but are distinguished by fervor of feeling, breadth and truth of conception, and radiant utterance. Leckey (*Rationalism in Europe*, 2:80) says, "The

Paradise Lost is, indeed, scarcely a more glorious monument of the genius of Milton than the *Areopagitica*.”

Milton’s prose style is not in general either good or attractive. It is not merely intricate and cumbrous, but it is prolix, vagabond, and wearisome.. Its high reputation has been derived from the *Areopagitica*, and from rare bursts of rhetorical brilliancy in other writings. Only a small part of the prose works merits the eulogies bestowed upon the glorious “purple patches;” and even these are more worthy of admiration than of unrestricted praise.

On March 15, 1649 — six weeks after the execution of Charles I — Milton was appointed secretary for foreign tongues to the Council of State. He had probably gained the favor of the Republican authorities by his *Tenure of Kings* and *Observations on the Articles of Peace* in Ireland. He held the position till a short time before the Restoration; but the salary was reduced by nearly one half after 1655; and after 1652, when he became blind, the duties were discharged, first, by Philip Meadows, and afterwards by Andrew Marvell. The appointment called him away from his preparations for his Arthurian epic, which was published towards the close of his life as a *Historie of Britanie*.

His first task under his political taskmasters was *Eikonoclastes*, in answer to the *Icon Basilike* the political testament ascribed to Charles I, and bequeathed by him on the scaffold to his people. Milton’s reply is bold, defiant; breathing all the exhilarating airs of sanguine freedom, but coarse, vituperative, passionate, and ungenerous. It was a suitable prelude for the Latin “Apologies for the People of England” (*Defensio pro Populo Anglicano, Prima et Secunda*), composed in 1651 and 1654 as a refutation of the celebrated scholar Salmasius. In his various “Letters of State” — extending from August 10, 1649, to May 15, 1659 — including the “Manifesto of the Lord Protector” in 1655, there are many lofty sentiments and sounding periods; but it would be scarcely fair to transfer to the secretary the praise for sagacious or audacious policy, which may belong exclusively to the Republican councillors, or to the great Republican sovereign. Cromwell was not a man to borrow his policy from a subordinate, and from a subordinate awed into unscrupulous homage by his resolute character.

In the composition of the *Defence for the People of England* Milton’s sight gave way. As early as 1644 it had been seriously impaired by much

study, frequent vigils, and constant writing. He became totally blind in 1652. He was warned by his physicians to abstain from literary labor. He refused to spare his eyes by the renunciation of what he conceived to be a high patriotic duty. He studied and wrote for his party and country till "the drop serene" totally darkened his vision. The assertion of his lofty resolve is imbedded in his *Second Defence for the People of England*, and a touching account of the advancing stages of his blindness is given in a letter to a Greek friend, which is much less known than his pathetic allusions to his great privation in the *Paradise Lost*, the *Samson Agonistes*, and two of his sonnets.

Shut out from the light of day, cut off from the direct pursuit of his official duties, denied personal communion with his books, the companions of his solitary hours, Milton's thoughts were turned inwards, employed on poetic visions, and fed with the treasures of his vast memory. During the long years of darkness and enforced leisure, he gradually conceived and moulded and commenced his *Paradise Lost*. When Cromwell died, confusion and anarchy returned, and the hope or fear of the restoration of the Stuart line occupied the public expectation. The blind seer then resumed his political labors, endeavored to preserve or to improve the recent order in the Church, and to uphold the late scheme of government, in several small publications. His ideas of religious and civil freedom tolerated only views consonant in spirit With his own; and would have sought to perpetuate English freedom and republicanism by rendering the remnant of the Long Parliament a close, permanent, and self-renewing oligarchy.' His urgent clamors awoke no echo. His voice was too faint, too wild, too foreign to the necessities of the country and the time, and to the wisdom of sober statesmanship, to meet with any acceptance. Fairfax and Monk insured Charles II's return to his ancestral throne. Milton's political life was ended. All his hopes, all his dreams; all his cherished plans, were turned to dust and ashes. Poor, forlorn, outlawed, helpless, but not wholly dejected, he entered an the last period of his life in difficulty and danger and distress.

IV. *Period* 1660-1674. — The closing years of Milton's life offer little biographical detail. He was blind, in want, helpless; shunning the world, and shunned by it. Vane and other leaders of the lately dominant faction perished on the scaffold; others were outlawed or exiled. Milton was threatened with the like fate in consequence of his prompt and virulent denunciation of his slaughtered monarch. He was spared, tradition says,

through the intercession of Sir William Davenant. He was compelled to remain in hiding. His second wife, nee Woodcock, had died in 1659, within a year of her marriage. He took a third in 1665, Elizabeth Marshal, daughter of Sir Edward Marshal, of Cheshire. She must have been a young bride, as she survived her husband more than fifty years. Of his second and third wives, of his daughters in their young womanhood, of his domestic life, of his intercourse with his still remaining friends, scarcely anything is heard at this period. Andrew Marvell and a few other intimates still consoled his loneliness and obscurity with their fervent attachment. Dryden, in the flush of his young and garish reputation, did reverence to him; but the desolate poet disappears from public gaze, and communes with his thoughts, his memories, and his God. "Forgetting the world, and of the world forgot," he worked out his immortal fame. Content with "audience fit, though few," he created those wondrous poems, which were the sublimated essence of his life and learning and labors-his own undying glory, and the pride of the English tongue.

When Milton retired from the plague in London, in 1665, to the house which Elwood, the Quaker, had presented to him, at Chalfont, in Buckinghamshire, he exhibited to his friends the MS. of *Paradise Lost*. It may have been unfinished. It was sold, April 27, 1667, to Samuel Simmons, of London, for £5 down, and £5 on each of three future contingencies. Only two payments were made, whence it is inferred that less than 2800 copies were disposed of in the seven years preceding his death. This poem was the crowning labor of the poet's life. It had engaged his thoughts as early as 1654, and had occupied his solitary meditations during the ensuing years. It had been completed amid the boisterous license, and obscene dissonance, and reckless debauchery of the Restoration. He had poured into it all the wealth of learning and reflection and observation, and experience gathered in a studious, thoughtful, and full life crystallizing into radiant gems the rich materials he employed. Like his own Pandemonium,

*“Out of the earth a fabric huge
Rose like an exhalation, with the sound
Of dulcet symphonies, and voices sweet.”*

From his college days he had contemplated the production of a great poem. In penury and wretchedness and scorn he achieved his ideal, after the lapse of a whole stormy generation. The currents of his life changed the course of his fancies. He renounced the charms of old romance to sing the songs of heaven, and “tell of things invisible to mortal sight.”

Milton selected for his subject the fall of man — a subject of universal interest — of special interest to all believers in the redemption — of more peculiar interest to the religious enthusiasts and reformers of the 17th century; and pre-eminently attractive to Milton from his peculiar idiosyncrasies. It was no new theme. In whole or in part it had been treated by Avitus in the 5th century; by Caedmon in the 6th; by Proba Falconia in the 10th; by Fra Giacomo, of Verona, in the 12th; by the mediaeval writers of miracle plays between the 11th and 16th; by Andreini in the 17th, and by other writers. To most of these predecessors Milton was indebted, without sacrificing his own essential originality, which stamps every page with the seal of his own majesty. He hesitated long before settling the form of the poem. His genius was distinctly lyrical, but the *Ode on the Nativity* had exhausted the compass of the lyric strain, and demonstrated its insufficiency. He tried a dramatic cast, and commenced the play with Satan's invocation to the sun in the fourth book. His own temperament, the personages, the scene, the action, the incidents, were all unsuited to the drama. He finally adopted the epic mould, without creating a true epic, for the lyric spirit and strong predominance of his own personality still remain. If Satan is his hero, Satan is a glorified though fallen image of Milton himself. The poem is singular, alone, unapproached, a work *sui generis*. As Wordsworth said of the poet's soul, the poem

*“Was like a star, and dwelt apart,
It had a voice whose sound was like the sea,
Pure as the naked heavens, majestic, free.”*

There is neither need nor room here for any criticism of this noble masterpiece. It is nearly perfect in subject, plan, impersonations, sentiments, moral aim, language, decoration, episodes, and rhythm. It is unequalled in grandeur, sublimity, verisimilitude of invention, and pathos. The blemishes indicated by Addison and other censors are less failures of the poet than weaknesses of the theologian, as may be seen from his treatise *De Doctrina Christiana*. Even the blank verse, which was adopted by him on an erroneous theory, and would have failed utterly in feebler hands, becomes with him “the Dorian mood of flutes and soft recorders.” All the lavish rhetoric of praise of Macaulay, in the sparkling essay which his matured judgment disapproved throughout, may be bestowed on the *Paradise Lost*.

Four years after the completion of this signal work, Milton brought forth his *Paradise Regained* and *Samson Agonistes*. The former was preferred

by the poet to its greater predecessor, was its natural counterpart, and probably was designed in its opening lines. The author's partiality for this smaller work doubtless rested on theological caprices; but, as a work of art, it has striking excellences of its own. It is more quiet, more smooth, more uniform, and more symmetrical. Its radiance has a gentler glow than the fierce splendor of the more imposing poem. Its habitual depreciation may be due to the same cause which secured the parental preference — the mistake in determining the supreme moment of the Savior's life, as the subject of the tale. The temptation was more significant to Milton than the crucifixion. By the temptation Christ's divinity was earned; it was scarcely attested by the crucifixion, according to his views. The *Sanson Agonistes* is Greek in form and expression; Hebrew in conception and spirit; English and personal in aim. It is a martyr's death-song the agonizing wail of Milton's crushed, mangled, writhing, but triumphant soul; expostulating, like Job, with the Almighty and the Omniscient, who

“Now hath cast me off as never known.
 And to those cruel enemies,
 Whom I by his appointment had provoked,
 Left me, with the irreparable loss
 Of sight, reserved alive to be repeated
 The subject of their cruelty and scorn.
 Nor am I in the list of them that hope;
 Hopeless are all my evils, all remediless;
 This one prayer yet remains, might I be heard,
 No long petition: speedy death,
 The close of all my miseries, and the balm.”

The death invoked came soon. He sank rapidly under attacks of gout, which became both more frequent and more violent; yet in his paroxysms “he would be very cheerful, and sing.” He expired placidly in his own house on Sunday, November 8, 1674, and the seer of things celestial was buried near his father, who had so sanguinely cherished his young genius. It would be presumptuous to close this concise notice of John Milton with any summary estimate of ours upon his character and genius. He may be admired by all he can be judged only by his peers. “It may be doubted,” says Walter S. Landor, “whether the Creator ever created one altogether so great as Milton taking into one view at once his manly virtues, his superhuman genius, his zeal for truth, for true piety, true freedom, his eloquence in displaying it, his contempt of personal power, his glory and exultation in his country's.” “Milton,” says Macaulay, “did not strictly

belong to any of the classes which we have described. He was not a Puritan. He was not a Freethinker. He was not a Cavalier. In his character the noblest qualities of every party were combined in harmonious union... We are not much in the habit of idolizing either the living or the dead; but there are a few characters which have stood the closest scrutiny and the severest tests, which have been tried in the furnace and have proved pure, which have been declared sterling by the general consent of mankind, and which are visibly stamped with the image and superscription of the Most High. These great men we trust we know how to prize; and of these was Milton.... His thoughts are powerful not only to delight, but to elevate and purify. Nor do we envy the man who can study either the life or the writings of the great poet and patriot without aspiring to emulate, not indeed the sublime works with which his genius has enriched our literature, but the zeal with which he labored for the public good, the fortitude with which he endured every private calamity, the lofty disdain with which he looked down on temptation and dangers, the deadly hatred which he bore to bigots and tyrants, and the faith which he so sternly kept with his country and with his fame" (*Essay on Milton*).

Literature. — Miltonic bibliography is so extensive that it would be ridiculous to enumerate even the most important works. A general reference to Allibone, *Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors*, will answer a better purpose than any copious list presented here. It may then suffice to mention a few authorities of special interest for the assistance they afford for the appreciation of the poet and his labors. Masson, *Life and Times of Milton, narrated in connection with the Political, Ecclesiastical, and Literary History of his Time* (Lond. 3 volumes, 8vo; 1859 sq.; still unfinished); Keightley, *Account of the Life, Opinions, and Writings of John Milton* (Lond. 1855, 8vo); Brydges, *The Poetical Works of John Milton* (Lond. 1835, 6 volumes, 12mo); St. John, *The Prose Work of John Milton* (Lond. 5 volumes, 12mo); Prendergast, *A Complete Concordance to the Poetical Works of John Milton* (Madras, 1857-59); Hamilton, *Origin of Papers illustrative of the Life of John Milton* (Camden Society); Dunster, *Considerations on Milton's Early Reading, and on the Prima Stannia of the Paradise Lost* (Lond. 1800); Coleridge, *Lectures on Shakespeare and Milton* (Lond. 1857); Channing, *Remarks on the Character and Genius of Milton*; De Quincey, *Milton*, in *Theological Essay*; Skeats, *Hist. of the Free Churches of England*, page 61; Perry, *Ch. Hist.* vol. ii; Tulloch, *Puritan Leaders*, ch. v; Hunter, *Religious Thought in*

England (see Index, volume 3); Hallam, *Hist. of Lit.* (Harper's edition). 2:375 sq.; Hume, *Hist. of England*, chapter 62; Kitto, *Journal of Sac. Lit.* i, 236 sq.; volume 23; *Christian Examiner*, 2:423 sq.; 3:29 sq.; volume 57; *Retrospective Rev.* 1825, volume 14; Emerson, in the *North Amer. Rev.* 82:388 sq.; *Biblioth. Sac.* 1859, page 857; 1860, page 1; *Meth. Qu. Rev.* 1859, page 495 sq.; *North British Rev.* May 1859; *Edinb. Rev.* April 1860; *Lond. Qu. Rev.* April 1872; Prescott, *Biog. and Crit. Miscellanies*; Bayne, *Contemporary Rev.* August 1873; *Brit. Qu. Rev.* January 1871, page 115; July 1872, page 127 sq.; July 1871, page 111 sq.; *Presb. Qu. Rev.* April 1872, art. 10; *Catholic World*, February 1, 1873. Those who desire to know how the English Homer is regarded by a nation whose taste and habits of thought differ most widely from the Anglo-Saxon race, may consult the article "Milton" in the *Biographie Universelle*, from the pen of the justly-celebrated French critic Villemain. He admits that Milton's picture of our first parents in Eden surpasses, in graceful and touching simplicity, anything to be found in the creations of any other poet, ancient or modern, and that the human imagination has produced nothing more grand or more sublime than some portions of *Paradise Lost*. Comtars also the lately issued work on the *History of English Literature* by Taine (Lond. and N.Y. 1872, 2 volumes, 8vo); Geoffroy, *Etudes sur les Pamphlets Politiques et Religiens de Milton* (Paris, 1848), and *Revue Chretienne*, 1869, page 19 sq. A revised edition of Milton's *poetical works* has been prepared under the editorship of Prof. David Masson, the able biographer of Milton, and a multifarious worker, which when published will no doubt be the standard edition of the poetical writings of John Milton. (G.F.H.)

Mimansa

(from the Sanscrit *man*, to investigate; hence, literally, *investigation*) is the collective name of two of the six divisions of orthodox Hindu philosophy. **SEE HINDUISM.** These two divisions are respectively distinguished as *Purva-mimansa* and *Uttara-mimansa*; the latter being more commonly called *Veddāta* (q.v.), while the former is briefly styled *Mimansa*. Native writers rank the Mimansa with the five other philosophical systems; but the term philosophy — as understood in a European sense — can scarcely be applied to it, as it is neither concerned with the nature of the absolute or of the human mind, nor with the various categories of existence in general — topics which are dealt with more or less by the other five philosophies. The object of the Mimansa is in reality simply to lay down a correct interpretation of such Vedic passages as refer to the Brahminic ritual, to

solve doubts wherever they may exist on matters concerning sacrificial acts. and to reconcile discrepancies — according to the Mimansa always apparent only — of Vedic texts.

The foundation of this system is therefore preceded by a codification of the three principal Vedas [the fourth Veda, the “Atharvan,” never attained in India the high consideration paid to the others, and is not universally accepted as a Veda (q.v.)] — the Rik, Black-Yajus, and Smaan — and by the existence of schools and theories which, by their different interpretations of the Vedic rites, had begun to endanger, or, in reality, had endangered a correct, or at least authoritative understanding of the Vedic texts. It is the method, however, adopted by the Mimansa which imparted to it a higher character than that of a mere commentary, and allowed it to be looked upon as a philosophy; for, in the first place, the topics explained do not follow the order in which they occur in the Vedic writings, especially in the Brahminic portion of the Vedas (q.v.); they are arranged according to certain categories, such as authoritativeness, indirect precept, concurrent efficacy, coordinate effect, etc.; and, secondly, each topic or case is discussed according to a regular scheme, which comprises the proposition of the subject-matter, the doubt or question arising upon it, the *prima facie* or wrong argument applied to it, the correct argument in refutation of the latter, and the conclusion devolving from it. Some subjects treated of in the Mimansa, incidentally, as it were, and merely for the sake of argument, belong likewise rather to the sphere of philosophic thought than to that of commentatorial criticism such, for instance, as the association of articulate sound with sense, the similarity of words in different languages, the inspiration or eternity of the Veda, the invisible or spiritual operation of pious acts, etc.

The reputed founder of this system is Jaimini — of unknown date — who taught it in twelve books, each subdivided into four chapters, except the third, sixth, and tenth books, which contain eight chapters each; the chapters, again, are divided into sections, generally comprising several Sutras or aphorisms, but sometimes only one. The extant commentary on this obscure work is the *Bhashya* of Sabara-swamin, which was critically annotated by the great Mimanas authority, Ku-marila-swamin. Out of these works, which, in their turn, quote several others, apparently lost, has arisen a great number of other writings, explaining and elucidating their predecessors. The best compendium, among these modern works, is the *Jaiminiya-nyaya-mala-vistura*, by the celebrated Madhavachairva (q.v.).

See Mullens, *The Religious Aspects of Hindu Philosophy* (Lond. 1860); the Reverend K.M. Banerjew, *Dialogues on the Hindu Philosophy* (Lond. 1861); Chunder Dutt, *Essay on the Vedanta* (Calcutta, 1854); Duncker, *Gesch. des Alterthums*, 1;205; Clarke, *Ten Great Religion*, page 116 sq.

Mina

(in Greek $\mu\nu\tilde{\alpha}$, A.V. "pound"), a weight and coin which, according to the Attic standard, was equivalent to 100 *drachmae* (Plutarch, *Solon*, 16; Pliny, 21:109) or Roman *denarii*, i.e. (estimating the average value at the time of Christ) about \$16. It is the sum named in the parable of ~~<2013>~~Luke 19:13 sq., where the amount of 100 *mince* is therefore some \$1600. On the other hand, the *mina* mentioned in 1 Macc. 14:24 (comp. 15:18) is a weight, and (as being originally equivalent to the Heb. *shekel*) it may be reckoned at 8220 Paris grains (Bickh, *Metrol. Untersuch.* page 124); and the sum of 1000 *mince* of gold would then amount to about \$16,910. **SEE MONEY.**

Different from this is the Heb. *maneh* (hnm), originally likewise a weight, but used of the precious metals, and hence ultimately determining the value of coin. The word has perhaps an etymological connection with the Greek *mina*. **SEE METROLOGY.**

Minoeans

(i.e., *deniers*, *heretics*) is the name of a Jewish sect mentioned in the writings of the Church fathers. This is only another name for the *Nazarceans* (q.v.). Comp. Keim, *Leben Jesu*, page 608.

Minard, Abel

a prominent layman of the Methodist Episcopal Church, noted for his great philanthropic labors, was born in Massachusetts September 25, 1814. His father died soon after his birth, and he lost his mother when he was about eight years old, so that as a mere youth he was left alone in the world. His early life was an earnest struggle for success; he was subjected to all the disadvantages which attend those who are compelled to work their own way from poverty to fortune. He learned the trade of a tanner; but his energy of character soon sought a broader field of action in business operations, which proved successful, and rapidly secured him wealth and influence. In 1846 he went to California; in 1856 removed to Lockport,

N.Y.; and in 1866 settled at Morristown, N.J., where he died, January 31, 1871. In early life. Mr. Minard was a member of the Free-will Baptist Church, but in the prime of his days he neglected his Church privileges. In the spring of 1870 he united with the Methodist Episcopal Church at Morristown, in whose communion he spent his last days. In early life he promised his God that if he would bless him he would give away the tenth part of his income, and he dealt out largely to the poor and to the Church; in later years, fearing that he had not kept the vow fully he failed not to make compensation for his neglect by numerous private and public benefactions. The churches both of Morristown and Lockport were remembered in his will. He also left a sum, the interest of which is annually applied for the education of four young men in Drew Theological Seminary at Madison, N.J. But the crowning work of his life was the establishment of the "Minard Home," in Morristown (valued at \$50,000), for the education of the female orphans of missionaries and home ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church. See *New York Christian Advocate*, June 15, 1870; Prof. Buttz, in the *Ladies' Repository*, 1872. (J.H.W.)

Minard, Louis Guillaume

a French ecclesiastical writer, was born at Paris January 31, 1725. Educated at the College of France by the care of Rivard, with whom he was a favorite pupil, he joined the "Brothers of the Christian Doctrine," and was appointed while still young to some of the superior offices of his congregation. He entered the secular clergy and obtained the benefice of Bercy, near Paris. His tolerance and easy profession of religion brought upon him many admonitions from his superiors; finally, Christophe de Beaumont, archbishop of Paris, suspended him from his sacred functions—having been offended by a book that Minard had written, entitled *Panegyrique de Saint Charles Borromeo*. Minard continued to dwell among his ex-parishioners, devoting all his time to study and to charity. In 1778 he refused the generalship offered him by the lay brethren. In 1795 he became a member of the Presbytery of Paris. He died, poor and infirm, at Paris, April 22, 1798. Besides the *Panegyrique de Saint Charles Borromeo*, condemned by the Sorbonne and his provisor the archbishop of Paris, Minard wrote *Avis aux fideles sur le schisme dont l'Eglise de France est menacee* (Paris, 1795, 8vo). In this tract, written to establish peace with the Jansenists, he says that all parties should unite to establish harmony in the Church, and that the resistance of a part of the clergy to the laws is as injurious to the divine service as to the state. It was replied to by

Bernard Lambert la Plaigne, a Dominican Jansenist, who, aided by Maulrot, wrote four *Lettres aux ministres de la ci-devant eglise constitutionnelle* (1795-1796). Minard afterwards replied to these by a *Supplemente* to the *Avis aux Fideles*. See *Nouvelles ecclesiastiques* (Utrecht, 1798); *Dict. historique*, s.v.

Minaret (Or Minar)

Picture for Minaret

is the name of a tall turret used in Saracenic architecture. The minaret, as it is called by the Turks, contains a staircase, and is divided into several stories, with balconies from which the priests summon the Mohammedans to prayer bells not being permitted in their religion, *see MOHAMAMEDANISM*, and is terminated with a spire or ornamental finial. The minarets are among the most beautiful features of Mohammedan architecture, and are an invariable accompaniment of the mosques (q.v.). In India, *minars*, or pillars of victory, are frequently erected in connection with mosques; some of these are lofty and splendid monuments, that of Kutub, at Old Delhi, being 48 feet 4 inches in diameter at the base, and about 250 feet high. They are often built on a plan of a star-like form, and are divided into stories by projecting balconies, like the minarets.

Minchah

(**hj** **mnæ**) properly a *gift* (as often rendered) or present (^{<0124>}Genesis 32:14; 19:21; 43:11 sq.), especially to nobles and kings (^{<0015>}Judges 3:15; ^{<0110>}1 Samuel 11:23; ^{<4175>}2 Chronicles 17:5, 11; ^{<19513>}Psalms 45:13; ^{<2391>}Isaiah 39:1; ^{<11025>}1 Kings 10:25); hence *tribute* from a subject nation (^{<1082>}2 Samuel 8:2, 6; ^{<1101>}1 Kings 5:1 [4:21] ^{<1274>}2 Kings 17:4; ^{<19210>}Psalms 72:10); but specifically an offering to God, i.e., *sacrifice* (^{<2013>}Isaiah 1:13; ^{<1369>}1 Chronicles 16:29), particularly a godless one, "meat-offering," consisting of flour, meal, or cakes, with oil and frankincense, burned upon the altar by itself, or in connection with a bloody offering (^{<0101>}Leviticus 2:1 sq.; 7:9, etc.). *SEE OFFERING*.

In Jewish liturgy the word *Minchah* is the technical term for the afternoon service of prayer. *SEE LITURGY* (I).

Mincing

(*āpīf*; *tpaphaph*', ²⁷¹⁶Isaiah 3:16) occurs in the prophet's description of the behavior of the "daughters of Jerusalem." The Hebrew word, as well as the Arabic *taf*, refers to the taking small and quick steps, the affected pace of a coquettish woman. The passage might be rendered, "They walk and trip along." Although the Hebrew word has perhaps a slightly different sense, yet the gait of the females seems to have been very much like the modern practice of swaying the body in walking. *SEE WOMAN*.

Mind

the exercise or expression of the spiritual part of man's nature. It is obviously divisible into the three elementary functions, thought, emotion, and volition; but scientific writers greatly differ as to the subordinate or detailed faculties, as they are called. Reilt thus classifies the mental powers: Perception, memory, conception, abstraction, judgment, reasoning. Stewart thus: Perception, attention, conception, abstraction, association, imagination, reason. Others propose a, deeper analysis of the intellectual faculties, and find three properties which appear fundamental and distinct, to one in any degree implying the other, while the whole taken together are sufficient to explain all intellectual operations: namely, discrimination, retentiveness, and association of ideas. Sir W. Hamilton, departing from common classifications, sums the intellections into six:

- (1.) The presentative faculty, or the power of recognising the various aspects of the world and of the mind.
- (2.) The conservative faculty or memory, meaning the power of storing up.
- (3.) The reproductive faculty, or the means of recalling sleeping impressions or concepts. (4.) The representative faculty, or imagination. (5.) The elaborative faculty, or the power of comparison, by which classification, generalization, and reasoning are performed.
- (6.) The regulative faculty, or the cognition of the *a priori* or instinctive notions of the intellect, as space, time, causation, necessary truths, etc.

Noah Porter divides his "Human Intellect" into four parts:

- (a.) He treats of natural consciousness, philosophical consciousness; sense perception, its conditions and process; of the growth and products of sense perception.
- (b.) He treats of representation and representative knowledge; by which he means memory, imagining power, etc.
- (c.) He treats of thinking and thought knowledge; by which he means the formation and nature of the concept, judgment, reasoning, etc.
- (d.) He treats of intuition and intuitive knowledge, in which he discourses on mathematical relations, causation, design, substance, attribute; the finite and conditioned; the infinite and absolute.

Berkeley and his school teach a pure idealism, which asserts that everything we can take cognizance of is mind or self; that we cannot transcend our mental sphere; whatever we know is our own mind. Others, again, as Locke, resolve all into empiricism, and look on mind as simply the result of material organization. These two views contain the extreme angles to which speculation has run. The former is idealism or spiritualism, the latter materialism or empiricism.

The pre-Socratic school of philosophers was materialistic, of which Anaximenes, Pythagoras, Heraclitus, were patrons. Between these and Plato, Socrates was a transitional link. The post-Platonic philosophers were spiritualistic in the main, notwithstanding French materialism and German rationalism. *SEE MATERIALISM*. Dr. McCosh, in his *Intuitions of the Mind*, makes a triplet of parts. In part first (which is on the "Nature of the Intuitive Convictions of the Mind") he shows that there are no innate mental images; no innate or general notions; no *a priori* forms imposed by the mind on objects; no intuitions immediately before consciousness as law principles. But there are intuitive principles operating in the mind; these are native convictions of the mind, which are of the nature of perceptions or intuitions. Intuitive convictions rise up when contemplations of objects are presented to the mind. The intuitions of the mind are primarily directed to individual objects. The individual intuitive convictions can be generalized into maxims, and these are entitled to be represented as philosophic principles. In part second he shows that the mind begins its intelligent acts with knowledge; that the simple cognitive powers are sense, perception, and self-consciousness. It is through the bodily organism that the intelligence of man attains its knowledge of all material objects beyond.

‘The qualities of matter — extension, divisibility, size density or rarity, figure, incompressibility, mobility, and substance — are known by *intuition*; and it is by cognition we know self as having being, and as not depending for existence on our observation; as being in itself an abiding existence; as exercising potency in spirit and material being “Cogito, ergo sum.” The primitive cognitions recognise being, substance, mode, quality, personality, number, motion, power. The primitive beliefs recognise space, time, and the infinite. The mind intuitively observes the relations of identity, of whole to part, of space, time, quantity, property, cause, and effect. The motive and moral convictions as appetencies, will, conscience are involved in the exercise of conscience. In part third he shows that the sources of knowledge are sense, perception, self-consciousness, and faith exercise. But there are limits to our knowledge, ideas, and beliefs. We cannot know any substance other than those revealed by sense, consciousness, or faith. We can never know any qualities or relations among objects except in so far as we have special faculties of knowledge. The material for ideas must be brought from the knowledge sources. These sources are limited, and our belief is limited. Professor Bain, in his book, shows that human knowledge falls under two departments — the object department, marked by extension; the subject department, marked by the absence of extension. Subject experience has three functions — feeling, will, thought. The brain is the organ of the mind. The nervous systems are only extensions or ramifications of the brain, and through these the mind transmits its influence. In this nervous system, which acts as a channel for the transmission of messages from the mind, are two sets of nerves — the in-carrying, the out-carrying. The intellectual functions are commonly expressed by memory, reason, imagination. The primary attributes of intellect are difference, agreement, retentiveness, or continuity. J.S. Mill propounds a psychological theory of the belief in a material world—postulates, expectation, association, laws, substance, matter. The external world is a permanent possibility of sensation. Then follows the distinction of primary and secondary qualities; application to the permanence of mind, etc.

The true theory is both scriptural and scientific, methodic and encyclopedic; and though it may not explain all ideation amply, yet it shows that the nature and functions of mind can only be seen in connection with all the other parts of the human system, just as the nature and functions of a fountain are only seen when considered in connection with

the other parts of the cosmos. We can only understand the nature and office of ducts, glands, veins, or arteries when we view them in their mutual relations, and in their relations with all the other parts of the physical system. We can only understand civil polity, social statics, natural phenomena, when taken in their reciprocal relations; and so we can only understand mind when viewed in connection with everything else it touches. Views taken from any other premise must be partial and imperfect. We hold that mind has seven great forces or modes. The so-called scientific writers acknowledge this, at least substantially. These are consciousness, conception, abstraction, association, memory, imagination, reason. Now if science shows us that there are seven great corresponding qualities or forces in the body, and if Scripture (which reveals what science cannot) shows us that there are seven great corresponding powers in the soul which lie back of and control all powers of body and of mind, why not conclude that this trial septenary of forces interlace and overlap each other, so as to constitute a human personality? We do not claim for this theory a scientific status, but is it not worthy of a speculative niche? Our observation shows us that this universe progresses by a duplex method, unfolding and infolding, or evolving and involving. Scripture shows that this unfolding *comes from* a sevenfold force; science shows that it comes *through* a sevenfold faculty. The following curious coincidences may not be out of place here, as illustrating a somewhat abstruse problem of this subject. The Revelation by John reveals ἐπτὰ πνεύματα, or “the seven spirits,” as the constituent powers of Deity. The question arises, What are these seven spirits? (^{<2310>}Isaiah 11:2; ^{<3310>}Psalms 111:10; ^{<3007>}Proverbs 1:7; ^{<3328>}Job 28:28). It is held by many influential writers that the spirits mentioned in these references are to be taken in connection with Zechariah’s sevenfold lamp (^{<3040>}Zechariah 4:1). Delitzsch, in his work on *Psychology*, endeavors to find these elements in the Hebraistic distinctions of “the spirit of fear,” i.e., of divine veneration (**hary**); “the spirit of knowledge” (**t [D]**), “the spirit of power” (**hrwbg**), etc.; but these are highly mystical and even fanciful. Whatever, however, may be thought of such abstractions, as to what Scripture says, or is imagined to say, about the sevenfold *doxa* or soul life, science does seem to discover, or at least point out, a sevenfold means of mind representation in the body. She recognizes seven forms of life: the embryonic, the breathing, the blood, the heart, the sensation, containing the five senses, the externalization of the *voig* by the tongue, and the outpressure of the entire mental phases and spirit feelings through the entire bodily habitus. In the trichotomy of nature

the soul is first, the mind- second, the body third. The mind is therefore moulded by the soul, and the body by the mind. As the soul lies at the base of the being, all its ramifications are tinged with the hues of the soul. The mind, nevertheless, is moulded by whatever it plays upon. Thus mind is a middleman standing between the world of morals and of matter (yet interlacing both), communicating the will of the spirit to the external sphere. It is not a monarch, but a marshal; yet it is august in its capacity; in its elasticity, eternal. *SEE PSYCHOLOGY.*

For further discussion of the mind, see the works mentioned above; also the early Greek writers, as Diogenes, Anaxagoras, Heraclitus, Empedocles, Democritus and the Socratic school, as Plato, Aristotle, etc. The modern schoolmen who treat of the subject are chiefly the following: Gassendi (1592-1655), Des Cartes (1596-1650), Geulinx (1625-1699), Spinoza (1632-1677), Malebranche (1688-1715), Hume (1711-1776), Reid (1710-1796), Brown (1778-1820), Condillac (1715-1780), Collard (1763-1845), Leibnitz (1646-1716), Kant (1724-1804), Schleiermacher (1768-1834). Many of these were rather metaphysicians than mental philosophers; yet their theories and discussions involve the nature and functions of the human mind, especially in its intellectual aspects; and they therefore may be said to have laid the foundations for mental science in its present development. The principal works more expressly relating to the intellectual faculties are Stewart, *Treatise and Essay on the Mind*; Brown, *Philosophy of the Human Mind*; Abercrombie, *Intellectual Powers*; Watts, *On the Mind*; Cudworth, *Intellectual System*; Reid, *Essays on the active Powers of the Human Mind*; Mill (James), *Analysis of the Phenomena of the Human Mind*; McCosh, *Intuitions of the Mind*; Wilson (W.D.), *Lectures on the Psychology of Thought and Action*; Bain, *Mind and Body: the Theories of their Relation*; Carpenter, *Principles of Mental Physiology*; Maudsley, *Body and Mind: their Connection and mutual Influence*. The works on *Mental Science* treat likewise of the emotional elements of the mind. *SEE PHILOSOPHY.* Most of the works named include the third or causative faculty of the mind, i.e. the will; but the importance of this, in its theological bearings, requires a separate treatment. *SEE WILL.* See also *Christian Monthly Spectator*, 8:141, 184; *Lit. and Theol. Rev.* 1:74,169, 614; 2:261, 576; *North Amer. Rev.* 19:1; 24:56; *Monthly Rev.* 68:441; *Brit. Qu. Rev.* December 1871, page 308; *Contemporary Rev.* April and Oct. 1872; *Meth. Qu. Rev.* 4:243; April 1870, page 221; *Popular Science Monthly*, July 1873, art. 10; December

art. 4 and 6; *The Academy*, November 1, 1873, page 445. *SEE MONOMANIA.*

Mine

Picture for Mine

The word does not occur in the Bible, but that mining operations were familiar to the Hebrew people from an early age is evident from many Scriptural allusions. *SEE METAL.* A remarkable description of the processes of ore mining occurs in the book of Job (28:1-11):

Why, [there] exists for silver a vein;
 And a place for gold, [which] they may filter:
 Iron from clod can be taken,
 And stone will pour forth copper.
 An end has [one] put to the [subterranean] darkness,
 And to every recess [is] *he* prying [after]
 The stone of gloom and death-shade.
 He has pierced a shaft [down] away from, [any] sojourner.
 [Where] the [miners] forgotten of foot [hold]
 Have hung [far] from man, [and] swung.
 Earth-from it shall issue [means to procure] bread,
 Though under it [its bosom] has been overturned as [by] fire:
 A sapphire-place [are] its stones
 And gold-clods [are] his [that explores it].
 A beaten [path thither]-bird of prey has not known it,
 Nor hawk's eye scanned it;
 Sons of rampancy [fierce beasts] have not trodden it.
 Roarer [lion] has not wended over it.
 On the flint he has stretched forth his hand;
 He has overturned from [the] root mountains:
 In the cliffs channels has he cleft,
 And every precious [thing] has his eye seen.
 From trickling [the adjacent] rivers has he stopped,
 While [the] concealed [thing] he shall bring forth [to] light.

The following comments on this passage (which maybe a later addition of the time of Solomon), as well as the remarks on metallurgy in general, are indicative of its pertinence to the subject. *SEE JOB, BOOK OF.*

It may be fairly inferred from the description that a distinction is made between gold obtained in the manner indicated, and that which is found in the natural state in the alluvial soil, among the debris washed down by the torrents. This appears to be implied in the expression "the gold they

refine," which presupposes a process by which the pure gold is extracted from the ore, and separated from the silver or copper with which it may have been mixed. What is said of gold may be equally applied to silver, for in almost every allusion to the process of refining the two metals are associated. In the passage of Job which has been quoted, so far as can be made out from the obscurities with which it is beset, the natural order of mining operations is observed in the description. The whole point is obviously contained in the contrast, "Surely there is a source for the silver, and a place for the gold which men refine; but where shall wisdom be found, and where is the place of understanding?" No labor is too great for extorting from the earth its treasures. The shaft is sunk, and the adventurous miner, far from the haunts of men, hangs in mid-air (5:4): the bowels of the earth — which in the course of nature grows but corn — are overthrown as though wasted by fire. The path which the miner pursues in his underground course is unseen by the keen eye of the falcon, nor have the boldest beasts of prey traversed it, but man wins his way through every obstacle, hews out tunnels in the rock, stops the water from flooding his mine, and brings to light the precious metals as the reward of his adventure. No description would be more complete. The poet might have had before him the copper mines of the Sinaitic peninsula. In the Wady Magharah, "the valley of the Cave," are still traces of the Egyptian colony of miners who settled there for the purpose of extracting copper from the freestone rocks, and left their hieroglyphic inscriptions upon the face of the cliff. That these inscriptions are of great antiquity there can belittle doubt, though Lepsius may not be justified in placing them at a date B.C. 4000 (*Letters from Egypt*, page 346, Eng. tr.). In the Magharah tablets, Mr. Drew (*Scripture Lands*, page 50, note) "saw the cartouche of Suphis, the builder of the Great Pyramid, and on the stones at Sarabit el-Khadim there are those of kings of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties." But the most interesting description of this mining colony is to be found in a letter to the *Athenaeum* (June 4, 1859, No. 1649, page 747), signed M.Δ., and dated from "Sarabit el-Khadim, in the desert or Sinai, May 1859." The writer discovered on the mountain exactly opposite the caves of Magharah traces of an ancient fortress, intended, as he conjectures, for the protection of the miners. The hill on which it stands is about 1000 feet high, nearly insulated, and formed of a series of precipitous terraces, one above the other, like the steps of the Pyramids. The uppermost of these was entirely surrounded by a strong wall, within which were found remains of 140 houses, each about ten feet square. There were, besides, the remains of

ancient hammers of green porphyry, and reservoirs “so disposed that when one was full the surplus ran into the others, and so in succession, so that they must have had water enough to last for years. The ancient furnaces are still to be seen, and on the coast of the Red Sea are found the piers and wharves whence the miners shipped their metal in the harbor of Abu Zeniineh. Five miles from Sarabit elKhadim the same traveller found the ruins of a much greater number of houses, indicating the existence of a large mining population, and, besides, five immense reservoirs formed by damming up various wadys. Other mines appear to have been discovered by Dr. Wilson in the granite mountains east of the Wady Mokatteb. In the Wady Nasb the German traveller Ruppell, who was commissioned by Mohammed Ali, the viceroy of Egypt, to examine the state of the mines there, met with remains of several large smelting furnaces, surrounded by heaps of slag. The ancient inhabitants had sunk shafts in several directions, leaving here and there columns to prevent the whole from falling in. In one of the mines he saw huge masses of stone rich in copper (*Ritter, Erdkunde*, 13:786). The copper mines of Phaeno, in Idumaea, according to Jerome, were between Zoar and Petra: in the persecution of Diocletian the Christians were condemned to work them.

The gold mines of Egypt in the Bishart desert, the principal station of which was Eshuranib, about three days’ journey beyond Wady Allaga, have been discovered within the last few years by M. Linant and Mr. Bonomi, the latter of whom supplied Sir G. Wilkinson with a description of them, which he quotes (*Anc. Eng.* 3:229, 230). Ruins of the miners’ huts still remain as at Sarhbit elKhadim. “In those nearest the mines lived the workmen who were employed to break the quartz into small fragments, the size of a bean, from whose hands the pounded stone passed to the persons who ground: it in hand-mills, similar to those now used for corn in the valley of the Nile, made of granitic stone; one of which is to be found in almost every house at these mines, either entire or broken. The quartz, thus reduced to powder, was washed on inclined tables, furnished with two cisterns, all built of fragments of stone collected there; and near these inclined planes are generally found little white mounds, the residuum of the operation.” According to the account given by Diodorus Siculus (3:12-14), the mines were worked by gangs of convicts and captives in fetters, who were kept day and night to their task by the soldiers set to guard them. The work was superintended by an engineer, who selected the stone and pointed it out to the miners. The harder rock was split by the application of

fire, but the softer was broken up with picks and chisels. The miners were quite naked, their bodies being painted according to the color of the rock they were working, and in order to see in the dark passages of the mine they carried lamps upon their heads. The stone as it fell was carried off by boys; it was then pounded in stone mortars with iron pestles by those who were over thirty years of age, till it was reduced to the size of a lentil. The women and old men afterwards ground it in mills to a fine powder. The final process of separating the gold from the pounded stone was intrusted to the engineers who superintended the work. They spread this powder upon a broad slightly-inclined table, and rubbed it gently with the hand, pouring water upon it from time to time so as to carry away all the earthy matter, leaving the heavier particles upon the board. This was repeated several times; at first with the hand, and afterwards with fine sponges gently pressed upon the earthy substance, till nothing but the gold was left. It was then collected by other workmen, and placed in earthen crucibles, with a mixture of lead and salt in certain proportions, together with a little tin and some barley bran. The crucibles were covered and carefully closed with clay, and in this condition baked in a furnace for five days and nights without intermission. Three methods have been employed for refining gold and silver: 1, by exposing the fused metal to a current of air; 2, by keeping the alloy in a state of fusion and throwing nitre upon it; and, 3, by mixing the alloy with lead, exposing the whole to fusion upon a vessel of bone-ashes or earth, and blowing upon it with bellows or other blast; the last appears most nearly to coincide with the description of Diodorus. To this process, known as the cupelling process, *SEE LEAD*, there seems to be a reference in ^{<9176>}Psalm 12:6; ^{<3058>}Jeremiah 6:28-30; ^{<2318>}Ezekiel 23:18-22, and from it Mr. Napier (*Metals of the Bible*, page 24) deduces a striking illustration of ^{<3982>}Malachi 3:2, 3, He shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver," etc. "When the alloy is melted upon a cupel, and the air blown upon it, the surface of the melted metals has a deep orange-red color, with a kind of flickering wave constantly passing over the surface. As the process proceeds, the heat is increased and in a little time the color of the fused metal becomes lighter. At this stage the refiner watches the operation, either standing or sitting, with the greatest earnestness, until all the orange color and shading disappears, and the metal has the appearance of a highly-polished mirror, reflecting every object around it; even the refiner, as he looks upon the mass of metal, may see himself as in a looking-glass, and thus he call form a very correct judgment respecting the purity of the metal. If he is satisfied, the fire is withdrawn, and the metal

removed from the furnace; but if not considered pure, more lead is added and the process repeated.”

Silver mines are mentioned by Diodorus (1:33), with those of gold, iron, and copper, in the island of Meroe, at the mouth of the Nile. But the chief supply of silver in the ancient world appears to have been brought from Spain. The mines of that country were celebrated (1 Macc. 8:3). Mount Orospeida, from which the Guadalquivir, the ancient Baltes., takes its rise, was formerly called “the silver mountain,” from the silver mines which were in it (Strabo, 3, page 148). Tartessus, according to Strabo, was an ancient name of the river which gave its name to the town that was built between its two mouths. But the largest silver mines in Spain were in the neighborhood of Carthago Nova, from which, in the time of Polybius, the Roman government received 25,000 drachmae daily. These, when Strabo wrote, had fallen into private hands, though most of the gold mines were public property (3, page 148). Near Castulo there were lead mines containing silver, but in quantities so small as not to repay the cost of working. The process of separating the silver from the lead is abridged by Strabo from Polybius. The lumps of ore were first pounded, and then sifted through sieves into water. The sediment was again pounded, and again filtered, and after this process had been repeated five times the water was drawn off, the remainder of the ore melted, the lead poured away, and the silver left pure. If Tartessus be the Tarshish of Scripture, the metal workers of Spain in those days must have possessed the art of hammering silver into sheets, for we find in ^(411B)Jeremiah 10:9, “silver spread into plates is brought from Tarshish, and gold from Uphaz.”

We have no means of knowing whether the gold of Ophir was obtained from mines or from the washing of gold streams. Pliny (6:32), from Juba, describes the *littus Hammceum* on the Persian Gulf as a place where gold mines existed, and in the same chapter alludes to the gold mines of the Sabaeans. But in all probability the greater part of the gold which came into the hands of the Phoenicians and Hebrews was obtained from streams; its great abundance seems to indicate this. At a very early period Jericho was a centre of commerce with the East, and in the narrative of its capture we meet with gold in the form of ingots (^(407B)Joshua 7:21, A.V. “wedge,” lit. “tongue”), in which it was probably cast for the convenience of traffic. That which Achan took weighed twenty-five ounces.

As gold is seldom if ever found entirely free from silver, the quantity of the latter varying from two per cent. to thirty per cent, it has been supposed that the ancient metallurgists were acquainted with some means of parting them, an operation performed in modern times by boiling the metal in nitric or sulphuric acid. To some process of this kind it has been imagined that reference is made in ^(107B)Proverbs 17:3, “*The fining-pot* is for silver, and the *furnace* for gold;” and again in ^(108B)Proverbs 28:21. “If, for example,” says Mr. Napier, “the term *fining-pot* could refer to the vessel or pot in which the silver is dissolved from the gold in parting, as it may be called with propriety, then these passages have a meaning in our modern practice” (*Metals of the Bible*, page 28); but he admits that this is at best but plausible, and considers that “the constant reference to certain qualities and kinds of gold in Scripture is a kind of presumptive proof that they were not in the habit of perfectly purifying or separating the gold from the silver.”

A strong proof of the acquaintance possessed by the ancient Hebrews with the manipulation of metals is found by some in the destruction of the golden calf in the desert by Moses: “And he took the calf which they had made, and burnt it in fire, and ground it to powder, and strewed it upon the water, and made the children of Israel drink” (^(109B)Exodus 32:20). As the highly malleable character of gold would render an operation like that which is described in the text almost impossible, an explanation has been sought in the supposition that we have here an indication that Moses was a proficient in the process known in modern times as calcination. The object of calcination being to oxidize the metal subjected to the process, and gold not being affected by this treatment, the explanation cannot be admitted. M. Goguet (quoted in Wilkinson’s *Anc. Eg.* 3:221) confidently asserts that the problem has been solved by the discovery of an experienced chemist that “in the place of tartaric acid, which we employ, the Hebrew legislator used natron, which is common in the East.” The gold so reduced and made into a draught is further said to have a most detestable taste. Goguet’s solution appears to have been adopted without examination by more modern writers. but Mr. Napier ventured to question its correctness, and endeavored to trace it to its source. The only clew which he found was in a discovery by Stahl, a chemist of the 17th century, “that if one part gold, three parts potash, and three parts sulphur are heated together, a compound is formed which is partly soluble in water. If,” he adds, “this be the discovery referred to, which I think very probable, it certainly has been made the most of by Bible critics” (*Met. of the Bible*, page 49). The whole

difficulty appears to have arisen from a desire to find too much in the text. The main object of the destruction of the calf was to prove its worthlessness and to throw contempt upon idolatry, and all this might have been done without any refined chemical process like that referred to. The calf was first heated in the fire to destroy its shape, then beaten and broken up by hammering or filing into small pieces, which were thrown into the water, of which the people were made to drink as a symbolical act. "Moses threw the atoms into the water as an emblem of the perfect annihilation of the calf, and he gave the Israelites that water to drink, not only to impress upon them the abomination and despicable character of the image which they had made, but as a symbol of purification, to remove the object of the transgression by those very persons who had committed it" (Kalisch, *Comm. on* ⁽¹⁸²²⁾*Exodus 32:20*). **SEE CALF, GOLDEN.**

How far the ancient Hebrews were acquainted with the processes at present in use for extracting copper from the ore, it is impossible to assert, as there are no references in Scripture to anything of the kind, except in the passage of Job already quoted. Copper smelting, however, is in some cases attended with comparatively small difficulties, which the ancients had evidently the skill to overcome. Ore composed of copper and oxygen, mixed with coal and burned to a bright red heat, leaves the copper in the metallic state, and the same result will follow if the process be applied to the carbonates and sulphurets of copper. Some means of toughening the metal, so as to render it fit for manufacture, must have been known to the Hebrews as to other ancient nations. The Egyptians evidently possessed the art of working bronze in great perfection at a very early time, and much of the knowledge of metals which the Israelites had must have been acquired during their residence among them.

Of tin there appears to have been no trace in Palestine. That the Phoenicians obtained their supplies from the mines of Spain and Cornwall there can be no doubt, and it is suggested that even the Egyptians may have procured it from the same source, either directly or through the medium of the former. It was found among the possessions of the Midianites, to whom it might have come in the course of traffic; but in other instances in which allusion is made to it, tin occurs in conjunction with other metals in the form of an alloy. The lead mines of Gebel er-Rossass, near the coast of the Red Sea, about half-way between Berenice and Kossayr (Wilkinson, *Handb. for Egypt*, page 403), may have supplied the Hebrews with that metal, of which there were no mines in their own

country, or it may have been obtained from the rocks in the neighborhood of Sinai. The hills of Palestine are rich in iron, and the mines are still worked there, though in a very simple, rude manner, like that of the ancient Samothracians: of the method employed by the Egyptians and Hebrews, we have no certain information. It may have been similar to that in use throughout the whole of India from very early times, which is thus described by Dr. Ure (*Dict. of Arts*, etc., art. Steel): “The furnace or bloomery in which the ore is smelted is from four to five feet high; it is somewhat pear-shaped, being about five feet wide at bottom and one foot at top. It is built entirely of clay... There is an opening in front about a foot or more in height, which is built up with clay at the commencement, and broken down at the end of each smelting operation. The bellows are usually made of a goat’s skin... The bamboo nozzles of the bellows are inserted into tubes of clay, which pass into the furnace... The furnace is filled with charcoal, and a lighted coal being introduced before the nozzles, the mass in the interior is soon kindled. As soon as this is accomplished, a small portion of the ore, previously moistened with water to prevent it from running through the charcoal, but without any flux whatever, is laid on the top of the coals, and covered with charcoal to fill up the furnace. In this manner ore and fuel are supplied, and the bellows are urged for three or four hours. When the process is stopped, and the temporary wall in front is broken down, the bloom is removed with a pair of tongs from the bottom of the furnace.”

It has seemed necessary to give this account of a very ancient method of iron smelting, because, from the difficulties which attend it, and the intense heat which is required to separate the metal from the ore, it has been asserted that the allusions to iron and iron manufacture in the Old Testament are anachronisms. But if it were possible among the ancient Indians in a very primitive state of civilization, it might have been known to the Hebrews, who may have acquired their knowledge by working as slaves in the iron furnaces of Egypt (comp. ^(Heb.) Deuteronomy 4:20). The question of the early use of iron among the Egyptians is fully disposed of in the following remarks of Sir Gardner Wilkinson (*Ancient Egyptians*, 2:154-156): “In the infancy of the arts and sciences, the difficulty of working iron might long withhold the secret of its superiority over copper and bronze; but it cannot reasonably be supposed that a nation so advanced, and so eminently skilled in the art of working metals as the Egyptians and Sidonians, should have remained ignorant of its use, even if

we had no evidence of its having been known to the Greeks and other people.; and the constant employment of bronze arms and implements is not a sufficient argument against their knowledge of iron, since we find the Greeks and Romans made the same things of bronze long after the period when iron was universally known... To conclude from the want of iron instruments, or arms, bearing the names of early monarchs of a Pharaonic age, that bronze was alone used, is neither just nor satisfactory; since the decomposition of iron, especially when buried for ages in the nitrous soil of Egypt, is so speedy as to preclude the possibility of its preservation. Until we know in what manner the Egyptians employed bronze tools for cutting stone, the discovery of them affords no additional light, nor even argument; since the Greeks and Romans continued to make bronze instruments of various kinds long after iron was known to them; and Herodotus mentions the iron tools used by the builders of the Pyramids. Iron and copper mines are found in the Egyptian desert, which were worked in old times; and the monuments of Thebes, and even the tombs about Memphis, dating more than 4000 years ago, represent butchers sharpening their knives on a round bar of metal attached to their apron, which from its blue color can only be steel; and the distinction between the bronze and iron weapons in the tomb of Rameses III, one painted red, the other blue, leaves no doubt of *both* having been used (as in Rome) at the same periods. In Ethiopia iron was much more abundant than in Egypt, and Herodotus states that copper was a rare metal there; though we may doubt his assertion of prisoners in that country having been bound with fetters of gold. The speedy decomposition of iron would be sufficient to prevent our finding implements of that metal of an early period, and the greater opportunities of obtaining copper ore, added to the facility of working it, might be a reason for preferring the latter whenever it answered the purpose instead of iron.” *SEE METAL.*

Mineralogy

This science, like all others of modern date, was in a very imperfect state among the Hebrews. Hence the sacred writers speak of minerals without any scientific classification, and according to their merely external characteristics. This occasions the utmost difficulty in identifying any but the commonest mineral substances. In precious stones, particularly, this vagueness of name and description precludes the possibility of any certainty as to the actual mineral intended, or, rather, leads to the presumption that in most instances no one substance is denoted, but that the name is generic, including all stones of the same general appearance,

color, hardness, etc. *SEE GEM*. The following is a list of the mineral productions mentioned in the Bible, with their probable modern representatives. For details, see each word in its place.

| | | |
|----------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| <i>Achlamah</i> | Amethyst | “amethyst.” |
| <i>Astro</i> | Alabaster | “alabaster.” |
| <i>Amethystos</i> | Amethyst | “amethyst.” |
| <i>Arguros</i> | Silver | “silver.” |
| <i>Bahat.</i> | Marble | “red marble.” |
| <i>Bareketh</i> | Emerald? | “carbuncle.” |
| <i>Barzel</i> | Iron | “iron.” |
| <i>Bedd</i> | Alloy? | “tin” |
| <i>Bedolach</i> | Bdellium | “bdellium.” |
| <i>Berullos</i> | Beryl | “beryl.” |
| <i>Betser</i> | Ore | “gold.” |
| <i>Bor, Borith</i> } | Alkali | “soap,” et |
| <i>Chalkedon</i> | Chalcedony | “chalcedony.” |
| <i>Chalkolibdnon</i> | Electrum | “fine brass.” |
| <i>Chalkos</i> | Copper | “brass.” |
| <i>Challamish</i> | Flint | “flint,” etc. |
| <i>Chashmaal</i> | Burnished Copper | “amber.” |
| <i>Chemar</i> | Bitumen | “slime.” |
| <i>Chol</i> | Sand | “sand.” |
| <i>Chrusolethos</i> | Chrysolite | “chrysolite.” |
| <i>Chrusoprasos</i> | Chrysoprase | “chrysoprase.” |
| <i>Chrusos</i> | Gold | “gold.” |
| <i>Dar</i> | Pearl-stone | “white marble.” |
| <i>Ekdach</i> | Carbuncle | “carbuncle.” |
| <i>Gabish</i> | Crystal | “pearl.” |
| <i>Gir</i> | Lime | “chalk.” |
| <i>Gophrth</i> | Sulphur | “brimstone.” |
| <i>Hals</i> | Salt | “salt.” |
| <i>Huakinthos</i> | Hyacinth | “jacinth.” |
| <i>Huilos</i> | Glass | “glass.” |
| <i>Jaspis</i> | Jasper | “jasper.” |

| | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| <i>Kadkod</i> | <i>Ruby</i> | “agate.” |
| <i>Kerach</i> | Crystal | “crystal.” |
| <i>Keseeph</i> | Silver | “silver.” |
| <i>Kethem,</i> | Virgin Gold | ”gold.” |
| <i>Krustallos</i> | Crystal | “crystal.” |
| <i>Leshem</i> | Opal? | “figure.” |
| <i>Margarites</i> | Pearl | “pearl.” |
| <i>Marnuros</i> | Marble | “marble.” |
| <i>Melach</i> | Salt | “salt.” |
| <i>Nechash, Nechosheth</i> | Copper | “brass.” |
| <i>Nether</i> | Nitre | “nitre.” |
| <i>Nophek</i> | Emerald? | “emerald.” |
| <i>O’dem</i> | Garnet | “sardius.” |
| <i>Ophereth</i> | Lead | “lead.” |
| <i>Paldah</i> | Steel | torch.” |
| <i>Paz</i> | Refined Gold | “fine gold.” |
| <i>Pitdah</i> | Topaz? | “topaz.” |
| <i>Puk</i> | Antimony | “paint.” |
| <i>Sappheiros,</i> | sapphire | “sapphire.” |
| <i>Sardinos</i> | sapphire | “sardius.” |
| <i>Sardios</i> | Carnelian | “sardine.” |
| <i>Sardonux</i> | <i>Sardonyx</i> | “Sardonyx.” |
| <i>Shaish</i> | Alabaster | “marble.” |
| <i>Shamir</i> | Diamond | “diamond,” etc. |
| <i>Shasher</i> | Red Ochre | “vermilion.” |
| <i>Shebo</i> | Agate? | “agate.” |
| <i>Shesh</i> | White Marble | “marble.” |
| <i>Shoham</i> | Onyx? | “onyx.” |
| <i>Sidros</i> | Iron | “iron.” |
| <i>Sig</i> | Scoriae, etc | “dross.” |
| <i>Smaragdos</i> | Emerald | “emerald.” |
| <i>Sochereth</i> | Spotted Marble | “black marble.” |
| <i>Tarshish</i> | Topaz? | “bervl.” |
| <i>Theion</i> | Brimstone | “brimstone.” |
| <i>Topazion.</i> | Topaz | “topaz.” |

| | | |
|-------------------|--------------|------------|
| <i>Tsar</i> | Nodule | “flint.” |
| <i>Yahalon...</i> | Onyx? | “diamond.” |
| <i>Yashepheth</i> | Jasper | “jasper.” |
| <i>Zahab</i> | Gold | “gold.” |
| <i>Zekuketh</i> | <i>Glass</i> | “crystal.” |

See Rosenmuller, *Biblical Mineralogy and Botany* (Edinb. 1846, 12mo); Moore, *Ancient Mineralogy* (N.Y. 1834, 12mo).

Minerva

Picture for Minerva

the name of a Roman goddess, identified by the later Grecizing Romans with the Greek *Athene*, whom she greatly resembled, though, like all the old Latin divinities, there was nothing anthropomorphic in what was told concerning her. Her name is thought to spring from an old Etruscan word preserved in the roots of *mens* (the mind) and *monere* (to warn or advise); and the ancient Latin scholar and critic, Varro (ap. August. *De Civ. Dei*, 7:28), regarded her as the impersonation of divine thought — the plan of the material universe, of which Jupiter was the creator, and Juno the representative. Hence all that goes on among men, all that constitutes the development of human destiny (which is but the expression of the divine idea or intention), is under her care. She is the patroness of wisdom, arts, and sciences, the personification, so to speak, of the thinking, inventive faculty—and was invoked alike by poets, painters, teachers, physicians, and all kinds of craftsmen (Ovid, *Fast.* 3:809, etc.; August. *l.c.* 7:16). She also guides heroes in war; and, in fact, every wise idea, every bold act, and every useful design, owes something to the high inspiration of this virgin goddess (Livy, 45:33; Virgil, *AEn.* 2:615). Popular tradition accounted for her origin as follows: “She was the offspring of the brain of Jupiter, from which she issued in full armor.” She was always represented as a virgin. In war she was contradistinguished from Mars (the god of brute force) as the patroness of scientific warfare, and hence, according to the ancient poets, was always superior to him. The favorite plant of Minerva was the olive, and the animals consecrated to her were the owl and the serpent. As she was a maiden goddess, her sacrifices consisted of calves which had not borne the yoke or felt the sting (Fulgentius, page 651). She had many temples and festivals dedicated to her. Her oldest temple in Rome was that

on the Capitol. Her most popular festival was held in March, and lasted five days, from the 19th to the 23d inclusive. Minerva was popularly believed to be the inventor of musical instruments, especially wind instruments, the use of which was very important in religious worship, and which were accordingly subjected to an annual purification, which took place during the festival just alluded to (Ovid, *Fast.* 3:849).

Athene, Or Pallas Athene

the Greek goddess corresponding, as we have said, to the Roman Minerva, was one of the few truly grand *ethical* divinities of Greek mythology. Different accounts are given of her origin and parentage, probably from the jumbling together of local legends; but the best known, and, in ancient times, the most orthodox version of the myth represented her as the daughter of Zeus and Metis. Zeus, we are told, when he had attained supreme power after his victory over the Titans, chose for his first wife Metis (Wisdom); but being advised by both Uranus and Gaea (Heaven and Earth), he swallowed her, when she was pregnant with Athene. When the time came that Athene should have been born, Zeus felt great pains in his head, and caused Hephaestus (Vulcan) to split it up with an axe, when the goddess sprang forth — fully armed, according to the later stories. Throwing aside the thick veil of anthropomorphism which conceals the significance of the myth, we may see in this account of Athene's parentage an effort to set forth a divine symbol of the combination of power and wisdom. Her father was the greatest, her mother the wisest of the gods. She is literally born of both, and so their qualities harmoniously blend in her. It is possible that the constant representation of her as a strictly maiden goddess, who had a *real*, and not a merely *prudish* antipathy to marriage, was meant to indicate that qualities like hers could not be mated, and that, because she was perfect, she was doomed to virginity.

Athene is not represented, however, by the Greeks as a cold, unfeeling divinity; on the contrary, tradition will have it that she warmly and actively interested herself in the affairs of both gods and men. She sat at the right hand of Zeus, assisting by her councils. She was regarded as the patroness of poetry and oratory; agriculture also she was supposed to protect and cherish; and as a warlike divinity she was regarded as the protectress in battle of those heroes who were distinguished as well for their wisdom as their valor. Pope, in his *Temple of Fame*, alludes to her twofold character as the patroness of arts and arms, where he says:

“There Caesar, graced with both Minervas, shone.” In the Trojan war she fought for the Greeks — who, in point of fact, were in the right. The poets feigned that Neptune and Minerva disputed for the possession of Attica, which the gods promised to him or her who should produce the most useful gift to mankind. Neptune, striking the earth with his trident, produced a warhorse, and Minerva produced the olive (the symbol of peace), by which she gained the victory. She was sometimes called Pallas, Parthenos (i.e., “virgin”), Tritonia or Tritogoneia, and other names.

Her worship was universal in Greece, and representations of her in statues, busts, coins, reliefs, and vase paintings were and are numerous. She is always dressed, generally in a Spartan tunic with a cloak over it, and wears a helmet, beautifully adorned with figures of different animals, the sagis, the round argolic shield, a lance, etc. Her countenance is beautiful, earnest, and thoughtful, and the whole figure majestic. There was a celebrated statue of Minerva, called “Palladium,” which was said to have fallen from the sky. and on which the safety of Troy depended (Milman, *Hist. of Christianity*, see Index). See G. Hermann, *Dissertatio de Graeca Minerva* (1837); Hartung, *Die Religion der Rome*, 2:78 sq.; Guigniaut, *Religions de l'Antiquite*; Smith, *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology*, s.v.; Vollmer, *Mythol. Worterbuch*, s.v.; *Biographie Universelle* (Partie mythologique); Chambers, *Encyclop.* s.v.

Mingarelli, Fernando

an eminent Italian theologian, was born at Bologna in 1724. He flourished as professor of theology at the University of Malta for several years. Impaired health finally obliged his return to France. He died at Faenza December 21, 1777. He was a member of the Academy of the Arcadians. Mingarelli wrote several works; the most important are, *Vetera monumenta ad classem Ravennatam nuper eruta* (Faenza, 1756, 4to; notes of Mauro Fattorini and of Bianchi): — *Veterunm testimonia de Didynmo Alexandrino ceco, ex quibus tres libri de trinitate nuper detecti eidem asseruntur* (Rome, 1764, 4to).

Mingarelli, Giovanni Lodovico

an eminent Italian bibliographer, the elder brother of the preceding, was born at Bologna February 27, 1722. He held successively the principal offices of the congregation of the regular canons of San Salvatore. Afterwards he was a professor of Greek literature at the College della

Sapienza, at Rome. Mingarelli employed his hours of leisure in visiting the principal libraries of the great papal city, and published some important works which he thus discovered. He died at Rome March 6, 1793. We owe to him, as editor, the *Annotationes literales in Psalmos* of father Marini (Bologna, 1748-50); he added new explanations of the Psalms, which are included in the Roman liturgy, and a life of the author, the exactitude of which is praised by Tiraboschi: — *Veterum Patrum Latinorum opuscula numquam antehac edita* (Bologna, 1751): — *Sopra un' opera inedita d'un antico teologo lettera* (Venice, 1763, 12mo; and in the *Nuova Raccolta Calogerana*, tom. 11). This is a treatise on the Trinity, which Mingarelli regards as the product of the 11th century, and he ascribes its authorship to Didymus of Alexandria. There is an analysis of his dissertation in the *Journal de Bouillon*, January 1766: — *AEgyptiorum codicum reliquiae Venetiis in Bibliotheca Naniana asservatae* (ibid. 1785, 2 parts, 4to). These catalogues are greatly valued by scholars. He left a number of works in MS. form; they are now kept at Bologna. See Cavalieri, *Vita di Mingarelli* (Novara, 1817, 8vo); Tiplado, *Biographia degli Ital. illustr.* 5:59.

Mingled People

(*br[æ]reb*, a mixture), spoken of a "mixed" multitude, such as accompanied the Israelites from Egypt (⁴²²³⁸Exodus 12:38), and joined them after their return from Babylon (⁴⁶³³⁵Nehemiah 13:3); but specifically (with the def. article) of the promiscuous mass of foreign auxiliaries, e. g. of Solomon (⁴¹¹⁰⁵1 Kings 10:15), of Egypt (⁴³⁰¹⁵Ezekiel 30:5; ⁴²⁵²¹Jeremiah 25:20, 24), of Chaldaea (⁴²⁶¹⁷Jeremiah 50:37). "The phrase (*br[h; ha-ereb*), like that of the mixed multitude, which the Hebrew closely resembles, is applied in ⁴²⁵²¹Jeremiah 25:20, and ⁴³⁰¹⁵Ezekiel 30:5, to denote the miscellaneous foreign population of Egypt and its frontier-tribes, including every one, says Jerome, who was not a native Egyptian, but was resident there. The Targum of Jonathan understands it in this passage, as well as in ⁴²⁰⁰⁵Jeremiah 1:37, of the foreign mercenaries, though in ⁴²⁵²¹Jeremiah 25:24, where the word again occurs, it is rendered Arabs. It is difficult to attach to it any precise meaning, or to identify with the mingled people any race of which we have knowledge. 'The kings of the mingled people that dwell in the desert,' are the same apparently as the tributary kings (A. V. 'kings of Arabia') who brought presents to Solomon (⁴¹¹⁰⁵1 Kings 10:15); the Hebrew in the two cases is identical. These have been

explained (as in the Targum on ^{<1105>}1 Kings 10:15) as foreign mercenary chiefs who were in the pay of Solomon, but Thenius understands by them the sheiks of the border tribes of Bedouins, living in Arabia Deserta, who were closely connected with the Israelites. The ‘mingled people’ in the midst of Babylon (^{<2815>}Jeremiah 50:37) were probably the foreign soldiers or mercenary troops, who lived among the native population, as the Targum takes it. Kimchi compares ^{<0123>}Exodus 12:38, and explains *ha-ereb* of the foreign population of Babylon generally, ‘foreigners who were in Babylon from several lands,’ or it may, he says he intended to denote the merchants, *ereb* being thus connected with the **Ēbe[ny]be[ʿ]** of ^{<3727>}Ezekiel 27:27, rendered in the A.V. ‘the occupiers of thy merchandise.’ His first interpretation is based upon what appears to be the primary signification of the root **br[ʿ]**; ‘*arab*, to *mingle*, while another meaning, ‘to pledge, guarantee,’ suggested the rendering of the Targum ‘mercenaries,’ which Jarchi adopts in his explanation of ‘the kings of *ha-ereb*,’ in ^{<1105>}1 Kings 10:15, as the kings who were pledged to Solomon and dependent upon him. The equivalent which he gives is apparently intended to represent the French *garantie*. The rendering of the A.V. is supported by the Sept. **σύμμικτος** in Jeremiah, and **ἐπίμικτος** in Ezekiel.” **SEE MIXED MULTITUDE.**

Mingrelia

an Asiatic province of Russia, situated between the Black and Caspian seas, in the country formerly called Colchis. It covers a territory of 2600 square miles, inhabited by nearly 250,000 people. The country is mountainous, but is largely cultivated. Tobacco, rice, and millet are raised, and a great deal of silk, honey, and wine are produced. Mingrelia became subject to Russia in 1803, but was until 1867 governed by its own prince, called Dadian, who resided in the small town of Zoobdidee. The inhabitants of Mingrelia are generally inferior in appearance to the mountaineers of the Caucasus. We are told by travellers that they are an ignorant, superstitious, and corrupt people.

Religious Condition. — The Mingrelians are ostensibly members of the Greek Church, but their religion consists rather in outward practices and observances than in inward purity and heart devotion. Many of their practices are open to severe censure. They observe four Lents, comprehending (1) the forty-eight days before Easter; (2) the forty days before Christmas; (3) the month preceding St. Peter’s day; and (4) a Lent

devoted to the Virgin Mary, and observed for a fortnight. Their chief saint is St. George, who is also the special patron of the Georgians, the Muscovites, and the Greeks. Their worship of images is of such a description that even Romanists declare it deserving the reproach of idolatry. They offer them stags' horns, tusks of boars, pheasants' wings, and weapons, with a view of insuring a happy success to their wars and hunting expeditions. It is even said that, like the Jews, they offer bloody sacrifices, immolate victims, and, like our Western savages, feast on them in general assembly; that they kill animals at the tombs of their parents, and pour wine and oil over the graves, as the pagans did. They abstain from meat on Mondays, out of regard for the moon, and Friday is observed as a holiday. They are exceedingly thievish: theft is not regarded as a crime, but rather a proof of skill that disgraces no one; he who is caught in the act has nothing to fear beyond a trifling fine.

Introduction of Christianity. — Some ecclesiastical historians insist that the king, the queen, and the nobility of Colchis were converted to the Christian faith by a female slave, under the reign of Constantine (Socrates, lib. 1, c. 20; Sozomen, lib. 2, c. 7). Others assert that the Mingrelians were instructed in the Christian doctrines by one Cyrillus, whom the Sclavonians in their own tongue call *Chiusi*, and who is said to have lived about A.D. 806. Perhaps religion was extinguished altogether in these regions during the time that elapsed between the fifth and the ninth centuries. The Mingrelians show, on the sea-shore, near the Corax River, a large church, in which, according to their statement, St. Andrew preached; but this is to be taken “cum grano salis.” In former times the Mingrelians acknowledged the spiritual supremacy of the patriarch of Antioch; but this supremacy has been transferred to the patriarchal see of Constantinople. Nevertheless they have two primates of their own nation, whom they call *catholicos*: one for Georgia, the other for Mingrelia. There were formerly twelve bishoprics. There are only six left at the present time, the other six having been changed into abbeys. The primate or chief bishop of Mingrelia, who resides at Constantinople, makes his appearance in Mingrelia only once in his life, and then only for the purpose of consecrating the holy oil, or chrism, which the Greeks call *myron*.

The statements of some travellers respecting the treasures of the primate and the bishops of the Mingrelians, the splendor of their garments, the extortions they commit, and the enormous sums of money they exact for mass, confession, ordination, etc., are rather at variance with the

statements relating to the general poverty of the nation; there is likely to be exaggeration on both sides. What is said of the ignorance and corruption of the clergy in general may be more readily believed. The bishops who are very loose in their morals, are regarded as acceptable if they abstain from meat, strictly observe Lent, and say mass in conformity with the Greek rite. Priests are allowed to marry, not only before their ordination, but also afterwards, and even to take a second wife, with dispensation.

The observances at baptism are very peculiar. As soon as a child is born, the priest anoints his forehead, drawing a cross on it with the chrism. The baptism is deferred until the child is two years of age, when he is christened by immersion in warm water; again unctions are made on almost every part of his body; holy bread is given him to eat, and wine to drink. The priests do not stick to the traditional form of baptism, and have been known to use wine for the christening of great people's offspring.

There are in Mingrelia monks of the order of St. Basil, who are called *berres*. They are dressed like Greek monks, and do not differ from them in their manner of living. A very condemnable abuse is that parents are allowed to engage their children to this state, in their tenderest years, when they are themselves incapable of choice. There are also nuns of the same order; they wear a black veil, and observe the same fastings and abstinence as the monks; but they do not submit to claustration, and make no vows, being thus at liberty to leave the monastic state when so inclined. The cathedral churches are adorned with painted images (no rilievi), covered, it is said, with gold and gems; but the parochial churches are sadly neglected. It is asserted that the Mingrelians are in possession of quite a number of precious relics, brought to them by the Greek fugitives, after the downfall of Constantinople among others they claim to have a piece of the true cross, eight inches long; but the statements of the Greeks and the Romanists, in the matter of relics, are somewhat subject to caution. The Theatins of Italy in 1627 established a mission in Mingrelia, and so have the Capuchins in Georgia, and the Dominicans in Circassia; but the small success which attended these endeavors caused the missions to be suffered to fall into decay, and finally to be abandoned. See Dr. J. Zampi, *Relation de Mingrelie*; Cerry, *Etat present de l'Eglise Romaine*; Chardin, *Voyage de Perse*; and especially Bergier, *Dictionnaire de Theologie*, 4:347 sq.

Min'iamin

(Heb. *Minyamin*, מִינְיָמִין *from the right hand*, or perhaps corrupted from *Benjamin*), the name of two men. *SEE MIAMIN*.

1. (Sept. *Βενιαμείν* v.r. *Βενιαμίν*, Vulg. *Benjamin*.) One of the Levites (or priests) who had charge of the distribution of the sacred offerings among the families of the sacerdotal order under Hezekiah (^{<1615>}2 Chronicles 31:15). B.C. 726.

2. (Sept. *Μιαμίν*, Vulg. *Mimamin*.) One of the priests that returned with Zerubbabel from Babylon (^{<1627>}Nehemiah 12:17), and celebrated with trumpets the completion of the walls of Jerusalem (^{<1624>}Nehemiah 12:41); probably the same elsewhere called MIAMIN (^{<1625>}Nehemiah 12:5) or MIJAMIN (^{<1607>}Nehemiah 10:7).

Miniatis, Elias

an Eastern theologian and teacher, was born at Liguri, Cephalonia, in 1669, and was educated at Venice. He filled offices as public instructor, and became afterwards clergyman at Constantinople, Corfu, and the Peloponnesus, and was finally bishop of Calaoryta. He died in 1714. His works are: *Πέτρα σκανδάλου* (Leipsic, 1718), a treatise on the schism between the Greek and Latin churches: a Latin and German version of it was published at Leipsic in 1843, and at Vienna in 18838: *Διδαχαὶ εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν καὶ μεγάλην Τεσσαρακοστὴν καὶ εἰς ἄλλας ἐπιστήμους ἑορτάς* (Venice, 1727, and often).

Miniato (Or Minias), St.,

an Armenian prince, who belonged to the Roman army, and served under Decius. When that emperor was encamped outside the city of Florence, according to the Florentine legend, this saint was denounced as a Christian, and condemned to be thrown to the beasts of the amphitheatre. A panther was first set upon him, but the saint was delivered from him in answer to his prayers. He was then hanged, put in boiling oil, and stoned, without being destroyed, for an angel descended to comfort him, and clothed him in a garment of light. Finally he was beheaded. It is said that this severe measure was executed in A.D. 254. Miniato is represented dressed as a prince, with scarlet robe and a crown. His attributes are the palm, the lily, and javelins.

Miniature

is a picture illustrating the text of a MS.; so called because filling up the outline sketched in vermilion (*minimum*).

Minims

(*ordo fratarum minimorum S. Francisci den Paula*), a religious order in the Church of Rome, founded by St. Francis de Paula, of Calabria, in the year 1453. The new order was called at first *Hermits of St. Francis* (*Eremita Minimoarum Firatrum S. Francisci de Paula*).

Pope Sixtus IV, in 1474, confirmed the statutes of the order, thus uniting them in conventual order, and named Francis superior-general. He enjoined on his disciples a total abstinence from flesh, wine, and fish; besides which they were always to go barefoot, and not permitted to quit their habit and girdle night or day. Their habit is a coarse, black woollen stuff, with a woollen girdle of the same color, tied in five knots. The order increased rapidly; it gained many disciples, especially in France, where Francis was in high favor with Louis XI, Charles VIII, and Louis XII. Many houses of the order were established throughout the kingdom, and the friars themselves were called *les bons hommes* (*Boni homines*). In Spain they also gained influence, Ferdinand the Catholic building their first monastery for them at Malaga. A new name, "the Fathers of Victory," was bestowed upon them, because Ferdinand believed that only by their prayerful intercession Malaga had been captured from the Moors. In 1497 the emperor Maximilian called them to Germany, and founded three monasteries for the order.

For a long time the order had no special rules and regulations, the example of the superior-general serving as a pattern. In 1493 Franciscus finished his threefold rules, and they were confirmed by pope Alexander VI. Humility and repentance, poverty, fasting, praying, and silence form the principal features of these ascetic rules, and Franciscus called his brethren "*Minimos Fratres*." This name was given them because they should be "the least among the brethren," and Christ's words (⁴¹⁵⁴Matthew 25:40), "Quamdiu fecistis uni de his fratribus meis minimis, mihi fecistis," should have a peculiar reference to them. The austerity of the rules is particularly great in the selection of food. The brethren are debarred not only the use of meat, but also of eggs, butter, milk, and cheese. In 1493 Franciscus also instituted a female order of *Minims*, and subjected it to the guidance of the older order.

The order is at present divided into thirty-one provinces, of which twelve are in Italy, eleven in France and Flanders, seven in Spain, and one in Germany. In the beginning of the last century the order had about 450 convents. At present their number has greatly decreased. The Minims have passed even into the Indies, where there are some convents which do not compose provinces, but depend immediately on the general. Their principal house is at Rome. The superior of each male body is called *corrector*; that of each female body, *correctrix*; the superior of the order is called *generalis corrector*. There are now but few houses for female Minims, The tertiaries of the order are secular persons; but while they are not obliged to retire from society, they are required to observe the abstinence from meat, etc. They have also correctors and correctrices, and are subject to the order of the general corrector. Their distinguishing mark is a girdle with only two knots. See Bonanni, *Verz. der geistlichen Ordenisleute*, 2:58 sq.; Wetzter und Welte, *Kirchen-Lexikon*, 6:152; Herzog, *Real-Encyclopeddie*, 9:538. (J.H.W.)

Minister

one who acts as the less (from *minus* or *minor*) or inferior agent, in obedience or subservience to another, or who serves, officiates, etc., as distinguished from the *master*, *magister* (from *magis*), or superior. It is used in the A.V. to describe various officials of a religious and civil character. The words so translated in the Scriptures are the following:

1. **trwm]** *meshareth*’, which is applied,

(1) to an attendant upon a person in high rank, as to Joshua in relation to Moses (^{<1243>}Exodus 24:13, Sept. **παρεστηκὼς αὐτῷ**; Aquila and Symm. **ὁ λειτουργὸς αὐτοῦ**; comp. ^{<1231>}Exodus 33:11, Sept. **θεράπων Ἰησοῦς**; ^{<1418>}Numbers 11:28; ^{<1001>}Joshua 1:1, Sept. **ὑπουργὸς Μωυσῆ**; Alex. **λιτουργός**), and to the attendant on the prophet Elisha (^{<1043>}2 Kings 4:43; 6:15, Sept. **λειτουργός**; comp. ^{<1001>}2 Kings 3:11; ^{<1122>}1 Kings 19:21);

(2) to the *attaches* of a royal court (^{<1105>}1 Kings 10:5 [Sept. **λειτουργός**, where, it may be observed, they are distinguished from the “servants” or officials of higher rank **db]**, a more general term, Sept. **παῖς**], answering to our *ministers*, by the different titles of the chambers assigned to their use, the “sitting” of the servants meaning rather their *abode*, and the “attendance” of the ministers the ante-room in which they were stationed);

persons of high rank held this post in the Jewish kingdom (¹⁴²¹⁸2 Chronicles 22:8); and it may be in this sense, as the attendants of the King of kings, that the term is applied to the angels in ¹⁹⁴³²Psalms 103:21 (**λειτουργοί**); comp. ¹⁹⁴⁰⁴Psalms 104:4 (³⁰⁰⁷Hebrews 1:7; and see Stuart's *Comment.* ad loc.);

(3) to the priests and Levites, who are thus described by the prophets and later historians (²⁴³²¹Jeremiah 33:21; ²⁶⁴¹¹Ezekiel 44:11; ²⁹⁰⁰⁹Joel 1:9,13; ¹⁵⁸¹⁷Ezra 8:17; ¹⁶⁰¹⁶Nehemiah 10:36), though the verb, whence *meshareth* is derived, is not uncommonly used in reference to their services in the earlier books (¹²²⁸³Exodus 28:43; ⁴⁰¹³¹Numbers 3:31; ¹⁵⁸¹⁵Deuteronomy 18:5, etc.). Persons thus designated sometimes succeeded to the office of their principal, as did Joshua and Elisha. Hence the term is used of the Jews in their capacity as a sacred nation, "Men shall call you the ministers of our God" (²³⁰¹⁶Isaiah 61:6).

2. **hl P]pelach'** (Chald.), ¹⁵¹²⁴Ezra 7:24, "minister" of religion, **λειτουργός** (comp. ἵ | ρ, verse 19), though he uses the word **μυτρημ** in the same sense, ch. 8:17. In the N.T. we have three terms, each with its distinctive meaning.

3. **Λειτουργός**, a term derived from **λείτον ἔργον**, "public work," and the *leitourgia* was the name of certain personal services which the citizens of Athens and some other states had to perform gratuitously for the public good. From the sacerdotal use of the word in the N.T., it obtained the special sense of a "public divine service," which is perpetuated in our word "liturgy." The verb **λειτουργεῖν** is used in this sense in ⁴⁴¹¹²Acts 13:2. It answers most nearly to the Hebrew *meshareth*, and is usually employed in the Sept. as its equivalent. It betokens a subordinate public administrator, whether civil or sacerdotal, and is applied in the former sense to the magistrates in their relation to the divine authority (¹⁵¹¹⁶Romans 13:6), and in the latter sense to our Lord in relation to the Father (¹⁵⁸¹²Hebrews 8:2), and to St. Paul in relation to Jesus Christ (¹⁵¹¹⁶Romans 15:16), where it occurs among other expressions of a sacerdotal character, "ministering" (**ἱερουργοῦντα**), "offering up" (**προσφορά**, etc.). In all these instances the original and special meaning of the word, as used by the Athenians, namely, with respect to those who administered the public offices (**λειτουργία**) at their own expense (Bockh, *Staatshaush. der Athener*, 1:480; 2:62; Potter's *Gr. Ant.* 1:85), is preserved, though this comes, perhaps, yet more distinctly forward in the cognate terms **λειτουργία** and

λειτουργεῖν applied to the sacerdotal office of the Jewish priest (^{<400B>}Luke 1:3; ^{<802B>}Hebrews 9:21; 10:11), to the still higher priesthood of Christ (^{<808B>}Hebrews 8:6), and in a secondary sense to the Christian priest who offers up to God the faith of his converts (^{<8017>}Philippians 2:17, λειτουργία τῆς πίστεως), and to any act of public self-devotion on the part of a Christian disciple (^{<5127>}Romans 15:27; ^{<4012>}2 Corinthians 9:12; ^{<1880>}Philippians 2:30).

4. The second Greek term, ὑπηρέτης, differs from the two others in that it contains the idea of actual and personal attendance upon a superior. Thus it is used of the attendant in the synagogue, the זָיָה ; *chazan*, of the Talmudists (^{<040>}Luke 4:20), whose duty it was to open and close the building, to produce and replace the books employed in the service, and generally to wait on the officiating priest or teacher (Carpzov, *Apparat.* p. 314). It is similarly applied to Mark, who, as the attendant on Barnabas and Saul (^{<4135>}Acts 13:5), was probably charged with the administration of baptism and other assistant duties (De Wette, *ad loc.*); and again to the subordinates of the high-priests (^{<3072>}John 7:32,45; 18:3, etc.), or of a jailor (^{<4025>}Matthew 5:25= ^{<0258>}πράκτωρ in ^{<0258>}Luke 12:58; ^{<4422>}Acts 5:22). Josephus calls Moses τὸν ὑπηρέτην θεοῦ (*Ant.* 3:1,4). Kings are so called in *Wisd.* 6:4. The idea of *personal attendance* comes prominently forward in ^{<0012>}Luke 1:2; ^{<0316>}Acts 26:16, in both of which places it is alleged as a ground of trustworthy testimony (“*ipsi viderunt, et, quod plus est, ministrarunt,*” Bengel). Lastly, it is used interchangeably with διάκονος in ^{<4041>}1 Corinthians 4:1, comp. with 3:5, but in this instance the term is designed to convey the notion of subordination and humility. In all these cases the etymological sense of the word (ὑπὸ ἑρέτης) comes out. It primarily signifies an *under-rower* on board a galley, of the class who used the longest oars, and consequently, performed the severest duty, as distinguished from the θρανίτης, the rower upon the upper bench of the three, and from the ναῦται, sailors, or the ἐπιβάται, marines (Dem. 1209, 11, 14; comp. also 1208, 20; 1214, 23; 1216, 13; Pol. 1:25, 3); hence in general a hand, agent, minister, attendant, etc. The term that most adequately represents it in our language is “attendant.”

5. The third Greek term, διάκονος, is the one usually employed in relation to the ministry of the Gospel: its application is twofold, in a general sense to indicate ministers of any order, whether superior or inferior, and in a special sense to indicate an order of inferior ministers. In the former sense

we have the cognate term **διακονία** applied in ^{<401>}Acts 6:1, 4, both to the ministration of tables and to the higher ministration of the Word, and the term **διάκονος** itself applied, without defining the office, to Paul and Apollos (^{<4015>}1 Corinthians 3:5), to Tychicus (^{<402>}Ephesians 6:21; ^{<5047>}Colossians 4:7), to Epaphras (^{<5007>}Colossians 1:7), to Timothy (^{<5082>}1 Thessalonians 3:2), and even to Christ himself (^{<5158>}Romans 15:8; ^{<8017>}Galatians 2:17). In the latter sense it is applied in the passages where the **διάκονος** is contradistinguished from the bishop, as in ^{<5001>}Philippians 1:1; ^{<5088>}1 Timothy 3:8-13. The word is likewise applied to false teachers (^{<4715>}2 Corinthians 11:15), and even to heathen magistrates (^{<5134>}Romans 13:4), in the sense of a minister, assistant, or servant in general, as in ^{<4026>}Matthew 20:26. The term **διάκονοι** denotes among the Greeks a higher class of servants than the **δοῦλοι** (Athen. 10:192; see Buttm. *Lex.* 1:220; comp. ^{<4213>}Matthew 22:13, and Sept. for **trçm**, ^{<7010>}Esther 1:10; 2:2; 6:3). It is worthy of observation that the word is thus of very rare occurrence in the Sept., and then only in a general sense: its special sense, as known to us in its derivative “deacon” (q.v.) seems to be of purely Christian growth. *SEE MINISTRY.*

MINISTER is a Latin word applied in that portion of the Christian Church known as the Western to designate that officer who is styled *deacon* in Greek. The word was applied generally to the Anglican clergy about the time of the great rebellion, since which time it has come into general use, and is now applied to any preacher of the Gospel. Even the Jews have adopted the use of this word, and *rabbi* is scarcely ever heard in English-speaking congregations of that people. Ministers are also called *divines*, and may be distinguished into *polemic*, or those who possess controversial talents; *casuistic*, or those who resolve cases of conscience; *experimental*, those who address themselves to the feelings, cases, and circumstances. of their hearers; and, lastly, *practical*, those who insist upon the performance of all those duties which the Word of God enjoins. An able minister will have something of all these united in him, though he may not excel in all; and it becomes every one who is a candidate for the ministry to get a clear idea of each, that he may not be deficient in the discharge of that work which is the most important that can be sustained by mortal beings. Many volumes have been written on this subject, but we must be content in this place to offer only a few remarks relative to it.

1. In the first place, then, it must be observed that ministers of the Gospel ought to be *sound as to their principles*. They must be men whose hearts

are renovated by divine grace, and whose sentiments are derived from the sacred oracles of divine truth. A minister without principles will never do any good; and he who professes to believe in a system should see to it that it accords with the Word of God. His mind should clearly perceive the beauty, harmony, and utility of the doctrines, while his heart should be deeply impressed with a sense of their value and importance.

2. *They should be mild and as fable as to their dispositions and deportment.* A naughty, imperious spirit is a disgrace to the ministerial character, and generally brings contempt. They should learn to bear injuries with patience, and be ready to do good to every one be courteous to all without cringing to any; be affable without levity, and humble without pusillanimity; conciliating the affections without violating the truth; connecting a suavity of manners with a dignity of character; obliging without flattery; and throwing off all reserve without running into the opposite extreme of volubility and trifling.

3. *They should be superior as to their knowledge and talents.* Though many have been useful without what is called learning, yet none have been so without some portion of knowledge and wisdom. Nor has God Almighty ever sanctified ignorance, or consecrated it to his service; since it is the effect of the fall, and the consequence of our departure from the fountain of intelligence. Ministers therefore, especially, should endeavor to break these shackles, get their minds enlarged, and stored with all useful knowledge. The Bible should be well studied, and that, especially, in the original languages. The scheme of salvation by Jesus Christ should be well understood, with all the various topics connected with it. - And in the present day a knowledge of history, natural philosophy, logic, mathematics, and rhetoric is peculiarly requisite. A clear judgment, also, with a retentive memory, inventive faculty, and a facility of communication, should by obtained.

4. *They should be diligent as to their studies.* Their time, especially, should be improved, and not lost by too much sleep, formal visits, indolence, reading useless books, studying useless subjects. Every day should have its work, and every subject its due attention. Some advise a chapter in the Hebrew Bible, and another in the Greek Testament, to be read every day. A well-chosen system of divinity should be accurately studied. The best definitions should be obtained, and a constant regard paid to all those studies which savor of religion, and have some tendency to public work.

- 5. Ministers should be extensive as to their benevolence and candor.** A contracted, bigoted spirit ill becomes those who preach a Gospel which breathes the purest benevolence to mankind. This spirit has done more harm among all parties than many imagine, and is, in our opinion, one of the most powerful engines the devil makes use of to oppose the best interests of mankind; and it is really shocking to observe how sects and parties have all, in their turns, anathematized each other. Now, while ministers ought to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints, they must remember that men always think differently from each other; that prejudice of education has great influence; that difference of opinion as to subordinate things is not of such importance as to be a ground of dislike. Let the ministers of Christ, then, pity the weak, forgive the ignorant, bear with the sincere though mistaken zealot, and love all who love the Lord Jesus Christ.
- 6. Ministers should be zealous and faithful in their public work.** The sick must be visited, children must be catechised, the ordinances administered, and the Word of God preached. These things must be taken up, not as a matter of duty only, but of pleasure, and executed with faithfulness; and, as they are of the utmost importance, ministers should attend to them with all that sincerity, earnestness, and zeal which that importance demands. An idle, frigid, indifferent minister is a pest to society, a disgrace to his profession, an injury to the Church, and offensive to God himself.
- 7. Lastly, ministers should be-consistent as to their conduct.** No brightness of talent, no superiority of intellect, no extent of knowledge, will ever be a substitute for this. They should not only possess a luminous mind, but set a good example. This will procure dignity to themselves, give energy to what they say, and prove a blessing to the circle in which they move. In time, they should be men of prudence and prayer, light and love, zeal and knowledge, courage and humility, humanity and religion.

See Dr. Smith, *Lecture on the Sacred Office*; Gerard, *Pastoral Care*; Macgill, *Address to Young Clergymen*; Massillon, *Charges*; Baxter, *Reformed Pastor*; Herbert, *Country Parson*; Burnet, *Pastoral Care*; Dr. Edwards, *Preacher*; Mason, *Student and Pastor*; Brown, *Address to Students*; Mather, *Student and Preacher*; Ostervald, *Lectures on the Sacred Ministry*; Robinson, *Claude*; Doddridge, *Lectures on Preaching*; Miller, *Letters on Clerical Manners*; Burder, *Hints*; Ware, *Lecture on the Connection of Pulpit Eloquence and the Pastoral Care*; *Christ. Examiner*;

Plumer, *Pastoral Theology*; Tyng, *Office and Duty of a Christian Pastor*; Bridge, *Christian Ministry*; Kidder, *The Christian Pastorate*; Townsend, *Tongue and Sword*; *Presb. Qu. and Princet. Rev.* 1854, pages 386, 708; 1859, pages 15, 366; January 1873, art. 6 and 7; *Universalist Qu.* October 1872, art. 7; Kitto, *Journal*, April 1853, page 192; *Meth. Quar. Review*, July 1851, page 430. **SEE MINISTRY.**

Minister of the Altar

was a title applied in the Church of Rome, since the close of the 12th century, to the provider of pure bread, wine, and water for the mass. The *ministrant*, as he is called by the clergy, also responds to the prayers and benedictions. Originally a clerk, deacon, or subdeacon was delegated for this position, but now the duty is assigned to boys, except on unusually solemn and festive occasions.

Ministerial Call

a term used to denote that right or authority which a person receives to preach the Gospel. This call is considered as twofold: *divine* and *ecclesiastical*. The following things seem essential to a divine call: 1. A holy blameless life; 2. An ardent and constant inclination and zeal to do good; 3. Abilities suited to the work: such as knowledge, aptness to teach, courage, etc.; 4. An opportunity afforded in Providence to be useful. The Methodists hold that no man should seek to enter the ministerial ranks who does not feel especially called to preach the Gospel. They are quite decided on this point. An *ecclesiastical* call consists in the election which is made of any person to be a pastor. But here those governed by an episcopacy differ from the Presbyterians, Baptists, Congregationalists, etc.; the former believing that the choice and call of a minister rest with the superior clergy, or those who have the gift of an ecclesiastical benefice; the latter teaching that it should rest on the suffrage of the, people to whom he is to minister. **SEE EPISCOPACY; SEE ORDINATION.**

Ministerial Education

It is rather an inference than a demonstrable historical fact that in the Levitical cities of the Jews schools were maintained for the instruction of priests and Levites in the knowledge and ceremonies of the law. **SEE EDUCATIONS.** It is certain, however, that under Samuel "schools of the prophets" were established for the purpose of training men for the high

function of moral and spiritual teaching. Not less than five such schools are named in sacred history; one at Naioth, one at Bethel, one at Jericho, one at Gilgal, and another at Mount Ephraim. The number of the sons of the prophets was often large. Obadiah hid one hundred of them in a cave to save them from the malice of Jezebel, and at the translation of Elijah fifty of the sons of the prophets were present to witness the wonderful scene.

At a subsequent period of Jewish history a species of schools came into vogue, known as the “assemblies of the wise.” The Talmud mentions some twelve of these institutions, of which those at Tiberias and Jerusalem were the most celebrated. Nevertheless they were not exclusively for the education of the priests, but also of elders and teachers. When Jesus the Christ appeared among men, no inconsiderable portion of his ministry was employed in the instruction and training of his disciples in a kind of peripatetic school, of which he was the great Teacher, as he went about doing good and explaining the things of the kingdom of God. From the Acts and the Epistles it is evident that the apostles imitated their divine Lord in giving personal attention to the instruction of younger disciples designed to succeed them in the holy vocation. As the great Head of the Church had commanded his disciples to “go teach all nations,” so Paul, in handing down his apostolical responsibility to the future Church, exhorts Timothy and his successors in this language: “The things that thou hast heard of me among many Witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also” (~~2~~ Timothy 2:2).

In harmony with such examples and precepts, it is recorded, in the early history of the Church, that the apostle John spent his advanced years at Ephesus in qualifying youth for the Christian ministry, that Mark founded a ministerial school at Alexandria, and Polycarp another at Smyrna. Subsequently, similar schools were established at Caesarea, in Palestine; at Antioch, Laodicea, Nicomedia, Athens, Edessa, Nisibis in Mesopotamia, Seleucia, Rome, and Carthage. Less distinguished than these were many episcopal schools connected with the prominent dioceses of the ancient Church. In some of the better periods and phases of monasticism conventual schools were established, in which young ecclesiastics were qualified as missionaries and teachers for the tribes and nations, to which they were sent forth. Prominent among these were the schools at Iona, at Bangor, in Wales, and Armagh, in Ireland. During the mediaeval period the Waldenses, although few in number and obscure in their seclusion, required

all their candidates for the ministry to be diligent students, prescribing to them a course of study, and testing them by specific examinations.

The schools of Charlemagne, and the various universities founded in sequence of the Crusades, appear to have contemplated primarily, though not exclusively, the instruction of ecclesiastics. The University of Prague and that of Strasburg are celebrated for their aid to religion and the diffusion of piety in the Church. Nor must Paris be omitted. All these institutions exerted their influence for the purifying of Christian doctrine, not only at home, but abroad. We need but mention, the names of John Huss and Jerome of Prague; and here let us not forget John Wickliffe, who labored so faithfully at Oxford, and instilled English students with those principles that gave life to the Reformation. D'Aubigne says: "The first rays of the sun from on high gilded with their fires at once the Gothic colleges at Oxford and the antique schools at Cambridge." During the Reformatory period, the Continental universities became the main agencies for the spread of the new doctrines. Wittenberg, then but recently founded, became the nursery, the citadel, of the Protestants. The lecture-rooms of the Reformers were their principal pulpits; and, as has been declared by Melancthon in his *Life of Luther*, the great cause owes its success to the universities. The University of Heidelberg heard with joy the lectures of the exile Reuchlin. Witteberg was the starting-point of the great Reformer himself, and from all Europe students flocked thither to sit at the feet of the immortal Melancthon. All the leaders of the new cause, in short, were university men — most of them professors, who diffused their opinions through attentive listeners. Calvin, first at Strasburg, and later, aided by Beza, at Geneva, exerted an influence chiefly through the famous schools with which he was connected. Fleury says, in his *Life of Calvin*: "He was indebted to the academy (at Geneva), which soon became greatly frequented, for the rapid diffusion of his doctrines in Germany, Holland, and France." In passing, we may remind our readers also of those university laborers, the ardent servants for the Christian cause, Erasmus of Paris, OEcolampadius of Strasburg, Peter Martyr and Martin Bucer of Oxford and Cambridge, and Arminius of Leyden.

From those days to the present all complete universities had had faculties of theology of greater or less extent. Their character and influence we shall consider in an article on *Theological Education* (q.v.). We confine ourselves for the present to a review of the educational advantages offered by the various religious organizations independent of the state; and as even

such are in Europe subject to more or less state aid, we shall consider here only those of religious bodies in the United States of America, but mainly in so far as they have in view the instruction of ministers.

In the colonial days of this country's history the ministers were, with few exceptions, men who had been trained for the work in Europe, and in a majority of cases were skilled laborers in the vineyard before they left the old country. It has been estimated that there was in the New England colonies, twenty years after the landing of the Pilgrims, a graduate of college for every 240 inhabitants. A few of these graduates were employed in the civil administration of the colonies, but most of them were in the ministry. As the population increased, it became necessary to supply the ministry from the rising generation. For this purpose, and this mainly, the university at Cambridge was founded in 1636, and as its motto was chosen "Christo et ecclesiae" (*To Christ and the Church*). Amid much sacrifice and denial this school was started, and for years, yea, decades, as new churches were planted, or as the early ministers passed away by death, the ministerial office was supplied, in great measure, from among the graduates of the infant college. 'More than half of its graduates, during the first century of its existence, entered into the labors of the ministry. Cotton Mather, in his *Magnolia*, furnishes a list of the New England churches in 1696, from which it appears that of the 129 pulpits supplied by 116 pastors, 107 of the preachers were graduates of Harvard College. In the charters of several of the oldest colleges it is declared that *virtue and religion* are the principal objects for the founding of these higher institutions of learning. "The Virginians have souls to be saved" was the plea presented by the pioneers in 1693, when the college was asked for Virginia; "and though the chancellor cursed their souls, saying, 'Let them raise tobacco,' William and Mary granted both a charter and money to the college which still bears their name." In a few generations all the leading churches, as they grew and found a need for training-schools to supply the ministry, founded colleges, until at present full four hundred chartered *Christian colleges* have grown into life as the outward material expression of the Christian zeal within American bosoms. What is peculiarly strange about American colleges is that all of them have felt more or less constrained to consecrate their work to religion. "Secular and state colleges, so called, many of them, surpass those under denominational control in their vigorous appeals to the religious feelings of the people." Placing some eminent worker of the Christian Church in the presidency,

they install the Word of God in the daily college prayers. They require all the students to attend church each Sabbath. They have daily prayer-meetings among the students. These students generally attend Sabbath-schools. The Greek Testament is read in the college lessons. The evidences of Christianity are taught in the classes. Free tuition and other inducements are offered to attract candidates for the ministry to these institutions. Revival measures are introduced. All the means of grace known to the evangelical churches are used as regularly, as frequently, as earnestly in the colleges as they are in any of the congregations. Of late years, the Church, working unitedly under the auspices of the "Evangelical Alliance," has appointed a day of prayer to be observed once annually now on the last Thursday in January and many have 'been the conversions and fruits for the ministry. It is asserted by those who have carefully searched the records of our colleges that nearly one third of their graduates enter the ministry. Of Amherst College, *e.g.*, it is told that "nearly half of its 'alumni,' since the beginning of its career, have become ministers of the Gospel." "Even West Point Military Academy, where they talk of war, and drill to the time of martial music every day, the cross of Jesus has won many a trophy. In one of the awakening seasons there the college chaplain was busy circulating tracts. A cadet to whom he gave a tract called soon afterwards to see him, exclaiming, 'I am a lost sinner; what must I do to be saved?' The chaplain led him gently to Jesus. The cadet was afterwards bishop Polk." Such is the religious influence upon the higher literary institutions in the United States of America.

Theological Seminaries. — Ministerial education, properly so called, was afforded to but few of the earlier preachers of this country. In the colleges no special advantages were known, except what the instructors could grant by special arrangement. Principally the custom prevailed in some churches of associating ministerial candidates as students with experienced pastors, from whom they might receive instruction in theology and pastoral duty, and to whom in turn they might render some assistance. In other churches, in which the pressure for ministerial aid was great, young and inexperienced men were associated in actual service with senior ministers, by whom they were expected to be taught. While such modes of instruction and training were the best practicable at an initial period of Church development, and, indeed, not without some intrinsic advantages, yet the increase of general education, and the necessity for more thorough study on the part of ministers, were thought to demand the establishment of a

class of institutions specially devoted to ministerial preparation and the cultivation of sacred learning.

The history of this class of institutions in the United States is limited to the present century, with the single exception of a Roman Catholic seminary in Baltimore, founded in 1791. The first theological seminary of the Congregationalists, that of Andover, was founded in 1807. The dates at which the other principal denominations followed these examples are as follows: The Presbyterians at Princeton in 1812; the Protestant Episcopalians at New York in 1817; the Baptists at Hamilton, N.Y., in 1820; the Methodists at Newbury, Vermont, in 1843 consolidated with Concord, N.H., in 1847.

The extent to which institutions for ministerial education have since been multiplied is indicated by the following summary, given in the report of the United States commissioner of education for 1886-7.

| Denomination. | Number of Institutions. | | Number of Instructors. | Number of Students. |
|----------------------|-------------------------|------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| Roman Catholic | 20 | 140 | 646 | |
| Presbyterian | 14 | 81 | 739 | |
| Baptist | 18 | 101 | 1011 | |
| Protestant Episcopal | 12 | 68 | 286 | |
| Methodist Episcopal | 13 | 101 | 655 | |
| Congregational | 11 | 65 | 378 | |
| Lutheran | 14 | 59 | 1013 | |
| Reformed | 6 | 21 | 95 | |
| Christian | 6 | 19 | 229 | |
| Minor sects | 25 | 36 | 987 | |
| Total | 139 | 691 | 6039 | |

Of the influence of this class of institutions as a whole, it may be said that it is greatly conducive to the advancement of sacred learning. By the accumulation of libraries, by the classification of studies, by the devotion of able men to special departments, more thorough instruction is provided, and students are enabled to secure, within limited periods, a more thorough acquaintance with the various branches of theological science than would be possible by any form of isolated or individual effort. (D.P.K.)

Educational Aid Societies. — In this connection a word must be said about the many educational societies founded by the various religious bodies to aid young men financially during their preparations for the sacred office of the ministry. The amount of work accomplished by these agencies may be estimated by reference to the following items: The American Education Society (including the parent society at Boston and its Presbyterian branches), since its formation in the year 1815, has raised and expended in the work of ministerial education not far from \$2,000,000. It has afforded aid to over 5000 young men in their course of education for the ministry. The amount raised by this society for one year was \$38,914, and the number of young men assisted for the same year was 432. The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions since its formation has sent out into the great foreign mission field not far from 500 ordained ministers. Of these over one half have been beneficiaries of the American Education Society. About one third of the Congregational ministers of New England at the present time were aided in their education by this society, while more than one third of that large body of men who have labored so efficiently in connection with the Home Missionary Society were raised up in the same way. The Board of Education of the Presbyterian Church (Old School) has since its formation furnished aid to about 2200 young men. How many of these men have been employed in foreign and home missionary service we have no means at hand for determining. The amount raised by this board from year to year for the purposes of ministerial education is not far from \$50,000, and the number of young men now assisted yearly is but little less than 400. There is also an Education Society in connection with the Baptist churches, which has rendered efficient aid in the same great work. In the Methodist Episcopal Church this agency has assumed such vast importance that special provision was made for a "Board of Education" during the American Centennial of Methodism, and there is now (1874) a fund of \$100,000, the interest of which is annually expended to aid candidates for the Methodist ministry. There are also educational societies for the same purpose in connection with most of the Annual Conferences. Even the non-evangelical churches support such agencies. See Knight, *Utility of Theol. Seminaries*; Kentish, *Importance of Min. Education*; Clarke (Adam), *Letter to a Preacher*; Mason, *Student and Pastor*; Raike, *Remarks on Clerical Education*; *New-Englander*, 1:126; *Eclectic Rev.* (new series), 1:99; *Princeton Rev.* 5:55; 15:587; *Christian Examiner*, 11:84; *Amer. Bible Repository*, 9:474; 11:187; 2d series, 8:444; 10:462; *Evangel.* (Luth.) *Qu. Rev.* 1868, July; *Meth. Qu. Rev.* July 1845, art. 2; January

1872, page 94; *Theol. Medium (Cumberland Presbyt. Rev.)*, January 1873, art. 1.

Ministerium

is a term applied to an ecclesiastical body within the pale of the Lutheran Church. It is composed only of ordained ministers, and transacts business pertaining only to the interests of the ministry, such as the *examination*, *licensure*, and *ordination of candidates* for the ministry. “This is the specific and chief business of the ministerium. It also, when necessary, examines and decides charges of heresy against any of its own members, and may, by appeal, act in the cause of a layman charged with heresy — but only by appeal ‘from the decision of a Church Council.’” It will thus be seen that the business transacted by the ministerium is of a special and definite character; and to preclude any attempt to go beyond this, it is expressly provided that “all business not specifically intrusted to the ministerium... shall belong to the synod.” Of late efforts have been made, especially in this country, to abolish the ministerium, and to transfer its power to the synod, in order that the lay members of the Church may have a voice in the management of the affairs now within the jurisdiction of the ministerium; and this demand has been made upon the ground that the Lutheran Church has suffered more from heresy and immorality in her ministry than other churches, because the minister is amenable only to his clerical brethren. See an able discussion on this subject in the *Quarterly Review of the Evangelical Luth. Church*, January 1873, art. 5.